

is made for the family as it comes along. Why should not every child have a place? We must take care of the children and make ample provision for their existence. If we wish to keep our heads above water we must have efficient administration, industrial peace, and a larger population. Regarding the former point, Ministers must keep in personal touch with their departments and responsible heads. They must take personal notice of everything and of those working under them. They must apply themselves now, as they have never done before, to their work. I am glad that reference was made from the other side of the House to the fact that they do not believe our compulsory industrial arbitration has failed. I do not think it has. I know what strikes mean not only to those immediately involved but to hundreds, and often thousands, of those removed from the scene of the strike. If we are to have the strikes during the next two or three years that we have had in the past, we shall never get out of our difficulties.

Mr. Clydesdale: Are you a pessimist?

Mr. DAVIES: Not altogether, but unless we face the position squarely and honestly, and try to find a way out of our difficulties, there is no possible chance for us at all. I believe in the good sense of the Britisher, and that when it comes to the absolute limit, he will say to himself and his fellows, "This will not carry us much further." We have to alter our tactics." We see what is taking place in the Official Labour Party to-day. There is a change in tactics and I hope this will be for the benefit not only of the workers but of the State as a whole.

On motion by Mr. Corboy, debate adjourned.

House adjourned at 10.30 p.m.

QUESTION—ESPERANCE LANDS, CLEARING.

Mr. O'LOGHLEN (for Hon. T. Walker) asked the Premier: 1, Has any provision been made for a steam traction engine for the purpose of assisting the Esperance district settlers in the mallee district on similar terms to like assistance rendered elsewhere? 2, If so, when can the settlers expect that the steam traction engine will be in commission? 3, If no steps have been taken to assist the mallee settlers to roll down the scrub, will he consider the advisability of rendering this assistance as early as possible?

The PREMIER replied: 1, No. 2, Answered by No. 1. 3, Inquiries by the General Manager, Agricultural Bank, go to show that horses will be more economical than an engine. If it can be shown that the engine is cheaper, he is prepared to send one down.

QUESTION—RAILWAY BUFFET CARS.

Mr. PICKERING asked the Minister for Railways: 1, How many buffet cars has the Railway Department? 2, How many are in operation? 3, What sections are they operating on? 4, What have been the financial results during the period of running?

The PREMIER (for the Minister for Railways) replied: 1, Three. 2, Two. 3, Perth-Wyalcatchem, Caron-Yalgoo. 4, Perth-Wyalcatchem car, 21st March to 31st July, profit £30 17s. 10d.; Perth-Kellerberrin car, 21st March to 31st July, loss £152 11s. 1d.; Caron-Yalgoo car, 16th May to 31st July, loss £49 12s. 11d. The Perth-Kellerberrin car was discontinued with the time table alterations operating from 8th August. The Caron-Yalgoo car is the only means of satisfactorily meeting refreshment requirements of passengers between Perth and Murchison District.

ADDRESS-IN-REPLY.

Seventh Day.

Debate resumed from the previous day.

Mr. CORBOY (Yilgarn) [4.36]: In common with others who have spoken on the Address-in-reply, and especially as the baby of the House, I desire to welcome the mother of the House amongst us. I hope that during my tenure in this Chamber I will not give Ministers, or others, cause to complain that, like most babies, I am always howling for a rattle. I will endeavour to bring forward for the consideration of the Government only those things that I think are reasonable, or that I consider should be granted. With regard to the Address-in-reply, there has been an almost total absence from the speeches delivered by members sitting on the Ministerial side of the House, of any proposal or policy, either on the part of Ministers or private members, indicating any definite ideas as to how the financial drift is to be remedied. In the Governor's Speech we

Legislative Assembly,

Wednesday, 17th August, 1921.

	Page
Questions: Esperance lands, clearing	255
Railway buffet cars	255
Address-in-reply, Seventh day	255

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

are confronted with a mass of figures. There is page after page and column after column of figures, and we have had the same thing from the Premier, who has read lists to members showing where losses are taking place. We have had from the Premier admissions that certain things, on the other hand, are showing profits, but we have had no definite proposal as to how the deficit may be stopped. When speaking on the Supply Bill some days ago, I made the same point, and I would like to again ask if the Government have any definite idea, or tangible proposal, to bring forward which will help to relieve us from the present position.

Mr. Marshall: Patience, Mr. Corboy, patience.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! An hon. member is not allowed to refer to another hon. member by name.

Mr. CORBOY: This is a matter of considerable importance, especially to the people outback, and more particularly to the mining constituencies. It has been necessary for the Government, in joggling along in the same old style, advancing nothing new from time to time, to increase the taxation in order to make up the few pounds they fall behind. In pursuing that policy, material injury has been done to some of the industries in Western Australia, and to men engaged in those industries, some of whom deserve a great deal more consideration than they have received in the past. Take the case of the prospector. We have men in this country—and I hope very soon to introduce the Premier to some of them—who have been battling in the back blocks for 15 or 20 years. Some of them have been battling there for a longer period than that, and with little more to show than a few clothes and tucker. Eventually some of these prospectors make a strike. What happens? Immediately they want to sell their show to a company and thus recoup themselves for their 20 years of work and privation, battling away in the solitudes of the bush, the Government step in with exorbitant claims for taxation, with the result that it is not possible for a company to buy, or for the man to sell.

The Premier: That is not a proposal of this Government.

Mr. CORBOY: You are not doing anything to rectify it.

The Premier: Yes, we are.

Mr. CORBOY: I am glad to have that assurance.

The Premier: The trouble is mainly with the Federal Government.

Mr. CORBOY: I will have something to say regarding the Federal Government as well. I am glad, however, to have the assurance from the Premier, that these men who are battling in the back blocks against conditions which the city people cannot realise, are to get some consideration. I have on many occasions supported the claim that it would be just to assess a primary producer's income on the average income derived during the five preceding years. I want to see some-

thing done in the interests of men like the prospectors, so that they may have a reasonable chance of securing a fair return for their work instead of having it taken away from them, as is the case to-day.

The Premier: Why five years, though?

Mr. CORBOY: Ten years would suit me better if it is possible for such a thing to be. I do not presume to be an actuary, to say that such a proposal is a possible one. Should it be found possible, however, I think that relief should be given to these primary producers.

The Premier: That is a suggestion worthy of consideration, anyway.

Mr. CORBOY: The Premier stated that the Federal authorities had a good deal to do with this question and I agree with him. The Federal imposts to-day are reaching almost the possible limit in taxation without considering in any way the State requirements. The Federal Government are indulging in extravagance throughout the Commonwealth, and they are creating new positions, with large salaries, not only within Australia but in England and America as well. I wish to enter a strong protest against the Federal authorities with respect to the loans which they have been floating during the past five or six years. Have the Federal Government, or any other Government, under the Commonwealth Constitution, any right to free their loans from taxation?

The Premier: The Federal Government have the right to free their loans from State taxation.

Mr. Angelo: A previous Treasurer, Mr. Gardiner, assured us that that was so some two years ago.

Mr. CORBOY: It is a most unfortunate thing if that is so. It is unfortunate that the Federal authorities can so materially interfere with our laws.

The Premier: Especially as they are paying 6½ per cent.

Mr. Angelo: Mr. Gardiner said that we could retaliate in connection with any loans we raised here.

The Premier: But can we?

Mr. CORBOY: So far the Government have not raised any loans in Western Australia. The position, therefore, has not been tested, seeing that no attempt has been made to raise a loan. When the member for Guildford (Mr. Davies) was speaking last night he brought up the question of the endowment of motherhood. Members will agree that that proposal is a good move, but the hon. member seemed to regard with horror the suggestion that a lottery should be conducted to raise the money. I put it to the Treasurer that it would be a good thing for this State if we were to start a State lottery. In Queensland enormous sums have been raised by these means, and it has been found possible, not only to maintain hospitals, but to build new ones, and to provide money for all sorts of charitable purposes. Similar action is proposed in New South Wales. Whether or not

we think these lotteries are good, we cannot hope to stop the Australian from participating in them by refraining from having a Government lottery in this State. If the people cannot get one here, they will continue to send their money to those in Tasmania and Queensland. It would be very much better if the Government used every possible endeavour to retain that money in the State by running a lottery here. I put it to the Premier that, instead of having private gentlemen going about begging for funds for the erection of a new out-patients ward at the Children's Hospital, we ought to establish a State lottery. This is a matter worthy of the most serious consideration. An enormous sum of money goes out of this State every year in the form of investments in lotteries in Tasmania and Queensland, and I hope some effort will be made to retain that money in this State. I was glad to hear the declaration of the member for Claremont (Mr. J. Thomson) that his own observation had shown him that in Queensland the Labour Government had done more for the returned soldiers than had all the other State Governments put together. It is a pretty sweeping statement; I should not care to go quite so far myself. But it is an indication that the Queensland Labour Government have honestly endeavoured to do their duty by the soldiers. When I remember statements made by members sitting opposite, to the effect that the Queensland Labour Government were a disloyal Government; when I remember the statements appearing in our newspapers that the Queensland Labour Government were against the returned soldiers, it is especially pleasing to hear one sitting on the Government side declaring that in his opinion the Queensland Labour Government are trying to do their duty.

Mr. Pickering: He is considering the changing of his position in the House.

Mr. CORBOY: He will be a welcome recruit over here. One with the genial disposition of the hon. member would add greatly to the tone of our side.

The Premier: He would be a handsome addition.

Mr. CORBOY: Yes, handsome in every sense of the word. I believe there are on the Government side one or two other members who if they wished could back up the statement that the Queensland Government have done exceptionally well by the soldiers. There are many on the Government side who claim to be the friends of the soldiers, that they are out all the time to do anything they can for the returned men. We have heard that statement many times during the last four or five years, but I noticed a significant silence, the lack of anything in the nature of a cheer, when the member for Claremont praised the Queensland Labour Government for having done their duty.

Mr. Angelo: Your side cheered so loudly that you did not hear our cheers.

Mr. CORBOY: I admit that we did cheer, and rightly so.

Mr. Boyland: In Queensland the civil population are getting better conditions than are the soldiers.

Mr. CORBOY: I do not believe that.

Mr. Boyland: It is a fact.

Hon. P. Collier: It is not. I have just come back from there, and I saw a good deal of what was going on.

Mr. CORBOY: I do not think the member for Kalgoorlie has visited that State recently. I have it from those who have been there recently, that no distinctions are made in that State, that the Government are giving everybody a fair deal. The same cannot be said of this State. We are getting retrenchment here. It reminds me that the Government are always proclaiming their desire to do everything possible for the immigrants who will come out here. They are laying themselves out to do that. We have in the community the Ugly Men's Association, who have done yeoman work in relieving distress in various directions. They also have laid themselves out to help the immigrants. That is a right policy to pursue, but I say that some effort should be made on similar lines to deal with the unemployed amongst us.

Mr. Mann: The Ugly Men's Association are doing that.

Mr. CORBOY: I fear that is not so. If an Australian born went to that association to-morrow without being entitled to wear a returned soldier's badge and asked to be put through their school, as the immigrants are, and for a farm to be found for him, he could not be granted those advantages.

Mr. Mann: The association have found work for over 400 since October.

Mr. CORBOY: But you are prepared to go a great deal further for the immigrant than for our own unemployed.

The Premier: I do not think so.

Mr. CORBOY: Well one can only go on what one sees happening around him. I should like to know from the Premier whether any effort has been made to provide jobs for the men recently dismissed from the Railways; has any work been put in hand in advance to provide for those men, just as the Government would provide for a ship-load of immigrants? When you dismiss men wholesale, you are throwing a crowd on the labour market.

The Premier: I have not heard that any of them are wanting work.

Mr. CORBOY: They are coming to us for it.

The Premier: I hope they will stick to you.

Mr. CORBOY: If the Premier sticks to his present treatment of them, I can assure him they will stick to us at the next elections, when the votes are wanted. I protest against these wholesale dismissals from the Railways. The Minister for Railways, in answer to a question the other day, informed me that the percentage of the salaried staff employed in the Railways has increased

during the last 12 months to a greater extent than either the mileage or the wages staff. There comes a time, as at present, when things are slack on the railways. They have had two bad monthly reports, and in consequence either the Commissioner or the Minister is panic-stricken and resorts to dismissals.

The Premier: I believe this will be the worst month in the history of the Railways.

Mr. CORBOY: It makes it the harder to understand the action of the Government during this and the previous month. Although the salaried staff has increased more than either the wages staff or the mileage, when it comes to a question of retrenchment there is no suggestion of getting rid of the surplus clerical staff.

Hon. P. Collier: They are increasing them.

Mr. CORBOY: There is no question of retrenching among that staff, but there are wholesale dismissals among the wages staff. In my opinion those dismissals are damaging to the service as a whole, and not in the best interests of the State. Let me quote an instance: In the Guildford electorate a few nights ago I met a lad of about 20 years of age who has been for five years in the railway service. He has ever taken a keen interest in his work and has done everything possible to advance himself. For some time past, although only 20 years of age, he has been a signal man in the signal cabin. Yet the department has dismissed that lad because he does not happen to be married at 20. The department keeps on other men who are casuals, and who will not take the same interest in their work as this lad did. In that the Government are following a policy not in the best interests either of the service or of the country as a whole. If that lad had been a rotter, if through being a rotter he had found it necessary to marry at 17, he would have been kept on; but because he has been decent he has to go. It is not fair.

The Premier: Have you mentioned it to the Commissioner?

Hon. P. Collier: The Commissioner says we must not approach him on these matters.

Mr. CORBOY: Yes, I have received a similar notice. Furthermore, when the dismissals are wholesale I do not feel justified in approaching the Commissioner about one man. It should then be a question of altering the policy, and not of rectifying an individual case.

Mr. Underwood: Keep them all on.

Mr. CORBOY: The Premier himself says that this will be the worst month in the history of the Railways, and naturally things will liven up again. Then why not keep them all on?

Mr. Underwood: Because it is not necessary.

Mr. CORBOY: I will take the hon. member at his word and agree that it is not necessary to keep them all on. But I then ask, what is wrong with dismissing some of the salaried staff, instead of making the wages men bear the whole brunt?

Mr. Underwood: A youngster of 20 years has to bear a lot of brunt, hasn't he?

The Minister for Railways: Exactly the same thing applies to the wages staff. The best paid remain on permanently. They cannot be put off.

Mr. CORBOY: That amuses me! The Minister was out of the Chamber when, a moment ago, I dealt with the case of that lad.

Mr. Underwood: Poor lad! Poor young fellow! Only 20 years of age! Can't he go into the bush?

Mr. CORBOY: I do not wish to go into the whole details of this lad's home, but I venture to say the hon. member was never in the circumstances of this lad.

Mr. Underwood: No, mine were not nearly so favourable.

Mr. CORBOY: I remind the Minister that in the Railways the term "permanent" does not mean that those officers cannot be dismissed. It means merely that they get certain privileges not given to casual men.

Hon. P. Collier: They have not the security of public servants.

The Minister for Railways: The permanent wages staff has. One cannot sack an engine-driver or a fireman.

Mr. CORBOY: The Minister says he cannot sack an engine driver or a fireman. That might be so, but he can reduce an engine driver to the grade of fireman, and a fireman to the grade of cleaner and put the cleaner out.

The Minister for Mines: That would be the boy!

Mr. CORBOY: No; in the other case of which I spoke, I was referring to a signalman. It is still possible for the Minister to retrench, for when the men are put back a grade, they are also reduced in wages. It amounts to the same thing as sacking the engine driver; one employee is got rid of.

The Minister for Mines: A boy at the bottom.

Mr. CORBOY: But the others, too, are dropped a grade, and the same amount of money is saved as if the engine driver were sacked.

The Minister for Mines: That is an entirely different proposition from putting the men off.

Mr. CORBOY: I shall again refer to the case of the signalman for the benefit of the Minister.

The Minister for Mines: I heard what you had to say.

Mr. CORBOY: That lad was supposed to be a permanent employee. Why should he be dismissed?

Mr. Underwood: Why should he be permanent anyhow?

Mr. CORBOY: I do not claim that he should be permanent, but there are many men wasting their time in the offices of the Railway Department who should go before a useful lad like this is put off. I make no bones about saying that I was in one of the offices of the Minister's own depart-

ment less than a week ago, and the whole of the office staff were crowded around a table where four members in office hours were playing bridge. If those men can be kept on, there is surely something wrong with the system.

The Minister for Mines: You ought to report a thing like that.

Mr. Underwood: And the lad should also be allowed to play bridge.

Mr. CORBOY: I was not there to play the part of detective on behalf of the Minister. Before this debate closes, I would like a declaration from the Minister for Railways as to where this business of dismissing men is going to cease, and whether the whole of the burden of it is to be borne by the wages men and not by the salary men. I do not wish to make this a bitter issue, but the Government should take us into their confidence. It is their duty to let the country know where we stand, and we have a right to know definitely what to expect and what provision to make to help to find employment for the men who are put off. I wish to deal with one other matter before I conclude. I do not intend to be like some babies who squawk all day. I notice that I am receiving an encouraging smile from the mother in the House, which is a great help.

Mrs. Cowan: Ladies only talk all day, but the sons are very good sons of their mothers, are they not?

Mr. CORBOY: During the debate the member for Katanning (Mr. A. Thomson) as deputy Leader of the Country Party outlined what I presume we must regard as the attitude of that party, and he also replied to certain statements made by the Leader of the Opposition. I wish briefly to continue that discussion, though I do not wish to labour it, because there are more important things requiring attention than the progress or even the future of the Country Party. I wish briefly to quote to the House a portion of the constitution of the Country Party and to compare that constitution with the statements made by the deputy Leader of the Country Party.

Mr. Pickering: What about your constitution?

Mr. Munsie: You are at liberty to deal with that.

Mr. CORBOY: I am quite willing to allow the member for Sussex to deal with our constitution, and I assure him that any member of this House can obtain a copy of our constitution on application.

Hon. P. Collier: And free of charge.

Mr. Pickering: To whom should he apply?

Hon. P. Collier: I will obtain one for you.

Mr. CORBOY: Any member on this side of the House will obtain one for the hon. member. We are not a bit frightened of letting it see the light of day, but it is interesting to note that I experienced some difficulty in getting a copy of the Country Party's

constitution. It is not so widely distributed as is ours.

