

liament and a recognition of its difficulties, the scheme will prove successful. If that attitude is adopted by all parties in the House, they will not find me critical of what has been done in the past. I have not the slightest desire to make the group settlements a party matter. I am not attempting to do so in my administration of the scheme. I have considered no one and nothing except what I thought was just. I have done justice to all, and so has the board.

Mr. Davy: I should hope so.

The MINISTER FOR LANDS: That is my attitude.

Mr. Davy: It is not conceivable that any Minister would take up any other attitude.

The MINISTER FOR LANDS: I shall welcome the assistance of the Leader of the Opposition and of all parties in this House, and if I get that, I feel sure that in the years to come the scheme will make good. That will undoubtedly be the result if the settlers do their part. If they will accept their responsibilities now in good heart, in a few years' time we shall have established a successful industry and a thriving community, and the prosperity of Western Australia will be greatly enhanced in consequence.

On motion by Mr. Richardson, debate adjourned.

House adjourned at 10.27 p.m.

Legislative Council.

Tuesday, 21st August, 1928.

	PAGE
Papers: South Province election	285
Address-in-reply, eighth day	285

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

PAPERS—SOUTH PROVINCE ELECTION.

On motion by Hon. J. Cornell ordered: That all papers relating to correspondence between Messrs. G. H. Rainsford, James Cornell, J. J. Lawler, C. B. Williams, and the Chief Electoral Officer, in regard to polling

places and postal vote officers for the South Province Election, 1928, also all papers relating to the cancellation of appointments of H. S. Buzacott and R. R. Judge as postal vote officers and their re-appointment, be laid on the Table of the House.

ADDRESS-IN-REPLY.

Eighth Day.

Debate resumed from the 16th August.

HON. SIR EDWARD WITTENOOM (North) [4.35]: I have always understood that the fifth wheel of the coach can be very useful. I find exemplification of it to-day, since I have taken the place of somebody else rather unexpectedly, owing, I believe, to a little indisposition. Still, I had intended to make a few remarks to-morrow, however much they may have been stated before; for at this stage of the debate very little can be said that has not been already mentioned. At the risk of repetition, I intend to refer to two or three subjects. If I cannot succeed in making myself interesting, at all events I will offer compensation by being brief. The Speech puts me in mind of our weather prophet at the Observatory in that, while most excellent in records, it is a little weak in forecast. However, I suppose the Government have availed themselves of that wise old maxim that we should not hide our light under a bushel. The first item I propose to deal with is that referring to our wheat production. As my text I take from the Speech this excerpt—

It is estimated that a further big advance will be made for the current season, and a campaign has been initiated for the production of 50,000,000 bushels of wheat during the centenary year (1929-30).

This has given me a great deal of food for reflection, because it is impossible for us to produce that quantity of wheat unless we have the necessary labour. That brings us back to the disputed question of land clearing, which is fundamental in the production of wheat. Unless we have labour available for the clearing of the land, it will be impossible to increase the acreage we have already under crop. During the last week or two I have been away in the country, where I have had exceptional opportunities for seeing the result of land clearing and the utilisation of the various classes of labour. Not long ago

I noticed in the newspaper that the Premier had some comment on the view that there were not sufficient Britishers available to do the necessary clearing, that Britishers would not do the clearing, and so it had to be done by foreigners. When I use the word "Britisher" I include in it the Australian. What the Premier said in effect was that it was absurd to think there were not sufficient Britishers here to do the work, else how was it the work had been done in the past, and how had the farmers been able to get the clearing done before the foreigners came to the State? That aspect of the question I do not propose to discuss, for I cannot say how the work was done; but I say this—more in sorrow than in anger—that those who did the work before the foreigners came left such records that they can hardly get employment at the task again. I say it regretfully because, as I have said, when I speak of Britishers I think also of my own countrymen; for they are Western Australians, as I am a Western Australian. However, either they cannot do the work of clearing, or they will not do it. I have gone carefully into this subject and have come to the conclusion that the Britisher does not like the work of clearing and is not inclined to apply himself to it. I visited one property of about 12,000 acres. Of that, some 10,000 acres were cleared. A lot of the clearing was still in hand. I asked how it was being conducted, and was told, "Mostly by foreigners." Then I asked how many applications for the work had been received from Britishers during the last 12 months. I learnt that three applications had been received from Britishers and 20 from foreigners. One of the Britishers was given work, but the remainder of the clearers were foreigners. But for those men the clearing would not have been done. On another property the owner told me that not only could he not have put in his present crop, but he would never have undertaken the clearing had he had to depend on British clearers. He said that in the first place they were not reliable and that, in the second place, they scarcely ever applied for the work. I dare say you, Sir, understand that the clearing of forest land is done in two processes. In the first instance the timber is cut down and heaped up ready for burning at a subsequent period. When this cutting down and stacking is finished, generally 50 per cent. of the total price is paid. I

am told that in many instances the Britisher, having received this 50 per cent., does not come back to finish the work, and in consequence it is not finished in time, and so a season is lost. On the other hand, I am told that when the foreigner takes the work in hand it is finished off entirely. I am going to give some instances of this. On the last property visited by me, 48,000 acres have been cleared, 20,000 acres planted with wheat, 2,000 acres planted with oats, while 12,000 acres are lying fallow. So members can imagine the class of property it is. The proprietor assured me that but for the work of foreigners, he could never have got so large an acreage cleared. I am dealing entirely with clearing. The staff of that property, indeed of all such properties, are not foreigners, but are truly British. It is the clearing question that I am considering. If we are to have an increased production of wheat, the clearing of the land is the fundamental principle of the whole business. Unless that can be done satisfactorily, we shall not have the promised increase. It is said that one of the reasons why the Britisher does not apply for clearing work is that he cannot get the wages, cannot make sufficient money at it. I do not know what money he can make, but the wages, I have ascertained in the case of foreigners, are from 12s. to 13s. a day, on day work, they to find themselves, and for piecework 31s. 6d. an acre. When the first cutting down and stacking is done, the contractor receives half that money. It is said they live on the smell of an oil rag. It must be a very nourishing rag, because they look strong and able. I also had an opportunity of seeing what their rations consist of. At the place I was in, they got out their rations from town twice a week. They had as much of everything as we have in the way of potatoes, bread, tea and everything except meat. They do what is a good thing for the State, namely catch all the rabbits they can, but the rabbits are so elusive they may not get as many as they want. I have here a few details. On one place, 20 Italians applied for work and three Englishmen. There was room for only one Englishman. On the other place, where there were 48,000 acres, only one Britisher applied for clearing in the last five months. It was proof in those two cases and on those two large farms that for some reason

or other the Britisher did not want the clearing work.

The Honorary Minister: How often did the employers apply for British labour.

Hon. Sir EDWARD WITTENOOM: I would not expect them to apply for it. Those who wanted work came along for it. One employer said that a good deal of the British labour was unsatisfactory. I am not one of the proprietors, and have not employed any foreigners.

The Honorary Minister: You would think that if they had wanted British labour, they would have applied for it.

Hon. Sir EDWARD WITTENOOM: I should think it would be the other way. If British labour wanted the work, and there were 400 unemployed, they would naturally go looking for it.

The Honorary Minister: If they knew where it was to be found they would go for it.

Hon. Sir EDWARD WITTENOOM: I do not say they would not go for it. At any rate, they would not have much trouble in finding it.

Hon. H. A. Stephenson: It is possible the men were advertised for, but did not apply.

Hon. Sir EDWARD WITTENOOM: These people advertised for the clearing of 500 or 600 acres, and the work was taken at the prices I mentioned. On the smaller place, the permanent staff comprises nine Australians, three Englishmen and two Italians. I am dealing entirely with the clearing in its elementary stage. On the other farm, in addition to the 10,000 acres of wheat there are about 10,000 sheep, all of which must receive attention. Only one Englishman applied for a contract for clearing, and he got it. He had 226 acres to clear and he performed the work. The employer said if it had not been for the others, it would not have been possible to clear over 1,800 acres. I hope these particulars will be published. The Honorary Minister says that the work would be taken if Britishers knew it was available. There is any amount of work there, and in other districts, too, I expect. If Britishers want the clearing work, they should not have much difficulty in applying for it and getting it. I thought I would bring these details forward, having had a good chance of seeing the work where it is carried on, and having ascertained so far as I could

from the proprietors of these places the actual facts. I hope the information will prove of interest to hon. members. I now wish to deal with the proposed harbour improvements at Fremantle. One of the most important works, if not the most important work that is likely to be carried out, has to do with the extension of the harbour, and particularly the suggestions of the Engineer-in-Chief. It is such a huge scheme that further particulars ought to be supplied to us before we give it consideration. I am pleased to see from the Press that the Premier intends that Parliament shall express an opinion upon the recommendations of the Engineer-in-Chief. I do not know the Engineer-in-Chief, beyond having met him socially, nor have I ever discussed any of these proposals with him. Furthermore, I do not know Sir George Buchanan, nor have I ever seen that gentleman. I cannot, therefore, be accused of prejudice in favour of either of these gentlemen. After reading the two schemes and going over the particulars given, I must say I am very much in favour of the suggestions of Sir George Buchanan. Both engineers seem to have considered the matter, and both seem to be experienced, but they are singularly at variance in what they recommend. I do not profess to be an engineer—even if I did, not many people would believe it—and I do not profess to be a harbour engineer. Nevertheless I flatter myself I can give as good an opinion about harbour engineering as any member of the present Ministry. I do not know in what circumstances any member of the Government can be said to have qualified for the position of engineer; therefore I consider that my views are as good as any of theirs. I can only imagine that the members of the Government have been induced to adopt the recommendations of the Engineer-in-Chief because he has given them good and sound reasons which we have not yet heard, but which I hope we shall hear at a later stage.

Hon. J. Nicholson: Before the money is spent.

Hon. G. W. Miles: They began spending it last session.

Hon. Sir EDWARD WITTENOOM: My knowledge of Fremantle is of long standing, for I was born there. I remember the bar across the river, when one could almost walk across it through about three feet of water

Hon. E. H. Harris: Water at the bar!

Hon. Sir EDWARD WITTENOOM: The only boat that went across was a small flat-bottomed vessel with a paddle in the stern. I was also intimately connected with that port when Sir John Coode came here to give us information in connection with the harbour for Fremantle. I happened to be a member of the Legislative Council in those days. Owing to certain circumstances of which I have not the details, he decided against the river, and recommended going south of Fremantle. I also remember distinctly that Mr. C. Y. O'Connor induced Sir John Forrest to allow him to open up the river, on the ground, as far as I can remember, that the information supplied to Sir John Coode was not correct, and because of the scour of the tides at the mouth of the river. Unfortunately he induced Sir John Forrest to agree with his view. I was a member of the Government for three or four years while this work was progressing, and I heard a good many opinions expressed concerning the Fremantle harbour. I never heard one opinion expressed but that there should be an extension of the harbour up the river. Great stress was laid upon the fact that Rocky Bay was a commodious little harbour, and when well supplied with wharves on each side it would accommodate as much shipping as would be required for many years. The idea was so prevalent of using the river, that I was invited to join the Chamber of Commerce in Perth. I was going to do so, when Mr. Frank Wilson told me that one of the chief planks in his platform was to bring all the shipping to Perth. That decided me at once. I did not want the shipping brought to Perth, and would have nothing to do with the Chamber. The whole idea then for an extension of the harbour, when it did come about, was up the river. No one with any knowledge of Western Australia and its weather conditions—we have had a very good sample of it during the last few days—who happened to go to the site, where Mr. Stileman proposes to make an outer harbour, could fail to note the tempestuous seas and the terrific winds there which the shipping would be called upon to cope with. It seems to me that if we are to go outside the river for a harbour, we should go south instead of north. In the south there is some shelter, but there is none if the extension goes north. My common sense will not allow me to adopt the suggestion of the Engineer-in-Chief with regard to harbour accommodation without

further explanation. I shall look forward to the debate on the question, or to its being submitted to the House, and I shall want to hear some very convincing arguments, which no doubt will be forthcoming. I think there must be arguments in favour of the latest proposal, because without them the eight members of the Ministry could not have been so convinced that Mr. Stileman's recommendations are the best. I shall await this further information with a good deal of interest. It will take a good deal to convince me that the harbour should be extended to the north in preference to the south. I have a few remarks to make on the question of road construction. I do not profess to be an engineer on that subject either. From what I have read and seen, I feel that the method of carrying out this work is so unsystematic and so devoid of regulation, that I am surprised it has been done at all. We see a portion done in some places and a portion done in others. I do not know on what terms the money is allocated or how it is spent, or by whom it is spent; therefore I am not in a position to give an opinion, but I do know this, that on Saturday last I travelled over a good many miles of newly made roads and I found that those roads, instead of the drains, were the receptacles for water. Nearly everywhere the centre of the road seemed to hold all the water that had fallen. What kind of road-making is that? Again, for many miles there were holes in the road that were full of water and every time the wheels of the car went into those holes, material was splashed up and so the hole was made larger. There was not a single person or a party to attend to the roads, to attempt to divert the water from them, or to endeavour to effect repairs. After the expenditure of a considerable sum of money on main roads, there should be some sort of supervision; they should be kept in something like decent order. One would think that the idea prevailed that the road having been made, it was going to remain like that for ever. Thousands of pounds must have been spent on the roads and it was wicked almost to see so much water lying on the surface without any attempt being made to divert it.

The Honorary Minister: Would you mind telling us where that was?

Hon. Sir EDWARD WITTENOOM: Between Guildford and towards New Norcia, and it was particularly bad through the Upper Swan. It cannot be very long since

the road was made there; just beyond Bullsbrook before coming to the forest all needs attention. It is a splendidly made piece of road, but with the water running over it and in so many places remaining on it, it must rapidly deteriorate. On coming closer to Perth in the vicinity of the racecourse crowds of men were seen working away apparently on a task that did not appear to be necessary. They seemed to be cutting away roads, while others that had been newly formed, were permitted to go to ruin. There must have been fully 100 men there with wagons and horses working like steam instead of their being occupied on the work of preserving those roads that had already been built. This haphazard way of spending money is disgraceful. It seems to be the policy to construct a road and then to let it look after itself. We know also that the road to Kalamunda is in a shocking state of disrepair. It is quite good for a couple of miles, but going over the remainder one runs a risk of breaking the springs of his car. I should like to ask why only a patch is constructed and the remainder neglected.

