

# Legislative Council,

Thursday, 20th September, 1928.

	PAGE
Question: Technical education ... ..	826
Bills: Education, report ... ..	826
Forests Act Amendment, 2R. ... ..	826
Dried Fruits Act Amendment, 1R. ... ..	829
Abattoirs Act Amendment, 1R. ... ..	829
Navigation Act Amendment, 2R., Com., report	829
Electoral Act Amendment, 2R. ... ..	829
Kulja Eastward Railway, 2R. ... ..	832

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

## QUESTION—TECHNICAL EDUCATION.

Hon. E. H. H. HALL asked the Chief Secretary: 1, As printed copies of the report made by Mr. Nangle on technical education in this State have been circulated, when will copies be made available to members of this House? 2, As the evidence discloses the fact that the principal reason for the inquiry into technical education in this State was the appointment of a clerical officer of the Public Service as superintendent, and that of a school teacher as inspector, will the Minister give an assurance that the position of superintendent, or acting director, will be given only to an applicant possessing a university degree in engineering or architecture? 3, Do the Government intend to adopt the recommendations made by Mr. Nangle? 4, On what date does the Director of Technical Education commence his leave prior to severing his connection with the service? 5, What arrangements, if any, have been made to fill his position?

The CHIEF SECRETARY replied: 1, The full report is still in the hands of the Government Printer and will be made available as soon as possible. 2, No. The question is based on an assumption which is quite wrong. 3, The recommendations will receive earnest consideration. 4, February 1, 1929. 5, The position has been advertised.

## BILL—EDUCATION.

Report of Committee adopted.

## BILL—FORESTS ACT AMENDMENT.

Second Reading.

**THE CHIEF SECRETARY** (Hon. J. M. Drew—Central) [4.36] in moving the second reading said: This Bill comes up every year. During the last few years it has provided for a sum equal to 10 per cent. of the net revenue from sandalwood, or £5,000—whichever is the greater—to be set aside for the re-growth of sandalwood. On this occasion the Bill comes up in a different form. There is no provision for any money to be set aside for the re-growth of sandalwood for the year ending 30th June, 1929. The reason why such a provision is not made is that in the past the Conservator of Forests has had more money than he could wisely use, and he has in hand accumulated balances amounting to £7,127 2s. 11d. Since the Act was amended for the purpose of setting aside 10 per cent. of the net revenue from sandalwood, not in any one year has there been spent the amount made available to the Conservator under this legislation. I have here a statement showing the receipts and expenditure from 1st July, 1924, to 30th June, 1928. It reads as follows:—

### Sandalwood Trust Fund.

Statement of receipts and expenditure from 1st July, 1924, to 30th June, 1928.

Receipts.			
		£	s. d.
1924-25	.. .. .	5,009	19 0
1925-26	.. .. .	5,100	0 0
1926-27	.. .. .	4,900	0 0
1927-28	.. .. .	5,009	4 6
		£20,010	3 6
1928. July 1st:	To bal-		
	ance in hand	£7,127	2 11
Expenditure.			
		£	s. d.
1924-25	.. .. .	1,647	10 6
1925-26	.. .. .	3,269	5 7
1926-27	.. .. .	3,353	8 9
1927-28	.. .. .	4,612	15 9
		£12,883	0 7
Average	.. .. .	£3,221	0 0

It should not be concluded from this statement of income and expenditure that the Conservator has been taking things easy. For he has been doing nothing of the kind. He has spared no effort, so far as I can dis-

cover, to carry out experiments on sound lines; and he has to his credit a fine record of good work in testing. Attention was first given by the Conservator to the question of securing suitable reserves within the 14-inch rainfall belt; but outside the better class wheat and grazing land no large areas available for sandalwood growing could be found. A careful study was made of the natural regeneration of sandalwood in the Eastern Goldfields. In that locality much land was obtainable free from any conflict with pastoral or other interests. Investigation showed that practically every shrub in this country was a host plant of sandalwood, and that the removal of the eucalypt timber over large areas by firewood companies operating around Kalgoorlie had allowed these shrubs to take possession and regenerate freely. Moreover, the parasitic habit of the sandalwood gave reasonable prospect of success by sowing nuts; and the young plant, shortly after germination, was able to tap a well-established root system and draw supplies from a vigorously growing host plant. To provide for control of experimental sowing, 2,100 acres have been fenced with rabbit-proof fencing and 8,000 acres with cattle-proof fencing. During the last four years 2,850 acres have been sown. A general examination of sandalwood-bearing country in the Eastern Goldfields, outside the more valuable pastoral regions there, has been carried out. This has been done with a view to ascertaining the extent of natural re-growth, and selecting areas most suitable for reforestation purposes. Areas chosen in this way have been more closely classified by strip survey to determine whether suitable host plants exist, and also whether young sandalwood is growing. As a result, 302,000 acres have been selected and gazetted as sandalwood reserves. The whole of this country is carrying an average of three to four young sandalwoods per acre, and it is anticipated that a large proportion of it will prove suitable for artificial regeneration by the sowing of sandalwood nuts. External boundaries have been surveyed, and the work of clearing a cart-track along these boundaries, to facilitate patrol operations and prevent illegal pulling by sandalwood getters working in the localities, is now nearing completion. The Conservator, in a report he has put up, summarises the position in this way—

