

Mr. LAMBERT: The matter should be left to the discretion of the court.

The Premier: It is left to their discretion.

Mr. LAMBERT: It will also be necessary to define what the metropolitan area is. Surely the court can be counted upon to deal with a question of this sort.

The PREMIER: The provisions of this clause are necessary and should be included. There is nothing here that would not have to be set up in the case of the city of Perth or the town of Fremantle if the administering authority did its duty. I do not know why the member for North-East Fremantle wants the paragraphs deleted. Would he have less than these provisions? I hope the amendment will not be carried.

Mr. LAMBERT: In countries where liquor is certainly controlled better than it is here, they have what is called an hotel, the licensee of which is permitted to dispense liquor but must have what is called an hotel attachment, which must be at least 100 feet away from the place where liquor is sold. I am speaking of South America, where a sine qua non of a liquor license is that the living and sleeping accommodation must be a certain distance away from the licensed premises. South America has the most advanced liquor legislation in the world. In order to approach the ideal, let us provide that the sale of liquor here shall be kept away from the living and sleeping accommodation. I agree with the member for North-East Fremantle that it is a mistaken idea to penalise the man who intends to build premises by saying to him, "The test as to whether you shall have a license is whether you are prepared to build 12 bedrooms." If the man builds only two rooms, then, so long as these are all that is needed for the public requirements, he should get his license. The bar should not be poked in front of the nose of a lodger at an hotel.

Progress reported.

House adjourned at 10.59 p.m.

Legislative Council,

Wednesday, 20th September, 1922.

	PAGE
Questions: War news	815
State Saw Mills	815
Licensing Act, Cue offences	815
Locomotive spark arresters	815
Newdegate, clearing	815
Bills: Light and Air, report	815
State Trading Concerns Act Amendment, 2a., Com. report	831
Motions: Water Supply Department, by-laws, to disallow	816
Immigration, State-wide scheme	820
Adjournment, Special	830

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

QUESTION—WAR NEWS.

Hon. J. EWING: At your request and on your behalf, Mr. President, I desire to ask the Minister for Education the following question: Whether the Premier has received any reliable news in connection with the present war movement, and if so, will he give the House as much information as he can?

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION replied: We have received nothing beyond what has been published.

QUESTION—STATE SAWMILLS.

Hon. A. BURVILL asked the Minister for Education: 1, How many loads of timber have been milled at the State Sawmills since the works started, including that used for public works? 2, What is the percentage of waste between timber treated in the round, milled, and the finished product? 3, What royalty would have been paid by a permit holder in respect of the timber referred to in answer to question No. 1? 4, Has any royalty or railway freight been charged against the State Sawmills? 5, What amount of railway freight would have been payable in respect to timber milled at the State Sawmills, and carried over the State railways, including the 17 miles used for shunting? 6, Is the forest cut by the State Sawmills taken on a face or are only the best patches cut out? 7, Can the Minister explain why the State Sawmills charge 1s. per dozen more for fruit cases than the privately-owned mills?

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION replied: I think this question should take the form of a motion for a return, as it will take some time to get out the information. However, if the hon. member will allow it to stand over, I will answer it later on.

QUESTION—LICENSING ACT, CUE OFFENCES.

Hon. T. MOORE (for Hon. J. W. Hickey) asked the Minister for Education: 1, Has his attention been drawn to a leading article in

the "Murchison Times" of the 15th instant, relating to the case in which two well-known and highly respected citizens of Cue were found guilty of an offence against the Licensing Act? 2, If so, does he consider that the action taken by the police was justified and in the best interests of law and order? Will he take the necessary steps to prevent a recurrence?

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION replied: 1, The Minister's attention had not been previously drawn to the article, but a petition has been received by the Minister accompanied by a copy of the depositions taken in the court. 2, The petition will be considered on the evidence produced before the court.

QUESTION—LOCOMOTIVE SPARK ARRESTERS.

Hon. J. A. GREIG asked the Minister for Education: Have all the locomotives on the railways been fitted with the best spark arresters obtainable, ready for next summer?

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION replied: 149 locomotives have been equipped with the best spark arrester known to the department, and this work is still proceeding. It is anticipated that all locomotives working in the agricultural areas will be so equipped by the summer season.

QUESTION—NEWDEGATE, CLEARING.

Hon. J. A. GREIG asked the Minister for Education: 1, Are the men clearing at Newdegate employed on contract or day work? 2, At what rates are they employed?

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION replied: 1, The men at Newdegate are employed on contract felling, trimming, and stacking timber ready for burning. 2, A maximum of £1 per acre.

BILL—LIGHT AND AIR ACT AMENDMENT.

Report of Committee adopted.

MOTION—WATER SUPPLY DEPARTMENT, BY-LAWS.

To Disallow.

Debate resumed from the 13th September, on the following motion by Hon. A. Lovekin:—

That by-laws promulgated by the Metropolitan Water Supply and Sewerage Department, dated 24th March, 1922, and numbered 7, 43, 52, 69, 93, 100, 105, 119, 125, 131, 132, be and are hereby disallowed.

Hon. J. CORNELL (South) [4.40]: I do not intend to detain the House long in debating the motion. I followed the Leader of the House with some interest and I find that some of the regulations are in the form

in which they have appeared for a good many years past. There are others, however, to which that does not apply. I find that By-law 52 has been altered and I think Mr. Lovekin is to be commended on bringing this question under the notice of the House. He has every right to do so, and when regulations such as these have stood for so long, and drastic alterations are then made to them, those responsible for the alterations, although not obliged by statute to do so, would assist hon. members very materially and remove a good deal of misconception if they made a comprehensive survey of the considerations leading to those alterations, for presentation to the House. If that were done, hon. members would see at once what alterations had been made. Some valid reason should be given for the alterations that have been made and which are now under review.

The Minister for Education: To which alterations do you refer?

Hon. J. CORNELL: I refer to alterations generally that are made from time to time. It is not the practice of the department to table a summary of alterations such as I have referred to, but I throw it out as a hint that if such a course were pursued, it would save a good deal of discussion, particularly if such an epitome were presented to members whenever any drastic alterations were made. Hon. members are entitled to know the reasons for these alterations. As it is the Minister comes along and asks leave to lay on the Table of the House certain alterations to by-laws or regulations. They may be drastic alterations, and if one desires to find out where the drastic alterations have been made, they have to compare the new ones with the old regulations. It would require a Philadelphia lawyer and a bush lawyer combined to discover where the alterations have occurred in some instances. At any rate, if what I suggest were done, it would be a great convenience to members. I am well aware that By-law 52 has been in operation for many years, almost since, I believe, the inception of the Coolgardie water scheme on the goldfields. It provides that connections have to be made by licensed plumbers. That is a long time ago and I have heard no serious complaint from plumbers working under it, nor yet have I heard any complaints generally against that regulation. Yet we find it has been altered. The old regulation is to be found in No. 49 of the old by-laws. The following words have been inserted in the new regulation: "or who within seven days from the date tenders close withdraws or varies any tender he may have lodged." There is another obligation cast on the licensed plumber. Why these words have been inserted I do not know, but I take it Mr. Lovekin has a valid reason for asking for the disallowance of the regulation. There is a great departure in the concluding words of the regulation. The old regulation provided that any person removed from the list of licensed plumbers should not be readmitted

until he has served the term of his suspension or paid such fine as the Minister might determine. The new one states: "Any person who has been removed from the list shall not be readmitted as a licensed water supply and sanitary plumber or water supply plumber until the term of his suspension has expired or the Minister has directed his reinstatement."

The Minister for Education: That is practically the same thing.

Hon. J. CORNELL: If the old phraseology stood for 16 years, why introduce new phraseology now? The only conclusion is that something else might be intended.

Hon. A. Lovekin: So it is.

Hon. J. CORNELL: Regulation No. 69 takes the place of Regulation No. 66. This is a very involved regulation covering nearly six pages of printed matter and dealing with the specification of pipes. Mr. Lovekin, in moving for the disallowance of this regulation, is doubtless actuated by consideration for the public weal. He is probably one of those who would be affected to a large extent. I commend him for having directed our attention to this regulation. From the department we have not the slightest indication as to how far or to what extent the old regulation has been departed from or the reasons for the departure. Regulation No. 93 sets forth that it shall be at the discretion of the Minister to supply water to any individual consumer or to any land whether rated or not. I do not think any serious objection can be taken to that. The discretionary power must be vested in someone and that someone must be the Minister as head of the department. At the same time, I think the water supply of Perth should be controlled by a metropolitan board, and then we might get something resembling water instead of the libel being supplied to-day. I have no very serious objection to regulation No. 100, which gives the Minister discretionary power to deal with the illegal taking or selling of water. This is a repetition practically word for word of the former regulation No. 96.

The PRESIDENT: I do not want to hurry the hon. member, but I suggest that he should have his particulars a little more readily to hand.

Hon. J. CORNELL: Unless one set himself out for a week's work in order to make a close comparison of the old and the new regulations, it is impossible to concentrate on this question. Members are asked to do work which should have been done by the framers of the regulations. I do not wish to detain the House longer than to say that after the explanation of the Minister—

Hon. E. H. Harris: What do you think about meter rents?

Hon. J. CORNELL: I think Mr. Lovekin should withdraw from his motion some of the regulations and concentrate on those which have not been in force heretofore. If a regulation has been in operation for 15 or 16 years, and the phraseology has not been altered, we should not be asked to disallow

it. Regarding Mr. Harris's interjection, I am not so much concerned about meter rents as about meter readings. We know how we stand in relation to meter rent, but my experience is that whether my meter registers or not makes not the slightest difference to the yearly water bill. My complaint is against the meter. I have had meters changed and during a period when the meter was not working, the quantity of water consumed was considerably higher than during a period when the meter worked throughout.

Hon. A. LOVEKIN (Metropolitan—in reply) [4.56]: Mr. Cornell's view that because some regulations have been in force for 15 or 16 years they should stand, and that only those which have been altered should be disallowed, does not commend itself to me. It does not follow that regulations which have been in force for 50 years are good regulations and applicable to-day. If that were the doctrine, we should never change anything. True, quite a number of these regulations have been in force for a long time, but this is the only opportunity we shall have for many years to deal with them again as a whole. Therefore, the House is quite within its rights in looking at them as a whole, and refusing to pass them. If I may judge by the experience of the past, there will never be an opportunity to deal with these regulations again, at any rate not in my life time. The cancellations and repeals of old regulations came up once at a time, some on pieces of type-written paper and, in a form that the public could not see them, they were allowed to pass this House and become law. Thus the opportunity to deal with them was lost. I have spent a good deal of the recess in looking through these regulations. They were gazetted in March last and I took the "Government Gazette" and went right through them. I am satisfied we shall be doing a good service to the country if we disallow all the regulations mentioned in the motion. Even if some members do not agree that certain regulations should be disallowed, no possible harm can be done by disallowing them because the department can and will put them up again. The department will have an opportunity to peruse the discussion which has taken place in this House and to put up regulations in accordance with the wishes expressed by members.

Hon. J. Duffell: What good can result if they submit them again?

Hon. A. LOVEKIN: The regulations should be sent back in an amended form taking into account the opinions expressed in this House. If the department again put up the regulations in the same form, the Minister should come prepared to justify them.

Hon. F. E. S. Willmott: If they had taken any notice of what has been said in the last few years, the regulations would have appeared in different form to-day.

Hon. A. LOVEKIN: The first regulation referred to by the Minister was No. 7. All

I suggested was that the department should give the person who was required to do work an appeal to the Minister from the decision of the inspector. Regulation 7 gives to an inspector the power to order certain work to be done—to order the removal of closets and urinals situated on a catchment area. Of course we all want to preserve the purity of our water supply, and nobody objects to such a regulation. But this regulation refers to such outhouses as have already been passed by the department. Under it an ordinary inspector has the power to put the owner of a property to no end of expense, and that without any appeal. The Minister says, "You can appeal." I would draw the Minister's attention to a recent decision of the court, that where a discretionary power is given to an official, there is no appeal. All I suggest to the department is that they shall put up the regulation again, giving to the person concerned the right of appeal to the Minister. That seems to me a fair thing in the interests of the public, and I leave it at that. Now I come to regulation 43, which in the interests of the department itself ought to be looked to and reconsidered. Section 47 of the Act says that a person must himself look after his pipes and mains and so on. But the regulation comes in and says that a licensed plumber alone must do so. That might be tested against the department, and I suggest that the regulation be considered again. To my mind it is clearly *ultra vires* the Act. The Act provides sufficiently for the matter, so far as I can see. Personally, in my own case, I would attend to a leak on my side of the meter and let the department prosecute me.

Hon. E. H. Harris: Quite a number of people do that.

Hon. A. LOVEKIN: But why should we be liable to a penalty for doing it? Mr. Cornell has dealt with regulation 52. As he very properly points out, it is an alteration of the past practice, and is altogether too drastic. The regulation might well be reconsidered by the department.