Mr. Hickmott: You can get them by the dozen.

Hon. P. Collier: In fact, you paper your houses with them.

Mr. CORBOY: If that is so, perhaps the member for Pingelly will give me an amended copy of the constitution at the close of the conference now being held. The member for Katanning, as deputy Leader of the Country Party, said—

We have no caucus. The Country Party is free and untrammelled in its deliberations in this House.

Paragraph 51a of the constitution of the Primary Producers' Association reads—

The Country Party in both Houses shall, upon all party measures outlined in the political platform, vote solid and as the majority of the party dictates at a properly constituted party meeting.

Mr. Pickering: That is not outside influence.

Mr. CORBOY: I shall deal with that in a moment. The paragraph continues—

Any member or members of the party voting against such decision shall be deemed to be no longer a member or members of the Country Party.

The Country Party's constitution therefore provides for expulsion if a member dares to defy the party caucus, and yet they say they are the only party without a caucus. I would remind members opposite of the statements repeatedly made in this House by members of the Country Party, that they have absolute freedom on the floor of this House and that they can do just as they wish. When one member of the National Labour Party was speaking, there was an interjection by a member of the Country Party to the effect that no more liberty was enjoyed by any party in this House than by the Country Party. I venture to say that, if the statements made by members of the National Labour Party are true, that there is absolutely nothing binding upon them, then the Country Party are bound a great deal more than they are, and furthermore I maintain that the Country Party are bound to a greater extent than ever members of the Labour Party have been.

Mr. Pickering: We have not seen your constitution yet.

Mr. CORBOY: I shall supply a copy to the hon. member before he makes his speech in order that he may comment on it.

Mr. O'Loughlen: We will give him a framed copy.

Mr. CORBOY: A majority of the Country Party outside of this Chamber dictates to the whole of the party in this House, and if any member dares to oppose that majority, the constitution of the Country Party clearly provides for his expulsion from the party.

Mr. Pickering: Surely you would not suggest holding a caucus meeting in this Chamber.

Mr. Underwood: Do not complain about the Country Party when the same thing applies to you.

Mr. CORBOY: The member for Pilbara was well content with the Labour Party for many years until he saw an opportunity to get out.

Mr. Underwood: I was expelled.

Mr. O'Loghlen: You were not expelled.

Hon. P. Collier: It was one of the mistakes we made that we did not expel you.

Mr. Underwood: You talk about expulsion!

Mr. O'Loghlen: Why repeat it? You were never expelled.

Mr. CORBOY: The member for Sussex wanted to know something about the outside domination. The constitution of the Country Party also contains a paragraph treating with this aspect. The denial has gone forth repeatedly from this Chamber and from members of the Country Party outside that there is no such thing as outside domination so far as they are concerned, and that there is no dealing at all with any outside body as to what their actions in this House shall be. Let us study paragraph 51 of their constitution, which reads—

In the event of any doubt arising as to the interpretation of the party platform, the council may, at the request of the Parliamentary party, convene a political conference comprising the members of the council and the Parliamentary party, and the decision of such conference shall bind the Parliamentary party.

Mr. Pickering: Notice that it states "at the request of the Parliamentary party."

Mr. CORBOY: And I would be pretty right in concluding that if a request was necessary, it would come along.

Mr. Pickering: From us?

Mr. CORBOY: Yes, and it would not need a very strong hint from the executive to convince members of the Country Party that it was desired to have a talk with them. If there is no such thing as outside domination, why should the deliberations of a body consisting of members of this House and members of an outside organisation be binding on Country Party members in this House? They say there is no outside domination. Yet their own constitution clearly shows that the executive of the Primary Producers' Association has power, together with members of this House, to bind the whole of the members of the Country Party.

Mr. Pickering: To give an interpretation of the platform.

Mr. CORBOY: That is merely the thin end of the wedge. It is very easy to widen a loophole like that when it is desired so to do.

Mr. Pickering: We do not want to.

Mr. Munsie: Not just at present.

Mr. CORBOY: I do not intend to pursue that subject further. The member for Sussex apparently desires to reply to me, and I shall listen with pleasure to any explanation of his which can possibly show that my interpretation of the two clauses of their constitution which I have quoted is not the correct one.

Mr. Pickering: I shall be delighted.

Mr. CORBOY: The deputy Leader of the Country Party (Mr. A. Thomson), during the course of his remarks, went to some pains to explain how the decision to support the present Government was arrived at, and he denied the accuracy of the statement made by the Leader of the Opposition. The hon. member said that members of the Country Party sitting in this House met and came to a conclusion as to what they should do, and then went to the executive of the Primary Producers' Association and said, "We have come to this conclusion," and that the executive endorsed it. The Leader of the Opposition, in his statement, said that the Country Party members and the executive met together, thrashed the question out, and together came to a decision on the point at issue. The member for Katanning denied that this was so, but only yesterday the real leader of the Country Party, Mr. Monger, in the course of his statement, said—

Following upon the general elections in March, and in conformity with the instructions received from the conference in August last, the members of the Country Party and the executive met in conference on the 30th March to consider what steps should be taken by the party in respect to linking up with other parties on the Government side of the House.

I have no objection to the Country Party doing this.

Mr. A. Thomson: Thank you for that.

Mr. CORBOY: If the member for Katanning wishes to run his party on these lines, that is the concern of the Country Party only, but I maintain that Mr. Monger, in this particular controversy, has backed up the statement of the Leader of the Opposition and denied the statement of the deputy Leader of the Country Party.

Mr. A. Thomson: Have you noticed that everything done at our conference is published, that we sit with open doors?

Mr. CORBOY: Yes, and I can give the hon. member an assurance which can be borne out by members on the Government side who have belonged to the Labour Party, that everything done at our conferences is published in our own paper just as the proceedings of the hon. member's conferences are published in his own paper.

Mr. Pickering: We publish ours in the "West Australian."

Mr. CORBOY: Well, that paper supports the Country Party. What difference does it make?

Mr. A. Thomson: I know of a Labour conference that was held in Perth with closed doors, and no one could get in or out.

Mr. Munsie: You never saw a conference with closed doors yet.

Mr. CORBOY: I wish to enter a protest against one statement which was made by Mr. Monger and which is repeatedly being made, namely that the deficit in this State is due almost entirely to the State Trading Concerns.

The Minister for Works: He does not know what he is talking about.

Mr. CORBOY: Quite so, and I want the Government to deny the accuracy of his statement. A few evenings ago the Premier, when referring to this matter, told the House that the State Trading Concerns during last year had made a profit of nearly £8,000.

The Minister for Works: We made £15,000 on the State Sawmills alone.

Mr. CORBOY: I venture to say that but a tiny proportion of our deficit to-day is due to any of our State Trading Concerns. The statement, however, has gone out repeatedly. It has been used by members of the Country Party in an endeavour to damn the Labour Party for the reason that these trading concerns were brought into existence through the agency of the Labour Party. The statement has been used in an endeavour to convince the people that our deficit is due to these trading concerns. I do not think anyone in the community has had half as good a deal from these trading concerns as the farmers, for instance, have had from the State Implement Works and the rest of them. The farmers have had even more advantage out of these things than have the people represented on this side of the House. Whenever statements of this kind are made I want to see the Government do their duty and put them right, and point out that these things are not as stated by members on the other side of the House.

The Minister for Works: That man does not know what he is talking about.

Mr. CORBOY: I have held that opinion of him for a long time. I would again appeal to the Government to give us, as early as possible, a definite idea of what they are going to do towards stopping the drift. Without following the old channels let us find a new line which will not impoverish and hurt the people in the way that we find to-day. Let the Government evolve some means of pulling the country out of the mire that it is wallowing in to-day. Let us make an endeavour to get upon our feet. Let me add to the assurances of my leader and others on this side of the House and say that I will give every possible assistance to any equitable and just measure that will hold out some hope of stopping the financial drift. Let me assure Ministers that I have no desire as a private member to embarrass them in any way. I recognise that they are faced with one of the toughest propositions that has yet confronted them in the matter of the finances. I have no desire to place before them any requests which I think should not be granted, or are unreasonable and likely to embarrass them. Let me again make an appeal on behalf of the men out back—those who have had to face many a thirsty day, and have suffered many privations from year to year in the hope, as Micawber would say, that something would turn up—to the end that greater consideration shall be extended to them in the future than has been extended to them in the past.

Mr. ANGELO (Gascoyne) [5.18]: There seems to be an epidemic of congratulations in the House, and I find myself affected by some of the germs of that complaint. I will preface my speech by congratulating you, Sir, on your return to the seat you now occupy. During the last month I paid a visit to the Eastern States, and it was my privilege to also visit the Federal Houses of Parliament and the two State Houses. As a result I find that this House stands out for the decorum and dignity with which its deliberations are conducted. This in a great measure is due to the able manner in which you, Sir, have presided over its deliberations. I am also glad to see how well, comparatively speaking, members of this Chamber attend to their duties. I visited the Federal House on four different occasions. On one occasion there were 17 out of 75 members present, on another occasion 14, on another 13, and on the fourth occasion, when a most important debate was taking place, there were only 7 members of that august body sitting in their places. It is a deplorable thing that our Federal members do not attend more regularly to the work for which they are so highly paid.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: You will have an opportunity of changing them next year.

Mr. ANGELO: On each of the occasions when I visited the Federal House our good friend, Mr. Gregory, was in his seat, the member for Fremantle was there on one occasion, and the other members from Western Australia were conspicuous by their absence. I join with other members in congratulating our lady member. It is indeed a good thing to see a lady in the House who will look after the interests of the race and home. The member for West Perth said that it is not a good thing for man to be alone. I say it is not a good thing for one woman to be alone. I hope shortly that the member for West Perth (Mrs. Cowan) will have one or two colleagues sitting in the House with her.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: When I was young I was satisfied with one at a time.

Mr. ANGELO: We have only one lady amongst 49 of us. That is perhaps what appeals to a good many of us. An excellent opportunity might be grasped for increasing the number of our lady members when the Re-distribution of Seats Bill comes along. Perhaps, by cutting out a few of the electorates and putting aside four or five seats for women members, the State voting as a whole for those particular four or five, we might get the desired effect. I am surprised that the member for Claremont should object to such a proposal. He has taken the most coveted seat in the House as it is alongside that of the lady member. I also desire to congratulate the various new members of this House. I am particularly pleased to see the new members on the opposite side of the House. The Opposi-

tion has not gained much in numbers as a result of the elections, but in its new members I feel sure it has gained much in talent. I consider that no Government can be properly run without a good Opposition. They need a good Opposition, and their supporters do also, to keep them up to the mark.

The Minister for Mines: You ought not to be putting thoughts into their heads.

Mr. ANGELO: We saw last year how irregularly members were to be seen in their seats, but now I think it will be found that members will stick more closely to them. A good deal has been said about the Country Party during the course of the debate. Even the last speaker threw a few bouquets at the party to which I belong. I would not have referred to the matter but for the statement of the member for North-East Fremantle (Hon. W. C. Angwin), who said that there were some members who had joined the Country Party and who were rather sorry they had done so. He appeared to look in my direction. I assure him that I am not at all sorry I joined the Country Party. I am satisfied that I did the best possible thing for my electorate and the State as a whole when I did so. The Country Party, as it exists to-day, is a totally different party from that which existed 13 months ago. Some 18 months ago, when I was first invited to join that party, I declined to do so. I said, as the member for North-East Fremantle has said, it was a selfish party representing one particular industry amongst the primary products of the State. I said that whenever the association could extend its objective to cover all primary industries, and so that there would be no mistake about its objects alter its name to that of the Primary Producers' Party, I would be only too pleased to join it. I think the member for Kimberley (Mr. Durack) replied in the same way. At the ensuing conference, held 12 months ago to-day, the name was altered to the Primary Producers' Party, and the objective of that body extended to cover all kinds of primary industries.

Mr. Lambert: That is a very weak apology.

Mr. ANGELO: It may be so in the opinion of the hon. member, but not in the opinion of those who count. The Primary Producers' Party represents all the primary products of the State, not only the farming and wheat growing industry, but the mining industry, of which the member for Coolgardie is a representative, and as such could safely join the party; the pearling industry, the timber industry, and every primary product in which the State is interested.

Hon. T. Walker: Would you include the workers?

Mr. ANGELO: The workers have their own organisation looking after their interests. It is very desirable that the organisation to which I belong should also be formed in the interests of the producers of the State. I find no fault with the organ-

isation that is looking after the workers. It is because of that organisation that its members have such different and better conditions to work under than they had before. It is only by organisation that a community can be built up. It may be said that imitation is the sincerest form of flattery. I do not mind if it is said that the organisation referred to by the hon. member has set the example, and that the primary producers have followed it. The member for Yilgarn (Mr. Corboy) referred to the constitution of the Primary Producers Party. If he will turn up that constitution he will find its objects covered by one paragraph—

To watch over and guard the interests of the primary industries of the State, and generally to promote the interests of those engaged in such industries.

Mr. Lambert: That is for the masters.

Mr. ANGELO: Can any member find fault with that paragraph? This party embraces all primary producers. We do not restrict our membership to wealthy people. We have wealthy pastoralists amongst us, and also men who are striving day and night to earn a small pittance and make a living from their primary products. It is the duty of the party to watch over every section of these people who depend upon their primary products for their living.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: You have only changed the name.

Mr. ANGELO: The entire objective of the organisation has been changed. We have committees in our association, one representing the pastoralists, another the farmers, another the fruit growers, another representing those engaged in the mining industry, another representing those interested in the pearl shell industry, and so forth, and they all send delegates to the common executive body. What organisation could be finer, or what better could be done in the interests of the State?

Mr. Underwood: What do we care about the party anyhow?

Mr. ANGELO: That is an extraordinary remark when the hon. member must realise what the party means in the government of the State to-day.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: Dr. Page said that yesterday.

Mr. ANGELO: There is no need for Dr. Page to say it. This party is now a totally different one from what it was 13 months ago. Then, this party had only one representative in the Cabinet. Apart from Honorary Ministers, we had only one member in the Cabinet, as against five Ministers of another party.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: Honorary Ministers take the same rank in Cabinet as other Ministers.

Mr. ANGELO: Yes; but it is evidently seen that Honorary Ministers are not required, and, further, the Constitution lays down that there shall be six executive Ministers. We had one Minister 13 months ago: to-day we have three Ministers—half the Cabinet. Further, in this Chamber, which is the popular

Chamber, the House that deals with the financial affairs of the State, we have three out of five Ministers. I may go further and say that the Premier, although he does not belong to the Country Party, is the finest Country Party man in the House. What reason, then, have we to complain? We do not complain. It is said the member for Katanning (Mr. A. Thomson) held out a threat the other evening that if the Government did not do certain things the Premier would be put out of office. I say deliberately that no threat was uttered. There was simply a declaration of what the member for Katanning himself thought and what the other members of this party think, and what every member on this side of the House thinks; I may add, what every member on the Opposition side of the House likewise thinks.

The Minister for Works: The member for Katanning said he spoke on behalf of the party.

Mr. ANGELO: The member for Katanning could easily have said the same thing on behalf of every member of this House. What he stated was simply that if the Premier, or any other member of the Cabinet, did not do his utmost to keep down expenditure, the present Government would have to be replaced by another Cabinet. Has not every other member of the House who has spoken said practically the same thing? However, I go further and say that the present Premier and his Ministers are doing their utmost to keep down expenditure. I feel certain of that; otherwise I should not support them.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: But the member for Katanning said that your party had instructed Ministers to do that.

Mr. ANGELO: The hon. member interjecting is wrong. A threat is the declaration to a man who is not doing what he ought to do that he is to receive some punishment. But here there was simply a declaration that if the members of the present Government did not do their utmost to economise, they would have to give way to some other Administration. I think the member for Katanning was perfectly right in making that declaration, and I consider that in doing so he was voicing the opinion of the party as a whole. Something has been said about Mr. Monger being a Tsar over this party. At the time I joined the Country Party, I did not know Mr. Monger; I had never met him up to that time. However, I have since had the pleasure of meeting him on many occasions; and I say emphatically that Western Australia has not a more ardent patriot than Mr. Monger, the president of the Primary Producers' Association.

The Minister for Works: That gentleman aspires to be the dictator of Western Australia.

Mr. ANGELO: Mr. Monger would be the last man to do that. He could easily become a member of this House. I know that, and I say it deliberately.

Hon. P. Collier: Mr. Monger would lose his power if he became a member of Parliament.

He would be merely a politician then. He has more power where he is.

Mr. ANGELO: I agree. The Country Party can easily obtain members of Parliament to represent its interests, and can probably get many Ministers to do so; but I doubt if there is in Western Australia to-day a man who could replace Mr. Monger as president of that very important association.

Hon. P. Collier: Hero-worship!

Mr. ANGELO: Mr. Monger is giving all his time and energy to that important post for the good of the State, of which he is a native; and he is doing that work in an honorary capacity. I would like to know how many other so-called Tsars of other associations give their time and energy in an honorary capacity. When I went to the first executive meeting of the association, which I did by invitation—

Mr. Lambert: By command.

Mr. ANGELO: —I was welcomed, and was told that I should be welcome to any and every meeting of the executive, that I was quite free to take part in the executive's deliberations but that it was to be clearly understood I would not be dictated to in any shape or form and would be absolutely free regarding what I said and did in Parliament. If there were even 25 per cent. of truth in what certain members have said about outside domination of this party, I for one, and I think the member for Kimberley (Mr. Durack) as well, would not remain in the party for five minutes. The statement as to domination from outside is absolutely untrue and without foundation.

Hon. P. Collier: Why only yourself and the member for Kimberley? Have you no such faith in the other members sitting around you? Do you mean that they would put up with outside domination?

Mr. ANGELO: The member for Kimberley and myself are the two latest to join the Country Party. I do not wish to be misunderstood at all. I feel perfectly certain that other members around me are of exactly the same way of thinking, and that if domination from outside were attempted they would not stand it.

Mr. Mansie: Can you give an explanation of that clause in the constitution of the Primary Producers' Association to which the member for Yilgarn (Mr. Corboy) made reference?