Hon. C. F. Baxter: That is not the duty of the Main Roads Board; the road is under the control of the local body.

Hon. Sir EDWARD WITTENOOM: Whoever is responsible for the maintenance of the road is allowing it to get into a state almost beyond repair. There is one other subject to which I wish to allude. It is generally conceded that the Governor's Speech does not give cause for amusement. In one paragraph, however, there is a gleam of humour—the paragraph alluding to the proposal to introduce a Redistribution of Seats Bill. If I know the Premier at all, and I know him to be exceedingly diplomatic, I can prophesy what will happen. A Bill will be submitted, it will pass another place by the usual majority and then will come along to the Legislative Council for approval. It will not be acceptable to the Legislative Council and so will be rejected. The Premier's diplomacy will then show itself. When the elections come round the Premier will say, "I promised to bring in a redistribution of seats and did so, but the recalcitrant Legislative Council threw it out."

Hon. A. Lovekin: We must pass it, surely.

Hon. Sir EDWARD WITTENOOM: Even if they do pass it by a majority, why should we pass it if it does not meet with our approval?

Hon. E. H. Harris: We should pass it as we passed the Financial Agreement.

Hon. Sir EDWARD WITTENOOM: The Premier will be able to go to the electors and say, "I submitted the Bill as I promised, but the recalcitrant Council would not have it. Therefore I am obliged to go to the electors once more on the existing distribution." As we say in Euclid—Q.E.D. I have much pleasure in supporting the motion for the adoption of the Address-in-reply.

HON. C. F. BAXTER (East) [5.8]: There is not very much to debate on the Governor's Speech unless one discusses the legislation forecasted. In the Speech we have before us, there appears an announcement—and it is very interesting to note it—that the Government intend to take up seriously the question of attempting to put the groups on a proper business basis. Unfortunately, a good deal of this work is now beyond us and a big loss has already been sustained. In this respect it was very interesting the other evening to listen to Mr. Mann who is one of the representatives of the South-West Province, speaking about the advance made by the dairying industry in that part of the State. This advance has been brought about by group settlement, and if Mr. Mann's figures are correct, it has been a rapid and satisfactory advance. Of course a good deal of the success has been due to the high price being paid for butter fat, and my feeling is that this will continue to help to put dairying on a solid basis. As we know, the dairying industry has done a great deal for Victoria, but we are not in the same position as was that State because we are not being paid a bonus. One of the burning questions of the day is the administration or perhaps we might say the mal-administration of the Main Roads Act. It is interesting to note that the Federal Government on the one hand blame the State Government for the existing state of affairs, and the State Government blame the Federal Government. In addition, we find that the Premier, as he is always ready to do, is blaming this House for the whole of the trouble. The real position, however, is that 90 per cent. of the existing trouble is the result of the bad administration of the Act. That is where the fault lies. I listened to the address delivered a week ago by the Chairman of the

Main Roads Board to the conference of delegates from country road boards, and he assured the conference that everything would be right in the future. Unfortunately he gave an assurance that it is difficult to take seriously. Next morning we read the opinion of the Premier which was diametrically opposed to that of the Chairman of the Main Roads Board. One wonders what the position will actually be in the future. Hon. members are aware that I advocated, and that I still advocate that the only satisfactory way of having the work done is by permitting it to be done by the local bodies who are familiar with existing conditions, and who in the past have been able to do the work satisfactorily and at much less cost than the Main Roads Board. The Government engineers might be permitted to collaborate with the local authorities and perhaps tender them advice, but I do not believe in surveyors and engineers going all over the country and spending thousands of pounds needlessly.

Hon. A. Lovekin: It is all cheap money.

Hon. C. F. BAXTER: Probably, but what is the use of wasting it? There are numerous instances of excessive cost that could be given. I know of one where a road, the estimate of which was set down by the Main Roads Board at £18 10s. a chain and which was actually carried out by the local authority for £6 10s. a chain—one-third of the cost. Sir Edward Wittenoom referred to the bad state of the roads that he had travelled over and said that some of them had been left in a disgraceful condition. I cannot agree, however, that there should be someone continually employed to fill up the holes as they appear. To do this, there would be required a great number of men and a considerable amount of money because of the heavy traffic that exists at the present time. One wonders what is going to happen. A large majority of our farming population, we know, favour motor transport, and motor transport is responsible for the increased expenditure on our roads. In years gone by there were slow-moving wagons which did not cause the friction for which the motor vehicle of to-day is responsible. Heavy motor traffic goes along at a high rate of speed.

Hon. Sir Edward Wittenoom: I did not suggest that all the holes should be filled up as they were made; I said that there was not adequate supervision over the roads.

Hon. C. F. BAXTER: The trouble is caused by the differences that exist between the local bodies and the Main Roads Board.

Hon. Sir Edward Wittenoom: If there had been supervision the holes would not have appeared.

Hon. C. F. BAXTER: The whole trouble is as to who is to bear the cost. The local bodies, unjustly, are saddled with the cost of maintenance, and in many cases the local bodies do not receive any benefit whatever from the roads that are being constructed. In the city, however, the municipality of Perth derives benefit by being debited with only a small amount. The better system would be for the local bodies to be permitted to carry out the construction. At the present time it is difficult to understand the allocation of costs. Up to date the Main Roads Board have not explained how they assess the value of a road.

The Honorary Minister: Do you mean to suggest that something done has been contrary to the Act?

Hon. C. F. BAXTER: I have already said there has been maladministration. Does the Honorary Minister want anything clearer than that? Another interesting matter that has been the subject of considerable discussion by members and the public generally is that of bulk handling, an old question in this State. As far back as 1913 the Scaddan Government appointed a committee under the Hon. Thomas Bath to inquire into the advisableness of establishing bulk handling in this State. In a report furnished to the Government bulk handling was strongly recommended. Negotiations were opened with a firm of engineers and proceeded until 1915, when the Scaddan Government approved of bulk handling and came to an arrangement with the engineers to proceed with the work. Everything was finalised except the actual signing of the agreement, when the Scaddan Government went out of office. Let me remind members that at that time the cost of installing the scheme would have been comparatively low. The Wilson Government came into office and were sympathetic towards the proposal. I remember that Sir James Mitchell, then Minister for Agriculture, took the matter up and after considerable inquiry expressed himself satisfied that bulk handling would be a good thing for the State. Unfortunately the war created financial difficulties and the scheme could not be proceeded with.

In 1918 a Bill was introduced to provide really for bulk storage. The object was mainly to safeguard the stocks of wheat held here because the grain was getting into a very bad state. We were in the unfortunate position of having in the four States £22,000,000 overdraft represented in wheat that was diminishing year by year through weather effects and insect pests. A Bill was introduced to ratify an agreement with the same body of engineers, but after much discussion, it was defeated by a majority of one. Following that two measures were introduced to authorise an outside body to instal bulk handling facilities. Both those measures were defeated. They reached this House on the last day of the session and received the guillotine, one hon. member having moved the adjournment of the debate until the following day, when it could not possibly be continued. I was Minister at the time and was handling those measures. There is some controversy at present as to the wisdom of proceeding with bulk handling. In 1918 the cost of establishing the silos and temporary machinery—provision was made for the proper machinery to be installed later—was 1s. 2d. per bushel of wheat. I am afraid that the cost in 1928 would be vastly different. To-day the cost of labour is almost double what it was 10 years ago, while the cost of the material that would be used in the erection of silos has also increased considerably. These factors have to be considered before any serious step is taken to commit the State to a bulk handling scheme. The first thing to ascertain is the cost per bushel at which bulk handling could be established. If the scheme is going to be so highly capitalised that it will be more costly than the present bag system, what is the good of establishing it? That is the question to be considered. People, too, must not run away with the idea that bulk handling will be suitable for the whole State. It will be suitable for only a small portion of the State. It is possible to establish silos only at sidings where there is a sufficient quantity of wheat to warrant their erection. Then the Government would have to consider the question of reconstructing the railway trucks, and other incidental expenses would be incurred. Among the benefits that it is said would accrue to the farmer is that he would need to buy only one-third of the quantity of bags he has to buy now. That

would apply to the farmer who is situated near to a siding and who is able to keep on carting, but farmers at a distance from a siding could not save a great deal on bags. It may be said that the farmers, after using the bags this year, could use them again next year. During my years of experience as a farmer I have not seen a bag sold in this State during the last 15 years that was of sufficiently good quality to stand two years' handling.

Hon. H. A. Stephenson: And they are getting worse every year.

Hon. C. F. BAXTER: Yes. Consequently there are many points to be considered before the State is committed to a system of bulk handling. I am not opposed to the bulk handling system. If it can be beneficially established at a capital cost that will not be too high and a saving can be effected on the present cost of bags, let it be adopted by all means, but I am satisfied it will entail a huge expenditure. It is all very well to point to Canada as an example. The position here is quite different. We have a few sidings where storage silos could be erected, but at many sidings the silos could not be provided, and in such districts the bag system must continue. As is usual at this season of the year we have the unemployed with us. Unfortunate though that is, it occurs in every country. This winter the unemployed difficulty has been very acute, in fact it is the worst year that I can remember. It was interesting to note that a distinguished visitor to Perth in the person of Mr. Scullin, Leader of the Federal Labour Party, took the Prime Minister to task because he passed the unemployed over to the State Government, but while Mr. Scullin did that, he did not make any reference to the State Government. In recent years the State Government have been very lax in not preparing to meet the unemployed difficulty, which occurs every year. This year they waited until the position had reached its worst before they took any action to relieve it, and then outside bodies had to rally to the Government's assistance. Unemployment is a deplorable thing in any country, but had the Government taken the matter up sooner, a lot of suffering could have been avoided.

Hon. A. Lovekin: Was not a good deal of it beyond the control of the present Government?

Hon. C. F. BAXTER: Yes, but the Government could have taken action sooner. No Government can hope fully to cope with the unemployed difficulty, but the State Government knew that they would be faced with trouble during the slack season and preparations should have been made to provide work for the men, instead of waiting until the difficulty became so acute.

The Honorary Minister: You cannot be aware of what was done.

Hon. C. F. BAXTER: I am fully aware of it. The Government provided free meals and doles for the men, instead of work, and I am quite opposed to anything in the shape of doles. I am satisfied that 80 per cent. of the men did not want relief of that kind. What they wanted was work.

Hon. A. Lovekin: You could not expect the Government to anticipate the exodus from the other States and the influx of Southern Europeans.

Hon. C. F. BAXTER: I am not blaming the Government for that. I say the Government made no provision beyond free meals and a little assistance of that kind. What they should have done was to provide work that would have been of benefit to the State. Doles are no good in any country.

Hon. Sir Edward Wittenoom: Not unnecessary work.

Hon. C. F. BAXTER: There is any amount of necessary work to be done in this State. Wherever we look, we see work waiting to be done. Mr. Scullin also voiced the opinion that what was necessary in Australia was a system of unemployment insurance. What with unemployment insurance and child endowment, we shall be depriving the manhood of Australia of all incentive to work.

Hon. G. W. Miles: If the price of wheat comes down it will settle all those schemes.

Hon. C. F. BAXTER. A fall in the price of wheat would be a bad thing for this State as well as for other producing countries. I do not take the pessimistic view held by some people regarding the price of wheat and the huge stocks held in America. We hear the same pessimistic views expressed every year. As one who has grown wheat for a good many years. I have noticed that nature has a wonderful

way of rectifying the position. In one year the prospects are for a wonderful harvest everywhere, and a price that will not be payable to the producers. But a calamity happens in some part, and the price of wheat is maintained. I have often thought that the price of wheat was not likely to be very remunerative in a certain year, but it has turned out all right. If the price of wheat does fall, it will be a serious thing for Western Australia. Wheat and wool are the two lines of primary production on which we have to depend at present. Only a small railway programme is included in the Governor's Speech, but I take it that much greater progress will be made than the Speech seems to indicate. If the Government are going to settle thousands of men on the land, they will have to move considerably faster than the Speech indicates. Still, I understand that the Government are doing their best to meet the requirements. I was interested in the remarks of the Premier to a deputation regarding the Brookton-Armadale line. For many years there has been strong agitation for the construction of a railway through that district. I am glad that the Premier at last recognises the value that that line will be to the State. The Railway Department is faced with an impossible position in having to haul all the wheat, except that sent to outports, through the bottle-neck at the Perth railway station, whereas if the Brookton-Armadale line were built, a large quantity of wheat would be conveyed direct to Fremantle. The building of the Brookton-Armadale line would benefit the Working Railways considerably, because it would be possible to increase the loads hauled and decrease running costs. Most important of all is the fact that the line would open up an area of very fine country suitable for dairying, sheep-raising and oat-growing. The district has a splendid rainfall and no part of the State would respond better than that district to railway facilities. The Yorkrakine railway extension is still held up. Close on 20 years have passed since that line was promised, and I do not know whether it will ever be built. The Government probably conclude that motor transport will meet the requirements of the Yorkrakine settlers. So long as that view is maintained, the progress of the district will be retarded. Settlers cannot transport their produce by motor at anything like the cost of railway haulage, and an additional disadvantage is that con-

siderable time is occupied by carting that should be devoted to improving the farms. Another important matter is the price of meat. This question has aroused considerable discussion in recent months, and my sympathy goes out to consumers in the high prices being charged. It has been said that the suppliers of meat are making a lot of money. But that is not so. The season has been responsible for enormous costs. Whereas in ordinary years the stock grazed on natural feed, this season it has cost a great deal of money to keep stock alive. Perhaps I may instance my own case. In an ordinary season I market lambs at the end of June. Here we are at the end of August, and I have not had them fit to send in yet. The worst feature of the situation is the enormous cost of fodder and grain which the grower has to feed to his stock, whereas they should be on natural grass. Further, there is the great amount of revenue lost to the State, since the fodder and grain should have been available for transportation instead of being utilised in feeding stock. Thus the cost of the stock is increased by hand-feeding, which most growers have had to resort to; personally I may say that I have had a man engaged for hand-feeding since March. All such costs must be added to the ordinary cost of stock. It follows that the higher prices have not benefited growers materially. In addition, the losses of stock have been considerable. The most important point, however, is the beef position. During the last week or two I have seen reports of an agitation on the part of retail butchers, and of demands for supplying the metropolitan area with frozen meat. There is, however, no opportunity for sending frozen meat from Wyndham to this market. Moreover, whilst frozen meat may be supplied to hotels and so forth, it cannot be advantageously sold to the general public. As regards the drawing of supplies of frozen meat from Wyndham, in the first place there is not the necessary space on the steamers, and in the second place meat supplies to the metropolitan area must be regular—spasmodic supplies are useless. Even if the Singapore boats were influenced to provide storage space for chilled meat—frozen meat I regard as out of the question—there is the consideration whether the quantity of chilled meat available at Wyndham would be sufficient to divert steamers to that port. The most important point, however, is the supply of beef. Where is our beef supply for next summer to come from?