The Minister for Education: Regulation 52 is made less drastic than before.

Hon. A. LOVEKIN: I cannot read it that way. I consider the regulation should be reconsidered in the interests both of the occupier of the premises concerning which information is required, and of the man who gives the information. Regulation 69 is a very long regulation, and I have to ask that the whole of it be disallowed, though only two or three paragraphs are concerned. This is the regulation which compels owners of property to take bits of pipe and sockets and elbows and other things per medium of a licensed plumber to the Water Supply Department and get them tested there, paying small fees for the purpose.

The Minister for Education: This refers only to sewerage, you know.

Hon. A. LOVEKIN: Quite so. But is not the obvious way of doing it to have the work inspected by a departmental inspector after it has been carried out under the supervision

of an architect? Should not that course be adopted, instead of forcing people to take all this trouble of getting a licensed plumber to go down to the department and get a socket tested and pay a penny? The thing is ridiculous. Then regulation 93 says that it shall be at the discretion of the Minister to supply water to any individual consumer, or to any land whether rated or not. In the first place I hold that if a person is compelled to pay rates, he should get some return for those rates, and the Minister should be compelled to give him water. The Leader of the House tells us that this is merely an amplification of what is contained in Sections 36 and 46 of the Act. The regulation, however, attempts to go further, because the two sections, read together, show that where a person pays rates Parliament has cast upon the Minister the obligation to supply water, except under almost impossible conditions, conditions which amount to *force majeure*. But the regulation goes right beyond that, and says that with or without reason, notwithstanding that the man has paid his rates, the Minister can perversely say that the man shall not get water. There are some Ministers who are sometimes perverse. Though the Leader of the House says the regulation does not go one step further than the Act, I will ask hon. members to read for themselves the regulation in conjunction with the two sections of the Act. If the regulation does not go a step further than the Act, why is it here? What is it wanted for at all? That is a very good reason why it should be disallowed. Now I come to regulation 100—

No person, whether entitled to receive water from the Minister or not, shall, without the written consent of the Minister, allow any water to be taken or carried away from his premises, or sell the same to any person.

The Leader of the House says that is quite reasonable. I suggest to him that the Minister in charge of water supply does not agree with him. To the knowledge of our Leader, Mr. Holmes, and of other members of this Chamber, that Minister has laid it down most emphatically, and in fairly strong language, that what a man pays for he is entitled to do what he likes with.

The Minister for Education: But that was not water.

Hon. A. LOVEKIN: It might have been anything, but the principle was there.

The Minister for Education: Do you suggest that a person paying big rates on a city property should be permitted to sell the water that he is entitled to use?

Hon. A. LOVEKIN: I do not see why he should not. Of course, that is going a bit further. If the department say that is not to be done, however, let the words of the by-law be clear as to that being intended. But do not let us pass a regulation which declares that a man cannot give a kettleful of water to his next door neighbour.

Hon. E. H. Harris: The object of the regulation may be to prevent the possibility of a

man who is tampering with his meter getting supplies of water from other premises.

Hon. A. LOVEKIN: Possibly that may be, but we should legislate for honest men rather than for rogues. If the intention is as suggested the department should say so in the regulation, instead of making a sweeping regulation that covers everything under the sun. Now I come to another regulation. Some of us who are residents of Perth have trees in front of our premises, trees planted there by the Perth City Council. Under this regulation one cannot squirt one's hose on to such a tree. One is paying for water, and wants to beautify the city; but under this regulation one cannot put one's hose on the tree. If that is not what is meant by the regulation, I say to the department, "Put up what you do mean." Undoubtedly there is a good deal of right intention in these regulations; but as they become law when we pass them through this House, I do suggest that they should say exactly what they mean. I ask that these by-laws be disallowed, and sent back to the department, so that the department may say exactly what they want. Next I come to regulation 119, which refers to rates and charges. This is taxation, and taxation by regulation pure and simple. As I have shown, and as Mr. Macfarlane, who is a member of the City Council, admitted by interjection, here is an average increase of 24 per cent. in the city assessments this year over last year; and the department are going to get 24 per cent. more revenue than they got before, and this for no more storm water service, for no more water, for no more sewerage. At the same time there is a proposal to charge 1s. 3d. per thousand gallons for excess water. Two years ago the charge was 1s. per thousand. Last year it was raised, and no objection was taken to the amended regulation. I myself would not take objection to it, because I thought the department probably wanted the money. But here is an increase of 24 per cent. on all the rates. It is time that the price of water got down to a reasonable figure. Even 1s. per thousand is an excessive price. The Minister speaks of shortage of water and so on, but the Governor's Speech tells us that the new hoses are all down and that there will be any amount of water available in future. So there is no reason why the price should be kept up.

The Minister for Education: I do not think the Governor's Speech says that.

Hon. A. LOVEKIN: Here is the paragraph in the Governor's Speech:—

In order to augment the metropolitan water supply, larger mains have been provided where required, and it is expected there will be no difficulty in coping with the demands during the coming summer.

The Minister for Education: That does not suggest that there will be water to waste.

Hon. A. LOVEKIN: I am not suggesting that we waste water. People are not likely to waste water while they have to pay for

every drop that goes through the meter—and, as Mr. Cornell has just reminded me, some meters run pretty rapidly. It is time the price of water should come down to 1s. per thousand gallons, especially when one has in mind the experience of North Perth and Mt. Lawley last summer, when people had to allow thousands of gallons to run to waste because mud instead of water came through their pipes. It is only fair that in the interests of the people this House should compel the department to reduce the price of water. After all, it is nothing less than a super tax.

Hon. J. J. Holmes: Could not the city council collect the water rates for the department, and so save thousands of pounds?

Hon. A. LOVEKIN: Last year I read in a report that the department has 45 clerks to send out rate notices. Of course, all those notices should be sent out with the municipal rate notices at one expense, and the money collected at one expense and handed over to the department.

Hon. J. J. Holmes: If they can amalgamate a State and a Federal department, why should they not amalgamate two local departments?

Hon. A. LOVEKIN: Regulation 125 affects only those in outside areas, who, although paying no rates, are required to have meters put in. I do not mind people paying for the water they use, but here is a charge of 20s. rent per annum for a quarter-inch meter. So, if one uses 20,000 gallons of water the price of which is 1s. 3d. per thousand gallons, he has to pay another 20s. for his meter, which bring up the price of the water to 2s. 3d. per thousand gallons. This is one of the by-laws which require further consideration. Now we come to by-law 131, which says that when a building is being erected the department can get an over-riding commission on the value of the building. The department claims payment, not for the actual water supplied, but in the shape of a percentage on the value of the building. What has this water department to do with the levying of a tax on a building in course of erection? It is only right that the department should be paid for the water used in the construction of a building, but why should the owner of a house have to pay a special tax imposed by regulation on the value of the building?

The Minister for Education: He does not have to pay if he does not want the water.

Hon. A. LOVEKIN: The by-law expressly states, "charges shall be based on the cost of the building, and where there is no contract the value of the proposed building shall be fixed by the Minister." This is pure taxation. The department has no right to levy taxation on a building.

The Minister for Education: It is only when water is required for building purposes.

Hon. J. Cornell: Why cannot he pay on his consumption?

Hon. A. LOVEKIN: That is the point! Some water is necessary to the erection of

every building, if only to give the workmen a drink. But where any pipe is laid to a building in course of construction, the department has the option of charging on the value of the building, as against the quantity of water consumed. This is a department for supplying water, not a taxation department! Again the Minister told us the other day that we were getting along very well with our secondary industries. Every time I look around I see that instead of encouraging those industries we are hampering them. Last month we had evidence of it in a select committee inquiring into the question of power supplied to secondary industries. In the furnishing of water it is the same. There is a super charge of 1s. 6d. per thousand gallons on water for an industry. Surely that is not promoting industries! In view of the announcement in the Governor's Speech that there will be ample water this year, I suggest that the department might re-consider this by-law, in addition to the others enumerated, and see if they cannot, with others, do a little for the encouragement of secondary industries. I am sorry to have taken up so much time with this question, but it is in the interests of everybody in the metropolitan area and, moreover, there is an important principle involved. If the House disallows these regulations, presumably we shall have a different set issued which will be more reasonable and, perhaps, meet with the approval of hon. members.

Question put and a division taken with the following result:—

Ayes	12
Noes	4
Majority for ..					8

AYES.

Hon. F. A. Baglin	Hon. A. Lovekin
Hon. A. Burvill	Hon. G. W. Miles
Hon. J. Cornell	Hon. G. Potter
Hon. J. Duffell	Hon. A. Sanderson
Hon. E. H. Harris	Hon. H. Seddon
Hon. J. J. Holmes	Hon. J. A. Greig

(Teller.)

NOES.

Hon. H. P. Colebatch	Hon. J. Mills
Hon. J. Ewing	Hon. E. Rose

(Teller.)

Question thus passed.

MOTION—IMMIGRATION, STATE-WIDE SCHEME.

Debate resumed from the previous day on the following motion by Hon. G. W. Miles—

That in the opinion of this House, the Government should, at once, enter into negotiations with the Imperial and Commonwealth authorities in order to arrange joint schemes for development and migra-

tion, which shall apply not only to the South-West Division of the State, but also to Eucla, Central, Eastern, North-West, and Kimberley Divisions.

Hon. H. SEDDON (North-East) [5.29]: We all agree that while we can readily support the scheme advanced for the settlement of the South-West, it would be desirable to inaugurate other schemes with a view to effecting a considerable benefit to the whole of the State. I support the motion on that account. The South-West has the reputation of being one of the finest parts of the civilised world for the settlement of the human race. It has been well chosen for the inauguration of this settlement scheme. There are, however, other parts of Western Australia that are also entitled to consideration. Mr. Miles has shown the possibilities that exist in the northern areas where development is so urgently needed. There is frequently a certain amount of criticism because of the fact that the whole State is being administered from one centre. As a consequence there arise certain misunderstandings at times. If we had other settlement schemes centred in different districts they could be administered locally more sympathetically than would otherwise be the case. The whole State will be required to face the financial responsibility that will be incurred in connection with the immigration scheme. If people feel they are not participating in the benefits of that scheme, a certain amount of resentment and dissatisfaction will arise. I am, therefore, glad that Mr. Miles has moved this motion. Western Australia naturally falls into various divisions. It is a large State and covers a tremendous area. There are great variations in climate and rainfall. The various parts of the State have developed industries that are natural to them. The State may be divided into four divisions from this point of view. There is the North-West with its tropical agriculture and cattle industry. The South-West has its forest and dairying. The wheat belt has its wheat production and sheep raising. Last of all there is the great central dry area, in which at present there is no industry except mining that claims attention. Each of these divisions has distinct conditions and distinct resources, and each should be administered from the standpoint of its resources. Each could be worked under a separate scheme, such a scheme as would meet the requirements of each one, in place of a scheme designed to cover the whole State. From that point of view also I welcome Mr. Miles' motion. On Monday last, the 30th anniversary of the discovery of Coolgardie was celebrated in that town. Although mining meant so much to this State, and was the means of thousands of square miles of country being opened up, there is nothing developed in that part of the State that could keep it going outside the mining

industry. Now that this industry is declining we have to consider how we are to keep the people who are now living there, and how to find means of employment for them. With that end in view we must seriously consider such a scheme as that put forward by Mr. Miles. As I have said, it is a dry area. Possibly that had something to do with the neglect of the people to develop other resources. We find from the records that the average rainfall for the last 25 years in that area has been 9.9 inches, but that 70 per cent. of the rain has fallen during the growing period, between April and October. Within that area there grows a number of different plants, which are especially adapted to meet the requirements of graziers of sheep or cattle. These plants represent a very valuable asset. Sheep men have told me that the country could well be utilised for the raising of sheep if it were fenced and the dogs were kept out. Preparations would also have to be made for the conservation of water. The plant life, to which I have referred, would, if properly developed, carry a considerable number of sheep.

Hon. J. Ewing: What does the plant life consist of?

