

them to their fate, and to the will of the people in a few months' time.

On motion by Mr. Chesson, debate adjourned.

House adjourned at 10.10 p.m.

Legislative Council,

Wednesday, 25th. August, 1920.

Leave of absence	Page
Address-in-reply, seventh day	257

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

LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

On motion by Hon. H. Stewart leave of absence for six consecutive sittings of the House granted to the Hon. J. A. Greig (South-East) on the ground of ill-health.

ADDRESS-IN-REPLY.

Seventh Day.

Debate resumed from the previous day.

Hon. Sir E. H. WITTENOOM (North) [4.33]: I would like to preface the remarks I am going to make by expressing my regret at the loss of three members who were with us last year in the House. I refer to Mr. Allen, Mr. Carson, and Mr. Millington. Those three gentlemen were with us a very long period and we must all agree that they carried out their duties, so far as this House is concerned, in a very satisfactory manner. Two of them were known to me fairly intimately personally; and by the constituencies they represented they were held in the greatest respect. They were men of high character and good positions. They carried out their duties in this House satisfactorily and were of very great service by reason of the experience they gained on account of the period in which they were able to render service to the country. With regard to Mr. Millington, his views on public matters were, to a large extent; opposed to my own, but I will say he was always exceedingly straightforward in submitting those views. We all recognise that different views should be represented in this House, and that there is nothing like having really good men to expound those views. I maintain that, amongst those whom we had here, Mr.

Millington was one of the best we have known to represent the views of his constituents. He developed into a strong, severe, and capable critic. Indeed I may add he was an exceedingly cynical critic, though he always imparted into his speeches a certain amount of humour that was exceedingly welcome in the Chamber. I can only hope that the new members—they are not personally known to me—will prove equally good men as the three whom they have displaced. I do not think I should lose this opportunity to congratulate Mr. Harris on the remarks he made in his speech on the Address-in-reply. We all of us who have gone through that experience know it is rather a trying ordeal, and I think we may admit that he came through it with credit. With regard to the Address-in-reply and the Speech of His Excellency the Governor, it seems to be very full of what has been done by the Government and what the prospects are. We do not see in it a great deal of what it is proposed to do; indeed it is a very difficult Speech to say very much about, because it does not invite keen criticism and it does not open the way to a large amount of discussion. One thing I congratulate the Government on, and particularly on account of its brevity, is the list of Bills it is proposed to submit for the consideration of members. It seems to be the ambition of every Government to be able to say at the close of a session, "Look at the number of Bills we have submitted and passed; see how many have been treated in this or in that way." My idea is that we want to address ourselves more to administration than to legislation. There is plenty of legislation already on the statute-book and the great requirement at the present time is that the various departments should confine themselves to administration, so that we may get the finances of the country into a good position. The first vital paragraph in the Speech is in connection with production. It says—

My advisers, however, because of the ability of the State to produce in abundance many of the things of which the world is most in need, feel that the prospects are encouraging, and that vigour, enterprise, and goodwill amongst the people—

I emphasise this, are alone necessary to replace the material losses of war, and to inaugurate a period of expansion.

I need hardly point out to hon. members that we are able to command these three conditions, vigour, enterprise, and goodwill, we should have no trouble in increasing our production, because at the present time what we really want is vigour and enterprise, and to some extent goodwill. The two great troubles that confront us at the present time are, on the one hand, industrial troubles, and on the other, the most of living, and one is, to a large extent, consequent on the other. If we can imagine a worker and a producer sitting down together to discuss the present situation, the

worker would immediately say, "Why, it is occasioned by the cost of your produce; I have to pay so and so for your produce and I cannot be content and satisfied with it at the price at which I have to purchase it." The producer would say, "How can I do it any cheaper; you are always applying for higher wages; railway freights have been put up, how can we produce any cheaper?" and so it goes on ad infinitum. Let us take the cost of living. It is outside of any influence that we can bring to bear on it, but we can dissociate it and say that we can influence to some extent the cost of food. The cost of food, as distinct from the cost of living, is a matter that we may be able to control to some extent, because it is a question of production. I am going to repeat a few remarks I made last year, but which probably members have forgotten. I am certain they would not remember my speeches of 12 months ago. I am going to say once more there are four things we must have, no matter what the circumstances may be, and they are bread, meat, fruit, and vegetables. There is only one way to produce those and that way is by manual labour; they are the product of the soil and they can only be produced by work. Those articles are necessary for existence. I am not saying anything about bacon and eggs, and so on. I am just taking the four staple articles that can be produced in plenty in this country and can only be produced by work. Unfortunately, and it is a hard thing to say, there seems to be on the part of a section of the community a disinclination for work. That may be owing to dissatisfaction because of labour troubles or it may be due to the cost of living. Whatever it is due to, the fact remains that there exists this disinclination for work and, consequently, there must be a restriction of production. So long as there is that restriction of production, the cost of articles we require must rise. There are also advances in many things over which we have no control, for the reason that the Federal Government, who control taxation, are responsible for these increases. But the matters to which I have referred are matters that we can control if we choose to do so. It is the want of desire to work and the absence of production which has made the four articles I have quoted dear. There is another reason which is responsible for the increase and it is what I might describe as the prolific amount of money which is in circulation. One is surprised at this. So long as people have a fair supply of money they do not care about work, and especially that particular work which involves the production of articles such as I have mentioned. If people are obliged to work they prefer to work in the towns rather than in the country, and in secondary industries rather than in primary industries. To give some idea of the expenditure which is going on, I will refer to a few statements to show the extent to which money is being circulated throughout the Commonwealth and for which no work

is done. Let us take first the old age pensions. We find in the report of the 2nd January, published in Melbourne, that there is a total of £3,880,000 provided by the Commonwealth to pay for the invalid pensions during 1918-19, and Western Australia gets a share of that. There is no production whatever for the expenditure of that money. No one could expect it. We also have the maternity allowance, which comes to £620,000. I was going to say that there was no production in that, but there is, and a very useful production, too. Then we come to the war pensions. The war pensions, unfortunately for those who get them, cannot produce anything. Therefore, this is another allowance which is expended but for which there is no production. That amounts to nearly seven million pounds. The aggregate of these three items is 10½ million pounds. There is, therefore, this large sum of money expended throughout the Commonwealth, for which there is no production whatever. Of that, six millions is a recent matter due to those who have been wounded in the war. We add to that the gratuity to the soldiers which, I am told, is going to be 30 million pounds. This is to be distributed throughout the Commonwealth, and Western Australia will get a fair share. That 10 millions and that 30 millions makes 40 millions. Then we have the very handsome and useful addition to the price of wheat. Wheat has gone up—I am not going to say altogether due to the Minister for Agriculture, though he played a part in it—to such an extent that only a few weeks ago nearly one million pounds was distributed in Western Australia alone. Last year in making some remarks on the Address-in-reply, I suggested that the Government should guarantee 5s. per bushel to the farmers, and do away with these advances that are made through the I.A.B. and other channels, and take no responsibilities. If a guarantee of 5s. a bushel were given, and the person getting it could not make wheat growing pay, then he could give it up. Mr. Dodd immediately objected, and said that there should be a similar guarantee to the goldfields and the other people. What do we find? We are guaranteeing 8s. 6d. now.

The Honorary Minister: No, 5s.

Hon. Sir E. H. WITTENOOM: Then we are getting 8s. 6d.

The Honorary Minister: Yes.

