

monetary penalties. It is within the discretion of the bench to inflict that penalty, but they have not exercised the power. I believe everyone is of opinion that better control of motor traffic is essential, and that is the object of this Bill. I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

On motion by Mr. Latham, debate adjourned.

RESOLUTION—FINANCIAL RELATIONS, COMMONWEALTH AND STATE.

Council's Message.

Message from the Council received and read, notifying that it had concurred in the Assembly's resolution, as follows:—

That this House is of the opinion that there should be no departure from the basis upon which the financial relations of the Commonwealth and States have rested without the fullest consideration at a constitutional session of the Federal Parliament and the approval of the people by referendum; and that no financial scheme should be assented to by the States that does not provide for their receiving from the Commonwealth Government an annual payment of not less than 25s. per head of population.

House adjourned at 10.27 p.m.

Legislative Council,

Wednesday, 1st September, 1926.

QUESTION—KONDININ-EASTWARD RAILWAY PROJECT.

Hon. J. E. DODD asked the Honorary Minister: 1, What will be the length of the proposed Kondinin-eastward railway? 2, Are the Government aware that blocks have been surveyed and occupied to a distance of 50 miles east of Kondinin?

The HONORARY MINISTER replied: 1, It was proposed to construct 25 miles as a first section, but the matter will be further considered. 2, Land has been surveyed and occupied up to 50 miles East of Kondinin, but such land was not surveyed in advance of selection.

ADDRESS-IN-REPLY.

Twelfth Day.

Debate resumed from the previous day.

HON. V. HAMERSLEY (East) [4.40]: In addressing myself to the motion for the adoption of the Address-in-reply, I would like to follow the lead of other members and while expressing regret that certain of our members have fallen by the wayside since last session, extend a hearty welcome to the new members we have amongst us. I feel sure we shall benefit by their presence for they bring new minds and new views to bear upon the questions that will come before us from time to time. I also appreciate the return to Western Australia of the Leader of the House, who paid a visit during the recess to the islands close to our northern shores. After the arduous session he experienced, I am sure the trip must have done him an immense amount of good. His experience of new conditions in the islands he visited must have made him realise the close proximity to our coast of those foreign lands, with their millions of people. His appreciation of what it means to Western Australia will probably enable him to entertain views regarding some of our legislation that would not have been possible had he not undertaken his trip. It behoves more of us to pay visits to the countries lying to the north of Western Australia.

Hon. Sir Edward Wittenoom: Travelling by the State motor ship "Kangaroo"?

Hon. V. HAMERSLEY: I do not mind how members may travel. For my part I prefer a faster boat, but the "Kangaroo" is a good vessel to negotiate some of the

	PAGE
Questions: Kondinin-Eastward Railway project ...	665
Address-in-reply, twelfth day ...	665
Bills—Supply (No. 2), £831,000, 1s. ...	663
Trust Funds Investment Act Amendment, 1s. ...	693
Kalgoorlie and Boulder Racing Clubs Act Amendment, 1s. ...	693
Herdsmen's Lake Drainage Act Repeal, 1s. ...	693
Jetties, 1s. ...	693
Shipping Ordinance Amendment, 1s. ...	693
Navigation Act Amendment, 1s. ...	693

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

weather we experience along our northern coast line. At any rate, by travelling aboard the "Kangaroo" hon. members are able to get into close touch with one phase of the business enterprises upon which the Government have embarked. His trip probably enabled the Chief Secretary to appreciate some of the mistakes we have fallen into. The Leader of the House must have been able to acquaint himself with some of the defects of the vessel, quite apart from the disadvantages that followed upon the inauguration of the State shipping service. His trip also would enable him to realise the unhappy effects that followed upon the alterations to the vessel. I have always regretted that the "Kangaroo" was not sold when the Government of the day received a substantial offer for her. That offer was rejected by the previous Government, a Government that failed to carry out the instructions given to them by the country and by those standing behind those Ministers. Undoubtedly the vessel should have been sold. It was indeed a great blunder that was committed by the then Government when it was decided to dock the vessel for alterations instead of selling her. Had the sale been effected, the whole department would have been placed on a sound basis and, if the Government deemed it necessary to continue the shipping service along the coast rather than to subsidise privately owned vessels, a boat more suitable for the purpose could have been purchased. As it is, the alterations that were carried out practically ruined the boat and have made her unsaleable except at a figure much below what was offered for her some time ago. It is by actual experience gained by travelling aboard the vessel that one can appreciate what has happened. By that means one is able to fully appreciate what an appalling blunder was made when the offer for the purchase of the vessel was rejected. With the money that would have been at the disposal of the Government, a vessel much more suited to the existing conditions along our northern coastline could have been purchased. Most members of this House hold that the State should not engage in such trading. It is only by travelling to Java, Singapore, and other parts of the world that we realise what wonderful works are being carried out in those countries. This makes us deplore the fact that we have such a small population in this State and shall have to wait many years before we can hope to emulate

the example set us by some of those countries. The magnificent ports with their great volume of shipping must have impressed the Minister. I should have been delighted to hear him speak of his trip during the debate on the Address-in-reply, but if he does not do so, he may take another opportunity to give us the benefit of his experiences. New members have contributed some very fine speeches to the debate, and each of them has advanced matters for the attention of the Government. Each, too, appears to have struck a new note in recommendation of his particular centre. I, too, hope to be able to offer some suggestions that will make for the welfare and progress of the State. I should like to impress upon new members the fact that we have always regarded ourselves as a non-party House. Most of us are jealous of the Constitution under which we work. It is a pity that, when the Federal Constitution was framed, it was not based on the principles of the Legislative Council Constitution. Mr. Brown has expressed the opinion that the Legislative Council should be scrapped; he argued that the abolition of the Upper House in Queensland had proved desirable. I do not agree with that view, and I hope the new members will not be impressed by it. I urge them to consider carefully all questions sent to us for review, and to give a ready hand to shape and improve, in the interests of those we represent, the legislation placed before us. The Constitution under which we work is a broad one and is construed in the widest possible spirit on behalf of the whole community, but we regard ourselves as a sort of legislative safety valve. We naturally represent the smaller section of the community, who exercise thrift and possibly run the risk of being imposed upon by a vote of the larger section on questions of importance. We are on the eve of a referendum of the whole of the people of the Commonwealth, but I consider that danger lies before us in relying upon a majority vote to determine such important questions. A large number of people do not understand the proposals and have no idea which way to vote. Probably very few are able to judge what the outcome of the passing or the rejection of those proposals will be. Only by carefully reviewing legislation that might be hurriedly introduced can we give the community an assurance that their interests will be adequately safeguarded. A House of revision such as this will always be necessary; it is a safeguard

that ought always to be retained. It is unfortunate that Queensland has abolished its Legislative Council.

Hon. J. R. Brown: Queensland is prospering without it.

Hon. V. HAMERSLEY: Mr. Brown quoted Queensland as offering the greatest inducements to settlers, but I feel that he was not giving wise counsel when he spoke in that strain. I consider that the Queensland Government have run riot. In this State the Government have expended public moneys very freely.

Hon. J. E. Dodd: The Queensland Government abolished the Upper House in spite of two referenda against it.

Hon. V. HAMERSLEY: Yes, the Queensland Government, instead of trusting the people, ignored their vote in opposition to abolishing the Upper House.

Hon. J. R. Brown: The Queensland Constitution is different from ours.

Hon. V. HAMERSLEY: Consequently, investors in Queensland feel that they have no section of the Legislature on which they can rely to save them from the onslaughts of the thriftless section of the community, who are ever ready to heap taxation upon those who have been thrifty.

Hon. J. R. Brown: They are better off under present conditions.

Hon. C. F. Baxter: If that is so, why don't you go there?

Hon. V. HAMERSLEY: It depends upon the point of view. The brigand goes out and helps himself to the wealth that another man has saved and put away in a strong box, and no doubt the brigand is better off for it, but it is questionable whether the general community would accept that as a desirable rule of life. We in this House stand for the people who have savings and who desire the investor to come here. We say to the investor, "You will have a safe country where you will receive the fair play characteristic of Britishers and will enjoy all possible safeguards for your property and your family." That has been the guiding principle of this House since the inauguration of Responsible Government. I feel sure the House will be strengthened by the presence of new members who know the country, its wants, and the possibilities it offers to people who are prepared to work for its development. The Speech refers to the record revenue collected last year. It is indeed pleasing to note how the revenue has increased year by year, but

notwithstanding the increase we still have a deficit.

Hon. E. H. Gray: It was smaller than the deficit of the previous year.

Hon. V. HAMERSLEY: After having enjoyed a record revenue, it is extraordinary that there should be a deficit of £99,142.

Hon. J. R. Brown: Look at the good work the Government have done.

Hon. V. HAMERSLEY: As to that, opinions differ. The Government receive a fine revenue from the Railway Department but the profits have been curtailed, largely owing to the competition of motor vehicles for both passengers and goods. This competition affects the most profitable portion of the system. While the motors bid for the better paying classes of freight, the Commissioner of Railways is left to cater for the lower classes of freight. I am pleased that the Government have decided not to accept the Federal Government's per capita proposals. No doubt the Premier was fully seized of the great strain that would be imposed upon the finances of the State if the per capita payments were withdrawn. Although the Commonwealth offered to relinquish certain fields of taxation, I am glad that the Premier resisted the proposals, and I still hope that the Commonwealth will be dissuaded from severing the last remaining financial link with the States in the shape of a proportion of the Customs and Excise revenue. It is through the Customs that we receive so much per head on behalf of those who are born in the State and for those whose passages we pay from the Old Country. Regarding newcomers, the State receives practically nothing from them by way of taxation for a period of some years, at any rate not until they have established themselves. Therefore it seems only fair that we should get a portion of the Federal revenue that is now collected by reason of those people having come amongst us. All consume dutiable goods, and in that way pay indirect taxation through the Customs. The Federal Government should recognise that we are entitled to some of the revenue collected in that way. There was nothing in their proposals to suggest that they would remain out of the sphere of land and income taxation for all time. It is satisfactory to know from the Governor's Speech that migrants are still coming here and that the number was greater last year than in the year before. I am glad that the present Government are continuing the policy of bringing those people to our shores, glad because

I know many of their followers feel that by bringing migrants here, the new arrivals compete with those already on the labour market, and in that way are creating unemployment. We have an enormous territory that requires to be developed. We know that there would be no value whatever in any of our areas—agricultural, pastoral or mining, or even in the city—if the people already here were content to sit down and twiddle their thumbs. We are aware that while the natives in their thousands possessed this country there was no value in the land. The greater number of people we can have in our territory, provided they work, the greater will be the values. Those who work and develop the country create the wealth, and the more we have to open up our areas, the greater will be the good done to the State, the Commonwealth and the Empire. Unfortunately we have within our borders many who frequently cease operations and declare that there is no work to be had. We know that there is any amount of work requiring to be done by the people, even to the extent of those people going out to develop the country on their own account. It seems strange indeed that any body should think we are doing harm by bringing people from the home-land and from those countries where we know there are good and sound people to be obtained, and who are glad to come out in a healthy country such as ours, not only to make homes for themselves, but to help us in the work of development. It is on that account that I am glad that more migrants came here last year than in the year before. The more work we create, the more will there be for others whose desire it is to work. As we carry on some improvement in the country to-day we may employ perhaps two or three people, the number will be sure to be doubled in the space of a few years. The same thing happens in connection with trades that are carried on within the community. It is only by getting the greatest output, instead of by men sitting back on the job, that we can advance. Those who sit back merely create greater difficulties for the people who come after them. Those who are associated with land development find that one of the greatest stumbling blocks is the Federal Government itself which was created to help us out of our difficulties. Handicaps are put upon development by the continually increasing duties. On behalf of those settled on the land I appeal to the members in this Chamber

representing the metropolitan area to take a fervent interest in helping us to get a reduction of the duties that are constantly being added to or placed upon the shoulders of those of us who in the interior of the State wish to gather greater harvests from the soil. I allude to mining, agricultural and pastoral production. The increases in duties seem to take place at the whim and pleasure of the board appointed by the Federal Government. Almost month by month we see some addition to the duties, but we never see any reduction, and the increases are being heaped upon all forms of machinery and other things that are so necessary to the development of our State. Those increases are making it more difficult for us, who have to get our livelihood from the land, to compete in the open markets of the world. With the 44-hour week and the awards of the Arbitration Court, we cannot face the increasing demands being made at the instance of those controlling the tariff. Many of the duties may seem small but they mount up when, for instance, farmers have to carry out many acres of clearing and miles of fencing. The tariff operates detrimentally to our railway system, and in fact every article that comes here and is required for the development of the country has to bear a portion of the burden. This makes it very difficult for us to remain on the job in order to compete with the outside world. It may be all right while we secure a good price for wool and wheat, but those prices are likely to come back any day. In fact, I feel confident—and I regret to say it—that the price of wool must come back rapidly. We know that wool has to stand up in the markets of the world against the competition of cotton. Several years ago cotton was 25d. a lb. A big drop in wool took place, when cotton came back to about 13d. I notice that cotton has now receded to about 9d. Our wool must come back at the same ratio, and as cotton is being grown in increasing quantities, so must wool recede rapidly in price. We have to face this matter and realise that the incomes from that primary product will be considerably reduced within the next few years. I suggest to the Government that they begin to realise that in the not distant future we shall be in that position that freezing works will be required to handle the surplus sheep within our borders. The price of wool and the shortage of sheep have been factors against the successful

