

Legislative Assembly,

Wednesday, 6th August, 1924.

	Page
Questions: Sandalwood, Government's intention	176
Companies operating in the State	176
Miners' Phthisis	176
Railway Project, Newdegate to Albany	176
Group Settlements, Denmark	176
Railways, Petrol Coaches	176
Papers: Wooreloo Sanatorium	176
Address-in-reply, Fifth day	176

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

QUESTION—SANDALWOOD, GOVERNMENT'S INTENTION.

Mr. PANTON asked the Premier: 1, Is he aware that sandalwood pullers are suffering great hardship owing to Regulation No. 180, issued on the 28th November of last year? 2, Will he consider the advisability of cancelling the regulation? 3, If not, will he make a statement to the House at an early date as to the intention of the Government in regard to the sandalwood monopoly?

The PREMIER replied: 1, The sandalwood trade has been subject to periods of slackness during past years when sandalwood cutters have suffered hardship. At the present time 500 tons per month is being purchased from Crown lands at satisfactory prices, in addition to considerable quantities obtained from private property. 2 and 3, The matter has been dealt with by the Government, who consider it necessary that some definite scheme should be formulated and considered in detail before any alteration to existing regulations can be given effect to.

QUESTION—COMPANIES OPERATING IN WESTERN AUSTRALIA.

Mr. MARSHALL (for Hon. W. D. Johnson) asked the Premier: Is it his intention to lay upon the Table a list of the commercial and mining companies or firms operating in Western Australia whose head office or principal registered office or main business premises are situated in the Eastern States, giving the names of such States?

The PREMIER replied: It is regretted that it is almost impossible to give full information on this matter. Such information as is available would entail very heavy work and expense. Moreover, the results could not be regarded as satisfactory, as comparatively few foreign companies, when relinquishing business, comply with the Act and give notice of intention to cease carrying on; therefore, no knowledge is possessed of

the demise of the companies, and there is no machinery under the Act for striking such companies off the register.

QUESTION—MINERS' PHTHISIS.

Mr. MARSHALL asked the Minister for Mines: 1, What advancement is being made with the erection of the laboratory at Kalgoorlie for treatment of miners' phthisis? 2, Can he, at present, give the approximate date when the Miners' Phthisis Bill, passed in 1922, will be proclaimed?

The MINISTER FOR MINES replied: 1, The original contract for the removal and re-election of the laboratory is practically completed. The additions are not due for completion until the 1st September. The contract for the fittings is awaiting approval from Melbourne for acceptance. 2, So soon as the laboratory is completed immediate consideration will be given to the question of proclaiming the Miners' Phthisis Act.

QUESTION—RAILWAY PROJECT, NEWDEGATE TO ALBANY.

Mr. THOMSON asked the Premier: Is it his intention to lay upon the Table of the House the report of the Railway Advisory Board on the route of the proposed railway from Newdegate to Albany, as promised by the ex-Premier?

The PREMIER replied: This area has not been inspected by the Railway Advisory Board. Only a rough classification by a surveyor was made last year.

QUESTION—GROUP SETTLEMENTS, DENMARK.

Mr. A. WANSBROUGH asked the Minister for Lands: 1, What was the total number of horse-drawn vehicles purchased and railed to the group settlements at Denmark? 2, Were any such vehicles purchased in the Albany electorate? 3, If so, how many? 4, What was the average cost of such vehicles, plus railrage?

The MINISTER FOR LANDS replied: 1, Twenty-seven. 2, Yes. 3, One. 4, Spring carts ex Perth, including railrage, £30 4s. 2d.; drays ex Perth, including railrage, £44 0s. 10d.; spring cart ex Albany, including railrage, £26 18s. 6d.

QUESTION—RAILWAYS, PETROL COACHES.

Mr. LUTEY asked the Minister for Railways: 1, Have the Government ordered more petrol coaches for our railways? 2, If so, is it the intention of the Department to run one or more of them on the Brown Hill-Boulder loop line?

The MINISTER FOR RAILWAYS replied: 1, No. 2, Answered by No. 1. An improved service has recently been instituted on this loop.

PAPERS—WOOROLOO SANATORIUM.

On motion by Mr. Marshall ordered: That the file dealing with the milk supply at the Wooroloo Sanatorium be laid upon the Table of the House.

ADDRESS-IN-REPLY.

Fifth Day.

Debate resumed from the previous day.

Mr. MANN (Perth) [4.39]: I cannot congratulate the Premier and his colleagues upon their elevation to the Treasury bench because I very much regret that the change took place.

Mr. Marshall: Have you no sympathy for the State?

Mr. MANN: I have some for the hon. member.

Mr. Marshall: That is some consolation.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. MANN: Whilst I regret the change of Government I intend loyally to abide by the decision of the people, and so far as I think it fair and reasonable will support the Government in the carrying out of their duties. I congratulate the Premier upon the clear and lucid manner in which he placed before this Chamber the debit side of the ledger. I expected him to have given us something on the credit side.

The Minister for Mines: There is nothing on that side.

Mr. MANN: He might have told us in what manner loan moneys have been expended and invested; but that was left to our own conjecture. There was the inference that the State would be put to considerable disability in meeting the interest bill. It was left to the member for York (Mr. Latham), by way of interjection, to draw from the Premier the statement that for the loan moneys that have been expended on group settlements the Imperial and Federal Governments were paying 4 per cent. interest for the first five years.

The Minister for Lands: You do not know what you are talking about. They are doing nothing of the kind. They are merely paying on migrants and nothing else.

Mr. MANN: The interest on the loan money that has been invested through the Agricultural Bank is being paid by the settlers who have borrowed it.

The Premier: All of it? I gave the figures showing that this was not so.

Mr. MANN: I repeat, the interest on that money is being paid by the farmers of the State.

The Premier: Unfortunately that is not so.

Mr. MANN: Although there was an amount owing, or there was at the end of June, it is debited to the settlers against their securities.

The Premier: Yes, it is debited.

Mr. MANN: The bank holds security for the money.

Mr. E. B. Johnston: And very good security.

Mr. MANN: I should have thought the Premier would have drawn our attention to the benefits that have accrued to the country from the expenditure of that loan money. To the extra money that was advanced by the Agricultural Bank we owe our increased wheat yield.

The Premier: I acknowledged that.

Mr. MANN: The Premier acknowledged that we had had a large wheat yield, but did not state that this was due to the special loans maturing in 10 years. The fact that we had a heavy harvest was due to the expenditure of that money, which, in turn, meant a considerable increase in railway freights.

The Minister for Lands: How many acres were cleared through the Agricultural Bank?

Mr. MANN: The Minister should be able to give that information. The money was advanced to the farmers, and the result was an increase in the wheat yield.

Mr. Latham: Which we would not have had but for that money.

The Minister for Lands: You got it through the I.A.B.

Mr. MANN: The farmers, therefore, had an opportunity of following extra land for the coming season, which they could not have done but for that expenditure. The increased wheat yield also meant greater harbour dues, more shipping, and increased employment all round. If future loan moneys are expended in the same way the country will have nothing to regret. As to the interest owing under the soldier settlement scheme, it is to be regretted that the amount is so large. It has to be remembered that that money was spent under great disabilities.

The Minister for Lands: Why is it to be regretted in respect of the Soldier Settlement Scheme and not of the Agricultural Bank? They are practically the same.

Mr. MANN: Probably there is not the same security in respect of the soldiers as with the farmers who have received advances from the Agricultural Bank.

Mr. Panton: Why?

Mr. MANN: Because the farmer is probably a better security than the disabled soldier.

Mr. Latham: In addition to that, the soldiers were settled on repurchased estates, representing high costs.

Mr. MANN: The expenditure of that loan money and the prosperity that was brought about in consequence, increased the credit of the State to a considerable degree. The building trade was never so prosperous as during the last 12 or 18 months. Money

has been spent in improvements and extensions to existing buildings, while many new buildings have been erected. The Associated Banks have advanced money, with the result that work has been obtainable. The returns show that the banks advanced some £3,000,000 over and above the amount deposited in Western Australia. The deposits totalled about £8,000,000 and up to December of last year the banks had advanced over £11,000,000 for the development of the State. This means that the banks were satisfied with the security offered, and that security was enhanced by the administration of the late Government in the investment of loan moneys. The prosperity of primary industries favourably affected our secondary industries and many of the latter have reached the point at which they have been able to export to the Eastern States. That result was reached because the overhead charges were covered by increased trade. Such a result could not have been achieved had it not been for our increased population and the prosperity of the farming districts. The statistics for the six months ended December last in relation to the trade of Western Australia with the other portions of the Commonwealth are interesting. Imports to Western Australia amounted to £3,626,405. The exports were valued at £775,129, an improvement of £184,554 compared with the corresponding period of the previous year. These figures show a balance of trade against Western Australia of £2,848,274—a surprising sum, but capable of being overtaken.

The Minister for Lands: That shows that money has been going to the Eastern States instead of being spent here.

Mr. MANN: It is true that our money has been going to the Eastern States for a long time, but during the period I have quoted, £184,000 less was despatched to the East than was sent there during the corresponding period of the previous year. The exports from Western Australia in December were distributed as follows: New South Wales, £53,233; Victoria, £52,623; South Australia, £36,601; Queensland, £876; and Tasmania, £303. Some of the lines that could have been produced here but were imported were as follows: Butter, £46,787; bacon and ham, £17,720; boots and shoes, £15,571; jams and jellies, £14,228; cheese, £7,415; confectionery, £6,871; wine, £6,598, and agricultural machinery, £6,290. Our exports to the Eastern States included timber, £42,012; potatoes, £26,780; wearing apparel produced in our own factories here, £19,274; confectionery, £1,815; cigarettes, £1,540, and chinaware, £840. This is the first time that our factories have been in a position to export goods to the Eastern States on such a scale. Although some of the amounts mentioned are small, still they show that during the period referred to, the secondary industries of Western Australia overcame the period during which they had had to struggle for an existence.

The Minister for Lands: It does not apply at all; it does not affect the position!

Mr. MANN: The Minister for Lands will have an opportunity to tell the House why it does not apply.

The Minister for Lands: We had the only chinaware factory in Australia at that time.

Mr. MANN: This is interesting because it shows that our factory has been able to compete with the Japanese in the Eastern States.

Mr. Taylor: In the Eastern States?

Mr. MANN: Yes. Until recently the Japanese controlled the whole of the chinaware industry in the Eastern States. Now our local factory can compete with the Japanese who are operating there. These results have been due to the judicious expenditure of loan money. The member for Guildford (Hon. W. D. Johnson), when discussing the possibility of the success of the group settlement scheme last night, contended that it was impossible for success to be achieved in view of the way the clearing was being done on the groups. I have in mind the evidence taken before the Royal Commission on Forestry on that particular point, and for the information of the House I will quote some of it. That evidence will show that virgin country from which the green timber has been removed has been successfully developed in the past and is being successfully developed now. Mr. Thomas Duff, a settler at Pemberton, gave valuable information to the Commission. He said that he took up land outside Pemberton and that he had cut his own road for a distance of four miles in order to bring his holding nearer to the Pemberton township. He had a family of four boys and a girl. He started growing vegetables and had five acres under fruit trees. He grew potatoes and sent them to Perth. He informed the Commission that two of his sons went to the war leaving with him the two younger lads. The sons returned in March, 1922. In that month Mr. Duff and his two younger sons took up another holding, and in the following April they had eight acres cleared. They were feeding ten cows from which they were procuring 50 lbs. of butter, and in addition they were supplying the Pemberton people with vegetables. All this was done on land that had been in its virgin state shortly before.

The Minister for Lands: All on eight acres?

Mr. MANN: Yes. I saw the holding myself. I saw maize, elephant grass and clover as well as root vegetables growing on what had been virgin country in 1922. A Mr. Thomson gave similar evidence. He told the Commission that he and his brother had cleared the land successfully, and had grown splendid crops of vegetables and potatoes. Another settler, Mr. Johnston, of Manjimup, gave similar evidence, and he told us that he had taken £1,000 worth of potatoes from his holding in the year. This

Mr. Johnston referred to the Denmark settlement as a failure. On the other hand, a settler at Denmark told the Commission that he had spent his whole time on his holding, apart from the period he was away at the war. He had been there for some 12 years and he showed the Commission Commission that he had taken 124 cases of fruit from his trees and had obtained 150 bags of potatoes and 190 cases of tomatoes from his property, and had sent them to Perth during the previous year. All had been grown on land that had been in its virgin state just prior to that period. He was asked if his area comprised karri country and his answer was, "Pure karri soil." When asked what he used for manure, he told the Commission that he had used potato manure. He also said that he had 23 acres cleared, and added that he had made a successful living on his holding during that period. I went to the trouble of looking up this evidence, because the member for Guildford put it to the House that it was impossible for the groups to succeed in view of the way the land was being cleared. This evidence shows that it is possible for success to be achieved. The member for Guildford attacked the ex-Premier for his administration and for the way in which the groups had been established. Hon. members should throw their minds back to the time when that work was undertaken. We had hundreds of unemployed in Perth and Fremantle and hundreds more on the goldfields. Meetings of the unemployed were held every day, and I remember the ex-Premier going to Fremantle to several meetings of lumpers who were demanding assistance. Some of those men were taken from the wharves, and they were placed on a group in the South-West. If everything was not just as it should have been at that time, we have to remember that the work was done hurriedly owing to the position that had arisen. That settlement has been successful. Later, I visited some of the groups in the South-West, particularly the lumpers' group outside Pemberton. I found that the men were doing well. Questioned by myself and by the late Mr. Peter O'Loughlen the lumpers declared they had no desire to go back to the wharves to sit on coal-boxes waiting for ships to come in.

Mr. Pantton: Were they getting 10s. a day?

Mr. MANN: Yes; does the hon. member suggest that they did not earn it?

Mr. Pantton: You cannot put that over me.

Mr. MANN: Those men were filled with enthusiasm and anxious to get their homes erected on their own holdings.

The Minister for Lands: That group has cost £23,770 and the work will not be finished for another two years.

Mr. MANN: That is not excessive. There were 22 families there, which works out at £1,000 a farm.

The Premier: How do you know that is not excessive?

The Minister for Lands: There were 20 families, and there was no plant or stock on the holdings.

Mr. MANN: If people can be settled there on farms at £1,000 each, the Government will have done very well.

The Minister for Lands: You cannot do it.

Mr. MANN: Why does the Minister say it has cost £23,000?

The Minister for Lands: You said they were doing well.

Mr. MANN: Does the Minister suggest that the cost has been excessive?

The Minister for Lands: I do.

Mr. MANN: I do not.

The Premier: How do you know that the cost has not been excessive?

Mr. MANN: I know there were 22 settlers in that particular group, and that £23,000 is not excessive for a group that has been in existence for three years.

The Minister for Lands: It has still two years to go.

Mr. MANN: These people have worked very hard, and at all events they have a home, which is more than they had when they were living in the back streets of Fremantle.

The Minister for Lands: Many sold their houses to go there.