Mr. ANGELO: I think I will leave that to the member for Sussex (Mr. Pickering), who has already stated his intention of doing so. I do not wish to encroach on his domains, and I do not like repetition in this Chamber. One of the planks of the constitution of the Primary Producers' Association is decentralisation; in fact, that is one of the most important planks.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: Your association will have to alter human nature.

Mr. ANGELO: The Country Party are out to make the State more prosperous; that is to

say, the rural portions of the State. They are out to break down the ever growing and ever increasing cities, which mean nothing but race suicide in the near future.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: The position is the same all over the world.

Mr. ANGELO: It is not so all over the world. Take the case of the United States of North America. I only wish the hon. member interjecting could have heard Dr. Page's speech last night, when all these questions were dealt with. In that case the hon. member would be a wiser man than he is to-day. Of the finances we have heard a good deal, and I shall not dwell on that subject, as there will be an opportunity of dealing with it later. However, a few words appeared in the Press to the effect that I had said in this Chamber that I was satisfied with the condition of the finances. That is absolutely not the case. Only a maniac could be satisfied with the present state of the finances, which is most unsatisfactory. What I did say was that the Premier's statement as to the finances, and the Premier's explanation of why his anticipations had not been realised, were satisfactory to me. The reason is obvious. How can any Treasurer or any business man who forms his estimates have those estimates verified if there is an outside body like the Arbitration Court coming in to upset his calculations? I am not objecting to the wages which the Arbitration Court has granted, but I contend that the Premier's estimates were totally upset by the court's awards. I am not saying that the wages awarded were just or were unjust; but those wages were undoubtedly the reason why the Premier's forecasts were not verified.

The Minister for Works: The Premier has stated that.

Mr. ANGELO: Yes. So far as I am concerned, that explanation is perfectly satisfactory; and I fail to see how the Premier could be expected to do better.

Mr. Lambert: But what about the increases in fares and freights?

Mr. ANGELO: There is, however, one phase of the Arbitration Court with which I cannot agree, and that is the retrospective nature of some of its awards. I do not think it fair that either the Arbitration Court or any other tribunal should deliver retrospective awards.

Hon. P. Collier: Retrospective awards are a fair thing if we are not providing such machinery as will enable men to secure awards promptly. If the men are kept waiting six months for their due, then it is a fair thing to make the award retrospective.

Mr. ANGELO: The sooner we provide machinery to do away with retrospective awards, the better.

Hon. P. Collier: There is a case now on the list of the Arbitration Court, which has been there since last October.

Mr. ANGELO: Such a position is ridiculous, and should be rectified as speedily as possible. I am very pleased that since the

debate on the Supply Bill the Premier and the Leader of the Opposition have agreed that there is a good deal of Federal extravagance, and that our unfavourable financial position is in large measure due to that Federal extravagance.

Hon. P. Collier: The Federal people have rectified all that. They are saving £1,200 a year in printing!

Mr. ANGELO: I have already given notice of a motion for the appointment of a select committee to consider the relations between this State and the Commonwealth, and I trust hon. members will agree to that motion, so that we can thoroughly inquire how Federation is affecting Western Australia, and so that we can prepare our case for the forthcoming convention. We understand that a convention is to be held very shortly. As soon as the necessary measure has been passed by the Federal Parliament, there will be a rush to elect delegates, and then those delegates will be rushed over to Melbourne to attend the convention, and there is considerable danger that they will not know what they are sent to the convention for. Hon. members who have happened to be concerned in litigation know that a man who has an action to bring does not simply present himself before a barrister and tell him the facts of the case and say, "Go into court and argue the case on my behalf." The usual and proper course is for the man to go to a solicitor, who looks carefully into the case, and then prepares a brief for the barrister, who goes into court and pleads. That is the procedure this State should adopt with regard to the approaching convention. We should appoint a select committee to act as a firm of solicitors on behalf of this State, to collect the evidence, and to submit something in the nature of a brief to the delegates who will represent Western Australia in Melbourne at the convention. Now I come to the North-West. For the last four years the Governor's Speech has contained a paragraph dealing with the North-West—a paragraph regularly every session. That paragraph has invariably made promises of early development of the North-West. I think the thing started with three lines, and got to five, and then reached seven. This year's Governor's Speech, however, contains 10 lines devoted to the North-West. In my opinion, the time has arrived when the Government and this House must take into serious consideration the development of the North-West. There must be no more hesitation in the matter. As many of us are aware, a strong movement already exists for the creation of new States. The convention is due at the end of this year or the beginning of next, and probably there will not be another convention for 20 years to come; and therefore the movement for the creation of new States will use every endeavour to place that objective before the Australian people and before the convention.

Mr. Pickering: Do you favour a north-west State?

Mr. ANGELO: Unless the Government take immediate steps to develop the North, I can see no other way to achieve that object except by the creation of a new State. We all know that the only title which Australians have to hold this vast continent is effective occupation. A new world has been created since the War, and one of the most important centres of that new world is the Pacific, with America on one side of it, and Japan and Australia on the other. We must have effective occupation of every portion of this vast territory of ours if the Australians are to hold Australia. We must never lose sight of the fact that adjoining our very shores there are countries with close on one thousand millions of people, which population is increasing at the rate of five millions per annum. That is to say, the yearly increase of those countries is equivalent to the entire population of Australia. That is why I think it essential that something should be done immediately towards the development of this vast territory called the North-West, which at present is carrying not more than 3,000 people. It is the most vulnerable part of Australia.

Mr. Pickering: Is it any different from the Northern Territory?

Mr. ANGELO: When I speak of the North-West, I include the Northern Territory. Our North-West and the Northern Territory adjoin each other, and one is just as vulnerable as the other. And I think that the fiasco that has taken place in the development of the North-West territory shows conclusively that the development of that part of the State as a whole cannot be successfully carried out except by a Government domiciled within the territory itself.

Mr. Money: Quite right; it cannot be done from outside.

Mr. ANGELO: The Minister for Mines said last year that the development of the North-West could not be undertaken for 25 years. What will happen if it is not developed within the next 10 years?

Mr. Lambert: He meant when the pastoral leases ceased to exist.

Mr. ANGELO: He did not mean anything of the kind. What he meant was that the Government were so busy developing the South-West that they had no time to develop the North. He declared that it would be soon enough to tackle the North-West in 25 years' time. Where does he expect the North-West to be in that time?

The Premier: He was referring to the Northern Territory.

Mr. ANGELO: He was referring to the North-West and he made the remark by way of interjection when the leader of our party was speaking. I can show it to the Premier in "Hansard." In the same way as this part of the State has suffered by reason of its immense distance from the Federal capital, so are we in the North-West suffering because of our distance from the seat of Government in Perth. Four years ago when I had the honour of moving the Address-in-

reply, I advocated that a North-West department should be formed and that a Minister for the North-West should be appointed. What I advocated was carried out in the following week—a department was created and the Minister for the North-West was appointed. Now, in addition, a Commissioner for the North-West has been appointed and in connection with that office, I would like to say that the North-West members have not been asked by the Minister to meet the newly appointed Commissioner. I do not think anyone of us has met him yet. I was told by a friend of this gentleman only this morning that the newly appointed Commissioner is pleased with his job and that he expects to spend three months of each year in the North-West and nine months in Perth. If that is to be the position, it was simply ridiculous to appoint him. We have a Minister domiciled in Perth and he has his secretary and staff here. If we do not get separation and have our own Government, the chief administrative officer must live all the time in the North-West. If he is not prepared to do that, the position will be untenable. Unfortunately, we have lost the services of Mr. Tindale. North-West members were unanimously of opinion that Mr. Tindale was the man we should have had for the job. He was a good engineer and knew North-West conditions thoroughly. Everyone would have welcomed his appointment.

The Minister for Works: He was not keen on it.

Mr. ANGELO: That, I understand, is the case.

Mr. Johnston: You have just as good a man now.

Mr. Münsie: What does he know about the North-West?

Mr. ANGELO: The trouble is that he does not know North-West conditions and it will take a year or two before he can acquire the knowledge which will be necessary for so important a job as that. The Minister is there to control and administer the department, and it would be a good idea if he were to meet the four representatives of the North-West in this House, and the three in the Upper House to consult on everything connected with the development of that part of the State and the policy generally to be adopted. It is all very well to have a department, a Minister, a Commissioner and members of the staff, but what can be done without money? To develop a huge territory like the North-West requires money, and there is not sufficient in the small votes which are provided from loans. What I urge is that a special loan of two millions be authorised exclusively for the development of the North. I do not say that it should be spent at once, but we should make a start at no distant date because if we do not give it the attention which it deserves, and occupy it successfully, there is nothing more certain than that we shall lose that territory.

As a matter of fact, the North-West at present is a menace to the Commonwealth and the Empire.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: Divide it up into small States.

Mr. ANGELO: I am contending that that will probably be necessary. If that were done, it would certainly be developed very much more rapidly. It might be said that there is no precedent for raising a special loan for the development of a particular part of the State. I would, however, refer hon. members to the loan which was raised for the development of the goldfields. I think that loan was for the sum of three millions and the object was to provide a water supply for Coolgardie and Kalgoorlie. That constituted the development of a particular portion of the State. Why not do the same for the North-West?

The Premier: There were 50,000 people on the goldfields.

Mr. ANGELO: There would be 50,000 people and more in the North-West if it were developed. I repeat that the North-West, as it is, is a menace to Australia, and if we want to keep it we must populate it and develop it. If the Government think they are not able to do this, let them say so, and then the Commonwealth can be asked to create a new State. The North-West then will work out its own salvation and end the present unsatisfactory state of affairs. Being a West Australian I do not wish to see a separate State created. I would prefer to see the West Australian Government hold on to it. If it is possible to do that, so much the better because I am satisfied that the North-West is one of the finest assets Western Australia has. Even if it be not possible to raise a special loan, I would suggest that from now on separate accounts be kept in connection with the development of the North-West.

The Premier: That would create a bad feeling straight away.

Mr. ANGELO: I do not think so. Later on a separate State may have to be created there, and the keeping of separate accounts from now would prove a great help to those who would subsequently have control.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: You would build up a big city at Broome.

Mr. ANGELO: What has happened in Queensland? Brisbane is a fairly big city and there are many good-sized towns north of Brisbane. Those towns are connected with the hinterland by rail, and that should be the policy adopted in connection with the opening up of the North-West. Spur lines will be necessary to connect the various ports with the producing areas. In that way we too would have fair-sized towns along the coast and these would become the termini of the various lines. The member for Pilbara (Mr. Underwood) expressed the opinion last night that the Government should purchase a new steamer. I do not wish to see the Government buy any more

ordinary boats for the North-West. If, however, they intend to provide new boats, those vessels should be built with every consideration for the peculiarities of the North-West coast.

Mr. McCallum: They could be built in Australia.

Mr. ANGELO: Why not, if we can build them in Australia? What I wish to point out is, however, that the coast is what might be called exacting, and vessels must be specially built to successfully engage in trade on that coast. Our experience has proved that it is not possible to buy a vessel that is suited to the conditions. At the present time there are three serviceable boats on that coast, and one of them stands alone as the most satisfactory that we have ever had. I have travelled on all the boats which have traded on that coast during the past 30 years, from the ill-fated "Koombana" to the "Rob Roy," and I can say that the "Minderoo" stands out alone. That vessel was built specially for the North-West trade, and while the "Charon" and the "Gorgon" are also excellent boats, they have not been as successful as the "Minderoo." This is what I told the Premier last year when the Government sent Home a man to advise on the kind of boat that should be secured for the North-West trade. The "Bambra" is quite unsuitable. She draws too much water and is too slow, and does not carry sufficient cargo to make the run profitable. Let me give an instance. The other day she was sent to Carnarvon for a load of sheep. She was doing nothing at the time and to earn freight it was good business to send her, but she only carried 3,000 sheep, whereas the "Minderoo" could have carried 5,000 or 6,000.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: We were lucky to get the "Bambra" when we did.

Mr. ANGELO: Under the new arrangements brought into force in connection with the Navigation Act, a boat trading between two States is considerably handicapped. The trips which the "Bambra" makes to Port Darwin and which occupy four days, must result in a big loss. If that extension were cut out I feel certain that the "Bambra" would be able to make two additional trips to the North-West each year. Reference was made to the loss which had been sustained by the Port Hedland-Marble Bar Railway. Last year I took the trouble to get the exact figures for the previous five years and found that from a loss of some £2,000 or £3,000 during the first years, that had been turned to a profit of £400 or £500 in the last year. That, of course, was before interest and sinking fund had been deducted, so that on the operations for the year the loss was about £11,000. A considerable amount of increased benefit could be obtained from this railway. Pastoralists in other districts have to pay for the carriage of their wool and stores, and it works out at about 1s. 9d. per ton per mile. In addition, they

have to provide back loading. Taking the latter into consideration, it means that the cost represents about 2s., if not more, to bring the wool down to the port, and the same charge is levied on the small amount of goods needed for the station requirements. The Port Hedland line has been engaged in carrying wool and goods for 6d. a mile. That is the charge levied upon the pastoralists in that area; they could easily pay 1s., if not more. Why should the pastoralists in that area have such an advantage over pastoralists in other districts? Last year I urged that a railway should be taken from Carnarvon to the Junction. I understand that a report has been supplied by Mr. Tindale regarding the proposition, but I have not seen it. In making out estimates of expenditure and revenue in connection with that proposed railway, I put down 1s. per ton per mile for the carriage of wool and produce. The pastoralists would also pay that amount on the goods carried back by train on the return journey. In these days 1s. per ton per mile is little enough for pastoralists to pay for these advantages.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: Are you listening to these remarks, Mr. Minister for Railways?

The Minister for Mines: I have taken a note of them.

Mr. ANGELO: I do not see why the pastoralists should have the advantages of the railway and not pay for them. The Premier has stated that £16,000,000 is to be spent upon a closer settlement scheme in the South-West. I have nothing against any closer settlement scheme in the South-West, but the State is up against a pretty tough proposition at the present time. Money is badly wanted and time is the essence of the contract. In the South-West, it must be remembered, we will have to wait for from 7 to 10 years before such a scheme would become profitable.

Mr. Pickering: You are taking a pessimistic point of view.

Mr. ANGELO: There is a tremendous amount of clearing to be done in the South-West and some of the soil is sour and has to be sweetened. On the other hand, a land settlement scheme in the North-West would be reproductive inside 18 months.

Mr. Pickering: Have you had any experiments to prove that?

Mr. ANGELO: Yes, and that is the result.

Mr. Pickering: Where were the experiments undertaken?

Mr. ANGELO: In the Gascoyne, and in districts further north.

Mr. Pickering: The people have not taken on this proposition.

Mr. ANGELO: They have never had any encouragement. I will give hon. members one case to demonstrate what I mean. Some two years ago a gentleman representing a Melbourne syndicate approached the Government with a request to be allowed to purchase from 7,000 to 10,000 acres near Carnarvon and he guaranteed to spend £30,000 in developmental work during the first three years.

Mr. Pickering: That must have been De Garis.

Mr. ANGELO: No, it was not De Garis. The Government kept this man waiting for two years and then the proposition was turned down.

Mr. McCallum: What is the explanation?

Mr. ANGELO: I have never been able to get a satisfactory explanation. One suggestion was that the present Act only allowed a person to take up 1,000 acres and therefore a special Act would have to be prepared to deal with the position. This syndicate waited for over two years without any satisfactory results. I want to ask the Premier if in the event of a company being prepared to spend £200,000 on an approved proposition in the Gascoyne, £100,000 to be spent in the first ten years, he would be prepared to sell the company 50,000 acres. If the Premier gives a satisfactory answer to that question, an application for that area will be placed in his hands within a week and a guarantee will be given that the sum mentioned will be spent in a developmental scheme in that district.

The Premier: I think you had better give notice of the question.

Mr. ANGELO: I hope that the Premier will think about this matter. I am not kite flying or in any way making fun of the House. This is a serious, solid proposition.

The Premier: You show the £200,000 and I will give you an answer.

Mr. ANGELO: What does the Premier mean? Does he simply want an assurance or proof that the money will be available?

Mr. Johnston: He wants you to show the bona fides of the offer.

The Minister for Agriculture: Show us the money. Who is the man?

Mr. ANGELO: It is not a man; it is a company who are prepared to take on this proposition. I have been urging the Government to do something along these lines for some years past. The Government will not do it. Are they prepared to allow private enterprise to carry it on? That is the question which I put to the Premier. It is absolutely necessary that these lands in the North-West should be populated and developed. The Government have already turned down one proposition from a private source. They have not gone seriously into the matter themselves.

The Premier: We turned down a proposition certainly, but you show us your £200,000 or prove that you have got it and we will talk business.

Mr. ANGELO: I feel certain that the company will not ask the Government for any title to the land until they have spent the money I have mentioned. Does the Premier expect them to put the £200,000 on the Table? It will be a solid company and I am perfectly satisfied that they will satisfy the Premier on all points.

The Premier: Very well.

Mr. ANGELO: The idea is to get Anglo-Indians, not coloured men, but old civil servants and army officers who have lived in a

tropical climate for years past, to come to Western Australia. It is considered that the climatic conditions in the Gascoyne will be more suitable to them than the climate further south.

The Premier: I will meet you.

Mr. ANGELO: Such a scheme would not interfere with any land settlement proposals down south. Markets for what the people will produce up there are available in the adjoining islands in the Dutch East Indies.

Mr. Pickering: I thought you wanted to grow bananas.

Mr. ANGELO: That is only one product of many that can be grown in the Gascoyne district. The settlers there could go in for dairying and butter making to an extent which would astonish even the member for Sussex. I hope that, should there be an extension of the State shipping service, it will be to the Dutch East Indies. I spoke on this matter last year and I notice from the daily Press that the Minister for Mines stated he was going to encourage an extension of the State steamship service to Java and that he was going up himself to inaugurate the trade. I have heard since that the Government have purchased a number of cattle and sheep to send up there. I hope that is not so.

The Premier: We have not purchased them to engage upon the trade ourselves, but only as agents for the Dutch Government.