operation of freezing works. In Western Australia the sheep now outnumber the total in South Australia. Our numbers are increasing very rapidly. The consumption of mutton will not cope with that increase and a considerable number must find their way to the freezers. The growers themselves must give earnest attention to this matter because it is known that the sheep that grows wool is not the sheep that is suitable for freezing. The community will not have the same return from their wool clips. I suppose that has been one of the best sources of revenue to the community within Australia; in fact that is principally the source that has been the backbone of Australia's wealth. I feel sure we are on the turn and that the revenue derived from that source within the next few years will not be anything like what it has been in the past. I say this, not pessimistically, but merely because we have to face the facts. I am pleased that the Minister for Agriculture has decided to establish further experimental plots in some of the drier areas. We have immense tracts of virgin country that can safely be used for wheat growing. I remember when there was an agitation against the railway being extended from Northam to Goomalling, 30 miles east, on the ground that Goomalling was not safe for wheat growing. In the next stage anything further inland was regarded as too risky. Yet by the breeding of earlier wheats and by systematic testing and recording, it was found that with certain newly produced wheats we could get fine results in a relatively low rainfall. The continuation of that system of experimenting and breeding, I am sure, will demonstrate that we can still go much further east with perfect safety. So I wish to congratulate the Government on the energy they are displaying in that regard and the ready backing they are giving to their departmental officers. Thus are they likely to afford an outlet to many young people within the State who otherwise would be at a loss for an avocation to follow. If only we could keep down some of the cost of production there would be no limit to the wonderful potentialities of our wheat growing areas a little outside what has been regarded as the safe boundary. I feel sure that by careful attention to the breeding of new wheats and the necessary cultivation, those relatively dry areas will be brought into profitable use. One of the main factors that enable us to

compete with wheat growers in other parts of the world is the use of large machinery on wide areas. If those areas had to be worked on the small farms plan they would not be so successful; but by the use of large machinery and the aid of our favourable climate one man can get over a very much bigger area than he could cope with in other parts of the world. So, although our average crop per acre is not as high as are those in other countries, the use of large machinery on extensive areas enables us to successfully compete with growers in distant parts of the globe. The outside world recognises that our wheat is able to hold its own with all comers. I hope further attention will be given to the system of pooling. In the past nobody has had less to say about what he should get for his product than has the farmer. He has been practically a football to be kicked about by all those in the selling and purchasing departments of the wheat industry. Only by the system of pooling has he been saved. If he be able to set up some such system in conjunction with Canada and America, and if arrangements can be made to market his product at a fair price, a very good thing will have been done. In this State the pooling has been carried out, not under legislation, but by voluntary effort. I know there has been a good deal of opposition to it, but I am sure the success achieved will break down that opposition. Unfortunately during last season a number of wheat vessels were hung up as the result of the attitude of the men working on the wharves. I cannot understand how it is the men on the wharves do not realise that their interests are interwoven with those of the wheat growers. If they could be made to see that, they would not be so ready to hold up the wheat ships.

Hon. E. H. Gray: To whom are you referring?

Hon. V. HAMERSLEY: To the men at Fremantle and at Geraldton. At Geraldton I saw three vessels in the harbour being loaded at a ridiculously slow pace. On the other hand I saw men walking about the streets of Geraldton looking for work. They were not permitted to go on the wharf, merely because they did not belong to some union. The vessels were waiting to berth, but were not allowed to do so.

Hon. E. H. Gray: Why?

Hon. V. HAMERSLEY: Because nobody was allowed on the wharf to load them.

The Honorary Minister: What was the name of that boat?

Hon. V. HAMERSLEY: I cannot tell you.

Hon. E. H. Gray: The hon. member is dreaming.

Hon. V. HAMERSLEY: I am not. That was the condition of affairs as I saw it. The same thing occurred at Fremantle. There is this general tendency to hang up the work of the country. It is only increasing the difficulties of those endeavouring to develop the agricultural areas. Also it is adding greatly to the cost of production, for when those vessels have to pay enormous sums in harbour dues, they must pass on that cost. In Fremantle when the last strike was on, one shipping company received a bill for £3,000.

Hon. E. H. Gray: Was that the British seamen's strike?

Hon. V. HAMERSLEY: Yes. The shipping companies, of course, have to charge the wheat growers the cost of the delay. It is our own wheatgrowers who have to pay those added costs. In that way we are not doing the best we can for the State. I appeal to all members who take a reasonable view to endeavour to put an end to that sort of thing. It is in the interests of everybody to try for increased production, and so encourage the newcomers as well as those already in the industry.

Hon. E. H. Gray: You cannot mention one wheat boat that was held up at Fremantle during last season.

Hon. V. HAMERSLEY: I am not concerned with the names of the vessels. The wheat growers, seeing these delays occurring at our ports, feel constrained to come down and load the vessels themselves. They were quite prepared to do it last season, although feeling it was not properly their job. I hope there will be no necessity for it in future. It is for this Chamber to say whether we are going to stand by without insisting that people ready to invest their money in this State shall get a fair deal. I appeal to all members to do their best to assist in securing better results for the State. During the past year the railways have had a very strenuous time. Had things been different many farmers would have put far greater areas under crop than they did. We should congratulate the Government and the State on the farmers having used this year an additional 20,000 tons of phosphate, and having put under crop an additional area of from 400,000 acres to 500,000 acres. There

would have been more than that but for the delay in the receipt of the superphosphate. On the Government line running into the wheat areas these deliveries were no less than six weeks late, and on the Midland line no less than two months late. That represents a great loss to the country. Many of the farmers were in despair, and appealed to the Railway Department to expedite the delivery of their fertiliser. Many of them also lost a great deal of time in uselessly travelling miles to the siding, only to find that the phosphates had not arrived. This carting was done at a time when the teams could ill be spared from work on the farm. Furthermore, a great deal of phosphate was destroyed because there were not sheets enough to cover it at the siding. In the absence of sufficient rolling stock could not the Government urge upon the Commissioner of Railways to extend the system that was in operation before 1910. Under that system many of the farmers who required storage accommodation arranged with the Commissioner of Railways to build a joint shed at a railway siding instead of putting up separate sheds on their different farms.

The Honorary Minister: On Government property.

Hon. V. HAMERSLEY: Yes. They have to pay an annual license for the right to erect a shed within the railway fence.

Hon. C. F. Baxter: There are many of them in existence to-day.

Hon. V. HAMERSLEY: Yes, but the system has died out. I understand the Commissioner has been trying to withdraw these rights over the sheds. Something in this direction would be of assistance to the railways. Many more farmers would build their joint sheds in this way at railway sidings rather than build them on their own farms. When they had taken off their crops they could do their carting at once. If no trucks were available the wheat could be stored in the shed, and when convenient to the Railway Department, could be trucked away. This would not cause any inconvenience to the farmers in the way of carting. Similarly, any superphosphate or other goods that arrived for the farmers could be stored in the shed until they arranged to call for it. As things are to-day wheat is placed in open stacks at the siding. One sees 80,000 bags here and 100,000 bags there. If there is a shortage of trucks and engines, for the mass of work they are called

upon to do, a great deal of this wheat may have to lie out in bad weather and a good deal of it may be destroyed. Hundreds of thousands of bags of wheat are affected because of this system. This represents a loss to the State as well as to the farmers. It is dreadful to see the waste that is going on when the wet season begins. If we get a big harvest this year we shall be in a deplorable position. Wheat will be grown at Esperance, which is a long way from the main line. This means that trucks and other rolling stock will have to travel a long distance in order to keep pace with the demands made upon them by the Esperance settlers. The amount of rolling stock will not be sufficient to cover the area over which it will be called upon to travel, and to cope with what I hope will be a record average yield of wheat for the State. I hope the Government will give earnest consideration to this matter of providing facilities for the storage of wheat at sidings. Settlers should be given an opportunity to erect their own sheds if the Government cannot afford to do so. These sheds will keep from deterioration not only the wheat but the superphosphate. It is no use the Commissioner of Railways saying that the farmers must cart their phosphate at the time they are carting their wheat. That is impossible, because one team would get in the way of another at the siding and the system would be unworkable.

Hon. J. J. Holmes: Do you not think the 44-hour system has caused a lot of delay on the railways?

Hon. V. HAMERSLEY: That is one of the troubles.

Hon. E. H. Gray: It makes for greater efficiency.

Hon. J. M. Macfarlane: Does the hon. member agree with that?

Hon. V. HAMERSLEY: No. It is a deplorable departure. These men are not working hard. Half the time they are only twiddling their thumbs. Whether their hours are 44 or 52 they do not know how to fill in their time. They can do so much reading that an impetus has been given to the printing trade in order to provide them with sufficient reading matter. The introduction of the 44-hour week has meant great loss to the railways. It hits very hard the man who is trying to develop the country. At many of the sidings the gates are now closed at half-past five. A farmer may have travelled many miles to the siding, but on arrival there may find the gates locked. If he is just in

time to get in he may find it impossible to get out. The man who is using horses must travel from water to water, and at some sidings it may be very inconvenient for him if he is not able to unload or load as the case may be, and get back to his water supply at the time he has calculated upon. If the railway men have to cease work at a certain hour they should leave the railway gates open so that farmers may have access to the siding. Furthermore, many of the trains run at inconvenient hours. I suppose that is due to the 44-hour system. Trains run through parts of my province at midnight. There is no reason for this except that it has something to do with an award of the Arbitration Court. People who are trying to develop their country have to leave Perth at 4 o'clock in the afternoon, and may not arrive at their siding, a comparatively few miles away, until midnight, or the early hours of the morning.

Hon. E. H. Gray: Is that a general thing?

Hon. V. HAMERSLEY: Yes. I blame the Commissioner and his staff for that. I have been at one of these sidings more than once. Men who have been in charge of the train, and have been getting goods out of the van, have been equipped only with an old bull's eye lantern, which is bad enough to ruin their eyesight. If the department desire to run their trains at midnight and prevent delays the men should be equipped with lighting arrangements that will permit of them reading the addresses on the packages with greater expedition and ease than is the case at present.

Hon. J. J. Holmes: The Midland Railway Company have done it.

Hon. V. HAMERSLEY: The Government have not.

Hon. J. J. Holmes: It would save them hundreds of pounds.

Hon. V. HAMERSLEY: I am sure it would. The goods have to be put out, and it is extraordinary that the officials should be furnished with such a poor light that they cannot even read the addresses on the packages. I believe the worst station of the whole lot is the Perth railway station, because in making up trucks there the officials use little or no discretion in stowing goods. A little while ago I saw perishable goods which had been destroyed by a heavy tractor wheel tossed in on top of them. It is ridiculous that officials at the main railway station should load trucks in such a fashion. Their want of attention must be one of the contributing causes to the over-carrying

of goods and the late arrivals of trains. Possibly the poor lighting arises from cheseparings on the Commissioner's part. If so, the responsibility may in part be ours, since we expect him to make savings. Certainly a better lighting system should be adopted and more consideration given to the loading of trucks at the Perth railway station. At sidings one may see the guard of the train running to half-a-dozen trucks before he finds the particular goods he has to unload. I trust that the Leader of the House will be able to give me some little hope of sheds for the coming wheat season. They would be an important factor towards bringing about savings to men who are endeavouring to create wealth in this country.

HON. C. F. BAXTER (East) [5.49]: Before dealing with the subjects mentioned in the Governor's Speech, I should like to congratulate you, Mr. President, on your elevation to the Chair, a position to which you do honour. Your experience and ability will undoubtedly prove of great value to the House. Whilst it is pleasant to welcome new members, it is regrettable to have to part with old members who have assisted in the advancement of Western Australia; and in the recent election some valuable members have been lost. I appreciate highly the fact that my province has for the third time returned me unopposed. It is the most populous province outside the metropolitan area, and I regard my being returned unopposed as a great compliment. The East Province covers practically two-thirds of the wheat lands of the State, and almost every acre of those lands has been settled and is being worked. Such a situation does not exist in any other wheat-growing province. I cannot omit a reference to an innovation in the opening of Parliament—to my mind a regrettable innovation. How it was brought about I do not know. I certainly regard it as unnecessary, and as not tending towards smooth working. If there had not been a quorum in this Chamber on opening day, what would have been the result? Parliament could not have been opened. And the want of a quorum could easily occur in such circumstances. I trust that you, Sir, will see that the innovation is not repeated at the next opening of Parliament; that is, unless there is some sound reason for it. I, as a member not sworn in, could not take my seat, and where I was placed I could neither see nor hear anything. Ac-

cordingly with other members similarly circumstanced I retired to a room, where we chatted over political matters. The unfortunate feature of the situation was that Mr. Gray, who had to move the adoption of the Address-in-reply, was not present when the Governor's Speech was read. That was ridiculous.