Hon. Sir E. H. WITTENOOM: That shows how the thing has worked out. In addition to the wheat money, which is by no means an unimportant consideration, we have the very large returns from our wool. Wool moneys are distributed throughout Australia. As this money comes to the wheat people and the wool people, it is again distributed to the workers and the community connected with them. Therefore, when we take all that into consideration, we see that there is a very large distribution of money which must necessarily enhance the price of the produce which is

wanted, by all, inasmuch as, if so much money is readily available, there must be competition for the amount of production that takes place. If there is only a limited amount produced, and a fairly liberal amount of money forthcoming, the price of the produce must necessarily increase because each person will continue to want it. The only question is, in what way can we get over these industrial troubles so that we may work together and produce as much as possible. I was conversing with a man the other day who put a very pertinent question to me. He said, "Do you think the leaders of the unions want to settle these questions?" I said, "I am not on intimate terms with any of the leaders of unions, and I am not in a position to say, but why do you ask?" He said, "It seems to me that if they settled these questions, and there was contentment amongst the workers, some of the leaders of the unions might have their services dispensed with." I only mention this by the way. People have their own ideas on different subjects. However, from what I can see and the little I know about the matter, I think those in charge of these industrial questions do try as far as possible to get peace, quiet and comfort. There is a very great difference between labour and capital, and a difference that, if possible, we ought to get over. I have no belief in arbitration courts at all. I would do away with them entirely. Arbitration courts, so far as they have been in Australia, have only been bodies for the registration of the increase of wages—that is so in nearly every case. The time has arrived when they have outgrown their usefulness. I would be prepared, were the time and place proper, to make suggestions as to how these places could be filled. What I am trying to argue now—I am only taking a superficial view of the question at present, and the time may yet arrive when it can be dealt with more fully—is that if we are going to have cheap living, we must have more production. If we do not have a cessation of labour troubles, and if there is not a more congenial feeling between those who work and those who produce, I am afraid production will not improve. Unless production does improve, the cost of living must continue to be high. The influx of so much money will, I am afraid, cause prices to go up. The next paragraph which gives me a certain amount of satisfaction in the Speech is in connection with the North-West. It says—

The development of the North-Western and far Northern portions of the State is receiving attention. The recent Ministerial and Parliamentary tour of those districts—in which the Federal Government participated—has served to bring prominently before the public the possibilities of this portion of our great heritage, and to make clearer the requirements of those who are engaged in its industries.

But this is the most important part—

Steps have been taken towards assuring a satisfactory steamer service for the North and North-Western ports, and also to increase the utility of the Wyndham Freezing Works. The Government feels that the adoption and prosecution of a comprehensive and continuous policy for the North is justified and necessary, and steps are being taken in that direction.

I should like to say, in passing, how much we are indebted to Mr. Holmes and Mr. Miles for introducing a deputation of a number of persons throughout the North and northern part of the State, which action has given a great deal of publicity to that part of the world and made a great deal known of which we were hitherto ignorant. The fundamental requirement of the north and North-West is a good shipping service, which will be accurate and continuous.

Hon. J. Duffell: And population.

Hon. Sir E. H. WITTENOOM: Whilst I am in accord with the Northern Development League, and their desire to develop the interior, and bring immigrants there and place them in these large areas to open up the country, I say that our first consideration should be for those men who have already gone there, and are now on the spot. We must give facilities to those who have borne the heat and burden of the day in opening up this country. Once we have satisfied them, there will be plenty of time to place other new people in a decent position. What we want now is to get a steamship service, so that the people who are already developing the country, and living there, can make sure of getting their produce to market within reasonable time, and at dates on which they can rely. I am opposed to Government industrial concerns. I would be opposed to this shipping service, only that it was through the interference of the Government some years ago that the steamship service along the coast was spoilt. There was a first-class shipping service, which included the Adelaide Steamship Coy. and others. The Government of the day introduced some steamers just sufficient to make competition and frighten some of the others, but without giving a complete service. Had the Government at the time said, "We will do away with private enterprise, and are going to give you a good service in competition with them," one would have understood it. But they did it in such a partial way that, had it not been for the present steamers stopping there, there would be no service at all, or only a partial one. I have taken a great deal of interest in this matter in the past. I understand that the Government have now a comprehensive scheme for giving the people along the coast a good shipping service. If it is carried out it will be quite satisfactory, that is, if it is worked properly. I do not believe any Government industrial concerns can be worked properly, for the simple reason that under no circumstances can any

organisation carry out a business commercially or otherwise in a satisfactory way where the workers are the masters of the managers and the directors. This is always the case in any industrial concern belonging to the Government. At present there is a lot of room for improvement along the North-West coast. I essayed recently to go as far as Broome, but I did not get any further than Carnarvon. I did get to Shark Bay, and I found that the people there were living under very trying conditions in the way of getting their goods, and in the way they were served by vessels. No doubt it is a difficult position to deal with, and it is an expensive place. One of the troubles along the North-West is that in many cases townships have been created in the wrong places. If the persons who established them had gone five miles this way or five miles that way, they would have got into a better position. To give them the facilities they asked for would be exceedingly expensive. In this particular case I pointed out, after conference with the captains of the ships and the people who live there, what could be done in the way of getting their stores. A steamer now has to anchor out three or four miles from the land. The goods are lightered to the coast, and when a lighter gets within perhaps half a mile of the shore, into seven or eight feet of water, everything is put into a dinghy and, if it is rough, the conditions of landing can well be imagined.

Hon. J. Duffell: The same thing exists in Queensland.

Hon. Sir E. H. WITTENOOM: I do not know that is any justification for its existing in Shark Bay. I applied to the Government. They said, "We will do what we can, but we have not got the money." When I found they had not got the money it made me reflect. It then occurred to me that this very Government, who said it could not do this and could not do that for the development of the State, had actually refused the sale of a timber concern that it had, to a syndicate for the sum of £400,000, and that it could have had this amount of money with which to develop the State.

The Minister for Education: When was this?

Hon. Sir E. H. WITTENOOM: Last year. I know that a French syndicate wanted to buy it.

The Minister for Education: They would not have had the money.

Hon. Sir E. H. WITTENOOM: Do not tell me that. We know that the Government were not game to bring it forward. Although they had an Opposition of only 15 in another place, they were not game to bring the proposition forward. Those people were prepared to take over that business.

The Minister for Education: They were not.