Mr. MANN: I had an opportunity of visiting Groups 6 and 7 on the Augusta-road. These groups are made up of miners taken from the mines at Boulder. We were told by the people there that they had no future to which to look forward because their lungs were so affected by dust, and that they could not possibly have continued working in the mines. When I was at the groups I found these men with their families in a happy frame of mind, making a success of the work they had undertaken on their areas. These people have been given a chance in life. We must remember, too, that their children are being brought up under healthier surroundings than was the case when they were on the goldfields. Some of the adult males told the late Mr. O'Loughlen, who was with us, that they were getting over their miner's complaint by reason of the change and healthy nature of their occupation, and that they were able to do a great deal more work than they had done for many years before. They also stated that the foreman at the groups had been very considerate and that at the outset he had not forced them into doing heavy labour. At the time we were there the prospects were very bright and the people were contented. Therefore, even if settlements of this description be over-capitalised, have we not an asset of value when we find group holders of this class living in better conditions, and doing good for themselves and the State that has

helped them? Will not members therefore give the previous Government that credit to which they are entitled? We should not measure these things entirely from the pounds shillings and pence point of view. Is it not much better for the State to spend a little more money in improving the conditions of this class of people, and giving them and their children a chance to get restored health and to make good? It certainly is better to do this, because the alternative is the Wooroloo Sanatorium.

Several interjections.

Mr. MANN: I am putting the position as it exists and as it appeals to me, and all the interruptions from the other side of the House will not stop me.

The Minister for Lands: What you are saying is wrong.

Mr. MANN: I have had an opportunity of visiting other groups as well. I went to Group 16 on the Nannup-road and I found there a number of men that had been drawn from oversea arrivals, lumpers, miners, and soldiers, and to show the satisfied condition of their minds, these people, out of their 10s. a day allowance had raised sufficient money to enable them to pay a small deposit on timber with which to build a hall for themselves. The day I was at that group I found the men working under the guidance of the foreman, erecting this building. Then I went to Group 37, containing seven settlers only, drawn from the unemployed of the metropolitan area. I spoke to one man, who told me that he had been a glass beveller and knew nothing about cultivation before he went there. He had got a couple of cows on easy terms, as well as three or four pigs, and he had three or four acres of barley growing profusely. His home was well fixed up. That is the kind of thing that I saw almost everywhere, and I have come to the conclusion, after having inspected various groups, that the failures will be the exception. Where there are failures—and these must of necessity occur—the asset will remain.

Hon. W. D. Johnson interjected.

Mr. MANN: We cannot all be as perfect as the hon. member; we are not all as successful as he has been; the weak must drop out and make room for the strong.

The Minister for Lands: The number that has dropped out is 718.

Mr. MANN: I expect, then, that 718 more will have taken the places of those that have dropped out. At any rate, that is not an extraordinarily high average. I notice that the Minister for Lands has arranged for the appointment of a board to advise settlers at the groups.

The Minister for Lands: It was there before I took charge.

Mr. MANN: I should have said that the Minister has made additions to the board. I would like to suggest, in addi-

tion to the fruit and dairy expert, that an expert in pig raising and bacon curing should be included in the personnel of that board. I can quote figures to show that there is room for the exploitation of that industry.

The Minister for Lands: Mr. Hampshire is on the board.

Mr. MANN: I admit that Mr. Hampshire is an expert in dairying, but I do not know whether he has expert knowledge in regard to pig raising. The position with regard to the bacon industry in this State is not at all good. At the present time the Western Australian requirements range from 1,500 to 2,000 bacon pigs per week, and the demand is steadily increasing. The average that has found its way into the market has been less than 600 and we have had to draw our supplies from the Eastern States. Some time ago the management of one of our bacon factories sent an agent to the Far East and he was able to get good orders from Mesopotamia, Egypt, Ceylon, Calcutta and the Malay States. But when those orders came along the local factory was not able to fulfil them, and had to transfer them to the Eastern States. We can well exploit this industry, especially when we know that a pig can be raised to profitable production at about 4d. a lb., and that to-day baconers are bringing from 8d. to 9d. per lb. If we overtake our own requirements, we have the Far Eastern markets to exploit. In addition, I understand that Great Britain imports upwards of 60 million pounds worth of bacon products.

Mr. Marshall: To be correct, 68 millions.

Mr. MANN: Surely we can exploit that market and secure something of that trade. Is it not worth while seriously tackling the industry? Is pig raising not something that can be profitably undertaken by the groups, remembering that at the groups it is possible to grow the greater part of the fodder required? If this can be done, it will tend towards making the settlers more contented by reason of the profit to be earned. I make the suggestion in the hope that the burden of the Minister's worries will be lightened. It is no use stopping sustenance to the people on the groups until we are able to give them stock—dairy cows and breeding pigs—with which to make a start. Then the question arises as to whether we can get the breeders in this country. I regret that we have not in Western Australia what is required, and that it will be necessary to make judicious purchases in the Eastern States.

The Minister for Lands: We can buy all we want here.

Mr. MANN: Let me, as an illustration of the position as it exists, quote what happened at Koojan, Mr. Padbury's pro-

perty, recently. Mr. Padbury disposed of a number of breeding sows and they brought up to £22 each. Apparently there are people who can see the advantage of going in for the bacon industry. There is no doubt about it, the prospects of its success here are very good.

The Minister for Lands: I suppose you are aware that Sir James Mitchell's idea was to provide side-lines?

Mr. MANN: I admit there is not a market for certain classes of fruit, although last year our fruit industry did very well. Last year we exported 213,000 cases of apples and 14,000 cases of grapes. These two items are surely worthy of some consideration.

The Minister for Lands: There are tons of fruit waiting now to be sold, and it cannot be sold.

Mr. Panton: Have you any idea how much waste fruit there is on the ground?

Mr. MANN: That fruit could well be utilised for the feeding of pigs. I have given notice of motion for the appointment of a select committee to inquire into the marketing of our products in the hope that it will be possible to bring the consumers into direct touch with the growers.

Mr. Marshall: The middleman will be after you next election.

Mr. MANN: The middleman is a bogey. I expect I have had as good an opportunity as most hon. members of learning something of the ramifications of the middleman. I know that in many instances the middleman has financed the grower. All he desires is the right to control the sale of produce. Is it possible for the grower to travel to the city every time he has a consignment of produce to sell? No; there must be reputable persons and companies in a position to handle the consignments.

The Minister for Railways: The grower sometimes gets 3s. and the middleman gets 4s.

Mr. MANN: Until there is a better system of marketing we must guard against flooding the market. The local demand is limited. If the market is flooded with fruit, prices naturally go down; if there is a scarcity, prices rise. In addition to the local market we must look to markets overseas. I have a copy of a journal published by the commercial world of the Dutch Indies containing an article entitled "Australia facing the future," written by H. D. Newby, B.A., L.L.B. The writer was evidently well in touch with the facts concerning Australian production and market requirements. It is true we are not commanding the volume of trade with the Dutch Indies that we should have by reason of our close proximity. On the Eastern side of Australia freights have been cut considerably. A number of shipping companies are competing for the trade, and in that way we are beaten.

Mr. Marshall: Why are the freights on this coast so high when we have black labour on the boats?

Mr. MANN: The hon. member is more in touch with black labour than I am.

Mr. Hughes: Chinese are your specialty.

Mr. MANN: The article says—

The area of Australia is 2,974,581 square miles—as large, that is, as the whole of Europe save portions of Russia; and its population is only 5,347,000, of whom only a little more than half are producers and wealth creators by hand and brain. And yet the figures of their solid achievement read almost like a fairy tale. The world's production is set down at £1,715,805,356 of which Australia accounts for only 3 per cent., and yet she is credited with the following percentages of the world's total production:—Wool 23 per cent., wheat 2.73 per cent., meat 2.94 per cent., gold 9.76 per cent., silver 8.78 per cent. The figures for primary and secondary production in Australia may be taken as follows:—Pastoral £98,287,000; agricultural £58,080,000; dairying, etc. £33,738,000; Forestry £7,137,000; Mining £26,150,000 . . . To-day, perhaps as one of the practical lessons of the war, Australia has begun the task of establishing the domestic manufacture of woollen goods. . . . Next to the golden fleeces which give to Australia so prominent a position on the world's markets, wheat is the outstanding primary product of the Commonwealth. Her yields are enormous and expanding, and the quality commends itself to the overseas buyers and consumers. Perennially, drought affects the volume of production, but the quality remains super-excellent. The season 1915-16 saw 12,485,000 acres under cultivation yielding 179,065,703 bushels. That is the record yield, and the present season's yield may be estimated at approximately 140,000,000 bushels. Moreover, the quality of Australian flour is well known and highly regarded. Australian agricultural scientists have for years devoted special attention to developing wheats of special excellence; and in the result it is now found that our wheat possesses inherent qualities that enable the flour to remain better and pure in all countries and in all variations of climate overseas, especially in the hot climate of the Dutch Indies, British India, and countries bordering on the Equator.

It is shown also that Australian exports to the Dutch Indies increased from £2,000,000 to £8,300,000 in the space of five years. The member for Murchison (Mr. Marshall) asked why freights from Western Australia are so much higher than those from the Eastern States.

The Minister for Railways: On flour the freight is 5s. per ton lower from Western Australia.

Mr. MANN: That may account for Western Australia getting some of the flour trade. If we cannot compete with the shipping companies trading from the Eastern side of Australia, there must be something wrong. The market should be ours and we should endeavour to get a better share of the trade. The whole question should be investigated. Recently there has been a discussion regarding the rise in the price of bread, and not without cause, as people are paying as much as they can afford. Here, however, comes in the question of supply and demand.

Mr. Pantou: Good old supply and demand!

Mr. MANN: Recently overseas buyers bought practically the whole of the wheat in stock for Egypt and Mediterranean ports, and only those millers with stocks on hand could continue to mill at the old price. Those millers that have to buy wheat at present cannot sell their flour at the previous price. The question is whether the margin of profit on the flour from the miller to the baker is too great or whether the price of bread from the baker to the consumer is too great.

Mr. Pantou: Is it not whether we are going to give cheap bread to the Egyptians or keep it for ourselves?

Mr. MANN: If Egyptian buyers had sufficient foresight to purchase the available wheat against our traders, it is to their credit. It is to the discredit of our people that they were beaten in the deal.

Mr. Pantou: It is to the discredit of Parliament that that wheat was allowed to go out of the State.

Mr. MANN: If the farmer has his wheat—

Mr. Pantou: I did not say the farmer; I said the Parliament.

Mr. Hughes: Should not the rest of the community protect themselves against that sort of thing?

Mr. Lindsay: Yes, by buying the wheat.

Mr. MANN: Local traders had an opportunity to buy it and failed to take advantage of it. The meat supply of the State is in a very precarious condition. I do not know where we are going to get supplies when the boats cease running to the North. At present the whole of the meat supply for the Eastern goldfields is being slaughtered at Walcalla and Port Augusta. Three butchers have established abattoirs at a site 260 miles on this side of Port Augusta and others have leased abattoirs in Port Augusta. The whole of the stock required for the Eastern goldfields meat supplies is being produced and slaughtered in South Australia. I do not see that anything can be done to remedy the position. I do not blame the Government; I commend them for what they have done to relieve the market in the metropolitan area. We have abundance of sheep, but the high price of wool is preventing them from reaching the meat market.

Mr. Marshall: You are not altogether correct.

Mr. MANN: About one-third of the metropolitan supply is frozen beef that is being imported from the Eastern States.

The Minister for Railways: The price of wool is the same over there.

Mr. MANN: It is possible to buy frozen mutton at 5½d. per lb. r.o.b., Sydney, and that is being landed here at about 6d. per lb. Fresh mutton costs 8½d. or 9d. in the sale yards, and it cannot be retailed at less than 1s.

Mr. Angelo: What are we getting for our Wyndham meat?

Mr. MANN: It is sold in Perth for 1s. a lb.

Mr. Angelo: But in England it is sold for 3d.

Mr. MANN: Probably that is a contract that must be fulfilled. The Government cannot be blamed for it. The position will be much more serious later in the year. It is impossible to see where that stock will be obtainable until well into next year. When the few boats on the north coast cease to run, there will be little fresh beef on the market, and the people of Perth will have to rely upon frozen beef from the Eastern States, while the goldfields are supplied with fresh meat from South Australia. With that matter, however, I shall deal more fully when I move my motion for a select committee. I am not going to be a carping critic of the Government. The new administration have some very difficult problems to solve, and provided they apply themselves to those problems, keeping in view the best interests of the State and not undertaking any further schemes of State trading, they may rely upon my support.

Mr. A. WANSBROUGH (Albany) [5.30]: Whilst not gifted with that fluency of speech which one might desire to possess on such an occasion as this, and whilst not professing to be an orator of any description, I would ask hon. members to bear with me in my humble desire to speak to the motion before the Chair. In doing so, I shall endeavour to imitate the example of the member for Menzies (Mr. Pantou) by making my remarks brief. To you, Sir, I offer my personal congratulations upon your unanimous election to the Speakership of this House; and I congratulate the Premier and his colleagues upon their elevation to Cabinet rank. To the member for Northam (Sir James Mitchell) as Leader of the Opposition, and to the member for Katanning (Mr. Thomson) as Leader of the Country Party, I offer my sympathies. It is indeed gratifying to me, as a new member, to learn that members on the opposite side of the Chamber are desirous of assisting the Government in their deliberations; and I trust that the assistance will be forthcoming. Turning to the Governors Speech, I am glad to note that the Government intend during the present session to amend the Land Tax and the Income Tax Act, and also to intro-

duce a Closer Settlement Bill designed to bring into use the unproductive lands adjoining our railway system. To my mind such a measure is long overdue. Especially pleasing is it to note that the Government intend to appoint a Royal Commission to inquire into the numerous phases of group settlement. Although a believer in group settlement, I do not hold with the past practice of settling men in the south-western portion of the State. In my opinion those south-western groups are over-capitalised—a circumstance brought about by hurried, and, in many cases, unsympathetic administration. The proposed Royal Commission should clear the atmosphere, and prove creditable to the people of the State as a whole and also to the "groupies" themselves, and, further, to those engaged in carrying out the scheme initiated by the present Opposition Leader. In support of my reference to unsympathetic administration, may I draw attention to the replies given to my questions of today, as follows:—

1, What was the total number of horse-drawn vehicles purchased and railed to the group settlements at Denmark?—Twenty-seven. 2, Were any such vehicles purchased in the Albany electorate?—Yes. 3, If so, how many?—One. 4, What was the average cost of such vehicles, plus railages?—Spring carts ex Perth, including railages, £30 4s. 2d.; drays ex Perth, including railages, £44 0s. 10d.; spring cart ex Albany, including railages, £26 18s. 6d.