It is not even in sight. I say advisedly that the Government should take that problem in hand without delay. As regards bringing stock from the North, the first difficulty is that they could not be fattened there. Then, as regards the overland journey, the worst feature is the 60-Mile Desert. With a plentiful supply of water, cattle can get through well enough; but to traverse a bad stretch with neither feed nor water is disastrous. In one instance known to me a mob of 460 cattle were put on the road, and the driver reached Mingenew with 22 head. To establish a stock route and put down wells would involve too much expenditure. Attempts have been made in that respect, stations sinking wells in many places. However, the expedient proved too costly. Now recourse has been had to the new system of boring, whereby bores can be put down to a depth of 400 or 500 feet fairly cheaply. I know of a case where a boring plant arrived at the scene of operations on Sunday, and started boring on Tuesday, and got down to 450 feet in a fortnight. That system, obviously, is much cheaper than sinking wells. One may sink a well and come on hard country or even a small salt stream, and that is as far as the well will go. On the other hand, a boring plant goes right through. Bores with casing can be put down instead of wells. A storage capacity of 10,000 gallons would mean that any stock could be overlanded to Mingenew or Mullewa for southern growers to fatten. If a stock route from the North-West could be opened up, it would mean the bringing down of many cattle for early fattening here. I do not know of any other means of overcoming what seems to be an inevitable beef shortage to be faced here during next year, and I hope the Government will give the question their earnest consideration. An agitation on the subject of meat prices is now in progress, and justifiably so, because there is a shortage and prices are extremely high. Undoubtedly the beef position will be acute next year, and will not be relieved by bringing chilled meat from Wyndham, because only small quantities will be available there. Frozen meat should be put out of consideration altogether. If any meat is brought down from Wyndham, it should be chilled meat. Frozen meat handled as it would be handled by the public, would seem very poor, even though originally of good quality. I support the motion for the adoption of the Address-in-reply.

HON. J. NICHOLSON (Metropolitan) [5.39]: This motion offers hon. members generally that opportunity which the present occasion alone affords of voicing their opinions on a wide range of subjects. It must be acknowledged that the House has had the advantage of hearing a discussion on many subjects of great diversity. Members coming into the fray somewhat late are undoubtedly indebted to hon. members who have preceded them for the full discussion which has already taken place. The magnitude of the requests and the variety of the views put forward by previous speakers must serve to open the eyes of the Government to their shortcomings, and doubtless they will realise that the criticisms uttered by members here show that remedial measures should be introduced by the Administration in certain important respects. It is a pleasure to see the father of the House, Sir Edward Wittenoom, returned after his severe accident; and we hope that his presence here signalises his restoration to complete health.

Hon. Sir Edward Wittenoom: Thank you.

Hon. J. NICHOLSON: During the discussion to-day Sir Edward certainly showed that he has lost none of his intellectual vigour or logical power. Prior to the opening of Parliament I saw in the Press an announcement that it was intended Mr. Fraser should move the motion now before us and Mr. Williams second it. I noticed, however, that on the important occasion of the opening of Parliament Mr. Williams, who was to have seconded the motion, was absent from his place, and that another hon. member had to perform that duty, which I am sure any member is pleased to do for another. I regret particularly that Mr. Williams should have been absent on that occasion, as his presence would have given all speakers to the motion the opportunity which no doubt they desire of extending congratulations not only to the mover but also to Mr. Williams as new members. When Mr. Williams addressed the House last Wednesday, I had expected that he would at least have referred to the incident and afforded us some little explanation, so as to remove that sense of disappointment which I am sure other members in addition to myself must have felt at his absence. I merely mention the matter; probably the Leader of the House will be able to explain it. I have thought it fair to call attention to the matter, seeing that Mr. Williams, as a new member, had apparently overlooked—

The Chief Secretary: The hon. member's absence was due to illness in the family.

Hon. J. NICHOLSON: I am indeed sorry to hear it. His Excellency's Speech is marked by a tone of distinct optimism. It refers to the approach of the celebrations in connection with the centenary of the foundation of Western Australia. There is also a reference to the fact that the State has reached the highest point yet recorded in trade and commerce. We are told that the value of the year's trade reached the remarkable total of £36,297,719, divided as follows:—Exports valued at £17,941,603, and imports valued at £18,356,116. It will be observed that the difference between our exports and our imports amounts to £414,513 on the wrong side; that is to say, our imports were greater by that amount than our exports, which is not as one would desire to see the position. I can merely express the hope that our various industries will continue to progress, and that the advent of the present financial year will bring with it a balance of trade indicating that our exports exceed our imports. It is, of course, wise for any country to look at the position from the economic standpoint and assure that the trade balance is on the right side of the ledger. I take this opportunity to express the thanks and appreciation that should be extended to members of various organisations that have interested themselves in stimulating the purchase of local products. If that spirit is encouraged, we shall thereby be able to achieve some measure of success if our people will, as far as possible, support our local industries. Satisfaction has been expressed regarding the financial position generally. In the Governor's Speech it is stated, "The financial position is viewed with satisfaction within the State and in Great Britain." We are pleased to have that assurance, but unfortunately a later paragraph in His Excellency's Speech indicates that we closed the financial year with a deficit of nearly £26,500. I do not know that that is altogether complimentary from the Government's standpoint, having regard to the picture that has been presented regarding trade and production. Seeing that our trade and production have reached such a high peak, one would have thought means would have been found to obviate the creation of a deficit. It is true that some explanations have been given as to the cause of the deficit, but in view of all the circumstances it would have been much better had there been a surplus instead of a deficit. I raise

the question of the deficit because hon. members will recall that when we were dealing with the Financial Agreement Bill last session, the agreement itself contained certain provisions relating to loans raised in connection with deficits. Paragraph (d) of Section 4—that section dealt with sinking funds—of Part II. of the Agreement reads—

In respect of any loan raised after 30th June, 1927, by a State or by the Commonwealth for and on behalf of a State to meet a revenue deficit accruing after that date, no sinking fund contribution shall be payable by the Commonwealth, but that State shall pay from revenue a sinking fund contribution at a rate of not less than 4 per centum per annum on the amount of that loan.

There are certain other provisions regarding the sinking funds, interest and so forth. It will be observed that as a result of that provision, we may suffer the penalty that follows loans raised for deficits, although I hope that will not be so. Should we experience further deficits, it may be necessary to raise loans to liquidate them, and, in view of the Financial Agreement, we must suffer the penalty because of those deficits. In the circumstances, it is all the more important that the Government shall see to it that deficits are avoided. It is true that the deficit for the last financial year was a small one; probably the position will be rectified as the result of the current year's financial transactions. I expected to find some reference in His Excellency's Speech to the present serious position regarding unemployment. The Speech, however, is strangely silent on that point. I feel sure everyone deplors the periodical recurrence of the unemployment difficulty, because I believe that the men who have been out of work are, in the majority of instances, anxious to secure work but have been unable to do so. During the recent demonstrations of the unemployed, I took the opportunity to move about among those men. I am convinced that there were many men genuinely desirous of securing work, for I was impressed by their appearance and their evident disappointment at their inability to secure employment. Western Australia is not singular in this respect. For other countries have the same problem. In the Mother Country the distress has been more marked than in Western Australia. All the world over it is recognised that this problem is a difficult one, but in a young country like Western Australia, it should be easy to overcome compared with the position in older and more settled industrial

countries. The Premier has attributed the existing position to various causes. If I remember aright, he attributed it chiefly to the admission of aliens, to migration and, thirdly, to the influx of people from the Eastern States. It will be admitted that the problem is much wider and more far-reaching than that, and probably it can hardly be properly discussed on the present motion. The Premier, whose views were endorsed by Mr. Williams, blamed the attitude of the Federal Government in relation to the introduction of alien migrants. It was suggested that foreigners were allowed to come to Australia to secure work, thus depriving Britishers of employment. I have always held the opinion, shared by Mr. Williams, that the Britisher could hold his own with men of any other race, and I hope that will always be so. On the other hand, we know there are certain occupations that are best undertaken by foreigners. While I admit it is an extreme instance, I would refer to the position in the early days on the goldfields. How would the residents of the goldfields in those days have procured their vegetables had they not the advantage of Chinese in their midst? While that is an extreme instance, it illustrates my point. The Chinese represented a useful section of the community in those days. Now it is stated that Italians, Jugo-Slavs and representatives of other European nations, are coming here and taking work as clearers.

Hon. E. H. Gray: Who did that work before they came?

Hon. J. NICHOLSON: I will come to that in a moment. We are told that those foreigners have deprived the Britishers of the opportunity to secure work that had formerly been available to them.

Hon. E. H. Gray: Because the foreigners provided cheaper labour.

Hon. J. NICHOLSON: I do not know anything about that from personal experience, because I have had nothing to do with such operations. On the other hand, I took the trouble to make inquiries from men who know something about this matter. I have been credibly informed that these foreigners are not employed at a cheaper rate at all.

The Honorary Minister: I wish that was correct.

Hon. J. NICHOLSON: I am repeating what I have been informed. According to my informants, the foreigners are not employed at a cheaper rate than would be paid to Britishers if they undertook the work.

Hon. E. H. Gray: That is not so.

Hon. Sir Edward Wittenoom: I gave the rates this afternoon.

Hon. J. NICHOLSON: They furnished marked examples of what I have been told.

Hon. Sir Edward Wittenoom: The particulars I gave were taken from the contracts I have one of them here.

Hon. E. H. Gray: The rates for contract clearing have gone down 30 to 40 per cent.

Hon. J. NICHOLSON: We should go into this matter and see where the trouble really lies. It is useless denouncing people; let us get at the bottom of it, and see what is the explanation. We should see if what I have said can be verified.

Hon. H. A. Stephenson: It can be verified by a number of members of this House.

Hon. J. NICHOLSON: Quite so. It has been said that where contracts have been let to Britishers in preference to foreigners, they have been left incomplete, and the land has not been ready, as it should have been by a certain date. So in many cases the men who undertook the contract have left and other men, foreigners, have had to be employed to complete the task.

Hon. H. A. Stephenson: That is perfectly true.

Hon. E. H. Gray: In some cases.

Hon. J. NICHOLSON: There must be some reason for this. If the members of our own race do not care for this work, and prefer some other kind of employment, then let us see if we can find the class of employment they prefer. But, be he Britisher or foreigner when he undertakes a task he should show—and particularly does it rest with the Britisher to show that he at least can do better than men of any other nationality, and that when he undertakes a task he sees it through. If it be true that these Britishers leave their job incomplete, desert it, can we wonder that the farmers, who want their land cleared in order to put it under the plough, must feel aggrieved at their own countrymen deserting them.

Hon. E. H. Gray: They themselves are deserters from their own country in giving employment to the foreigners.

Hon. E. H. Harris: The hon. member's own Government employ the foreigners.

Hon. H. A. Stephenson: Yes, and the hon. member does not know the true position.

Hon. J. NICHOLSON: No, if Mr. Gray were to go around the country and make

investigation it would be instructive for us to have the benefit of the information he would gain. If he were to make an inquiry, probably there would be such an array of evidence adduced as to convince him beyond all doubt.

Hon. E. H. Harris: When a person enters into a contract, is he not bound to complete it?

Hon. J. NICHOLSON: He can be proceeded against for his failure, for the damage caused by the breach. But it would avail the employer nothing to take action against a man for not completing his clearing contract. The most effective way is to say he will employ only those men who will complete it.

Hon. E. H. Gray: The foreigner is exploited by the farmer.

Hon. J. NICHOLSON: I do not wish to see anyone exploited. I want to see a fair deal given, whether to the Britisher or to the foreigner.

Hon. E. H. Gray: The Britisher does not get a fair deal from the farmer.

Hon. J. NICHOLSON: The farmer is prepared, and has been prepared, all through to give a fair deal to members of his own race.

Hon. E. H. Gray: Not in the past.

The PRESIDENT: If the hon. member wishes to reply to this speech, he will have ample opportunity.

Hon. J. NICHOLSON: A little time ago Mr. Gray interjected, "What about the men who cleared the land before?"

Hon. H. A. Stephenson: One farmer cleared 60 acres in 60 years!

Hon. J. NICHOLSON: He took his time.

Hon. E. H. Gray: He must be one of the old gropers.

Hon. J. NICHOLSON: I asked a man who has been here a good many years about the practice in former years. He said that in former years there were Britishers who undertook clearing work and carried out their work with such thoroughness and expedition as to win for themselves a very secure place in the community; so much so that now, my informant tells me, he cannot get any of that good old type of labour that used to clear the land so satisfactorily, because the clearers of those days, as the result of their excellent work, have done so well as to be able to take up land for themselves.

Hon. E. H. Gray: That is why so many hundreds of experienced men who want land cannot get it now.