(1) 302,000 acres have been reserved for the protection and regeneration of sandalwood in

the Eastern Goldfields districts. The selection of this country has been based on a strip survey, and only areas already carrying sufficient immature sandalwood and vigorously growing host plants to justify immediate demarcation and reservation have been included. (2) 10,000 acres have been fenced and 2,850 acres sown with sandalwood nuts. (3) Owing to a series of disappointing seasons, the results of sandalwood sowing in the 10 to 10in. rainfall belt have been inconclusive. It would appear that in order to secure satisfactory germination and allow young plants to parasitise freely, a rainfall of over 1in. per month for three consecutive months at the end of the summer is necessary. Between 1900 and 1918 these conditions occurred in eight years out of the 18, but since 1918 the only satisfactory year was 1925, when good results were secured from all seed in the ground when the rains started. Sandalwood nuts buried in the ground will retain their germinating capacity for four years. The factor which is most difficult to determine is the interval at which satisfactory seasons or germination may be expected, as meteorological data are available for a 30-year period only. The state of our knowledge does not warrant more than a continuance of large scale field experiments in sowing, and the completion of demarcation of selected reserves for the next twelve months.

Hon. Sir Edward Wittenoom: At what age is a sandalwood tree marketable?

The CHIEF SECRETARY: From my own reading, I should think at about 40 years. That is, if the tree is to be properly matured. Sometimes sandalwood is cut at the expiration of about 25 years from planting.

Hon. Sir Edward Wittenoom: Do you know what the experts think?

The CHIEF SECRETARY: No. It is clear from the remarks of the Conservator that any expenditure greater than he has undertaken would not be justified in the circumstances. In fact, he says as much in the last paragraph of the statement I have just read. Should money be required next year—and it seems probable that some will be needed—we can make ample provision for it in the next measure of this nature to be submitted to Parliament. I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

HON. J. CORNELL (South) [4.45]: The introduction of this Bill, and the history of similar measures, if they do nothing else, serve to show what a party in Opposition want, and what a party in Government are not prepared to do. The Chief Secretary confined his remarks solely to the fact that there is sufficient money in the forest fund at present for the reforestation of sandal-

wood. I have just turned up "Hansard" for 1924 and have glanced through some of the remarks that were made on the introduction of the first Bill of this sort in that year. It is safe to say the revenue derived from the royalty on sandalwood since the present Government came into office amounts to over £150,000. That sum they would never have collected had they got their way when in Opposition. For when Sir James Mitchell was Premier his Government brought down a set of regulations that more than trebled the royalty on sandalwood. The present Premier, then Leader of the Opposition, moved in the Assembly to disallow those regulations, and every one of his followers supported him. Mr. Gray in this House endeavoured to get the regulations disallowed here, when they were not disallowed in another place.

Hon. E. H. Harris: He was particularly enthusiastic, too.

Hon. J. CORNELL: He was more than enthusiastic. On the hustings it was said from a dozen platforms that, if Mr. Collier's party were elected to carry on the Government, they would endeavour to do what they had sought to do when in Opposition, namely, repeal those regulations. But the first step Mr. Collier's Government took was to ask permission to transfer the whole of the revenue derived from the royalty on sandalwood into Consolidated Revenue. The Forests Act provides that three-fifths of the revenue has to go into the forest fund. This House, because the Government were hard up at the time, agreed to give them what they had thought extraordinary when they were in Opposition, less £5,000, which was to go into a special fund for the re-growth of sandalwood. In 1925 a similar Bill came down.

Hon. G. W. Miles: The original Bill was limited to one year.

Hon. J. CORNELL: That is so. In 1925 a similar Bill came down and the Council agreed to re-enact it. In 1926 a similar Bill came down, and again the Council agreed to re-enact it. Last session another Bill came down with an alteration in phraseology in regard to the re-growth of sandalwood. Once more the Council agreed to re-enact it. On this occasion we are asked to do what we would not do in 1924, namely, give to Consolidated Revenue the whole of the royalty derived from sandalwood. I have yet to learn there