Hon. H. SEDDON: It consists mostly of shrub, for the grasses grow mainly in the winter time. These grasses, however, by a process of development, are specially adapted to the dry conditions under which they grow. It is possible that this plant life could be further utilised so as to increase the carrying capacity of the land. A tremendous advance has been made of late years in the methods employed in wheat production. When I went to the gold-fields some 20 years ago it was commonly stated that any man who wished to start growing wheat at Tammin was mad. A little while after people were quite pleased to go to Merredin, where fine crops are now being produced. There are now many men settled around Southern Cross, and land is being opened up as far as the Yilgarn area for wheat growing. Last week I saw a crop there that had been sown this season. The land had been well fallowed, and, even with the small rainfall we have had this year, the crop is looking well. This affords an illustration of the improvement that is being manifested in wheat growing methods, and shows what might be done by the investigations being followed up. Splendid work has been done by the Merredin State Farm in the direction of wheat growing experiments. The management of that farm has now evolved a method which is thought to be eminently suitable for the light rainfall of that district. Most members are familiar with the splendid work that has been done by Mr. Farrer in wheat breeding. Varieties of wheat have been grown at the Merredin farm that are especially adapted to dry areas. Some of these varieties have been sown, and most of them have come up to expectations. It is possible that in a little while this drier country on the gold-

fields will be found worthy of further experimental work with a view to ascertaining whether it would not be possible to grow wheat on a large scale. At present the general opinion is that wheat growing there is a gamble. On the information we have, it would be entirely unwise to attempt settlement on a large scale in that locality. After two or three years of experimental work it may be possible to arrive at the position when people can be assured of carrying on the agricultural industry there with every chance of success, provided they use the types of wheat that have been proved to be suitable, and that stock raising is also made part and parcel of the farming operations. Not long ago we were told of the excellent work that had been done by Mr. Luther Burbank in California with respect to the development of natural fodder plants. Professor Biffin of Cambridge has also done excellent work on much the same lines. These two gentlemen by employing and applying the principles of Mendel have discovered certain characteristics in various plants, and by fixing them have been enabled to produce excellent results. Mr. Breakwell, of the Agricultural Department of New South Wales, has also been carrying on a series of investigations upon the plant life found in the centre of Australia, as well as of grasses. He too has found that these plants possess distinct characteristics that make them specially suitable for the resistance of drought. These characteristics are common to a number of plants growing in these areas. He is now endeavouring to follow up this research work, and see if it is not possible to successfully cultivate these plants. It is very difficult to cultivate native plants, but Mr. Breakwell hopes to succeed in doing so. If he is successful in his experiments this may be the means of thousands of acres of country being brought under cultivation which at present are regarded as so much waste territory. Experimental work of this nature would well repay Western Australia, and might be the means of bringing us into line with the other important wheat raising countries in the world. Canada only came to the fore as a wheat producing country because types of wheat suitable for its short growing season had been evolved. The breeding of 90-day wheat suitable for that Dominion was the starting off point of the greatness as a wheat producer that the country has now reached. Surely we in Western Australia have an equal opportunity, and if we undertake and extend work along these lines, there may be opened up for us possibilities just as great as those that some years ago lay before Canada. We may yet see this State occupying the foremost position in Australia as a wheat producer. It is desirable that every part of the State should be developed. There are many miles of railway running through the country on which the traffic is very small because there is so little production

going on in the areas served by them. Every opportunity should be taken to increase our production and provide traffic for our railways. The position of Australia would be tremendously improved, if at any time there was an invasion, by the provision of sources of production in the interior. If that could be accomplished the defending forces could retire to the interior, falling back mile after mile and putting up a successful resistance. Our armies would be sure that behind them lay supplies of food, which would greatly increase their resisting powers, and at the same time make more difficult the task of the invader. The menace of war has not yet disappeared, and this is not the least factor to be taken into consideration when we outline the policy for the development of our country. There are definite opportunities in Western Australia for proving to the outside world that there is not a portion of the State that will not respond to the man who studies it, and intelligently applies the lessons afforded by nature of improving its indigenous resources along lines which have already given such definite and important results.

Hon. J. A. GREIG (South-East) [5.45]: I congratulate Mr. Miles on being such a public spirited man and on having spent a considerable amount of time and money in developing this subject. I realise that Mr. Miles is a man of big ideas. The matter of detail in every scheme is always one of controversy, and I do not suppose it would be possible for anyone to propose any scheme for closer settlement in Australia without being subjected to hostile criticism from some quarters. But I think it is only right that such should be the case. In every instance, if those who do not see eye to eye with whoever may be promulgating such a scheme, placed their reasons for opposing it before whoever was in charge, there might be a chance of bettering the scheme. Probably every hon. member will vote for the motion because it is broad in its conception. I realise that and therefore I intend to support it. But it can only be a pious hope under existing conditions. What I mean to say is that, even if the Federal Government step into the breach—and if any Government does so it should be the Federal Government, because immigration to Australia generally is a Federal question—under existing conditions we are bound to meet difficulties. We have a tariff wall around Australia which has increased the cost of everything produced in Australia, and once we supply our own demands, we shall have to find outside markets. But then we shall be competing against the production of the world, and the task will be rendered exceedingly difficult by the tariff which operates here.

Hon. J. Duffell: When we export we shall not require a tariff.

Hon. J. A. GREIG: I maintain that we should be an exporting community. Our Government should aim at exporting and not

manufacturing, in order to feed and clothe the people. To-day in Australia we are, so to speak, taking in one another's washing for a living. That is the way it appeals to me. The South-West scheme which the Premier has inaugurated is a big idea, but I can see that it is going to be a difficult matter to make a success of it. I honestly believe that it will cost 21s. to produce one pound's worth.

Hon. T. Moore: A bit more.

Hon. J. A. GREIG: If it would only cost 19s. to produce a pound's worth, the scheme, I am convinced would be a success. At the same time, I am prepared to render every assistance to ensure the success of the scheme. My opinion, however, is that it will fail, though the time will come when we shall be able to get ahead of it. The time will also come when the people of Australia will be awakened to the fact that the existing policy of high protection is wrong. This must be realised when they are big enough and broad-minded enough to see things as many of us do, especially those of us who travel through the back-country and who have big ideas like Mr. Miles. When that comes about, I believe the people of Australia will alter the existing policy and give primary production a chance to make good.

Hon. F. A. Baglin: The people of Australia will soon declare whether the policy is wrong.

Hon. J. A. GREIG: The people of Australia should see that the policy they advocate and insist on is carried out by returning members to the Federal Parliament to carry it out. Australia is a country that should be producing wheat, wool and meat as well as minerals and timber. Let us look at the position of the timber industry as it exists to-day. We find that its operations are suspended. The cost of producing timber in Western Australia has become so high that the Government find it impossible to sell it outside the State.

Hon. J. Mills: And the people cannot buy it in the State.

Hon. T. Moore: There is something wrong with the system.

Hon. J. A. GREIG: That is so. To-day we can import softwoods cheaper than we can cut timber from our own forests.

Hon. C. F. Baxter: You will not get the tariff altered until you get stronger representation, because the other States derive so much benefit from it.

Hon. J. A. GREIG: Quite so, but I am hopeful that the time will come when the people will realise that the policy of Australia must be one of free trade.

Hon. C. F. Baxter: A revenue tariff.

Hon. J. A. GREIG: Yes, a revenue tariff. Mr. Miles' idea to settle our large tracts of pastoral country would be excellent but for the cost of production. He certainly has this in his favour, that I believe we shall be able to produce wool in this State when we cannot produce wheat, butter, or anything else, because there is little labour required in the production of wool. To-day we find many

farmers giving up wheat growing and going in for sheep. They are thus able to dispense with labour and machinery and produce a commodity at considerably less cost. That may be to the interests of the individual, but it certainly is not in the interests of the State. I have not been to that part of the State to which Mr. Miles has referred, and which is marked on the map before us, but I have been further north and west of it, and from what I was able to see and hear, it was possible for me to form a fairly good idea of the nature of the country. I realise that it is not possible to mark out 32 million acres of country into stations of 200,000 acres each, just as one would mark out a draught board, and give those taking up the areas a fair chance of making a success of them. I realise that some of those 200,000 acre blocks would be comparatively worthless. Of course, they would not be taken out in squares, and I presume it is not Mr. Miles' intention to do that. The country, I presume, would be surveyed and selected so as to provide a variety of feed in each area. I am aware that fortunes have been made in that country by men of experience who were prepared to rough it and to battle against the conditions. I am against the coddling of any industry by the Government. That is what has been wrong with us in the past. It is the Government coddling of industries that has brought about the state of affairs which has induced Mr. Miles to move the motion we are discussing.

Hon. F. A. Baglin: They have coddled the farmer pretty well.

Hon. J. A. GREIG: But they coddled the other fellow first. The whole system is wrong. We have our Arbitration Court, which has coddled the worker, who is no better off to-day than he was before. He gets his high rate of wage but that is taken from him by the high cost of living.

Hon. A. Lovekin: Is the court any good to-day?

Hon. J. A. GREIG: I do not think so, and if everyone in Australia were of my opinion it would be abolished to-morrow. We have had Government interference in many ways. In Australia to-day we have too much legislation and it is hampering the progressive people of this country. We do not allow people to mind their own business and to progress as they would wish to do. Only this afternoon Mr. Lovekin pointed out that an individual was not allowed to use his own judgment even to the extent of purchasing a length of piping; he had to take it to a Government official to get it examined. Such restrictions hamper progress. Then when a person has products to sell in the open markets, and has to compete with other countries, hampering legislation is introduced and thus he is compelled to work at a disadvantage. If Australia had gone in for a different policy in the first place, there would be no need for the Government to seek immigrants. We have the land and the people would come here. Men

with capital would be prepared to come to Australia to develop the territory. I have much pleasure in supporting the motion. If it goes forward to the Federal Government, I hope it will be seriously considered and that the members of that Government will be big enough and broad-minded enough to look at the question from various points of view. They should be made to realise what is standing in the way of progress, and that the people themselves would be prepared to go on the land if the conditions were less drastic and if there were less interference on the part of Government.

Hon. A. LOVEKIN (Metropolitan) [5.57]: Mr. Miles is to be congratulated for bringing this motion before the House. I am pleased with it because it is comprehensive and portends big things. My view is, that from an Empire standpoint the North is more in need of people than the South, and if we can do anything which will help to populate the empty spaces in the tropical parts of the State, we shall be doing a useful service to the country. In considering a scheme of this magnitude one must also look at the proposal which has been advanced in connection with the South-Western province, and we must guard against entering upon a scheme such as that which is being put forward for the settlement of the south. I propose to show how the South-West scheme has been misunderstood by some hon. members, and also how my attitude towards that scheme has also been misunderstood. On the Address-in-reply I took up a fair amount of time in trying to put forward objections to the scheme and to suggest what I thought might be done to improve it. The remarks I made on that occasion have been criticised in several directions and I wish to show that, in the light of the facts, those criticisms were not well founded. I want to show that the South-West scheme is not a good one, in order that we may attempt a bigger and wider scheme for the North and other provinces, such as Mr. Miles has in view. Dr. Saw, in criticising what I put forward, referred to me as Jeremiah. He drew attention to the fact that Jeremiah wrote some lamentations. The obvious view of the hon. member was that I was lamenting, or "crying over spilt milk." I think Dr. Saw did me great honour in referring to me as Jeremiah.

Hon. A. Sanderson: Hear, hear!

Hon. A. LOVEKIN: Jeremiah was not only one of the major prophets, but he was the maximus prophet. He was even above Isaiah. When I heard of the hon. member's references—I was not in the House at the time—I at once took my Bible and read a little of Jeremiah. I am convinced that if we had followed Jeremiah, and if the State had followed him, we would not have been in half the difficulties which face us now. Dr. Saw occasionally makes flippant

speeches. He never puts any legislation of a constructive character before us. Hon. members will remember that there was an ancient author—I am not sure whether he was Pliny the younger or Pliny the elder—who told a story about an artist named Appelles, who had painted a picture of a maiden. A cobbler came along and drew the artist's attention to the fact that the shoes on the maiden were not quite as they should be. The artist saw that the man was a cobbler and considered that he should know something about shoes, in consequence of which he repainted the shoes in accordance with the orthodox fashion. Then the cobbler got swelled head because of the attitude of the artist. The cobbler thought he might venture upon a little further criticism and he drew attention to the legs of the damsel. The artist immediately turned upon him and uttered the following words, which have become famous as a proverb: "Ne sutor ultra crepidam." The English version of that is: "Let the cobbler stick to his last." Dr. Saw also challenged my statement—

The PRESIDENT: I think the hon. member's quotation might also be suggested regarding his remarks and the motion.

Hon. A. LOVEKIN: That is so. I will show in a minute how this applies. I will change the wording somewhat and apply the quotation to Dr. Saw. I suggest in language which at least you, Mr. President, will appreciate, the following: "Ne chignria ultra veram," which I will interpret as meaning: "Let the surgeon stick to his saw." We are prepared to listen to Dr. Saw when he refers to the composition of pills, or to the use of forceps, but we recognise that the hon. member gets out of his depth when he starts discussing finances or economics.

The PRESIDENT: I do not think the debate the hon. member refers to took place in connection with this motion.

Hon. A. LOVEKIN: I am following an hon. member who discussed the South-West scheme, and put it to us that that scheme was a good one. I want to show that the scheme is a bad one, and that we must have something different for the North-West.

The PRESIDENT: That is how you connect your remarks with the motion?

Hon. A. LOVEKIN: That is so.

The PRESIDENT: So long as you keep within the four corners of the motion, it is all right.

Hon. J. Duffell: He has only touched one corner, but he is sticking to his last!