Thus 27 of these vehicles were purchased, but only one was purchased in the Albany electorate, and that one was purchased there three weeks before the general elections. On going into the figures it appears that an additional cost of £81 18s. has been put on to the spring carts ex Perth since they left the metropolitan area. That is where the unsympathetic administration came in, and that is how the group settlers in the Denmark area have come to be over-capitalised. Whilst on the subject of group settlement I desire to compliment the Minister in charge of the settlements upon the many reforms he has effected during his short term of office, reforms which are appreciated by the "groupies" in the Albany electorate. It is pleasing to learn from the Governor's Speech that the gold mining industry is to receive special consideration. In that connection I would suggest that consideration should also be given to the southern and south-western parts of the State with a view to assisting towards the location of oil. Extremely promising reports, I understand, have been received by the South-West Oil and Shale Company. I sincerely trust the Government will do everything possible to help in the discovery of oil. Again, it is gratifying to note that consideration has been given to providing

educational facilities in the back country, and especially on the group settlements. I hope that the schools that have been authorised will not be delayed any longer. In my opinion, there has already been too much delay. I gather from the Governor's Speech that many railways authorised during the reign of the previous Government remain to be constructed. I would ask those in authority to give serious consideration to the building of a railway between Newdegate and Albany, thus linking up the lines running eastward from the Great Southern railway, from Tambellup to Ongerup, Katanning, Pingrup, Wagin, Lake Grace, and Newdegate, a distance of about 170 miles. The country which would be opened up is suitable for closer settlement and dairying. The dairying industry should receive the utmost consideration from the Government. Then I would also ask consideration for the settlers in the Frankland River and Forrest Hill districts, the country lying to the western side of the Great Southern railway, between Kojoonup and Denmark. I would also suggest to the Minister for Railways that he take into consideration the advisableness of linking up the Denmark and Boyup railways, the distance involved being approximately 80 miles. The district in question was promised railway communication many years ago, in fact by Sir John Forrest when Premier of Western Australia. The line has been reported on times out of number, and the country it would serve is suitable for closer settlement and dairying. I would point out that on the Frankland River there are four settlers holding, between them, 500,000 acres under leasehold. That is not right. Country like that on the Frankland River should be put under closer settlement, and I trust this phase of the question will receive the Government's attention. Whilst on the subject of railways, the Government and the Labour Party being pledged to decentralisation, I would ask for early consideration to the zone system for our railways. That system would give each seaport its geographical due for products grown within that zone for export. In my opinion the system of centralisation has proved the reverse of beneficial to the State as a whole. In that connection I would suggest that close consideration be given to the subdivision of the State, a matter that will need the most serious attention before long. With regard to the Albany-Newdegate country, I was surprised to hear the answer given to the question of the member for Katanning (Mr. Thomson) this afternoon. The question and answer read—

Is it the Premier's intention to lay upon the Table of the House the report of the Railway Advisory Board on the route of the proposed railway from Newdegate to Albany, as promised by

the late Premier?—This area has not been inspected by the Railway Advisory Board, although a rough classification by a surveyor was made last year.

In 1922 a deputation comprising members of the Albany Chamber of Commerce, the Albany Municipal Council, and every road board and progress association in the district waited on Sir James Mitchell to ask that a report on that country be obtained from the Railway Advisory Board. The late Premier gave a definite promise to that effect, but from the reply given to the member for Katanning at question time it appears that no such report has ever been made. I urge the present Premier to honour the promise given by the late Premier in March of 1922. In 1912 Sir James Mitchell gave the Ongerup people a definite assurance that he would have a survey made and a classification prepared. While dealing with the question of railways, I may give expression to my fervent hope that a proper super-annuation scheme for railway employees will be instituted. Having had 29 years' experience of the railway service, I speak feelingly for my fellow employees. I trust the Minister for Railways will have such a scheme prepared on a reasonable basis. The scheme submitted and rejected was an impossible one for the employees. For example, had I been able to join in the scheme, I would have had to pay about 12s. 6d. per week by way of contribution. No railway man, no working man, can stand such a payment every week. Further, I would ask for consideration for the introduction of long service leave into the railway service generally. To my mind, that is something long overdue. I do not believe in class distinctions, such as have been created by the administrators of the Railway Department. Those class distinctions are to-day prevalent throughout the railway service, and are responsible for the unhappiness and discord existing between various branches of the service. I deeply regret that the Governor's Speech makes no mention of beginning the construction of the Denmark-Nornalup railway, which was authorised last session, and which has been promised to the people in the district as far back as I can remember, even during my boyhood. I trust consideration will be given at an early date, and that that line will be gone on with, not only for the sake of those who have been in the district for 25 or 30 years, but also for the sake of the group settlers. No mention is made in the Speech of a review of the railways in the direction of better transport facilities. I ask the Minister for Railways to have a review made of the section between Katanning and Albany, and thus give settlers and residents along that section a reasonable degree of comfort by minimising night travelling. I am pleased

to note that we are to be called upon to consider many measures of importance such as State insurance, main roads, fair rents, scaffolding and drainage. This question of drainage affects my electorate. I ask the Minister for Works to give consideration to the Torbay drainage scheme. I do not profess to be an engineer, but I say that the person responsible for that scheme should never get an opportunity for drawing up another. An enormous amount of money has been expended in draining and in the building of flood gates, yet the position to-day is worse than that of 15 years ago, before the drainage started. Instead of the water being locked on the lower side of the gates, it is locked on the upper side. So the scheme, instead of being a blessing, has proved to be a hindrance to the settlers. During the past few months those flood gates have been opened for six consecutive days, and then at the expense of manual labour. I am satisfied that, in view of the proposed appointment of an engineer-in-chief, some alterations could be effected there without very much cost. In my opinion as a layman, a charge of dynamite would do more good than would anything else. The members for Katanning (Mr. Thomson) and for Avon (Mr. Griffiths) referred to one or two matters in my electorate. The member for Avon referred to differential treatment of the railways as between Mt. Barker and his electorate, as evidenced by the new station at Mt. Barker. The new station at Mt. Barker was warranted, and I only regret that the Commissioner did not see his way clear to complete the whole scheme. I hope he will complete that scheme, at all events to the extent of building the overhead bridge and finishing off the platform. The member for Katanning complained of the dredging of the channel at the town jetty not having consideration. I, too, regret that it has not been carried out under the scheme of the banjo area adopted by the previous Government. However, as the present Minister proposes to bring down a comprehensive scheme for the building of wharves and reclamation of the foreshore, I am desirous of assisting him. I, like the member for Fremantle (Mr. Sleeman), am not going to ask for a graving dock or anything of that sort, because I realise that is a matter for the Federal authorities, and I hope we shall hear something about it from the Federal authorities before very long. On behalf of the people of Albany and of the King River district, I tender my thanks to Sir James Mitchell for his policy of land settlement as expressed in the experimental plots in those districts. Personally, I believe the land settlement policy there inaugurated should be extended to group settlement, for it would be to the advantage of those settlements, and would give the "groupes" some reasonable chance of success. I am sorry the member for East Perth (Mr. Hughes) is not here, for I

wished to convey to him on behalf of the settlers of Kendenup my best thanks for his efforts in their interests. While the Royal Commission appointed did not achieve much for those people, it served to reveal a scandalous state of affairs. It is amazing that such sharp practices should be countenanced in civilisation. Those settlers have spent £100,000 in hard cash on their holdings, yet to-day they find they have no security of tenure, nor any redress. It is time the law was put into action to protect them from men of the De Garis type. If our statute-book does not provide for such action, it ought to be reviewed. I hope the Government will give serious consideration to the proposals put forward for the relief of the 67 settlers now at the mercy of De Garis, and will afford those people a reasonable chance of making good. I sincerely trust that assistance for the Government will be forthcoming from members of the Opposition, so that the State may benefit thereby.

Mr. DAVY (West Perth) [5.53]: I find myself experiencing some difficulty in determining just what is the right note to strike in such a debate. The range of subjects appears to be as wide as the horizon. Just consider the difficulties facing a new member making his maiden speech on the Address-in-reply. In the first place, he is set amid unusual surroundings. Then he has to face the not always unexpressed criticism of his audience. And he has to remember all the time that every word he says, and every word said by any interjector, and his reply thereto, are being taken down by "Hansard" and may be used in evidence against him in the future. I know of no other place where a speaker is confronted with those conditions.

Mr. Lambert: Then you now know the feelings of a man in the dock.

Mr. DAVY: No, not the feelings of a man in the dock, but rather the feelings of a man questioned by a policeman who has just arrested him. The man in the dock can keep his mouth shut if he likes; he need not go into the witness box. The other man can do that too, but there is an awful temptation for the man just arrested to talk out of his turn, as we saw in a recent case. In addition to the difficulties I have mentioned, there is a certain degree of humility expected of a new member. The new member who appears to be able to reform the whole of the troubles of his country during his first two minutes in the House is just as foolish as he is vain. Some of those who have gone before me in this debate have dodged all these difficulties by confining themselves to preferring requests to the Government, or the remedying of various ills under which their constituents imagine themselves to be suffering, or alternatively have given vent to the grievances of their constituents. I am in the unfortunate—on this occasion, but otherwise for-

tunate—position of representing a constituency that really has no grievances. West Perth needs no more railways or tramways than it already has. I cannot imagine where we could put a new bridge in my constituency, unless it were to stretch from my electorate across the river to the constituency of the member for South Perth.

Mr. A. Wansbrough: Evidently West Perth has been well looked after.

Mr. DAVY: Yes, because we happen to be in the centre of things.

Mr. E. B. Johnston: And thanks to the zeal of your predecessors.

Mr. DAVY: I give them that credit. Certainly our footpaths are not too good, but that is a matter for the City Council; our sewerage system is not complete, yet it is more nearly complete than is that of many other electorates, some of which, indeed, have no sewerage system at all. So it will be seen that I have no chance of escaping the difficulties confronting me by confining myself to remarks of a general nature, or by recapitulating the grievances of my constituents. The question before the House is the Address-in-reply to the Governor's Speech. I heard that Speech read on the opening day, and have since read it for myself. I find that 90 per cent. of it consists of, I will not say eulogy, but, at all events, approval of the deeds of the late Government, whilst the balance of 10 per cent. consists of a somewhat sketchy outline of the legislative proposals of the new Government.

Mr. Sampson: The first part of it is very proper.

Mr. DAVY: I am not going to disagree with either the first or the second part of it, at all events, not for the moment. The 10 per cent. dealing with the proposed legislation, I find on perusal, indicates—in a manner which it is impossible to disagree with, because there is not sufficient information given—the intention to introduce legislation of a new nature, and to introduce amendments to existing legislation. In regard to many of those proposals, so far as I can judge at present, I am in favour of them. For instance, I notice the Government propose to introduce amendments to the Workers' Compensation Act, to the Industrial Arbitration Act, to the Municipal Corporations Act, and to the Pearling Act. Those are just a few of them. I am of opinion that some of our Acts stand in serious need of amendment. Whether the amendments that will be deemed to be urgent by the Government will be those that I shall deem urgent remains to be seen. The Government may see defects where I see virtues, and virtues where I see defects. The proper time to express one's views on that legislation is when it comes before us. I should like to refer to the speech delivered by the member for Guildford (Hon. W. D. Johnson) last night. It appealed to me as a very able and statesmanlike criticism of the deeds of the past Government, and a very able and statesmanlike attempt at an

explanation of the difficulties under which this country is labouring. I was surprised to find that I agreed with a great deal of what the hon. member said. I think I would have agreed with a great deal more had I been in a position to know the facts. I found him advocating, in preference to railway extensions, the construction of roads and the use of motor lorries. I have not all the facts before me but I am convinced that in the near future we shall find that most of our main railways will be fed in that way, by constructing good roads and using motor traction.

Mr. A. Wansbrough: You will have competition.

Mr. DAVY: Competition is what I like. Many members opposite probably do not like it. I have always held the opinion that competition is the oil that makes the machinery of society work.

The Minister for Railways: It is sometimes an economic waste.

Mr. DAVY: Sometimes it is and some times it is not. Where it is a severe economic waste it may be necessary for the State to step in. It is seldom, however, that the State is able to do as well as private enterprise with all the economic waste. I am inclined to agree with the member for Guildford on that point. I am also inclined to agree, with the meagre knowledge I have upon the subject, with what he said as to the proper method of preparing the South-West land for group settlement. It has never seemed to me possible that raw and entirely ignorant town dwellers should be brought to Western Australia, given an axe such as they have never had in their hands before, and told to chop down trees, clear the land, and do it economically on a sustenance allowance of, say, 10s. a day. Every Australian has handled an axe since boyhood, even if his operations have been confined to chopping wood in the back yard. The average Englishman, however, never sees an axe during his lifetime. If he does see one, it is totally different from the type we use out here. With it one could not chop down a jarrah tree in 100 years. It has always struck me that it will prove to be economically wasteful to endeavour to clear land by this unskilled labour. It would be better if we had endeavoured to clear the land by contract, using the latest machinery and most skilled labour, before we put our settlers on to the groups.

Hon. W. D. Johnson: Hear, hear!

Mr. DAVY: Applauding as I do the general tone and thoughtfulness of the hon. member's speech, I was sorry he allowed the tone of that speech to descend from the high and pure atmosphere of statesmanship to the lower and more sordid level of party politics, when he exhibited a desire to take every credit for everything the Labour Party had done, and refrained from giving credit to everything the Opposition had done.

Hon. W. D. Johnson: You misquote me. My desire was to give credit to the late J. M. Hopkins, who has been robbed of the credit due to him.

Mr. DAVY: That was not the impression left on my mind, or on the minds of other members sitting on this side of the House. The hon. member challenged this side of the House to search the records and find a single act that Sir James Mitchell had ever done for the development of the lands of Western Australia. That is a very bold challenge indeed. Particularly is it bold when we consider that the member for Northam (Hon. Sir James Mitchell) was Premier of the State for years, was Minister for Lands for another period, and was a member of this House for many more years. It would be remarkable if such a man had done nothing during his career for the benefit of agriculture. The statement is so obviously exaggerated that it does not merit an answer.

Mr. Richardson: It was a ridiculous statement.

Mr. DAVY: It hardly behoves me, as a new member, to take up the cudgels on behalf of the member for Northam. I wonder whether the member for Guildford would have made his challenge so emphatic and vehement if the member for Northam had been sitting in his place last night.

Mr. Richardson: He would not have done so.

Hon. W. D. Johnson: You will find out before long that I would have done so.

Mr. DAVY: The Premier, in replying to the remarks of the Leader of the Opposition when he moved to reduce Supply, stated with regard to the 44-hour week that no successful candidate on this side of the House at the recent elections had dealt in any way with the subject. The Premier was wrong. The question was brought up at a great number of meetings that I held during the campaign. The usual form of the question was, "Is the candidate in favour of a 44-hour week?" My answer was that the question in that form could not be answered. If it meant, would I like to see that no man had to work more than 44 hours a week, and that nevertheless every man got all reasonable requirements, my answer would have been "Yes." On the same terms I would be in favour of a 34-hour week or a 24-hour week. The shorter the week can be made, without letting the enemy of mankind find work for idle hands to do, the better it would doubtless be. The question is not a matter of policy. I cannot see how it can be regarded in that light. How can it be a matter of policy to believe in a 44-hour week any more than in a 34-hour week or a 54-hour week?

The Minister for Lands: Yours was a very diplomatic reply to the question.

Mr. DAVY: I thought so, too. It was also an honest reply, and one that I believed.

Mr. E. B. Johnston: A successful reply.

Mr. DAVY: I also went on to say that at the moment I was of opinion that the country, in view of its financial position,

could not afford to give its employees a 44-hour week. That, too, was an honest statement and it is an opinion I still hold. The matter is purely one of finance. The Government is a large employer of labour, and if it can afford to allow its employees to work four hours a week less than other people, I am delighted to think it can do so. My conviction at the moment, particularly in view of the somewhat gloomy picture painted to us the other day by the Premier concerning the finances of the State, is that we cannot afford it. That seems to be the final and definite answer to the question. Very few people, I thank Heaven, in Western Australia do less than a full week's work.

Member: There is a considerable number in the Government service.