Mr. ANGELO: I am glad to hear that, for I do not want to see the State embarking upon another State enterprise. I am certain we could encourage a splendid trade with the islands from our North-Western districts. Last year I had four cablegrams in one day asking for sheep for Singapore. The proposals had to be turned down because there was not freight available.

The Minister for Mines: Was that the only reason?

Mr. ANGELO: Yes.

The Minister for Mines: Are you quite sure?

Mr. ANGELO: That was the only reason. We tried to get freight on the Singapore boats, but they were all bound to serve one man.

The Minister for Mines: Now you are giving some information; that is more like it.

Mr. ANGELO: The freight was not available, for what freight was available had already been taken by this individual. It was not left idle, for the freight was being used fully by that man. We hoped to get some other line by which to ship the sheep, but, so far, no way has been found out of the difficulty. Regarding the trade with Singapore and Java, I have for some years heard it said that the Singapore market for beef was limited. That may be so, for there may be a small population at that port to be served with meat, but, on the other hand, there is a tremendous trade to be done with the ships that call at Singapore, which is the third largest port in the world.

The Minister for Mines: It is the largest trans-shipment port in the world.

Mr. ANGELO: There is a tremendous tonnage entering and leaving that port. If floating abattoirs were centred at Singapore, then our ships could take the bullocks to Singapore and place them aboard the abattoirs. The requirements for the shore could be taken off and the cattle could be kept aboard, fed and slaughtered as required. Ships coming into the harbour would see the floating abattoir and give their orders, receiving their supplies almost immediately.

The Minister for Mines: Do you suggest that we should provide the floating abattoirs?

Mr. ANGELO: I intended to suggest that as the "Kwinana" is about to be scrapped, she could be used for that purpose. The vessel could be towed to Singapore and turned into floating abattoirs. The bullocks could be put aboard and slaughtered in due course.

The Minister for Mines: I thought you did not want any more State trading concerns.

Mr. ANGELO: I think speculators could be found who would be prepared to lease the "Kwinana" and carry on the work at Singapore. At any rate, I made that suggestion because I heard that the Government are going in for this trade and that they are sending up sheep and cattle for that purpose.

The Minister for Mines: We are sending them to the Dutch Government, and we are acting on their behalf only.

Mr. ANGELO: That is all right then. Coming to the Wyndham and Carnarvon works, I consider it is regrettable that these two works should not be operating at the present time. While I was East some time ago, I had many conversations with the meat people there. I told them of our difficulties and was informed that I should be very glad that our troubles were so small. I was informed that there were numbers of works throughout Australia which were not operating and which had contracts for the purchase of stock and labour, in connection with which contracts they had to pay heavy sums.

Sitting suspended from 6.15 to 7.30 p.m.

Mr. ANGELO: Before tea I was referring to the meat works at Wyndham and at Carnarvon. I mentioned that in conversation with some of the meat people in the East I was told we ought to consider ourselves lucky that our position is not worse than it is. At Carnarvon the works are practically completed but, owing to the miserable prices offered for the product, it is impossible to profitably operate those works at present. However, I think the district and the State can be congratulated on having the works ready for operation immediately the markets improve. Had the building of those works been left until now, when the prices of wool and meat have so greatly depreciated,

I am certain the works would not have been started for some time to come. I hear that the Government have not purchased any stock in anticipation of resuming operations at the Wyndham Meat Works. Consequently, to at least that extent they are in a better position than they might otherwise have been. I still think the Government should have got rid of those works. Three years ago I told them that they could get a quarter of a million for the works, and I strongly advised them to sell, and make the first loss the last.

Mr. Johnston: And that loss over half a million!

Mr. ANGELO: I am pretty sure that it will now be considerably over a million. However, if we were to cut down the capital and get rid of the works to a company of local pastoralists, or lease them for a long term at a minimum rental, the Government would be well advised to do so.

Mr. Mann: Would the local pastoralists take them?

Mr. ANGELO: They might, at a reasonable figure. Since the last Parliament, we in the North have had the pleasure of a visit from the Premier. While there he was not only weather-bound but "beknighted." I congratulate him on his knighthood, but it certainly was a pity that he should have been weather-bound, for he was unable to see either the Gascoyne or the Murchison, and under this disability he cannot have anything like a fair idea of the potentialities of the North-West. For years past northern members, in endeavouring to impress the Premier with the possibilities of the North, have met with rather an unsympathetic hearing. Yet immediately the Premier returns from the North-West we read a most glowing Press interview, in which he spoke in the highest terms of all that he had seen. I am very pleased that he visited the North, and I trust that other Ministers and members will make a similar trip.

Mr. Boyland: Has he promised any assistance to the fisheries?

Mr. ANGELO: I am very much disappointed with the Premier's attitude in that connection. After several years of endeavour, we have been able to persuade a man, representing a company, to spend £12,000 in establishing a fishing industry at Carnarvon; but owing to the abnormal expense and unexpected trouble in the distribution of fish in the metropolitan area, where he has to compete with the fish ring, he found he was £3,000 or £4,000 short of his requirements. He offered the whole of his securities to the Government for a temporary loan of this amount, but his offer was refused.

Mr. Mann: Are not his works so situated that they cannot be economically operated?

Mr. ANGELO: No, that is absolutely wrong. The works are on the most suitable site imaginable. A lot of this man's pro-

duct is now being distributed through the metropolitan area. The trouble is that he requires a little more money to put into the distribution and, further, to insulate the steamer "Torrens," which the Government have leased to him, and so enable him to give the Shark Bay pearlers an assured living in catching fish for him until the price of shell returns to normal. However, the Government have turned down his proposition, and he is now in the Eastern States endeavouring to raise the capital he requires. If he be successful I feel sure that fish, instead of being, as it is to-day, a luxury in the metropolitan area, will become a staple article of diet. The Premier was very much impressed also with the possibilities of tropical agriculture. He enumerated a number of products that can be grown up there. What I object to is that he has robbed me of my title, for whereas until recently I was known in the House as "the member for bananas," we now hear the Premier irreverently referred to as "Banana Jimmy." I do urge the Government to afford members generally an opportunity for seeing the North-West for themselves. Dr. Page last night told an audience that he is advocating closer settlement in his electorate, about 200 miles from Sydney, that at last he had succeeded in persuading 36 members of the Legislature of New South Wales to visit his electorate, and that out of the 36 who went, 33 had not seen the district before. How many members of this Assembly know anything at all about the North-West and other outlying portions of the State? The Minister for the North-West has paid one visit to the North, but it is impossible in the course of a flying trip to make oneself acquainted with the capabilities of the district. Again, we desire to see some of our friends arrive up there during the summer, when they would be able to appraise the adverse conditions with which the men and women there have to contend.

Mr. Mann: Under that plan, you will not get population up there.

Mr. ANGELO: We shall get the population all right, but it will take time. Let me refer to the shearing trouble. The member for South Fremantle (Mr. McCallum) the other night expressed regret that the pastoralists would not agree to go to arbitration. If that offer had been made when the trouble first started, the pastoralists would have readily accepted the invitation. But it is too late now.

Mr. Underwood: The A.W.U. cannot get before the Arbitration Court.

Mr. ANGELO: But they could have gone to private arbitration. However, the trouble has been going on for three months, and half the shearing has been done at 1920 rates, so what is the use of going to arbitration now? The strike is going strong, and so is the shearing—that is the position to-day. It is up to those who are holding out to realise that they have made a mistake. It is never discreditable to acknowledge a mistake, and without doubt a

mistake has been made. For four successive years have the shearers asked for increased rates and, generally those increased rates have been conceded. Now, however, they are up against a brick wall. They are asking the pastoralists to pay increased rates when the industry cannot possibly afford it. We occasionally see reports of good sales of wool but, taking the prices as a whole, they will not allow the pastoralist to accede to the new demand made upon him. According to an article to-day, we learn that six million bales have to be got rid of before prices can become anything like normal, and the present low prices of wool are bound to continue. I trust that the Trades Hall officials will yet see that they have made a mistake, and will come along and allow the shearing to proceed at the 1920 rates, which the pastoralists are prepared to pay. I think the pastoralists themselves are largely to blame for the present position. If they had organised as they should have done years ago, they would have been able to resist an unjust demand such as I consider this to be. I do not say that they should organise to resist a just demand; I do not think they would do so, but when confronted with an unjust demand, such as I consider this to be, they should be able to resist it. The Country Party have organised; we have followed the example set by the Labour Party. Imitation, we are told, is the sincerest form of flattery. The pastoralists should follow this lead. They should organise in order to be ready to meet any unjust demand of this kind. We all know that a pannikin might look all right, but there might be a hole in the bottom of it, making it useless for its purpose. This is the position of the pastoralists to-day. Two-thirds or three-fourths of the pastoralists are combined in the Pastoralists' Association, but unfortunately there is a leakage. Until they can get the pastoralists now standing out to combine with them, they will be unable to stand up against unjust demands. Some members might ask, "How can you make the men who are standing out join the association?" I say "Follow the example of the other associations, and if they do not come in, boycott them and treat them as outsiders." This could easily be done. Good organisation is required to meet good organisation on the other side.

Hon. P. Collier: You are advocating compulsory unionism.

Mr. ANGELO: For their own protection, the pastoralists will have to do it.

Hon. P. Collier: We were severely criticised years ago for having done the same thing.

Mr. ANGELO: I recognise what organisation has done for the Labour Party, and I for one am not too proud to follow that example in connection with anything with which I am associated. I am very pleased to see my friend, the member for Greenough (Hon. H. K. Maley), occupying a seat on the Ministerial benches. I am pleased especially for

the reason that he is practically a young man. Unfortunately, in most cases, Ministers of the Crown are selected from the older men, whose years of life are pretty well spent, and by the time they reach Cabinet rank, they are too old to be of much service to the State.

Hon. P. Collier: Do you assert that the Minister for Works is too old to be of much service to the State?

Mr. ANGELO: The Minister for Works is doing good work.

Hon. P. Collier: Is he too old now?

Mr. ANGELO: There is a provision in the Public Service Act which compels public servants to retire at 60 or 65 years of age, but this need not apply to Cabinet Ministers. If the member for Greenough makes good, he will have many years of good service in front of him. He has already shown that he is desirous of improving his department, a department which I have said in this House previously is the most important we have in the service of the State. It will be due to the good or bad advice given by the Department of Agriculture and its officers whether Western Australia ever becomes a great country. I am glad to learn of the reforms which the Minister is carrying out, and I trust he will be successful in his work. During the course of this debate, we have heard a little about the cost of living. A great deal has been said about the price of wheat, and a fair amount has been said regarding the proposal to increase the price of bread by a $\frac{1}{2}$ d. per loaf. Of course that would be bad enough, but with all due credit to those who are trying to keep down the price of bread, I would ask, what is the importance of this $\frac{1}{2}$ d. on a loaf compared with the price we are paying for meat? This, I consider, is a greater injustice to the people of the metropolitan area than an increase of $\frac{1}{2}$ d. on the loaf of bread would be.

Hon. P. Collier: Why not have a word with those North-West meat kings?

Mr. ANGELO: I wish it to be clearly understood that the grower is not getting the profit. Let me prove it.

Hon. P. Collier: Is it the middle man?

Mr. ANGELO: When I was in Sydney a month ago, I took particular notice of the market. Prime full-wooled wethers were selling at 25s. and 26s. a head. Good cattle of about 800lbs. weight were selling at £15. Over here, only last week, bullocks brought £12, and prime Carnarvon wethers, full woolled, brought 16s. in the market. Those wethers were carrying wool to the value of from 4s. 6d. to 5s. and they were 50-lb. wethers. Unfortunately, 500 of them were mine, so I know what I am talking about. This means that the wholesale butcher got those wethers for about 11s. each and the meat, therefore, cost him less than 3d. a lb. In Sydney similar wethers were bringing 25s. and 26s. a head.

Mr. Wilcock: I do not think so.

Mr. ANGELO: I saw them sold at the markets; I am speaking of the wholesale price. In Sydney I went round from shop to

shop and found that prime sirloin was being retailed at 9d. a lb., prime ribs at 7d., legs of mutton and mid-loin chops at 6d., corned beef at 3d., and 7lbs. of corned mutton for 1s. Until last week, when there was a fall of 1d. a lb. in prices, we in Perth were paying 11d. to 1s. a lb. for sirloin, 11d. for legs and loin chops, and 6d. to 7d. a lb. for corned beef. These figures show a difference of 25 to 30 per cent. in the wholesale price and 25 to 30 per cent. in the retail price between Perth and Sydney, so that the middleman here is getting 50 to 60 per cent. more than the middleman in Sydney.

Mr. Underwood: And we have a price-raising Commission, too.

Mr. ANGELO: We have a Prices Regulation Commission. Why there should be such a fuss about a paltry increase of $\frac{1}{2}$ d. on a loaf of bread when people are being asked to pay for meat at least 50 per cent. more than the people of Sydney, taking into consideration the prices to the producers and the consumers, I cannot understand. Why is this position of affairs existing to-day?

Mr. Heron: New South Wales has a Labour Government.

Mr. ANGELO: Surely the hon. member does not infer that the Government of this State are supporting the middleman. It is not the grower who is getting this extra money; in fact the grower here is not getting anything like so much as the producer in New South Wales is getting, and yet consumers here are paying more. The Prices Regulation Commission should inquire into this matter. I wish to point out what these comparatively high prices for meat mean to the metropolitan area. I guarantee that the average person in the metropolitan area can afford to eat meat only once a day at present, owing to the high prices, but if these prices were lowered to anything like those ruling in Sydney, or to what they ought to be here, people would be able to have meat two or three times a day. If they ate more meat, they would eat less butter, bacon and other things which we have to import from the Eastern States. Further, the pastoralists who at present find it difficult to discover markets for their stock would have an increased market here because of the heavier consumption. I ask the Government to take this matter in hand immediately and see if the price of meat cannot be lowered to something like a reasonable figure, lowered to the consumer and if possible raised a little for live stock in the interests of the producer. I notice by the Governor's Speech that a great number of new Bills, some of them important, are to be brought down. I trust that these Bills will be introduced much earlier this session than has been the practice in time past. Among the Bills listed are the Factories and Shops Amendment, the Land Act Amendment and other measures which are necessary simply to rectify mistakes made in previous legislation owing to the Bills having been rushed through the House during the

last hours of the session. I trust that the Government will see that these measures are introduced earlier in order to give the House a better opportunity to consider the various provisions before they are finally passed. I had expected during the course of this debate to hear some discussion on the Licensing Act under which a poll was recently taken. I trust that the amending measure will be a comprehensive one which will have the effect of controlling the consumption of liquor to a reasonable degree. I believe that liquor is one of the greatest curses and also one of the greatest blessings, and when legislating we should legislate against the curse part and leave the blessing part alone.

The Minister for Agriculture: What is the blessing part?

Mr. ANGELO: According to the quantity and the frequency with which liquor is taken.

The Minister for Mines: Are you going to muzzle a man to make him take less?

Mr. ANGELO: No, legislate against the curse part so that those people who take it in moderation shall not be affected by the measure. My opinion is that if the existing law had been properly administered in the past, the trouble which the country has experienced owing to over-indulgence by people would have been very much minimised. Probably the proposed Bill will cover any defects which the present Act contains. The licensing law is a most important one and it should be carefully administered. I suggest that the Bill should contain a provision that every barman, barmaid and steward who supplies or serves liquor should be licensed. If these bar tenders are licensed and a clause is placed in the Act under which their licenses are forfeited if they break the law in any way, it will be a big step in the direction of doing away with the harm that the consumption of liquor does at present. The Act should also provide that any person serving another with intoxicating liquor who is already under the influence of such liquor, would be severely punished. I am afraid the over-indulgence in liquor is doing a great deal more harm in some directions than it was some little time ago. A few weeks ago I was travelling in a tram to West Perth, and took my seat alongside a lady.

The Minister for Mines: We will take the rest as read.

Mr. ANGELO: I did not know the lady. She evidently knew, however, that I was a member of Parliament, for she had probably frequently come into the gallery. She said, "I want you to do something for me. I want you to go to a certain hotel in Perth about 11 o'clock in the morning and sit there for an hour."

Mr. Simons: And wait there for you?

Mr. ANGELO: She said, "I want you to see what you do see." I did what she asked me and sat there for an hour. I was horrified to see the number of women and young girls there, sometimes accompanied by men and sometimes not, sitting at the table of this, one of the leading hotels in Hay-street, and

partaking of not one, but in some cases two or three whiskies and sodas or cocktails within the house. These girls are to be the mothers of our future Western Australians. They were not ordinary flappers, but evidently girls of the higher class, well dressed, and of some position in the State. Not content with one drink, they had two or three brandies and sodas or whiskies and sodas, but particularly did they have cocktails. There should surely be some provision in the Licensing Act to prevent the landlord from allowing this to go on. If the landlord was possessed of any decent feeling, he would know the harm that was being done, and his honour and better judgment should prevent him from allowing this sort of thing to take place.

The Minister for Mines: It is not a very good outlook.

Mr. Teesdale: Was this in the morning?

Mr. ANGELO: Yes. This was taking place at one of our fashionable hotels in Perth, and is going on every day. So seriously did I regard it that I thought it ought to be given publicity. I do not know if the parents of these young girls or the husbands of the women know what is going on there. I hope when the Bill is brought down every effort will be made by hon. members to do away with the evils that befall those who do not know when they have had enough to drink, while at the same time not interfering with the liberty of those who only take it in reasonable quantities.

Mr. Lambert: Some of these young girls smoke as much as they drink.

Mr. ANGELO: Most of the girls I am speaking of had cigarettes in their mouths while they were drinking their cocktails. I am delighted with the tone of the debate so far as it has gone. We are all agreed it is necessary to economise. All sections of the House have said so. The speech of the Leader of the Opposition was most generous. Most of the other members and most people outside say that the drift must stop and that there must be no more deficits. The Leader of the Opposition has been most generous in his desires and suggestions. He says that so long as he sees we have turned the corner, and that the Government are cutting down the deficit by £250,000 for the present year, and will continue to cut it down by £100,000 in the years to follow, he will be satisfied. This should be possible, and with the assistance and advice of the entire House I think the Government should be able to accomplish it. The speeches which have been delivered by other members also give promise of good support to the Government. I was particularly interested in the speech delivered by the member for South Fremantle (Mr. McCallum), who has considerable influence with the workers. If he means all that he said—and I do not doubt him—there appears to be a silver lining upon the cloud of industrial unrest that has been causing so much trouble in the past to the industries of the State. If

we all work together and do our utmost to assist the Government in their task, I feel sure the State will speedily emerge from its trials and difficulties, and become once more a flourishing unit in the greatest and most glorious Empire the world has ever seen.