is one of those members of Parliament who, inside Parliament and out, condemned those regulations, who has endeavoured to justify himself for their maintenance since his Government came into power. There is such a thing as consistency. If the regulations were bad at their inception they are bad now. Yet there has been no attempt whatever made to get back to the old state of affairs. On the other hand, all the attempts made have been to take into Consolidated Revenue the extra royalty brought in by those regulations. It is as well that, without any carping spirit, we should make a retrospect. Political parties should endeavour to live up to at least some of their promises. One of the promises made by the party now in power was that those regulations would be repealed. But the only effect of that promise has been that a royalty has been paid and an impecunious Treasurer has granted what he thought fit to the forest fund. On four occasions the Opposition have sought to take some of the revenue derived from sandalwood and devote it to the continuity of growth of sandalwood. Now the Treasurer, who is also Minister for Forests, says there is sufficient money in hand for this year, and that the whole of the revenue from the royalty on sandalwood should be taken into Consolidated Revenue. I should like to point out, as I did in 1914, that the taking of the three-fifths of the sandalwood royalty from the forest fund is a direct breach and violation of the Forests Act. Because as you, Sir, know, the Forests Act lays it down that three-fifths of the revenue derived from forests products shall be paid into a fund to be controlled by the Conservator for reforestation and other matters. It is unreasonable to assume that in any year there is sufficient revenue in hand to provide for that year. We have just as much right to devote the royalty on jarrah to Consolidated Revenue as we have to take the royalty on sandalwood for that purpose. We are on very dangerous ground when we interfere with the Forests Act. It was more or less a dispensation of Providence that this royalty ever came about, the dispensation of Providence being the return of the present Government. It is for the House to decide whether it is going to so amend the Forests Act as fairly to lay down the line of demarcation and say that we can take the Forests Act piecemeal, and that we may

take in any given year the whole of the royalty derived from any timber and put it into Consolidated Revenue. Heretofore it has been agreed that the royalty should be used for the definite purpose of the re-growth of the timber, and that the remainder should go into the forests fund. I am not particularly concerned for the £5,000, which is really what it amounts to. I think the House would agree to re-enact the old Bill, leaving the £5,000 in the fund, whereas three-fifths of the total revenue rightly belongs to the forests fund.

On motion by Hon. H. Seddon, debate adjourned.

### BILLS (2)—FIRST READING.

1, Dried Fruits Act Amendment.

2, Abattoirs Act Amendment.

Received from the Assembly and read a first time.

### BILL—NAVIGATION ACT AMENDMENT.

#### *Second Reading.*

**THE HONORARY MINISTER** (Hon. W. H. Kitson—West) [4.59] in moving the second reading said: This is a small Bill to amend the Navigation Act of 1904. Section 31 of the Navigation Act, 1904, stated that owners of steamships were to have their vessels surveyed by shipwright and engineer surveyors "appointed under this Act." In the amendment put forward in Section 4 of the Amendment Act, No. 33 of 1926, the words "appointed under this Act" were omitted. The effect of this omission is that owners of vessels contend that they may produce declarations signed by marine surveyors appointed for purposes of Part V. of the principal Act, Sections 65-67 of which deal with the certification of marine surveyors. These surveyors are certificated in order that they may practise as consulting engineers or surveyors for cargo hatches, and insurance purposes, but not as surveyors for the purpose of annual inspection of hulls, boilers, or machinery of vessels, as in most cases these surveyors are also interested parties from the shipowner's point of view. Section 14 provides—

The Governor may appoint persons to be shipwright surveyors and engineer surveyors responsible under this Act, at such ports as he thinks desirable.

The department administering the Act and regulations has no control over these marine surveyors, whereas the surveyors "appointed under the Act" to carry out the duties of shipwright and engineer surveyors are admitted only by examination. In fact the Board of Trade have informed the State Governments that their surveyors must be appointed only by examination. It is essential that all surveyors who make declarations, on which sea-going certificates are issued, should be officers of this department appointed under Section 14 of the principal Act. The surveyors "appointed under the Act" are required to keep up to date in all Board of Trade regulations relative to the survey of vessels, which regulations are amended from time to time and despatched to the various Governments and are available only for the officers of the department. In fact the principal book of instructions to surveyors alone contains 140 printed pages of regulations which are issued as official instructions for the guidance of surveyors "appointed under the Act" only. It is not to be expected, therefore, that a marine surveyor appointed under Sections 65-67 of the Act would be as conversant with the requirements of this department and other authorities as a surveyor "appointed under the Act." I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

#### *In Committee.*

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

### BILL—ELECTORAL ACT AMENDMENT.

#### *Second Reading.*

**THE CHIEF SECRETARY** (Hon. J. M. Drew—Central) [5.6] in moving the second reading said: The object of the Bill is to provide joint rolls for the Commonwealth and State Assembly elections. On two previous occasions a measure having this objective was introduced to this House, and failed to reach the statute book. Other amendments, considered desirable by the Government, were included. But in this Bill the Government have aimed at excluding from it all matter except such as will

assist in accomplishing the object in view. In other words, it provides only for the insertion, in the Electoral Act, of a new Part (to be known as IIIA.) to permit the Government to enter into and give effect to an arrangement with the Commonwealth Government in regard to the preparation and use of joint rolls for Commonwealth and State Assembly elections. The new Part will take the place of Part III. of the principal Act, Divisions (2), (3), (4) and (5), in regard to Assembly rolls only, and the present Part III. of the principal Act will still apply to Legislative Council rolls, and I desire to emphasise this latter fact. No one can correctly term this a party measure. Any doubt on that point should be removed when it is realised that the two statutes upon which it is modelled, viz., the South Australian and Victorian Acts were introduced and carried by non-Labour Governments in 1920 and 1924 respectively. Hon. members have seen a copy of the Commonwealth-Victorian Joint Rolls Agreement of 22nd January, 1924, and this sets out the advantages which may be expected if a similar arrangement were entered into by this State. These advantages, briefly stated, are:—