Hon. C. F. Baxter: Well, hurry up your Government to provide land for them.

Hon. J. NICHOLSON: Those men were undoubtedly experienced, because they got their training in a very good school. Before we denounce the employment of foreigners, we require to sift the matter a little more thoroughly than has been done. The Premier suggests that the Federal Government, who have the control of immigration, should cease to allow these foreigners to land here, should practically stop all alien immigration. The result of that undoubtedly would be the raising of serious international questions. I think that was indicated in an interview with the Prime Minister, published by a newspaper a few weeks ago.

Hon. E. H. Gray: It did not do so in the United States when they adopted that policy.

Hon. J. Nicholson: No, they adopted the quota system. The Prime Minister has explained that—it was referred to by Mr. Cornell—the standard of our white population is maintained at 98 per cent. British.

Hon. E. H. Gray: Is that in Western Australia?

Hon. J. NICHOLSON: That was in a statement by the Prime Minister, published some time ago. That is for the whole of the Commonwealth.

Hon. E. H. Gray: It does not apply to Western Australia.

Hon. J. NICHOLSON: Take it this way: The population of Australia is 98 per cent. British. That is the point. It is the intention of the Federal Government to maintain that standard.

Hon. J. R. Brown: I think those figures are wrong.

Hon. J. NICHOLSON: Well, the hon. member had better make inquiry of the Prime Minister, or alternatively secure a seat in the Federal House. Probably he would then have an opportunity to test the question there.

Hon. J. R. Brown: One need not go to the Federal House to test it.

Hon. J. NICHOLSON: Opportunity will be afforded him there which, unfortunately, we in this House cannot afford him.

Hon. J. R. Brown: Well, why take any notice of it?

Hon. J. NICHOLSON: Because if we have an objection to raise, we must in the first place be sure of our facts. If the fact is established that the Australian population is 98 per cent. British, I do not see that we can possibly complain. I was remarking that the Premier, from his wide knowledge—I have always regarded the Premier as holding a statesman-like view of all these matters—must realise that international relationships might possibly be disturbed if we were to seek to alter that position and stop alien immigration entirely. There would be grave difficulty in shutting the door absolutely in the faces of members of other European races.

Hon. Sir William Lathlain: The Prime Minister definitely said so.

Hon. J. R. Brown: Oh, he is an Imperialist.

Hon. J. NICHOLSON: Any attempt to do anything like that might provoke a conflict, which I am sure none of us desires to see. But, above all, the effect would be to alienate the friendship and support of other nations that would be of great help to us if we in Australia should be threatened by any other power. I believe in giving the greatest possible help and facilities to members of our own race, and I believe also in maintaining our high standard of British population so as to retain this territory as an undoubted British possession. By adopting the quota system, we are avoiding the alienation of that friendly feeling that we desire to cultivate amongst other nations, and at the same time probably we should be helping to develop our own country. If Mr. Williams had an opportunity to travel through Europe, as he may have in the near future, he would learn something of the grave problems that arise amongst the various European nations, and he would then appreciate more than ever the difficulty in absolutely excluding other nationals from entering the Commonwealth.

Hon. J. R. Brown: To the detriment of Australia.

Hon. J. NICHOLSON: May I point out to the hon. member that probably he would create something that would be very much to the detriment of Australia were he able to carry out the idea, that apparently he has, of absolutely excluding members of other races.

Hon. J. R. Brown: No one is advocating absolute exclusion.

Hon. J. NICHOLSON: Then what does the hon. member advocate? The maintenance of the quota system?

Hon. J. R. Brown: They are coming in like flies to a sugar basin.

Hon. J. NICHOLSON: What does the hon. member advocate?

Hon. J. R. Brown: The quota system might do, if it were fair.

Hon. J. NICHOLSON: Then the hon. member must admit that the quota fixed by the Federal Government is fair.

Sitting suspended from 6.15 to 7.30 p.m.

Hon. J. NICHOLSON: I gathered from Mr. Williams' speech that he had been working for some years in the mining centres, amongst a large number of these foreigners. I was more than surprised to hear him make the disparaging remarks he did concerning these people. He told us, I think in the case of the Sons of Gwalia mine, that there were within recent times up to 95 per cent. of foreign employees on that mine. That is a big percentage. He said in other cases that the average of foreigners employed in the mining industry would vary from 20 to 25 per cent. I think, in response to an interjection, he stated that these men were trade unionists. We know that men would not be employed on the mines if they were not trade unionists. Presumably, therefore, these men must have paid their subscriptions to their union, the usual membership fees. In that way they supported the funds of the various associations with which Mr. Williams was connected. I believe he occupies the position of secretary or organiser of one of the unions in the mining centres.

The Honorary Minister: He did once.

Hon. J. NICHOLSON: He was organiser or secretary there. No doubt many of these men voted at the last elections. We see in the public press that any number of foreigners have applied for naturalisation. When they secure naturalisation they are entitled to the full rights of citizenship. I feel sure that these men, who must apparently have supported their own organiser and probably voted for him at the recent election when he was returned, will feel disappointed at his utterances regarding them. These men contribute to the funds of the union, and the least they have a right to expect of any officer of that union, or one who is connected with it, is that he should have

supported and stood up for the men who were associated with and members of that union.

Hon. E. H. Gray: Those men who are engaged in clearing are not members of a union.

Hon. J. NICHOLSON: The hon. member was speaking of the mining industry, and the number of foreigners engaged on the mines. I do not advocate that they should be so employed. If, however, I happened to be one of these men, subscribing to the union funds, the least I would have expected as a subscriber would be that the organiser of my union would have backed up my membership.

The Honorary Minister: Are you not missing the point he made?

Hon. J. NICHOLSON: I think that was his point. That is how it struck me.

The Honorary Minister: These men are not members of the union until after they have secured employment. His point was that they get preference of employment.

Hon. J. NICHOLSON: He was speaking of the number of men employed on the mines, and was adversely criticising them.

Hon. H. A. Stephenson: He stated that they had preference over him.

The Honorary Minister: Quite correct.

Hon. J. NICHOLSON: That deals with another point.

The Honorary Minister: The point was that the Italians were getting preference on the mines, and that they had to join the union. He claimed that preference should not be given to foreigners, but to Britishers when available.

Hon. J. NICHOLSON: In certain branches of the mining industry it may be found that these men fill positions, such as one associated with trucking, more effectively than the Britisher, who may not care so much for that kind of work.

The Honorary Minister: He has suggested another reason.

Hon. J. NICHOLSON: I will deal with that later. The matter I referred to was such as to justify members of the union, who might fall within the class described by Mr. Williams as foreigners, in feeling a great deal of disappointment that their organiser or secretary should have criticised them in the way he did.

Hon. W. J. Mann: Is it not a fact that they must become members of the union before they can get employment?

Hon. J. NICHOLSON: A man cannot get employment until he is a member of

the union, or at all events he cannot continue at his employment unless he joins the union. The Honorary Minister: He becomes a member after he gets employment.

Hon. E. H. Gray: Yes.

Hon. J. NICHOLSON: He could not continue in that employment unless he was a member of the union.

The Honorary Minister: Mr. Williams' point was that they got preference in the first place. Naturally when they get employment they must join the union.

Hon. J. NICHOLSON: The fact that they are there is evidence that they must have given some degree of satisfaction, otherwise they would not be employed. They must have been engaged in some work of production, apparently winning wealth that would reflect in some way on the finances of the country. They must be doing some good.

Hon. W. J. Mann: There was nothing to force the union to make them members.

Hon. J. NICHOLSON: I presume not.

Hon. W. J. Mann: The union need not have taken them if it had not desired to have them.

Hon. J. NICHOLSON: I suppose not.

Hon. E. H. Harris: The union wants them, and gets them.

Hon. J. NICHOLSON: That is the point that occurs to me. Why do not the unionists turn round and say to their own authorities—"Exclude all foreigners from employment," which would be in keeping with their suggestion to the Commonwealth Government that they should exclude all foreigners from coming into the country?

Hon. E. H. Gray: Who said that?

Hon. J. NICHOLSON: Once they are here, they are surely entitled to carry on their avocation, and engage in such labour as they are capable of doing.

Hon. E. H. Harris: Once a majority is engaged in an industry, that majority may want one of their own countrymen as secretary.

Hon. J. NICHOLSON: I am not aware that any union has a secretary of the same nationality as the general body of members, in the case of foreigners.

Hon. E. H. Harris: They have had that on the Kurrawang wood line for years.

Hon. H. A. Stephenson: And there are some in Sydney.

Hon. J. NICHOLSON: I do not know whether Mr. Williams when giving utterance to his statement—

Hon. E. H. Gray: He seemed quite sincere about it.

Hon. J. NICHOLSON: He was very emphatic, I admit, but I do not know whether he weighed with sufficient seriousness the effect of what he was saying. Many authorities in the world are striving for what they call the world's peace. I can hardly conceive that statements such as these are calculated to attain that most desirable end. I took an opportunity during the week-end to read an interesting book by a man who has made himself somewhat noted of late, namely, Sir Leo Chiozza Money. He wrote a book entitled "The Peril of the White." We all know the serious position in which the white races of the world are placed, as compared with the other races. The very men who are employed on these mines, and described as foreigners, are members of the white race. They constitute part of that great body of the white race. Here is what Sir Leo Money says—

Mankind as a whole continues to grow apace. The population of the world in 1925 is about 1,900,000,000. The composition and distribution of this vast number of human beings are matters of supreme importance, which have been too much neglected. The first quarter of the 20th century has been marked by a strife amongst the white nations which has involved all mankind in its consequences. The races who should lead the world in concert have done their worst to injure each other and have succeeded only too well. Those who remain to carry on the work of the world have to face fortifications of hatreds, a world-wide exacerbation of national feeling, an unprecedented strength of race antagonisms, and an awakening of mingled aspiration, unrest and distrust amongst protected and subject nations. The world has nearly 2,000,000,000 people, but it is far indeed from the ideal of possessing 2,000,000,000 consciously helping each other to make the most of its limited resources.

It is a well-known fact that whilst there is that large population in the world, it includes all colours, and the proportion of whites is comparatively small; it is only just over 600,000,000 out of a total of nearly 2,000,000,000. Surely common sense would suggest to nearly every one of us to strive to aid those persons who are seeking to establish a world peace, particularly amongst members of our own race, and I think that when an hon. member makes utterances, as

Mr Williams did here, they are calculated to destroy that which other people are trying to build up.

The Honorary Minister: Mr. Williams was not criticising the foreigner, he was criticising the employer for giving preference to the foreigner.

Hon. J. NICHOLSON: If he was not criticising the foreigner, he was at least showing that the foreigner was not to be received here, and that if he came here he was not to be allowed to live.

The Honorary Minister: Not to have preference of employment.

Hon. J. NICHOLSON: Can it be said that he receives preference?

The Honorary Minister: Yes, the employers on various gold mines give preference to foreigners over Britishers.

Hon. J. NICHOLSON: What I wish to urge is that these men who are engaged in the work of production, and are transferred to some other occupation by being displaced from the mines, are compelled by necessity to seek some other form of employment, and that other form is the clearing of the land. Whilst I admit I would prefer to see men of our own race employed in the work, and I would strive personally always to provide employment for our own men, all conditions being equal, if our own men fail, as has been alleged—I have not had any personal experience and can only rely on information given—we should not be blamed for employing others to do it. If the foreigners are engaged in clearing work and they carry it out satisfactorily, then they are only doing what is suggested in the Governor's Speech. In the opening paragraph we find these words—

The magnitude of the various projects associated with the speedy development of the primary industry upon which progress is substantially based calls for the heartiest co-operation of all sections of the people.

All sections of the people, Mr. President! We want co-operation. Are we securing co-operation, and is Mr. Williams trying to secure the co-operation of all sections of the people, when he seeks to put one class, as it were, against another? This sentiment that is expressed in the sentence I have just read seems to me somewhat strangely familiar, and it serves to recall the slogan for which Sir James Mitchell, the present Leader of the Opposition when he was in power, was responsible—Produce, produce

produce! In other words, the present Government have adopted that slogan and say that there must be the heartiest co-operation in the speedy development of the primary industry upon which progress is substantially based. Thus we find that one call which was made by the Mitchell Government is being adopted by the present Government. I am very pleased to see that. I come to another point in Mr. Williams' speech which arrested my attention, and that was with regard to the support to be given to the mining industry. The hon. member said—"I do not favour giving the mining industry another shilling of assistance until such time as the mines are worked on a systematic basis for the benefit of the shareholders and not for the few men who have control." I ask this question: has the hon. member thought of the result of this suggestion? He could not have done so, because if he had given it serious thought or even reflected for a moment, he would have realised that this might mean less work and less employment and greater distress in mining centres. At the same time, it would necessarily have been detrimental to that industry which has done so much for this State. Another thing to which he alluded in connection with the mining industry was the question of diseases and the amendment passed last year at the instance of Mr. Seddon. On that occasion I took exception to the amendment; I opposed it. I maintained that there was only one way to deal with the question of these diseases and that was to bring them all within the scope of the Miners' Phthisis Act, so that they could all be treated alike. At the present time the section which was introduced last year provides that where a man is suffering from a certain percentage of a disease, he can claim a percentage of the compensation. The curious thing about it is that where a man is suffering from tuberculosis or miners' phthisis, he is entitled to the payment provided under the Miners' Phthisis Act, but when he happens to be an unfortunate sufferer from silicosis, or certain other forms of disease peculiar to the industry, he must make his claim under the Workers' Compensation Act. Surely there should be uniformity in these matters, and those interested in the industry should strive, and I hope the Government will assist them, to get that uniformity so that all men suffering from disease caused by working in the industry will get that measure of compensation to which they are entitled, instead of

being given it under the other Act. I am sorry to have to refer to so many of the subjects mentioned by Mr. Williams, but there is one more to which I must allude. Mr. Williams made a charge against the bosses and the management of the mines. He alleged that the reason why so many foreigners got employment was because of the palm oil which was put into the bosses' hands, and which secured the foreigners their jobs. I interjected, "You accuse them of bribery," and Mr. Williams replied that he did. If an hon. member of this House wants to make a charge of that kind, the fairest way, especially when it is against an industry as a whole and the management of that industry, is for him to make the charge in the open and not within the privileged precincts of Parliament. There are associated with the mining industry men of the highest character. It may be that there are black sheep in every flock but it does not necessarily follow, speaking generally, that men holding positions of responsibility should be accused, as Mr. Williams accused them, particularly when the words of the member representing a mining constituency will go forward to many people who may possibly believe those remarks to be true. The fairest way for the hon. member to have acted would have been to make the charge outside, or to have applied for the appointment of a select committee or Royal Commission to investigate the truth or otherwise of what he said, and then depend upon the report presented. But to make an unchallenged statement, particularly when the people who are accused have no chance of replying is cruel and unjust. There was one other reason given by the Premier as the cause of unemployment, and that was migration.