Mr. RICHARDSON (Subiaco) [8.10]: I wish to follow the precedent set by many other hon. members, and to congratulate the member for West Perth (Mrs. Cowan) upon being the first lady to be returned to any Parliament in Australia. I have been associated with her on many occasions outside the House in connection with various organisations. I say without fear of contradiction and without any hesitation that there is no woman in Australia more fitted to take her seat in Parliament than the member for West Perth. I desire also to pay a tribute to the Leader of the Opposition for the able speech he made on the Address-in-reply. Unfortunately, through illness, I was unable to attend the House on that occasion, but since then I have taken every opportunity of reading and studying his remarks. Perhaps the greatest compliment I can pay him is to say that I have set his speech as an example in moderation for myself as a new member. The new members of the House owe a great deal to the Premier for the trouble he has taken in presenting the financial reports to the House. He said that he had given more time to and taken more trouble over the preparation of the figures than on previous occasions because he desired that new members should thoroughly grasp the situation. I do not assert that I have thoroughly grasped the situation as yet, but while he was speaking I did learn many things I did not know before. The figures were so set out that by going into them carefully one could obtain a very thorough insight into the financial position. I am not unduly appalled by the five million deficit. I have sufficient faith in this young country to believe that if every member gives his whole attention to the finances, and does his best as a member, Western Australia is prolific enough and wealthy enough to rise above the present position. I have dissected the figures with the idea of boiling them down so that I might understand them myself and be able to discuss them reasonably before the House. It is evident, notwithstanding what has been said in the Press and on public platforms, that instead of the State trading concerns showing a loss, they have added over £7,000 to the general revenue during the last financial year. I have also discovered that the general revenue is almost, if not entirely, sufficient to cover our general expenditure. That being so, we have to find out where our actual losses are occurring. I find that these come under the heading of business undertakings, or public utilities. We are losing, for instance, a considerable amount on our railways. The reason for that is not far to seek, and my contention is that when we know exactly how it comes about, and why,

our railways are losing such considerable amounts of money, it will not be a very difficult proposition to discover a remedy. The whole financial position, it seems to me, may be described as due to the over capitalising of our public utilities, and more particularly the railways. The unfortunate part of it is that we are over-capitalised by loan moneys. The position is just the same as that of a man putting, say, £50,000 into a business and then finding that he can get only a turnover of £50 per week. The proposition is simply unsound. However, I shall not unduly criticise any past Government because of this aspect of the State's finances. I am reasonable enough to recognise that any other members of Parliament—and there are some hon. members now present who are implicated in this matter—would have adopted the same policy. For my part, I should have done so. At the time we were borrowing money to extend our railway system for the purpose of giving facilities to the settlers on our lands, there was a firm belief that the holders of land along the railway lines would do their duty, by making their land productive and thereby providing the railways with traffic sufficient to yield interest, sinking fund, and working expenses. To-day we find that that has not been accomplished.

Hon. P. Collier: Of course, the war overtook us a couple of years afterwards.

Mr. RICHARDSON: Yes; and that is why I do not intend to criticise the Parliaments of the past on the score of our having a deficit of five millions to-day. No matter what Government had been in power at that time—whether the present Opposition or the present Ministry—we would still be faced to-day with a very large deficit. The circumstances confronting past Governments have been abnormal, and it is unreasonable to suppose that Western Australia could have come out of them better than any other country in the world has done: all countries are in the same boat. But now that we have discovered our losses to be in great measure due to the fact that our public utilities are far in advance of present requirements, it remains for us, in our wisdom, to discover the best possible means of building up our transactions so that the public utilities may become payable propositions. In this Chamber I have heard two means suggested for reducing the deficit. The member for Yilgarn (Mr. Corboy), speaking on the Supply Bill, mentioned that 30 per cent. of the present strength of public servants could be done away with; and the hon. member suggested that those 30 per cent. should be given axes and sent into the country to clear land. I do earnestly hope that that pronouncement does not embody the policy of the Leader of the Opposition and of members sitting behind that gentleman. If we are going to cut down the Public Service by 30 per cent., throw one-third of our public servants on the cold world to find work at a moment's notice, we shall, I think, be doing some-

thing for which we shall be extremely sorry afterwards. As a new member I am not able to say whether the Public Service is or is not over-staffed; but I will say this, that if the Public Service is in fact over-staffed, I am going to stand behind any Government prepared to seek economy in the right direction when dispensing with some proportion of the public servants. Let me add that on every occasion when retrenchment is suggested, it is always the man on the lowest rung of the ladder who is to become its subject. I venture to say there are to-day in the Public Service many men who have been drawing tiptop salaries, having spent the best of their years in the Public Service, and having given of their best to that service, but who are now to a considerable extent past their usefulness. It may be contended that we should retain those public servants by reason of their former merits. But those men have been for years in a position to save money against their old age. The Minister for Agriculture said last night that there is no sentiment in business. I agree with him. If we find that those public servants are beyond the age when they can give a fair and full return for their salaries, I think we should start retrenchment at the top of the tree, if we are to have retrenchment in the Public Service. We have in that service young men who have entered it with the ambition to serve their country. I for one would hesitate very long before I agreed to those young men, full of vitality and energy and loyalty, being dismissed, while I know that there are in the service men who have outlived their usefulness, and are therefore due for retirement, or perhaps for retrenchment. On the other hand, another suggestion has been made for reducing the deficit. I was surprised and interested to learn from the Premier the other evening that practically the whole of the lands abutting on the railway system of this State are held by private persons. For some two or three years I had the opportunity of travelling over practically all the railway lines of Western Australia; and as a result of my observations I can state that there are millions—I am quite safe in saying "millions"—of acres of land lying practically undeveloped alongside the existing railway system. The Governments who built those railways built them in the belief that the lands abutting on the lines would be brought into production. Seeing that that anticipation has not been realised, it is our duty to cause the lands to be rendered productive at the earliest possible moment, so that our Railway Department may be enabled to render its operations payable. A further object to be achieved by the adoption of such a policy would be to assist genuine settlers, by enabling their freights and fares to be reduced considerably from the present figures. If the holders of the lands in question will

not bring them into production, we must find a means of making such holders pay to the State the equivalent of the freights and fares which their lands, in a condition of productiveness, would yield to the Railway Department. That appeals to me as a perfectly fair proposition. The lands I refer to are being held for one purpose, and one only, namely, the obtaining of the unearned increment which must result from the construction of railways through these properties. As land is continually being taken up and developed nearer to the metropolitan area, and as people are thereby being compelled to go further out, land necessarily becomes dearer in those portions of the country, and as land in the remoter districts increases in value by, say, £1 per acre, the land which lies nearer to the metropolitan area will advance in value by 30s. an acre.

Hon. P. Collier: We ought to have the betterment principle applied; that is, a charge on the land as its value is increased by reason of new railway construction.

Mr. RICHARDSON: The question of land taxation is one which the Government will have to take up very seriously, if they are going to assist the Minister for Railways to make his department a paying proposition. I repeat, it is in the Railway Department that our greatest loss is incurred; and therefore the Government must stand behind their Minister for Railways and absolutely tax unused land so as to obtain from it an equivalent of what it would yield to the railway system if put into production, by way of freights and fares. It appeals to me that as time goes on there may be a disposition to regard progress on the lines which I have suggested, as too slow. But I agree with the Leader of the Opposition that we are not going to get rid of our five-millions deficit within one year, or within five years. That work is going to take a long time. However, as representative of a metropolitan electorate, I am quite prepared to assist the Government in every possible way so long as I am satisfied that they are earnestly endeavouring to reduce the deficit, to secure economy in all directions, and to make our railway system pay. This is perhaps dealing directly with the finances as we find them to-day; but if we are going to build up this young country we must go further, and provide population, so that we may be enabled to develop Western Australia along proper lines. I listened with great interest to members on the Opposition side speaking on the immigration question, and similarly to members on this side of the House. I am in favour of an immigration policy, but that I am not in favour of any kind of immigration policy. I believe every member of this House will agree that our metropolitan area is at present overloaded with people. There are too many of our population living between Midland Junction and Fremantle for the work that is being

provided. In connection with any immigration policy that we adopt, we must see that we introduce into Western Australia the kind of people that we need. Let me say that I want, as immigrants, people of our own race, people from the British Isles. Even as regards such immigrants, we want to be informed regarding their merits, not when they arrive in Australia, but before they leave the Old Country. Before they embark, we want to be satisfied that they are the right class of immigrant, that they are men who will tackle our land problems, go out into the country and become agriculturists. I would strenuously oppose any other description of immigration policy, because it is only by introducing people who will become producers that we shall be able to build up this young country of ours. We have raised the cry "Produce, produce, produce"; but we cannot progress much further until such time as we bring more population into this State. If only we bring the right class of population, there will be no fear whatever of our future. In my opinion, the Britisher is the best class of immigrant. We should endeavour to bring him here, and to retain him here, and to settle him in a practical way, with every facility necessary for success. I hold that we should at all times afford our farmers adequate facilities. I have had some experience of farming, and I know the disabilities under which the agriculturist suffers. What we have to strive after is the production of wealth. It is no use our pointing to the unlimited potentialities of wealth in Western Australia, if we do not utilise those potentialities; and the only way we can do that is by bringing additional population here. Now I want to touch on another question; it necessitates my reverting to the railways. We have a considerable extent of our railway system running through auriferous country. I have had sufficient experience of prospecting to know that in our auriferous belts there are many hundreds of square miles which have never yet been properly prospected. I hold that the Government would be justified in giving every facility to prospectors; but I want to point out that there are prospectors and prospectors. From personal knowledge I can say that the geological conditions of this country are so very peculiar that a man must spend many years in prospecting before he becomes a really capable prospector.

Mr. Munsie: This country has proved that the geologist knows nothing about his subject.

Mr. RICHARDSON: I quite agree with the hon. member; and that is my reason for making this reference to prospecting. Western Australia has its own peculiarities as regards geological construction. If the Government are going to send out prospecting parties, I would advise them not to assist any party unless a first-class prospector of proved capacity is in charge, and, moreover, one who has a knowledge of the district which the party intend to prospect. At least one genuine expert prospector should be included

in each party. I believe that we are not likely to find another Golden Mile in Western Australia. We do not know what is under the earth, but it is very rarely that ever two mining districts of such a character are found in the one State. If history does not repeat itself in this instance, and we have another Golden Mile discovered, I am sure everyone will be pleased to admit that the predictions were wrong. We can only expect that in the future our mining industry will be spasmodic. I do not believe—and I hope I am wrong in that attitude—that we will find any more great mines in Western Australia. There can be no doubt whatever, however, that there is a considerable amount of wealth distributed throughout the auriferous areas and if we could only prospect the country properly and find that wealth, even though the discoveries were spasmodic, we would assist in the development of the State very considerably. There is no need to reiterate the arguments against the taxation placed upon prospectors' deals. It is needless to say that I am entirely opposed to such taxation. Should the Government have any taxation proposals which they intend to bring forward, which will unduly tax the prospector or the prospective buyer, I shall be entirely opposed to them. I believe that if a man has the temerity to go out prospecting under all sorts of adverse conditions, he is entitled to every penny he gets through the sale of any mine he may find, and I do not think the Government are entitled to take one penny from him for taxation arising out of any such sales. If we intend to build up this young country, we must give serious consideration to the development of secondary industries. The Minister for Railways stated the other night that the Government were paying particular and immediate attention to our secondary industries. I was delighted to hear that and I believe that the Minister was quite sincere in his remarks.

Hon. P. Collier: At the same time we are lamentably behind with it all.

Mr. RICHARDSON: I admit that.

Hon. P. Collier: The trouble is that we do not know where we can get our boys employment.

Mr. RICHARDSON: I was pleased to hear the remarks by the Minister, because I think that the Government have awakened to the fact that we must help secondary industries, not only to provide cheaper material for our people but to provide employment for our boys.

Hon. P. Collier: We train them here and send them to other countries to get a living.

Mr. Underwood: And yet we are bringing tradesmen here to-day.

Mr. RICHARDSON: Secondary industries are growing in Western Australia. They are already making headway despite all sorts of adverse conditions. That such should be the case should provide encouragement for other

men and companies with capital to come to Western Australia and start factories of one description or another. One point, however, must not be lost sight of. We must assure to people who have capital that their interests will be conserved, for otherwise we will be doomed to failure. We may build up firm structures on our primary products, and we may encourage our secondary industries, but unless the workers of Western Australia are to get a fair deal from the employers, we will not see very much advancement achieved. It is for this Government, and for any other Government, to see that we have industrial peace. It was stated by the member for South Fremantle (Mr. McCallum) that we had not experienced as many strikes in Western Australia as in other parts of Australia. That fact was well known to members before he made that statement, but its repetition served to indicate that there is something in Western Australia which has prevented strikes. That hon. member gave a great deal of credit to the secretary of the Employers' Federation and I want to endorse his remarks regarding that gentleman. Notwithstanding the fact that he is the secretary of the Employers' Federation he has been a good friend to the workers of Western Australia, because he has endeavoured on every occasion when a dispute has arisen, to bring about a conference between the parties so that work should not stop and the workers lose no money on account of that cessation. There is another phase to this question; there are other interests which have prevented strikes here. There are thousands of workers and good unionists who do not lend an ear to the doctrine of direct action. These men go into the highways and byways and denounce direct action. As a result they have held up strikes. I was very pleased to hear the member for South Fremantle declare in such strong terms that he was in favour of arbitration. I agree with him in many of his remarks regarding the Arbitration Court. If we are to have industrial peace, we must expedite matters in connection with union claims when a dispute arises, and the Court is approached. Unions are held up for month after month with the result that what at the start amounts to a little bit of ill feeling grows into a great measure of discontent. It is for this Government and for this Parliament to go into this question and ascertain if we cannot expedite matters arising out of these disputes.

Hon. P. Collier: Parliament has been mainly responsible for industrial disputes in the past through not providing adequate machinery for arbitration matters.

Mr. RICHARDSON: I am inclined to agree with that contention.

Mr. Mann: We will support any amendment to the Arbitration laws to that end.

Mr. RICHARDSON: It is because of these facts that I stress this position.

Mr. McCallum: My proposals would not involve an amendment of the Act.

Mr. RICHARDSON: If we are to have industrial peace employers and employees

alike must feel that they will have a fair deal. From time to time, when we have seen that disputes are held up because of the congestion in the Arbitration Court, it has appealed to me that in any other business when circumstances arose which led to congestion, the position would be immediately taken in hand and those conditions rectified. It seems unreasonable to suppose that we have only three men in Western Australia who are prepared, and fair minded enough, to arbitrate on matters of this description. If our Arbitration Court is so congested that disputes cannot be taken before that tribunal, is there any reason why we should not appoint three other men to arbitrate? I fail to see any reason why that course cannot be adopted. I believe we have many men in Western Australia who are well able to take up such positions. If the work of the Arbitration Court is congested, let us appoint other members of the Court and clear up the position. A considerable amount of discontent is engendered by reason of these delays. I am in this Chamber in order to endeavour to promote industrial peace and if we cope with these reasons for discontent, we are going to eliminate much of this trouble and lead to contentment between employer and employee. There are a few little pin pricks which annoy the workers of Western Australia to-day. The member for West Perth (Mrs. Cowan) stated that she would like the wives of unionists who were involved in a dispute, to be entitled to vote on the question whether the men should go on strike or not. I will not go into that aspect, nor will I express any opinion on that proposal. I contend, however, that when an industrial dispute exists, and the question has to be decided whether or not there is to be a strike, there should be a compulsory secret ballot so as to get an exact expression of opinion from every member of the union concerned.

Mr. O'Loughlen: Have you any instance where that has not been done during recent years?

Mr. RICHARDSON: I have instances.

Mr. O'Loughlen: Would you mind narrating them.

Mr. RICHARDSON: I will not do so now. The hon. member knows them as well as I do.

Mr. Troy: There is the usual evasion.

Mr. RICHARDSON: It is not a question of evasion, nor is it a question of giving time or instances in which it has not been done. I put this suggestion forward as one method by which we could help to secure industrial peace. I will not argue the matter, but content myself by that expression of opinion.

Mr. Davies: If that secret ballot were adopted, would that not legalise strikes?

Hon. P. Collier: I think it would.

Mr. Davies: We would have to amend the Act in those circumstances.

Mr. RICHARDSON: Parliament has considerable power and we could amend the Act in that direction. There is another matter which gives rise to ill feeling between unions. I am referring to it because I believe that if members sitting on the Opposition benches placed themselves in the position of very many good unionists throughout the State, they would realise that those men are suffering under an injustice. We find to-day that many men who belong to their unions have to contribute towards political funds notwithstanding that there are thousands of them who are not in favour of the whole of the A.L.P. political platform.

Hon. P. Collier: The position was the same in the old days.

Mr. RICHARDSON: I am aware of that, and if the Leader of the Opposition chooses to look back over the Labour statistics he will see that I opposed this practice 23 or 24 years ago, and I am still opposing it.

Mr. Munsie: The biggest unions in Australia do not make it compulsory for their members to contribute towards the political funds.

Mr. RICHARDSON: The fact that the biggest unions of Australia do not make it compulsory, does not alter the position that there are thousands of unionists in Western Australia who have to do it. If we do an injustice to ten unionists we are creating a feeling of discontent among the workers. My ambition is to see that that position is safeguarded.

Mr. O'Loughlen: Would you agree to a ballot on the question whether members of the union should have that levy? Would you accept that ballot?

Mr. RICHARDSON: That is a matter the unions would have to decide for themselves. I am laying it down as a principle. If members on the Opposition side of the House were sincere in their expressions, they would relieve those members of the unions to whom I refer of the responsibility for the payment of contributions towards these political funds.