Hon. E. H. Gray: It was awkward, too.

Hon. C. F. BAXTER: Certainly it was not a position in which any hon. member should be placed. It is pleasing to note the generous rains. All the indications are that the State will have a record harvest. There is no doubt whatever regarding feed, and if we are favoured with a few light showers during the next four or five weeks, the wheat yield should be a record. The wheat returns mean so very much to Western Australia. A poor harvest is at once reflected in the railway returns and in commercial activities throughout the State. The ever-increasing costs of wheat production are such that a return to low averages would place the industry in a parlous position. Costs are mounting up all the time. I am not referring to the wages aspect.

Hon. E. H. Gray: Wages could go up very nicely.

Hon. C. F. BAXTER: I do not like that old parrot cry from Mr. Gray. With very few exceptions, the men on the farms are well paid and are well satisfied. I have never yet heard a farm labourer complain about wages. A man getting £2 10s. per week and his keep is in receipt of a good living wage.

Hon. E. H. Gray: How many get that!

Hon. E. H. BAXTER: During the past eight years I have never employed a man at less, and during harvest I have paid £3 and £3 10s.

Hon. E. H. Gray: I wish all the farmers were like you.

Hon. C. F. BAXTER: Those are the ruling rates. The trouble is that the farmer cannot get experienced farm hands. Sometimes the men he is compelled to employ smash his machinery and kill his horses. I recently disposed of a large farming property for no other reason than that I could not get good employees. The want of competent men caused me tremendous losses during the last three years. I was prepared to pay £3 and £3 10s. per week to men who understood farming work. Mr. Gray, however, demands payment of high wages to men who know nothing about the work.

Hon. E. H. Gray: That is unskilled labour.

The PRESIDENT: The hon. member will have an opportunity to reply later.

Hon. C. F. BAXTER: The indications are that the price of wheat will drop, and therefore it behoves us to keep down production costs in every possible way. A recent occurrence which is really alarming is the change-over of the Argentine from the cattle industry to wheat-growing. The fact is not generally known, but that is the position. The Argentine has spent millions in establishing the cattle industry, but is now getting out of that industry and embarking upon wheat-growing.

Hon. E. H. Gray: Russia is coming in again, too.

Hon. C. F. BAXTER: Yes. Russia has recently ordered 1,500 farm tractors. These facts show the necessity for keeping down our costs, which, however, are always on the up grade. Largely this is due to the action of the Federal Government, who saddle the primary producers with increasing tariffs year by year. One wonders how it is going to end. The Federal Government, with an overflowing Treasury, and in command of all the means of taxation—

Hon. E. H. Gray: They are your own party.

Hon. C. F. BAXTER: The hon. member interjecting represents a party which would be worse than the present Federal Government. However, I am not speaking from a party standpoint at all. To me as a believer in a revenue tariff, the party now holding power in the Federal Parliament are nearly as objectionable as the Labour Party. They stand for the backyard manufacturer. We hear talk about the establishment of secondary industries and the Federal Government have a good deal to say about the assistance they have rendered in that direction. What is happening is that the Federal Government are bolstering up manufacturers who employ four men in a backyard! Do members regard that as a secondary industry? Recently the tariff was increased to 60 per cent. on all articles having cogwheels attached to them. That was done simply because a man had started running a machine for turning out articles with cogs. The Federal Government did not give him protection merely for the special lines the man was turning out, but imposed increased taxation through the tariff on everything

with a cog in it. Hon. members will realise what a ridiculous position that led to. Even cake beaters and egg beaters had to pay 60 per cent. duty under the tariff. That is protection run to an absurd extent.

Hon. G. W. Miles: The manufacturers and the workers cut it up between them and the primary producers have to pay.

Hon. C. F. BAXTER: But not 10 per cent. of the workers benefit. And even those included in that percentage do not really benefit, because of what they have to pay extra for their goods. The additional cost has to come out of the workers' pockets, just as it has to come out of the producers' pockets. Notwithstanding that fact, the worker is content to be led on blindly, listening to those who come to him with tales about protecting local industry.

Hon. J. M. Macfarlane: He hears about the division of the spoils.

Hon. C. F. BAXTER: But there are no spoils to be divided among the workers.

Hon. E. H. Gray: No, the worker does not get much of them.

Hon. C. F. BAXTER: I was surprised to hear Mr. Stephenson comment yesterday on what he regarded as the poor class of produce put on the metropolitan market. That hon. member should recognise that Western Australia is passing through the pioneering stages. I regret that Mr. Stephenson is not in his seat at present, for had he been here I would have dealt with his criticism much more trenchantly than I shall do in his absence. We hear a good deal of criticism along these lines from men like Mr. Stephenson, who do not own farms and take jolly good care that they do not get any.

Hon. J. Cornell: They are farming the farmers.

Hon. C. F. BAXTER: Quite so. Mr. Stephenson also said that there was 25 per cent. of foreign matter in the produce marketed. I have had a lot of experience in buying and handling produce and I have yet to learn that any large quantities can be found with 25 per cent. of foreign matter present. When the hon. member referred to the question I thought he was dealing with wild oats instead of the ordinary commodity. It should be remembered that a great many farmers in Western Australia are pleased when they see a dirty field, because it means that the paddock is a good one for sheep. I presume Mr. Stephenson was referring to oats.

That difficulty has been taken in hand by the Agricultural Department and an outside committee. I have attended two or three meetings of that body and arrangements have been made for setting up a minimum standard for oats for export purposes. That will overcome the difficulty Mr. Stephenson referred to. In Western Australia the growing of oats is mainly embarked upon for the purpose of building up land after it has been utilised for several crops of wheat. The majority of the farmers grow oats for the purpose of feeding their stock with it. They are not so anxious about sending it to the markets.

Hon. J. J. Holmes: It would be better to feed the oats to the stock than to pay the present railway freight to Perth.

Hon. C. F. BAXTER: Yes, because oats fed to stock will bring to the grower double what he could get in the market if he sent his oats there. At times a farmer may not require for his stock all the oats he has grown. In that event he may desire to get rid of some in the metropolitan market. I cannot believe that Mr. Stephenson referred to wheat when he expressed his opinion about the presence of foreign matter.

Hon. J. J. Holmes: No, he referred to oats and chaff.

Hon. C. F. BAXTER: Our samples of wheat in Western Australia are better than those produced in the Eastern States. Hon. members probably know that I handled the wheat scheme, when I was a Minister of the Crown, for a long enough period to understand what I am talking about. As a matter of fact, we are bound to get dirty chaff where we have old fields. One wonders whether it is worth while cutting some hay. It is regrettable that not only in Australia but throughout the Commonwealth one of the outstanding features to be noticed in the agricultural areas is the increased activity of the motor industry. Those concerned with that industry are not located in Australia; the money paid over on account of motors goes out of the Commonwealth. That is the trouble. Even in the city, the day of the horse seems almost to have passed. If 18 trucks of chaff were to be sent to the metropolitan market to-day, it would be congested. If we received any benefit in other directions from the advent of the motor industry, it would be all right, but there are no compensating advantages. Practically the whole of the money for the

motors, oils, and the various accessories is taken out of the Commonwealth. What little is allowed to remain in Australia is of no value to the State. It makes me wonder where Australia will finish up, seeing that all this money is leaving the country. Hon. members may consider for a moment what a huge amount of revenue has to be raised annually to meet the demands made by the motor industry. During the last few years much activity has been shown in the agricultural areas by experts attached to the Agricultural Department. I commend both the Mitchell Government and the present Government for the action they have taken from time to time in appointing additional experts. The work of those officers means much to the farmers. We hear talk on occasions of the necessity for farming operations being carried on in a practical up-to-date way. It cannot be expected that in a country where farming is still at the pioneering stage, operations can be carried out in the way suggested. The great majority of farmers are crippled for want of cash, and they have to rely upon Government assistance. While that is so, it is idle for Mr. Stephenson to talk about farming along the lines suggested by him. We must learn to creep before we can walk. The same position has had to be faced in every country, and each in turn has had to go through the pioneering stages. It has to be said in favour of Western Australia, however, that no other part of the Commonwealth made strides in land settlement and improved quality of production to equal our experience in this State. The policy of the Government in continuing to appoint experts will be of material benefit to Western Australia. The same comment applies to the policy of establishing experimental farms. At the same time it has to be pointed out that advantageous as are the experimental farms, they are not nearly so valuable to the producers as is the seed available to the farmers because of the existence of those experimental farms. The Government cannot do too much in that direction, because every farmer is up against the difficulty of procuring good seed. I trust that the Leader of the House will convey to his colleague, the Minister for Agriculture, one matter I wish to raise. It would seem that the State experimental farms have practically ignored that wonderfully solid wheat, known as "Federation." I have had experience extending over 25 years in wheat growing and I know

that there is no more reliable wheat than "Federation." Yet the State farms are not using that type of wheat. I know that "Federation" has rather peculiar characteristics.

The Honorary Minister: It fell down on its job once.

Hon. C. F. BAXTER: No other wheat deteriorates so quickly as "Federation," which will stand three or four main crops. After that, the seed drops off in quality and reverts back to its earlier type. A farmer should get a small quantity of, say, ten bags of "Federation" wheat from a State farm. He should sow that wheat and the resultant crop would give him sufficient wheat for the next year's main crop. He could carry on with that wheat for three main crops, but it would not be advisable to use the same seed beyond that. I have given the "Nabawa" wheat a thorough test, and although "Nabawa" is a very satisfactory wheat, "Federation" will produce three bushels or more per acre more than "Nabawa." I do not know why the Agricultural Department have given up growing "Federation" wheat. I do not say it should be sown in districts where the earlier type of wheat is more suitable, but this also applies to Nabawa.

Hon. J. J. Holmes: Would you not overcome the difficulty by exchanging wheat with other farmers?

Hon. C. F. BAXTER: No, it is necessary to get fresh seed.

Hon. J. J. Holmes: How can you get fresh seed unless you exchange with someone else?

Hon. C. F. BAXTER: It is necessary to cross other wheats to produce "Federation." It is necessary to breed new seed altogether. If fresh seed were to be procured from another farm, the producer would merely be getting some of the same seed that was deteriorating. The Governor's Speech did not contain language other than the usual verbiage, the object of which might be said to be to induce us to go on our way happily. A few new railways are mentioned, but apart from that, the Speech is the usual type that we hear during the closing stages of a Parliament. I regret that no reference was made to one railway that has been promised to the settlers for over 18 years. I refer to the Ucarty-Baandee railway. One wonders if that line will ever be constructed. It is annoying to hear successive Ministers say-

ing, "You have your motor transport." Ministers and non-members generally should not push on the advancement of motor transport because, as I have already indicated, that industry is not of much advantage to Australia, owing to the vast sums of money that go out of the Commonwealth. Apart from that, there is the enormous amount that will have to be spent on the upkeep of roads to cope with motor transport. I do not know how the country areas will be able to stand up under the rates that will have to be levied to maintain our roads in a proper condition.

Hon. A. Burvill: You have to remember that in one instance it is a case of 1s. per ton per mile as against 1d. per ton per mile.

Hon. C. F. BAXTER: But we cannot afford to keep our roads in the order required for motor transport. Then there is the question of the competition with the railways. The particular line I refer to has been promised for many years, and a number of deputations have been sent to Perth at considerable expense to the residents of the districts concerned. Yet to-day they are in no better position and are no further advanced regarding their railway proposition. Some of the people have to cart their produce for 23 miles, and that is an impossible proposition for wheat growers, even with motor trucks. It is all very well for some people to talk about tractors. Experience shows that tractors are all right for two years and at the end of that period the trouble and expense really starts.

Sitting suspended from 6.15 to 7.30 p.m.

Hon. C. F. BAXTER: I was referring to the Yarramony railway. It is surprising how successive Governments have shelved this question, though it is of vital importance to the settlers of the district. This is one of the richest districts in the State. All over the wheat belt we have land of the best quality, equal to the wheat land to be found in any country.

Hon. V. Hamersley: There is none to beat it.

Hon. C. F. BAXTER: That is so. Yet the people of this district are suffering a tremendous handicap because they cannot develop their holdings as they desire. Some of them have been in the district for 18 years, battling along, hoping against hope year after year that a railway would be built to help them out of their difficulties.

Hope, however, has been so long deferred that the settlers are becoming sick at heart. I regret that no mention is made of this railway in the Governor's Speech, but I hope that a Bill will be introduced this session to authorise it, and that the Government will see their way clear to build it. Another much needed railway is the Brookton-Dale River line. The country that would be served by that railway is suitable for closer settlement, and fine dairying land could be opened up if the railway were built. In addition to that the grades on a line joining up with Armadale would permit of almost double the present loads being hauled.