The Honorary Minister: Did the Premier say that?

Hon. J. NICHOLSON: I read it in the newspaper.

The Chief Secretary: I have never heard him use that argument, nor have I seen anything in print to that effect.

Hon. J. NICHOLSON: I do not wish to do the Premier an injustice, because I have considerable respect for him. I should hesitate to do him the slightest injustice. However, if anyone believes that migration is a cause of unemployment I would direct his attention to a recently issued report by the Development and Migration Commission on the subject of "Unemployment and Busi-

ness Stability in Australia." The report says—

In public discussions of unemployment hasty conclusions concerning the relationship between migration and unemployment are frequently expressed, e.g., that high unemployment in Australia is caused by excessive immigration. An examination of British emigration for the three decades before the war showed that emigration was highest during a period of good trade, the lowest during a period of bad trade. (Hobson: *The Export of Capital*, Ch. viii.). This feature of emigration from Great Britain has also been referred to by other authorities. The conclusion is reached by these authorities that the state of trade in the country of destination is the principal determining factor, but that conditions in the country of emigration are also important. Moreover, as a general rule, periods of depression in Australia roughly correspond with similar conditions in Great Britain, so that, while bad trade in Australia tends to create unfavourable conditions for the absorption of immigrants, depression in Great Britain reduces the resources of likely emigrants and creates an adverse psychological atmosphere. As the majority of immigrants into Australia come from Great Britain, this would suggest that there is not a direct connection between active immigration and periods of bad trade in Australia.

Extensive studies of the relationship between immigration and business conditions in the United States of America have shown that there is a strong tendency for the flow of migrants to be influenced by the state of business in the country of their destination (Jerome: *Unemployment and the Business Cycle—National Bureau of Economic Research*, Ch. x.). This also would suggest that the condition of trade in Australia would have some effect upon the flow of immigrants to Australia.

If immigration were high when trade was good, and low when trade was bad, there would be an inverse correlation between immigration and unemployment. To test this point, the statistics of immigration and unemployment were graphed for the period 1908 to 1928. On the whole, the graph (Graph "C," Appendix IV.) confirms this point of view. This is particularly noticeable during the low unemployment of 1911-12, and the high unemployment of 1921-22. In order to test the matter further, a statistical measure of the correlation was attempted. The result was inconclusive, but it showed that any degree of correlation that might be established between unemployment and immigration would be inverse rather than direct. That is to say, the tendency would be for high unemployment to be associated with low immigration.

The above point may be illustrated by reference to the numbers of nominations of British assisted migrants submitted throughout the Commonwealth. During the first quarter of 1927, when the recorded percentage of unemployment was 5.9, the number of nominations was 3,242, comprising 7,952 souls, which includes dependants; during the first quarter of 1928, when unemployment was recorded at 10.7 per cent., the number of nominations was 2,540,

comprising 4,961 souls, a reduction, in souls, of 37 per cent.

It is probable, however, that the response of immigration to business fluctuations is somewhat delayed, and that the flow of immigration continues at the former level for a time after business conditions have commenced to recede. To this extent, the rate of immigration might increase the difficulties of the business depression (but dependent, as mentioned hereunder, on the types of migrants), but there is nothing to suggest that this immigration is the cause of the business depression or of the high unemployment.

It is also important to note that the effects of migration depend upon the type of migrant who is moving to Australia. Migrant land settlers absorbed pursuant to a land settlement scheme should increase rather than decrease the scope of employment; and the immigration of domestics, boy farm workers, and specially skilled workers for new industries, will generally have the same effect. On the other hand, a large flow of artisans and labourers would intensify any unemployment already existing amongst those classes.

What seems to emerge from a consideration of the relationship is that immigration is not a fundamental cause of unemployment, and that the flow of migration into a country will, to a great extent, automatically adjust itself to the economic conditions in that country.

The matter is treated fully in the report, and is well worth studying. In relation to industrial disputes, constituting one of the causes of unemployment, the report says—

During 1926, 1,310,261 working days were lost in industrial disputes, involving a loss of wages estimated at £1,415,813, which is equivalent to an average wage of £250 per annum for 5,600 people for 12 months.

Various causes of unemployment are dealt with, including seasonal fluctuations. That is one of the main causes in this country because of our dependence to such a large extent on primary production.

Hon. H. Seddon: Do not you think we should attempt to apply some of the recommendations contained in that report?

Hon. J. NICHOLSON: I do. I shall not weary members by going into that phase of the question now, because the report is available for the perusal of members. No doubt the Government will consider the matter. The report will certainly repay study. What are the remedies for this serious position? None of us wishes to see unemployment. We wish to see everybody happy and prosperous. The Leader of the Opposition in the Federal Parliament, Mr. Scullin, suggests recourse to unemployment insurance. Well, I think that for a new and young country such as this, with all its empty spaces requiring to be developed and opened

up, that is about the last thing we should resort to. We have seen the effect of the dole system and of this method of dealing with the difficulty in the Old Land, and I do not think that those who have seen any thing of that system can say it has done good to the people of the Old Country. It is calculated to destroy the very qualities in mankind that it is essential for us to build up. It would be a serious burden to those who are struggling to open up and develop this country if they had to provide for such a scheme.

The Honorary Minister: It is very hard to suggest an alternative for the Old Country.

Hon. J. NICHOLSON: I admit that conditions in the Old Country are not comparable with those in Australia. We are in a totally different position and for that reason I pray we shall not resort to something that has been attended with such serious results as has unemployment insurance in the Old Land. The Honorary Minister asks what we can substitute.

The Honorary Minister: I asked what alternative you would suggest in the Old Country. I am not suggesting it should be introduced here at all.

Hon. J. NICHOLSON: I am glad to hear that; I mistook the hon. member's intention. I admit it is one of the greatest problems confronting us. Is any remedy possible? If there is a remedy, let us have it. No one wishes to see unemployment. It is bad for everyone. It creates a state of misery and benefits nobody. The question arises whether it is possible for us to regulate public works. It might be difficult to regulate production in secondary industries, but is it not possible to regulate Governmental works and those of local authorities? Could not those works be regulated in such a way that certain of them would be laid down for those periods when unemployment in country districts was rife? Such works might be eased off to a certain extent when the workers could be transferred to work on the farms, or when the stream of workers who suffer because of the fluctuations that take place year in and year out could be otherwise absorbed. It should be possible to do something in that way. In England a committee was appointed to consider this important question, "Is unemployment inevitable?", and a book was published under the signatures of the members of the committee, namely, W

T. Layton (Chairman), J. J. Astor, A. L. Bowley, Robert Grant, J. H. Jones, P. J. Pybus, B. Seeborn Rowntree, D. Spring-Rise, and F. D. Stuart. Those gentlemen made suggestions of a valuable kind in connection with various industries. They took the coal mining, iron and steel industries, and in fact all the great industries that mean so much to a country like England, examined the causes of unemployment, and tried to suggest solutions of the difficulty. Amongst them, in connection with the manufacturing industries, they suggest certain organisations where public spirited men might come forward to do something towards regulating output and purchases in such a manner as to minimise the unemployment that takes place from time to time. One can appreciate the extreme difficulty of regulating such matters in the manufacturing industries; for, suppose a British manufacturer should receive an order say from Australia for a large quantity of certain classes of goods, the order has to be supplied say to meet an urgent demand in Australia. The manufacturer could not very well put it off, because if he did so some foreign manufacturer would immediately seize that trade and rob the people of the Old Land of employment. One recognises how great and how numerous are the difficulties involved in dealing with these important questions. As regards our own State, something might be done to regulate public works in conference with local authorities. With reference to Government work in particular, it may be pointed out that about June, when men begin to be paid off in the country districts, is the season when the Government usually find themselves getting to the end of their resources and stop spending. The Government should conserve some of their means so as to be able to expend them with greater benefit to the community by removing from amongst us the agony suffered by many men who desire work and cannot obtain it. I know Mr. Kitson takes the keenest interest in these subjects, and I have no doubt he will see that in this direction, and in any other directions which may suggest themselves to him, the utmost possible is done to minimise unemployment. Various speakers made reference to the maintenance of law and order, and the employment of the police in connection with recent processions and displays on the part of the unemployed. The police were brought in, and I wish, not to apologise for them, but

to compliment them and pay them a tribute as a body of very fine men. One can travel the world over to find another body of men so capable and exercising so much restraint, wisdom and moderation in carrying out their thankless task. The duty of maintaining law and order is imposed upon them, and it is our duty as citizens at least to uphold the police and render them that recognition which they deserve. What they did during the displays to which I have referred does not reflect upon them in any except a creditable way. The police are entitled to our best thanks. Anyone who saw what took place on the occasions referred to must recognise that had the police not been there, very little indeed would have sufficed to bring about a condition of disturbance which would have been most regrettable. I am quite sure that many of the unemployed no more desired than I did to cause any disturbance, but there were amongst them various men who unfortunately were overcome by, shall I say, enthusiasm, and whose enthusiasm might possibly have led to scenes that we would rather not witness. I hope, therefore, that every citizen will do his best to ensure that the police are given the support which they merit. Another matter to which reference is made in the Governor's Speech is land settlement generally and the opening-up of our virgin lands. Special allusion is made to the opening up of that large area of 8,000,000 acres east of Southern Cross. That undertaking I regard as an evidence of empire-building, and I congratulate the Government on that work. With it is necessarily associated the question of migration. We can definitely assert that the Government and the people of Western Australia have sought to give the heartiest welcome and the fullest assistance to migrants from the Mother Country. It is therefore to be regretted that so prominent a person as Dean Inge should have made the utterances attributed to him.

The Honorary Minister: Hear, hear!

Hon. J. NICHOLSON: In the cable columns of our newspapers it was announced that he had written an article reflecting seriously on Australia and its people, an article having as one of its headlines, "No room for Englishmen;" that is, no room in this continent of Australia. Being a Scotsman, I presume that Dean Inge used the word "Englishmen" in the comprehensive sense

of Britishers, as sometimes it is used. I had expected to see some emphatic contradiction of the Dean's statement by the Government, and I therefore hesitate to speak on the subject. However, I feel that Dean Inge's statements should not be allowed to go uncontradicted or unchallenged. Speaking from personal knowledge and experience I assert that the statements are a gross libel on a most generous and hospitable people.

The Honorary Minister: Unfortunately the resolutions carried at a recent conference lend credibility to Dean Inge's statements.

Hon. J. NICHOLSON: That is true. However, if one's personal experience affords guidance—as it must—in these matters, then I may relate that I came to Australia as a young man, that I have spent the greater part of my life here, and that I can testify, as I gladly do, to the unvarying help and kindness extended to me throughout my life in Australia. In place of finding that there was no room here, I have found ample room, and I have never been denied a welcome. That is not merely my experience, but that of thousands of others. We want, however, as was suggested in a previous speech, the right type of migrants—migrants possessed of some of the spirit and courage of our hardy pioneers.

Hon. E. H. Gray: Some farmers say they do not exist nowadays.

Hon. J. NICHOLSON: I think they do. Unfortunately, however, there are migrants who are not trained to the work of land settlement, who find that work uncongenial, and who would prefer to be engaged in one of the numerous secondary industries in which they were employed during their former lives. Work on the land is foreign to them, and they do not care for it.

Hon. E. H. Gray: Moreover, the pay is very low.

Hon. J. NICHOLSON: On the land, the opportunities for a man who applies himself are unexcelled by those offering in other trades. Indeed, they are far greater than those of the man entering upon employment in some of the secondary industries. By going into the country districts we obtain evidence innumerable of men who, coming here with practically nothing, were welcomed here and assisted, and who have risen to positions of happiness and independence. I sometimes try to picture to myself the original position of some of our

hardy pioneers. I think of the great and numerous obstacles they encountered, obstacles which must have seemed almost insuperable but over which nevertheless they triumphed. In those days, almost a century ago, the journey from the Old Land to Western Australia occupied many months. The conditions of life on board were certainly not comparable with the conditions prevailing on the magnificent steamers now connecting us with the Old Country. Upon landing here the pioneer found neither house nor home. He had to raise a structure after landing, and then he had to build his own home. He had to provide for his own wants and those of his family. He had to grow his own wheat. There were no supplies at hand. There were no railways, no roads, no means of communication. These pioneers applied themselves with industry, and opened up this great country. For some years after the settlement of Western Australia it was an impossibility for the pioneers to penetrate beyond the Darling Ranges. Nowadays we can travel in comfort by rail or road in a few hours over distances that it took the pioneers weeks to traverse. We can do nothing else but pay our tribute of honour and respect to the men who carved the way and blazed the track for us. According to the published report Dean Inge says that he made his statement in order to be contradicted! It will be admitted that that is a most extraordinary attitude for a man of the standing of Dean Inge to adopt. Surely we are entitled to say that he should have displayed a greater sense of justice than he has shown.

Hon. Sir William Lathlain: He is old enough.

Hon. J. NICHOLSON: I think so. He has denounced and libelled the people of Australia without making any personal investigation. Then he invites a contradiction!

Hon. E. H. Gray: He must have been reading the reports of the Primary Producers' conference.