(a) Common units for the purpose of registration;

(b) One claim form for enrolment or transfer, containing a declaration by the applicant that he is not disqualified for State and Commonwealth enrolment, or for either as the case may require; and

(c) The appointment of one Electoral Registrar to act for both Governments in each registration area.

Under the existing order of things applicants for the Assembly and Commonwealth franchise have to fill in two sets of forms, causing unnecessary annoyance and in some cases creating confusion which often results in persons qualified to be electors being deprived of their rights. The terms of the arrangement concluded between the Commonwealth and Victoria (1924) will bear recital and are briefly as follow:—

(a) Appointment of the same persons as Registrars under the joint control of the Chief Electoral Officers for the State and for the Commonwealth.

(b) Alteration, as found necessary and convenient, of boundaries of State Assembly Districts and of Commonwealth Subdivisions so that they may be coterminous. (This must not be taken to mean that we shall alter our boundaries to suit the Commonwealth.)

(c) Preparation of Joint Rolls—the State Rolls to form the chief basis thereof—all such Rolls to contain special footnotes and references to indicate those electors who are enrolled for State or Commonwealth only, as the case may be, due principally to a slight but unavoidable variation in the qualification of an elector for the Parliament concerned.

(d) Preparation of joint electoral forms for State and Commonwealth purposes.

(e) State Chief Electoral Officer to have the right to inspect at all reasonable times the claims received or filed at the Commonwealth Electoral Office.

(f) Commonwealth to bear all expenses, except under the following heads which shall be shared equally by the State and Commonwealth Governments—

(i) the printing and binding of joint electoral rolls and of books and forms and other printed matter used for joint electoral purposes, and the material therefor; and

(ii) special allowances to individual police officers in the form of extra remuneration, as may be jointly agreed upon.

(g) The State to make available, in the joint interest, the services of the police for the purpose of electoral inquiries and canvasses, as may be found necessary; and

(h) Termination of arrangement—12 months' notice on either side.

It will be seen that, while the arrangement should be advantageous to the State and the public, the independence of the State and Commonwealth electoral systems will, in all essentials, be fully preserved. In addition, a certain amount of economy should be effected without impairing efficiency. Probably the annual amount saved will eventually reach a total of at least £500. This, however, in the opinion of all who have given the matter consideration, is a small matter. The actual saving is not so much the question for consideration as the fact that the enrolment of electors will be greatly facilitated and simplified. It will be noted that under the proposed arrangement, the Commonwealth electoral officers will be under the control of our own Chief Electoral Officer where State rolls are concerned. This should ensure the conserving of the independence of the State electoral system. The monetary saving which is anticipated will be mainly due to doing away with duplication of registration machinery and to the lessened cost in the printing of rolls and forms. Efficiency should also be easy of achievement. The united official resources of both State and Commonwealth will be available for tracing the movements of persons eligible for enrolment. In the metropolitan area, covering our 12 most

populous electorates, and in certain gold-fields and country centres, the Commonwealth has a habitation index, under periodical review by the postmen and also a system of review by country postmasters and local agents. The State has, in addition, the assistance of State and Local Government officers and of the police, or in all, over 2,000 State electoral agents. The joint rolls, therefore, should be as accurate and as up-to-date as it is possible to make them. The actual work of registration under the joint rolls arrangement will be carried out by divisional returning officers and their clerks and 27 registrars. Let it be understood that the services of these officials, as well as those of the local Commonwealth administrative staff, will not cost the State anything. The Commonwealth is defraying the whole of the expenses involved. In the preparation of the first joint rolls, the Commonwealth will, where practicable, make the boundaries of their sub-divisions coterminous with those of our Assembly districts. But where necessary, special sub-divisions will be established until steps are taken to make all boundaries absolutely coterminous. This is, of course, essential to the smooth working of the joint rolls arrangement proposed in this Bill.

Hon. E. H. Harris: That cannot happen until 1932.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: Not absolutely; it may happen partially in the meantime. The Assembly districts, which (with present boundaries), it might be necessary to subdivide, are those of Avon, Canning, North-East Fremantle, Guildford, Irwin, Leederville, Moore, North Perth, Pingelly, Subiaco, Swan, Toodyay, Williams-Narrogin and Yilgarn—14 in all. Wherever a State electoral district does overlap a Commonwealth division, one roll will do for both Commonwealth and State. But where our State districts overlap the boundaries of a Commonwealth division, it will be necessary, as a temporary measure, to have a special sub-division in the State district and it may be necessary, even, to print a special roll in the case of such districts as Leederville, Canning, Guildford, Moore and Yilgarn.