Hon. V. Hamersley: But men will not go dairying when they can get relief work from the Government at 16s. 8d. per day.

Hon. C. F. BAXTER: The unemployed difficulty is with us every year. Most of the unemployed, I fear, are unemployable, and I sympathise with the Government in their difficulty. Apart from the unemployed there are people who would take up the Dale River country if the railway were constructed. Mr. Hamersley dealt exhaustively with the shortage of trucks and tarpaulins on the railways. Recently the Minister announced that it was impossible to provide the necessary trucks because of lack of material, due to industrial troubles abroad. The feature I complain of is that the Government should have left it till the eleventh hour to decide upon making this necessary provision. For years the Commissioner of Railways has been in a most difficult position owing to the shortage of rolling stock. He has applied for increased rolling stock year after year, but it has not been provided. Imagine the manager of a business concern trying to carry on if he were hampered in this way. What hope of success would he have? Yet that is the position in which the Commissioner of Railways has been placed, but he is not the only sufferer; the real sufferers are the producers whose position is being rendered impossible. I do not know what will happen this year. There is no doubt in my mind that we shall have a record harvest.

Hon. A. Burvill: The railways will have to haul the wheat to the nearest port this year.

Hon. C. F. BAXTER: Seeing that the supply of rolling stock has been severely taxed in the past, I cannot imagine what the department will do this year. Difficulty is also experienced over the forwarding of

superphosphate to the country. I am wondering whether an arrangement made when was Minister is still operating. We arranged with the super firms to run special trains without tarpaulins during the time when the weather could be relied upon to keep fine, and the loads were sent to station provided with goods sheds. That relieved the pressure in those years. If that arrangement is not operating to-day, I should like to know why it was discontinued. If damage was done to the superphosphate en route, the railways hauled it back free of charge and the companies reconditioned it at a cost of 5s. per ton. Again, the Railways Department have a specified period during which producers can get their superphosphate supplies carried at reduced rates. Outside of that period they have to pay higher rates. Yet it is impossible for the department to haul the requisite quantities during the specified period. The Government should extend the period during which low freights are charged to an extent that would permit of the railways carrying the whole of the season's requirements. Under the existing arrangement, some producer must be favoured, while others must suffer.

Hon. J. M. Macfarlane: Do not the department receive applications for trucks before the expiration of the period?

Hon. C. F. BAXTER: An extension of the period was granted last season, but the point I make is that the railways cannot haul the quantity required in the stipulated period.

Hon. J. M. Macfarlane: If they cannot haul it during the stipulated period, do they charge the higher rates?

Hon. V. Hamersley: Many tons have been hauled recently that were intended for February delivery.

Hon. C. F. BAXTER: I hope the Minister for Railways will consider this matter. Thousands of acres of land which should be under wheat this season are lying idle owing to the lack of superphosphate supplies. This is regrettable because it means loss of revenue to the railways. It was interesting to hear Mr. Miles's references to the settlement of the North, a subject on which he is well qualified to speak. Western Australia is in the position that it cannot hope to find the necessary money to develop the North for a long time, in fact the time is not in sight. This being so, should not arrangements be made whereby the money could be found to develop the North properly? A few thou-

sand pounds is useless. In the North we have a wonderful heritage lying dormant. Some time ago a North-West Department was set up. At the time I said it was a foolish step, because I considered that the Government were merely throwing away £10,000 on a department when the money could better be spent on jetties or harbour requirements. The department was established simply to placate the northern people: it never could be of any advantage. We had an engineer for the North-West, Mr. Tindale, who had given good service; in fact I consider his work better than that of the North-West Department. A tremendous amount of money is required to develop the North. It is all very well for people to talk about the North being worth millions of money. It is worth very little in its present state, and will not be worth much until a tremendous amount of money is spent on its development. Can Western Australia find the necessary money to develop the North? Of course not. Something should be done, even if it has to be done by the Federal Government.

Hon. V. Hamersley: They would need to do better than they have done with the Northern Territory.

Hon. C. F. BAXTER: Yes. I have no faith in the Federal Government. My four years' experience as Minister, travelling backwards and forwards between Melbourne and Perth fighting claims for this State, have not made me enamoured of the Federal Government. Federal representatives come here and profess to be sympathetic to Western Australia. They are sympathetic while they are here. As a Minister I refused point blank to meet such men when they came to Perth, because I had been refused things that should undoubtedly have been granted to the State. We have never had the consideration to which we were entitled from the Federal Government. Still, they hold the key to the situation. They command the main avenues of revenue, and have the power to increase them at any time they like. They can increase taxation—

Hon. V. Hamersley: They are doing it every day.

Hon. C. F. BAXTER: Of course they are. They can increase the land and income taxation, they can double and treble the Customs duties, and thus be able to indulge in expenditure that appears to me to be criminal waste. If ever there was a regrettable incident in the history of the

Australian Commonwealth, it is the building of Canberra. If there was anything in the district to warrant the building of a city there—iron or coal deposits or something of that kind—there might be justification for it, but there is no justification for building a city to appease the jealousy between New South Wales and Victoria. For that we have to pay. The Federal Government are following the lead of one of our recent Governments in wasting expenditure on the establishment of boards. Week after week they are establishing boards to take the responsibility from the shoulders of Ministers. An attempt was made during the Mitchell-Colebatch regime to establish a public works board in this State, and the present Federal Government are appointing men who have not the necessary training to do justice to the work entrusted to them. The Federal authorities are taxing us heavily, showing us little or no consideration and making very poor use of the money. I wish to refer to the unfortunate position of this State as regards the electoral districts. East Province is a big one and well settled, and has 66 per cent. more electors than have some of the other provinces. Some provinces have only 500 or 600 electors; East province has between 8,000 and 9,000. It is difficult to keep the rolls in order. The Electoral Department have done good service and I congratulate the head upon his work, but if the rolls had been put in good order there would have been 12,000 to 14,000 electors. It is necessary to have a redistribution of seats and an amendment of boundaries. The present arrangement has existed for a long time. It is of no use blaming the present Government, who might introduce a Bill that would be unacceptable to most of us. When the Mitchell Government were in office they were pledged to bring about a redistribution, but they did not carry out their promise. This is only one of the many broken promises that caused the country to turn against that Government.

Hon. J. Cornell: It would not have effected this House one iota.

Hon. C. F. BAXTER: It would have affected the Government. The Mitchell Government were definitely pledged to bring in a redistribution of seats just as they were definitely pledged to dispose of the State trading concerns. They should have carried out those pledges. Yet the Leader of the Government at that time excused himself by saying he could not get the backing. Any

man who was a leader would have gone straight ahead and let his followers take the responsibility for their own actions. If Sir James Mitchell had insisted at the time, the Bill would have been passed, because the dissatisfied members would have supported it when it came to the vote. A leader of men would have said, "I am going through with it." He should have respected his pledges. Though that measure went by the board, we now find Sir James Mitchell tabling a motion in another place urging a redistribution of seats. There is one matter to which I wish to call attention and it is the position of one of the most important, if not the most important department in the State. I refer to the Police Department. I regret to find that that department is working in such a way as to be what might be said, a department within a department. In saying that I have in mind the position of the gold stealing staff. A staff such as that even though it is paid from outside sources, should be under the control of the head of the police.

Hon. J. Cornell: There is no gold stealing staff.

Hon. C. F. BAXTER: Then they should be appointed again. Something will have to be done because we know what gold stealing has done, and that it practically ruined the goldfields. I trust that when another staff is appointed, it will be directly connected with the Police Department. If there is a feeling of jealousy existing in a department such as that of the Police, we cannot expect to get good work done.

Hon. J. Cornell: We have one of the finest police forces in the Commonwealth.

Hon. C. F. BAXTER: I admit we have a force to be proud of. It does not at any time shirk responsibilities, but I regret to say it is working under bad conditions. Take the position of a man who has reached the age of 60 years. When an officer has got to that period in life he should no longer be sent to an outpost to do duty. That work should be reserved for younger, active and virile men. The older officer should be found occupation in the office where experience would be of considerable service.

Hon. J. Cornell: Or he could be sent to a well populated town.

Hon. C. F. BAXTER: In any case, an outpost is not a place for a man who is 60 years of age or more. Why is it that these men are kept on duty of that kind when

they reach an advanced age? It is simply because the retiring allowance is so poor that retirement would mean making them dependent on charity. There is in existence a Police Benefit Fund, the total of which at the present time is about £42,000. Under that fund an officer who has served 25 years is entitled on retirement to receive £750, that is, on his having attained rank as a sergeant. A constable with similar length of service to his credit, receives £600. Is it reasonable to ask those men to retire from the service at 60 years of age on such amounts? How far will that money go? Certainly not far.

Hon. A. Burvill: How does that payment compare with payments made in other branches of the service?

Hon. C. F. BAXTER: The Police Benefit Fund is made up by payments from the salaries from members of the Police Force to the extent of 3 per cent., and pound for pound is contributed by the Government. Such a fund does not exist in connection with any other branch of the service. If an officer is working in the Police Department, even though he has been there for, say, 15 years, he is seriously handicapped if he has to go out. He gets £350, an amount which is not enough to buy a fruit barrow. If the members of the force are prepared to pay 3 per cent. of their salary into this fund, is it not fair to establish a reasonable pension fund, especially remembering that the calling is the most dangerous in the State.

Hon. J. Cornell: Not only the most dangerous, but the most responsible.

Hon. C. F. BAXTER: Absolutely. Suppose an officer has been eight years in the force and he is injured while executing his duty. This has actually happened, and I know of such a case at Fremantle. I know of another instance where a policeman was hit on the head while executing his duty and later took his own life, because of the pain he was suffering and the effect on his brain. An officer may be killed and the maximum that can be paid to his dependants, if the officer has only eight years of service to his credit, is £308. Is that reasonable? Under the Workers' Compensation Act a man may be killed after being employed for only a week, and his dependants will receive £750. The dependants of a policeman who may be killed in the execution of his duty will receive, in the circumstances I have mentioned, £308,

and then they will probably have to depend upon charity. That is absolutely wrong, and I hope something will be done to alter such a condition of things. I hope too that an alteration will be made in the direction of retiring the older men and allowing the younger officers to have a chance. There is a great deal of jealousy in the Police Department and I believe there is justification for it. There does appear to be a great deal of favouritism shown, and the sooner that subject is investigated seriously, the better will it be for everyone associated with the Police Department. If there is any Government department that deserves consideration and should as a right pay pensions on retirement, it is the Police Department. We must remember that the police do not come under Section 4 of the Workers' Compensation Act.

Hon. J. Cornell: I do not know why.

Hon. C. F. BAXTER: All that they get is a benefit which is the result of a contribution that they themselves make. We have a police force that is second to none in the Commonwealth and this is the consideration they get. The men do their duty nobly and well and will continue to do so. I hope therefore the Government will take up the matter and see that the department is put on something like a reasonable footing—a footing equal to that of other workers. A good deal has been heard during the course of the debate about the produce of the State being despatched to its natural port. There appears to have been a three-cornered contest in this Chamber arising out of the claims of the ports of Albany, Bunbury and Fremantle. Occasionally our friends from Geraldton come into the question as well. Esperance cannot get into this wrangle, because the wheat grown in that district cannot be taken to any other port. The position so far as the wheat country is concerned is that the commercial people handle it and they send it to the port where there are the most suitable shipping arrangements. No Government can control that; if they attempted to do so they would get themselves into trouble. Time alone will remedy the position.

Hon. A. Burvill: In South Australia they send their produce to six different ports.

Hon. C. F. BAXTER: When this State is as old in the way of development as is South Australia, all our ports will be used. In past years I received considerable

castigation for my advocacy of the claims of the Esperance district. To-day I am pleased to find that the pessimism of days gone by has turned to optimism and that those who were then ready to slay are to-day with us and are ready to admit the mistake they then made. Quite recently one of the heads of a Government concern, vitally interested in the advancement of the agricultural areas, paid a visit to the Esperance district and on his return said to me, "I have been looking for you. For a great number of years I wondered what sort of a bee you had in your bonnet, every time you advocated the claims of Esperance as a wheat growing district. I have been down there and now admit that I was blind and you were quite right." I am pleased to be able to say, further, that that view is becoming widespread. It is only necessary for people to see to know that what you, Mr. President, advocated 18 years ago, and what I advocated 12 years ago, is now being proved right. The results are coming much sooner than I expected. Over and over again I urged the Government not to treat Esperance lands as they were treating other parts of the State. I pointed out that those areas would take longer to develop. I claim that what could be done in other districts would be done at Esperance but that it would take a little longer time because the country was a shade more expensive to handle. What can be done in the Eastern agricultural areas in two years will require three years at Esperance. I trust that the Government will push on with the work they have in hand there. If they do they will find that it will soon repay them. Regarding the outports, I consider there is some ground for complaint, but I consider the most unfortunate port is Albany. Albany has never had a fair deal. The Premier has said the people down there are all croakers. Why is it? Because those people have received anything but a fair deal. I hope the day is not far distant when the treatment of Albany will be reversed. I trust the Government will push forward with their general policy of advancement. That policy is quite right, but they should modify their views respecting railways and land settlement. We have hundreds of thousands of acres of good wheat land yet to be opened up, but I ask the Government not to start pushing settlement in any district before they are prepared to put down a railway. There is any amount of money

in the State, even in the city, awaiting investment in land. Recently a number of people approached me with a request that I should urge the opening up of land at Morawa. When I found that 20 of them were prepared to take up blocks, I went to the Minister for Lands. That was on a Tuesday. On the following Thursday week those lands were gazetted as open for selection. The whole area had been reserved, but as soon as the Government were assured that it was wanted by genuine settlers, they threw it open. I may say that all those 20 applicants had sufficient capital to develop their own holdings. I congratulate the Government upon their land settlement policy. I will support the motion.