Mr. DAVY: The only people who do not work very hard now are those who have worked hard in their youth, and are now enjoying leisure in their old age. Many men that I know of about my own age work as hard at their occupations as a navy or a railway man. So far as hours go, I have not enjoyed anything like as short a week as 44 hours for the last three or four years. I do not expect to be able to do so for the next 15 or 20 years. It seems obvious that the hours of work have been slowly but surely diminishing ever since machinery was introduced into manufacturing, with the resultant greater output. I feel sure that as the application of machinery becomes more general and the machinery itself more efficient, there will be a steady increase in the output, while the hours of work will continue slowly but surely to diminish. If we try to substitute for the word "slowly" the word "quickly," we run a big risk of substituting for the word "surely" the word "uncertainly." We do not require to effect these changes in too great a hurry. The Government are running the biggest business in the country. That business is in sore straits for want of money. It would appear to be unwise, not wicked or wrong, for the Government to take this step of reducing hours.

Mr. Angelo: Your views are beginning to coincide with those of Mr. Theodore.

Mr. DAVY: I do not know what his views are. No doubt I will find myself sharing quite a number of views with him.

Mr. Latham: And very reasonable ones.

Mr. DAVY: No doubt I shall share quite a number of the views of almost any honest and reasonable man. I should like to refer to two tendencies which appear to exist in the Parliaments of Australia and New Zealand, and in a less degree in other countries. These are, strange to say, diametrically opposed to each other. On the one hand there is the tendency for Parliaments to obtrude into affairs that are not truly theirs. On the other hand, there is a tendency for them to withdraw from affairs that are truly theirs.

Mr. DAVY: At the tea adjournment I was beginning to remark upon what appeared to me to be the tendencies of Parliaments not only in Western Australia but throughout Australia, and to a lesser degree perhaps, in the older countries. First there was the tendency for Parliament to intrude upon matters not rightly within its province, and the second tendency was for Parliament to withdraw from matters that rightly concerned it. I am credibly informed that the Labour Party speak on matters of policy as with one voice, and I am on safe ground, therefore, if I assume that the definition given by the member for Guildford (Hon. W. D. Johnson), when he described in his speech last night what were and what were not the true functions of government, represented the view of the Labour Party. The definition appealed to me as very succinct and clear. I will have an opportunity later to find out whether that definition was created in his brain or was a definition arrived at by others. To me it was a new definition. He said that the true function of government is not to do for the people what the people can do for themselves but to do for the people what the people cannot do for themselves. I am in entire agreement with that definition, but if that definition has been applied and adhered to by Parliaments of Western Australia, and is being adhered to to-day, all I can say is that the people of Western Australia must be a singularly helpless crowd. In these days, the Governments of Western Australia—I am not accusing the present Government alone—have become accustomed to do for the people all manner of things that have been done by the people themselves in the past and which people of other countries can and do do for themselves to-day. The functions of Parliament as opposed to the functions of government—the member for Guildford's definition had relation to the functions of government—in my view are these and these only: its duty is to grant Supply and to give statutory authority to the Government for the carrying out of their policy. Thus when the Government, as I say they do, intrude into realms which do not truly belong to them, Parliament does the same. If some member interjected with a query as to what they were doing, I would answer that to-day the Government make bricks, run railways and boats, can meat and saw wood, as well as many other things that in other countries are done by the people themselves.

The Minister for Lands: They were knocked out when the war started.

Mr. DAVY: Of course, in time of disease the human body has to be subjected to treatment which in health no sane man would permit. In war time a country has to subject itself to treatment which would not be healthy in normal times. I admit

there is a great tendency to do things in war time that would not be tolerated during more normal periods.

The Minister for Lands: Some of those tendencies are still going on.

Mr. DAVY: Of course they are. We have from time to time witnessed all manner of interferences with the liberty of the subject, and by this means Governments have entered into spheres that do not truly belong to them. This has been done in America and Australia. What was more iniquitous—I regret it was done by the Government representing the party to which I belong—than the ramifications of the War Precautions Regulations? They are still in existence and it will take us years before we can get back to that liberty of which the people were robbed by the Federal Government. It may be that most of the regulations were legitimate at the time, but they should have been wiped out the moment the time of emergency disappeared. That has not been done. The same tendency has been shown throughout the history of the world. We know that people have been robbed of their liberties and have not had opportunities to regain them for a long time. At the present time Parliament is steadily intruding more and more into spheres that do not belong to it. If we are to run sawmills and implement works, we have to see that they are run properly. It stands to reason that hon. members must gain a smattering of those industries. The Lord knows, the job of a member of Parliament is difficult enough as it is! It requires sufficient acumen, insight, study, knowledge and work, even when Parliament confines its activities to the realms to which it belongs. If a member of Parliament has any conscience and a desire to carry out his task in an efficient manner, there is sufficient now for him to devote his energies to.

Mr. E. B. Johnston: You would not have many railways without a Government.

Mr. DAVY: In other countries they have their railways. I do not wish to be misunderstood. I am not suggesting that we should sell our railways or do anything so ridiculous. I am talking generally of the tendencies one notes in connection with Parliaments. I believe the railways to be one of those activities that the Government wisely undertook.

The Minister for Mines: What about agricultural development, too?

Mr. DAVY: That is a necessity as well. But it is because there was a good excuse for that departure from the proper sphere of Parliament in the past that this tendency has been increasing. It is difficult to draw the line, and I suggest to members that if we attempt to take another step—in the same direction, I admit—we should give careful consideration before we adopt any such course. As to the second tendency of Parliament—to withdraw from its proper

sphere of activity, it is obvious to any student of the laws enacted in Australia that there is that tendency. Just as it is the function of Parliament to grant Supply and grant legislative sanction in order that the Government may give effect to their policy, so is it the duty of Parliament to see that it is not robbed of its right to pass laws for the enforcement of the policy of Governments. On the other hand, what do we find? In almost every statute passed to-day—this applies more to the Commonwealth even than to Western Australia—there is included a section giving power to Ministers or the Governor-in-Executive Council, which means the Government generally, to make regulations. The expression used in the legislation sets out, for the most part, that the regulation is for the better enforcement of the Act in question. The task of a lawyer, although he does not need to be mentioned in this connection, is difficult enough as it is. Not only do we get from the Federal Parliament at the end of each year a vast tome of statutes, but an equally vast tome of statutory regulations. These regulations are laws that have the same binding force, unless challenged in the proper way, as the Acts themselves. We have the same thing in Western Australia but in a modified degree. We seem to be developing a habit of avoiding our responsibilities and allowing Ministers and the Government generally to pass regulations that should have been passed as substantive laws by ourselves. The result is that it is not even the Minister or the Government who make the regulations; they are made, in many instances, by more or less subordinate officials in Government departments. Laws enacted should be as simple, concise and certain in phraseology as they can be framed. I need not tell you, Mr. Speaker, that ignorance of the law is no excuse in any court of law. If that be so, surely knowledge of the law should be made easier for the ordinary citizen by making the laws as simple as possible! It should be easy for an individual, without the necessity for any explanation, to ascertain what his rights and duties are by consulting an Act. That is not the position to-day. As a practising lawyer, I find I am constantly ignorant of some by-law or regulation which may place an entirely different complexion upon an Act under which a man has certain powers or under which rights or liabilities are conferred upon that person. The result is that before a lawyer dares to advise his client he has not only to analyse the statutes, but he has to consult "Government Gazettes" and pay visits to Government departments to ascertain when the last regulations were framed.

Mr. Marshall: He has to work more than 44 hours a week.

Mr. DAVY: That is so, and I can assure the hon. member that the task of a lawyer is not as easy as it would appear to be. The law is not to be undertaken lightly; it is an onerous and responsible

profession. If Parliament relieves the lawyer of some of the burden, no doubt it will be reflected in the lawyer's bill of costs to his client.

Mr. Lambert: Now your imagination is running away with you!

Mr. Corboy: That may be used in evidence against you later on!

Mr. DAVY: There are one or two State Acts to which I will draw attention. During the last Parliament, the Licensing Act Amendment Act was passed. One of the provisions was that the public-house keeper was to keep a record of all the visitors who came to and went from his establishment, and failure to keep such a record was made an offence. It was also provided that the form of the book should be as prescribed. That meant to say that the book would be as decided upon by the Government in the ordinary way. When we came to examine what was the prescribed form, we found that at the bottom of the page there was a lot of writing. First of all, this writing set out that the entries in the book had to be made in ink. This august Assembly never considered that it was to be a criminal offence if a man did not keep his book written up in ink, but the Minister in charge, or the clerk in charge, decided that if a licensee did not have his book written up in ink he was actually committing a criminal offence, for which he would have to suffer a penalty. Further, it was said that it should not be necessary to have a guest enter his name in the book every day that he was staying in the hotel, provided he entered his name in the book on the day that he arrived and on the day that he left. The law never contemplated that, I am sure; this Assembly would never have made such a ridiculous piece of legislation as that. Of course it is easy to make a man sign the book when he arrives at an hotel, but when he pays his bill and he has his baggage in the taxi cab outside the door of the hotel, it is easy for him to say, "I refuse to sign my name." What earthly remedy can the publican then have? Yet if a publican does not see that that is done he commits an offence for which he is liable to a penalty.

Mr. Lambert: We shall have to protect the publican when his guests are leaving.

Mr. DAVY: It makes the position all the more difficult, if my friend's estimate of the character of the people who stay at hotels is correct. Let me quote another example. The Traffic Act was passed, and it was intended by that measure to take from the City Council the control of the traffic in the streets of Perth. That Act also created a department to deal with the traffic in towns other than Perth. I am not concerned with that. It was quite clear that the intention of Parliament in passing the Traffic Act, and in making amendments to the Municipalities Act, was that both should correspond with the intention of Parliament, and that the Commissioner of Police should have conferred upon him the job of con-

trolling the traffic on the roads in the ordinary sense of the word. Usually there is a section in an Act giving power to make by-laws, and that was included in the Traffic Act. When by-laws were made and published, it was found that the police had been given power under those by-laws to deal with offences such as walking on the right side of the footpath, wheeling perambulators on the footpath, expectorating on the footpath and throwing grape skins on the footpath.

The Minister for Lands: They did not have the power before.

Mr. DAVY: The only way in which the validity of the regulations could be tested was to contest them in the Police Court, and take the matter to appeal, because a magistrate would seldom declare a by-law or regulation to be invalid. But if an individual decided to contest the regulations he would have to do so at his own expense. If he entered a defence against his prosecution in the Police Court, he might be let off. Even then he had to pay his own costs. I am told that the Crown Law Department advised the department in charge of the traffic that they could make by-laws to deal with the traffic on the roads, and the department proceeded to invade the sphere of the City Council by making regulations to deal with the control of all matters on the footpath. It was perfectly manifest that when this House and another place passed that Act it was never intended to do anything but control traffic in the streets. I submit that the time has come when we must check this tendency, this lazy tendency.—

The Minister for Lands: The Act has been altered since.

Mr. DAVY: I believe that is so. If we pass bad by-laws, we should not afterwards approach Parliament and ask that those bad by-laws be made good.

The Minister for Lands: I was responsible for that amendment.

Mr. DAVY: Then the hon. member did good work. Our duty is to make substantive laws and to see all laws are made so that they shall be thoroughly understood by everyone. We should not delegate to any person or body, except within the most rigid limits, our undoubted function to make laws. I hope in future Parliament will bear that in mind and not put such sloppy sections into Acts of Parliament. I use that expression with all due respect to the House. In addition to this question I submit that in the past we have not been careful enough with the drafting of our laws. Several of our recent Acts have been so badly drafted that the lawyers are likely to reap a harvest as a result.

Mr. Corboy: You should not regret that.

Mr. DAVY: I am here, not as a member of the profession, but as a representative of the constituents of West Perth with a duty to perform to the citizens of Western Australia. My friend's cynical remark does not apply to me. With the greatest respect

I submit that there has been in the past a lot of sloppy legislation put through, which, I repeat, has been of no value to anyone except the lawyers, and the honest lawyer, as hon. members know, does not like to see sloppy legislation, even if it does bring additional grist to his mill. I recommend to the Government, with all humility, that there is urgent need for the appointment of a Parliamentary draftsman who shall have no other work to do but to draft our measures.

Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. DAVY: The work of drafting Bills is not easy, by any means. Until a man sits down to draft a Bill of any importance or size, it is hard for him to realise just how difficult the task is. This work cannot be done in a hurry; it requires careful and close consideration in order that mistakes may not afterwards result. I do not wish my remarks to give anyone the idea that I desire to cast a reflection on the Crown Law officers. The gentlemen in question are extremely able, industrious, and conscientious. But at the present time they have far too much work to do. A man cannot be expected to be advising people on matters of importance at one minute, drafting conveyances at another minute, and preparing difficult Bills, to be presented to Parliament, almost at the same time. We shall reap the benefit if we appoint a competent person to the position of Parliamentary draftsman and instruct him that he is not to do anything but that work. Of course, if he runs out of work in the way of drafting Bills, he can be given the task of preparing a consolidation of existing legislation. Everybody knows the need for this. I suggest that the task of putting our existing legislation in order in the space of a couple of years would appal anyone who recognises the magnitude of the work.

The Minister for Lands: It would take six months to put the Land Act in order.

Mr. DAVY: Yes, it is in a shocking state. The older laws relating to property are in an even worse condition. I am not making any apology for again referring to the speech of the member for Guildford (Hon. W. D. Johnson). He referred to what he termed the outrage of granting pastoral lessees an extension of their leases to 1948.

Mr. Lambert: Is that the only speech you heard?

Mr. DAVY: It was the only speech on the Ministerial side of the House that attempted to give anything like a statement of the policy of the Government. Other speakers on that side of the House have been content to offer remarks about their own constituencies. Of course, we have not yet heard the Leaders of the Ministerial Party.

Mr. E. B. Johnston: What about the Premier? He has spoken.

Mr. DAVY: My only regret is that I had the misfortune to speak prior to the member for Coolgardie (Mr. Lambert),

otherwise I might have been able to direct a little attention to his speech which, I am sure, will be interesting and instructive.

The Minister for Lands: You explained your position when you started by declaring that you did not require anything for your electorate.

Mr. DAVY: The member for Guildford described as an outrage the extension of the pastoral leases from 1924 to 1948.

Mr. Corboy: Would you call it something worse?

Mr. DAVY: No. I will not go into the merits or demerits of what was done. I am afraid that if the hon. member's remarks go out to the world without any explanation or amendment, the public may get an entirely false impression of the position. I remind members of the existence of Section 59 of the Land Act which gives the Government power, at any time they choose, to declare open for agricultural or horticultural selection, any Crown land, even though the subject of a pastoral lease. Our friend the member for Guildford painted a glowing picture of the rich alluvial flats on the river at Minderoo Station, and he spoke of the possibility of damming that river and providing irrigation, and then went on to say that Parliament robbed the State of all this and handed it over to monopolists. The hon. member is giving an impression that is entirely false. The only monopoly those people have over their million acres is the monopoly to use their property for pastoral purposes, and nothing else. At any time the Government may come along and, recognising the possibilities that the hon. member has told us about, declare the land open for agricultural or horticultural purposes, and it will then be within the power of any person to come along to select a conditional purchase lease under Sections 55, 56, or 57 of the Act. Then it will be possible to get to work on the wonderful scheme of irrigation that we heard about. The answer of the hon. member might be that if the property were cut up it could be made to carry more sheep than it is carrying now.

Mr. Hughes: Do you suggest that the banks that lend money on pastoral leases have no security?

Mr. DAVY: I say that the bank that lends money on pastoral leases has no remedy whatever if the Government like to come along and declare the lease open for agricultural purposes. Hon. members and Ministers are perfectly well aware of that. The only remedy that the pastoral lessee has is to make a claim, which he is entitled to do, for the value of the improvements on the land declared open. Of course, he has to be given a year's notice before the land can be thrown open, and then compensation has to be paid to him.