Hon. J. NICHOLSON: Or some of the hon. member's interjections! The Dean's opinions, apparently, have been based upon letters received from disappointed settlers. We may be generous enough to him, and offer that as, perhaps, an excuse for the statements he has made. In every community and in every walk of life, there is

always a proportionate number of disappointed people. On the other hand, do not the successful settlers in their thousands throughout Australia far outnumber the disappointed ones. Undoubtedly they do. If one were to form an opinion based on the experience of the disappointed people without inquiring into the experiences of the successful settlers, then wrong conclusions only could be drawn. Surely, Mr. President, the duty rested upon so noted a writer before committing himself to such statements, to have paid a visit to Australia and inquired personally into these matters! Some of his views on certain topics, I do not deny, may receive acceptance readily, but when he makes the statement, "No room for Englishmen," then this is calculated to damage our land settlement and our development, and we are entitled indignantly to resent his attitude. Take, for example, Dean Inge's statement when he said:—"While a sturdy lad is welcome on the land, probably he will be workless by the time he is 21." That is a shocking statement. One can find many instances of lads who have won their way through to a competency and independence. We can also, I believe, furnish examples of the excellent results achieved by lads who have come out here under the auspices of the Fairbridge Farm School. We can also draw attention to the good results that can be shown by lads who have passed through institutions in this or other States. Again, we can take the Big Brother movement, which is no mere name, but a real live organisation, helping to build up that confidence with the sons of people at Home that Dean Inge's remarks will serve only to destroy. There are also other active associations doing good work. Passing, however, from the lads to actual men settlers, members of Parliament and others in public life know of men who have come from the Old Land and by a display of grit and determination, inherited by them from their ancestors, have won through and done more than well.

Hon. Sir William Lathlain: Mr. Gray is an example.

Hon. J. NICHOLSON: Yes. One may ask what has aided them in achieving that end? The reply is that they possessed those qualities of application, determination and courage to which I have referred. Further than that, they were backed up, and ably

supported by a liberal land policy that enabled them to acquire land more cheaply and more favourably than in any other part of the world. In instances where those men had little, if any, money, this facility for acquiring land would be insufficient were it not for the generous financial help extended through the Agricultural Bank and the Industries Assistance Board. Another fact I should like to mention is that people who have come here from the Motherland mark with appreciation the intense loyalty of the Australian people. As has been stated by the Prime Minister of the Commonwealth (Mr. Bruce), we have a standard of 98 per cent. British stock. We are here at one of the remote outposts of Empire, trying to build up a greater Britain and practically on the eve of celebrating the centenary of the foundation of our State. It is at such a time that we find our structure assailed by the cruel and unjust charges of Dean Inge! I ask the question: Are such charges or statements calculated to strengthen the bonds of Empire? To that question there is but one answer—No! Let us at least hope that Dean Inge will at once seek to redress the wrong inflicted, a wrong that we resent because of the injury to our national unity. I support the motion.

HON. H. SEDDON (North-East [8.38]): In addressing a few remarks in support of the motion before the House, I wish at the outset to draw attention to the way in which the Governor's Speech stresses the importance of the occasion we are approaching, namely, the centenary of Western Australia. In order fittingly to commemorate that centenary, the Speech points out the progress that has been made in various directions and to the apparently satisfactory trade position. For some time past, there has been issued from the Premier's office a series of monthly publications, endeavouring to set out the advance of the State and the wonderful prosperity there is ahead of us. The fact has been stressed that we have the greatest area of cultivable wheat land in the Commonwealth. Into those conditions one would be entitled to expect that a note of discordance would not be allowed to creep. As a matter of fact, Western Australia, a month or more ago, received an advertisement that, I am afraid, will do more damage than all the careful propaganda work that is issued month by month is likely to benefit the State.

This State has been held up as the land of promise, and inducements have been held out to secure settlers from the Mother Country and from other parts of the Commonwealth. Yet we found ourselves confronted with unemployed demonstrations that were by no means a sudden development but disclosed a position which had been growing for some considerable time past, apparently being passed over and practically ignored. When we remember that there is a Government in office elected by a party that particularly prides itself upon being acquainted, and able to deal with, the problems associated with the workers, one may be entitled to draw the inference that the present Government have failed to carry out the ideals they have so carefully advertised from time to time. In support of that statement, we must remember the argument that has been advanced by the Labour Parties throughout the world that their members have specially studied Labour problems. There is no problem that is so severe in its effects upon the worker as that of unemployment. One would be justified in describing it as "the workers' nightmare." It demands careful attention and study, and failure to cope with it, effectively, will condemn those who claim to be the exponents of Labour's policy. One can recall the demonstrations that took place a few years ago when the Mitchell Government were in power. Since that time I cannot say that the problem has decreased. On the contrary, I intend to give statistics to show that the problem has rather increased. Though the unemployed demonstrations have been more or less repressed, we know that unemployment has been a pressing problem, and that it has not been coped with as we would have liked. Mr. Nicholson referred to the report issued by the Migration and Development Commission. I commend that report to hon. members for their perusal. The document shows the careful investigations that have been undertaken, and drives home certain conclusions that have been arrived at by the International Labour Office in their reports. It stresses the fact that the unemployment difficulty is not an insurmountable problem, but that it can be tackled with a considerable amount of success if investigated scientifically and approached by way of proper investigation methods. We know that unemployment is a world problem. In some directions it is more complex in the old world, with its class distinctions and with the tremendous pressure of population. There it could well be regarded as insur-

mountable. In the United States of America, with its gospel of industrial efficiency, we find that unemployment represents a very grave problem, and that millions of people are out of work there. Then again Russia, with its Communistic Government also has an acute unemployment problem with vast numbers of people out of work. On the other hand, in facing this as a serious problem, we ourselves are inclined to lose sight of the fact that 100 years ago the problem then was not so much one of unemployment as one of actual starvation, because of the lack of food, which was not an uncommon state of affairs in countries that regarded themselves as civilised. In dealing with the unemployment question, a good deal has been done already, and I recommend hon. members to read the reports of the International Labour Office. They disclose what work has been done in different countries in an effort to cope with the economic cycle, and in those countries where that task has been undertaken much relief has been obtained by the practice of transferring labour from one branch of industry to another. In agricultural countries the seasonal drift is coped with and attempts are made to fill in the periods of slack employment by arranging a campaign of work in other avenues during that period. For quite a long time in America the motor-car industry has laid itself out to conduct a campaign of manufacturing during the winter months. So men who came in from the harvest fields found employment in the factories, sufficient to carry them over till the next harvest. In Russia the problem is being approached from quite a different standpoint and under far different conditions from what obtain in our western civilised countries. The organisation in Russia is such that all industries are more or less State-controlled. Therefore they have available statistics, a knowledge of the trend of affairs, and of the conditions of demand and supply in those occupations, that have enabled them to lay out a scheme whereby they can concentrate on the development of backward industries while restraining other industries that are more or less meeting the existing demands. It is possible we shall see them achieving success because of the facilities they have available, facilities that are not available in our own country. We have no similar machinery. I think the position in our western civilised countries has been that what is everybody's business is nobody's business. And I am inclined to think that the position existing in Australia is due to that

very fact. We have no permanent organisation to study this important problem and lay out a plan of campaign to meet it before it arises, with a view of smoothing out the variations of employment which exist owing to the seasonal nature of so many industries in Australia. To elaborate this point I should like to refer to statistics regarding employment in Western Australia. In 1921 the agricultural industry employed 21,916 men and in 1926 it employed 24,831, or an increase of 2,915. In the same years the pastoral industry employed 7,160 and 6,476, or a decrease of 684. In the same years the dairying industry employed 1,632 and 2,604 or an increase of 972. In the same years forestry and fisheries employed 2,176 and 1,993 or a decrease of 183. In the same years mining employed 7,084 and 5,437, or a decrease of 1,647. In the same years manufacturing employed 19,098 and 22,140, or an increase of 3,042. Orchards and market gardens employed 3,892 and 3,188, or a decrease of 704. Transport employed 8,541 and 9,928, or an increase of 1,387. If we examine these figures it will be seen that the greatest increases have been in agriculture, manufacturing and transport. When we recognise that manufacturing at any rate largely depends for its markets on our internal consumption, it is realised how the manufacturing industries are likely to be affected by bad seasons or by a fall in prices. The transport industry also is considerably affected in the demand for employment by the harvest, a small harvest naturally meaning not so much transport as would be necessary in the event of a good harvest. I have quoted those figures because it will be seen from them that the increase of employment over a period of five years is comparatively small. One may say from those figures that the increase of employment is less than the number of persons who made up the increase of population in any 12 months during the past six years. So it will be seen that the unemployment has been steadily growing, is calling for more and more attention and will in future be still more marked, unless we plan out how to meet it. This year it has been aggravated by the Eastern States' drought conditions causing a volume of unemployment right through the Eastern States. In consequence men were compelled to leave their own States and go to other parts of Australia for employment. Because Western Australia had such a good name, quite

a number of them came here to look for work. What occurred in the Eastern States last year may occur in the future through a fall of prices in the agricultural industry. We might find ourselves in the position that occurred in Australia 30 years ago when there was a glut in agricultural products, but owing to the prices being so low, it was almost impossible to market them. There is however, one point we ought to recognise, namely, that a country that concentrates on agricultural development really provides a comparatively slow process of absorbing population. The quickest increase of population can be met by mining development, and a rapid increase can also be obtained by industrial development. Because in the past we have concentrated on agricultural development, we must expect that we shall be able to absorb permanently a comparatively small number of people unless hand in hand with that agricultural development there occurs industrial development and, if possible, mining development. It should be evident that the recommendations in that report I have quoted ought to be applied to Western Australia. There is great need for a permanent committee being appointed in Western Australia; in fact this House might do much worse than appoint a select committee to make a preliminary inquiry into unemployment in this State. That committee could provide such data for the Government as would enable them to meet the position from year to year as it arose. Another point that needs to be stressed is in regard to the employment of youths. This is a very pressing problem. If there is one place where we should tackle unemployment, it is at its source, in order to devise a scheme under which the youth of the country can be drafted into occupations and to ensure that they shall get jobs when they leave school. Let me quote these figures from the Education Department's report: In 1926 there were in our schools scholars between six and 14 years of age as follows:—In the primary schools 24,431 boys and 22,517 girls; in the high schools 92 boys and 81 girls; in the private schools 3,677 boys and 4,865 girls; totals in each case 28,200 boys and 27,263 girls. If we take the average of that number, roughly there will be released from our schools every year 3,100 boys and 3,000 girls. We can reckon on that number of young people who have to be placed in industries. At the other end of the scale we find there are something like 3,300 deaths per annum.

So the margin between the two sets of figures is about 3,000. That is to say, if we replace those who die we still have a margin of 3,000 each year to provide for in employment. The most promising avenue of dealing with unemployment and ensuring our young people getting a chance is to apply some method of vocational guidance and then to endeavour to elaborate some scheme whereby there shall be brought about a collaboration between the employer and the school departments which have the promising young people coming on for work. If some such scheme could be inaugurated, it would be to the benefit of Australia as a whole and of the young people who have had the advantage of our splendid educational system. I suggest that is an avenue of investigation that could well be referred to a permanent committee. I am sure the result of their labours would be entirely to the advantage of Western Australia. No doubt there is considerable scope for enlargement in regard to the young people that could be worked into our industries.

Hon. Sir William Lathlain: The conditions are too stringent.

Hon. H. SEDDON: Yes, but public opinion is changing. Whereas conditions in the past were such as to induce the tradesman in his own protection to lay down a certain ratio between apprentices and journeymen, it is now being recognised that in a country like this young people should be given every opportunity to advance. If the apprenticeship system is handled in a careful manner, the danger to a journeyman is minimised, and the tradesmen themselves are only too willing to welcome any one who will introduce a system whereby young men, frequently their own children, can be apprenticed. Take an illustration that came under my notice last January. I had a case where there was trouble in a certain district. With the secretary of the Engineers' Union, I interviewed the employer. I found that exception had been taken to a young man, not a tradesman, who was employed at the works. As a result of my talking the matter over with the employer and the men, the men suggested that they preferred to see a youth taken on as an apprentice rather than allow the young labourer to undertake a tradesman's work. The thing was finally settled by the employer agreeing to take on an apprentice, and the men undertaking to see that the apprentice should be properly trained and turned out as a first-class tradesman. I have

since had reports and I find the experiment is going on quite well. It appears to me that if we in Western Australia are going to advance as we should do, and adopt up to date methods in manufacturing, it can only be done by training our young people in those methods and giving them every chance of succeeding. This aspect of unemployment should commend itself to every section of the community. With regard to the immediate pressure of unemployment, I should like to ask the Leader of the House whether the subject of long service leave which obtains in the public service has been exploited with a view to sending the men on leave, and by the simple method of promotion making temporary vacancies in the lower scale of employment in order to absorb some of those who are out of work. It is known that a certain number of men are to be sent on long service leave every year. It appears to me that if it is arranged for long service leave to take place at a time when the work is lightest it will lead to the absorption of some, at least, of the unemployed. Then there, is the question of the railway regrading, much of which work will require to be done. When it is done, it will be of advantage to the efficient working of the service. This work could be scheduled for the slack season. Then there is the question of railway rolling stock. We know there is a shortage in that direction. It appears to me that it could be so arranged that a winter campaign could be instituted to bring all the trucks that require to be repaired into the shops and get a strong force to deal with them. This, too, would mean absorbing a number of unemployed, and it would also mean providing sufficient rolling stock to handle the harvest, and thus carry out that part of the work in a more efficient manner than is done at present. It may be that these suggestions have already been considered by the Government, but I commend them to Cabinet in case they have not been fully developed. The whole problem of unemployment can be handled if it is taken in hand scientifically, adequate data obtained and proper recommendations and investigations made. The Disabilities Commission laid stress upon that point. They referred to the need for organisations in every State to go into the question of unemployment, and see whether seasonal work could not be introduced, and data, which are at present not available, obtained. In the meantime this State has had a most unfor-

fortunate advertisement. It is one that will have rather a bad effect, unless we try immediately to dispel it by introducing such a state of affairs as should exist in a new country like this. There is no doubt that with the amount of development work that is awaiting attention here there should never be an unemployment problem. If things were properly planned out we should be continually looking for sufficient supplies of men to carry out the necessary work. I am aware that finance is required to do this. In another place the Premier complained of or bewailed the bad bargain he had made when he reduced taxation by applying the Federal grants to the relief of taxation. He said he had made a bad deal by utilising the money in this direction.