Mr. Troy: We cannot find them, because they vote for us.

Mr. RICHARDSON: I can bring the hon. member a thousand of them. I am laying down these few things because I desire industrial peace. So long as we have these little pin pricks we shall not get absolute industrial peace. If we are to have industrial peace we must have cheaper food. I am looking to our friends of the Country Party to assist us in that direction.

Hon. P. Collier: That is the most disturbing factor of all, the cost of living.

Mr. RICHARDSON: I have no objection whatever to the formation of a wheat pool, but I want to see that the consumers get a fair deal.

Capt. Carter: How is that to be done?

Mr. RICHARDSON: There are several ways. On the 29th September of last year

the member for Menzies in this House moved the following motion, which was carried:—

That in the opinion of this House the practice of making world's parity the basis for fixing the prices of commodities produced and consumed in Australia is unsound, and that the cost of production and forwarding to market should be the factors considered in fixing such prices.

This House carried that motion last year. The Government have not attempted to make any move in that direction. For my part the wheat farmers can have their pool. I believe that at the present juncture it would be unwise to endeavour to restrain them from getting it. I am speaking as a farmer with 25 years' experience of wheat growing and sheep raising. I understand the disabilities of the farmers. I know that they do not have as many luxuries as are enjoyed in town. They have not the same opportunities for enjoyment, and they have to contend with many hardships.

Mr. O'Loughlen: That is only in the pioneering stage.

Mr. RICHARDSON: I am going back to that.

Mr. O'Loughlen: Did you ever get through it?

Mr. RICHARDSON: I am prepared to assist the farmer in every possible way. During the last 17 or 18 years successive Governments have assisted the farmer, and the majority of the people of Western Australia have applauded them for it.

Mr. O'Loughlen: The farmers themselves did not.

Mr. RICHARDSON: We now require to point out to the farmers that it is their duty to assist in the development of the State in other directions. If the farmers are genuine in their professed desire to return the good things we have done for them in backing their bills, they will not complain if we ask them to let us have wheat at 7s. per bushel.

The Minister for Agriculture: Who backs the consumer's bills?

Mr. RICHARDSON: The consumer gets very little out of the Government. I am glad the Minister interjected, because it has served to draw my attention to him. Last night he told us—I give the Leader of the Opposition credit for having drawn it out of him—that they have sold wheat to foreign countries at 7s. 7d. He said he had not had a complaint from any farmer on the score that wheat was sold at that price, and he pointed out to the Leader of the Opposition that the consumers alone were complaining. We who represent the consumers are not complaining that wheat was sold at 7s. 7d. What we complain about is that the farmers do not want to sell wheat to us, their own flesh and blood, at the same price as they are selling it to foreigners. That is our complaint. I am prepared to support the wheat pool, but I want to see a fixed price. In the creation of secondary industries, we want to know

where we are financially. We require to be able to say to the people, "You are going to get your bread for such and such a price for the next 12 months," and we require to be able to tell the poultry farmers, the pig raisers, and the dairymen, exactly what their wheat will cost them for the ensuing 12 months. Then those people can go ahead, knowing what to expect. But if we are to place everything on a sliding scale, nobody will know whether it is 5s. or 15s. that will have to be paid, and so we cannot hope to make much advance. When it comes to the wheat pool, I hope the Country Party will have consideration for the views expressed by consumers. If the farmer could be guaranteed 7s. for his wheat for the next 10 years, he would jump at it.

Mr. C. C. Maley: Make it 5s.

Mr. RICHARDSON: Yes, or even 5s. We are prepared to give them 7s. at present. I see no good reason why the members of the Country Party should not agree to that price.

Mr. Hickmott: Make it 5s. for 10 years.

Mr. RICHARDSON: In this morning's paper was a statement given out by Mr. Monger that the Cabinet has three Country Party members, and that therefore they are controlling half the Government. The metropolitan area, with a population of 160,000, has no representation in the Government, and therefore we as private members have to fight to secure what our constituents require. Mr. Monger has said that the Government are a Country Party Government. I say that neither Mr. Monger nor any other man is going to manufacture my politics, bottle them up and hand them out when he wants to.

The Minister for Agriculture: I think that what Mr. Monger said was that the Country Party had equal representation in the Government.

Capt. Carter: It was Dr. Earle Page who said they had control of the Government.

Mr. RICHARDSON: It might have been Dr. Earle Page, but whether it was he or Mr. Monger, I say that, while I am here to assist the farmers, I am not going to have my politics manufactured outside the House.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: They want to control your majority over there. We shall have to amalgamate.

Mr. RICHARDSON: There are a few matters of local interest which I should like to touch upon. I cannot understand any hon. member representing the metropolitan area being opposed to the extension of tramways. In Perth, in West Perth, in Subiaco, and in other suburbs abutting on the Perth boundary, we are becoming congested. The member for South Fremantle (Mr. McCallum) referred to the housing problem. We have to consider where we are going to place those people who to-day are living three and four families in one house.

Mr. O'Loughlen: Encourage them to go into the country.

Mr. RICHARDSON: I would if I could. I believe in decentralisation, but so long as people will insist upon living in the metropolis we have to find housing accommodation for them, while for the poor man who has to go into an outlying district to make a home, we have to find transport facilities to carry him to his work. I believe the time has arrived when the Government should begin tramway extensions. It is proposed to extend the tramways first to South Perth and Como. I offer no serious objection to that, because I believe the departmental officers are better able to say which should be the first extension than is a layman like myself.

Capt. Carter: Do you think the departmental officers should dictate the financial policy of the future?

Mr. RICHARDSON: If the officers of the department,—who, I take it, are qualified to say which extension is most required, which is going to be the most profitable—say that the first extension should be in a certain direction, I am prepared to abide by their decision. But I want to know when they are going to make a start with the extension to Claremont. There is a very large settlement situated between Claremont proper and Nedlands. Those people have been settled there, some of them for 25 years. They are workers in every sense of the word. For 25 years those men and women have walked a mile and a half to the nearest point of contact with railway or tramway. Figures can be produced to show that this line will be payable from the outset.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: Not at the present cost of construction.

Mr. RICHARDSON: The Government, once they have constructed the South Perth-Como line, would be fully justified in building the extension through to Claremont.

Mr. O'Loughlen: What about Belmont?

Mr. RICHARDSON: I take it the member for Canning can deal with the Belmont proposition.

O'Loughlen: The people there have four miles to walk, and only an old 'bus to look to.

Mr. RICHARDSON: If we are going to encourage our people to provide homes of their own, and I take it it is the function of every Government to encourage people to do this, we must make available cheap land and the facilities for them to get to and from their work. Tramway extensions would achieve this. Some of the finest building land in the State is to be found between Nedlands and Claremont, but it is lying idle because there are no means of communication.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: I can recommend equally good land at East Fremantle having a tramway running through it.

Mr. RICHARDSON: That is a different proposition altogether, but the hon. member

is energetic enough to get that district settled if the locality appeals to people.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: It is the most progressive district in the metropolitan area.

Mr. RICHARDSON: I realise that there is a big programme of work ahead of the Government in the metropolitan area. The Government have been shelving these works for the last two or three years, but it is necessary for them to tackle the problem seriously for the simple reason that we have outgrown all our facilities. Let me mention the question of the water supply. The whole of the metropolitan members were so interested in this matter that they decided to meet.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: Some of us were not invited.

Mr. RICHARDSON: That was due purely to an oversight on the part of the convener. We would have been glad to have had the hon. member present, because he could have given us a lot of information which we required and could not obtain. If ever another gathering of that description is contemplated, I shall take an early opportunity to see that the hon. member has been asked to attend. The question of the water supply has become a serious one, not only in my electorate, but in the metropolitan area generally, and it extends right down to Fremantle. The people of Fremantle have perhaps a worse supply even than the people of Subiaco, and therefore I am prepared to assist to secure not only an adequate, but a pure water supply from the hills for the whole of the metropolitan area.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: And we are prepared to pay for it.

Mr. RICHARDSON: Yes. I am convinced that we pay for a lot of water that we never use. We have been told that we shall have an ample supply during the coming summer. It is gratifying to hear this, but I would point out on the other hand that it will be bore water. I am not partial to bore water either for human consumption or for garden purposes. I have spoilt one good garden with bore water and I should be very sorry to spoil another. If bore water is not fit for garden purposes, I am satisfied it is not fit for human consumption. I know that it will be impossible to get an adequate supply from the hills this year, but it behoves the Government to realise that they must begin this work right away. I trust that members will see that the Government take up this matter in earnest. They have been dilly-dallying with it, they have been putting us off with this engineer's report and that engineer's report until the present time when we do not know whether we are going to get an adequate supply or when the Government intend to start the work.

Mr. Hickmott: Is that your method of economy?

Capt. Carter: The metropolitan people are prepared to pay for what they get.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: They are paying for it now.

Mr. RICHARDSON: We are prepared to put this matter in the hands of a board.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: I am not too sure of that.

Mr. RICHARDSON: We are not going to ask the country people to pay for the metropolitan water supply; they will have enough to do to pay for their share of the Mundaring scheme. The question of the water supply appeals to me in a double sense. Let me explain the position regarding the sewerage of Subiaco. Subiaco is the largest suburb in Western Australia; it has the largest population and is the most congested. The Government for some reason or other brought the sewerage system to Leederville and West Perth, right to our boundaries, and refused to carry it further. Consequently, we are condemned to put up with an obsolete system which we are afraid might land us any day in a serious epidemic. Times out of number we have had reports from health officers who have informed us that this suburb is in danger. The question of the extension of the sewerage system will have to be faced by the Government. The eastern portions of Subiaco are congested and there is no reason that I know of why, when the Government had the plant and the men available, these works should not have been extended to Subiaco.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: It would be of no use extending the sewerage works unless you had the water.

Mr. RICHARDSON: I remarked that I was doubly interested in the question of the water supply. Until we have a sufficient water supply we cannot claim to have the sewerage system extended, because it would be unworkable. For this reason I strongly advocate that the Government should take steps to provide an adequate water supply. The present sanitary system is a menace not only to my electorate but to the electorates abutting on Subiaco. If an epidemic occurs there, it will assuredly spread to adjoining districts. Therefore, this question affects not only Subiaco, but all the surrounding districts, and members should see that the Government do not remain inactive and so court disaster.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: Subiaco is one of the healthiest districts in the State.

Mr. RICHARDSON: Quite so, but to preserve the health of the district costs considerably more than should be the case. While dealing with the question of an adequate water supply, it may seem somewhat paradoxical that I should speak very strongly on the question of drainage. In many portions of my electorate the water has been rising for years and years. In one particular spot in Jolimont, where a fairly large settlement has taken place, a miniature lake has made its appearance. Some 20 residents have already had to move from their houses, and there are still a score of others on the verge of this lake. One resident told me that he fishes in his own kitchen every morning for his breakfast, and a lady told me that her family had no occasion to pay for amusements as they had a good combined concert there day and night by mosquitoes and frogs. The question of

drainage is one that must be faced by the Government. We approached the Minister for Works on this question but he, with a mighty wave of the hand, said, "There are many parts in the same condition and I am preparing a comprehensive scheme." Surely we have engineers in the Government employ who are capable of suggesting some partial remedy to relieve the present situation. I cannot believe that among our full-fledged engineers there is no one capable of doing this. Yet we are told that we must wait until this comprehensive scheme, which will cost millions of money and which is to be designed to drain the whole of the metropolitan area, is completed before we can get any redress. It was wrong of the Minister for Works to suggest such a thing. He should have given due consideration to the facts and not contented himself with saying that nothing could be done until the comprehensive scheme was put in hand. Members of the Opposition should be able to support me in this request. Workers are losing their homes on account of the lack of drainage and they are the people who can least afford the loss. They went out into this particular district because the land was cheap and built homes there. Fifteen or sixteen years ago there was no sign of any water there the Government, however, constructed a large storm-water drain, and emptied it alongside Jolimont, and it is believed by first class engineers that the reason for the water rising is that the water is discharging on to higher ground, filtering through and coming out at the lower part of Jolimont. If this is a fact, it is a disgrace that the Government should permit it to continue. An easy and simple method of disposing of the drainage water would be to take the present 6-inch drain a quarter of a mile away where there are no inhabitants. I protest against the attitude adopted by the Minister for Works, and I hope he will review the situation and afford us some relief. There are one or two small matters with which I wish to deal. We have heard continual complaints, and rightly so, regarding the high cost of living, and some provision was made to meet the difficulty by appointing a price-fixing commission. There is another cost to which no reference has been made whereby poor people and small shopkeepers are being absolutely plundered. This is in connection with their rents. It is essential that a fair rents court be established in Western Australia.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: This House has passed a motion to that effect.

Mr. RICHARDSON: I am pleased to hear that, and I hope such a court will be brought into operation at the earliest possible date. This burden falls on the poorer people who have no redress whatever. If their rents are raised, there are no other houses available for them and the landlords know it. Consequently, the landlords are clutching for more rent with both hands. The small shopkeeper is penalised, too, because he does not know how long he will last in business, and there-

fore does not secure a lease. Immediately the landlord finds that a shopkeeper is progressing in business, he fleches a little more from his poor and struggling tenant. I was quite unaware that this House had passed a motion in favour of a fair rents court, and I hope that the Government will give effect to the resolution at the earliest possible moment. Considerable injustice has been done to many ratepayers, not only in the Subiaco electorate, but in other parts of Western Australia, owing to the methods which are adopted in raising the rates. I notice in the Governor's Speech that it is proposed to amend the Municipalities Act. I intend to urge, and strongly support, an amendment enabling municipal councils to rate on the unimproved value of land. This is a step in the right direction. The right to do this has already been given to road boards, and I am rather surprised that members in the House at the time did not insist that it should also apply to municipalities. There may have been some reason for this of which I am not aware. I hope the measure will be passed through at an early date so that municipalities whose financial year ends on the 30th October may have an opportunity of rating next year under the new system. I also notice from the Speech that it is intended to do something with regard to assisting our hospitals both in the metropolis and in the country areas. I will uphold anything that is brought forward in that direction. Something ought to be done. There are people in the community who are unable to help themselves. If the Government can do anything to assist them the House should stand behind them and give them their support.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: It all depends on the basis of the Act.

Mr. RICHARDSON: I take it the Act will be framed so that assistance is given to our hospitals; if so, it will have my support. There is one organisation which I hope will not be overlooked, namely, the St. John's Ambulance Association. Members of that organisation work entirely gratuitously and give their services free both day and night in the relief of suffering. I shall be willing to support anything that will recognise the work of that body. As a new member I think I have had a fair innings. Most of the new members have given the House a concise idea of where they stand. I am a member of the National Labour Party. Owing to that fact I have the right of free speech and free thought in all matters political and otherwise. I intend in this House to exercise that freedom of thought and speech. I am prepared to support any measure brought before the House that I believe to be for the good of the country. I do not care where the measure comes from, but I am prepared to support it if after looking carefully through it and giving every consideration to it I am of opinion that it should be given effect to. On the other hand I am pleased to notice the moderation shown by members in their speeches. It is

true that members opposite have criticised the constitution of the Country Party, and that members of the Country Party have criticised the constitution of the Labour Party.

The Minister for Agriculture: Those are their long suits.

Mr. RICHARDSON: I do not care one iota what the constitution of either party is. That is their business. I presume they do not care a great deal about the constitution of either side. Whilst, however, they are bickering amongst themselves as to their constitution I am afraid they are wasting good time. Neither party will alter the constitution of the other because of that criticism. Although I believe the criticism has been offered in a friendly sense, more perhaps to create some little amusement, for my part I should like to see less of it. I trust as time goes on and I become more fully acquainted with the procedure of the House and have grasped matters more in detail, and when I have obtained a good deal more information about matters in general than I possess at present, I may be able to add something that will be of benefit to the House. Let me assure hon. members that if I make any personal enemies in the course of my sojourn here I will consider at the end of my time I have not fulfilled my duty. I do not believe in bickering or in personalities between parties. I am here to do my best for my country according to my way of thinking.

[The Deputy Speaker took the Chair.]

Mr. TROY (Mount Magnet) [9.21]: During my fairly long term in the House I have never heard a more unsatisfactory programme than that outlined in the Governor's Speech, presented on the occasion of the opening of Parliament. His Excellency certainly acquitted himself by reading the Speech impressively, but beyond that the Speech placed in his mouth was both disappointing and despairing in nature. It conveyed nothing but excuses for the present state of the finances, and hopes more pretended than real that the Government had grasped the position of affairs. I knew the weak points of former administrations, that they could repair past defects, and that they were now proceeding on safe and sound lines. We were told in the Speech that the deficit is nearly five million pounds, and that there was a surplus in June of £200,000. The backwash in July, however, was so great that it wiped out almost completely that June surplus. Last year the estimated deficit was £285,000, and the excuse offered for exceeding that estimate was that owing to a falling off in railway freights, due to strikes and other industrial disturbances, the Government did not receive that amount of revenue which the Premier had forecasted. Surely, as the freight which would have been car-

ried over the railways but for the strike, has since that time been carried, the railways must have made up that loss on their earnings. The Government paid no salaries during the strike, and inasmuch as we are told that these salaries constitute a heavy burden on the earnings of the railways, there must have been some considerable saving as a result of the strike. I do not think the excuse will hold good. There will always be excuses, particularly when the Treasurer's estimate is so far from realisation as has been the case in this instance. We are told that the industries of Western Australia are passing through a period of crisis resulting from world-wide influences, the outcome of the recent war and the turbulent conditions still prevailing in many countries. We are told also that the markets for wool, frozen meat, base metals, pearls and pearl shell, sandalwood and other products are in a condition of collapse, and that although this phase is merely a passing one, the greatest care will be necessary to meet the resulting losses and to keep these industries in a state of readiness to resume activities when the markets recover. It is a doleful tale that the Government tell, namely, that the industries of Western Australia are in a state of collapse. This is the result of the policy of "produce, produce, produce," initiated by the self-same party now in power, who claimed that everything would then be well in the country. The markets are in a state of collapse, but whilst the Government tell that doleful tale to the House and the country they offer no remedy to meet the position. We are told that the greatest care is necessary to meet the resulting losses and to keep these industries in a state of readiness to resume activities when the markets recover. I am sorry the Premier is not present to-night. What do the Government propose to do to meet the situation, and to assist the country until the markets do recover? What is their policy? It has not yet been set out by any Minister who has spoken. Let us take stock of our resources. The industries on which Western Australia depends are wool, gold, wheat, timber, meat and base metals. The wool market has collapsed and our gold production is in a very depressed state. There are no sales, we were told last night, so far as our wheat is concerned. The timber market is normal. The meat market has collapsed inasmuch as there is no sale for our meat outside the State. The base metal market has also collapsed. The figures read at yesterday's meeting of the Farmers' and Settlers' Association, as put forward by Sir John Higgins, show that the total stock of Australasian wool on hand is six million bales. When we compare this with the annual Australasian clip of 2,300,000 bales, it is evident that Australasia has a three years supply of wool still unsold. In addition to this there is a large quantity

of South African wool on the market. There is a large quantity of manufactured woollen goods, which manufacturers have not disposed of because it has been manufactured at too high a cost. When do the Government think the wool market will improve? This State depends largely upon the sale of its wool. When will the wool market improve, and what do the Government propose to do to assist the State if the wool cannot be sold and the market does not improve?