Hon. J. Nicholson: That will make it rather complicated.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: If a Redistribution of Seats Bill is introduced in either the State or Federal Parliament,

there is provision for cognisance to be taken of the existing boundaries, and it is agreed that provision is to be made to have the boundaries coterminous as far as practicable. But it is not obligatory upon us to do so. The Commonwealth has a redistribution of seats only after a census. The last census was taken in 1921, and the alterations in the Commonwealth boundaries were made as the result. There will be no further census until 1931, and therefore it is not expected that there will be any alteration of the Commonwealth electoral boundaries before 1932. On the other hand, it is anticipated that there will be an alteration in the electoral representation in Western Australia in the near future.

Hon. G. W. Miles: Hear, hear!

The CHIEF SECRETARY: Hence in any Redistribution of Seats Bill cognisance has to be taken by the State of the existing Federal boundaries, and we are to endeavour to fit our boundaries in with the Federal boundaries.

Hon. E. H. Harris: How many do you think will coincide after that has been done?

The CHIEF SECRETARY: Does the hon. member mean after our redistribution?

Hon. E. H. Harris: Yes.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: I am not in a position to say at the present time. I wish, however, to emphasise the fact that we will not alter our boundaries just to suit the Federal boundaries; if we can conveniently alter our boundaries so as to make them coterminous, we will do so, but not otherwise. There is no necessity to alter our boundaries because of this provision where, for instance, we find that such alteration would adversely affect one of our electoral quotas. Part IIIA of the Bill is taken from the Commonwealth, Victorian and South Australian Acts and is essential to the successful working of the proposed joint roll, as the Commonwealth system of registration will then apply to both State and Commonwealth electors and must be uniform. The system does not materially differ from our own and is certainly not less liberal in its application. In submitting the Bill, I would remind the House that joint rolls, as now proposed, have been in force in Tasmania since 1909, in South Australia since 1920, and in Victoria since 1924, and they appear to have worked smoothly and efficiently.

Hon. E. H. Harris: Under their system, had they not different boundaries and systems compared with ours?

The CHIEF SECRETARY: The contentious clauses that appeared in the previous Bills have been eliminated from this measure. The title of the Bill clearly shows its object, and there is no ulterior motive behind it. I desire to impress upon hon. members in the most emphatic manner possible that uniformity of procedure in all matters covered by the Bill, is absolutely essential to the success of the joint rolls and their resultant convenience to the Assembly electors. Any amendment calculated to mar that uniformity must tend to militate against the usefulness of the Bill. I move:

That the Bill be now read a second time.

On motion by Hon. E. H. Harris, debate adjourned.

## BILL—KULJA EASTWARD RAILWAY.

### *Second Reading.*

THE HONORARY MINISTER (Hon. W. H. Kitson—East) [5.22] in moving the second reading said: The Bill authorises the construction of the Kulja eastward railway, the total length of which will be 74 miles. The route of the line is disclosed on the litho. now on the Table of the House. The area to be served comprises magnificent country and full particulars regarding it are contained in the report of the Railway Advisory Board, which report has been in the possession of the House for some time. That being so, I do not think there is any need for me to repeat its contents in justification of the Bill, except to say that I know a good deal of the country that is to be served by the railway. In my opinion, the area comprises some of the finest country we have in the State for wheat and sheep production. Settlement has taken place nearly 30 miles north of the Wyalcatchem-Lake Brown railway and if the settlers there are to make a success of their holdings, it is necessary to provide railway communication. I believe that in many instances crops in the newer portions of the settlement ranged last year as high as seven and eight bags to the acre.

Hon. J. Cornell: At Kalgariu the settlers have been carting over distances up to 48 miles for the past five years. Settlers there are established, whereas the people to be served by this railway are not.

The HONORARY MINISTER: In addition to that, there is a very large acreage of land quite suitable for wheat production within that area. The survey for the railway is in progress and has been completed for the first 20 miles. The line will be constructed on a ruling grade of one in 80, with minimum curves of not more than 20 chains. The construction of the railway is contemplated on lines similar to those adopted for the Ejangding northward railway. The rails will be 60lbs. weight; the number of sleepers per mile, 2,112; the ballasting to be done, 1,110 cubic yards; the depth of the ballasting under sleepers, four inches; and the size of the sleepers, 7ft. by 9in. by 4½in.

Hon. Sir William Lathlain: Do you intend to call for tenders for the construction of the line?

The HONORARY MINISTER: No.

Hon. V. Hamersley: What is the estimated cost of the line?