Hon. A. LOVEKIN: In the course of my remarks, I contended that the South-West scheme was not likely to be effective, because we have already had the same scheme in existence for many years, and it has not brought population to the State. I pointed out the position as set out in the Governor's Speech, where it was mentioned that we got so many people since 1909 and so few remained. I also pointed out that last year we only succeeded in keeping 27 people out of all those who came here. Dr. Saw, in reply, put it

that they were not the same people who went away as those who came here. There the hon. member got away from the business of his profession and got into the realms of economics, which resulted in his putting up a stupid answer such as that. He said they were not the same people who went away! How do we reckon the indebtedness per head of our population? Is it not on so many people in the State? How does the Commonwealth pay the per capita grant, except on numbers and not on Brown or Jones? Dr. Saw challenged another statement I made to the effect that the British Government and the Commonwealth Government would each make money out of the scheme, whereas Western Australia must lose money. He replied to that by saying that I had miscalculated the whole proposition, because the British Government would not make anything on the volume of the amount involved in the export trade to the Dominions, but would only make a profit on it. The Minister followed that line of reasoning.

The Minister for Education: That the British Government would not make a profit on the trade?

Hon. A. LOVEKIN: It is exactly what the Premier said in another place, and I will show that the British Government will make a considerable amount of money out of it. In an interview published in London on the 13th July last, Mr. Amery—I am keeping to authorities such as he is—gave figures dealing with the export trade in 1913 to illustrate the value of the markets of the Dominions compared with those of Germany and Russia before the war. Included in the figures he referred to were those of Australia, and the export trade from Great Britain to Australia was represented at a value of £34,447,269, or £7 3s. 7d. per head.

The Minister for Education: On thirty-four million pounds, the average per head would be more than £7.

Hon. A. LOVEKIN: I have not checked the figures.

Hon. G. W. Miles: The amount is £8 7s. 4d.

Hon. A. LOVEKIN: I will call it £8 per head. If we take only 10 per cent. of that as profit, we get a return of £3,447,126 to the British people, which is five times the £600,000 the British Government advance to us during the five-year period.

The Minister for Education: For the new population.

Hon. A. LOVEKIN: Those figures prove that, allowing the profit as 10 per cent., the British people make five times the amount they are advancing to us, and I regard that as profit. When I stated that the British people will make as much in one year as they will pay in five years, it will be seen that I was correct, according to the figures quoted by Mr. Amery. Then again, Sir Phillip Lloyd Greaves, Parliamentary Secretary for Overseas Trade, quoted £8, as against Mr. Amery's £7 3s. 7d. I take it that the sum of £3,447,126 represents

the profit on the exports to Australia. The hon. member stated that the British Government would make no profits.

THE PRESIDENT: Will the hon. member resume his seat? I think the hon. member is out of order in discussing this matter. He is taking advantage of an opportunity to reply to remarks regarding his own speech in discussing the details of the scheme for the South-West. What I can see in the motion before the House is that, in the opinion of members, the Government should at once enter into negotiations with the Imperial and Commonwealth authorities, in order to arrange joint schemes for development and migration, which shall apply not only to the South-West division of the State but also to Eucla, Central, Eastern, North-West, and Kimberley divisions. All these references to details regarding the South-West scheme are, to my mind, out of order. I do not wish to control the hon. member too much, but I think he is going beyond what I regard as reasonable bounds.

Hon. A. LOVEKIN: I submit respectfully that I must show the South-West scheme to be untenable and bad, before I can put up an argument about a larger scheme regarding the North-West.

THE PRESIDENT: But these details have already been discussed.

Hon. A. LOVEKIN: Not from my point of view. The Minister and Dr. Saw say that the British Government make nothing out of it.

The Minister for Education: I never said anything of the kind.

Hon. A. LOVEKIN: The Premier said so. "Where does the British Government make any profit out of it?" was what the Premier asked. I want to show that they make something out of it, so that I can indicate that the British authorities should go much further, with the powers they have, in connection with a North-West scheme.

THE PRESIDENT: If you continue on those lines, it is all right.

Hon. A. LOVEKIN: I propose to do so. I intend to show that the Imperial Government will make money out of this scheme and I contend that, from an Empire point of view, they should not make money out of it.

Sitting suspended from 6.15 to 7.30 p.m.

Hon. A. LOVEKIN: Before tea I was attempting to show that the British Government as well as the Commonwealth Government would greatly profit by the south-western scheme, but as I understand you, Sir, do not wish me to proceed on those lines, I do not propose to traverse the Premier's remarks in reply to the criticism I levelled against the scheme during the debate on the Address-in-reply. I had hoped to be able to show that the Premier was mistaken in his own scheme and did not understand his own scheme, but I shall have to avail myself of some other opportunity to do that. I shall content myself now with putting to the House that the British Government must

make money out of the scheme, with a view to showing that they can do more with a larger scheme. I have referred to the large volume of goods that Great Britain exports to Australia. On those goods a profit is made by Great Britain which, calculated at 10 per cent., would give in one year £3,000,000 odd.

The Minister for Education: Not on these new settlers.

Hon. A. LOVEKIN: I am not speaking of the new settlers. I am speaking of the profit on the trade to Australia. The British manufacturers and others export large quantities of goods to Australia upon which they make a profit. On that profit the Imperial Government levy income tax which runs up to 12s. 6d. in the pound. Out of the £3,000,000 odd of profits, therefore, the Chancellor of the Exchequer reaps a large amount of revenue. I am not able to pursue that argument, or I would proceed to show that in this year there is a much larger volume of trade, a much bigger profit and a much larger amount of taxation accruing to the Chancellor of the Exchequer. Seeing that the British Government must reap great advantages from this migration to Australia or even to Western Australia, I submit they can do much more towards such a scheme than they are doing at present. If we are going to adopt these large schemes in Empire interests, it is up to the British authorities as well as the Commonwealth authorities to take their fair share of the responsibilities. I think the British Government are prepared to do more than they have done. I propose to read from the British "Hansard" debate portion of a speech by Colonel Amery delivered on the 22nd May last on the third reading of the Empire Settlement Bill. He said:—

As regards the land settlement, the view expressed by myself on behalf of the British Government at the special conference to which I have referred was that whatever the cost, the amount we should be prepared to advance to the settler should not be more than £300, although as a matter of fact the cost of settlement might well be over double that amount.

This means £100 under our scheme as the amount per settler on the 6,000 settlers, or £8 per settler on the 75,000 settlers.

That, as a general rule, is a proposal I shall be inclined to adhere to and, if I were not so inclined, I rather think the Treasury would insist upon my adhering to it.

The Minister for Education: That is advanced as a loan, not as a gift.

Hon. A. LOVEKIN: I shall show that the British Government will take the responsibility of it. Colonel Amery continued:—

Of course, we shall try to get people settled on the land on the most economical basis, but in co-operation with the Dominion Governments we shall not advance more than £300 per settler, and we reckon that in the greater number of cases, we shall get our money back. There will, of course, be a certain number of failures, and where

there is a failure, the Dominion Government concerned will share pro rata in the loss. But, roughly speaking, we hope in nearly all cases to get our money back. Then there is a third item in the settlement scheme which I illustrated in the House the other day in reference to Western Australia. Under that scheme we rather suggested—and, of course, the matter will have to be gone into much more fully than it has been so far—that we should give no advance towards the total cost of the settlement, but that we should make a contribution towards the interest on the cost of the settlement for the first five years, to cover any loss and to cover also the initial period before the settler could repay. In such a case, it would be a grant so far as we are concerned and not a loan, but it would be a very much smaller amount. In the second reading debate I have pointed out that under the scheme we had had before us, the Western Australian Government undertook to settle 75,000 persons, men, women and children, at a cost of some £6,000,000, provided that the Commonwealth and the United Kingdom made a contribution of one-third of the interest for five years on the successive instalments raised.

It does not mean that they are going to lend the money; we have to raise the money.

This spread over a period of seven or eight years, would cost us something like £600,000, or £8 per settler.

They are prepared to advance a settler £300 and this scheme is going to cost them £8 per settler.

Personally I think these figures are too low. I do not think quite so many people could be settled there for so low an expenditure. But, given suitable areas, it may be possible, by means of a contribution to the interest on the scheme, to settle men even more cheaply than in any other way.

It will be observed that the British Minister in charge of this scheme himself suggests that it cannot be carried out for the money, and probably he was influenced by the article which Mr. Holmes referred to last night which said that this is a unique country where men pay themselves their own wages and the Government advance the money to them. This was probably Mr. Amery's view. He is entitled under his Bill during 15 years to expend three millions of money.

The PRESIDENT: The hon. member is quite out of order in referring to the south-western scheme. He must confine his remarks to the motion before the House. If he disapproves of the south-western scheme he cannot approve of the motion before the House, unless he has something further to say on the matter. He must keep away from the south-western scheme. He has debated it *ad nauseam*.

Hon. A. LOVEKIN: With due respect, Sir, I am endeavouring to show that the British Government can do more for a settlement scheme. In connection with the

south-western scheme they say they are surprised that it is being done for so little money, and I want to point out that under the scheme submitted by Mr. Miles, they should go much further and that they have the power to do so. I suggest also their willingness to do it, because they marvel at the small amount this scheme is to cost. I respectfully submit that I am in order.

The PRESIDENT: The hon. member must confine himself to the North-West scheme. He is continually harping on the south-western scheme and in doing so is quite out of order.

Hon. A. LOVEKIN: I am afraid I cannot advance my arguments if I am not able to show that a scheme which the Government have initiated is being carried out for too small an amount, and that if the Imperial Government are to be approached in connection with the larger scheme, we shall require a larger amount of assistance which the Imperial Government are apparently willing to give.

The PRESIDENT: The hon. member has already shown that.

Hon. J. J. Holmes: Reference to the south-western scheme is included in the motion.

Hon. A. LOVEKIN: Yes. I do not wish to challenge your ruling, Sir, but I think the argument I have submitted is in accordance with the Standing Orders and the practice of Parliament. Before us is a wide motion, and I submit that I am entitled to discuss any schemes referred to in the motion. As, however, you apparently think that I am digressing too much, I shall close my remarks.

Point of Order.

Hon. J. J. Holmes: On a point of order, Sir, I do not want to see this discussion baulked in any way. The motion refers to joint schemes which shall apply not only to the south-western division of the State, but also to other divisions. Surely under that members can discuss the south-western scheme.

Hon. E. H. Harris: That is the point.

The President: The hon. member has already discussed the south-western scheme to no end, both on this and on a previous occasion.

Hon. J. J. Holmes: Assuming that to be so, surely he is at liberty to enlarge on and discuss the south-western scheme as much as he thinks fit.

The President: It is nothing but repetition.

Hon. J. J. Holmes: I have never heard Mr. Amery on the subject before, and I listened with interest to the hon. member's quotations from what Mr. Amery has to say of the scheme. Now I have to peruse "Hansard," or go elsewhere, to get the information.

The President: That has all been said before.

Hon. J. J. Holmes: I have never heard it.

The President: Because the hon. member was not here.

Hon. A. Lovekin: This has never been read before, Sir. It is quite new. I have only got it since the last debate on the subject. However, in view of your wishes I will not proceed further.

Debate resumed.

Hon. T. MOORE (Central) [7.47]: I join with Mr. Holmes in regretting that this discussion is hampered to some extent. In referring to any scheme for settlement in any part of this State, one cannot help referring to what is now being done. It stands to reason that if any other scheme is proposed, we should take into consideration that as the same people, namely the State Government, the Federal Government, and the Imperial Government, will be concerned, considerable importance attaches to the question whether there has been blundering in the past.

The PRESIDENT: That is quite correct. Mr. Lovekin addressed his remarks to that aspect before tea.

Hon. T. MOORE: A large settlement scheme such as this might well occupy the attention of the House for many hours. If by devoting several evenings to the subject, we could do anything to help towards the development of the North-West, the time would be well spent. However, seeing that the discussion has been baulked to some extent owing to Mr. Lovekin being obliged to refrain from proceeding with his remarks, I shall offer a few comments. I regret that I was not present when Mr. Miles moved his motion. I think one can grasp a subject much better if one hears the actual speech than if one merely reads the report of it. Having read Mr. Miles's speech, I do not altogether agree with it. I acknowledge that it is possible to do something to develop the north, as has been said here repeatedly. Mr. Miles submits a scheme suggesting that development should be done in the large area north of Meekatharra. I am not acquainted with that particular area, but I will say of it as I say of the South-West, that in our settlement schemes we are always going to the other end of our railways, are always going to the back of beyond in a country where the population is sparse and where there is a large mileage of railways. Following on the lines suggested by Mr. Holmes, I would point out that much could be done to settle that portion of the State which is easily accessible. Along our railway lines we have many areas which might well be cut up and settled before we proceed with settlement further back, where, after all, there is a doubt. Even in and around Yalgoo, at no distance from the coast, there are instances of as much as a million acres being held by one man. That is altogether too much. I agree with Mr. Miles that it is possible for a person to do well with sheep and cattle on 200,000 or 250,000 acres. I take pastoral development to be the feature of Mr. Miles's scheme. As for mineral resources, they do not really

enter into the scheme. Prospectors are out wherever it is possible for them to go, and I hold that much could be done for them, though not under this particular scheme. Now, before any further development of the pastoral industry takes place, we want an outlet for the products of that industry.