HON. H. J. YELLAND (East) [8.2]: I desire to heartily congratulate you, Sir, on your having reached the highest position in the gift of the House. When first I entered the Chamber it was you, Sir, who offered me your congratulations and gave me your sympathetic assistance, with assurances of further help at any time. I know of nobody to whom I would go for advice with greater certainty of receiving it, than to you, Sir. From personal knowledge of the manner in which you have assisted us in the past, I am sure your assistance to the whole House will be of distinct benefit and that we shall be able to enjoy the advantage of your wide experience. Also I have to extend a welcome to those members who on the opening day took their seats for the first time. Under your direction they will, I am sure, find their duties very easy; and if they are prepared to ignore the 44-hour week principle, and direct their efforts to the work before them, no doubt they will be able to do much for the provinces they represent. It has been said that legislation is wrapped up in finance. In looking up the records I find that in 1910 Western Australia had a surplus of £209,939, which in 1911 was followed by another surplus amounting to £115,991. Those were the days when great advancement was being made in land selection. It was then that Sir James Mitchell started to open up the wheat belt. The developmental policy of those days was responsible for the great advances then made by the State. After that there was a steady increase in our revenue, but unfortunately a larger increase in our expenditure, with the natural result that we had an increasing deficit year after year, until in 1922 we reached the climax of the sliding years. It was in that year that the

major difficulties in respect of repatriation were overcome and the financial corner seemed to have been turned. In 1923 there was a distinct decline in the deficit, the receipts gradually overcoming the expenditure. In 1923, the last full year of office for the late Government, there was a deficit of £326,771. In 1924, embracing nine months of the late Government's regime and three months of that of the present Government, there was a deficit of £176,206. From 1922 onwards we experienced a gradual improvement in the finances. When Sir James Mitchell left the Treasury, he estimated that in 1924-25 he would have been able to balance the ledger. I feel certain that, had he remained at the Treasury, his estimate would have been vindicated. But in 1924-25 there was a deficit of £58,398, and during last year we had another deficit of £99,142. It seems strange that, with the possibility of balancing the ledger well in sight, we should have had during those two years a total deficit of £157,540.

Hon. J. J. Holmes: Who said the balancing was in sight?

Hon. H. J. YELLAND: It was in sight, provided there was a continuance of the conditions experienced by the previous Government. We can put our fingers on the reason why that deficit of £157,540 in two years was created. Last year the State trading concerns lost £214,257. I should not like to have to estimate what has been lost to the Government by the establishment of the 44-hour week on the railways. I have no objection to a man receiving just recompense for his services, but hard work has never killed any man. Rather is it that men have been killed because of the work that they refused to do. No person prepared to turn his hand to anything need go short of a few shillings in Australia.

Hon. E. H. Gray: Provided he can get the work.

Hon. H. J. YELLAND: But when a Government reduce the hours that a man shall work and still pay him for the longer period of work, they are inducing in that man a state of indolence. We have to remember that we are a primary producing country and that our primary products have to take their stand in the world's markets. We cannot possibly compete in those markets under the severe handicap laid on our primary producers by the conditions of the labour market. Also under the present Government the deficit has been ascribable largely to unproductive expenditure. Shorter hours and

higher wages have resulted in a great loss of work. So production has been retarded, and, naturally, expenditure has been greater. Again, higher wages mean less work. By higher wages I do not mean the actual cash paid out for work done; but present conditions make our wages considerably higher because of the reduced volume of work done. Reduction of work means a greater number of unemployed, and this in turn breeds dissatisfaction. I am pleased that Mr. Gray has been returned to the House. In his opening speech he had something to say about a lack of organisation amongst the rural workers. He declared that if the rural workers were organised and placed upon a better footing—I presume he meant in respect of unions—

Hon. E. H. Gray: No, a better standard of living.

Hon. H. J. YELLAND: Well, then, he declared that by placing them upon a better standard, we would be able to overcome the unemployed difficulty.

Hon. E. H. Gray: To a very large extent.

Hon. H. J. YELLAND: I am prepared to give the hon. member the benefit of that qualification. He said that if they were organised, three conditions should be imposed, decent living accommodation, higher wages, and shorter hours.

Hon. J. J. Holmes: And no work between meals.

Hon. H. J. YELLAND: If such conditions applied to rural workers, it would mean not less unemployment but a great addition to the ranks of the unemployed in the cities. A number of farmers who have spoken to me with regard to the organisation of rural workers have no objection to it. I should be pleased to assist them in any organisation that would be for the benefit of rural workers, and which would mean increasing our rural population. I desire first of all to increase our production, and then to bring about an advancement in the quality of the produce obtained. If by organising the rural workers we can effect these things, I will assist in every possible way. If they were organised under the conditions that Mr. Gray would like, they would have a 44-hour week, a basic wage on the lines of the city basic wage, and conditions that could not be complied with in most cases. Farmers who have been settled for a long time might be able to give these conditions, but those who were in the early stages of developing their holdings would not be able to do so because of their financial position.

They themselves have been prepared to live in a hessian humpy or even a tent. It would hardly be fair to insist that they should put up a building at a cost of £300 or £400 in order to house their employees. This would lead to a cessation of much of the pioneer work of the State. If these conditions applied, a man with a thousand-acre block in the wheat belt would be able to do without any employees. By growing less crop and by keeping sheep he could do without any labour except that of his sons, and would have less work to do in consequence, and this would mean turning one or two men from each place on to the labour market. Instead of a man producing 3,000 bags of wheat in a year he could turn his attention chiefly to sheep raising, and he and his sons would be able to manage the whole place. Thousands of bags per annum would be lost to the State and hundreds of thousands of pounds would cease to be distributed in wages. The landowner himself would be just as well off, if not better, and his wife would not have the trouble of feeding a lot of extra mouths. The country, however, could not stand this sort of thing. The conditions desired by Mr. Gray would have the effect of decreasing employment and also retarding production. I trust that, if an attempt is made to organise rural workers, this will be done on sound lines with a view to the possible results to the wheat-growing industry. If Mr. Gray desires that all our wheat farms should be turned into pastoral areas, he should persevere with his scheme. If, however, he wants a satisfied working community in the farming industry, I am prepared to assist him on the understanding that it will lead to increased production.

Hon. E. H. Gray: We want a satisfied community amongst the farm labourers.

Hon. H. J. YELLAND: To-day I spoke to a gentleman who had noticed an interjection of mine published in this morning's paper. He told me he had always given £4 a week to his men, a house to live in, all the milk they wanted, meat at reduced prices, and still they grumbled. My own experience at times has been much the same. Now I have a man working with me who is satisfied, and the work is going on to our mutual advantage.

Hon. J. M. Macfarlane: It is a question of efficiency.

Hon. H. J. YELLAND: Efficiency should always come first, but under Mr. Gray's scheme it would find second place, so long as

a man had two legs and two arms. I received a letter the other day stating that it was difficult to get men to work on a certain farm. The owner had a 4-roomed cottage for his men, gave them £4 a week, a cow for themselves, meat at reduced rates, and provided feed for 30 fowls. Labourers who work under those conditions are on a good wicket.

Hon. E. H. Gray: He must be an ideal employer.

Hon. H. J. YELLAND: And yet his man was not satisfied, and left him in the lurch.

Hon. E. H. Gray: He was a very foolish person.

Hon. H. J. YELLAND: Yes, and he deserved to be on the labour market.

Hon. E. H. Gray: We will provide you with any number of men on that basis.

Hon. H. J. YELLAND: They would not last long if they were not efficient. The present distribution of seats is out of keeping with the sense of fair play that is usually shown by Australian people. The time is opportune for the introduction of a redistribution of seats Bill. An attempt was made in this direction during the regime of the previous Government, and it should have been passed.

Hon. E. H. Gray: They had not the courage to go on with it.

Hon. H. J. YELLAND: I should like to know if the present Government have the courage to go on with it. They had not the courage to place it in the Governor's Speech.

Hon. A. Burvill: They may not think it necessary.

Hon. H. J. YELLAND: Perhaps they think it would be inadvisable from their point of view. It is generally acknowledged that the present distribution of seats is not right. A Bill on this question can fairly be introduced only on a non-party basis. The Bill introduced by the Mitchell Government was on non-party lines, seeing that it was based on the advice of outside expert officers. I trust the present Government will not show the white feather, and turn their backs on such a necessary measure. I represent an agricultural province and would naturally like to see the agricultural industry advanced. I am glad to know about the agricultural college. It made its initial entrance under the regime of the present Government. This question is of too much importance to enter into the realms of party politics. I wish to testify to the high esteem and respect in which I hold Mr. H. J. Hughes, first principal of the college. To no man

would I more readily entrust the future of my son than to him. He has done remarkable work in the Education Department and his integrity and uprightness are so well known that I believe his appointment augurs well for the institution. The appointment, however, was not made under very commendable conditions. When it was about to be made the Public Service Commissioner felt that he was not capable of selecting a man for the position. He therefore decided to delegate three other gentlemen of repute—the Director of Education, the Director of Agriculture, and Prof. Shann of the University—to assist him in making the appointment. I do not know that the selection for any other position has been delegated to such a committee. The appointee was to be possessed of qualifications along the lines represented by the three delegates. In the closing hours of last session a file dealing with the matter was laid on the Table, and from that file we found that the Minister for Agriculture had asked for reconsideration of a selection which had been made, and had been turned down. I am not here to discuss the merits or demerits of either gentleman. As I have said, I entertain the highest opinion of Mr. Hughes and am satisfied that he will fill the position with integrity and ability, with justice to the students and with benefit to the State. Yet there seems to have been the semblance of interference by the Minister. We know that Ministers come and go, and therefore the Minister's action seems to me injudicious. He interfered with the decision of three highly reputable gentlemen. For reasons such as this I recently stated in the Press, and I repeat the statement here, that in the best interests of the college and of the State, the college should be placed under the wing of the University and thus entirely removed from political control. I regret that Mr. Stephenson is not present. Yesterday that hon. member uttered some rather scathing comments on the products of this State. I am sorry also that the Press, in reporting our proceedings, drew attention to those comments. In my opinion such things, being derogatory to the interests of Western Australia, are best omitted. I hope the Press will now take a broad hint and give publicity to some facts I have to offer on the other side of the question. Mr. Stephenson went so far as to say that it was im-

possible at present to get in Western Australia a decent sample of produce. I take it he was referring to oats and chaff. But the fact that we do have some produce of inferior quality is owing largely to the attitude of the Chamber of Commerce, of which I understand Mr. Stephenson is a member. How foolish would a farmer be to grow wheat or oats of prime quality if the merchant in Perth will only give him the f.a.q. price for it! No prime wheat is sold on the market as prime wheat. I believe that is true also with regard to oats. By the method adopted in Western Australia, and unfortunately throughout Australia, wheat is sold on what are known as f.a.q. samples, being fair average samples of the whole of the wheat grown in the State. Numerous samples are procured from all over the State, and are all mixed together. The mixture is placed in a bushel measure, and that measurement of wheat is weighed and the result is the f.a.q. standard. It stands to reason that good wheat and bad wheat mixed together will produce a fair average sample. No objection is raised to that; but when the merchant deals with an owner of wheat, he docks that owner if the sample is below f.a.q., whereas if an owner brings a prime sample of wheat, the merchant admires it and praises it and politely gives the owner the f.a.q. price for it. That prime wheat is eventually mixed with poor wheat, thus making up the f.a.q. sample. The middleman gets his profit at the expense of the grower of the good sample of wheat. What is the result? The man who sets out to produce wheat of good quality questions the wisdom of doing so, saying, "If I do produce a good sample, I will only get the f.a.q. price for it; so I had better leave in a little bit of rubbish and still get the f.a.q. price." Incidentally, the rubbish weighs a little more. The very method adopted for selling wheat conduces to the production of poor samples. I wish Mr. Stephenson were present to hear me. The conditions under which the grain merchants buy and sell wheat are inducing the farmers to send such samples as will get them the value of what they send. They object to producing good wheat in order to make up the penalty of dockages on poor wheat. Let me quote a recent instance. A whole cargo of wheat was sent to the Old Country where a dispute arose. It was alleged by the buyers that the cargo was not up to f.a.q. standard. There must have been some

pretty bad wheat in the cargo to cause such a dispute. The sellers appointed an arbitrator, and the buyers appointed an arbitrator, and the two arbitrators chose an umpire. The three inspected the whole of the cargo, taking samples here, there and everywhere. In the result the adjudicators decided that the whole cargo was well up to the f.a.q. standard of the State in question. If the decision had been that the cargo was under f.a.q. standard, there would have been a dockage of 3,000 tons of wheat. The point I wish to make is that there must have been a large proportion of poor wheat in the cargo, and that dockage had already been imposed upon that poor wheat when it was delivered at the sidings. It appears, therefore, that the merchants had sent Home the inferior wheat mixed with better quality wheat, and that the mixture was up to the f.a.q. standard, notwithstanding that from 25 to 50 per cent. of the wheat had been docked here. The trouble arises from the pernicious system in vogue, a system towards the improvement of which the Chamber of Commerce will give no help. The system has been in vogue for many years, and it enables the commercial man to fleece the producers. The only remedy is to have a standard for our wheat. Such a standard is at present under consideration. I may add that last year it was opposed by the Chamber of Commerce. The proposed system is that wheat containing only one per cent. of foreign matter should be classed as No. 1 wheat, while wheat containing two or three per cent. of foreign matter should be classed as No. 2 wheat, and so on.