Hon. Sir E. H. WITTENOOM: Then I have been misinformed. Had the mills been sold the Government would have had the

£400,000. Yet in addition to refusing to sell the mills the Government were able to find £80,000 with which to buy out the sleeper hewers' association. This is a nice state of affairs for a Government pledged to have nothing to do with State trading concerns. A Government opposed to State enterprise not only refused to sell the timber mills to a syndicate for £400,000—one of the mills has since been burnt down—but they bought out the timber hewers for £80,000, a sum which would have given the people along the north-west coast all sorts of conveniences. I am saying this, not in anger but in sorrow, because I feel that all the money that could have been acquired from these industrial enterprises, which are not paying, might be usefully spent in the development of the northern part of the State, and so bring in revenue and, in addition, settle the country. Glad as I shall be to see the recommendations of the Northern Railway Development League carried out, yet before we spend money on these new enterprises I say let us give all the facilities we can to the men already up there. What they want is a good, reliable shipping service, properly managed. I could say something about past management, but I do not wish to do so. I have heard the Government congratulated on the score that the deficit is not as large as was expected. In a way that is satisfactory, but to my thinking the time has arrived when we should get rid of the deficit. No one realises more than I the difficulties the Government have had to face in connection with the finances, but it is becoming a scandal that we should consistently, year after year, come down with a deficit. Surely we should avoid these deficits. I have read on the Sabbath an article dealing trenchantly with the way in which the Government have handled the finances, and on the Monday I have read another article explaining the reasons why the Government have had these deficits. I have since read the speech of a Minister who also explained many of the difficulties confronting the Government. I assure the leader of the House that he has my entire sympathy, but I think that if possible we should try to avoid deficits in the future. It is humiliating to find Queensland or New South Wales saying, "You have a deficit every year!" It would be altogether better if we made up our Estimates in such a way that our expenditure would approach our revenue. Of course in this I am only anticipating the views of the Government, because I find on looking at the Speech that it contains this announcement—

You will be asked to grant temporary supplies, and at an early date the Estimates of Revenue and Expenditure for the financial year will be submitted; and you will be further invited to consider proposals with a view to bringing the annual revenue and expenditure into closer accord. That exactly attunes with my own views. Let us by all means bring them into closer accord, and do not let us have these continually recurring deficits; because they are

humiliating when commented upon by our neighbours, and altogether unsatisfactory to ourselves. Of course this paragraph in the Speech means further taxation. But is there no way of achieving the same object by economy? There are two recognised ways of bringing revenue and expenditure together, one by taxation and the other by economies. The time has arrived when we should begin to think about economy. Not being the Treasurer, I am not in a position to suggest where those economies should begin and end, but I think something might be done to effect some saving. We should get rid of these State enterprises. Unfortunately I am obliged to make reservations in connection with three of them, because it seems to me an impossibility to get rid of those three. One is the Railways, the second is the State Steamship Service, and the third is the State Implement Works. The State Implement Works are only justified by the excessive taxation imposed on us by the Federal Government, and I take it the maintaining of those works to some extent modifies the charges that would be made on agricultural implements. Under these circumstances the State Implement Works are justified. But if I had my way, the whole of the Federal taxation would be reviewed. Whilst I am not a freetrader—I am a moderate protectionist—I do not believe in going to the taxation excesses we are indulging in at present. The railways, I understand, are the chief cause of this year's deficit. They have gone to the bad by some £400,000. It is an extraordinary state of affairs that a commercial concern like the railways should go before the Arbitration Court and prove that it is losing money, notwithstanding which the award of the court imposes upon the railways an additional cost of some £200,000. If any private commercial concern, losing money, went to the Arbitration Court and there met with an award imposing additional expenses of £200,000, that concern would have to close its doors. It puts me in mind of the man who was trying to make ends meet by burning the candle at both ends. If we cannot do any better with the railways than we have been doing, it would be far better to sell them to a company for their value—some 18 or 20 millions—and let someone else carry them on. I believe that if the railways were looked after and managed properly—I do not say they are mismanaged now—it might be found possible to make the receipts equal the expenditure. Whilst on that subject we see in the Press—that was referred to by Mr. Dodd yesterday—that the only way in which to make the railways pay is to tax the unimproved land values. I am opposed to land taxation of any kind, for the reason that Western Australia, unlike other States, is absolutely dependent for success on the development of its lands. In the circumstances we should not impose any obstacles to the development of the lands. We require to put the people on the land. We know that the development of land is an expensive process, and therefore

to tax the land is absolutely absurd. But I go this far with those who advocate this form of taxation: I consider that everyone who owns land within 12 miles of a railway should be made to use that land, or alternatively the Government should resume it. Taxing the land means confiscation. Those who own the land have lawfully acquired it, and to tax them in the way proposed means confiscation. But I agree that they should be given notice that unless within 12 months they have made use of such of their land as lies within 12 miles of a railway, that land shall be resumed. In this way all the land along the railways would be utilised for the benefit of the railways. I do not know whether there is much unused land of any value along the railways. My experience suggests that there is not. I have travelled from Bridgetown to Nannine, and I can honestly say that from what I saw from the train windows there is not 5,000 acres of land along that line which I would have if it were given to me. Some day it may become useful, but at present I know of no use for it. Between Midland Junction and Moora can be seen sufficient poor land to make one despondent. I do not think that much land is held for speculative purposes, but wherever it is so held, let the Government resume it and let the people take it and make it useful for the railways. Of course some will say that my remarks refer only to country lands. They do refer to country lands entirely. I shall be asked, what about the people who hold town lands for speculation while other people spend money on improvements which add to the value of the idle lands. My answer is, leave that to the municipalities and road boards. If they have not got gumption enough to know what to do in regard to such lands, they deserve to go without their rates. They will be able to look after that. I think all this £300,000 or £400,000 could be saved. Another place where money could be saved is in the Education Department. The amount of money spent on the Education Department is far too great and I am quite certain that, if the Department were put on proper lines—it is on wrong lines now—we could save £100,000 a year. We are educating our people in the wrong way. I want members to understand that I do not underrate the value of education. I am a great believer in education, but I believe in people being educated for their opportunities. To-day we are educating people beyond their opportunities and for opportunities which cannot possibly come their way. What we want in this country is people who will go out on to the lands and work and develop them. There is a good living and a lot of money to be made by those who will go on the land, but the education we are giving to our young people will lead them to remain in the towns. One of the most mischievous parts of the education system is the continuation classes which induce the young people to stay in the

towns from the time they reach the compulsory age of 14 until the age of 17 or 18. What is the consequence? These young men, fine young men many of them, who ought to be going out to an agricultural college or to the country at the age of, say, 15, the same as I myself did, are induced to stay in the towns for another three years in order to attend continuation classes. What happens? They get attached to their football and cricket clubs and their sweethearts, and, by the time they are 18, they arrive at the decision, "No country for me; the town is good enough." What is the end of such boys? They go into a large commercial concern or into a bank, and it is good-bye to their opportunities for the rest of their lives. If they go into the country, there is a chance of getting a place of their own and doing well for themselves. There is an idea amongst some people that education is everything; that so long as we carry education so far as is possible, the boys must prove of some good. It is not a bit of good giving a man an education which will be of no use to him. It would be of no use educating a man as a farmer if he was required as a demonstrator at the University. Equally, it would be of no use educating a man at the University if he was required for a farm or a sheep station. We need to give people education for the work which is wanted in the country, and what is wanted here is production. We have a vast country which requires the settlement of its lands. We do not want professors; professors are of no use here. In the circumstances, I say our education is all wrong and that we could save at least £100,000 a year if we put our boys on the land as I suggest. This country requires material development. We do not want too much scientific development and brains such as the University business gives us. We want people able to work and develop the country. I know that the Minister for Education will give me a terrible slating when he gets up to speak.

The Minister for Education: I have given you up.

Hon. Sir E. H. WITTENOOM: He will tell the House that we are not so far ahead in matters of education as England; that we are nothing like America and nothing like some other place. We do not want to educate our men as men are educated in England; England is a different place altogether, and so is America. We need to educate our people for the opportunities available for them. The Minister for Education is going to give me what we vulgarly call fits, and I might have felt a little frightened were it not for a very strong justification I have for my remarks in an excellent article I saw the other day. It is headed "Our educational failure; Brightest boys trained for others. Serious loss to the State." It starts—

Our educational system is good in its intention, but ill in its results.