The HONORARY MINISTER: The estimated cost is £340,000. Much of the country in the vicinity of the line has been inspected by members of the Development and Migration Commission, and it is understood that they were favourably impressed. The opening up of this country represents part of the 3,500 farms scheme. The British Government have authorised an expenditure of £150,000 for the purpose of opening up this district and the area south of Southern Cross, for pioneering water supplies, and to enable railway surveys to be made. I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

HON. SIR EDWARD WITTENOOM (North) [5.27]: Before I can favourably consider the Bill, I should like to find out from the Honorary Minister how many lines, already authorised but not constructed, have priority over the Kulja eastward proposition. I consider the system of authorising the construction of railways each session and not completing them, is a bad one. In the circumstances, I wish to find out what railways that have already been authorised, have not yet been completed, before I will agree to give the Government power to proceed with the Kulja eastward railway.

HON. J. CORNELL (South) [5.28]: I shall not oppose the Kulja eastward railway because I think it is justified. It is useless putting settlers on the land unless we provide them with railway communication. For

many years now I have argued that it would be of economic advantage to all concerned if railways preceded settlement. If the Kulja line is to be constructed almost immediately after authorisation, that will practically amount to the construction of railway facilities prior to settlement. However, there is no guarantee that should we pass the Bill, the settlers will be served within any given period.

The Honorary Minister: The necessary plant is on the Ejanding line at present.

Hon. J. CORNELL: So that if the Bill is agreed to, that line will be continued on.

The Honorary Minister: Yes.

Hon. J. CORNELL: That introduces another phase. There are a number of railways that have been authorised but not constructed. One of those lines has been authorised to serve a district where settlement has extended to 52 miles from a railway and where the settlers have had to take an average haulage of 36 miles for the past five years. The Agricultural Bank trustees advanced money to the farmers there on the promise that a railway would be constructed to that centre, and advances have been made to settlers as far as 33 miles away from existing railway facilities. Two years ago the Loan Estimates contained a vote for £10,000 in connection with this particular railway that had been recommended by the Railway Advisory Board. An additional committee considered the matter and reported on the route suggested by the Railway Advisory Board. I understand that committee consisted of the Surveyor General, the Engineer-in-Chief, and Mr. McLarty of the Agricultural Bank. That committee was appointed to consider whether or not the original recommendation of the Railway Advisory Board was the right one, and they reported that it was. The Kalgarin settlers have been out there for five years and, through circumstances over which they have no control and over which I believe the Premier had no control, they have not the slightest idea when they are going to get railway facilities.

Hon. V. Hamersley: They understood that when they went there.

Hon. J. CORNELL: I can understand Mr. Hamersley's interjection. The Kulja railway will be in his province. Really, he should not vote upon it. Even if those settlers went there of their own free will, it is beside the question. I am raising my voice on behalf of those people. If there

is any set of settlers in this State who have a prior right to a railway it is the set at Kalgarin. They have a prior right over any of the people in the 3,500 farms project, and I might say that I have a farm amongst them.

Hon. J. Nicholson: Was not a railway to Kalgarin authorised?

Hon. J. CORNELL: It was definitely promised by the Premier, who had the money placed on the Estimates at the same time as the Ejanding northward and Lake Brown-Bullfinch lines were authorised. Now we find that the Ejanding northward and Lake Brown-Bullfinch lines are almost completed, and it is proposed to extend the Ejanding line to Kulja while the plant is on the spot. Meanwhile, the people of Kalgarin are left in the air. That is not right. Some definite assurance should be given them as to when the railway will be authorised. Kalgarin is as much a part of the 3,500 farms scheme as is Kulja.

Hon. E. H. Harris: It should be.

Hon. J. CORNELL: Yes, and it will be. I think Mr. Glasheen will also raise his voice on behalf of the people of Kalgarin. They have unquestionably a stronger case for railway authorisation than have any other settlers in the State. The Minister has told us that because the plant is at Kulja, that line is to be constructed. I feel sure that if something had not occurred, the Premier would have honoured his promise, and the Bill would have been introduced at the same time as the Ejanding and Lake Brown-Bullfinch lines were authorised, so that to-day the Kalgarin people would have had a railway almost as forward in construction as are the lines I have mentioned. I hope the Leader of the House, with that fairness and breadth of vision characteristic of him, will endeavour to get from the Government some assurance that the Kalgarin people will receive what is due to them and what was considered their right two years ago. They will be satisfied if they can get an indication when the line is likely to be built. At present, however, the position is so obscure that they do not know where they are. I shall not deal generally with the 3,500 farms scheme, but in passing I would say that the Kulja line is only as a straw on a camel's back as compared with the railways necessary to open up the 3,500 farms. Not only is the Kulja line needed, but railways are also required from Lake Grace to Kalgarin,