Mr. Hughes: That is an important point you nearly overlooked.

Mr. DAVY: It is a matter of no consequence whatever. No one would imagine that the Government could step in and seize the improvements of a pastoral lessee without paying him compensation. If they could, it would indeed be an astonishing thing. I am satisfied to leave it to the intelligence of all members of the House and of the average member of the public that compensation must be paid for improvements actually executed. I would like to refer to the Premier's graceful words of welcome, encouragement, and advice to the new members. He expressed the hope that the new members would not too soon lose the ideals with which they had entered the House. I am not afraid that those who are made of the right stuff will lose their ideals. We may well find that some of our ideals are incapable of realisation in our lives, perhaps because of our own ineffectiveness. I know members on both sides of the House who have long experience of Parliamentary work, and I believe they still retain the ideals they had when they entered political life. It is sad but undoubtedly true that in Australia at present the general public have got into a habit of speaking contemptuously of the Legislature. The term "politician" is frequently used in the Press as one of disparagement.

The Minister for Railways: Australia's representative in London made a remark of that kind only the other day.

Mr. DAVY: I am sorry to hear it. If he did so, the layman, who knows little of what goes on here, might well be excused. The wit who said the people got the government they deserved was not far wrong. When members of the public speak disparagingly of their politicians, they speak equally disparagingly of themselves. I have never held the opinion that members of Parliament were anything like the scoundrels that some sections of the general public seem to think they are. In my dealings with them I have found them in the main honourable and conscientious men. Perhaps members themselves are slightly to blame because, judging from the Press, there is a tendency to cast serious imputations on the honesty of one's opponents. That, however, is usually done in the heat of the moment, and as proof of my statement one may often see the hon. member for A, after having cast most damaging aspersions on the character of the hon. member for B, subsequently enjoying a milk and soda with him. One of the ideals I have brought into the House is that anything in the nature of dishonesty of motive on the part of any member must be clearly and conclusively proved before I shall believe it, and I ask that other members may extend the same consideration to me.

Mr. MARSHALL (Murchison) [8.4]: I apologise for my presence in the Chamber because I am in a rather awkward position. New members apologise to the House be-

cause they are here for the first time, but I have reached the point when I do not know whether I am in or out. It is preferable to be a new member, because one then receives the sympathy of the House. When one gets a little political service behind him, he is referred to as an old limber, and is apt to suffer the wrath of his opponents. I fear the member for West Perth (Mr. Davy) will, by his political innocence, bring about his own political execution, unless he changes in the next few years. He has allied himself to the Labour Party.

Mr. Davy: Do not believe it.

Mr. MARSHALL: Unless he alters in the next few years we shall have the female member for West Perth back again.

Mr. Hughes: We are responsible for his being here.

Mr. MARSHALL: And who may be responsible for the hon. member's presence? I have learnt during my three years' experience that one has to be more than discreet in his utterances here.

Mr. Latham: But you know you are not discreet.

Mr. MARSHALL: I heard an elector of West Perth refer to Mr. Davy as a white man. Though in appearance he is very dark, if the elector referred to principle, I agree with him. I was impressed with the hon. member's address, though there were small points on which I differ from him. The hon. member said that the Government had been unwise in restoring the 44-hour week. I wish he had dealt more fully with the question. In what way is it unwise? The hon. member said the only people in Western Australia that were living an idle life and enjoying riches and comfort were those who for years had struggled hard in early life. I grant that the hon. member was correct. Our troubles have not their origin in the wealth of people in the Commonwealth. Most of our difficulties are due to overseas financial institutions that govern the finance of the world. Unless the hon. member concedes that science has been of some advantage to society, his argument is bad. The Leader of the Opposition said if it took 48 hours to make a pair of boots, and the working week was reduced to 44 hours, you would get only three-quarters of the work done. That is typical of the hon. member's idea of reckoning. During my three years in the House the hon. member has shown no ability in reckoning anything. Years ago one could see men tilling the soil with a couple of horses and a single-furrow plough. Now we have tractors hauling 12-furrow ploughs and capable of doing in an hour what formerly took a week. Who is benefiting by the application of science to industry? The Leader of the Opposition on the public platform proclaimed that he had secured a greater yield per acre because he had applied science to production. Is the farmer getting the benefit of that? No. Neither is the consumer. I congratulate the member for Katanning (Mr. Thomson) on his speech. It is the first time in three years

I have had occasion to congratulate him. At last he has developed sufficient courage to speak the truth.

Mr. Latham: He has joined the right party now.

Mr. E. B. Johnston: We have not joined the wrong party, anyhow.

Mr. MARSHALL: The member for Katanning spoke about the burden of indirect taxation on the farmer. With his argument I agree more or less. I am not a free-trader straight out, but the tariff has reached such a pitch that this State must enter a bitter protest. The hon. member's figures were not quite accurate, but they were good enough for an argument. He said that owing to the abnormal exchange it was impossible to get 20s. for the £1. Though wealth to the extent of £82,000,000 had been created, we could get only £79,000,000 odd for it. The hon. member as a business man knows how that comes about. He knows that the financial institutions of all countries, including England, are the Shylocks of the universe. They lend us money to develop our industries and for the accommodation ask five and a-half per cent., and get it. After the development has taken place and we commence to export our produce, Shylock says, "The exchange is not normal, and you must accept a lower value for your produce."

Mr. Thomson: That is due to the value of our exports exceeding that of our imports.

Mr. MARSHALL: We are told it is due to the exchange not being normal. Who manipulates the exchange? The great financiers who lend us the money to develop our country. The statement that what one misses on the spinning jenny he picks up on the swing boats applies to these Shylocks. What he lends us only serves to aggravate the position from a productive point of view here, and further to strengthen Shylock's position. Is it fair that the workers of Western Australia should derive no advantage from the application of science and invention to industry, and should be compelled, year in year out, to work 48 hours? Are we to make no advance? From my childhood I remember that my father worked 48 hours. Since then there have been great advances in every industry by virtue of invention and scientific aid. I ask members on the cross benches, is not the working man justified in demanding a fair share of the victories of science and invention? I would advise the member for Katanning (Mr. Thomson) to keep as near as possible to the truth when making statements here. I am sorry he has made a statement which is not anywhere near the truth. I do not say he made the statement with any deliberate intention of misleading the House, for that would not be possible. I took a note of what he said—

How can we expect to compete with the industries of the Eastern States that are working under the 48 hours system,

if we are working only 44 hours? It is impossible.

Mr. Thomson: That is correct, I agree.

Mr. MARSHALL: The member for Katanning can have no knowledge of the actual facts as to the hours worked in other States of the Commonwealth. I have here the Commonwealth statistician's figures, and I defy the member for Katanning to show me the industries in the Eastern States, outside domestic and hotel industries, in which any section of workers work 48 hours weekly. The member for Katanning can see these Commonwealth figures if he wishes to. There is not an industry in the Commonwealth in which the worker, on an average, works 48 hours per week.

Mr. Thomson: What about New South Wales?

Mr. MARSHALL: In New South Wales furniture trade workers work 45 hours, engineering workers 47 hours, food and drink workers 47 hours, clothing and boots workers 44 hours per week.

Mr. Thomson: Go on, carry on!

Mr. MARSHALL: I could go on reading out the hours, but it would be waste of time. Apart from the industries I have quoted, there is not one which, in the aggregate, works 48 hours. It may be news to the member for Katanning that the 44 hours week has predominated in Queensland for over 40 years.

Mr. Thomson: In all trades?

Mr. MARSHALL: Pretty well.

Mr. Thomson: Things were different when I was there.

Mr. MARSHALL: In all probability the Queensland Premier knew the hon. member was coming, and in order to mislead him got all the trades and manufactures to work a 48-hours week. It was done by way of putting up a joke on the hon. member. Another member—who it was I cannot call to mind at the moment—said that the 41 hour week would increase the cost of production. I do not dispute that under the economic system of to-day the economic result would be to force up the cost of production in a very minute degree. But if every idler in the world were put to some honest work, the cost of production would be reduced, in spite of a 44-hour week. The fact is that the working man—in which term I include the farmer—has to carry so great a burden to satisfy the Shylock of the universe that he is forced to work much longer than would otherwise be necessary. Another member deliberately stated that as the result of the 44-hour week the cost of living must go up. This State has had two industrial fights against an increase in the working hours, fights put up by the engineers and by the Public Works employees. After a battle against the Government they resumed work at the longer hours. If the argument I have quoted had any force in it, the cost of living should have gone down after those men had gone back to work the longer hours. But what have we seen? Instead of a reduction in

the cost of living, there has been an increase since the increase in the weekly hours. Members who make wild and weird statements, members who utter deliberate falsehoods, are not upholding the dignity of this Chamber. For the year 1923 the cost of living, as compared with 1914, had risen by 39.1 per cent. During the last three months, when there should have been reduction in the cost of living because of the reversion to the 48-hour week, there was an increase over 1914 of 41.7 per cent. No one works longer hours than the farmer, and it is perhaps that fact which makes him unkind and causes him to desire that everybody else should work the longest hours possible. But the New Zealand farmer has been working a 48-hour week for years; and does not the New Zealand farmer, in spite of much higher sea freights, compete successfully in the world's markets?

Mr. Thomson: New Zealand is not a wheat growing country. It imports wheat.

Mr. MARSHALL: Is the hon. member sure of that? If the New Zealanders wanted anything else, I could recommend them something. They have been working 8 hours per day for years past in primary industries, and yet they compete successfully with growers in other parts of Australasia.

Mr. E. B. Johnston: New Zealand is a very rich country.

Mr. MARSHALL: No doubt it is, but I am not going to disparage Western Australia. What New Zealand can do, Western Australia can do. I would advise my friends on the cross Opposition benches to cease telling the farmers that the workers are bleeding them. I would advise my friends to ally themselves with the party of the workers, with a view to securing some measure of the benefit that has resulted from the application of science and invention to industry. I know members on the cross Opposition benches try to mislead the farmer by telling him that the Labour Party is strongly against him, and that reduction of hours in any industry outside the wheat belt is going to be the cause of longer working hours for the farmer. But in another industry there are men who work quite as hard as the farmer, and they do it without any prospects whatever except Wooroloo Sanatorium or the nearest cemetery. There is no farm and cottage after a life spent in the gold mines. In 99 cases out of 100 the miner has nothing to look forward to but a miserable death in the Wooroloo Sanatorium. On the other hand, the farmer, if he does work long hours, has an asset when he finishes, and, besides the asset, has something infinitely more valuable still—good health. Members on the cross Opposition benches continually harp upon the alleged fact that the only worker in the Commonwealth is the farmer. I do not altogether disagree with their mode

of reasoning, but surely they will admit that the farmer is only one of the working units of society.

Mr. E. B. Johnston: A very important unit.

Mr. MARSHALL: Agreed, but where would he be without the coal miner, the railway worker, the school teacher and many others? Without their aid, could he stop on the farm and produce? Every individual who labours to supply the necessities of society is equally important with the farmer. When the member for Katanning again rises to address the Chamber, I hope he will make that point quite clear.

Mr. Thomson: You would not get very far without the farmer.

Mr. MARSHALL: And how far could the farmer get without the other workers I have mentioned?

Mr. E. B. Johnston: We should co-ordinate.

Mr. MARSHALL: Yes, and then the hon. member interjecting would tell his friends in Williams-Narrogin what a beastly crowd the Labour Party are and how they rob him. I know what the hon. member says on occasion. From the Press reports of his speeches one would never gather that the Labour Party have his sympathy equally with the other parties represented in this Chamber. During the Labour Party's 4½ years of office, between 1911 and 1916, they did more for the farmer than any other party in this State had ever done. The Labour Government did more for the farming industry than had ever been accomplished before or has ever been accomplished since. Before leaving the all-important question of the 44-hour week, let me say that since this controversy began here, I have inquired into the possibility of the shorter week driving capital out of the State. I suppose I shall be justified in assuming that capital tends only towards those corners of the globe where the hours of work are lengthy and the wages are low.

Mr. Thomson: Where it will get an adequate return.

Mr. MARSHALL: When the electors of Katanning get an adequate return from their representation in this Chamber, they will be lucky. When I look round for an example I marvel that all the capital of Europe has not drifted to China and India, where the hours worked are anything up to 60 or more. Capital, like any other commodity, is on the market for sale. Where it gets the most adequate return it will stay. Yet with all the argument for long hours and low wages, the trend of society shows that the nation affording its subjects a living with a reasonable standard of comfort and refinement is the nation that makes most progress. In the

Malay Peninsula I have, on behalf of my firm, employed coolies at anything from 6d. to 1s. a day. For that wage a coolie will work from daylight to dark. Yet what is the state of the country where that obtains? It is marked by absolute poverty, degradation, all the infectious and rotten diseases known to men. There is no progress in such countries. They are practically in a state of slavery. Do hon. members desire to bring our country to that? I do not think they do, although from their arguments one would surmise that that is what they are after. We are told that the Federal Government are bleeding the farmers through the tariff. I have looked into the statistics, and I find the duties paid on all importations of agricultural implements last year amounted to £123,000 for the whole of the Commonwealth.

Mr. Thomson: A binder sold in Canada for £60 costs £90 odd in Western Australia.

Mr. MARSHALL: I am not dealing with individuals. I am quoting statistics.

Mr. Mann: Does your figure include fencing wire?

Mr. MARSHALL: It includes all farmers' requisites. On the other side, the export of primary products from the Commonwealth during 1923 totalled £79,600,000. If we reckon what it costs the farmer through the tariff to produce all that for export, it will be found to be a relatively small sum.

Mr. Thomson: But the whole of the duty has to be paid by the produce consumed locally.

Mr. MARSHALL: The hon. member has to prove that statement. If we take out from the total export figures £56,000,000 worth of wool exported last year, we have remaining £23,600,000; and if we take from that the £123,000 duty paid on agricultural implements and work it out, we find that it represents .005d.; and that is not allowing for local consumption. So, while I agree with the protest against the tariff, it must be remembered that others are being hit equally hard with the farmer. The tariff hits mining harder than it does agriculture. We should organise a protest to the Federal Government against the tariff that bears so heavily on this State. Since I shall have an opportunity when on the Estimates to deal with matters of administration, I do not intend to touch upon those questions to-night. Just now, I am particularly interested in the North-West. I had occasion to go through a large part of that district recently. I was astounded at the awful state of affairs brought about up there by the Mitchell Administration. It is no wonder that the electors of the North-West decided upon a marked change. The public are always wondering why it is the North-West has lost population. I say it is owing to want of sympathetic administration. The member for Claremont (Mr. North) gave us

an exposition of private enterprise, eulogising its wonderful results as compared with State enterprise. If during the next recess I can spare the time and have the necessary money, I will take my friend through the North-West and let him see the results of private enterprise up there.

Mr. North: Thank you.

Mr. MARSHALL: It is astounding to see there the effects of monopoly. Almost every commodity, such as explosives, butter, etc., necessary to the prospector and the pioneer, costs from 100 to 150 per cent. more than it does in Perth. Is it any wonder that the prospector and the pioneer of the North have gradually drifted away? It is the direct effect of private enterprise. There seems to have been on the part of the past Government, with a view to securing seats, a desire that certain industries in the North-West should be killed by administration. Apart from the wells along the main stock routes, wells put down in order to develop the mining industry have been allowed to fall in, with the result that prospectors have had to leave the district. The wells that did not fall in were leased to pastoralists.