Mr. Teesdale: They cannot influence the London wool market.

Mr. TROY: If that is the case how long do the Government propose to nurse the industry and by what method will they do so. If there is a three years supply of wool on hand how do the Government propose to nurse the industry in Western Australia until the wool market is in a condition to resume operations? We are told by the Minister for Agriculture that there is no sale for our wheat. Inasmuch as the government of the country must depend partly upon the sale of wheat to carry on the business of the country, what do the Government propose to do to nurse this industry until fresh markets are found? Our gold production and the mining industry generally have been handicapped by the high cost of commodities, by high rail-age, by taxation, and by the Federal tariff. The position is not improving; in fact, the gold industry of Western Australia is stagnant and retrogressing. Since all this has happened, what we want to know is, what do the Government of Western Australia propose to do in order to meet that position of affairs? The Governor's Speech contains nothing on the subject, and no statement has been made in this House by the Premier as to any action the Government propose to take. Last night the Minister for Agriculture made some complaints about the Federal tariff. He said the Federal tariff was killing the industries of Western Australia, and particularly the farming industry. A little while ago at a prospectors' conference a letter was read from Mr. Gregory, M.H.R., saying that the Federal Government were ruining the country districts of Australia, and also ruining the gold mining industry. I thought this was a peculiar statement to come from Mr. Gregory, inasmuch as that gentleman was sitting behind the Government who he asserted were working this ruin. As regards the Federal tariff, what has our Minister for Agriculture to complain of? His speech was not a reasonable one. The Federal Government this year expect a revenue of over 60 millions, which is necessary in order to meet their liabilities. They propose to raise that revenue through the Customs. In order to raise that revenue they must increase the tariff. I do not agree with the increases in the tariff, but I do say that neither the Minister for Agriculture nor any other member on the Government side of this House has any reason to make any complaints whatever about the action of the Federal Government, because the Federal Government have to meet

liabilities which were incurred with the support and the concurrence of those hon. members. I am surprised at the complaints coming from Mr. Gregory, and from our Minister for Agriculture and other members of the National Party who insisted upon all that heavy expenditure which now has to be met by the people of the country. Those hon. members supported Federal loans and Federal extravagance. How can they complain of sacrifices which have now to be made because of their ardent Nationalism? A few years ago they were prepared to sacrifice everything. Now let them make these sacrifices without complaining, because all the extravagant expenditure and all the liabilities and all the taxation and all the oppression of the Federal Government came about with the consent and in the name of their supporters. The Federal Government say to-day, "We must raise 60 millions in order to meet our liabilities," and then Ministers, Nationalist Ministers, who supported the policy that brought about these liabilities, come here and complain that the Federal Government are ruining the country. Mr. Gregory writes to the prospectors' conference declaring that the Federal Government are ruining the country; and Mr. Gregory sits behind that Government.

Hon. P. Collier: But the axe is being sharpened.

Mr. TROY: Yes; but why? Because the people are discovering the position of affairs, because the heavy burden of taxation which the people have to bear is awakening them to the real position of affairs. Now the Country Party propose to stand from under, saying, "We had no responsibility, and we have still no responsibility." That was the tone taken by the member for Katanning, the deputy Leader of the Country Party, last week; and yet every thinking person, and likewise every dullard, knows that the Federal Government adopted all these measures, and entered upon all this taxation, and created all these liabilities, with the consent and concurrence of the Country Party, and also of the Nationalists, of this State. So my advice to those gentlemen is to stew in their own juice, and to do so without complaining.

Hon. P. Collier: Pretty sound advice, too!

Mr. TROY: The Minister for Agriculture also referred to the relative positions of Western Australia and New Zealand; and he said, "Federation, Federation!" Good old Groper argument! Federation may not have been a good thing for Western Australia; but how can the Minister compare this country with New Zealand? Western Australia and New Zealand cannot be compared with each other. Every acre of New Zealand land is productive and valuable land. It is impossible to compare New Zealand and its population with a country like Western Australia and our population. Hardly an acre of New Zealand but is within reach of the seaboard, whereas our railways for thousands of miles run through waste, unoccupied country. New Zealand is a thickly populated country. If

we had the conditions of New Zealand here in Western Australia, neither Federation nor anything else would bother us. But such is the knowledge of the gentleman who is the boy of the Cabinet.

The Minister for Agriculture: You are getting very complimentary now.

Mr. TROY: Compliments are deserved sometimes. The Minister's education requires development.

The Minister for Agriculture: I do not want you to talk to me on education, at any rate.

Mr. TROY: I shall give the Minister a little more later on. We are told that the base metal trade is gone, absolutely gone. Here again, who is responsible? In order to foster the activities of the metal combine in Australia, representing wealthy capitalists in the Eastern States who were backing the Government of Mr. Hughes, that gentleman and his party put an embargo on the trade in metals. Practically they said to the producers of base metals, "You must not export," because all these people in Melbourne, who were supporters of the Hughes Government, were getting their cut out of it. But immediately the trade collapses, the embargo is removed. And then there is a complaint that the metal trade is settled, collapsed. It never had an opportunity, because the whole policy of the Federal Nationalist Government was to let the trade be exploited by those Melbourne people who supported the Government at the time. We are told that the markets where we previously disposed of our wheat and wool have collapsed. We want to know from the Government of this State, what are they going to do if those markets have collapsed? I commend the member for Claremont (Mr. J. Thomson) for the advice he gave the other evening. If the markets have collapsed, what ought to be the policy of the Government? To find new markets. In my opinion, the markets in Europe have collapsed for a number of years. I have always had an opinion of my own, and backed that opinion, because, in spite of advice given to me by people who ought to know, I got rid of my little wool clip quickly, and got out of it at a good price; so that my judgment proved sound. The European markets have collapsed for years to come because the peoples with whom we formerly traded, those of Germany and Central Europe, though they want our materials, have no money to pay for them. The Government must know this, and the Government should be finding new markets for old. However, the Government have no policy and no ideas. They are prepared to spend £6,000 annually on an Agent General, for goodness knows what purposes, whereas they ought to be spending that money on a State commercial agent to try to find other markets for Western Australia. Can you imagine, Mr. Deputy Speaker, any sane Government putting such a policy before the Parliament of this country? "Until the market recuperates, we will have to nurse things and make the losses." No other suggestion;

no activity whatever. The Government's proposal is to go on in that way until Germany or England or some other country can purchase our products, whereas we know that some of those countries may not be able to buy largely for a generation. I do not want to see any ordinary person appointed to the position of Government agent, as suggested. I want to see the position filled by a man possessed of commercial knowledge, who will be able to visit foreign countries with a prospect of securing new markets for this State. I think it is possible. Instead of the Government wasting money on the appointment of commissioners and Agents General in London, they ought to be spending it on an enterprise of this character, in an endeavour to find new markets to replace those which we have lost as the result of the war. Another part of the Government policy is the increase of our population by immigration. How do the Government propose to accomplish that? One hon. member stated to-night that he wants to see immigrants from Great Britain, and nowhere else. But where in Great Britain are we to find the sturdy population that we need to open up our agricultural areas, for which purpose, we are told, the immigrants are intended? Great Britain does not breed them. Great Britain is largely an industrial country. It is not a rural country as it was a hundred years ago, or seventy years ago, but an industrial country. Therefore, if the Government want a steady stream of carefully selected immigrants to open up the waste areas of Western Australia, they will not get those immigrants from the industrial centres of Great Britain, but will have to go elsewhere, where the people are still on the land. Is the present time suitable for a policy of immigration to be carried out by this State? In my opinion, there never was, since I came to Western Australia, a time when there was so much unemployment here. I have never seen so many men walking about carrying their swags as at present, or so much destitution as at present.

Mr. Teesdale: But we have no soup kitchens yet.

Mr. TROY: No; but the hon. member does not come in contact with men in the condition I describe. On a recent evening I had the experience of visiting a certain house in the electorate of the member for Perth (Mr. Mann), to see a man whom I used to know on the Murchison, and who wanted me to witness his application for an invalid pension. Here was a man and his wife and two children living in one room and sleeping and eating in the same room. The location is in Hay-street, Perth, not far from Irwin-street. The air in the room was not good, and the father, in my opinion, is suffering from miners' complaint, and one of the children was ill. The condition of affairs that I have described is not singular in Perth, I understand. I was not aware that that sort of thing existed here at all; but I am informed that it obtains to a much larger extent than is known to the general community. People

suffering in this manner do not go into the highways and byways to tell their condition to the first man they meet. No man is more in favour of immigration than I am. I want to see people come into this country to help to carry the burden that weighs on the shoulders of our people. I know that the burden of interest and taxation is oppressing the people of this country. But I do object to a policy of bringing out numbers of immigrants from England and throwing them higgledy-piggledy on the labour market here, to join in the scramble for employment. There is no reason in such a policy as that. If the Government want to encourage immigration, they cannot do it by bringing people out here and throwing them helplessly on the labour market. Would you, Mr. Deputy Speaker, in a time of stress increase your household responsibilities by adding another family to your own, at a time when you could not pay your way? That is our position. In this household of Western Australia we cannot pay our way, cannot meet our liabilities. We cannot provide reproductive work for the people we have here. We cannot pay our household bills. And yet we are inviting strangers from overseas to come and live with us—which merely means increasing our liabilities. In my opinion this is no time for the assisted immigrant. The Government should find a market for the products of Western Australia, including our wool, our wheat, our base metals, our timber, and so on, and when these markets are provided, there will be no stagnation. The people who are in the State will be well provided for and there will be room for many others. That is the policy the Government should embark upon. On the contrary, they are bringing in people by the thousands and while that is so, we are told that the wool industry has collapsed, that there are no sales of wheat, the base metal industry has collapsed, and also that the meat industry has collapsed. We have all those difficulties to combat. The policy of any Government with any sense in such circumstances would be to find markets for our products.

Mr. Teesdale: That is not confined to Australia.

Mr. TROY: I do not care which country it is confined to. Other countries are getting rid of their surplus population but they are not increasing their households, so to speak. Yet we are increasing ours although we cannot provide for those already here. I am not opposed to immigration, but in times like these, when we cannot provide for our own people, and when we are told that all these disabilities have to be faced, that is not a policy to be pursued.

Mr. Hickmott: We were told to-day that 160 immigrants coming from the Old Country were all provided for.

Hon. P. Collier: Who told you that?

Mr. Hickmott: Mr. Clydesdale.

Mr. Wilson: I know 300 men in Collie who are not provided for.

Hon. P. Collier: Does it mean preference for the immigrant, while we cannot provide for the men already here?

Mr. TROY: We are told that the Government are alarmed because of the disproportion between the populations of the metropolitan and rural constituencies. That was shown in the recent census, which disclosed the fact that there are more people in the metropolitan area than there are in the country. This, of course, is a very dangerous state of affairs. Despite this position, we find the Government intend to spend a large sum of money to further encourage concentration in the city. They propose to spend money in connection with tramway extensions which may give relief to a few people in the city, but which, to my mind, will be a very fine thing for the land agents and land speculators. No doubt many people are inconvenienced because they have to walk a mile or two in the metropolitan area. People in other parts of the State have to do that as well, and compared with those people, the individual residing in the city is much better off. This is a time when we should put up with some inconvenience, because the country cannot afford expense of this nature. In another portion of the Governor's Speech we find the good old, never-missing expression of the Government's intention to develop the North-West. That paragraph has never been missing from any announcement of Government policy for years past, and 50 years hence, if the North-West is still attached to the State of Western Australia, the same paragraph will appear in the Governor's Speech.

Mr. Teesdale: It is a really good stand-by.

Mr. TROY: I have one opinion about the North-West; it is too big a job for the present State of Western Australia. This State with its total population of 300,000 people, will never develop the North-West.

Hon. P. Collier: Where would our revenue go?

Mr. TROY: I am convinced that our present population cannot develop our South-West. We cannot develop the wheat belt, or the Eastern Goldfields, or the middle west, with our present population.

Mr. Mann: We want more population.

Mr. TROY: We are in this position; we are like a firm carrying on a business in very large premises with only a small stock. We have a tremendous State but we cannot face the task of development in connection with the North-West. It sounds very important for the Premier to say that he governs a third of Australia. It is just like two people occupying a mansion comprising 100 rooms. It is very nice and showy but the cost is too great; the rooms go to rack and ruin; the grounds and the gardens go to waste. That is the position with Western Australia. It is not possible to develop the North-West. It should be cut off and we should give it to someone else to develop, and turn the attention of

our 300,000 people towards the development of the southern portions of the State.

Mr. Teesdale: The revenue of £100,000 you get from us is a bit handy to take.

Mr. TROY: That may be, but the Government have appointed a resident Commissioner, and therein lies the whole of their activities.

Mr. Munsie: I do not think he is a man who knows anything about the North-West.

Hon. P. Collier: He belongs to a family who have been very lucky recently.

Mr. TROY: Unless the Commissioner has some hundreds of thousands of pounds to spend, he will not be able to get any results. In the interests of the North-West, as well as of the South-West, the North-West should be cut off from the State and be handed over to a local authority, or to the Federal Government, to administer.

Hon. P. Collier: Oh goodness, the Federal Government! What have they done to the Northern Territory?

Mr. TROY: The member for Pilbara (Mr. Underwood) spoke last night regarding the North-West. I am not in the habit of paying compliments, but I desire to refer to that hon. member's remarks. He attributed the disabilities of the North-West and its lack of development to the high cost of labour, the inefficiency of the workers, and the "go-slow" policy adopted by them. He gave an instance of a drunken man whom he saw. The man was paid while he was drunk and asleep, and he was the cause of trouble which held up the work. This was an instance to demonstrate the incompetency and inefficiency of the workers in the North-West. The hon. member's statements may have been perfectly true, or they may have been simply what he has referred to as "a tale." I have heard a lot of statements of this nature; I frequently hear them in the trains. I generally find that they are repeated as statements by someone else and that they are invariably grievously exaggerated. It should be remembered, however, that there are others who have similar lapses—others who are not labourers. Some of these people occupy positions of great responsibility, and draw their salaries under similar conditions. Why should a lumper be picked out as an example to show what is ruining the North-West? I should say that a moralist, like the member for Pilbara, who is so distinguished for his virtue and sobriety, would make some allowance for the frailties of human nature, and particularly for human beings living in the North-West. I am surprised that he should bring a tale of such a character under the notice of this Chamber for our serious consideration. Then we have the member for Guildford (Mr. Davies) who spoke last night. That hon. gentleman always arouses in me a most unresponsive chord. I do not know whether it is because of his too apparent

sympathy with the workers, and his desire to protect labour interests. When in that tuneless Welsh complaining voice of his he speaks of his love for the worker, and of his concern for the labour movement, it is interesting to listen to him showing how he has searched through the journals of the world, through the chronicles and magazines, to find some weakness in Labour's principles which he may lay open to our opponents. What a paradox the hon. member is! He is interested in the workers and their needs, but he is always endeavouring to find weaknesses to thrust into and scarify and lay bare, so that the opponents of Labour may know how they can get at Labour and destroy its interests.

Mr. Davies: The workers appreciated it.

Mr. TROY: I generally speak pretty straight and I will tell the hon. member frankly that his speeches always have to me that bitter flavour of a vindictive woman, who, because of infidelity, has been thrust from beneath her husband's roof, and becomes full of malice and misrepresentation. Thrust from her husband's protection, she becomes a "nagger"; the man she loved, she now hates. While she still pretends to love the man, she goes amongst the community exposing his weaknesses. Whether I be right or wrong, the speeches of the member for Guildford always have that distinctive kind of flavour to me. I may be wrong but I am not the only one who is wrong if I do err, for I err in company.

Mr. Davies: You may err in bad company.

Mr. TROY: The remarks by the member for Guildford regarding the shipping strike were illuminative. He said that he went to a conference—it was a Nationalist conference—and that the seamen and lumpers had been out on strike. He protested against the strike. He said that he would have been behind the seamen and lumpers if they had opposed the whole of the plundering by the ship owners, whereas they only desired a share in the plunder. Yet at this National conference we find that the member for Guildford sat cheek by jowl with the plunderers and their agents.

Hon. P. Collier: Probably his expenses were paid by them.

Mr. TROY: I do not know as to that, but although he could attend such a conference as a supporter of the plunderers, he claimed he was opposed to the seamen because they only wanted some of the plunder.

Mr. McCallum: The socialisation of industry does not go far enough for him.

Mr. TROY: At that Nationalist conference were representatives of all the plunderers of Australia, people who were responsible for the high liabilities built up by the Federal Government and people who put their hands in the pockets of the people of Australia and put money into the war loans which were free from taxation and who are now drawing interest and adding to the burden of Australia.

Hon. P. Collier: And who gave Mr. Hughes his £25,000.

Mr. TROY: The hon. member also made another remark upon which I desire to comment. He said that the workers' worst enemies were themselves. I heartily agree with that statement inasmuch as he speaks no doubt of the workers of Midland Junction. They are their own worst enemies seeing that we are told that they put the hon. member into Parliament to represent labour interests and the workers of the Guildford electorate. I am sorry the deputy Leader of the Country Party is not here.