Kalgarin to Southern Cross, and from Southern Cross South-easterly to Forrestania and Salmon Gums. I have not mentioned the stretch of territory extending from Lake King to Mt. Hamilton where to-day there are at least 350 farms located. The Honorary Minister said that some of the settlers along the route of the Kulja railway are 36 miles from railway facilities. If he will take the trouble to glance at the locality of Lakes King, Camm, Fox and Carmody, he will find there are not six locations of the 350 nearer to railway facilities than 36 miles. The nearest point on those locations to a railway is between Lake Camm and Lake King, and it is 32 miles as the crow flies from Lake Bittern. Some of the settlers are 50 miles away from a railway. I think that both the Chief Secretary and the Honorary Minister will agree it is impossible under existing conditions for any settler, even if he had £1,000 behind him, to establish himself in a district where the water problem is so acute, and cart his produce 50 miles to a railway. I will support to the fullest extent any railway policy introduced by the Government, because I am satisfied that the success or failure of the 3,000 farms scheme in the territory where it is proposed to be established, with a rainfall not too secure, will be largely governed by the expedition with which settlers are given transport facilities so that they will not be wasting their time carting wheat and water long distances. If the provision of transport facilities can be expedited, there is a good chance of the 3,000 settlers making good. Otherwise I am afraid the scheme will not prove to be what some people think it will be. I support the second reading.

**HON. W. T. GLASHEEN** (South-East) [5.38]: I support the Bill. We stand for the principle of bringing every settlement or every community engaged in primary production that needs a railway—and all of them need railways—within 12½ to 15 miles of a line, and when we get a recommendation by the competent authorities we have to advise us on the necessity for a railway, I, without seeing the territory or knowing the people or the land, am quite prepared to vote for the proposal. This proposal is one of that kind. I wish particularly to associate myself with the remarks of Mr. Cornell. I know the Kalgarin area. Speak-

ing from memory—a few bags one way or the other will not affect the argument—the Kalgarin people last year delivered 50,000 bags of wheat at Kondinin from an average distance of 29 miles. The cheapest contract into which those people were able to enter for the transport of the wheat over that distance was 1s. 3d. per ton per mile, and one does not need to be a mathematician to calculate just what amount of money that involved. That 29 miles of carting has been going on for five years. I cannot say how much wheat has been produced year by year and carted into Kondinin, or whether that was the average distance, but if the total costs of transporting the wheat were aggregated, together with the whole cost of conducting an enterprise of primary production so far removed from a railway, I venture to say the amount would have gone a long way towards building their railway.

Hon. J. Cornell: The settlers are only holding on in the hope of getting a railway.

Hon. W. T. GLASHEEN: I identify myself with the principle that the railways authorised years ago should be constructed before new lines are considered. Four years ago Mr. Angwin visited the Kalgarin district at the invitation of the people, and when he came back, both in the other House and in the corridor, he made no secret of his conviction that of all the railways promised or authorised in the State, the need for a line to serve the Kalgarin people was the most urgent of all.

Hon. J. Cornell: There is no doubt about that.

Hon. W. T. GLASHEEN: After Mr. Angwin had spoken in that strain, we expected that in the following session a Bill to authorise the line would be presented to Parliament. Mr. Stileman, however, came on the scene with a suggestion for a comprehensive railway scheme that would affect the position. A special committee was appointed to make further inquiries, and the outcome was a recommendation that the line to serve the Kalgarin people should go to Lake Grace. There was a battle of the routes, and that has accounted for the long delay. I voice the hope that, during the session in which we are now engaged, the Government will recognise the great importance of constructing the line. The Government might well feel fortified by the conviction expressed by Mr. Angwin, and as to the route, it is immaterial to the people of the district what route is followed so long as they get a railway. I hope authorisation

will be given for the Kalgarin line before any new railway is considered. I understand that the cost of the Kulja line will be in the vicinity of £4,500 per mile. That cost will be incurred under the principle of day labour. For years this State has not constructed any railway under the contract system. I should like to see adopted some method by which we could get a comparison of the cost of railway construction under the contract system and by day labour. I would further suggest that a practical illustration might be made as to how we are running in the matter of cost on some of the railways to be constructed as part of the 3,000 farms scheme. Because of the lack of any inducement to people to tender for railway construction, and because of the fact that no one has any equipment here for that purpose, the position from the point of view of private contractors has become somewhat impossible. A man will not incur heavy overhead charges to provide himself with equipment for the construction of railways unless there is something in the nature of continuity about the business. I would ask the Honorary Minister whether it is the intention of the Government to go on with the railways that have already been authorised, particularly in respect of the 3,000 farms scheme, and to continue the day labour system. I do not say whether that is better or worse than any other system, but I desire, and think the whole community would desire, to obtain some practical illustration of the difference between the cost under day labour and under contract. The Government must be desirous of constructing these railways for the people at the lowest possible cost. Should it be found cheaper to construct them by contract, I cannot think that the Labour Government would disagree with that system, if a trial of the two systems proved that this was the better and the cheaper one. In this House we have simply gone on passing railway Bills. Those lines are going to be constructed some day. Hope springs eternal in the human breast. Hundreds of people had the hope years ago that railway facilities would soon be given to them. The Bills had passed through Parliament, and the construction of the lines had been authorised, but that is all they know about them up to the present. Fully 75 per cent. of those people have not even been assured that the lines will be provided. The Stileman scheme, which caused the hanging up or dislocation of the