Hon. Sir William Lathlain: He did not use it all.

Hon. H. SEDDON: The second and third grants were the sums to which he referred. There must be a tremendous economic waste in Western Australia due to the handling of the unemployed problem. Possibly the application of this money as a nucleus for an unemployment fund, and working out plans in the Public Works and other departments for carrying on a winter campaign of work, would be of great benefit to Western Australia, and would relieve the finances of the State by reason of the State not being obliged to contribute relief in the ordinary way. There is one other aspect which we cannot help recognising when dealing with unemployment. The trade statistics quoted in the Speech show that our imports last year were about 18½ millions. When we realise that amongst these commodities imported are many that could be produced in Western Australia we see an avenue for employment that could well be developed and exploited. There is a campaign that could well be inaugurated of "preference to Western Australian goods." We should make that the slogan throughout Western Australia. The demand that would arise would be such as to induce the people to cater for the market now supplied from overseas. These are means by which the unemployment problem can be successfully attacked. I am sure that steady and sustained work would result in minimising unemployment during the slack season, and probably mean advancing the interests of Western Australia to a tremendous extent. I wish now to refer to the question of the Fremantle harbour extension. There has been a considerable amount of comment

on this subject. The Premier very justly said that we have two engineers of high standing who are in disagreement; how then can laymen decide? One of the questions which arose was whether the extension of the harbour up river would bring up the water level in the higher reaches of the river, and the scare was raised that this would probably mean blocking back the water, with consequent damage to properties in the vicinity of Perth. Mr. Stewart who is now in Victoria spoke on the matter to my colleague and myself, and said he would make inquiries while in the Eastern States as to what technical advice was available that could be used as a kind of umpire decision or buffer between the contentions of Mr. Stileman and Sir George Buchanan.

Hon. J. Ewing: Would not the Premier do that?

Hon. H. SEDDON: Yes. The suggestion was made by Mr. Stewart that he might assist in meeting the situation which has arisen.

Hon. J. Ewing: The Premier said he could not get a man.

Hon. H. SEDDON: Mr. Stewart telegraphed from Victoria as follows:—

Smith leading hydraulic engineer, president Institute Engineers', Australia, could determine mathematically between Stileman and Buchanan statements re flood level. Smith established reputation with United States Institute and their gold medallist for equally difficult calculations. States spent 100,000 dollars testing experimentally his conclusions, which were proved correct. Utilise.

Hon. J. Ewing: Could he get the Premier to agree to that?

Hon. H. SEDDON: The suggestion is worthy of the consideration of the Government, in the way of settling this aspect of the Fremantle Harbour extensions and dealing possibly with any detrimental effects that might accrue. Certain statements were made by Mr. Williams when dealing with miners' phthisis. He referred to the amendment passed by this House last session. I am satisfied that this amendment has done a great deal of good in preventing the evasion of compensation to certain men who were not receiving it. I interjected that one man, whose case I have quoted in the House before, had not received compensation. Other cases have also been dealt with. In order to make sure of my position, I got from the secretary of the State Government Insurance Office in Kalgoorlie a statement show-

ing the number of cases dealt with since this amendment came into operation. He gave me the following reply, dated 20th August, 1928—

Dear Sir, Following upon your visit to this office on Saturday, I have to advise since 1st January last 14 claims have been lodged under the Third Schedule. These are accounted for as under:—Liability accepted (including posthumous claim by widow) five, refused three, voluntarily withdrawn two, not yet finalised four. In no instance, however, has a percentage basis been applied, and where liability has been accepted, the maximum amount payable under the Act has been admitted. The foregoing represents claims known to this office. There may be possibly a few dealt with by head office.

It appears to me that the position has been so far cleared up by that amendment that the cases are now being dealt with. Diseases such as weakness of the heart or other bodily troubles are evidently not now being made an excuse for evading payment under the Workers' Compensation Act. Since the House met there has been laid on the Table a report by Dr. Nelson. I should like members to read it. It is the result of investigations by the doctor in the year 1925-26. He draws certain very important conclusions which ought to be brought under the notice of the House. He shows that it is possible to classify these men distinctly into six classes. The result of his investigations shows that a certain number of men can be classified as normal, and are just as healthy as many men in other occupations. There are also men who are in a state where they have been neglected and it would be impossible to distinguish the extent to which they have been affected by dust until a certain time had elapsed. Then there are two other classes.

Hon. J. Cornell: As soon as dust affects a man, he ought not to remain in the industry.

Hon. H. SEDDON: Hon. members will find certain diagrams which show that as soon as silicosis sets in, there is a definite change in the appearance of the radiograph showing how a man's lungs are affected. In silicosis, the radiograph shows that there is a mottled appearance indicating the effect of the early stages of dust on the lungs. Then there is the next stage of definite silicosis in which this becomes more marked, and in which a man is seriously affected in his capacity to work. Then there are two other divisions: silicosis complicated by tubercu-

erculosis, and pure tuberculosis. This shows that the doctor has been able to classify the men into six definite classes without any trouble, four of which are entitled to compensation. We have endeavoured to deal with this important problem by two Acts. There is the Miners' Phthisis Act, which deals with men who are suffering from tuberculosis, and the Workers Compensation Act which deals with men who are dusted. I agree with Mr. Nicholson's contention that the only effective way of dealing with the men is to bring them all under the scope of the Miners' Phthisis Act, to classify them under the four distinct classes for which compensation can be paid, and to group the compensation according to the degree to which a man is affected, that is to say, bring into operation a scheme practically on the same lines as that which obtains in South Africa. Until that is done we shall continually have this friction and these anomalies arising from the interpretation of clause 7 of the Workers Compensation Act. That Act has been left so wide that there is room for a considerable amount of dispute between the claimants on the one hand and the insurance department on the other. There is also a difficulty with regard to the working of the Miners' Phthisis Act and the Workers' Compensation Act, namely that it does not apply to or provide for the prospector. If there is anyone to whom this country owes a debt of gratitude it is the man who has given his life to searching for and opening up the gold deposits of Western Australia. I know of at least two cases of men who have been so badly dusted that had they been working for wages they would have been able to claim full compensation, but were unable to get it because they had been engaged in prospecting and could not claim relief under the Workers' Compensation Act.

Hon. E. H. Harris: There are numerous cases, but because the men have worked for themselves instead of an employer they have not been able to get compensation.

Hon. H. SEDDON: That is so. This is an anomaly that should receive urgent attention. In view of the unsatisfactory nature of existing legislation the time is ripe when we should consolidate the law on the point, have one measure providing for the three different grades of compen-

sation, induce men to leave the industry before they are severely and permanently affected, and bring under the scope of the Act those men who have done so much to develop the resources of Western Australia. There is another matter on which I would like to say a few words. It relates to the Kalgoorlie School of Mines. I do not know just exactly how it came about, but Mr. Nangle was induced to make reference in the course of his report to the Kalgoorlie School of Mines. I understand this gentleman was brought over to inquire more particularly into the question of technical education. We must recognise that the work of the Kalgoorlie School of Mines is quite of a different category from that of ordinary technical education. We can define technical education as education for the purpose of enabling apprentices to become better tradesmen and to assist in teaching them their trades. The status of the man who passes through the School of Mines is above that category, because the man who has the diploma of the School of Mines is able to take up the duties of a manager or any executive post rather than the work of a tradesman. Incidentally, too, we must recognise the work done by the school in the way of investigation. Anyone who has read the Mines Department report will recognise the valuable work done by the staff of the school in the laboratory provided there. Incidentally also I would commend to the Government the question of extending the scope of that laboratory by providing electrical equipment. There are many problems now and many processes in connection with the treatment of refractory ores which necessitate the use of electro metallurgy. The adoption of this method in Canada has met with success in the extraction of metals from ores by means of electrolysis. Then we have the question of electric smelting. There is a lot of data which could be worked out by the School of Mines staff and the work done by the chemical department should be extended by utilising the services of the electrical staff. The cost of the equipment would not be great, and a series of electrical investigations by the technical staff of the School of Mines would open out new avenues in dealing with ore problems and probably indicate successfully a method by which costs might be reduced. No doubt hon. members noticed a letter in the Press recently from Mr. Whitfield, a visiting director of one of the Kal-

goorlie mines. While Mr. Whitfield was in Kalgoorlie he carried out a considerable amount of inquiry work and he went away with very correct ideas of the state of affairs generally. One of his suggestions which should commend itself to the Government is that of preventing mine officials from securing tributes on the company's leases. I think it is recognised that is not a wise practice to allow to exist, and I hope the Government will take the matter into consideration with a view to remedying it. There is also another question raised and that is the application of the flotation treatment to Kalgoorlie ores. The laboratory experiments have been successful, and speaking to men who have carried out these experiments apart from the laboratory, I understand there is every possibility of flotation being successfully applied to Kalgoorlie mining. It is very effective in the way of reducing costs. Mr. Whitfield proposed that the Government should consider the question of running a flotation pilot plant to deal with Kalgoorlie ore and I understand he himself is prepared to enter into co-operation with the Government on those lines. I would like to hear what the Government think of the proposal because it opens up the question of the reduction of costs, and will bring about the commercial exploitation of ore now left in the mines. Another question that should receive consideration is that of the holding of leases by convicted gold thieves. Although a man may be convicted of stealing gold, it is possible for that man to hold a lease, and it is found very difficult indeed, owing to existing conditions, to keep track of that man's work. A suggestion has been made that possibly the department may exercise their authority in this respect and prevent any man who has been convicted of gold stealing from holding a lease and so take away from him an avenue whereby he can continue his operations. No doubt a considerable amount of assistance has been given to the prospector in the way of the geological examination of new fields. Unfortunately too frequently the reports that have been prepared have not been made available until a considerable time after the field has been opened up. It has been pointed out that if we had a resident geologist on a new field, a geologist who could camp there and move about amongst the men, and follow the work that was being carried out, it would be possible to give the prospectors considerable infor-

mation and thus assist them in the way of searching for and developing ore bodies. Only too frequently men have been unsuccessful and have left the field without its having been properly prospected. In such cases geological advice on the spot might have been the means of disclosing ore bodies never opened up. There is another matter which deserves the attention of the Government. There is not the slightest doubt that a considerable amount of capital is being brought into the State in the hope of investing it in the development of our industries. It is most remarkable that Western Australia, which is so much in need of this class of money, imposes stamp duties that are much higher than those in any other State. In support of this statement I would like to quote a letter given to me by a prominent business man in Perth. The letter points out the effect of the stamp duties in the way of driving business from this State to the Eastern States. The stamp duty charged on banking and trading companies' share transfers is as follows: Western Australia, £1 per cent. ad valorem; Victoria, nil; South Australia, since 1st of January, 1928, nil—prior to that date, 5 per cent. ad valorem; New South Wales, 7s. 6d. per cent. ad valorem; Queensland, 5s. per cent. ad valorem. The letter sets out—

Western Australia: As above mentioned the stamp duty on banking and trading concerns share transfers is charged at the rate of £1 per cent. ad valorem, which is the highest rate charged in the Commonwealth. It is the opinion that this high charge prevents business in Western Australian concerns, or in concerns with a Western Australian register. I would like to mention that many of my clients have refrained from investing in Bank of New South Wales shares on the local register for the reason that if purchased they would require to pay to the local stamp duty office 10s. per share for the stamp duty, which is equal to a loss of one quarter's dividend. It pays them to purchase these shares in this bank on the Melbourne market where the stamp duty is nil. This is one great reason why there are no transactions on the Perth Stock Exchange in Bank of New South Wales shares. I have also at various times recommended my clients to purchase West Australian newspaper ordinary shares, but business at times has not eventuated as my clients objected to paying in addition to the market price of the shares, a sum of nearly 6d. per share to the local stamp duty office. At the present rate of dividend paid by the newspaper company, this extra charge would mean three months' dividend.

Victoria: The Melbourne Exchange is probably the largest exchange in the Commonwealth for banking and trading concerns which is due, very largely at any rate, to the fact that investors are not called upon to pay any stamp

duty on the transfers of shares in Victoria. At the opening meeting on January 5th last, the Chairman of the Melbourne Stock Exchange in addressing the members, drew attention to the matter of stamp duty on share transfers, and his remarks are as follows:—

"After our adjournment for the Christmas vacation, our State Government introduced a Bill to provide for payment of stamp duty in respect of certain transactions relating to stocks and shares. This Bill was passed in an amended form by the Assembly but rejected by the Council. I understand the whole estimated revenue from this Bill was to be £20,000 for the next year, and I do not think, if the Government realised the amount of inconvenience, expenses and curtailment of business that would have occurred had the Bill become law, that they would have introduced it in the form in which they did. These are days when much public money is wanted in our industries, and the way to obtain this is to have the freest market possible, unfettered by irritations, the small amount of revenue from which is of little importance to our Government."

South Australia: The Stock Exchange of Adelaide raised the question of stamp duty to the local authorities, and coming on top of the Victorian State Government rejection of stamp duties, had the effect of ending this charge in South Australia, and since this date very much larger business in banking and trading concerns has resulted on the Adelaide Stock Exchange. No alteration has been made in New South Wales and in Queensland, but it will be seen from the above that the charge in those States are very much below the stamp duty charged in Western Australia. I would like to mention that the stamp duty on mining transactions in Western Australia is a nominal fee of 1d. duty per transfer, and this charge is not ad valorem, and consequently if one man sells to another, even if the consideration were a million pounds he would only be called upon to pay 1d. duty stamp. It seems to me that this shows clearly that years ago it was the intention of the powers that be, to offer no resistance for large sums of money to be expended on mining concerns in Western Australia, and if such is the case, surely Western Australia would benefit very considerably by having her market unfettered by these irritations. I trust your Chamber will be entirely successful in its endeavour to have these charges either lowered very considerably or deleted altogether.