Could I have anything better to bear out my contention that we are educating our young people too much for their opportunities? I do not discredit education. Members must not think that I hold a poor opinion of it. I believe in it, but I believe in a man being educated for what he is intended. There are two or three statements here which I would like to quote. They deal with the boy after he has got his honours. It says—

He goes out into the world of work, proud of the honours he has gained through a score of years of hard study, only to find that under present day conditions brains are at a discount and that there is no room for him unless he is prepared to work—and work at undertakings which involve a heavy responsibility and require great scientific knowledge—at a wage which would be scorned by an ordinary artisan who had left school at an age when he could not have done much more than mastered the three R's. Too late he realises that the carpenter, the bricklayer, the plumber or the lumper, as far as financial remuneration for work performed is concerned, is much better off than he is, and furthermore even of poorly paid but suitable positions very few are available, and he comes to look upon himself as the victim of one huge mistake. Through the visionary ideas of a paternal Government in establishing a secondary school and a University, in order to fully develop the brains of the young, and the mistaken notions of a fond father who considered it his duty to allow his son to have the full benefit of educational advantages undreamt of when he himself was a boy, he finds himself at the age of 24 or 25 an encyclopaedia of scientific knowledge, whom nobody wants (except at a starvation wage) and wholly unfitted for the luxurious life of a carpenter, a bricklayer, a plumber or a lumper.

And I add to that—"Or a farmer." Therefore my argument is that we should educate the boy for the luxurious life, and not for a life in which he is not wanted. The writer of the article goes on to say—"The fault is not his"—that is exactly what I have been arguing—"It lies with the Government." The writer naturally implies that, having educated these boys up to this standard, the Government should find something for them to do. Having been educated up to these positions the boy says, "I am not going to take off my coat to work. Put me in a position in accordance with my education," and very properly too. This is how the writer of the article concludes—

Is it any wonder the young fellows go (to Ceylon and other places) and Western Australia thus fails to reap any harvest from the seed it has sown? Looking at the position as it is, we recommend the Government to devote some careful thought to the subject, for it is one that

intimately concerns the future welfare of Western Australia.

The writer implies that, having educated these boys up to these positions, it is the duty of the Government to find situations for them. We could not have anything more absurd than that. We do not want men who have been educated in the Universities. Look around the city of Perth; look at all the commercial institutions and point out one which is managed by a University man. Look around the farms and stations and show me where a University man has been successful on one of them. Let me take a recent experience. The ex-Premier, Sir Henry Lefroy, at a luncheon in this very House, congratulated himself, and with pardonable pride, on being the first English public school boy to attain the position of Premier. That was 26 years after responsible Government had been declared. It apparently took a very long time—26 years—before an English public school boy attained the Premiership, and I can only ask members to reflect for themselves how successful the experiment was. We do not find in any of these cases that very high education is necessary for success and, as we must have a population to develop the State, a population with a knowledge of what they require, what is the use of educating them beyond it? Take the University of Perth. Could we have anything more pitiable than we have seen in the Press during the last few days. One professor says the University is absolutely hopeless, and another writes that unless more money is granted to the University, it cannot go on. Altogether the University seems to be in a bad way. I am one of those who always believed that the establishment of the University in Western Australia was premature. The place is too small to support a University. A University education is a magnificent thing for anyone to have, but Western Australia, with 330,000 inhabitants, is too small in numbers for an expensive institution like a University. The consequence is that there is difficulty in carrying on. Western Australia is not a wealthy place. I do not suppose that in any other State in Australia is wealth or money so equally divided. There are no wealthy men here. I doubt whether I could count 10 or 20 men who could be said to be wealthy. Consequently an institution like the University cannot well be supported, especially by a Government having a deficit of £600,000 or £700,000 every year. There are no wealthy people here to endow the institution and, moreover, it is superfluous and unnecessary. Being one of the States of the Commonwealth, we have a right to use the Universities in the other States, and those few young people who desire University education can get it at a far better University than we have here, namely in Adelaide or Melbourne.

Hon. J. Duffell: What about the degrees?

Hon. Sir E. H. WITTENOOM: I am only looking at the degrees of education. Some people might ask why is the University of Adelaide better than that of Perth. The reason is that Adelaide for years had Broken Hill behind it. Thousands of people made tons of money out of Broken Hill and were able to do justice to the University of Adelaide. One or two men endowed it with large sums of money.

Hon. H. Stewart: Not so very large.

Hon. Sir E. H. WITTENOOM: Yes; what about the Elder bequest? On the other hand we find that one man who died here left an endowment, and it was necessary to go to law to get the money. I am not ridiculing it. I am only saying that the University was prematurely established and I do not see how it can be maintained. Some people are very ambitious. They want to make it a free University which is an additional disadvantage, in that it induces young people to give up what they ought to do, namely, the work and development of the land. By giving up such work for a University education, they in time become useless for anything else. Some time ago the Royal Agricultural Society had to nominate someone to attend the University of Melbourne. A friend asked "What is the good of it. Directly a boy gets his degree, all he wants is to be a demonstrator." The scientific men are of no use for work. It is of no use them trying to work in the country. Take the case of the Government expert in connection with the dairying industry. I have forgotten his name.

Hon. H. Stewart: Mr. Connor.

Hon. Sir E. H. WITTENOOM: Yes. Twelve months before he retired he made a tour of the Geraldton district. He went up there during September, the very finest period of the year and said if ever there was a place where dairying should be instituted, and where people could make fortunes, that was the place. And he said to the people, "Come along, there is an absolute fortune to be made at dairying in this district." Twelve months later he retired. Did he go up there and start a dairy and make his fortune? Did he attempt to carry out what he had advocated? No. He went away and took a situation somewhere else. I am not under-rating education at all. I want that to be thoroughly understood. No one appreciates education in its proper place more than I do, but I say we are largely wasting our money in educating our young people beyond their opportunities. Once that is done, they will not do what we want them to do.

The Minister for Education: Would you mind giving me the name of the authority you are quoting from?

Hon. Sir E. H. WITTENOOM: The "Sunday Times" of last Sunday. I consider the "Sunday Times" just as good a judge of the University as any other paper is. I have nothing further to comment upon except the list of measures, which are to come before us. I hail with much satisfac-

tion the promise of Bills to amend the Mines Act and the Mining Development Act. If there is any industry in this country that justifies developing, it is the mining industry. I had the honour and pleasure of being Minister for Mines for a good many years, and the Government with which I was associated did its best for the industry. I am always in favour of largely subsidising people who go out to seek new goldfields. The expenditure of £20,000 in bonuses, or subsidies would be nothing provided we could find another goldfield. That would be the finest immigration scheme we ever had, and would benefit every section of the community. I trust that the conditions of the new measures will be of such a nature as to encourage everyone who possibly can to try and find a new field. Speaking in the interests of the Royal Agricultural Society and the Pastoralists' Association, I note with regret that the Government do not promise to place on the statute-book a measure for regulating stallions. That is a very important matter. I understood it was going to be taken into consideration during this session. I believe the number of stallions of poor quality travelling about the country are doing a great deal of harm. I would suggest the inclusion in that measure of a clause authorising the export of horse meat to any country that will take it. There are in this country thousands of horses of the very poorest quality, and it is a pity to have to destroy them for no return when there are other countries which would be glad to take them as an article of diet. The other day I happened to be at a station where there was a man who had 120 horses for sale. He got a ring on the telephone and I heard him say, "Three pounds ten shillings." He ended up by saying, "Oh, well, £2 10s. is too little, I think; say £3." He sold 110 horses at £3 per head. In regard to horse meat, there is only prejudice against it; it is quite as succulent as beef, and we know there is a good market abroad for it. If the export of horse meat were permitted, people would get rid of their inferior animals; and then, if we had decent stallions travelling the country, we would improve the breed of our horses to an enormous extent and do away with the duffers that are now eating the feed of good horses. Moreover, we would open up a good market for army horses in India. I understand the Honorary Minister has the matter in hand, and I feel certain he will do what he can. I am sure also that the omission of a Bill to regulate stallions from the Government's legislative programme for the session is a purely accidental omission.