Hon. G. W. Miles: There is a good market for wool.

Hon. T. MOORE: Certainly, but we want to go further. We want our freezing works erected.

Hon. H. Stewart: There are freezing works at Carnarvon, Wyndham, Geraldton, and Fremantle.

Hon. T. MOORE: At Geraldton too?

Hon. J. Ewing: There ought to be.

Hon. T. MOORE: I agree with that. However, the present Government will not do anything for the development of Geraldton and its district—not even in the way of providing the first essential of development, which is harbour accommodation. There have been sums of money on the Estimates for the building of a harbour at Geraldton, but for some reason or other nothing is done.

Hon. J. Ewing: The necessary stone cannot be got there.

Hon. T. MOORE: The stone is there, and plenty of it. But, that obstacle having been overcome, still nothing is being done. I am glad, however, to think that we have a Government who will do something for the marketing of North-West products. Much more will have to be done in that direction. As was proved before a select committee which sat last session to inquire into the Wyndham Meat Works—to the report of which committee the Government paid so little attention—all meat works latterly have had a bad time. The meat works have been hard up against it. But we know that the meat market will become normal again. In Britain to-day there are many people not in a position to buy meat at all. I have not been in Britain for the past two or three years, but I know that to be a fact. The time will come, however, when those people will be back in their old callings, and then our meat market will develop. I would start by developing markets, because we now have a surplus of stock in this State. That fact was proved by last session's select committee. We have quite sufficient stock for our own needs, and until we get a market for our surplus stock we shall not find ourselves further ahead. I believe the Imperial Government could do more in connection with the furtherance of migration than they have yet done. The Imperial Government are paying two or three million pounds a week in unemployment relief, and I suggest that they should be in a position to make better use of their surplus population than simply keeping it in the country. We are all agreed that there is plenty of room in this continent. What we want, however, is money; and I hope we shall not always be paying the same rate for

money as we are paying to-day. What we are up against is the high rate of interest. Even in connection with the present scheme we shall at the end of five years find ourselves paying 6 per cent. per annum interest. In fact, there are many things we have to do under that scheme, or else pay six per cent. on the money from the very start. Now, despite the fact that during the two or three years which have elapsed since the war we have been introducing immigrants into Western Australia, more people have left this State than have come into it. If that condition of things continues to the end of the five years of this contract, we shall get nothing under the contract.

Hon. J. J. Holmes: We have to establish 6,000 men on farms, and find employment for 75,000 people altogether.

Hon. T. MOORE: The best that we can expect is that at the end of five years we shall be paying 6 per cent for the money involved in the Government's immigration scheme. I will not make the position worse than that. As regards any money we may raise for the development of the agricultural industry, of which I know something, it will be a most difficult problem for a man engaged in farming to pay 7 per cent. for money and make his enterprise a success. That is one of the biggest jobs ever undertaken in Australia. The land settlement scheme of Western Australia is unique. No other State has ever embarked on the same lines. All the Eastern States have been settled by private enterprise. I am rather surprised to find that in this Chamber, almost every member of which has expressed the opinion that State enterprise is bad, there is support for State enterprise in connection with the immigration scheme. It has been pointed out that the people who have done well and are doing well in the back country are being taxed so heavily that they cannot last. Our taxation is altogether too high, and I trust something will be done to bring about a reduction. As regards land settlement beyond our existing railway system, there will be immense railway freights to pay. We shall not lighten the burden of our Railway Department unless we get something to put into the train between here and Meekatharra. Freight from Meekatharra would not yield much profit, even if special trains were running between Meekatharra and the coast all the time. We should look after that portion of the State where we have railways already. As to the problem of the man settling on the land, I would point out that if he is to pay 7 per cent. for his money and is also to pay excessively high railway freights, and on top of that high taxation, he has three strong factors operating against him. Those factors are operating against the success of the South-Western scheme.

Hon. G. W. Miles: Cannot the Government reduce the railway freights and run the railway system on business lines?

Hon. T. MOORE: I do not agree that we are going to help the railways at all by going

beyond the end of the existing lines. While I am in this House I shall endeavour to have something done for that which we have already built, in order that it may be made to pay. In any new development which may take place we should see whether we can get a quick return, particularly if we are to pay this high rate of interest. I believe with Mr. Holmes that we should endeavour to stay within the safe rainfall. There is plenty of land within the safe rainfall. We should concentrate on that, and afterwards take on any doubtful propositions which may be offering. I do not think the people who have been recently negotiating would be the proper people to negotiate the new scheme. I will oppose anything of that sort. If Mr. Miles can tell us that other people will have the management of the scheme—not those who have been negotiating—I will vote for the motion. Despite all that has been said about the scheme which has just been agreed to for us, I do not think we are on the high road to success.

Hon. J. Duffell: Are not the North-West League people to negotiate this scheme?

Hon. T. MOORE: It does not say so. I feel sure that if the thing were properly managed great development would take place, but I do not believe that everything which should be done will be done if we allow the scheme to be handled by the same set of bunglers as handled the last.

Hon. G. W. MILES (North—in reply) [8.2]: Before replying to the arguments used in the debate, I wish to congratulate you, Sir, on your election as President. I sincerely regret losing your support from the floor of the House, but I offer you my whole-hearted congratulations on your advancement. I wish also to express regret at the defeat of some of our older members, more particularly your predecessor. At the same time, I congratulate all new members on their election. I have to thank the Minister for putting this motion high on the Notice Paper so that it could be dealt with promptly. Mr. Ewing said he wished to know more about the mining section of this scheme. The motion is not for this scheme in particular. This scheme was only put forward as a concrete proposition for developing some portion of the State other than the South-West. Several members have made that the chief point, as if it were the actual motion before the Chamber. They were working on false premises. The Minister, at one stage of his address, appeared to be out to knock down the scheme; but as the result of carefully reading the report of his speech in "Hansard," I have concluded that he is a pretty warm supporter of the scheme. However, he wrongly accused me of attacking the Premier in a vehement and vindictive fashion. Certainly that was not my intention.

The Minister for Education: You do not know how fierce you looked.

Hon. G. W. MILES: I may have looked fierce; I was not feeling very well, but I did

not attack the Premier in a vehement way. The Minister asked also was it reasonable, having put such a proposition forward towards the end of last year, to expect the Government to carry it out during last session. I never suggested such a thing. All I said was that I thought the Government should have given the scheme greater consideration and definitely stated whether or not it was worth going on with. It has been before the Government for a year, and they have had ample time to go fully into the question. The plan prepared by us affords all information. It has been taken from the Government maps showing the classification of that country. When moving the motion I tried to indicate that it is absolutely necessary that we should people the country and people it quickly if we are to hold it for the British and the white races. Our objective should be to double our population in 10 years. It is of no use members and Ministers merely saying they are in favour of a White Australia. Talking will not keep Australia white. We cannot keep it white by keeping it empty. We require to place before Parliament other propositions for peopling other parts of the State besides the South-West. The policy of the Government is like making use of one section of an orange and leaving the remainder to rot. The South-West is but one section of the State.

Hon. J. Ewing: A valuable one.

Hon. G. W. MILES: Yes. I am not opposed to the South-West scheme; indeed, I want to see it enlarged. But there should be other schemes of development, three or four schemes of the same size as the Premier's South-West scheme. The Canadian-Pacific Railway Company, in Canada, without Government assistance, absorb 100,000 people per annum. If one company in Canada can do that, surely we here can evolve schemes to absorb as many people in Western Australia.

Hon. H. Stewart: Do the C.P.R. get their interest guaranteed?

Hon. G. W. MILES: It is a land grant railway, and the company have to develop their land to get revenue for their railway. If we had such railway schemes here, it would be a good deal better than losing money on Government railways.

Hon. T. Moore: The Midland railway people are not doing too well.

The Minister for Education: We have had the Midland Railway Company for years on those lines.

Hon. G. W. MILES: And you hamper them pretty well. You have an absentee land tax to drive them out of the country. That is another thing which the Government can do if they are in earnest about getting private enterprise and capital to develop the country: they can repeal that absentee tax at once. People here are selling out and making their bonds payable in Victoria, where there is no absentee tax. Mr. Moore has referred to the necessity for developing lands already served by railways. Pastorally speaking, the particular area under consideration is served by

the railway to Meekatharra. The scheme does not ask for any new railway construction. One of the main points in connection with the mineral resources there is that if that area were taken up and developed, and 1,700 wells put down, prospectors could go out through the country and search it thoroughly. It might be the means of opening up another Golden Mile, for the map shows auriferous country all through there, and so offers all sorts of possibilities. I fully expected that Mr. Holmes would criticise the scheme in the way he did. He is honest, at all events, for he criticises it inside and outside of Parliament. It is characteristic of Mr. Holmes to knock down anything put up. I have never seen him put up anything constructive himself.

Hon. J. J. Holmes: What about the scheme put up for Kimberley?

Hon. G. W. MILES: A committee was appointed to report on the Kimberley scheme. I agree that the Government should have given greater consideration to that committee's report.

Hon. J. J. Holmes: You said I never put up anything.

Hon. G. W. MILES: That was not exclusively the hon. member's scheme. He was merely one of the committee. He does not know the country proposed to be developed under the scheme I have referred to.

Hon. J. J. Holmes: It cost me a few thousand sheep.

Hon. G. W. MILES: The hon. member is not the only man who has lost sheep in the back country. The Government have appraised a great deal of that area. There are men in the Lands Department who favourably regard this scheme. They have classified certain areas up there. The Minister and Mr. Holmes both said they were doubtful about the rainfall. The average rainfall of the district is from eight to 10 inches, and at Mibeau, about the centre of the area, the average over eight years has been 10.39 inches.

Hon. H. Stewart: What is the minimum?

Hon. G. W. MILES: The figures for the period 1908 to 1916 range from 2.84 inches to 16 inches.

Hon. J. J. Holmes: That 2.84 inches is a bit of a hit.

Hon. G. W. MILES: We must always expect bits of hits, whatever we may be at work upon. We want some new blood, some good old British blood here to counterbalance the effect of the croakers we have. We want some Manchester men here, men with confidence in themselves and their country. The men of Manchester put up 17 million pounds with which to build a canal. If they had been men of the standing of Mr. Holmes, they would have said, "We cannot take on this responsibility; we have no confidence in ourselves, or in our country." That is not the type of men we want here.

Hon. H. Stewart: We want men with money.

Hon. G. W. MILES: I discussed this scheme in a casual way with the Minister for

War in London. There was present also a director of one of the banking institutions of Australia. Before I mentioned anything about pastoral development, this gentleman said, "We want companies formed for the development of pastoral areas in the northern part of Australia." I replied I had a proposition I was putting before the Overseas Settlement Committee that afternoon. I also said that another asset we had in our North was the Yampi Sound iron deposit, containing 97 million tons of ore above sea level, and being 69.3 per cent. pure iron. I stated that ships could lie in eight fathoms of water and load direct from the mine into their holds. I pointed out that Britain was getting her iron in Newfoundland at a depth of two miles under the sea; that at Yampi Sound there was an Empire supply for the next century, and that this asset alone was worth holding Australia for, apart from our wool, our wheat, and our other resources. The Japanese and the Germans know the value of this deposit. I have stated before that a Japanese laundryman knows more about Australia than an average Australian does. It is time Australian Parliaments awoke to the fact that we have a country worth holding instead of writing it down at every opportunity that occurs. The Minister for Education, in the course of his speech, was on the very brink of talking this country down. He said that no map of the State would be complete without its deserts being shown. It is time we gave up that attitude and admitted that the maps were not up-to-date.

The Minister for Education: I told you they were not up-to-date and why they were not.

Hon. G. W. MILES: The Minister will use any argument in order to justify himself. It does not matter how he talks down the country in doing so.

The Minister for Education: I defy the hon. member to prove that I have ever talked down the country.

Hon. T. Moore: He is Minister for the North-West.

Hon. G. W. MILES: I am getting tired of him in that capacity. He asked if I knew the meaning of the word "desert." I replied that 99 people out of 100 thought a desert was a barren waste of useless country, such as the Sahara. The Minister stated his definition was that it was a wilderness containing a few people. The "Bulletin" has been writing down our assets, and in the "Sydney Mail" a little while ago we read a reference to Wallal as a sweltering waste in the great sandy desert up north. I would point out that within the last few years a cattle station was sold there for £25,000 and a sheep station for £20,000. There is not much desert about that. There is too much of talking our country down. Mr. Holmes said we would require wire netting with which to develop this country. The majority of the sheep stations in this State have no wire netting fences. Pastoralists are able to combat the dogs in other parts of the State, and they can do so up there. As the country

is developed and fenced, the dogs will be reduced in number.