Hon. J. M. Macfarlane: Would that improve the return to the farmer?

Hon. H. J. YELLAND: Yes, and it would induce the farmer to grow better wheat. The Director of Agriculture, who is au fait with the whole subject, favours the proposed system. Here we have a member of the Chamber of Commerce audacious enough to stand up and say that the producers are not giving the country a fair deal—that is practically what his words amount to—while the Chamber of Commerce will not allow a proper standard to be introduced. Canada has such a standard.

Hon. A. Burvill: Does it work all right in Canada?

Hon. H. J. YELLAND: Of course it does.

Hon. J. M. Macfarlane: But it does not exist in any other Australian State.

Hon. H. J. YELLAND: That is so. The merchants are not going to give away their bread and butter if they can help it. For many years it has been my privilege to grade wheat kept for seed. Usually one has a few bushels left over, and when that is sold as graded wheat, though it does not contain one per cent. of foreign matter and is the best stud wheat, originally obtained from the State farm, it has to be sold at the ordinary f.a.q. price. It has cost 3d. per bushel in labour for grading, and perhaps 40 per cent. of the smaller grains have been taken out; nevertheless that first-class graded sample brings no more than f.a.q. price on the market.

Hon. J. M. Macfarlane: It represents a very small percentage of the whole crop, though

Hon. H. J. YELLAND: That is so, but the principle underlying it is such that it does not encourage farmers to produce better class crops. I am under instructions from my medical adviser not to speak at any great length this evening and I feel that I have spoken a little longer than I should have done. I have warmed up to the subject I have been dealing with and I feel it would be possible for me to say much more. I had intended to make reference to other important matters such as the Federal road grant and the dried fruit industry, which is very dear to my heart. Vermin control is a matter of great importance to the agricultural industry, and I should have liked to say something about it. I understand, however, that most of these matters will come under our notice at a later stage. I had intended to refer to the education grant and the position of the University, to experimental farms and research work in connection with the agricultural industry, agricultural development generally, and the development of the South-West as well as of the North-West. They are all subjects that could be dealt with at great length, but as they have been touched upon by most hon. members, I will not detain the House any longer. Before concluding I would like to express to you, Mr. President—this is the first time I have addressed the House since you have occupied the Chair—the hope that you will be permitted to long remain there to guide and direct the business of this House.

HON. H. SEDDON (North-East) [8.47]: In contributing a few remarks to the Address-in-reply debate, may I at the outset, congratulate you, Mr. President, upon the position you occupy. The honour accorded you is one you well deserve after your long experience in this House. It is a recognition of your ability and I know you will worthily fill the office. I also congratulate the new members who have been elected, and I feel sure we shall benefit by their counsels. I would like to deal briefly with the finances. That question has been well handled by some hon. members. It is rather amusing to compare the present financial position with what was said by the Premier in his policy speech delivered at Boulder on the 18th January, 1924. On that occasion the Premier said—

Finance is Government and Government is finance. Certainly there was no more important question affecting the well-being of the State. The same conditions obtained with the State as with the individual in financial matters. Difficulties in State finance meant difficulties for the people who had to face the high burdens of taxation, increased railway freights and increased charges for services rendered by the State to the people.

He went on to say—

The accumulated deficit was now £6,286,000 as against a deficit of £1,361,000 in 1916 when the Labour Government left office. There was an increase in the deficit for seven and a-half years under the National Government of £4,925,000. The average annual deficit for the Labour Government's five years of office was £275,000, whilst the average annual deficit for the National Government was £628,000, or an increased average annual deficit of £353,000. That would not have been so bad were it not for the fact that the party now in power enjoyed largely-increased revenue. It was easy to understand that it would be difficult to avoid a deficit if a Government were faced with falling revenue, but not so in a case where from year to year there was a largely expanded revenue.

In view of those remarks it is interesting to compare the revenue that the present Government have enjoyed since they have been in office, with the revenue collected by the Mitchell Government. In 1916 the revenue of the State was £5,356,978, and in 1923 it amounted to £7,207,492; in 1924, to £7,865,596; in 1925, to £8,381,446, and in 1926, to £8,808,166. Considering those figures on a per capita basis we find that in 1916 the revenue was £16.8 per head; in 1924, £22.24 per head; in 1925, £23 per head, and in 1926, £23.6 per head. So that regarding revenue, the present Government have received largely increased revenue returns

compared with those of their predecessors in office. The remarks of the Premier therefore are particularly appropriate when applied to his own administration. The Premier in the course of his speech went on to say—

The total revenue of the State in 1916, the last year the Labour Government was in office, was £4,557,000, while in 1923 the revenue of the National Government was £7,207,000, or an increased total revenue of £2,620,000 as against the figures for 1916. It was interesting to note that with a largely increased total revenue the National Government had built up, as he had already shown, a total deficit of £6,286,000. The largely increased expenditure of the Government, he would admit, had been due in some measure to the aftermath of war, with its higher cost of government and of material and various requisites. Even allowing for that, the financial record of the National party in power had been disastrous. That state of things would not have been as bad if the National Government had financed along the same lines as the Labour Party had done during its term of office. That had not been the case. The National party had enjoyed a largely increased revenue as a result of the increased burden of taxation thrown upon the shoulders of the people of the State. In 1916 the total amount paid by the people in direct taxation (income tax, stamp duties, etc.) was £407,000, whilst the amount paid last year was £987,000 or an increase of £580,000 that had to be paid by the taxpayer. The average annual direct taxation under Labour rule was £350,000, whilst the average annual direct taxation since Labour went out of office was £859,000.

To apply those remarks to the present Government we find that in 1925 the taxation received was £1,224,030, and in 1926—the financial year that has just ended—the taxation amounted to £1,418,050. Therefore it will be seen that the remarks of Mr. Collier regarding the finances generally, also apply to his criticism regarding taxation. The present Government have increased taxation tremendously compared with that available to the previous Government. To put the matter on a per capita basis, we again have interesting figures. In 1923, the Mitchell Government receive taxation to the extent of £2.8 per head, and in 1926 the Collier Government collected taxation to the extent of £4.5 per head.

Hon. E. H. HARRIS: Yet they complain that the Mitchell Government overburdened the people with taxation!

Hon. H. SEDDON: I am showing that the present Government have increased taxation enormously and, therefore, when we take into consideration the deficits, the question of taxation should be taken into consideration as well. In order to contrast the posi-

tion and to show what it would be if that state of affairs were continued at the 1924 rate—the last year of the Mitchell administration—the deficit last year would have been £474,752, or £375,610 more than was accounted for by the increased taxation compared with what was available during the Mitchell regime. These facts should drive home to members that when it comes to a question of finance, the present Government have nothing more to be proud of than had the previous Government. In fact, in view of the increased taxation available, the Collier Government have less to be proud of from that standpoint.

Hon. J. M. MACFARLANE: In addition to what the Mitchell Government had, the present Government have the land tax and the entertainment tax as well.

Hon. H. SEDDON: That is so. Then we come to the Premier's remarks regarding loan expenditure. After making reference to the deficit, he referred to loan expenditure as follows—

The Government, in order to carry out a policy of development, last year incurred a loan expenditure of £3,389,000, the total loan expenditure for the past four years being £11,193,000. The estimated loan expenditure for the current financial year—that was, what the Government had asked for and Parliament had approved—was no less than £4,474,000. It was proposed to spend this amount—the largest sum in the history of Western Australia. The interest bill for that amount of loan expenditure would be £282,000. It would result in a public debt of £13 per head of the population of the State. He wished to say that this State could not with its limited population afford for any number of years to spend loan moneys at the rate of four and a-half million a year. It was impossible. It would be all very well if they were increasing their population very rapidly, which in turn would increase their wealth production, and that in turn would earn the interest on the money borrowed and expended. With the small increase in the population of the State they could not afford to spend anything like four and a-half million a year.

When we look at the figures of loan expenditure we can again make an interesting comparison. In 1923 the loan authorisation was £3,888,464 and the loan expenditure £3,389,299. On a per capita basis, the authorisation was £10 19s. 9d. and the expenditure £9 14s. 4d. per head. In 1924 the loan authorisation amounted to £3,767,230 and the loan expenditure to £3,936,833. Again putting it on a per capita basis, we find that in that year the loan authorisation represented £10 6s. 11d. per head and the expenditure £10 16s. 2d.

per head. Then we come to the Collier Government's period of administration. In 1925 the loan authorisation amounted to £5,834,431. It will be remembered that the Premier said at Boulder that a loan expenditure of £4,500,000 in a year was all that Western Australia could face in view of our population. In 1925 the loan expenditure amounted to £4,099,021. Again making use of the per capita basis, we find that the loan authorisation in that year represented £15 13s. 4d. per head and the expenditure £11 0s. 2d. per head. For the year just concluded the loan authorisation amounted to £4,000,000 and the expenditure to £4,078,686, or, on a per capita basis, the authorisation amounted to £10 15s. and the expenditure to £10 19s. 4d. per head. By making this comparison I wish to drive home the fact that as far as loan expenditure is concerned, the present Government have no more reason to boast than had the Mitchell Government. As for the financial administration of the affairs of the State the words of the Premier could be applied equally to his own Government as to the Mitchell Government. While dealing with loan authorisations and expenditure I would like to draw attention to the state of affairs in the Old Country. We must realise that our position regarding future loans is likely to be affected by the existing state of affairs there. That is a very cogent fact. During the present year, not less than £100,000,000 worth of State and Commonwealth loans will become due and they will have to be renewed. Most of those loans are carrying a comparatively low rate of interest, so that the renewal of the loans will certainly result in an increased interest burden having to be shouldered by the whole Commonwealth. These loans will become due at a time when there will be a considerable shortage of funds for investment. The coal strike in England must necessarily decrease production in the Motherland. When we consider the statements emanating from Great Britain we must realise that their industrial activities are being greatly curtailed by the shortage of power and coal supplies. This means that there will not be the surplus money available for investment next year. Then again Great Britain has undertaken tremendous obligations arising out of the redemption of her loans from America and the charges incidental to those transactions. I refer to the moneys borrowed from

America for war purposes. It will be readily understood that the position regarding loan moneys next year will be very stringent. That means there is every necessity for careful economical administration in order that we may not find ourselves in a tight position next year. For that reason the greatest care should be exercised in administration and we should cease from our inclination to indulge in expenditure that may be described as extravagant. There is another question I would like to refer to, with regard to the special grant made to Western Australia by the Federal Government last year. There was considerable discussion about that money and I understand it is in the hands of the Treasurer at present. This was money granted to the State up to the end of June, 1926. I was interested to read in to-day's "West Australian" the remarks of the Premier dealing with the financial position. In the course of his statement the Premier said—

The figures on the revenue side include two months' proportion of the disabilities grant paid to the State by the Commonwealth Government last year. In making the amount available, the Prime Minister drew attention to the special Act passed by the Federal Parliament, providing that the payment was subject to appropriation by the State Parliament.

In my Budget, which I hope to deliver at an early date, I am providing for the special appropriation of this money, and instead of bringing the amount into revenue in one lump sum, I have decided, on the advice of the Under-Treasurer (Mr. G. W. Simpson) to spread the transfer equally over the twelve months. The Prime Minister has also agreed to pay progressively the grant of £300,000 for the present year, less the existing special payment of approximately £87,000. I have asked for a cheque covering the past two months, and for the balance of the grant to be made available monthly.