Hon. A. J. H. SAW (Metropolitan-Suburban) [5.51]: I think I can at the outset dissociate myself from, at any rate, some of the views expressed by Sir Edward Wittenoom. I would like to remind the hon. member that no modern State can be the baccarat paradise which he would evidently like to live in. On the contrary, I am ex-

tremely sorry that there is such scanty reference in the Governor's Speech to two of the most important matters that contribute to the welfare and happiness of the people. I refer to health and to education. There is a slight reference to health, but it appears to me that pertains to the Health Amendment Act, which is a dainty delicacy that apparently the Government like to put on the menu of every session. I should like to ask the leader of the House whether it is the intention of the Government to make the Health Amendment Act a permanent addition to our statute-book, or whether it is to be merely a temporary affair to come up year by year, affording opportunity every session for the discussion of certain nauseous details. There is something in health matters which is more important even than dealing with venereal disease, and that is the condition of the Perth Public Hospital. That institution is overcrowded and in many respects is far behind the times. No additions have been made to the accommodation there for the last 10 years. In fact, the hospital is now one ward short of what it had 10 years ago. The accommodation for women is particularly limited.

Hon. H. Stewart: There is none for women in the country.

Hon. A. J. H. SAW: I am speaking of the Perth Public Hospital. The turn of the country will come afterwards. The accommodation for men also is deficient. The result is a very large waiting list of people requiring operations. These people have to wait their turn, standing down sometimes for months in order to make room for more urgent operations. These waiting cases are operations for hernia and for similar diseases which are, to a certain extent, crippling, and which undoubtedly impair a man's earning power, though the necessity for operation cannot be described as urgent. It is essential, I think, that further accommodation should be provided at the Perth Public Hospital. Not only is there deficiency of accommodation, but the hospital is sadly lacking in certain essentials. There is no electro-therapeutic department, and no hydro-therapeutic department at the institution. The result is that these branches of medicine are practically represented by one masseur, who I understand is now resigning. They are very important departments, and there ought to be at least four or five masseurs working at the hospital under medical direction in a properly equipped electro-therapeutic and hydro-therapeutic establishment. Such an establishment should be under the control of an expert in that direction. From an intimate knowledge of this subject, especially so far as it affects injured workmen, many of whom I see referred to me by various insurance companies, I say without hesitation that injured men who require skilled after-treatment on those lines are not at present getting it. The result is that they are very often kept back for months from restoration to full earning power. There should also be a reform in that institution

as regards the pathologist and bacteriologist. At present all specimens that have to be examined are sent from the hospital to the central board of health and examined there, whereupon a report is sent back. That is not a satisfactory position. The pathologist should be in more intimate relationship with the staff and with the patients. I believe he is nominally associated with the hospital, but as a matter of fact he does not go over there. One of the great lessons that we learnt during the war in hospital matters was the very important benefit to be derived from a close co-operation of the surgeon, the physician, the pathologist, and the X-ray man. It is only right that the experience gained during the war should be applied to civil hospitals. I would like to say a word about the X-ray department. Formerly that department was under the care of Mr. William Hancock, a layman, and I have nothing but admiration for the noble and self-sacrificing work, self-sacrificing both as to health and time, which Mr. Hancock did in that capacity. Now that there is an opportunity of an X-ray expert taking over that department, Mr. Hancock has very magnanimously retired in favour of a qualified medical man. The result will undoubtedly make for the good of the institution. The apparatus has up to the present been an extremely poor one, but I understand that that is going to be remedied. Recent advances in science leave no doubt that the X-ray is an extremely important factor from the point of view of both diagnosis and treatment. The time has come when, in my opinion, a change should be made in the status of those who are directing this department and that of electro-therapeutics. In my opinion they should be paid officers, for the simple reason that that kind of work gives very little scope for private practice. With a population so small as ours, it is very difficult for experts in that kind of work to come here and settle down. If, however, they were subsidised by being attached to the hospital with a paid job undoubtedly great advantage would result to the patients and also to the rest of the community. Then there is the infectious diseases hospital. The conditions there are not satisfactory. Owing to a lack of accommodation for the staff, who have to attend on various cases of different types of infectious diseases, there is great danger of what is called cross-infection—that is, for instance, carrying scarlatina from one patient to another patient who is already affected with diphtheria. The state of things obtaining there at present is highly dangerous. I have pointed out in some detail what I consider to be faults in these institutions, but there is little advantage in pointing out defects unless one can suggest remedies, and can indicate what is the cardinal root of the failure. I take it that the cardinal fault is the composition of the board of management of the Perth public hospital. I put it to you, Mr. President,

that that board consists, with one possible exception, of members who have no knowledge whatever of the inside of a hospital. Dr. Atkinson, the principal medical officer, is the possible exception. Then there is Mr. George Taylor, the Speaker, Mr. Davies, M.L.A., the Hon. Mr. Panton, Mr. Hawkins, a contractor, the mayor of Perth, who holds a seat ex-officio, and who, I believe, is a draper, Mr. Bolt, who represents the friendly societies, and two ladies—Mesdames Cowan and Rischbieth.

Hon. A. H. Panton: And Dr. Barker.

Hon. A. J. H. SAW: He is not a member of the board.

Hon. A. H. Panton: But he votes.

Hon. A. J. H. SAW: He is a paid servant of the Board and if he were to vote that would be an improper thing to do. Dr. Atkinson is a very admirable man, but so far as I know, since his student days, he has never had anything to do with the treatment of the sick. His work has been confined to the Health Department. I do not think that he even held a hospital appointment before he branched out in the work he is now engaged in. The fact remains that apart from him there is not a single person on the board who knows anything about the conduct of a hospital. The staff is not even represented, and neither are the general practitioners represented, and that is the cardinal fault in connection with the institution. It is not to be wondered at that the board of management does not know in what direction they should launch out, and what should be necessary for the general welfare of the institution. I fancy the board are fairly well satisfied with the conditions which prevail there. I notice that Sir Edward Wittenoom is leaving the Chamber. I am sorry therefore that what I intend to say about the University will not be heard by him.

Hon. Sir E. H. Wittenoom: I shall remain.

Hon. A. J. H. SAW: I just caught the hon. gentleman in time. The other important subject to which I intend to refer is that of education. The present conditions at the University cannot go on. We must have adequate building and the University must have a permanent home on an accessible site. I know there are great financial difficulties in the way, but I am sure that if this were a matter, not of brains but of grains, the Government would manage to find the money. If it were a question of bulk handling or the erection of elevators it would be all right.

The Honorary Minister: We are not finding any money for that.