Hon. J. J. Holmes: Dogs have practically driven sheep out of the Kimberleys.

Hon. G. W. MILES: They are not the only cause of sheep being driven out of the Kimberleys. Under the scheme that I have put forward there are 12 million acres of land, which have been taken up and classified by Government officials. The land marked green on the map shows that from 15 to 18 acres are required per sheep. There are 5,942,000 acres classified by Government officials up to 15s. an acre. Mr. Holmes said that 33 acres to the sheep would be required.

Hon. J. J. Holmes: Why do you not tell the House why the league you are always speaking about turned down this proposal?

Hon. G. W. MILES: The hon. member does not know what he is talking about. As president of our league, two years ago I said to him, "If you have no confidence in this country or yourself, you have no business in our council." Mr. Holmes said we would never get our railway scheme through in our children's time or in the time of our children's children. If money is spent on this area, if only on that which has already been taken up, success will follow.

Hon. J. J. Holmes: Backed by the Government.

Hon. G. W. MILES: It does not matter whether it is backed by the Government or not. It is not a trading concern. If the House can prove it is, I will have nothing to do with it.

Hon. J. W. Hickey: A public utility.

Hon. T. Moore: A business undertaking.

Hon. G. W. MILES: There are some men in this country with whom I am proud to be associated. They have put up information for a man like Mr. Holmes to knock down, if he can. Most people know that in the past wool growing in an average season returned a profit of from 15 to 20 per cent.

Hon. H. Stewart: Wool was a lot lower in price then.

Hon. G. W. MILES: Wool is at a fine price to-day. The Murchison country grows some of the finest wool in the world.

Hon. T. Moore: That is the country.

Hon. G. W. MILES: Water can be obtained there from 6 to 60 feet in depth. If money is spent in developing it, and small paddocks are fenced, and water supplies are obtained, similar results should follow. The financial institutions of Australia had not sufficient cash to support the pastoral industry to the full. If money can be obtained from abroad to assist in the development of the country, so much the better for the State. There is also land east of Meekatharra and land on the east-west line. Some of our Murchison squatters have said they would give anything to have some of the land I am speaking of on which to put their stock.

Hon. T. Moore: A lot of it is taken up.

Hon. G. W. MILES: But the people are not developing it. Money is required to be

spent on it in order to fence it and provide water.

Hon. T. Moore: You would have to buy them out.

Hon. G. W. MILES: That could be done.

Hon. H. Stewart: It is only a question of finance.

Hon. G. W. MILES: I repudiate the remarks of the Minister for Education with respect to my criticism of the Premier. There is nothing in my speech of a venomous character regarding that hon. gentleman. Some of his supporters will not allow one even to mention him. Apparently he ought to be put in a glass case. The trouble is that a lot of his followers are dependent upon him and are afraid they will go down with him. The Minister for Education said I had adopted a venomous and vindictive attitude towards the Premier. I stated in my speech that I was criticising our Premier with all due respect, and I had no intention of being in any way offensive. I said he was trying to do too much and that he must listen to other people. He was Premier, Treasurer, Minister for Lands and Minister for Migration, and handling this scheme himself. I said the man was not born who could do that. If we had good organisation and good men to handle the proposition, it would be in the best interests of the immigrants, of the Government, and the country generally. There is nothing offensive about that. I did not suggest either that the Government should have brought in a Bill last year to put this scheme through. All I have asked for is that it should receive the mature consideration of the Government. If it is no good it should be turned down at once. If, however, it is good enough to be considered, it should be considered immediately, without the matter being left to drift on for a year or two. I wish to place on record my deep regret at the loss this State, Australia, and the Empire have suffered by the death of Lord Northcliffe. The best tribute the Press of the Empire can pay to the late statesman is to emulate him if they can. The Minister for Education said it was impossible for him to explain the vindictive and venomous attitude I had taken up towards the Premier. I have not said anything along those lines and never intended to do so.

THE PRESIDENT: The hon. member had better leave that out.

Hon. G. W. MILES: I am only replying to the remarks of the Minister. There is nothing in my character of a venomous or vindictive nature. I ask the House to agree to the motion. If the Meckatharra scheme is worth considering, probably the Government will do something in regard to it. The motion before the House is one which should be agreed to. We cannot keep Australia white by keeping it empty. Our objective should be to double our population within 10 years, and in order to do that we must provide the organisation, the public works policy, and have the courage to go on.

Hon. T. Moore: Do you think the Government can handle a scheme like that?

Question put and passed.

BILL—STATE TRADING CONCERNS ACT AMENDMENT.

Second Reading.

Debate resumed from 14th September.

Hon. J. J. HOLMES (North) [8.28]: I desire briefly to support the Bill. Mr. Lovekin explained why he had taken upon himself the responsibility of introducing it. All he is proposing to do is to delete the section of the Act preventing the Government from selling these State trading concerns without the consent of Parliament. The question of State enterprises versus private enterprise is one upon which I could talk at some length. I shall content myself, however, by saying that, in my opinion, this country has declared against State enterprises. The main difference between the present Government and the party following it, and the Official Labour Party which is now the Opposition, hinges upon the one issue, that is private enterprise versus State enterprise. That is not only my opinion but the opinion of the majority of the people of the State. That, too, is the opinion of the Minister controlling the State trading concerns, because when he assumed office as Minister in charge of those concerns, in the course of the first speech he made in another place on the subject, the Leader of the Opposition interjected that the Minister had stolen the policy of the Opposition, and the Minister replied, "The difference between our side of the House and your side of the House is that you are in favour of State enterprises and we are in favour of private enterprises," and the Minister added, "And all the flapdoodle in the world will not make any difference." That is the difference between the two parties at the present time. Ministers controlling affairs of State will stand up almost anywhere at any time and declare that they are opposed to State enterprises. It is not a fair thing for a Minister who is opposed to an enterprise to have control of it. In this way we shall never get good results. How can we expect good results when we have these enterprises administered by an unsympathetic Ministry. Another matter I wish to point out is that when the State Trading Concerns Act was first introduced, the section we now propose to delete was not contained in it. When the Minister who is responsible for the measure brought it down, it was provided after mature consideration that the Government should be permitted to sell these enterprises without consulting Parliament. An amendment, however, was inserted by I think, a minority, and it was agreed to by the Government. At any rate the Government were not prepared to fight their own Bill, and

although they told us it was their intention to bring down such a Bill as the one we now have before us, they have not done so. The position will be that unless this House and another place takes the matter in hand, the Government will go on administering the State trading concerns unsympathetically. It is claimed that the trading concerns having been established, should not be sold without the consent of Parliament. I venture to suggest that so long as that provision remains in the Act, none of these enterprises will be sold. Knowing what Parliament is, no man will waste his time nowadays negotiating for the purchase of anything that the Government have, if the question of the purchase must first be submitted to Parliament. As to selling the State enterprises without the consent of Parliament I would point out that a number of them were embarked upon without the consent of Parliament. Parliament was never consulted, yet we have the Government, an unsympathetic Government towards the State enterprises, allowing a clause to be put into a Bill to prevent those enterprises being sold without reference to Parliament. If Parliament had been consulted in the first instance, there might be something said in favour of Parliament being consulted if the opportunity to dispose of them came along. I wish only to add that in view of the fact that the Government have declared, and that the country has declared against State enterprise, the Government should be put in the position of being able to sell.

Hon. T. Moore: What makes you say the people declared?

Hon. J. J. HOLMES: Count your numbers after each general election.

Hon. G. POTTER (West) [8.35]: In introducing this measure Mr. Lovekin declared and even stressed the point that discussion should be narrowed, inasmuch as the principle and efficacy of the State trading concerns was not under review. That is all very good so far as it goes in order to save time, but as it is impossible to divorce cause from effect, so I venture to say it is a fact that the disastrous results which have followed State trading have been important factors in prompting the hon. member to take this commendable action. From time to time the Government have been upbraided hotly for their lack of promptitude and the failure to display a certain degree of commonsense in connection with these concerns or, to quote that oft-used term "business acumen." The critics after having exhausted themselves in a storm of vituperation must realise in the cold dawn of reflection that the exercise of those admirable attributes to success has been very early arrested by fatuous procedure—a circumstance this Bill seeks to overcome. If it is the declared policy of the Government to help to develop the resources of the State by virtue of private enterprise—the best source

of all development in my opinion—then it does seem incongruous and absurd that the opportunity should be lost by virtue of an obstructing proviso being retained, making as it does for enforced procrastination. It requires but a small gift of the imagination to forecast the reply of a prospective buyer, when he is told that the problematical consummation of any negotiation must be submitted to what might develop into an acrimonious debate in Parliament, at some indefinitely distant date. So that by virtue of the proviso an advantageous opportunity might be lost to sell something, which sale might be in the best interests of the State. Why should the sale of a State trading concern be referred to Parliament? Is not Cabinet entrusted with greater responsibilities than the disposal of deficit producers? Why must an incubus be cherished like a household god, merely for the gratification of some exploded idea?

Hon. T. Moore: Do you know which are paying and which are not?

Hon. G. POTTER: I do not think any reprimands should be hurled at the head of any Government who seek to discontinue an experiment if that experiment is costly and futile. Therefore, let the Government be free to perform its legitimate functions and shoulder the responsibility of ridding itself of any incubus that mitigates against the progress of the State. These concerns have had an excellent opportunity to justify themselves and so far they have proved nothing but a burden and a menace to the progress of the State.

Hon. J. A. GREIG (South-East) [8.40]: I support the second reading of the Bill, but I would like to have seen it go even further. I suggest that the Government should put a price on each of the trading concerns. If that were done it would make it possible to sell them. I am of the opinion, however, that the Minister who controls the trading concerns does not want to get rid of them. He has said in effect that he is opposed to them, but that whilst he is in charge he will try to make a success of them. I consider that it would please the Minister a great deal better if we were to place these concerns under his control as Commissioner.

Member: Then God help the trading concerns.

Hon. J. A. GREIG: Even if the Bill be carried I am sure that we shall not find in the Minister for Works one who is anxious to push the sale of any or all of the enterprises. I would like to see a provision inserted in the Bill to enable a price to be put on each of the concerns. The fact should also be disclosed whether they have shown a profit or a loss, what they have cost, and whether they are at the time paying. In this way it ought to be possible to secure a better price.

Hon. T. Moore: You would keep the paying ones.

Hon. J. A. GREIG: I would put a higher price on them. Not much harm would be done to the State if assistance were given to those

that were paying. However, the policy generally is one that I do not hold with at all. I maintain that the Government are exceeding their functions when they enter into competition with private individuals. In selling these enterprises I do not say that they should be sacrificed, but I consider that the Government should advertise them and put a price on them so that prospective purchasers would know what they were about to handle.

Hon. E. H. Harris: Would you put them up separately, or collectively?

Hon. J. A. GREIG: Separately, although I would not expect one buyer to take the whole box and dice. I know that there are some people who consider that we should allow them to go on the walk-in-walk-out basis and that we should even throw in Parliament House and all. Some people are opposed to selling the State Implement Works.

Hon. T. Moore: Quite a lot of people, and you will find that out when you go before your electors again.

Hon. J. A. GREIG: I know that a few farmers are silly enough to think that way, but we should dispose of the Implement Works and provide in the agreement that the purchaser should continue to provide duplicate parts, say, for the next 10 or 20 years, the life of a machine.

Hon. E. H. Harris: Would you fix the price of the parts?

Hon. J. A. GREIG: That could be done if the House thought fit. I do not like price fixing, but prefer open competition. We have had too much price fixing in Australia, and I think open competition will be more beneficial. Apart from the State Implement Works there are other State trading concerns such as the State Sawmills.

Hon. T. Moore: They are paying well.

Hon. J. A. GREIG: It is not a question of whether they are paying well or not. They could be sold with the proviso that the purchaser should supply the Government with all the timber they might require. I do not think there would be any difficulty on that score. Then as regards the Wyndham Meat Works, they could be sold with a clause providing that the persons purchasing the works would be compelled to treat a certain quantity of beef that might come forward.

Hon. J. J. Holmes: We do not want any clause like that. We want to deal with private enterprise.

Hon. J. A. GREIG: I do not think the hon. member would require any such clause. The protective clauses could be put into the contract of sale regarding all these State trading concerns. I feel that if we pass the Bill, we will then be faced with the difficulty of getting the Government to sell them. The Government have had one or two opportunities to sell the State Sawmills and I am satisfied that when the French Commission were out here, if the Government had sold the Sawmills to the French people and had given them the right to remove the timber from the areas which are now being cleared for settlement, we would have got a consider-

able amount for the timber that is now being burnt.

Hon. J. EWING (South-West) [8.48]: I support the second reading of the Bill. For years past, and ever since the inception of the State trading concerns, I have been entirely opposed to them. I congratulate Mr. Lovekin on bringing the Bill forward. At different times during the last two or three years, the Premier, the Minister for Works—who administers the State trading concerns—the Leader of the House, and in fact all members of the Government have expressed themselves as entirely opposed to State trading, yet we find that year after year they are not only maintaining the present position in regard to those concerns, but they are encouraging them in every possible direction.