I raise that point because I remember distinctly the reading of the Act passed by the Federal Parliament dealing with the grant of this money to Western Australia. The condition under which the money was granted was that it might be appropriated by the Parliament of Western Australia. Judging by the text of the measure, it was not intended that the money should be dealt with and taken into Consolidated Revenue. Yet, on the Premier's own statement, that is what is taking place. It was intended that the money should be specially appropriated to meet the disabilities under which Western Australia had suffered as a result of Federation. Therefore, I cannot

understand why the Premier has assumed the responsibility of taking this money into Consolidated Revenue when it should have been specially dealt with by Parliament and its distribution approved by this House as well as by another place. I raise a most emphatic protest against this high-handed action on the part of the Premier. We have to realise that the State is suffering from serious disabilities, which were made plain to the Royal Commission appointed by the Federal Government and for which that money was specially granted. In the circumstances, the House should protest strongly at the arbitrary way in which this money is being handled by the Government. Reference was made last night and on other occasions to the attitude of the present Government toward the mining industry. I must commend the Government on having shown themselves sympathetic towards the industry. As far as opportunities presented themselves, they have endeavoured to assist the industry to a considerable extent. One cannot altogether compliment them upon the way in which assistance was granted and I refer particularly to the conditions under which money was made available to the Horseshoe mine. An advance of about £20,000 was made to the Horseshoe mine because the Government were informed that, unless the money was found, the mine would have to be closed down. One could well understand that the Government felt impelled to render some assistance to the mine; otherwise it would have meant that a considerable number of men would be thrown out of work. To avert that calamity, the Government were justified in finding a certain amount of money to keep the mine going. At the same time one would have thought the Government would have insisted upon a *quid pro quo* from the company. Those who read the report of the Royal Commissioner on mining will remember that the working costs of the Horseshoe mine were much higher than those of other mines on the Golden Mile. One would have expected that fact to be the subject of comment by the Government when a request was made for assistance. When the Government were requested to provide a second amount, it was given on an understanding that the directors would endeavour to raise money in London to carry out certain improvements to the mine and repay the Government for the advances they were making.

Yet at the end of the period apparently nothing was done. Certain of the directors took refuge behind the excuse that they could not raise the money. Apart from the assurance obtained from the directors of the mine, no attempt was made to insist upon money being spent by the directorate to carry on the mine. One would have thought that the Government when providing the money would have insisted on a pound for pound basis. I must congratulate the Government, however, on their proposal to provide cheap power for the mines. That is a recommendation which was made by Mr. Kingsley Thomas in the course of his report. I understand that a committee have gone thoroughly into the proposal, and are confident that they will be able to supply power to the mines at a very much cheaper rate than it is possible for them to generate power at present. That will have a good effect on mining costs. I have been informed by a mine manager that if he could get his power supplied at a $\frac{1}{2}$ d. per unit, it would mean a reduction of power costs to one-third of the present figures. The mine in question employs electric power in all the services of the mine with the exception of the winding. Members will realise what an advantage it will be to the mines if this proposal is adopted. On the other hand, it is only fair to point out that the adoption of the proposal will entail considerable expenditure on the part of the mining companies. It is pointed out that to take full advantage of the offer of the Government, it will be necessary for the mines to instal electric winders. This will involve considerable expenditure in the way of new machinery, and the mining companies are asking themselves what their position will be if they meet this expenditure in order to take advantage of the cheap power supplied by the Government. It looks as if the offer of cheap power is a step in the right direction, but it will have to be followed up by some sort of amalgamation scheme such as the adoption of a central treatment plant. At any rate, I compliment the Government upon the initiative they displayed in taking this step, and I trust their efforts will meet with success. Though the Government are making this effort for the Golden Mile, one hears little of any proposals to assist the outlying mines. There are mines outside Kalgoorlie struggling along under considerable difficulties. Their working costs are much lower than those of the Kalgoorlie mines, and yet

they find it hard to make ends meet. Let me quote the Sons of Gwalia mine, where the value of the average grade of ore is very much lower than the working costs of the mine. The result is that that mine is compelled to treat a higher grade of ore than the average, while being unable to do any development work, and consequently the life of the mine is being considerably shortened. When the Government were making their offer to the Kalgoorlie group of mines, one would have expected them to grant some assistance to the outside districts. Reference has been made to the Great Victoria mine. This mine has been struggling along for a number of years. It is a mine that would benefit greatly if the Government would subsidise low-grade mining production. I trust that the Government will indicate their intentions in this direction, because I feel sure that anything they do in the way of assisting the smaller mines in the outlying districts will be of benefit. If they adopt the principle that out of the Federal disabilities money they will make a subsidy grant to the smaller mines to determine what effect a gold bonus would have, it is quite possible they will make a demonstration and provide an argument sufficiently powerful to warrant asking the Federal Government for assistance for the mining industry. I have some interesting figures published in the "West Australian" some time ago by Mr. Jack, who quoted the results of the working of the seven principal mines of Western Australia during the six months ended June, 1926, as follows:—

Associated Mine—Loss, £419.
 Great Boulder—Loss, £833.
 Golden Horsehoe—Loss, £21,796.
 Lake View and Star—Profit, £11,600.
 South Kalgoorlie—Profit, £15,448.
 Sons of Gwalia—Profit, £430.
 Great Victoria—Profit, £1,486.

When the question of cheap power was being discussed, the Premier met at Boulder a deputation who asked him for assistance to the mining industry out of the special grant made available by the Prime Minister. At that meeting Mr. Collier mentioned the idea of producing cheap power for the Golden Mile. The Government were considerably impressed with the serious position obtaining in the industry at that time. Therefore, one would have thought that, when they were prepared to assist the Kalgoorlie mines by providing cheap power,

they would have refrained from taking any step that would impose an additional burden on the industry. Yet what do we find? The Government apparently quite ignored this condition of affairs when they put into operation the Third Schedule of the Workers' Compensation Act. I wish it to be understood clearly that in criticising the action of the Government for proclaiming the Third Schedule of the Act, I do not say the Government should refrain from taking any action and thus deprive the miners of the benefits provided for them. One feels that the miners are entitled to all the compensation that may be available for them, but one cannot congratulate the Government on the means they took to ensure the men getting that protection when they realised the serious position of the mines. Reference has been made to the dispute which occurred between the insurance companies and the Government with regard to insurance premiums. One would have thought the Government would have endeavoured to find an alternative which would not have pressed so heavily on the mines. I have pointed out how most of the mines have been experiencing hard times. Yet the imposition of this extra premium will mean an increase of some thousands of pounds in their expenditure each year. It has been said that the increased expenditure on insurance on the Gwalia mine, as a result of the proclaiming of the Third Schedule, will exceed £4,000 a year. Realising the serious position of the mines, the Government were ill-advised in putting this additional load on them at that time. Still, we have no right to deprive the men of the benefits provided under the Third Schedule. The Government might have carried the liability until the power scheme had been completed and the mines had been enabled to reduce their costs to such an extent as to enable them to bear the imposition. That would have shown some sympathetic understanding of the financial position of the mines. I should like to commend the Government upon the scheme of land settlement at Salmon Gums for the men affected by dust. This scheme is one of the most liberal that has been brought forward for the settlement of men on the land. I understand that an area of 300,000 acres has been reserved in that district for the men who have been "dusted" on the mines. The Government have notified all the men whose lungs are affected of their readiness to assist them to find other employment and, if they so de-

sire, to provide them with farms in the Salmon Gums district. The terms are liberal and it will be possible for a man to go on to a block there although he is not possessed of a penny. The Government will assist him and carry him until he is able to finance himself. The Government deserve all possible credit for this scheme, and I assure them that it will be highly appreciated by the miners. There are one or two difficulties that have manifested themselves as a result of the application of the Act. I am not offering these remarks in any spirit of criticism; I do so in the hope that Ministers will be able to remedy these difficulties. Under the Miners' Phthisis Act it is provided that a man whose lungs are affected by dust shall be notified and advised for his own protection to leave the mines. Under the Workers' Compensation Act it is provided that if a man leaves a mine and is away from it for 12 months, he is no longer able to claim compensation. Thus, by a man taking the advice of the Government in the interests of his own health, he may be deprived of any benefits to which he may be entitled under the Workers' Compensation Act. It is a matter that has really come to light as a result of the application of the principle, and I intend to bring it under the notice of the Government. In the case of men enjoying good tributes they feel in those circumstances they are throwing up a good living to take up a job provided for them by the Government. They have no guarantee of the continuity of that job and they therefore are inclined to remain in the mines to the detriment of their health, their object being to get together sufficient money to enable them at a later date to engage in some other occupation. I would like to make a few remarks with regard to the railway position that has been stressed by other members. There are two important facts that should be stressed. It has been pointed out that there is a serious truck shortage and that the Government have made arrangements for the construction of 160 "Gc" trucks. The capacity of these trucks is about ten tons. Recently I had the pleasure of receiving a report from South Africa giving me particulars of the trucks and engines which are employed on the South African railways. The system there has a mileage of 11,126. There, too, they have a 3ft. 6in. gauge and consequently we can reasonably compare the conditions existing in that country and in ours. The

first point that strikes one in comparing the equipment there with our own is the much larger hauling power that the South African engines have. The hauling power of their smallest engine is 11,000 lbs., and the hauling power of the largest 47,000 lbs. In Western Australia the hauling power of our smallest engine at the present time is 7,000 lbs., and the hauling power of our most powerful is 24,000 lbs. One of the most important factors in economical railway working is to have engines of big hauling power. That is one of the first essentials towards low working costs. I would like to make a few comparisons with regard to the trucks used in the two countries. In the Western Australian system the trucks with the largest carrying capacity are the "Xa" and the "Qa." The latter has a capacity of 27 tons and the former 25 tons. The truck of the lightest carrying capacity is the "H" which will convey $5\frac{1}{2}$ tons. In South Africa we find that the truck with the largest carrying capacity is the "U," and its range is from 28 to 50 tons. Their light truck, the "C," has a capacity of from 10 to 24 tons. In order to estimate it at its best value, we want to take the ratio between the tare of the truck and the loaded truck. In Western Australia the ratio of the best truck is two to one, that is to say, that a truck will carry twice its weight. The ratio of the light truck is eight to five. Coming to the South African ratio, for the best truck there it is 2.5 to one, and for the lightest truck 2.03 to one. Therefore on the South African system they carry something like twice the weight of the train in load, whereas in Western Australia the ratio we carry is about 1.1 to one. In other words, we are dragging about as much weight of truck as the load, and that is one of the most important reasons why our costs are so high in regard to the railways. It has been argued that the large truck is only suitable here for certain classes of traffic. On the other hand, two classes of traffic on our system are growing rapidly, and these can be best handled by big trucks. I have perused the figures and compared the various systems and the various classes of loading in the years 1902, 1914 and 1925. In 1902 our coal traffic carried came to 784,000 tons. In 1925 the total was 212,940 tons. The mineral traffic in 1902 was 448,472 tons and in 1925 it was 560,951 tons. The wheat traffic in 1902 was 59,220 tons and in 1925 567,419 tons, whilst other grain and flour were responsible for 159,945 tons. In other words,

the wheat traffic which in 1902 was only 2.9 per cent. of the total tonnage, in 1925 was no less than 23 per cent. When we realise the tremendous advance that is taking place in wheat production, it will be seen how necessary it is to be able to cope with the traffic. Undoubtedly, therefore, larger trucks are urgently required. One cannot help but think that the decision of the Government to adopt the "Gc" truck was very unwise. By the use of a larger truck they would be able to handle the traffic much more efficiently. Another point arises in connection with economical railway working as the result of the employment of large trucks. I pointed out how the ratio between load and tare is very much better with a large than a small truck, but the hauling power of the locomotive is increased 10 to 15 per cent. by using large trucks. The length of the train affects the hauling power of the locomotive. They can not only haul big trucks as easily as the small trucks, but they can haul them better.

Hon. A. Burvill: You must remember that some of our railways have to negotiate big curves that do not exist in South Africa. Those curves are detrimental to the use of large trucks.

Hon. H. SEDDON: That is so, but you must not overlook the fact that you are hauling that train with an engine of 56 to 84 tons and if that engine can negotiate curves, surely 50-ton trucks should also negotiate them. There is another matter on which I would like to make a few remarks. It is the proposal to generate current at Collie. That I consider is a step in the right direction. We should recognise the fact that if the State is to progress, it has to take every advantage to develop secondary industries and make the best possible use of its primary industries, and to do that we must have cheap power. I had the pleasure the other day of listening to Sir John Monash who related what was being done at Yallourn. As I mentioned recently, they are transmitting current a distance of 306 miles, and the voltage is 128,000. At the end of that 306-mile line, they have 1,000 kilowatt load. It will therefore be seen that if the possibilities of electric transmission are so great in a country like Victoria, they are much greater here, because we have a drier climate. Another point that Sir John Monash stressed was that on that very long line of transmission the loss was under 7 per cent. It will be realised what economies can be effected by transmitting electricity at a high tension as compared with hauling fuel to generate cur-

rent at a distant point. The proposal now is to generate electricity by burning coal in pulverised form. This will permit of the use of coal for which use cannot at present be found. Another matter to which I wish to allude before I close has reference to certain remarks made in this Chamber last night. One regrets at times a departure from the rather high standard of impersonal debate which characterises this House. One cannot help remarking on the fact that certain persons are able to go further than others in making remarks.