Mr. McCallum: He is away getting some instructions.

Mr. TROY: I have some bouquets to throw at him. The other night he told the House that the Country Party accepted no responsibility for the deficit, was not responsible for the Government which had allowed it to grow up. Who is the deputy Leader of the Country Party? He has sat in this House for a number of years. He was interested in the formation of the first Liberal Government, sat behind them and endorsed their policy. Following on that he was a supporter of the Nationalist Government on their formation, and concurred in all their actions. In becoming a member of the Country Party, he merely threw off the old cloak and assumed the new one. Inasmuch as he has been a follower of every Government since the deficit has been increasing from one million to five millions, he must take the responsibility. Then, let me ask with the greatest possible respect, who are the Country Party? They are a body of members, old Tories who represented constituencies under the name of Liberals, wearing the Liberal label. They now call themselves the Country Party. Dr. Earle Page to-day spoke about the success of the Country Party in Western Australia. Let me make a prophecy. They have been successful, but I think they have reached their limit. The people are beginning to find them out. They have changed their name, but not their ideas. First they are Liberals. When that name becomes malodorous they call themselves Nationalists, and when the Nationalists are up against it they call themselves Country Party. There is a tendency among many men to say that they belong to no party. When the Country Party is discredited, the next cry will be, "Party has been the curse of the country." Do I hear an echo from the Minister for Mines? "Parties have ruined the country" it will be said, "they are responsible for all our troubles. I am independent. I stand for no party."

Mr. Money: Wouldn't they accept you on that basis?

Mr. TROY: Nobody was asked to. I speak for myself. I have no association with political humbugs and impostors. The other night, and again to-night, I heard an hon. member say in respect of another, "If I hurt his feelings I am sorry. I hope to make no enemy." For my part I do not care whether or not I make enemies. I am here to speak

my mind. If allowed to say "I don't give a damn," I would say it. I am here to speak what I mean. If I do not like a man and the way he carries on, if I think he is a hypocrite, I will say so, while on the other hand if he thinks I am a hypocrite he may say so.

Mr. Piesse: It would have no effect.

Mr. TROY: Not coming from the hon. member. While the hon. member was deciding between parties, while he was still in doubt as to whether to be a Country Party member or a Liberal, he wrote to the Liberal conference and expressed—

Mr. Piesse: It is absolutely false.

Mr. TROY: The Parliamentary rules provide that I should ask for a withdrawal of that remark, but I will not bother. So convinced am I of the truth of my statement that the hon. member's denial is of no consequence. The hon. member said the other night "I belong to no party." The view of the hon. member and others professing the same belief is that nobody has a right to hold any view but their view. The member for West Perth (Mrs. Cowan)—I am disgusted with her for this, although warmly respecting her in the ordinary way—is with those who deplore the fact that certain members hold party views. They want us to believe that they are against all parties. We cannot believe it, because we are only human.

Hon. P. Collier: And because we know.

Mr. TROY: And because we know. To their thinking, the view they hold is the only view, and our views have no value at all. The members for Guildford (Mr. Davies) and for West Perth (Mrs. Cowan) went to a Nationalist conference in Melbourne and there sat with a party which I abhor and detest, and which I hold responsible for a lot of the trouble to Australia; a party which I abhor for its lack of principle and for the rotten sectarianism which it has stirred up. Why they stand for those things, I do not know. I belong to a party which has some respect for other men's views. At the last elections on the Murchison a circular was issued by an organisation of which I understand certain members of the House professing non-party views are members. That organisation sent the apostle of sectarianism about the Murchison to influence the elections. Yet those members who associate with that organisation pretend that they are non-party. In my opinion they are partisans of the meanest and most despicable character. We had a fight on the Murchison; I fought the matter openly; yet the people who brought sectarianism to the Murchison told us that they were non-party in their views. I say that any member of this House who declares that he belongs to no party is without fixed principles. There always has been, and there ever will be parties while society exists on its present basis.

Mr. Money: Better no principles than a bad principle.

Mr. TROY: There will be those who think with the Premier, whom I respect because of

his consistency. When the late Mr. Frank Wilson was dispossessed because of his unpopularity, although the most capable man of them all, Mr. Mitchell stood by him. Because of that, he will always have my respect. I respect his views. But the person who tells me he is with me, and whom I find to be against me, the person who pretends to support me, yet exposes me to the enemy, I say he is my enemy, and a worse enemy than my open opponent.

Capt. Carter: Have they done that, have they told you they were with you and yet criticised you? For instance, the hon. lady who is absent, and whom you are accusing of having no principle.

Mr. TROY: I will not permit the hon. member to misrepresent me. I have never accused the lady of having no principle, I have never referred to her in that respect. I tell the hon. member to mind his own business. The lady is well able to mind hers. If he is irritated by anything I have said, he may have cause for irritation; but the lady has no cause for irritation, because my remarks do not apply to her. I said she had insisted that she belonged to no party.

Capt. Carter: And, therefore, according to you, has no principle?

Mr. TROY: Nonsense.

Capt. Carter: Wait till "Hansard" comes out.

Mr. TROY: I said that belonging to no party meant having no definite fixed principles. The member for West Perth has fixed principles. And so too have all the other members who pretend that they are non-party, because in their every day lives and actions we find that whenever there is to be determined an issue which affects their party interests, they quickly show to which party they belong. They only pretend to be non-party because they think it will go down with the electors. The member for West Perth has distinct views as a party woman. She may think she has not, but I think she has. Let me remind the member for Leederville that I attack no woman. If I have anything to say against the member for West Perth, I will always say it in her presence. If I made reference to her to-night it was because in making my speech I am discussing general principles.

Mr. Munsie: And it is not your fault that she is not here.

Mr. TROY: If I have irritated the member for Leederville by any disclosures, it must be because he has cause to be hurt thereby.

Capt. Carter: It is because I have a certain amount of chivalry.

Mr. O'Loughlen: That stuff won't work here.

Capt. Carter: I am afraid it will not, with certain hon. members.

Mr. O'Loughlen: There is just as much chivalry on this side as on that.

Mr. TROY: The hon. member says he has a certain amount of chivalry. He would be a despicable scoundrel if he had no chivalry at all.

Capt. Carter: It is a quality worth having.

Mr. TROY: Already attention has been drawn to the propaganda which is being carried on regarding State trading concerns.

Hon. P. Collier: It is a vicious propaganda.

Mr. TROY: I know that there are powerful influences at work to induce the Government to get rid of the State Trading Concerns. I know that in clubs in the city Ministers have been assailed and asked why they do not get rid of the State Trading Concerns. I know that the object of the propaganda in the Press is for the purpose of educating the public to the belief that the trading concerns are a ruinous policy for the State.

Hon. P. Collier: A propaganda of deliberate lying.

Mr. TROY: Yesterday Mr. Monger, the President of the Primary Producers' Association, in a calm, deliberate statement—

Hon. P. Collier: A calm deliberate lie.

Mr. TROY: Call it what you like, I say in a calm deliberate statement said that the conference would be called upon to express an opinion regarding the continuance of the State Trading Concerns which were the cause of the bad state of the finances in Western Australia.

Hon. P. Collier: And he offered no proof to back up his statement.

Mr. TROY: That is so. Only last week the Premier had to admit that the State Trading Concerns had returned a profit to the Treasury. All this propaganda is for one purpose, and that purpose is to get the Government to sell them in the interests of business men or middlemen who are the associates of Mr. Monger, who are his social friends, who associate with him in the city, and who desire that the Government should get rid of these institutions which are operating in the interests of the public. It is purely propaganda. I heard a member say that Mr. Monger was an honourable man, but can any man be called honourable who makes a statement which he knows is untrue?

Mr. Piesse interjected.

Hon. P. Collier: Why does not he prove his statement? He has not attempted to produce evidence. It was a mere statement.

Mr. TROY: Mr. Monger is now asked to produce figures in proof of the statement he made at the conference. Let the hon. member who interjected as an apologist for Mr. Monger, if he can produce figures to support that contention, demonstrate that the State Trading Concerns have given rise to the losses suffered by the finances. Let any member of the Country Party do it if he can.

Mr. Piesse: What about the railways?

Mr. TROY: Does Mr. Monger consider the railways a trading concern? Did he tell the conference that the railways lost £60,000 last year because they carried farmers' fertilisers at a loss?

Hon. P. Collier: A hundred thousand pounds.

Mr. TROY: Will the member for Toodyay do it? The same thing obtains with regard to the wheat pool. There has been insidious propaganda in one section of the Press

which has published photographs of wheat lying rotting at sidings, and of wheat lying at Fremantle, all this for the purpose of leading the people to believe that the commodity they are producing is being ruined instead of being sold, and that they are great losers in consequence. It is all propaganda. It reminds me of similar propaganda which was carried on when the Labour Government started meat shops in Perth. A certain journal, which, of course, would not be guilty of anything of this kind, reproduced a photograph of a bullock, the ribs of which had been retouched in order to lead the public to believe that the Government meat shops were dealing in starved beasts.

Hon. P. Collier: They faked the photograph in order to show ribs on a fat bullock.

Mr. TROY: That is so. That sort of propaganda does not influence us in the slightest.

Mr. O'Loughlen: And it does not help the State.

Mr. TROY: But it does influence a great body of the public who do not know the Press too well. I am a supporter of the wheat pool.

Mr. Hickmott interjected.

Mr. TROY: I get it and I do not deny it, and I intend to retain my share.

Mr. O'Loughlen: Among all the members in the House you are the biggest contributor to the wheat pool.

Hon. P. Collier: Bigger than all the Country Party put together.

[The Speaker resumed the Chair.]

Mr. TROY: I do not make that claim. I favour the wheat pool, but were it not for the Labour Party of Australia, the wheat pool would have been doomed. The Premiers of South Australia and of Victoria have declined to operate a wheat pool. Why? Because in Victoria the middlemen control the electorates wherein the farmers are resident. The farmers in Victoria have not an organisation as the farmers in Western Australia have.

Mr. O'Loughlen: In South Australia their position is hopeless.

Mr. TROY: In South Australia the farmers have not an organisation as the farmers in Western Australia have. As a result the Liberals there are not yet known as Country Party members. When the farmers of Victoria become organised, the Liberals will soon change their coat and put on the coat of the Country Party. Then they will not dare get rid of the pool. While the farmers are disorganised, they can focus the farmers in the interests of the middleman. In Western Australia the farmers would not have had a pool but for the fact that they are organised, and the Country Party have of necessity to go that far because our farmers are educated to that extent and know what is good for them. In lots of other matters the same members are still Liberals and will not support farmers' interests because the farmers have

not been educated up to a full knowledge of their requirements and circumstances.

Mr. Mann: It is a tribute to them.

Mr. TROY: It is a tribute to the fact that the farmers of Western Australia know a little more about the wheat pool and such like matters than do the farmers of other States. There are lots of other things which our farmers do not know because their representatives are old Liberals and do not stand for these things. New South Wales, which is controlled by a Labour Government, stands for the wheat pool, and the middleman does not get a chance. The support of New South Wales is the salvation of Western Australia. New South Wales too is the greatest among the wheat producing States. I stand for the wheat pool because it has been the salvation of the farmers of this State. It is true that losses have occurred, but I believe that those losses would have been greater if private enterprise had been operating.

Mr. Money: It has been a good thing for the State.

Mr. TROY: Yes, and the farmer knows that the pool is good for him.

Mr. Mann: You will give some credit to the Government in connection with that.

Hon. P. Collier: The Labour Government started it in Western Australia.

Mr. TROY: The hon. member ought to be aware that the present Government did not start the wheat pool.

Hon. P. Collier: The farmer threatened to shoot anyone who came to take his grain and put barbed wire around his hay stacks.

Mr. TROY: The present Government, comprised of the same individuals, would not have supported the wheat pool in 1913. They would have said, "No, we stand for private enterprise." Now, however, they support the wheat pool.

Mr. Mann: It might have not been necessary in 1913.

Mr. TROY: The reason why they support it now is because the enlightened electors know it is useful to them. I wish to make a few remarks in connection with the extraordinary action taken by the Minister for Railways this year, which, in my opinion, is lacking in principle, and in regard to which the Railway Department is being utilised to give advantages in one direction and inflict disabilities on at least one individual in the community. I do not intend to disguise my hand. Mr. Macfarlane of Perth succeeded in building up a business here after many laborious years. He helped the farmers in the wheat belt particularly, to establish the milk and cream industry. To some of them he lent milk cans, to others separators, and he stood to them, and by these means many farmers have been able to add to their income. Recently butter factories have been started at Albany, Northam, Bunbury, Gnowangerup—

The Minister for Mines: And Geraldton.

Mr. TROY: Not yet at Geraldton. The Commissioner of Railways has issued an in-

struction wherein he provides for differential railway rates. It is laid down that any settler who sends his cream past any butter factory or creamery must pay 50 per cent. increase in his railway freights on that cream. If he is 50 miles from Perth and 49 miles from Northam, and he sends his cream to Perth, he is penalised by having to pay an additional freight of 50 per cent.

The Minister for Mines: That is not correct.

Mr. TROY: The general instructions from the Commissioner read—

Coaching rates book, page 93—cream and milk (fresh) traffic—Delete—"The following is the general scale of rates and conditions for the conveyance of cream and milk (fresh) between all places." Insert—"The following is the general scale of rates and conditions for the conveyance of milk (fresh) between all stations, and cream consigned to the nearest butter factory in either an up or a down direction. Cream consigned elsewhere than to the nearest butter factory in either an up or down direction will be charged on the scale and with the maxima shown plus 50 per cent."

Is that correct?

The Minister for Mines: Yes.

Mr. TROY: I would like to have an expression from the Minister. This correspondence which I hold in my hand was given to me by Mr. Macfarlane, and I think it only fair to place it before the House. I have no objection whatever to offer to the butter factories which have been established in the country, but they ought not to receive preferential treatment. Further, the railways ought not to be utilised to penalise Mr. Macfarlane. If this is not being done, I shall be glad to hear it, and I am sure I can say that Mr. Macfarlane also will be glad. Here members may see voluminous correspondence which has been received from farmers in which all of them protest that they have received a very fair deal and resent the coercive action of the Government. They still insist upon dealing with the man who has given them a fair deal. Here is one such letter, which may be regarded as typical—

Yours to hand, notifying us of the Government action of putting an extra 50 per cent. of freight on present freights to Perth for cream passing Northam factory. We very much protest against such unjust action of not being allowed to market our cream where we wish without the Government putting on extra freight to drive us to market at one place. We would have to be content with their percentages of our cream as the extra cost of freight may keep us from sending to Perth where we have always been satisfied with the treatment received during the past years of business.

I could read dozens to the same effect in which everyone protests vigorously against this treatment.

The Minister for Mines: You know that Macfarlane's factory can afford to pay the increased railway freight and still be in a better position to compete with the country factory.

Mr. TROY: Even supposing that is so, what has that to do with the principle? I run a farm near Murchison. I can send my chaff to Murchison cheaper than farmers who are 50 miles further away. Why should I be penalised because my situation happens to be more favourable? I am prepared to pay and do pay the same rate for the same mileage and the same service as any other individual. Why penalise me?

Mr. Mann: I saw the Commissioner of Railways and his reply was that Macfarlane was at an advantage inasmuch as the country factories had to pay a greater rate on the butter coming to the city than the farmer had to pay on the cream.

Mr. TROY: The Northam butter factory can send butter to the goldfields and out-back districts cheaper than the Perth factory because it has an advantage in that way. The Geraldton Butter Factory will sell butter on the Murchison because it gains an advantage over other factories in so doing.

Mr. Mann: The great market is in the city.

Mr. TROY: I do not care about that. Because I happen to be situated in a certain part of the State why should I be called upon to pay a greater freight for my products than people who are situated elsewhere? The Railway Department ought not to be used to impose disabilities upon one set of citizens against another set. Of all things this Government should stand for freedom of trade and a fair deal all round, and I shall be glad to hear the explanation of the Minister for Railways upon this question. What the country needs to-day is not only an optimist but a prudent man. I can see no sign of prudence in the Governor's Speech. That is my complaint. All I can see is a long list of platitudes, excuses, and complaints about what has happened on the other side of the world. There is no policy for the future. Things are bad, and we have to take the necessary steps to face the bad times that are ahead of us. The Government should outline the action they propose to take so that the House and the country may know what it is. I have asked the Premier if he will find new markets, and exploit other parts of the world to replace the markets which are no longer available. He should refrain from spending money on immigration without system. There are hundreds of people in the country to-day who cannot make a living, and the country because of the restrictions of trade is not in a position to carry a lot of immigrants. I want to know from the Government how they will find work for all the immigrants they tell us are coming here. Are they going to put them on the land, and have they the capital with which to keep them there until they

become producers? If they are not to be put on the land how will they be provided for, and if they are put on the land what will be the policy in respect to finding markets for their products? That is a fair and reasonable question and any prudent and progressive Government should be able to give the House some lead in the matter. Things will be worse in this country than they are to-day. We have not yet reached the turning point. I welcome immigration provided the country is in a fit state to receive it, but to throw thousands of men to-day on the labour market and make no provision for them is not in the best interests of the country. I suggest that when the Premier has an opportunity he should tell the House how he proposes to arrange to provide other markets to replace those which have collapsed, and to provide work for the people in Western Australia as well as for those yet to come. That is my chief concern so far as the industries of this country are affected.

On motion by Mr. Money, debate adjourned.

House adjourned at 10.35 p.m.

Legislative Assembly,

Thursday, 18th August, 1921.

	Page
Questions: Tramway Extension, South Perth-Como	289
Railway Passes, Blinded Soldiers	290
Education, a school holiday	290
Government Stores Inspection	290
Message, Assent to Supply Bill	290
Royal Commission on Tributing, Ministerial Statement	290
Address-in-reply, Eighth Day	290

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

QUESTION—TRAMWAY EXTENSION, SOUTH PERTH-COMO.

Capt. CARTER asked the Minister for Railways: When is it proposed to start the construction of the South Perth-Como tram extension?

The MINISTER FOR RAILWAYS replied: When the necessary material comes to hand.