Hon. J. Duffell: And increasing them.

Hon. J. EWING: It is only necessary to go to East Perth to see the large expenditure of money that is going on in connection with the property bought from the Sleeper Hewers' Association. That expenditure is going in the establishment of joinery works. That is not the direction in which any Government in Australia or in the world should proceed. The right of people with money to invest is, I contend, a sacred one, and the function of the Government is to see that proper conditions of employment are provided for the people and that proper wages are paid. The individual investing his money is restricted in his income by reason of the taxation, and he should be given a free hand in other directions. Mr. Greig says that the Government could sell the State Sawmills or the Wyndham Meat Works, and so on, and that certain conditions might be provided which would be for the benefit of the Government. I am entirely opposed to that. If we are to sell the State trading concerns let competition do the rest. Those who take them over and run them must operate under the conditions obtaining in Western Australia. It is our duty as representatives of the people to see that the workers get proper conditions of employment and to provide for the proper rate of wages to be paid. Then the purchasers and competition will have to do the rest. It is no part of our duty to carry on work in opposition to private enterprise. Mr. Moore interjected that the State Sawmills were paying. It is not a question of whether one concern is paying and another is not paying. It is a matter of principle, and on each and every occasion I have spoken on this matter, I have not taken that aspect into consideration at all. Neither will I now take into consideration the fact that the State Sawmills are paying or that the Wyndham Meat Works are losing money. I would like to mention the excellent work of a select committee appointed by this House last session. I do not know that it has ever before been my lot, since I entered public life, to read such a fine report as that presented by those hon. members who inquired into the opera-

tion of the meat works. It was the most comprehensive, complete and fairest report I have ever read. They told the Government that if they operated the meat works during the succeeding year they would lose £100,000. The Leader of the House will probably say that had the works not operated, we would have been in a worse position.

Hon. A. Lovekin: He cannot prove that.

The Minister for Education: Are you a mind reader?

Hon. J. EWING: I can see from the stern look on the face of the Leader of the House that he may advance some such contention. I think that the Government will probably lose £100,000 on the operations.

Hon. T. Moore: But they are developing the North-West and is not that a set-off?

Hon. J. EWING: With the State trading concerns, it is not a matter of whether we are losing £100,000 or £250,000, but it is a fact that the more we put in, the more we will lose. The select committee I referred to pointed out the enormous amount of capital expenditure that will have to be incurred in connection with the Wyndham Meat Works before they can operate satisfactorily. Are we prepared to spend £100,000 in addition so that we can provide extra accommodation, or will it be better to sell them for £500,000, and so be released from all our obligations and troubles, leaving the purchasers to face the trials in years to come? I hope that the Government will be sincere in this matter. It is all very well to say that because the Minister for Works may desire to be appointed to a certain position we shall not dispose of the trading concerns, so that he may build them up. That statement has been made, and it is a very serious one. I do not believe it. I have too high a regard for the Minister controlling the State trading concerns to think that he has any such desire. I hold him in the greatest respect. I believe that even if the Minister did desire to have that position—

Hon. J. Duffell: He does not desire anything of the kind.

Hon. J. EWING: I did not say that he does, but should he do so and should a Bill be passed to enable someone to be in charge of those trading concerns, I contend that even if the Minister for Works were appointed, he would take the post with the object of carrying out his word and dispose of them.

Hon. J. Nicholson: Is there anything in the rumour that another Minister may take that position?

Hon. J. EWING: I do not know. We have to take the position as it is to-day and that is that the Government are entirely opposed to State trading. Each one of the Ministers has said that and yet as the years go by nothing is done.

Hon. G. W. Miles: They have extended them.

Hon. J. EWING: I have already mentioned that aspect. It is not fair for a sec-

tion of the community not in power to govern the country and the influence of a certain section of the community over the Government in this direction is a most pernicious thing.

Member: Which section do you refer to?

Hon. J. EWING: If the Premier of the State is in favour of the abolition of the State trading concerns and he has a majority of the House behind him in another place, he should be able to do so. Mr. Greig is a member of the Country Party and—

Hon. J. A. Greig: The Country Party are in favour of disposing of them.

Hon. J. EWING: It is true that recently they decided that they, as a party, were entirely opposed to the State trading concerns including the Implement Works.

The Minister for Education: That is only recently.

Hon. J. EWING: That is so.

Hon. J. J. Holmes: That is what the Government have been waiting for.

Hon. J. EWING: For years I have heard discussions that have taken place by that great party when they met together to deal with affairs affecting their particular section. In the past they have been in favour of the abolition of all the State trading concerns with the exception of the State Implement Works.

Hon. J. Duffell: They wanted them at one stage to be handed over free.

Hon. J. EWING: Now Mr. Greig says he is in favour of the abolition of the State trading concerns and I take it that is the opinion of his party.

Hon. J. A. Greig: I was voicing my own opinion.

Hon. J. EWING: We may take it, I presume, that is also the opinion of his party. They now consider that all the trading concerns should be abolished. If the Government is kept in power to-day, as it is in fact, by the Country Party, we must realise that the Government cannot live for five minutes without them.

Hon. G. W. Miles: Yes they can; they lived the other night without them.

Hon. J. EWING: If the Country Party are in favour of the abolition of State trading concerns, it only remains for the Government to take action.

Hon. F. H. Harris: Do you say that the Premier has not the courage of his opinions?

Hon. J. EWING: I say he has not the courage of his opinions in regard to this particular question. There is no individual who has a higher regard for the Premier than I, but this is a question of importance to all sections of the community and particularly to those endeavouring to carry out enterprise in Western Australia. They have been told that the Premier and his Government are opposed to the continuation of these trading concerns and despite the support of the Country Party, the Government have not taken the necessary action. We are indebted to Mr. Lovekin for introducing the Bill which

will relieve the Government of the difficulty which has stood in the way of disposing of these concerns, because in the past the Government have had to come to Parliament for permission to sell. The Bill will remove that disability. I hope the Bill will be passed by a substantial majority in this Chamber and that it will be passed in another place. If that be done, all the difficulties standing in the way at present will be overcome and then I trust the Government will take an early opportunity of getting rid of the incubus of the State trading concerns.

Hon. J. DUFFELL (Metropolitan-Suburban) [8.56]: I have listened with interest to the remarks of hon. members regarding the State trading concerns, and I think it will be generally agreed that I have never on any occasion supported the retention of them since I have been a member of this Chamber. This was one of the questions to which I was very strongly opposed when I was elected, but I realise that while the present Government are disposed to get rid of the State trading concerns, there are other obstacles which neither the present nor any other Government have been able to overcome.

Hon. J. Ewing: What are they?

Hon. J. DUFFELL: Those which this Bill seeks to eliminate. I congratulate Mr. Lovekin on introducing the Bill, because I realise that we will now be able to test the feeling of each Chamber. I have no doubt regarding the majority in this Chamber because we are all satisfied that these State trading concerns constitute an incubus and that they are a menace to private enterprise here. They are also one of the greatest things that have retarded the progress of secondary industries in Western Australia. While I express this view, I am also fully alive to the fact that some remarks that have been made by hon. members, who hold similar views to myself, can only convey one idea, namely, that the Government are anxious to retain the State trading concerns and, further, that the Minister controlling them is so absorbed with them that the work of controlling them is one of the joys of his life.

Hon. T. Moore: They are doing good business.

Hon. J. DUFFELL: I know as a fact that there is no one who feels his position more keenly than the Minister controlling these State trading concerns. There is no one so ready and willing to dispose of them, or even to relinquish control of them, as is the Minister in charge of them to-day. When one thinks of the work that Minister has to do and the responsibility he has to carry for the miserable pittance of the Ministerial emolument, I cannot see how members can hold such views. I do not understand how they can give credence to the rumours that the Minister for Works would be ready and willing to relinquish his portfolio in order to take over the control of those State

trading concerns. I am positive of the statement that the Minister for Works is not anxious to resign his portfolio for the purpose of taking charge of the State trading concerns. The Minister deserves congratulation for the measure of success he has achieved as a result of his business acumen. No doubt he has applied himself diligently to the work of conducting these concerns.

Hon. J. Cornell: He has used a little coercion.

Hon. J. DUFFELL: And he has used discretion. He has had the assistance of some very capable officers. A great deal has been said of the State Sawmills and what might have eventuated if the provision had not been in the Act when, on a previous occasion, the Government were approached by a syndicate from a European country in regard to the purchase of the State Sawmills. The Minister has some very able men controlling these concerns, especially the State Sawmills.

Hon. J. A. Greig: Men who increased the price of timber 80 per cent.

Hon. J. DUFFELL: I am not concerned about that. I am referring to the success achieved by his officers. Outside firms have realised the special ability of some of these men and have offered them more money with the result that we have lost two of the best men connected with the State Sawmills. We have lost the services of Mr. Properjohn, and another officer is going to Tasmania at the end of the month. The Government have a determination to sell if this measure can be passed. Therefore, I support the Bill. The Government have done all they could possibly do in the circumstances. Instead of these concerns being a miserable failure, and having to be scrapped, they will produce a fair return to the State if the Government are given this authority to dispose of them.

Hon. T. MOORE (Central) [9.3]: I intend to offer a few remarks, not that I believe I shall be able to influence one member by anything I might say—

Hon. G. W. Miles: You might.

Hon. T. MOORE: I have been in the House long enough to know that the consensus of opinion, at all events, is against State trading. I wish to point out why these concerns should not be sold. No member has shown, except by speaking in vague generalities, that any capital has ever been frightened out of the State. No one has shown that any harm has been done to the State by reason of the operations of State trading concerns. It would be only fair if those opposed to State trading concerns gave concrete instances showing how private enterprise has been hampered.

Hon. J. Duffell: What about the shipping on the North-West coast?

Hon. T. MOORE: Those who sat on the select committee last year will bear me out when I say that the management of the State

shipping service were hampered in all directions, because the Government were procrastinating and would not give them anything definite to work upon.

Hon. J. J. Holmes: Unsympathetic, too.

Hon. T. MOORE: Well, hardly that. The select committee who considered the State shipping service were not Labour members, and I would advise members of this House to read the report and consider whether the State steamships had any possible chance of proving successful. Fault is found with the management who are accused of being unsympathetic, but that it not a substantial reason for opposing the principle.

Hon. J. Ewing: Members object to the principle.

Hon. T. MOORE: But only on general lines. That objection, however, will not be put forward in another place.

Hon. J. Duffell: The A.U.S.N. and other boats were trading on the North-West coast.

Hon. J. Cornell: And they went profiteering during the war.

The PRESIDENT: Members should not interrupt too frequently.

Hon. T. MOORE: The State steamships played an important part during the war when the vessels owned by the shipping companies went profiteering.

Hon. J. J. Holmes: The select committee concluded that the State steamships could never succeed under political control.

Hon. T. MOORE: No reference was made to political control. The hon. member spoke generally. Why not come down to bedrock and give reasons? If political control is wrong, could not the hon. member have suggested that the State steamships be run in another way?

Hon. J. J. Holmes: But you would not get rid of political control even then.

Hon. T. MOORE: Is that so?

Hon. J. J. Holmes: Do you mean to say that our railways are not under political control?

Hon. T. MOORE: I do not really know who is controlling the railways. We have heard two Commissioners on them already and no one knows which of the two is right. You, Mr. President, know that the State steamships have frightened no one off the North-West coast. No harm has been done by this undertaking. The State steamships carried on the trade of the coast at a critical time in the history of the State when other boats left the coast, and when the North-West otherwise would have been left to its own resources.

Hon. G. W. Miles: That is not right.

Hon. T. MOORE: I shall endeavour to show some of the good for which these concerns have been responsible. No case has been made out to show that they have done any harm to the State. The Wyndham Meat Works were started with the object of accomplishing something towards the developing of the North-West. Surely that was a laudable object. For years and years it was open to private enterprise to come in and develop the North-West and to provide markets for

the products raised there, but nothing at all was done. If an industry could be developed there even at the loss of a million of money, would it not be something to be proud of?

Hon. H. Stewart: It would please Mr. Miles.

Hon. T. MOORE: I am surprised that he does not stick out for something in that direction. He is asking for money to develop the North-West in another way. The State, however, was proceeding on right lines. Regarding other enterprises, we find that the Government now in power have lent money to a private concern at Fremantle to the extent of £60,000 or £70,000.

Hon. G. W. Miles: Fine encouragement, too.

Hon. T. MOORE: No one finds fault with that, but I guess that money has gone.

Hon. J. Ewing: It has to be paid back.

Hon. T. MOORE: It will be a long time before the State gets it back.

Hon. J. Mills: And no interest has been paid to date.