Hon. J. W. Mann: Persons?

Hon. H. SEDDON: Hon. members, I should have said. Their remarks, however, are not always regarded as having been made with the same amount of responsibility. The question arose with regard to the position obtaining in dealing with miners' phthisis and certain statements were made which reflected upon the integrity of members of this House. It is only right, perhaps, that I should trace the facts that led up to the introduction of the subject, so as to refresh the memory of hon. members and enable them to realise exactly what has occurred. The Miners' Phthisis Amendment Act was introduced into this Chamber last session, and the Minister when submitting it pointed out that the Government were endeavouring to overcome a defect in the Bill which existed owing to the fact that the original Act merely provided for the finding of employment for the men, once only. The idea was that by amending the section of the Act in question it would be possible to extend the responsibility of the Government so that any man suffering from tuberculosis and taken out of a mine, would be on the hands of the Government and that employment would be found for him, not merely once, but from time to time, employment that would be suitable to his state of health. We recognise the importance of that, and the goldfields members gave full credit to the Government for their action. There was, however, a further amendment introduced with which we were not so impressed. That related to the section dealing with the amount to be paid for total incapacity as the result of tuberculosis. The provisions of the Act were that a man, on being declared to be totally incapacitated, should be provided for by receiving compensation from the Mines Department in the form of a sum not less than as prescribed by the scale of relief given at the commencement of the Act, under the rules of the Mine Workers' Relief Fund. In introducing the amending

Bill the Honorary Minister made use of the following remarks:—

The Bill further provides that if a man cannot work at all he shall be paid compensation, which shall be not less than that which would be payable under the Mine Workers' Relief Fund. That amount is not large. Furthermore, it is only the minimum that can be paid. There is nothing to prevent the amount from being increased as the disabilities affect the man concerned. We have to begin somewhere. In the event of death the widow and dependants of the miner will receive certain benefits, I think 25s. for the widow and 5s. for each dependant child. We must take a broad view of the situation. We start off with this minimum, but it may be increased as may be thought fit. There may be certain objections to this.

In Committee when the matter was being discussed I asked the Minister certain questions with the idea of seeing if it could not be arranged that the men so seriously affected as to be prevented from following any employment should receive the full compensation under the Act. The Minister, in answering the question, referred to the provisions of the Act, but on request he was kind enough to allow the matter to be held over till the next day in order that he might consult the Crown Solicitor. He consulted the Crown Solicitor and the result was that I introduced an amendment. In the debate on that amendment, the following remarks were made:—

Honorary Minister: The amendment to the Act provides that if a man is down and out he will be paid a sum equivalent to that paid by the Mine Workers' Relief Fund not the amount paid to-day, but the amount originally paid when the fund was inaugurated.

So, as the result of that, this House had no assurance as to the exact amount to be paid to those men under the proposed amending Act. The only assurance we had was that the Government would see to it that the men received not less than the rate under the Mine Workers' Relief Fund.

Hon. E. H. HARRIS: The Minister did not indicate how much more, if anything.

Hon. H. SEDDON: No. Our contention was that the full rate should be paid them, and we were attempting to obtain from the Government an assurance that the men would be adequately compensated. As the result of the debate in this House, and in consequence of a report in the Press, there was considerable discussion in Kalgoorlie on the question. The Minister for Mines wrote to the "Kalgoorlie Miner" taking exception to a report in that paper respect-

ing the Miners' Phthisis Act Amendment Bill. In that letter Mr. Troy stooped to make reference to the attitude of hon. members, accusing them of engaging in political propaganda. I think members were convinced of the attitude adopted in this House by goldfields members: they were endeavouring to get the position clearly defined, to see that the men should not suffer. It was not with any idea of political propaganda that the matter was brought up. However, it was introduced in the Press by the letter from the Minister for Mines. Further discussion ensued, and as the result of that discussion the men in Kalgoorlie took certain action. A meeting was called at Boulder by the A.W.U. mining branch for the 29th January, 1926. Let me quote from the "Westralian Worker" as follows:—

A special meeting of the A.W.U. mining branch was held at the Workers' Hall, Boulder, on Sunday morning last for the purpose of discussing the Miners' Phthisis Act and having its provisions explained by the Minister for Mines, Mr. M. F. Troy. Amongst those present in addition to the Minister, were the Honorary Minister for Health, Mr. S. Munsie, the Honorary Minister for Water Supply, Mr. J. Cunningham, and Messrs. G. Lambert and T. Walker, M.S.L.A., and Mr. J. R. Brown, M.L.C.

A remark was made last night that there was no row amongst the men in Kalgoorlie. During that meeting certain remarks were made. The report continues:—

The only matter the executive of the union did not agree with was the provision that a man who could not work or, in the event of his death, his dependants, should be paid a sum by way of compensation not less than that laid down by the Mine Workers' Relief Fund. Under the Act they had to have some basis and they have provided the basis indicated, and from that they could build up. The Government wanted to make the compensation reasonable. In New South Wales any payment made under the Mine Accident Relief is not taken into consideration by the Federal Government, and if a miner there receives from the accident fund £2 or £3 per week, the invalid pension allowed by the Federal Government is not reduced on that account. They were going to ask the Federal Government that any compensation fixed under the Miners' Phthisis Act should not influence the amount payable under the Invalid Pension Act. They wanted to do this before they could definitely fix the amount of compensation payable to the man totally incapacitated by T.B. He would take their view back to Cabinet, the members of which would see what amount they would fix. It was only lately that they had the returns from the laboratory showing how many men were affected and the number of T.B. cases that must be provided for.

So, on the word of the Minister for Mines given at that meeting of the 24th January last, the Government at that date had not fixed the scale of compensation proposed to be paid to totally incapacitated men. Mr. Troy is further reported to have said the men need not be afraid they were going to be put on the Mine Workers' Relief Fund. The Government would fix the scale of relief at an adequate rate. Mr. Troy continued—

When the amount payable to those who could no longer follow any occupation was decided upon, a regulation fixing it at that amount would be laid on the Table of the House, and no subsequent Government could alter it except by a similar procedure or by amendment. If any Government wanted to alter the Bill they would alter it by an amending Bill.

The following motion was then moved:—

That this union requests the Government to fix the basis of payment for those men taken out of the mines through having contracted T.B., and who cannot follow any occupation at the ruling rate of wages; and on the death of such beneficiary payments for dependants at:—Widows £2 10s. per week; mother or father £2 10s. per week; dependant brother or sister £2 10s. per week; and 10s. per week for each child.

That was the request made by the union to the Government at the meeting held on the 24th January last at which Mr. Troy was present. Further correspondence on the interpretation of the Act took place, my colleagues and I putting one interpretation on the original Act which Mr. Troy endeavoured to combat. The question of making payments was raised also. Now I wish to refer briefly to a further meeting held in Boulder. I quote from the "Westralian Worker" of the 12th February, 1926, so the meeting would have been held on the 7th—

Premier satisfies workers that the miners' phthisis schedule of compensation is the best in the world. Speech at Boulder lays bare the mendacious propaganda of Nationalist candidates for the Upper House.

Those are the headings. The Premier is reported to have said this:—

The Government had decided by way of compensation in such cases to pay half wages in accordance with the provisions of the Workers' Compensation Act, and to wife and widows in accordance with the scale of the Workers' Compensation Act of Broken Hill the maximum payment was to be limited to the basic wage for the district. Single men would be paid half wages, and where they had dependants—father, mother, brother or sister dependent upon them—they would be in the

same position as the married men there was to be no maximum on the total amount payable in the course of the amending of the Act it was decided that the amount paid to men no longer able to work should not be less than the amount paid under the Mine Workers' Relief Fund. That was put in as a basis. The Government knew that it did not compel them to pay that amount. Never in their minds for one moment was there any such intention. Had they put a higher amount into the Bill, it was quite possible it would not have passed the Legislative Council. Notwithstanding what men say to-day, that that Chamber would pass a higher payment, they lied in their teeth in saying so.

Those were the remarks of the Premier of this State. At that meeting Mr. C. B. Williams said—

They did not want the Mine Workers' Relief Fund rate, and they realised if they did not get generous treatment from their own Government they would have no hope of getting it from the other fellow. They felt they were right when they wanted to know the rates that were going to be paid, and their agitation arose from that anxiety. The rates that were going to be paid to the man who could not work at all was the only argument they had, and they had not entered into the controversy nor said one word in public to the detriment of the Government.

I think that gives a very effective answer to the remarks by Mr. Brown last night when he criticised the attitude of goldfields members and referred particularly to Mr. Harris. Mr. Harris, speaking on the question, said—

When the miners realised what this meant, they assembled in large numbers and held several meetings. Some of the speakers had hard things to say concerning the powers that be. Ministers and goldfields members were reminded of promises that had been made to them.

Hon. E. H. Harris: That is what is designated as kicking up a row.

Hon. H. SEDDON: Yes. I think I have demonstrated that there was considerable interest and anxiety amongst the men in Kalgoorlie regarding the position created by the Government in their amendments to the Miners' Phthisis Act, and that the men were not satisfied with an assurance from the Premier as to the scale upon which they were to be paid. It is quite clear from Mr. Troy's remarks that the scale had not been fixed prior to that meeting at Boulder. It was only that the kicking up of a row by those men in Kalgoorlie had forced upon the Government the necessity for dealing with this important question. In those circumstances, Mr. Brown's remarks last night were exceedingly ill timed. His reference

to the utterances of hon. members have been effectually refuted by what I have read to-night from the "Westralian Worker." In conclusion I trust that future debates in this Chamber will be characterised by a very much higher tone than that adopted by Mr. Brown last night.

On motion by Hon. J. W. Hickey, debate adjourned.

BILLS (7)—FIRST READING.

1. Supply (No. 2), £831,000.
2. Trust Funds Investment Act Amendment.
3. Kalgoorlie and Boulder Racing Clubs Act Amendment.
4. Herdsman's Lake Drainage Act Repeal.

Received from the Assembly.

5. Jetties.
6. Shipping Ordinance Amendment.
7. Navigation Act Amendment.

Introduced by the Honorary Minister.

House adjourned at 9.52 p.m.

Legislative Assembly.

Wednesday, 1st September, 1926.

	PAGE
Questions: Railways electrification	693
Electricity Supply	693
Fremantle Railway bridge	693
Dental Officer	693
Forty-four hour week	694
Leave of Absence	694
Bills: Forests Act Amendment, 1R.	694
Supply (No. 2) £831,000, all stages	694
Metropolitan Market, 1R.	708
Day Baking, 1R.	708
Inspection of Scaffolding Act Amendment, 1R. ...	708
Trust Funds Investment Act Amendment, 3R. ...	718
Kalgoorlie and Boulder Racing Clubs Act Amendment, 3R.	718
Herdsman's Lake Drainage Act Repeal, 3R. ...	718
Notice of Motion: Financial relations, Commonwealth and States	708
Motions: Police Benefit Fund, to inquire by Select Committee	709
Railway gauge unification	714
Retirement of W. Ripper, to inquire by Select Committee	718
Papers: Repurchased estates, Cummins	718

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

QUESTION—RAILWAYS, ELECTRIFICATION.

Mr. SAMPSON asked the Minister for Railways: Will he advise the approximate expense involved in the electrification of the Fremantle-Perth and Perth-Armadale, Mundaring and Chidlow railways?

The MINISTER FOR RAILWAYS replied: Separate detailed estimates have not been prepared, but the cost would be over £1,000,000.

QUESTION—ELECTRICITY SUPPLY.

Mr. SAMPSON asked the Minister for Railways: 1, Will he advise whether the limit of production has been reached in the generation of electric current? 2, If not, what margin of quantity is still available? 3, When is it anticipated that additional generating plant will be in operation? 4, What is the approximate quantity of electricity generated to-day? 5, To what increased extent will the installation of new plant make current available?

The MINISTER FOR RAILWAYS replied: 1, Yes, practically, with the present plant. 2, Answered by No. 1. 3, Winter, 1927. 4, At the rate of 60,000,000 units per annum. 5, An additional 60 per cent.

QUESTION—FREMANTLE RAILWAY BRIDGE.

Mr. SLEEMAN asked the Minister for Railways: 1, Can he inform the House who was the first person to report the collapse of the Fremantle railway bridge? 2, If not, will he have inquiries made so as to enable the people of Fremantle, who wish to recognise the services of the first person to report the matter, to do so?

The MINISTER FOR RAILWAYS replied: 1, Yes; Ganger E. Hogan. 2, Answered by No. 1.

QUESTION—DENTAL OFFICER.

Mr. SLEEMAN asked the Honorary Minister (Hon. J. Cunningham): When is the dental officer, for whom provision was made on last year's Estimates, likely to be appointed?

The HONORARY MINISTER replied: The dental officer was appointed early last month.