Hon. A. J. H. SAW: Perhaps the Government are doing it in some other way. The Government should certainly do something for the University. I was driving along the Terrace the other day and I had with me a friend to whom I was showing the beauties of Perth. I pointed out the makeshift buildings which do duty for a university. He was an old university man, and of course

courtesy forbade him saying anything. But presently he turned round and I caught his eye and observed a grin. That is the attitude most people adopt when they see our makeshift university buildings in Irwin-street. Not only should the Government find the money with which to make a commencement with new buildings, but they should also increase the University grant which has remained at the same level since the University was established, although the number of students has increased something like threefold. There is only one further matter with which I wish to deal and that is the civil service strike. That strike, to my mind, was one of the most discreditable episodes that has occurred in Western Australia. It was discreditable to everyone connected with it, even to Parliament, because Parliament last session unfortunately set the civil service a bad example. It was discreditable to the Government because the Government procrastinated and shilly-shallyed with the service, and refused for months, and various governments refused for years, to remedy the just grievances of the service. It was also discreditable to the civil service because at the eleventh hour and at the fifty-ninth minute the Government came down with what to my mind was the basis for a settlement, and the civil service instead of trying to meet the Government, formulated impossible demands. They held the pistol at the head of the Government with those demands, and they were such that any Government wishing to retain their self-respect, and the respect of the community must refuse to accede to. The result was that a strike ensued. As a matter of fact the people who formulated those demands must have been looking for a strike. The episode is over and I trust that such a thing will never occur again. I do not think it has done any good to anyone, and I hope that those concerned will have learned a lesson from it. The Government have certainly not gained by it because they now have a dissatisfied service. The service have not gained by it because whatever immediate advantage they may have got is more than counterbalanced by the loss of prestige which the service has sustained.

Hon. H. STEWART (South-East) [5.55]: I shall be very disappointed as I proceed with my address if Sir Edward Wittenoom is not present in the Chamber to hear my remarks in regard to science as applied to industry. However, I shall carry on over the adjournment for tea and perhaps then I may be able to induce him to change his attitude. I very much doubt though whether I shall succeed. In my earlier remarks in this Chamber during this session, I purposely avoided making mention—because I wanted to be brief—of the sense of loss that I feel, both on account of the Chamber and myself at the defeat of three highly esteemed members of the Council at the recent elections. I do hope that their services will not be

denied in the future to the State in the public interests. At the same time, I take the opportunity to welcome the new members. I feel quite certain that with further experience of this Chamber they will realise that not only has it a sphere of usefulness, but that it would be most injudicious and inadvisable and inimical to the interests of the citizens of the State; and the welfare of the State as a whole if the Chamber were abolished. It has struck me as rather curious that my remarks will follow to a large extent on the clauses in the Governor's Speech which have been commented on by Sir Edward Wittenoom, but my opinions will generally not be in accord with those expressed by the hon. member. In dealing with finance I find that to a large extent I am in accord with the views expressed by Sir Edward Wittenoom. I would like to direct attention to the explanation given in the Governor's Speech that the expansion in revenue is due chiefly to increased activity in the industries of the State. Looking at the published returns, we find that £148,000 is the increase which has taken place in consequence of the additional railway fares and freights. In addition to that there is £210,000 from taxation. Further the charges have been raised in most of the State business undertakings. Therefore in my opinion it is not at all indicative of the true state of affairs to say that the increase is due to activities in the industries of the State. When we deduct that amount from the increased fares and freights, and the increase on account of taxation amounting to £350,000 out of the total increase of over £900,000, it leaves only about two-thirds, and then we find that the business undertakings of the State, including railways, are responsible for the increase of £700,000. But with this increase of revenue that has resulted and which is attributed to the increase of the business activities of the State we find that there has been also increased expenditure exceeding the amount of the increase in revenue by an appreciable sum. The total increase in revenue was £919,000, and the increased expenditure was £934,000, but if we deduct the amount in round figures of £350,000 on account of increased fares and freights and the increase received in taxation, there is left a matter of something like £550,000, resulting from the business undertakings of the State—and they have increased their charges in many instances—as against an increase in expenditure of £934,000. Making a comparison of that kind discloses a position which should cause us a considerable amount of uneasiness. It is pleasing to note that attention has been drawn to the paragraph in the Governor's Speech which sets out that we shall be invited to consider proposals with a view to bringing the revenue and expenditure into closer accord. The House will be gratified if the Minister when replying will indicate somewhat more definitely what those proposals are. I am concerned with this fact that since June, 1917, we have had

national Governments in power, and while their first plank was "win the war," they set great store by the condition of the finances. This is how the plank reads:—

Parliamentary National party—Finance—A, economy in administration, concentration of Government offices, legislation where necessary to admit of organisation of departments, amalgamation of all branches exercising similar functions, and the encouragement of efficiency.

We have had a long period since June 1917. I cannot call to mind any legislation that has been brought down to achieve the objects outlined in that portion of the platform. It then goes on to say—

Taxation after making all possible economies.

I feel that successive National Governments have not introduced all possible economies even when we take into account the conditions existing, and the very exceptional circumstances, through the war and the aftermath of the war. Although I am a strong advocate of education I feel that it is necessary to be sure that the community is getting value for the expenditure. The expenditure on education this year is shown by the published reports in the "West Australian" to be £414,000 in round figures, and in 1916-17, during the period of adversity, it was, I think, £334,000. This is a tremendous increase, and we want to be sure that the results of this expenditure will lead to increased efficiency and the welfare of the whole of our people. One cannot but feel that the hon. member who was speaking just now in opposition to education, would be justified in his endeavour to see that the matter was fully investigated, and that such an expenditure as I have indicated is explained. By procrastination, of which successive Governments have been guilty in their handling of the civil service, they have missed the opportunity of introducing reforms in the service, and making very necessary economies and retrenchments—I do not say drastic retrenchments. It has been pointed out by Governments during the past four or five years that there was room in the service for retrenchment and efficiency. The late Treasurer resigned his position on the ground that he could not stand up against the permanent heads of departments and had not the support of his colleagues, when he sought to bring about economies that he considered were vitally necessary to secure efficient and economical administration. As one outside the actual departments I cannot help feeling that Governments might have taken steps to bring this about. Their attitude in regard to expenditure seems to have been "What is a saving of £5,000 a year on one item and £2,000 a year somewhere else and so on in our total expenditure?" If they had shown a little more care in the spending of these odd thousand pounds here and there, not only would the deficit have been less but they would prob-

ably have been able to at least save the amount of interest due upon these annual deficits, and that is not a small amount. I congratulate the Government upon the progress they have made in the settlement of returned soldiers on the land, and on having made better progress than the previous Government made. The work seems to have gone on satisfactorily, and comparatively speaking, rapidly. In the settlement of returned soldiers on the land and other people who are encouraged to enter the agricultural industry, it is of vital importance both to them and to the State that the Agricultural Department should be well administered on modern lines, and afford these people every facility that it is possible to afford them. The Agricultural Department should utilise all the advantages that are obtainable to-day by the employment of men who understand the scientific aspect of farming as well as the practical side. Before dealing at length with the Agricultural Department I should like to deal with the mining industry. Perhaps unfortunately in the opinion of Sir Edward Wittenoom, I had the advantage of the best technical training in mining, and have passed through all grades of the industry from being a worker, underground and in ore treatment works, through the various offices to that of sole control in the winning of gold and base metals not only in four States of the Commonwealth but also in Africa, and with opportunities of becoming conversant at first hand with the industry in Europe. With such a record as that, perhaps the observations I have to make and the suggestions I have to offer may receive some consideration at the hands of hon. members and of the Minister in charge of the department concerned. I should like to draw attention to the result of the action of the Government in ameliorating the conditions respecting freight to the firewood companies when the woodcutters' strike was on. This meant a loss in revenue of about £10,000. Prior to these conditions being imposed certain mines on the Golden Mile were enabled to draw supplies of firewood independent of the firewood companies. Outside competition, however, has now been eliminated, and the firewood companies have a monopoly over the supplies. For years the Kalgurli and the South Kalgurli have been using large quantities of firewood; the former takes from 400 to 800 tons per month, and the latter 1,000 tons per month. These mines were enabled to get supplies from independent sources and thus to check the prices. Under the altered conditions, to which I have referred, the outside suppliers are now unable to compete and supply these companies. The position is an unfortunate one. It may surprise hon. members if I read a cutting from the "National Banker," a United States paper. The article in question was published in 1916, and it says—