There is no duty so far as mining stocks is concerned; the duty applies solely to investment stocks. Realising the need for investment of capital in Western Australian industries, I commend to the Government the question of affording relief to investors in Western Australian industries in the direction I have indicated. I would like to say that I welcome the fact that the Government propose to introduce legislation for the financing of our hospitals and hope that legislation will take the form of a general

tax. There is no doubt that the Bill introduced by the Mitchell Government in its original form was the most equitable proposed. When we realise the fact that many of our nurses work excessive hours, and that many of our hospitals are in urgent need of equipment, particularly in the way of up-to-date equipment, I feel sure that if it is intended to impose a tax on salaries and wages, every section will bear its fair share in the way of supporting the hospitals and the measure will meet with general approval. I support the motion for the adoption of the Address-in-reply.

HON. C. H. WITTENOOM (South-East) [9.28]: At this late hour of the sitting I do not propose to take up much of the time of the House, especially as almost every subject has been discussed, and if I speak at any length it will not be possible for me to avoid repetition. I would like to take this opportunity to thank hon. members for their kind congratulatory remarks to the new members. I assure those members that their generous references were much appreciated by us and certainly helped to make the first few days of our Parliamentary life much easier. I agree with the remarks of Mr. Mann who said the other day that it was particularly pleasing to sit in the calm atmosphere of this Chamber. I appreciate this also very much after my strenuous campaign, an experience which, I suppose, was no different from that of other new members. It is very satisfactory to know that one can sit here and that, after he has spoken he can resume his seat knowing that he will not be bombarded with questions, reasonable and unreasonable, that are hurled at a candidate when he is contesting an election. I must confess that when I began my candidature I was surprised at the appalling condition of the Council rolls. I refer more particularly to those of the South-East Province. In spite of very hard work carried out by the Chief Electoral Officer and his staff, I found that less than 65 per cent. of the eligible electors were on the rolls. After that the Chief Electoral Officer sent around enrolment cards to everyone whose name was not on the roll. A great deal of work was done by the secretaries of the road boards and town clerks of municipalities, but in spite of that, when the time arrived for the rolls to close, though better, the position was still very bad. After the rolls were

closed my opponent (Mr. Burvill) and our respective supporters worked very hard to get the voters to go to the poll, but we succeeded in persuading only a little over 48 per cent. of the persons enrolled to vote. At the time I attributed that to the fact that Mr. Burvill and myself belonged to the same party and that that probably robbed the election of a good deal of interest. But on perusing the electoral statistics, I found that with one or two exceptions, all the percentages were very bad. In one instance it was as low as 38 per cent.

Hon. E. H. Harris: You want to go to the goldfields for a high percentage. It was 84.

Hon. C. H. WITTENOOM: Yes. I have given a good deal of consideration to the questions of compulsory enrolment and compulsory voting, and I am quite satisfied that compulsory voting is out of the question on account of the size of the provinces and the cost that would be entailed by the many polling places necessary under such a system. I still contend it is feasible to have compulsory enrolment and that that would save the country thousands of pounds. There is a lot of work in the Chief Electoral Officer's Department, and a large amount of money is necessary to enrol electors. If we had compulsory enrolment a large amount of money would be saved. Should a measure providing for compulsory enrolment be introduced, I shall be one of its supporters. During the last two or three weeks I have been given quite a lot of good advice, which I have appreciated, and it has certainly helped me a great deal. One piece of advice was that if I spoke on the Address-in-reply debate, I should keep away from home. Still, I wish to speak of Albany harbour, which is my home port.

Hon. E. H. Harris: I think we have heard of it before.

Hon. C. H. WITTENOOM: I consider that Albany is so important to the development of the country that I am fully justified in referring to it, although it is my home port. For a long time Albany has been endeavouring to get a harbour board, and the time has come when the Government should give consideration to the people's wishes. The Chamber of Commerce appointed a committee to inquire into the trade of the port and determine whether there was sufficient

trade to support a harbour board. The committee in its report showed that if the capital value of the harbour property, the jetties, etc., were put at a reasonable figure, there was sufficient trade to pay interest and sinking fund and leave something over for repairs and additions. It is not necessary for me to enumerate the many advantages of that harbour—its unique position on one of the most famous ocean routes of the world, its proximity to timber forests, wheat land and fruit land, and its safe anchorage for the largest vessels that trade to Australia. In the inner harbour, the Princess Royal Harbour, ships drawing 32 and 33 feet of water can lie with safety. What I wish to emphasise particularly is that Albany already exists as a harbour. It does not require an expenditure of millions of pounds or the provision of huge breakwaters to make it a harbour. It is already a harbour. If four steamers called at Albany simultaneously, they could lie at the different berths at the two jetties, one of which is deep enough for a vessel drawing 32 feet of water. All that the Albany harbour requires is a few additional railway facilities. During the wheat season a fair number of ships called at Albany, one very large one having loaded 10,500 tons of wheat. This was the second largest shipment ever made in a single vessel from Western Australia. She was going to take 10,750 tons, which would have been the largest, but I understand the engineer made some mistake in putting water into the tanks or not being able to get it out, and so she left with 10,500 tons. The reason I refer to that vessel is that before she left, the captain commended the agents on the splendid despatch his ship had received. He went further, and gave the lumpers a certificate, which they have in their clubroom, to the effect that he had never received better despatch or been treated better anywhere. There had been no going slow or other sins of which lumpers are accused, and he was treated in a manner that gave every satisfaction and that redounded to the credit of the harbour. Consequently it will be realised that the harbour is able to accommodate shipping and does not require much expenditure. To make it a first-class port, certain improvements to the wharves are necessary and greater railway facilities are required. In my opinion it would be better to use that harbour than to spend millions on some other harbour.

Only last week the Premier remarked that rather than spend a lot of money on luxurious bridges he would have it spent to open up the country and increase the production of wealth. He also said he would prefer that any large expenditure on harbours should be postponed for the present. I hope the Premier will stand to that opinion and use a natural harbour like that at Albany and give it improved railway and other facilities. There is no reason why Albany, without great expenditure, should not be connected with portion of the 3,500 farms scheme about to be opened up. Already there have been references to the new harbour at Fremantle, regarding which I feel considerable uneasiness. I know nothing of the building of harbours, wharves or bridges, but I know two schemes have been proposed. Before either scheme is adopted an expert apart from Mr. Stileman or Sir George Buchanan should be consulted. Certain soundings have been made in the river leading us to believe that the Stileman scheme will probably be submitted for the approval of Parliament this session. We are told that a new bridge is to be built at a cost of £1,000,000 and that it will be situated only 1,000 feet above the present bridges. That means that once the bridge is built, any further extension upstream will be impossible. It will enable a few more berths and a more commodious harbour to be provided, but in 15 years the harbour will be incapable of catering for the shipping and another harbour will have to be constructed outside. We are frequently asked why shipping should not be taken as far as that suitable stretch of water, Blackwall Reach. One member to-night has referred to the question of the Perth water rising, and that is the reason given for not constructing the bridge farther upstream. We are told that, on the occasions of extremely low barometric pressure or big storms at sea, the low-lying portions of Perth will be flooded. When I was a boy, in the stream where the Fremantle shipping now berths was a rocky shallow bar. That was blown up and that stretch of water was dredged to 36 feet, while there is now talk of dredging it to 40 feet. No question of the low-lying portions of Perth being flooded was raised at that time. The water has been deepened to a depth of 36 feet and still the foreshore of Perth has not been flooded.

But suppose the water does go to Perth, the Stileman report speaks of a maximum rise of only 12 inches, and surely it would be cheaper to build the foreshore up a few inches than to spend all the millions suggested on an outer harbour.

Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. C. H. WITTENOOM: It used to be the fear of the people of Fremantle that the shipping would be taken up the river and berthed in Perth. We know that the Perth people do not want the shipping and never will want it. They do not want coastal ships and oil ships on their beautiful Melville Water and Perth Water. I am of opinion, however, that more of the Swan River should be used for a harbour than the Stileman scheme suggests. When the inside harbour will no longer cater for shipping, an outer harbour is to be built in the Indian Ocean. That will be a gigantic engineering feat—a world scheme. I believe this is proposed against the advice of the Harbour Trust, the pilots, the shipping people, and a man who has made his name famous the world over as a harbour engineer, and has been granted a knighthood by His Majesty the King, apparently for his ability. I do not wish to criticise either engineer because I do not know anything about harbour construction, but a good deal seems to depend on the question whether the inner harbour scheme will cause the low-lying portions of Perth to be flooded or not. We have heard of a telegram from Mr. Stewart to the effect that there is an expert in the East. I think we need more than that. We should get the best man possible from abroad, and I believe the best men to deal with such questions are the Dutch. If that is so, an expert from that country should be obtained before we finally decide whether we shall adopt the Stileman scheme or the inner harbour scheme. So far as we know, the river scheme is going to save a good deal of money: and we want to save that money. We want more money to spend on other ports and on railways. Moreover, we want decentralisation: a point that is supported by the statements of the Government. We do not want to see all the public money spent at Fremantle. Apparently out of the migration money a railway is to be built from Southern Cross through the Kalgarin country to Lake Grace. I shall always be a supporter of that. It is one of the railways the

Government should build. No people are more deserving of a railway than the people at Kalgarin. It has been promised to them for the last two or three years.

Hon. Sir William Lathlain: For 10 or 12 years.

Hon. C. H. WITTENOOM: On account of that promise they have developed their country against fearful odds. We have been told they carted their wheat as far as 50 miles. I did not know that, but I do know that on the average they have carted it about 26 miles, and last season they produced 120,000 bags of wheat. I will always be a supporter of that line leading somewhere towards the Lake Grace railway. I think it ought to go down through Pingrup and Ongerup, through the Borden country, on to Albany, so that the wheat may get to the port by the shortest route. The other line from Pingrup to Magenta should also be built. It is very pleasing to know that the construction of the Cranbrook-Boynup line is to be provided for on the Estimates. I hope the survey of the Mt. Barker-Manjimup line will also be proceeded with. When Sir James Mitchell was in power he authorised certain experiments to be made in the bottle bush country round Albany. He instructed the Agricultural Department to clear a certain amount of land, and put in certain grasses and manures. The experiments were on a fairly large scale, and some were successful and some were not. Unfortunately, after the Mitchell Government went out of office the new Administration lost interest in the experiments, and the country was allowed to go back to a state of nature. I hope the Government will consider the advisability of continuing those experiments, by means of an experimental farm, or by subsidising some of the settlers to make their own experiments under the supervision of experts of the Agricultural Department. The question of hospitals has been referred to. It is such an important matter that I have a few words to say concerning it. The financial position of the Children's Hospital is deplorable, and that of the Perth Public Hospital is nearly as bad. As Mr. Hamersley said a few days ago, obstacles are often placed in the way of people who can afford to pay. Anyone that could afford to pay should be made to pay. An important institution like the hospital should not have to depend upon charity, Government grants, or even the ques-

tionable amusements tax. The hospital should be supported either by direct tax or by a State lottery or premium bonds, as suggested by Mr. Fraser. I do not see why all this money should go to Queensland, or Tasmania. I have yet to see evidence that the morals of the people of Tasmania or Queensland are worse than ours by reason of the fact that they are allowed to run consultations in those States.

Hon. W. J. Mann: There are not so many wowsers there.

Hon. C. H. WITTENOOM: We allow bookmakers here and other forms of gambling, and why not allow these consultations also? During my election tour I was able to recognise the position of the towns along the Great Southern railway with regard to their water supplies. I went to Wagin several times but found no water there. Katanning and other towns are in nearly as bad a position. These towns will grow larger and they should receive better treatment. Efforts are made to supply them with water by means of mud dams somewhere in the neighbourhood. It is all very well to say, "Give them water"; but they want soft and clear water, something akin to the Albany water. Consideration should be given to a big comprehensive scheme for watering all these towns. Water is without limit in the vicinity of the place where Albany draws its own supply. We know that the Albany water is equal to anything in Australia, for it was so determined by the analysis that was made for the purpose of testing it for the woollen mills. I hope consideration will be given to that necessary provision. I have much pleasure in supporting the motion.

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

House adjourned at 9.57 p.m.

Legislative Assembly,

Tuesday, 21st August, 1928.

	PAGE
Questions: Frozenmeat, Wyndham	316
Wheat, bulk handling	316
Western Australian dinner, cost	316
Apples, proposed importation	317
Address-in-reply, eighth day	317

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

QUESTION—FROZEN MEAT. WYNDHAM.

Mr. MANN asked the Premier: 1, What quantity of frozen beef is available on spot at the Wyndham Meat Works for sale for consumption in this State? 2, What quantity can be made available per month for consumption in the State during the present killing season at Wyndham?

The PREMIER replied: 1 and 2, The works will close down on 4th September. The estimated remaining quantity of frozen beef to come to hand for consumption within the State is 353 tons. Of this quantity, 93 tons has been shipped per "Koolinda" due at Fremantle about 21st inst.; about 200 tons will be shipped per "Kangaroo" leaving Wyndham on 10th September, and about 60 tons per "Koolinda" leaving Wyndham about 26th September.

QUESTION—WHEAT, BULK- HANDLING.

Mr. FERGUSON asked the Premier: In view of the interest in and importance of bulk handling of wheat to the wheat growers of the State, will the Government appoint a practical wheat grower to the committee that is inquiring into the question?

The PREMIER replied: The present inquiry into the bulk handling of wheat question is purely departmental and it is not considered advisable to add to the committee.

QUESTION—WESTERN AUSTRALIAN DINNER, COST.

Mr. SLEEMAN asked the Premier: From where does the money come and who foots the bill for the annual Western Australian dinner held in London?