Kalgarin railway for the time being, embraced almost a straight line, as the crow flies, from Fremantle, through Armadale, right up through Brookton, and continuing on to Kondinin, right through Kalgarin and on to Salmon Gums. A link would have to be put in from Corrigin to Kondinin. It is remarkable how straight the line is. I wish to associate myself with the remarks of Mr. Cornell, when he said that the 3,000 farms scheme could never be linked into effectiveness until the two unnecessary loops in the present railway system have been cut out. A great deal of wheat is coming from Narembeen, and away onwards, all these places being within the Fremantle zone. That wheat has to go round a loop until it gets to Brookton. The excess distance of this loop is 40 miles. When the wheat reaches Brookton it starts out on another loop, which adds another 40 miles to the distance over which it has to be hauled. Altogether this makes an excess distance over the two loops, for the haulage of the commodity belonging to the producers, of 80 miles. No settlement scheme can be effective, and certainly the 3,000 farms scheme cannot be, when through the special lay-out of the railways the settlers have to send their produce, and bring everything they require for themselves, an excess distance of 80 miles.

Hon. J. Cornell: We shall still require railways north and south in order to feed the Stileman railway.

Hon. W. T. GLASHEEN: Yes. This is a battle of the routes. Many people have said that if the Stileman scheme goes right through, and links Kalgarin with Salmon Gums, and Corrigin with Kondinin, it will disqualify the line now recommended by the Advisory Board from Kalgarin to Lake Grace. I maintain that one does not disqualify the other, but that both are necessary.

Hon. J. Cornell: Yes.

Hon. W. T. GLASHEEN: You, Sir, know this country, and the people, and what they are producing. I breathe the hope that prior consideration will be given to those who have waited so long for something more than promises.

HON. V. HAMERSLEY (East) [5.50]: I regret there has been any objection to this line being built, and to the suggestion that some other railway should be given priority. It is recognised that this is part of the 3,000

farms scheme. The line will pass through magnificent country, and a great deal of settlement has taken place in the locality. There is no necessity for this measure to be hung up while the battle of routes is going on with regard to some other locality.

Hon. J. Cornell: If it went to Kalgarin, I suppose you would ask where your district came in?

Hon. V. HAMERSLEY: I am sure there is no objection to Kalgarin getting its railway, or, after all inquiries have been made, to a decision being arrived at that it is the best plan. Sufficient information with regard to new railways has not always been obtained before a line has been definitely laid. Some of our railways have been run along the wrong route. Settlers are suffering to-day because railways have been constructed over heavier grades than was necessary in the circumstances. In some cases the lines have not been run to the best advantage of the districts served.

Hon. E. H. Harris: You would have no objection to this line being built in advance of the Kalgarin line?

Hon. V. HAMERSLEY: I commend the Government for bringing forward this Bill. It is a definite proposition for the settlement of a new area. This country must be opened up. I support the remarks of Mr. Glasheen, and regret that more of this work has not been done by contract, so that greater economy might be exercised in its execution.

Hon. E. H. Harris: Would you not move to amend the Bill?

Hon. V. HAMERSLEY: I know it is the policy of the Government to carry out such work by day labour. I hold the opinion that if more of these works were carried out by contract, greater expedition would be shown, and more economy effected. Furthermore, the charges that would fall upon the users of the railways would not be so heavy.

Hon. J. Cornell: Did not the hon. member move that the Wiluna railway should be built by contract?

Hon. V. HAMERSLEY: I was unsuccessful on that occasion. I am sure I should only be delaying the House if I attempted to move such a motion now. I certainly failed on the last occasion, and will not attempt to do anything of the kind on this Bill. I support the second reading.

HON. G. W. MILES (North) [5.53]: I support the construction of this line, but would like to know when the Government propose to build the railways already authorised.

Hon. W. T. Glasheen: That is the point.

Hon. G. W. MILES: I have a list of railways authorised but not commenced up to the 30th June last. This includes the Yarramony Eastward line of 85 miles, the Brookton-Dale of 27 miles, the Bridgetown-Jarnadup of 28 miles, the Boyup Brook-Cranbrook of 95 miles, the Manjimup-Mt. Barker of 107 miles, the Meekatharra-Wiluna of 113 miles, and one which should never have been passed by this House, namely, the Leighton-Robb's Jetty railway.

Hon. E. H. Harris: What amount of money was placed on the Estimates for the construction of these lines?

Hon. G. W. MILES: The Honorary Minister ought to supply that information. Although we passed these railways, the Government are not doing their part in constructing them.

The Honorary Minister: They have done very well up to date.

Hon. G. W. MILES: I should like to see all this work done by contract instead of by day labour. I still maintain that the authorised railways should be constructed before we go on with any others. When the Honorary Minister replies, I hope he will give us some reason why the Government are so anxious to get new railway Bills passed when they have so much uncompleted work already on hand. I support the second reading.

On motion by Hon. A. Lovekin, debate adjourned.

*House adjourned at 5.55 p.m.*