The combined dividends paid by the gold and silver companies of the United States are greater than the combined dividends paid by all the banking institutions of the United States; that the combined dividends paid by the copper companies of the United States are greater than the combined dividends paid by all the railroads of the United States; and that 52 per cent. of the freight handled by these same railroads is either ore or some commodity connected with the mining and milling of ore. To this somewhat astounding and not generally known fact Bradstreets and Dunn's commercial agencies supply these startling addenda that but 36 per cent. of all legitimate mining investments fail, as against 54 per cent. in commercial lines. During 1907, 300 million dollars was lost in gilt-edged securities, and about as much during the past two years, which was more than was lost in mining.

That shows the position of affairs in the mining industry, a position very different from that which exists in the minds of the public of Western Australia or of Australia as a whole. I preface my remarks in this way to draw attention to this aspect of the industry as a business, because it is upon that basis that I intend to make some suggestions. The Speech states that at the present time there is unprecedented activity in prospecting. That is very satisfactory. The position was brought about through people having come back from the war. These men have been assisted under the repatriation scheme by the State and the Federal Governments, and it has brought about that desirable state of affairs, namely, activity in prospecting, a position which a few years ago it seemed impossible to achieve. New Zealand is at present casting her mind over and deploring the fact of the falling away in the mining industry, and suggestions have been made in the technical papers as to how it shall be stimulated. In order that this activity in prospecting in Western Australia may be continued, it is necessary that the prospector should be able to market his commodity and get rid of it at a satisfactory price. An essential feature in maintaining the revival in the mining industry and establishing it as a sound and healthy business-like enterprise is that it shall have the confidence of the investing public, and that the investing public, the shareholders in particular, shall be safeguarded in a way similar to that of shareholders in any commercial concern. In a mining company the vital assets are the ore reserves and values in the ore itself. In a commercial concern the vital assets are the £ s. d. and stocks. Mining companies have to make their annual reports, which have to be checked by an auditor. Any kind of statement can be made with regard to the ore reserves and values, and as to the probable production of the mine concerned, that is to say, the

real assets. No commercial man who is only a commercial man can check that, and the protection of the shareholders in the mine is in many instances non-existent from that point of view.

Sitting suspended from 6.15 to 7.30 p.m.

Hon. H. STEWART: Before tea I was referring to the position of the mining industry. Hon. members will easily recollect the wild booms of the Bullfinch days, of Westonia, and more recently of Hampton Plains and Mt. Monger. Although some good may arise from such occurrences, still much harm results, causing a setback for a long period. The consequence of the more recent booms has been that the people of the Eastern States, where there is money to invest, regard us as the wild and woolly West, where all sorts of things still take place, and wildcat scrambles occur. It is generally in the pioneering stages that these things happen. Not only in Western Australia do they occur. In to-day's newspaper we have a report in respect of the Badak tin mining proposition at Trengganu. In connection with that proposition a wild rise in the syndicate share values to £2,000 each occurred a while ago, whereas the most recent quotation is equivalent to £200. Now it is found that the reports of the advisers, which it was previously held warranted those high prices, have been contradicted, with the result that the Melbourne Stock Exchange has written to the State Government intimating that the investigation of this question is too big for them and asking the Government to take over the matter and conduct the necessary inquiry. Such occurrences as that cannot be in the interests of the renewed activity and permanent establishment of the mining industry on a sound basis. One cannot but commend the action of the Minister for Mines in framing regulations restricting the issue of leases to companies until he has seen the terms of the proposed flotations. Unfortunately, those regulations came rather late. However, they were a step in the right direction. We should go further and insist that in connection with the flotation of companies it shall be a *sine qua non* that there shall be a report by a fully qualified mining engineer. It will be recollected that early in 1917 when Mr. R. T. Robinson was Minister for Mines, a conference was called of miners, mine managers, investors, etc., in Kalgoorlie, to discover the best means of reviving the industry. This problem has exercised the minds of many. There are those opposed to the restriction of flotations, men who believe in maintaining the position that mining should be free and unrestricted and that the greatest latitude should be allowed for the taking of chances. Mr. De Bernales at that conference openly advocated that freedom of action and contended that it was necessary to maintain interest in mining. My belief is entirely opposite. I think we

require to safeguard the interests of shareholders and investors and give them a fair run for their money. Illustrative of the position which has obtained recently, I intend to quote from a prospectus issued, calling for applications for shares in a Mount Monger proposition on the 8th April last. This prospectus contains the names of prominent Perth and Fremantle gentlemen. I am not going to give those names or even the name of the company. The capital of the company was £80,000, in 160,000 shares of 10s. each. Amongst the assets offered to the shareholders is an option obtained by certain vendors from the prospector, an option dated the 24th March. The prospector gave an option for six months for £1,000 to certain Perth men, with a right of renewal on payment of a further £500. If the option was exercised the prospector was to get £14,000 in cash and 16,000 fully paid shares. The prospector got £1,000. More power to him if he had gone out and done something. I viewed that property the day the flotation was before the public and I can say that the value of the work done on the lease at that time was not £20. It involved no pioneering. It was simply pegging on to an adjacent claim. The vendors after that agreement of the 24th March got £5,500 cash for themselves and 9,000 fully paid shares. What had they done? They simply went out, paid £1,000 for the option and got apparently within one month 550 per cent. on their £1,000. I believe the shares were over applied for. The prospector got £1,000 and the vendors £5,500, and there was left for working capital £5,850 to test the ground and develop the mine. That is not a fair proposition either to the State or to the people applying for shares. Let me come to the objects of the company and the position on which it was floated. I do not want to give too many details to show up the individual venture, because it is only one of scores of similar flotations which took place in that and in previous booms. The inducements to take shares in the company were that the lease abutted on the south of another which had been inspected with others at Mt. Monger by the then Inspector of Mines. The prospectus quoted from remarks made in a written report to the Mines Department—a report written in most optimistic tone. It talks of width of gold-bearing ore, but it gives no actual values, and no indication of tonnage of ore reserves. It indicates that the lease referred to may contain lodes which may be payable. The only cost on the property being floated when I was there was at the far end of the lease, 20 chains away, and as I say, the value of the work done on that lease was not more than £20. Following on this quotation by the Inspector of Mines referring to a neighbouring property, but put into the prospectus in such a way that it could easily mislead anyone not conversant with these matters, is this comment by those responsible for the flotation:—

The lode referred to in the mining inspector's report extends into and through the property to be acquired by this company.