Mr. Angelo: But the prospector can always use the water in those wells.

Mr. MARSHALL: If the hon. member could but use his intellect it would be better for us all. The prospector can use the wells on which windmills have been erected by the squatters, but the hon. member knows very well what it means. While the well remains a Government well, and manual labour is required to raise the water, no stock loiters about the well; but the moment the squatter leases the well and makes a windmill pump water continually into the troughs, the stock hang about the well without ever leaving it. Consequently, when the prospector comes along he cannot possibly hang up, but has to go on for miles to where he can get a feed for his horse.

Mr. Chesson: That is an absolute fact.

Mr. MARSHALL: And it is a crime. I have had to protest more than once to departmental administrators for leasing wells and leasing and exchanging reserves. The mining industry in that part of the State has no chance of developing under such intolerable conditions.

Mr. Angelo: When a well is leased like that it is looked after, and is not allowed to fall in.

Mr. MARSHALL: That well is like the hon. member, well looked after. The mining industry was responsible for the rapid expansion of Western Australia. It is a crying shame that any Government should make it so impossible in these outback parts for the prospector to remain there. Time and again he is driven away through the shortage of water. There is a sinister influence behind the whole thing. I have heard the member for Gascoyne (Mr. Angelo) say in this Chamber it would be a good thing to import indentured labour for the North-West, and that it is impossible

for the white man to develop that part of the State.

Mr. Angelo: In the extreme North-West.

Mr. MARSHALL: The hon. member has never been there.

Mr. Angelo: I have been there many times.

Mr. MARSHALL: There is an attempt to starve out the white man in order that there may be created some ground for the importation of coloured labour. I hope the present Government will not heed any such proposal, but will give to the North-West a fair share of the revenue of the State. I have felt it my duty to bring forward these few facts. Government utilities, such as State batteries, have been very much neglected. I am astounded that any prospector has remained on the fields. Most of the wells that have been put down at Government expense, and are suitable for the squatters, have been well looked after; but those that have been unsuitable have fallen in. The conditions up there are such that one wonders how any man can live there.

Mr. Thomson: Does not the high tariff affect the question?

Mr. MARSHALL: The hon. member is speaking as near to the truth as possible. My protest is against past Administrations, and my appeal is to the present Government for more consideration. The people at Port Hedland have been clamouring for years for a permanent and adequate water supply. If that were provided Port Hedland would probably become one of the most popular ports on the North-West coast. It is even possible that pearl-livers might go there from Broome. The people of Broome have no desire to lose that trade, and do not care about Port Hedland getting a water supply. I fear that the influence of Broome, by virtue of being the seat of government, has been pulling the wires to prevent Port Hedland from getting justice. It is not to be expected that a water supply would pay from its inception, but in a national concern of this sort that is not the point. If there is any desire to develop that part of the State, it behoves the Government to give it consideration. Irrespective of what the member for Claremont (Mr. North) has said, unless something can be done, the Government will have to step in.

Mr. North: What is there to prevent them from doing so now?

Mr. MARSHALL: Nothing. Probably they will step in, and the monopoly that is clothed in the garment of private enterprise will step out. I listened to a wrangle last night as to whether it would be wise to pay £10 an acre for clearing south-west lands, or follow out the procedure inaugurated by the late Government and pay £45 an acre. There can be no argument about the settling of the South-West. It is already "settled." Members talk about the dairying and hog raising industry, and allied activities, in the South-West, but they have no idea of the possibilities of those

industries in the North. It is an established fact that north of the Tropic of Capricorn there are many permanent water supplies bounded by beautiful fertile lands. There are streams which run all the year round, and there are places where it is possible to conserve an unlimited amount of water.

Mr. Angelo: And the rainfall is good.

Mr. MARSHALL: Yes. It is a singular thing that it should be thought that the South-West is the only place on which to concentrate for dairying. To clear land there costs a tremendous amount of money, whereas in the North there is land all ready to stock. Should there ever be an invasion of this country, the danger will lie in the North-West and not in the South-West.

Mr. Angelo: It is the weakest link in our defence.

Mr. MARSHALL: Yes. Members have no idea of the secret and quiet invasion of the alien races that is going on to-day along our coast. The industries I refer to can readily be established in the North. In that part of the State I have seen sugar grass growing 6 ft. in height. That can be kept for two years and will remain sweet. I have seen hundreds of square miles of it. It is merely allowed to go dry, because the stock do not eat it when it becomes rank, but two or three weeks after it has been burnt off the young grass grows again. In that part of the State nature is doing what the late Government were doing in the South-West by artificial means.

Mr. Angelo: The prime bullocks that come down from the North prove what the country is like.

Mr. Mann: Where are they this year?

Mr. MARSHALL: The hon. member had better take Providence to task over that matter. There has been no rain, and the stock cannot be travelled. Along the creeks and running streams of the North there are hundreds of square miles of grass country on which dairy cattle could be fed. There are also such grasses as kangaroo, rice and Mitchell, and also Kimberley couch, all of which grow in abundance and in the neighbourhood of fresh water. These grasses are sweet and palatable for stock. Previous Governments, however, have taken no notice of the North from the dairying point of view.

Mr. Angelo: The dairy expert has never been further North than Carnarvon.

Mr. MARSHALL: No previous Administration has had the courage to take stock in the North-West, and the departments do not know what good land there is there and what water frontages there are. It is only recently that the cotton industry obtained a footing in this State. A certain element consisting of influential men fought against the growing of cotton in the North-West. They had an object. They did not want the Government to recognise that dairying or anything else that would bring about closer settlement in the North would be

successful. They have a monopoly of the land, and they do not want any experiments to prove its suitability for closer settlement.

The Minister for Lands: I have given notice of intention to resume 21,000 acres.

Mr. MARSHALL: The people of the North will realise at last that there is courage in the Labour Government. One enterprising individual who went to the North-West in 1886, took up two or three hogs and released them. To-day there are hundreds of pigs running wild in the North. They have lived and thrived on the herbage, roots and water of the country; and yet, while such land is available, we undertake an expensive drain-the-Treasury system for the South-West! I hope the members for Pilbara (Mr. Lamond) and Kimberley (Mr. Coverley) will exert themselves to get members to visit that part of the State. It is a crying shame that we should be expending £45 to £50 per acre on land in the South-West when there is land available in the North. The member for Perth (Mr. Mann) referred to the bacon industry and the large importations annually made by England. Alongside Wyndham there are great possibilities for this industry. Freezing works are already provided, and shipping is available just across the strait. The defence of this country depends upon peopling and developing the North-West. I have figures to show that although wool and beef are the main products of the North, the total wealth produced there in 1920 was £3,091,000. Meekatharra is the railhead for the North-West, and in that same year from the Meekatharra station there was railed away £321,600 worth of produce and much was also sent from Nannine, Mullewa, and other centres. Various members representing the North-West have urged its claims to consideration, but very little notice has been taken of them. If the Governments of the past had given more attention to the North-West it could have now been producing sufficient wealth to cover the whole of the liability necessary to clear the South-West.

Mr. Coverley: It would not have been necessary to clear the South-West then.

Mr. MARSHALL: The Leader of the Opposition said his Government had first developed one portion of the State and then gone on to another. The trouble was he forgot to go up; he dealt with only one portion. It is regrettable that previous Governments have been so inconsiderate of the claims of the North. Had they undertaken its development it would have involved only a fraction of the cost of developing the wheat belt and the South-West.

Mr. North: Are you in favour of a separate State for the North-West?

Mr. MARSHALL: No. The mineral possibilities from Meekatharra northward are great. If past Governments had only undertaken development in the North, the State to-day would not have been in such an awkward position owing to lack of railway

facilities there. I do not dispute the right of the farmers to get all the railway facilities necessary for their convenience and for the cheap transport of their products, but they are not entitled to everything. They cannot claim every foot of railway to be laid during the next century. The manganese deposits at Peak Hill should be developed. Unfortunately the local company has been unsuccessful in its efforts to secure capital for that purpose. I have a report by Mr. Berry, a mining engineer, who for many years has been interested in manganese. He says there are at least 1,500,000 tons of manganese at Peak Hill, apart from the possibility of large quantities beneath the visible deposits. He says the manganese deposits in India are declining and must continue to decline. In that country the open-cut system has been abandoned and the manganese now has to be mined. The coolies of India are proving unfit physically for the work, and the companies will have to employ white labour. Water also presents a great trouble in India. Mr. Berry, after considering all the facts, recommends Western Australia to be up and doing in order to develop its manganese deposits and take advantage of the impending shortage of supplies. I have a cutting from the "West Australian," a paper that I admire for its truthfulness—occasionally. It refers to the shortage of manganese in Europe and America. Mr. Dunn, another expert, strongly advises the Government of Western Australia to extend railway facilities to Peak Hill. Such a line would have a bearing on the development of the North-West, for it must assuredly prove to be a link in the national system of railways. Every member of the House seems to be appealing to the Treasury for something. I suppose we shall all get the same answer. The Treasury is empty and there is no harm in my appealing for my portion of the State.

Mr. E. B. Johnston: What about the Federal Government building that line?

Mr. MARSHALL: It is the duty of the Federal Government to build it because it is a national work. I now desire to read the final report, in order that members may have some conception of what this expert thinks in regard to our manganese—

Even if the output of steel, both in the United States and in this country, slackens off in the course of the year, the production of manganese ore has a considerable gap to make good. The experience of companies in the manganese trade confirms this statistical impression of an approaching famine. Supplies of manganese ore for this year are practically sold out, and supplies for 1925 are already being contracted for. The only manganese ore company with which the London Stock Exchange is familiar is the Central Provinces Prospecting Syndicate, which showed an increase in net profits last year of 60.6 per cent., declaring total dividends of 25 per cent., plus 5 per cent. cash

bonus, all free of tax. The outlook for manganese ore companies is distinctly promising.

I hope the Government will give consideration to putting this line through, if the condition of the finances will possibly permit of it. All the experts, including the State Mining Engineer, Mr. Montgomery, recognise that the line should go through, and that the immediate construction of the line represents the only possibility of our capturing the market which is now developing. All of them emphasise that point, and Mr. Montgomery stresses it specially. Right through that stretch of 83 miles between Meekatharra and Peak Hill there is auriferous country, from which much wealth has already been produced. There is Garden Gully, which had good gold production for many years. Prospectors are now at Garden Gully, and on my last visit to Meekatharra some of them showed me fine specimens. Then there is Abbotts, Judge's Patch, and Holden's Find, the last named one of the most promising propositions on the Murchison. Unfortunately Holden's Find is not working at present, as it has been deemed necessary to reconstruct the treatment plants. Mine owners are holding back that expensive task in the hope that the speedy construction of a railway from Meekatharra will reduce the cost of the work. To many people Peak Hill is a gold-mining centre of the past, a centre which once flourished but now is done. For the information of such people let me give an extract from the latest issue of the local paper, under the heading "Peak Hill Pans":—

Our prospectors and leaseholders are receiving some very gratifying returns for their labours of the last few months. So far the State battery returns are:—Wardle and Mills 130 tons for 314 ozs., with probably over 10z. to the ton in the sands; Walker and Burrows 106 tons for 364 ozs., tailings should average well; E. Dowd 45 tons for 90 ozs. 12 dwts., tailings should also average well. Over £3,000 to date. Jenkins and Mahoney are now in with about 160 tons expected to top the $\frac{1}{2}$ oz. per ton. There is a good lively "kick" left in the old Peak yet.

These parcels were all large, and of high values. The railway, if constructed, will be of great assistance to the whole of the country, quite apart from gold-mining. It will materially aid in the development of the pastoral industry and other primary production. At present all the squatters in those areas resent very much the damage done to their stock, when overlanded, by reason of the auriferous country between Peak Hill and Meekatharra. Members conversant with the handling of stock will not need to be told that after a particularly big animal has been on the road for five or six months, its coming into contact with auriferous coun-

try renders it unfit for the metropolitan market, by reason of its being footsore. When the stock reach Meekatharra, the squatter has to cut out a considerable proportion. Thus his product deteriorates all the time it is on auriferous country. I have no desire to weary members with a long address, but will take the opportunity which will offer itself on the Estimates of speaking on other matters pertaining to Government administration in my electorate.

Mr. SAMPSON (Swan) [9.22]: I do not wish to be ungenerous, but I must acknowledge that I regret the change of Government. Further, I wish to express my feeling of regret at the defeat of our late leader, Mr. H. K. Maley. As Minister for Agriculture that gentleman was a very earnest and painstaking servant of the people. Apart from that fact, he represented the agricultural constituency of Greenough. The work Mr. Maley did in stamping out rinderpest would alone justify good treatment of him by those who are interested in primary production. Unfortunately, circumstances combined to deprive the State of his services. Having read the Governor's Speech, I recognise, like other members, that that document is to a large extent an acknowledgment of the work which the late Government carried out.

The Minister for Lands: The Governor's Speech usually gives a statement of the work of the previous year.

Mr. SAMPSON: I wish to remind the Minister for Lands of the promise made by the late Premier that the deficit would be reduced for the last financial year to not more than a quarter of a million. That promise has been more than fulfilled. It is not often that predictions of that nature are borne out so fully as has been the case with the late Premier's forecasts. Western Australia is in a better position to-day because of the advances made during the Mitchell Administration's term of office. I only hope that the present Administration will continue the good work of their predecessors, and follow the excellent example which has been set.

The Minister for Lands: I hope they will vary it in some respects.

Mr. SAMPSON: The reduction in the deficit was actually to £229,158, and here is a most important point: when the late Government went out of office, there was no unemployment.

Mr. Hughes: You know different from that.

Mr. SAMPSON: The hon. member interjecting, to judge by the volume of sound he emits, feels competent to express an opinion on any subject. However, I challenge him or any other member to

prove that there was unemployment when the late Government went out.

The Minister for Works: If you had been in my office during the first week I took over, you would have seen hundreds of unemployed there every morning.

Mr. SAMPSON: No one can wonder at that who bears in mind what was expected from the Minister for Works. Not only was there no unemployment—

Mr. Hughes: There was unemployment.

Mr. SAMPSON: There were more positions available than there were men to fill them.

The Minister for Works: Now you are repeating the "West Australian." Do give us something original.

Mr. SAMPSON: In addition I claim that the State was, and I believe it still is, on the up grade. I want to see the present Government maintain that condition of things. In common with every member on the Opposition side of the House, I will do anything in my power to assist towards the attainment of that end. I realise that anything in the nature of merely destructive criticism is useless. An attitude of pure destructiveness is one which I trust I have never adopted. I realise that although I have had the honour of being Colonial Secretary, I am a very young member of Parliament; and as such I may still retain the ideals to which reference was made earlier this evening. One of my youthful ideals was that one should not indulge in criticism that is merely destructive. However, there is one matter to which I think reference may justly be made—the action of the present Government in reducing the hours of work of employees of the Public Works Department from 48 to 44 per week. That action was, as has been said, a usurpation of the functions of the Arbitration Court; and yet Ministers did not hesitate to bring about, of their own volition, that reduction. It has been claimed during this debate that the principle of the 44-hour week was clearly enunciated during the general election. I will admit that; but I wish to add, fully and frankly, that when the present Premier went into the Swan electorate he refrained from making any such declaration.

The Minister for Works: Perhaps that is why the Labour man did not win there.