Hon. T. MOORE: Quite so. In all the enterprises we propose to build up, it seems that the State has to find the money while the other fellow makes the profits. This is supposed to be private enterprise. Private enterprise is continually coming to the State for financial assistance. If they wish to carry on on their own account, why do not they do so? I maintain that State enterprise is not being hampered in any way. The Wyndham Meat Works were built at a time when there was very little chance of their proving successful. When they were closed down, every meat works in Australia was closed down. The Wyndham works are operating this year, though some works in the other States are not operating. Wyndham, however, has resumed work in order to give the cattle owners a chance to get rid of their cattle.

Hon. A. Lovekin: We are paying dearly for it, too.

Hon. T. MOORE: Yes, but we are losing on many propositions and it is not proposed to get rid of them. The State Implement Works again were a laudable object to keep a check on manufacturers of implements for the farmers of this State. No harm has been done by their inauguration. No one was rushing here to set up implement works.

Hon. H. Stewart: Their establishment has killed wagon and plough building in the country.

Hon. J. Duffell: And shoeing horses.

Hon. T. MOORE: It is no argument in a debate of this kind to introduce something which has not happened at all. The State Sawmills are one of the largest of the State trading concerns, and it has been argued that they have hampered private enterprise. For years and years the karri belt of this State was left untouched. It was developed at one time to some extent by Millars' Company who worked out a concession at Karri-dale, but they did not propose to proceed. They gave up the idea of further developing karri. They came to the conclusion that it

was not a marketable timber and that it was not profitable to work it. The State stepped in, and since then wonderful strides have been made, because the timber most sought for railway construction work nowadays is powellised karri. How much has been said of the awful things that were going to happen because of the introduction of powellised karri?

Hon. J. Duffell: Yes, we saw the contract.

Hon. T. MOORE: I care nothing about the contract. I am speaking of the general principle. The capitalistic Press from one end of the State to the other said it was going to be a failure and why? Simply because it was introduced by the Labour Government and the State was likely to make something out of it. If Mr. Miles gets his railways built in the North, they will be built with powellised karri, because it is the most durable timber. By State enterprise we have developed that industry. We have developed a wonderful karri forest which another Government, if it had remained in power, would have rung.

Hon. A. Lovekin: And you have joined the master class.

Hon. T. MOORE: I do not know to what the hon. member is referring? When the present Premier was Minister for Lands years ago, his fertile imagination conceived the idea of settling the South-West, and he proposed to put settlers into the karri country and ring the timber which since then has proved such a valuable asset to the State. Mr. Ewing has seen much of the beautiful karri forest which years ago was rung.

Hon. J. Ewing: Yes, I have seen it.

Hon. T. MOORE: Those are the people who say that State enterprise is bad. They propose to destroy one of our most valuable assets. Mr. Burvill knows that what I say is correct. The karri industry was left by private enterprise, and now that the State has proved it to be a valuable asset, it is suggested that it should be sold. Jarrah was valuable before ever the State started sawmilling at all, but karri has become valuable by reason of State enterprise. Moreover, during the war period when other mills closed down, when the wonderful combine, which had done so well out of this State in days gone by, did not carry on with the idea of alleviating the unemployment due to the war, but shut down all their mills except two—as you know, Mr. President—throughout the war period the State Sawmills carried on, providing employment for men who would otherwise have been compelled to go to other parts of Australia. In my own particular line of timber work I have seen what State enterprise can do. It is very unfair for members to say, without advancing any reason whatever that they would sell the State trading concerns.

Hon. A. Lovekin: But if the Government could make a good deal?

Hon. T. MOORE: It is strange to hear anyone to-day suggesting that private enterprise is prepared to rush in with money. Everybody comes to the Government nowadays if there is any development to be done. The Government are always being asked to assist private enterprise. Private enterprise does not rush in.

Hon. J. Ewing: Not under present conditions.

Hon. T. MOORE: No; not while the present Government are in power.

Hon. G. W. Miles: Carrying out your policy.

Hon. A. Lovekin: If State enterprise continues, private enterprise must in time become impotent.

Hon. T. MOORE: There is plenty of room here for both State enterprise and private enterprise.

Hon. A. Lovekin: Private enterprise will not come in against the Government.

Hon. T. MOORE: We heard that some French firm wanted to buy the State Sawmills. It was an obscure offer.

Hon. J. Duffell: It was a good offer.

Hon. T. MOORE: I will say it is a good offer when the cash is put up.

Hon. J. Duffell: A deposit was put up.

Hon. T. MOORE: In French money, which, I believe, was not worth much. Members should show some reason before they propose to upset arrangements which are working satisfactorily to-day. All the State ever got out of the timber combine was a small fee for the forests. The finest forests in Australia were practically given away to private enterprise by the State Government. All the State Government ever got out of the timber combine was a few shillings by way of royalty—1s. per load for beautiful timber which, situated where it was, would to-day be worth £1 per load in royalty. The State Sawmills are much further removed from the sea ports, and therefore much more difficult to work, than the sawmills of the people who got in first. Naturally, those people got the best situated forests, and they did very well. As regards the prices charged by the State Sawmills, does anyone believe that if the State Sawmills did not exist private sawmillers would not charge as high prices as they are charging to-day? They are out to get all they can. Can one obtain timber any cheaper from the timber combine than from the State Sawmills?

Hon. J. J. Holmes: The State Sawmills are in the timber combine.

Hon. A. Lovekin: Yes; they have joined up.

Hon. T. MOORE: It is necessary to have a working basis, particularly in the export trade.

Hon. J. J. Holmes: Were not the State Sawmills established to reduce prices?

Hon. T. MOORE: Yes.

Hon. J. J. Holmes: Have they reduced prices?

Hon. A. Lovekin: They have joined the profiteers.

Hon. T. MOORE: Yes, because the profiteering class rule in this State to-day. The profiteering class are the Government of this State. They have killed building in the back country. As regards the scantling trade, the Government and the combine have made a mistake in not allowing small sizes to be sold more cheaply. They are making a mistake in allowing the scantling to accumulate rather than sell it at a reasonable price. As regards the State Sawmills charging higher prices than the private sawmillers, as has been alleged, if I wanted to buy anything and the State were charging more for it than private people, I simply would not go to the State at all; I would go to the fellow who was selling cheaper than the State. As I said at the outset, I did not expect to influence anyone by speaking, but I could not allow this Bill to pass without comment. When it reaches another place, the measure will no doubt be relegated to where it deserves to go. If it were shown that any enterprise operated by the State was hampering industry, then the case for the Bill would have its merits; then there would be a case to go before both Houses of Parliament. But, as things are, members having spoken quite generally and without adducing any facts, I trust the Bill will go into the waste paper basket when it reaches another place.

Hon. J. CORNELL (South) [9.25]: Most members who have preceded me have missed the purport of the Bill. The object of this measure is not to say whether or not a concern shall be sold, but by what methods a State trading concern may be sold. The position is that certain of those concerns are vested by Act of Parliament, and can no more be disposed of without the consent of Parliament than can our railways. The Bill proposes to vest the disposal of the State trading concerns in the Governor-in-Council, thus taking that power away from Parliament. It is true, as stated by Mr. Holmes, that nearly all the State trading concerns were established without the consent of Parliament. They were established by Orders-in-Council and by other means; and they were established by a political party who definitely believed in the principle of State enterprise, and who sought to bring that principle to fruition. During my first three years in this House I often wondered what the gentleman who now leads this Chamber would have done had it not been for the State trading concerns and the alleged lack of business acumen on the part of the men controlling them. At that time the politics of this country showed a definite line of cleavage between two parties, one the old Liberal Party, the other the Labour Party. But after three years there came into being a third political party, namely the Country Party. The downfall of the Labour Party was really

occasioned by a certain now Country Party man who put forward the alleged secret Nevanas contract for the Wyndham Meat Works as an excuse for getting out of his original party. By a combination of the Liberal and Country Parties the Labour Government were defeated. Every one of those who defeated the Labour Government was diametrically opposed to State trading. Only the other day I had the pleasure of reading a policy speech made by the late Mr. Frank Wilson, who held the Premiership, and two salient features of that speech were the abolition of the State trading concerns and the conversion of the workers' leaseholds into freeholds. That was six years ago. We find the people who said that the trading concerns were started without the sanction of Parliament, the people who condemned them horse, foot and artillery, the people who were returned to Parliament to bring in legislation which would give the Ministry leave to sell the State trading concerns, agreeing to sink all their political principles, all their political utterances and platitudes, and agreeing that the only body which can dispose of the State trading concerns is Parliament. On every possible occasion this shandygaff element has said, "The State trading concerns should be disposed of, but if we were to endeavour to dispose of them Parliament would not allow us." If the Government of the day are honest in their utterances to their constituents, they should test its party backing, and ask Parliament to agree to do away with these concerns.

Hon. H. Stewart: The Government have not got the pluck to try.

Hon. J. CORNELL: If the Ministries which are the lineal descendants of those who defeated the Labour Government in 1916 were honest and true to their principles, if they had regard for their obligations to their electors, they would at least have made an honest effort in that direction. I have yet to learn that Parliament will not agree to the disposal of the trading concerns. Parliament is not at fault. Those in fault are those in charge of the administration and who, through political exigencies, are not game to bring down such a proposal. I will vote against the Bill on those grounds. Until such time as the denouncers of State Trading Concerns can muster up sufficient courage to test Parliament, we should leave them stewing in their own juice. If we pass the Bill we will not be one whit forrarder, because those to whom we shall be giving power to dispose of the trading concerns have that power already. If a favourable opportunity not involving the fate of the Government presents itself they may dispose of the trading concerns, but if no such opportunity occurs they will continue to operate them. If those who instituted those concerns were as alleged by those in control to-day the greatest muddlers in history, they had at least the redeeming feature that not only the Ministers, but those who supported them, had

the courage of their conviction, whereas those who came after them have never had the courage to dispose of the, to them, objectionable trading concerns. So long as we have Ministers who, in season and out of season, declare that individually they are opposed to the State trading concerns, how can we expect those concerns to succeed? Fancy appointing to a private business concern a manager who had no confidence in it and who did not hesitate to say so! What would the proprietor of such a concern do, but invite the manager to get out?

Question put and a division taken with the following result:—

Ayes	15
Noes	5
Majority for	..	10	—

AYES.

Hon. A. Burvill	Hon. J. Mills
Hon. H. P. Colebatch	Hon. G. Potter
Hon. J. Duffell	Hon. E. Rose
Hon. J. Ewing	Hon. A. Sanderson
Hon. J. A. Greig	Hon. A. J. H. Saw
Hon. J. J. Holmes	Hon. H. Stewart
Hon. A. Lovekin	Hon. J. Nicholson
Hon. G. W. Miles	(Teller.)

NOES.

Hon. J. Cornell	Hon. H. Seddon
Hon. E. H. Harrie	Hon. T. Moore
Hon. J. W. Hickey	(Teller.)

Question thus passed.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee, etc.

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

ADJOURNMENT—SPECIAL.

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION: I desire to intimate that, in order to meet the convenience of hon. members, it is my intention at the conclusion of the business tomorrow to move that the House adjourn for a period in view of the condition of our Notice Paper and of the time likely to elapse before any Bills will be available from another place.

House adjourned at 9.40 p.m.

Legislative Assembly,

Wednesday, 20th September, 1922.

Leave of absence	PAGE
Bill: Licensing Act Amendment, Com.	839

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

LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

On motions by Mr. Mullany, leave of absence for two weeks granted to Mr. Boyland (Kalgoorlie) on the ground of ill-health; and four weeks to Mr. Teesdale (Roebourne) on the ground of urgent public business.

BILL—LICENSING ACT AMENDMENT.

In Committee.

Resumed from the previous day; Mr. Stubbs in the Chair, the Premier in charge of the Bill.

Clause 21—Amendment of Section 49—Amendment by Hon. W. C. Angwin "That all words after 'premises' in line 4, down to 'nor' in line 14, be struck out" (partly considered):

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: On reconsideration, I propose to withdraw the amendment. The words "within the city of Perth or town of Fremantle" can be struck out in another place. Moreover, I wish to give other members an opportunity to move an amendment to strike out paragraph (a). Consequently, I withdraw my amendment.

Amendment by leave withdrawn.

Mr. MUNSIE: I move an amendment—

That paragraph (a) be struck out.

I do not see any necessity for providing a separate door to a bottle department. I cannot understand why the provision was included. It is often said that gallon licenses are responsible for drinking in the home. Yet here we are asked to provide for a separate and private entrance to every hotel, which is to encourage what other provisions of the Bill propose to abolish. The provision of the extra door will mean an enormous expenditure to some licensees, and may prove to be a further inducement to the consumption of alcohol.

Mrs. COWAN: I hope the amendment will be carried. I regard this proposed extra door as a menace to our young people and to the women of the community. Moreover, I do not see why hotelkeepers should be forced to go to the expense involved in the architectural alterations.

The PREMIER: It is curious how, by entirely different reasonings, two members can be brought to support the same proposition. I have no objection to the amendment.

Amendment put and passed.