Mr. SAMPSON: By interjection the Premier made reference to the alleged action of a member on this side of the House, who, he said, when before his electors, was careful to abstain from any allusion to the proposed reduction of hours.

The Minister for Lands: Did the Premier refer to it in his policy speech?

Mr. SAMPSON: Yes, he did. In reply to the member for East Perth (Mr. Hughes), let me say that the Premier made no unfair references when he came to the

Swan electorate. I unreservedly admit that it is not the habit of the Premier to be unfair. I am sorry I cannot say the same of the member for East Perth.

Mr. Hughes: You went around saying the other fellow was low, and I said he could not possibly be lower than you. But he fought clean; and that is why you won and he lost.

Mr. SAMPSON: After making one more statement on this subject I shall ask to be allowed to pass to other and pleasanter topics. When the member for East Perth went into the Swan electorate, he did me a very great service, for when one speaks slightly, and not truthfully, of a candidate, then that candidate is materially assisted.

Mr. Hughes: Where I spoke the votes were against you.

Mr. SAMPSON: No.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order, order!

Mr. SAMPSON: This interlude has been caused by the interjection of the member for East Perth who stated that the Premier spent so much time in speaking about me. That was not so. The Premier is not so petty. He is possessed of too much wisdom. It is because of that that he is so difficult to contend against. If the Premier had adopted the attitude that the member for East Perth thinks is correct, I would still be on the Ministerial side of the House.

Mr. Hughes: Do you not think we should have told the public of the meat scandal at Claremont?

Mr. SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. SAMPSON: I do not know that we should discuss what the hon. member refers to as the "Claremont meat scandal."

Mr. Lutey: The Commission proved that frozen meat was supplied to the institution.

Mr. SAMPSON: The hon. member may ask one of his own Ministers for the full particulars, and he may be sorry that he interjected.

Hon. S. W. Munsie: No, not even on the evidence taken at the appeal which they had no right to give!

Mr. SAMPSON: The Honorary Minister will remember that when the report of the select committee was before the House I drew attention to two answers given by him that were contradictory. I said that the evidence was very sloppy and unconvincing. I do not intend to pursue the subject now.

Mr. Hughes: It was a unanimous report.

Mr. Latham: It could not be otherwise seeing that it was a select committee.

Mr. SAMPSON: To revert to the remarkable action taken by Cabinet in deciding that the employees of the Public Works Department should have their hours reduced, it was not in the interests of the State to give that concession to the men employed by one department. It makes for discontent and for a desire on the part of workers outside the department to share in those benefits.

The Minister for Railways: What is wrong with that, if they get it?

Mr. SAMPSON: The Premier referred in doleful tones to the heavy obligations that certain works had cast upon him. He gave the House a list of railways that had been authorised as well as the water works and other concerns.

Hon. S. W. Munsie: All of which your Government approved of, but for which they did not make any attempt to find the money. They left that to the Labour Government.

Mr. SAMPSON: That is not true.

Hon. S. W. Munsie: It is absolutely true.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. SAMPSON: I can assure the House that the Mitchell Government did not expect that the position would be altered. They expected to be in charge of the Treasury benches this session. Circumstances, however, combined to defeat that Administration.

Mr. Hughes: Your representative in the Upper House said that the return of the Mitchell Government was doubtful.

Mr. Latham: Evidently he spoke the truth.

Mr. SAMPSON: The Premier was pessimistic in his references to the difficulties ahead of him.

The Minister for Railways: He was pointing out facts.

Mr. SAMPSON: He told the House that he had lain awake for many hours wondering how he would get over those difficulties. This in face of the decision of Cabinet that the Public Works Department employees should have their working hours reduced from 48 to 44!

Mr. Lutey: The Government will get more work, too.

Mr. SAMPSON: That is an affront to the workers! When it is said that a man who works 44 hours does as much work as he can in 48 hours, it is an insult to those men.

The Minister for Railways: The same thing was said before.

Mr. SAMPSON: The inference is that men loaf on their jobs.

The Minister for Railways: No, we say they work harder when they have shorter hours.

Mr. SAMPSON: If a man is healthy and works under good conditions, particularly the outdoor man, he can work for 48 hours without suffering any disabilities. We would all like to see hours reduced, but if the privilege is accorded to the employees of the Public Works Department, why not to the employees of the road boards, of the municipalities, and to others as well. Why should they not receive the same advantage?

Mr. Hughes: They should receive it too.

The Minister for Railways: The road boards can grant similar hours.

Mr. SAMPSON: But the question is, can we afford to do it?

Mr. Hughes: Of course you could, if you reduced the margin of profit you required.

Mr. SAMPSON: That reminds me of the lines of poetry we learnt at school—

There none was for a party

Then all were for the State.

Was this decision in the interests of the State, or was it, in a measure, payment in fulfilment of promises given during the election campaign?

The Minister for Lands: It was our policy.

Mr. SAMPSON: Was it right to advocate such a policy before the election?

Hon. S. W. Munsie: Yes. If we believed the workers had been robbed of it, we were right in saying we would restore it. That was the true position. The workers were robbed of the privilege, and we gave it back to them.

Mr. SAMPSON: What is the position now?

The Minister for Lands: You are not so ungenerous as a rule. You are on the way to getting a good dressing down. I am sorry to hear you make such a statement as you have made. I would be sorry to make such mistakes as you made, costing this country thousands of pounds.

Mr. SAMPSON: The Minister for Lands is good at dressing down people, but when I refer to him it will be time for him to answer me.

The Minister for Lands: You were referring to me when you talked about the general election. You referred to remarks by one member and then you included the lot.

Mr. SAMPSON: Exactly.

The Minister for Lands: You will get it.

Mr. SAMPSON: If the Minister for Lands jumps at this, there is evidently good reason for what I am saying.

The Minister for Lands: There is no reason. I have a right to advocate my policy just as you have to advocate yours.

Mr. SAMPSON: I am not so conceited as to think that even in my short political life I have not made mistakes. I conceive it my duty, however, to protest against the action of the Government in usurping the functions of the Arbitration Court.

The Minister for Lands: What did you do? You have caused an expenditure of £20,000 in connection with the soldiers' mental home and did it before the elections. That was a responsibility the Federal authorities should have carried.

Mr. SAMPSON: I have not referred to the mental home.

The Minister for Lands: It was one of the most disgraceful things I have ever heard of.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. SAMPSON: The position as I understood it when I left office was that everything was in order for the work to be done.

The Minister for Lands: The State had to find half the money.

Mr. SAMPSON: Yes.

The Minister for Lands: That is £20,000 that should have been found by the Commonwealth.

Mr. SAMPSON: That is the position in South Australia, too, because I discussed the matter with the Inspector General for Hospitals when I was over there.

The Minister for Lands: I do not care what the position is there. It is wrong.

Mr. SAMPSON: Does the Minister for Lands suggest that this State should get preferential treatment? I understood the whole matter was completed, and that an agreement had been fixed. I think the scheme was a proper one.

The Minister for Lands: You would never draw up such an agreement for yourself.

Mr. SAMPSON: I do not know that I could induce the Commonwealth to find half the money for any proposition of mine.

The Minister for Railways: It was a responsibility that the Federal Government should have wholly undertaken.

Mr. SAMPSON: Reverting to the 44-hour question, the remarks of the Leader of the Opposition were thoroughly justified. Sir James Mitchell said that the reduction of the working week to 44 hours should bring with it an increase in wages because the reduction of hours would cause an increase in the cost of living.

Mr. Hughes: Did you make it clear throughout your constituency in your election campaign that you opposed the 44-hour week?

Mr. SAMPSON: I always said I was not in favour of that reduction when I was asked.

Mr. Hughes: Then there are a lot who misheard you.

Mr. SAMPSON: I suppose the member for East Perth believes what he states. I ask him, however, what bearers of mine suggest otherwise? I challenge him to prove his assertion. Of course he cannot do so.

Hon. S. W. Munsie: I spoke in your electorate only once, and I dealt fully with the question.

Mr. SAMPSON: I acknowledge that I did not hear of that. Apart from the member for East Perth, every political opponent in my constituency was perfectly fair and there was nothing to take exception to.

Mr. Hughes: What was said by me?

Mr. SAMPSON: I was treated fairly.

Mr. Hughes: You made a charge against me. What did I say that was unfair?

Mr. SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. SAMPSON: The hon. member introduced the subject himself.

Mr. Hughes: What did I say that was unfair?

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! I cannot allow this discussion.

Mr. Hughes: You know it is a lie. You are begging the question.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. SAMPSON: Last session the then member for Guildford moved a motion that was amended by the member for East Perth in favour of the appointment of a Royal Commission to deal with the apprenticeship question and the articles connected with the professions. Then the member for South Fremantle, who was a member of the Commission, became Minister for Works and that Royal Commission did not function. I regret that the Commission did not sit because there is a great need for a consideration of that subject. There is a great need for tradesmen throughout Western Australia, and indeed throughout the Commonwealth. It is well known that in the event of unemployment, those who are thrown out of work are invariably those who are not tradesmen. In these circumstances, it is in the interests of the State that something should be done to enable our youths to learn trades.

Hon. S. W. Munsie: I agree with you. I wish you could find places where the youths could learn trades.

Mr. SAMPSON: In my opinion every employer should be compelled to employ as many apprentices as the award or agreement permits.

Hon. S. W. Munsie: I agree with that, too.

Mr. SAMPSON: The unions might agree to liberalising the conditions governing the employment of apprentices, and remove some of those restrictions whereby employers are compelled to take apprentices in circumstances that are regarded as unprofitable. I hope a similar motion will be brought forward this session. It is needed and I know that members will approve of it. I am glad to hear that the Government intend to take action regarding the allocation of traffic fees. However, that is a parochial matter, and beyond referring to it as an introduction to the question of the Main Roads Bill, I will say no more. At a later stage I hope to have an opportunity for discussing the Main Roads Bill. It is long overdue, and I trust the Minister for Works will bring down such a measure as will have a speedy passage through the House.

Mr. Latham: I hope he provides for feeder roads first.

Mr. SAMPSON: Certainly feeder roads are necessary. We want equitable treatment for all districts in respect of the interpretation of "main roads." It is by no means an easy matter, for people living in any centre invariably believe that the road leading to that centre is a main road. During the recent controversy in the Press over good roads, reference was made to a proposed tax on petrol and a proposed tax on motor tyres. I am opposed to both. I do not think either will elucidate the great difficulty in finding money for our roads.

The Minister for Lands: How has the tax worked in the Old Country?

Mr. SAMPSON: I do not know, but the difficulties there are not as great as they are here.

The Minister for Lands: Good roads mean heavy rates for the land owner.

Mr. SAMPSON: Still, there can be no progress without good roads. A tax on petrol would affect only those who use motor-driven vehicles. There are also horse-drawn and steam-driven vehicles using our roads.

Mr. Chesson: But they do not cut up the roads as the motor does.

Mr. SAMPSON: The steam-driven vehicle carries enormous loads. I am told that one weighing six tons in itself carries an additional eight tons.

The Minister for Lands: They do not have rubber tyres.

Mr. SAMPSON: No, but even if they had, the weight would have to be carried, and the culverts and bridges in our country districts are not sufficiently strong to support those loads in safety. I want to look at this in a broad light and realise that the motor has come to stay, and that therefore it is an obligation on every local authority to provide necessary roads. But the proposed tax on petrol would be unfair, because imposed on but one section of the traffic. Let us go further and see what money the motor industry provides for the Commonwealth. I find that in duty the Commonwealth received last year from the motor industry £2,121,493, Western Australia contributing £94,060. That money should be the property of the State. I realise this is not the Federal Parliament. Still, the Premier and his Ministers might stress this point and endeavour to secure for the State that duty imposed upon the State's motor industry.

The Minister for Lands: In Fremantle every tram car we run costs us £75 per annum.

Mr. SAMPSON: The day of the tram car has nearly gone, at all events, in congested areas. In London some years ago I noted that in busy parts there were not trams, but motor buses, the trams being used in the less congested areas. The time is not far distant when the same plan will have to be adopted in Melbourne and Sydney and, later, in the smaller capitals. However, the man on the land would be penalised under the petrol tax, inasmuch as the roads in the city are better than those in the country, where the users of roads have to rely largely on the natural surface. So those using petrol-driven vehicles would pay a tax for which they received no benefit. A tax on tyres can be regarded in the same way. There is a widespread idea that the possession of a motor car postulates the possession of much wealth. But the time has gone by when it was necessary to have much money before owning a car. Moreover, a car is a necessity for many. In fact it has made walking a luxury.

The Minister for Lands: It is the heavy motors that damage the roads.

Mr. SAMPSON: Yes, but the motor has come to stay, and we must make provision for it. Let us utilise the motor as a feeder for our railways and take the fight into the camp of those opposed to our railways. I hope it will be possible in the not far distant future to electrify the railways in the suburban areas. To revert to roads: I have a word to say about the Federal grant. The conditions imposed are altogether too severe. In Western Australia it is made a condition that the money shall not be spent on any road having a grade of more than one in sixteen. In undulating country that grade is certainly severe. Then, too, there is the condition that the clearing shall be 22 feet. That is unnecessary for feeder roads. There is such an immense distance to be covered by our roads that this money, much as it may seem, is really but a drop in the ocean of what is required. It will not go far, and I suggest that the Minister for Works should bring the subject under the consideration of the Federal authorities with a view to having the conditions liberalised. The executive committee of the Road Boards Association should have been consulted upon the conditions imposed.

The Minister for Lands: The Commonwealth impose the conditions.

Mr. SAMPSON: That is so. Still, the Minister might well approach the Federal authorities with a view to getting those conditions liberalised. Now I want to touch upon one or two questions of sociological import. We have in Perth, as in other big cities, a mental observation ward. It is located at the Perth hospital. I understand the Ministry are thoroughly sympathetic in regard to this matter. There was purchased by the late Government a site at Point Heathcote for the erection of a mental reception house, and a convalescent home. For many years the need for a mental home has been recognised. Past Governments have overlooked their plain duty in this regard. At present should anybody become mentally afflicted, he is temporarily placed in the observation ward at the Perth Hospital. It is a dreadful, a hellish place, with an outlook on the morgue and on the rubbish destructor. In the female ward there was originally accommodation for six patients. To-day it contains 11 patients. To an extent the position is reproduced in the male ward. Members, I am sure, will be horrified at the dreadful conditions that exist. Take the case of a mother who becomes temporarily mental.

The Minister for Lands: You were in charge for three years, and we have been in charge for three months.

Mr. SAMPSON: I have not specially referred to the Minister, nor indeed to the Ministry generally. Still, they have been in office for four months, and during that

period they might have made further progress than has been done.

The Minister for Lands: It is also a question of funds.

Mr. SAMPSON: Four months is a comparatively short period in which to view such a big question. Imagine anyone being immured in a place like that for four months. There is no comfort or anything attractive about it, but everything to repel. There is a beautiful site at Point Heathcote, but unfortunately a building requires to be erected. When in Adelaide a few weeks ago I had the privilege of visiting the reception home at Enfield with the Inspector General of Hospitals, Dr. Morris. I also learned that the Minister for Lands, when Deputy Leader of the Opposition, had visited the institution. He has always been interested in this subject. I thought when he took office the utmost expedition would be shown in altering the present conditions.

The Minister for Lands: There was no necessity to spend £60,000, according to the plans approved of by your Government. We want a home, not an institution, something similar to that which they have in the Eastern States.

Mr. SAMPSON: All I want is that such a home should be provided as quickly as possible. I should be quite satisfied to have one like the Enfield institution, which cost £26,000.

The Minister for Lands: The local institution was to have cost £60,000.

Mr. SAMPSON: That is unnecessarily expensive.

Hon. S. W. Munsie: Why did you approve of it?

Mr. SAMPSON: Surely the Honorary Minister knows that the Colonial Secretary is not the Treasurer. How could I approve of that expenditure? For the sum of £26,000 the Government of South Australia have erected a place that is a home in every sense of the word. If one had a near and dear relative there, one would not suffer the dreadful shock that is experienced by putting a relative into the Perth observation ward.

The Minister for Lands: I asked you 18 months ago to send for the plans from South Australia, and I also asked Mr. Broun. The South Australian place cost half the money you wanted to spend on palatial buildings.

Mr. SAMPSON: I have never pressed for palatial buildings, or for a large structure. A building can always be added to. We do not require a big institution, because there are not many people concerned. There are, however, sufficient persons affected to make this a matter of importance. If we consider these people we shall doubtless reduce the number who are passed into the Hospital for the Insane as certificated mental invalids. The home at Enfield is delightfully situated, and is sympathetically

administered. On the tables one sees flowers. Imagine any one finding flowers in the observation ward of the Perth Hospital! It would be like looking for a piano in a stable. I hope the Government will expedite this matter and will have erected as early as possible a mental reception home for sufferers from temporary mental disability. This will give them an opportunity to regain their health. I am sorry a difficulty has arisen over the soldiers' mental home at Claremont. I was under the impression when the late Government went out of office that this matter had been settled. I regret that all this time has elapsed without a real start being made with the work. There is great need for prison reform. The prisoners are a long way from us, and perhaps we do not realise the seriousness of this question. When in Adelaide I visited the Yatala stockade. I saw prisoners there carrying out useful work. Not for the value of the work, but for the benefit that would accrue to prisoners a similar farm should be established here. Prior to my relinquishing office, the prison farm question had been developed. It only remained to find the money for the purchase of the property for us to have a prison farm. Western Australia has lagged behind. Every other civilised country in the world that I know of has its prison farm. In New Zealand prisoners are utilised for road making, afforestation, and in other directions. When I was in the Dominion in 1922, I learned that upwards of 90 million trees had been planted by prison labour. That principle is being followed more or less in the other States. There is an "honour system" in vogue in New South Wales. Prisoners are encouraged to secure for themselves the right to carry out certain work. They are taught different trades and farming operations, and in some instances they are put on to clearing. In a New South Wales paper the other day an article appeared dealing with the treatment of criminals, particularly at the Emu Plains prison farm, where the "honour system" prevails for young offenders. The article says—

That the New South Wales treatment of criminals is excellent—particularly at Emu Plains prison farm where the "honour system" is used with young offenders—is the opinion of Professor James Lichtenberger, of the School of Sociology, of Pennsylvania University, who is visiting Australia. Professor Lichtenberger has been 14 years with the university of Pennsylvania, and during that period he has given close study to criminology and prison reform, a subject which has attracted some of the best brains of America. "It is being realised," said the Professor, "that by destroying hope in the mind of the criminal, you are destroying all chance of improvement. It is only along curative lines that any lasting good will be secured. It is only by treating the criminal as you would the sick

that you can expect amendment. Why treat him as a bad man, and hold out no hope to him?" Professor Lichtenberger takes the view that there is only a small percentage of cases where such methods would be necessary. He says that there should be other ways of treatment. At Emu Plains the Professor saw healthy and courteous young men working in the gardens, and practically on parole. They were free from the blighting depression of a large gaol.

At the Yatala stockade the men are put on to do gardening and farming, and some are engaged in quarrying. I should like to pay a tribute to the work done by the comptroller of our prisons, Mr. Trethowan, and the acting comptroller, Mr. Dibdin, both of whom take a great interest in their duties. During Mr. Trethowan's absence in the Eastern States he visited many institutions, and brought back with him a mass of information of the utmost value. I hope it will be possible for the Government to do something here on the lines laid down in the Eastern State. The superintendent of the Fremantle prison, in his annual report, says—

My greatest trouble is to get sufficient work in order to keep prisoners fully employed. . . . In my opinion it is a short-sighted policy not keeping these men fully employed. If they were, it would be better for the prisoners, the officials, and the Government. For the prisoner because, while constantly employed, he concentrates on his work, forgets to brood over his sentence, and is more fitted to take up his position as a worker in the outside world on his release from prison. For the officials because, while the prisoner is working he is less likely to get into mischief, and, in consequence, gives less trouble. For the Government, because he is helping to maintain himself, thereby relieving the taxpayer to a certain extent. . . . I would draw special attention to the report of the Indeterminate Sentences Board that nothing further has been done towards selecting a suitable site for the establishment of a prison farm colony, and that the delay is hampering the efforts of the board in their endeavour to reform those who come under their control. Everything possible is being done by the board and the officers, who supervise this class of prisoner, in the way of reform under the prevailing conditions.

The chairman of the Indeterminate Sentences Board reports—

The board feel that they cannot too strongly urge the necessity for the immediate provision of some proper place for the reception and treatment of inmates away from common gaol surroundings, and unless something is done soon in the direction indicated, the board feel that their sphere of usefulness, being so limited, they must consider the question of resigning their position as members of

the board. . . . The board desire to point out that the question of the establishment of a farm colony has been mentioned in every report since the board has been established.

The board has been doing good work, but it is very little wonder they are discouraged. Year after year they put forward recommendations that always fall on deaf ears. I hope the Government will establish a prison farm, and give to the good conduct inmates an opportunity to retrieve their positions.

Mr. Corboy: Did you not control that department for some time?

Mr. SAMPSON: Yes. The farm was recommended, and it is now only a matter of finding the money.

Mr. Corboy: How long were you in control?

The Minister for Mines: It was an easy matter to recommend a farm.

Mr. Corboy: Were you not there long enough to carry out the job?

Mr. SAMPSON: I am sorry I was not there long enough to complete it. It would be a fine thing to give this opportunity to young men. On their release they would no longer be a menace to society, but an asset. They would be able to earn a living for themselves. At the present time when a man is held in prison without sufficient employment to prevent him becoming soft, he is incapable of doing a hard day's work when he gets out. Consequently the temptation to commit crime becomes greater. There is no need to spend a lot of money in this direction. The men themselves could do the clearing, and farms could be developed gradually. With such an institution Western Australia would take its place with the other States, and we would be able to take a step forward in prison reform.

Mr. Corboy: You want to add to our burdens a debt that your Government was not prepared to incur.

Mr. SAMPSON: I believe the farm would be self-supporting from the commencement.

Mr. Corboy: But your farmers tell us that applies to hardly any of them.

Mr. SAMPSON: I believe it would apply here. At Yatala in South Australia highly satisfactory results have been secured.

Mr. Hughes: You want us to make good one of your own deficiencies.

Mr. SAMPSON: I do not wish it to be regarded from a party standpoint. It should be considered from the standpoint of the State. If it is a good thing, it should be advisable for the present administration to undertake it.

Mr. Corboy: It would have been a good thing for you to do. Why didn't you do it? You were in charge.

Mr. Hughes: He was never in charge.

Mr. SAMPSON: Let me now refer to the Queensland fruit marketing scheme. A short while since a Council of Agriculture

was formed in Queensland, the work of which was to organise and do all it could in respect to marketing. It undertook the organisation of the fruit industry. There is no more difficult industry to organise, and there is no industry that has suffered worse than the fruit industry. Unfortunately the industry has suffered through over-production or lack of organisation, usually the latter. An effort is being made in the north-eastern State to bring about a change. As recently as July of last year a conference of growers, called by the Council of Agriculture, was held to discuss the whole question. Prior to the conference a review of existing methods of marketing Queensland fruit had been prepared and a copy of the booklet had been distributed to all registered fruit growers. It was decided that control was necessary and that to this end statutory power would have to be obtained. The Minister for Agriculture promised to introduce a Bill, and in October last it passed the Chamber, and came into operation on the 1st January of this year. The Fruit Organisation Marketing Act of Queensland controls all matters relating to fruit produced in Queensland. In addition to controlling all marketing the committee of direction have full power in respect of transport, and have representatives in the big southern markets of Sydney, Melbourne, and, I believe, Newcastle, and possibly Ballarat and Adelaide. These representatives discuss with the agents the question of the supply of Queensland fruits required during the succeeding four weeks. The only agents in the southern markets permitted to handle the fruit are those who have been approved by the committee of direction. This is a good thing, because it precludes the possibility of growers sending their produce to agents who are unfinancial. The committee now contemplate going still further. When I was in Brisbane a few weeks ago I was informed that the committee were likely to require the southern agents to enter into a fidelity bond or find a bank guarantee to the amount of £500. To this proposal a majority of the agents have no objection. The work of the committee of direction is to direct. The keynote of the scheme is to control. There is power under the Act to impose fines and strike levies, but so far there has been no occasion to do either. The committee are proceeding slowly but surely, and I am convinced after my inquiries amongst fruitgrowers in southern Queensland that this method will result in great advantage to them. During the recent elections in this State the Queensland Act was discussed, and I understand the Premier intends to introduce a similar measure. I welcome that proposal, subject to a vote being taken of growers that produce fruit commercially.

Mr. Luter: You have been converted.

Mr. SAMPSON: A vote of the growers was not taken in Queensland, and to that extent the claims of democracy were not given reasonable consideration. I am sure

such a measure would benefit our growers, and I have arrived at that conclusion after having discussed the Queensland Act with both fruitgrowers and agents. All agents do not favour the Queensland Act, but in my opinion a good agent has nothing to fear. The committee of direction take the view that, irrespective of whether the agent has reason to complain, he does not come into the question. The fruit is the property of the growers, and it is their privilege to say how it shall be disposed of. There are in Brisbane approximately 80 fruit agents, and most of them are auctioneers as well. Hitherto these agents have handled bananas as well as other fruits, but the committee of direction have decided that the handling of bananas in Brisbane shall be limited to one agent, an employee of the committee. It is a remarkable fact that the committee have operated without having to obtain financial assistance. Revenue is obtained from fruit barrows and stalls and from transport. They took over from the Southern Queensland Fruit Marketing Co. the business of transport and developed it, and it is claimed that £15,000 has already been saved to the growers. Only the fringe of the business has yet been touched; it is too early for the scheme to have accomplished much, but sufficient has been done to show that it is sound and practicable and that the growers will benefit from it. Some people are of opinion that this is really a fruit pool, but it is not a pool in any sense. It is a form of compulsory co-operation. We know what has happened in respect to the Australian Dried Fruits Association. For years this big organisation, which operates chiefly from the Sunraysia districts on the Murray and other dried fruit districts of the Eastern States, has endeavoured to control the price of dried fruits, but there has always been the difficulty that approximately 10 per cent. of the growers are not members. It is true that 80 per cent. of the produce had to be exported from Australia, and it was but fair that all growers should participate in the export. Owing to 10 per cent. of growers not being members, there was no control and so the members of the A.D.F.A. have found their position untenable. So it is realised that only by compulsory co-operation can the full benefits of co-operation be secured. That is the scheme of the committee of direction and I hope it will be possible to organise a similar scheme here.

The Minister for Lands: That will do away with individualism.

Mr. SAMPSON: No, it will not. The good grower and the careful packer will still receive better returns than will the careless grower and the careless packer. The representative of the committee of direction in Sydney confers with the recognised agents and ascertains the quantity of Queensland fruit that will be required there. That information is sent to the chairman of the committee of direction, and he passes it on

to the local producers' association, who in turn distribute the order amongst the members. The prices secured are not uniform. There may be a minimum price, but the price is in accordance with the quality of the fruit forwarded. Thus there is no elimination of individualism. If there were, I should hesitate to recommend the scheme.

The Minister for Lands: If it is compulsory, it must mean the wiping out of individualism. If you compel me to join a union, my individualism is gone.

Mr. SAMPSON: There is compulsion, but the grower receives for his fruit the price it brings on the market. The grower may send to any of the selected and approved agents that operate. The scheme does not eliminate competition. If it did, it would be doomed to failure. Cut out competition and you take away the incentive to do one's best. It will still be necessary for growers to produce the right varieties of good fruit and pack it carefully.

Mr. Marshall: What is the difference between compulsory co-operation and socialism?

Mr. SAMPSON: That is a question the hon. member might study. At this stage I am not prepared to answer it. This is not socialism in the accepted sense.

Mr. Marshall: Oh, no!

Mr. SAMPSON: It is organisation, and the difference under this scheme is the difference between organisation and disorganisation.

Mr. Marshall: Will you give your support to such a measure for this State?

Mr. SAMPSON: Undoubtedly I will, subject, as I have said, to a vote being taken of the growers. I do think the growers, who are most concerned, should have an opportunity of declaring whether or not they desire an enactment of this nature. I do not believe in introducing a Bill, as was done in Queensland, bringing it in and forcing the growers, willy-nilly, to swallow it holus-holus without a vote being taken.

Mr. Marshall: How would we have got on without the wheat pool?

Mr. SAMPSON: If the question had been put to the Queensland fruitgrowers, I fully believe they would have adopted the Bill. It was the right of every Queensland grower to have an opportunity of voting for or against the scheme.

Mr. Marshall: How would we have got on with the wheat growers if the course you suggest had been followed?

Mr. SAMPSON: This position is not quite the same.

Mr. Marshall: Be fair!

Mr. SAMPSON: The object of the Queensland Act is to control the fruit industry, to prevent gluts, to prevent famines, and to see that all residents of the State, especially those in outback districts, shall have the opportunity of securing fruit at reasonable prices. Further, the committee of direction have absolute power over retailing. If they are dissatisfied with the conduct of a retailer, that retailer can be

controlled, and if necessary stopped. In connection with the sale of fruit from barrows it has often been remarked that the good fruit is shown and the bad fruit put in the bag. The fruit barrows are controlled in Queensland. As time goes on, the committee of direction will secure complete control of all branches of the fruit industry. The great majority of Queensland growers with whom I discussed the matter are fully convinced that their position will be much better in the future than it has been in the past. One important advantage already secured is connected with the pine-apple crop. Hitherto the canneries were able to buy pine-apples at 2s. 6d. per case during gluts. But now, thanks to the action of the committee of direction, the canneries have agreed to pay a minimum price of 4s. per case. I was somewhat disturbed when I learned of the position of the Queensland State cannery, but there are other canneries there, and it is hoped that even the State cannery will pay better during the coming season. However, it is a fact that during the last three years it has lost a total of £70,000. Still, I do not desire to stress that point. I hope our Government will take steps to introduce and pass similar legislation for the benefit of our fruit industry, subject, nevertheless, to the question being first referred to the growers, in which work I would do my part. I hope the Minister for Agriculture, when he addresses the House, will give members a statement of the Government's intentions in this matter. I know that many of the growers are looking for such legislation, which, I understand, was promised them during the general election. With the member for Murchison (Mr. Marshall) and other goldfields representatives, including the member for Mount Margaret (Mr. Taylor), I hope that the gold-mining industry will revive. We all know that the late Government did encourage that industry, and in a very practical way. I trust that such encouragement will continue and increase under the present Administration. I trust also that our wheat districts will continue to advance, and that the living monument which the late Premier erected to himself in the form of the great wheat belt will find a replica in the group settlement scheme in the South-West.

On motion by Mr. Chesson, debate adjourned.

House adjourned at 10.35 p.m.