They make that statement, but nothing was done on that property to warrant that statement. The ground was covered with overburden. The lode, if a lode did exist, might or might not go under that ground. It should be necessary to put before people who propose investing in mining ventures in this State a report by a qualified mining engineer. The prospectus says that the lode extends into and through the property and that the vendors regard the property as having excellent prospects and that the mines should prove highly valuable. That, at the time it was written, was sheer bosh. It was not giving the applicants for shares a fair run for their money. That kind of thing is taking place systematically, and then we have the aftermath. I believe it is a fact that on the fields, if not here also, there are estimable citizens who were carried away by such reports and the general fever that prevailed at that time, and who have lost practically the savings of a lifetime and have had to part with their homes. From my connection with the industry, and knowing what is transpiring in this and other States, and in other important mining countries of the world, I am on safe ground in advocating that in all flotations of mining companies there should be a report by a qualified mining engineer. I regard that as being comparable to a report by a competent auditor or business assignee in connection with the taking over of a commercial concern. He puts the position before the prospective shareholders or the investors. It would be a good thing, as I mentioned in my maiden speech in the House, if every company conducting development and treatment operations were compelled to furnish once a year with their annual report plans and sections showing the true position of the mine and the assay values, together with the widths of the lode, so that shareholders could see them and check them. That would be simply requiring them to make a statement of the assets of the company comparable with the position of a commercial company, which, under the company law, is compelled to produce a balance-sheet certified by an auditor. Such plans and sections, together with the assays and estimates of all reserves, to be of any value would have to be signed in every instance by a qualified mining engineer. I realise that this is quite a new departure and that it would not meet with the approval of large numbers of people who are on directorates and dabble in shares, of company promoters, and perhaps even of sharebrokers, but I believe it would lead to a great improvement in the mining industry and to its being established on a firmer basis. The second suggestion seems necessary because there are mines on which a large amount of money has been spent on development and treatment work, mines which have paid dividends and in which the shares have appreciated to two, four or six times their

value, and have receded and the operation has been repeated several times, extending over a brief period of years. Yet there has never been published a correct plan of the mine workings showing the developments and values which would be roughly checked. That is to say, no one outside the directorate and staff of the company would be in a position to estimate the intrinsic value of the mine. In putting forward these suggestions, I would say they are really only what is done by successful, reputable and well managed concerns, who, though not compelled by law, do provide this information under the signature of their manager, who are qualified men. Mr. Dodd has dealt fully with the position of the miner and has ably pointed out how mining, like other industries of the State, has been handicapped by the State and Federal policies and by the increase of railway freights. I am entirely in accord with him on that but I do not agree with him in his proposal to impose a tax on the unimproved value of land. I do not agree that that tax cannot be passed on. It would be foolhardy on our part to rush into a remedy which might land us in trouble even greater than that with which we are faced to-day. Once such a tax was imposed a farmer or fruit-grower, whether he got produce, would still have to pay the tax. In the case of the railway freights the farmer pays only for the work actually done. But I think there is a way by which we can go somewhat along the line and which might enable us to see how the proposal advocated by Mr. Dodd would operate. As I advocated during my first year in the House, the Government could get revenue and help to bring into use lands which are not being utilised or improved, if the tax on unimproved idle land within the 12 mile zone of existing railways were increased from 1d. to 3d. in the pound. On the three million pounds' worth of land this would represent an increase of something like £25,000 and an idea would be gained as to how land prices and investments would be affected. This, however, is a digression from the subject of mining. In connection with prospecting the Government might be able to give further assistance by putting up indicators and guide posts in the far back country giving clear directions as to located water supplies, so that parties of prospectors might be able to go direct to the source of supply without loss of time and fatigue to themselves, and their animals. Another way in which interest might be maintained is by substantially increasing the reward to prospectors. Mr. McCrombie, a prominent New Zealand mining engineer, has advocated that the finder of a payable property should receive a bonus from the Government for 10 years while profits are being obtained from such a mine. Another suggestion to safeguard and stabilise the industry is that wardens should have power to refuse to grant a lease which is not on a proved line of lode or so located that there are satisfactory in-

dications of a lode running through the property. Another point which has been advocated is the simultaneous publication of reports in this State and in the State or country where the head office of the company is situated, in order that shareholders in this State might be on an equal footing with those in the other States. On many occasions people in this State are under a serious disadvantage through getting late information. The Government might well consider a modification with regard to the exemptions so that where a large amount of money has been spent in development—not wasted on surface equipment—the exemption should not be on any pro forma or empirical basis but graduated in accordance with the actual amount of developmental work done. A certain limited amount might be allowed for the capital expended on the surface. Not much good is done by spending money on elaborate surface equipment until the mine has been developed and then the exemption should be granted according to the sinking and the depth, the driving and the depth, and the relative value of other development. When a company has proved its bona fides by spending money in such development, the value of that work could be estimated and graduated on a regular basis and the period of exemption could be granted in accordance with the value of the work, in order to give further opportunities probably to raise more capital or to tide over adverse conditions. I am not one who would advocate the holding up of mineral assets of the country, the undue interference with the conduct of the industry or the throwing of people out of employment. When people have spent a considerable sum of money in development and a state of affairs arises under which they must have exemption, it is a fair basis to estimate the exemption on the value of the work they have done. We have been told that the Geological Department in this State is useless. In another place an ex-Minister remarked last night that it should be wiped out right away. I can speak as one who knows something of this branch of science, though in the three years I have been in this House I have tried to avoid mention of anything that would appear to be personal. However, when one comes to speak in connection with the mining industry and the Geological Department, much as one would like to be purely impersonal, it is only fair, in order to strengthen one's arguments, to state the position. After years of experience in the industry, and after my earlier training in geology, having gone to Glasgow in 1905-6 and got the latest training, especially as regards the economic aspect of geology work from the leading geologists of Great Britain, I think our Geological Department in its policy is guided too much by considerations for our general geology, certainly of scientific interest and of great importance to the rest of the world as well as to ourselves, but that policy is in the direction of developing our geological knowledge for the next generation or the genera-

tion following. Its policy is not one of giving the greatest possible help in our economic operations of to-day. In fact, I go further and say from my experience that the tardy publication of our geological reports and the avoidance of any contentious points in them detracts greatly from their value. The policy ought to be altered so as to bring the department into closer touch with the mining industry. There are mine managers in this State to-day who, knowing that a report was being prepared on a particular mine or a particular field in which they were interested, sought to have the information made available, possibly before the mine shut down. But they were not permitted to see the report in manuscript. Probably the report came out a year or two after the shutting down of the mine. What is the use of beautiful geological treatises on a mine which has closed down and will probably never open up again? Why should not the man in charge of a mine see the report of the Geological Department in manuscript? Why should he not have an opportunity of judging whether that report is of any value to him. If there is any utility in it let the man have an opportunity of seeing if it can throw additional light, instead of its being filed away on a bookshelf to be read eventually by a savant in the United States or Germany. That is the attitude of the department, though not the attitude of all officers. Some of the officers are exceedingly useful men and can render considerable assistance to the mining industry—notably Dr. Simpson, who by his patient and persistent research work in the geological laboratory has formed the basis for the successful establishment and prosecution of secondary industries here. In that connection I observe His Excellency's Speech foreshadows the establishment of a State Council with power to investigate and advise in connection with secondary industries. I hope the services of Dr. Simpson, and his claims to recognition, will not be lost sight of by the Government in connection with the establishment of that council. Possibly they may appoint him to the council. He is one of the most excellent officers we have in the service. I have spoken earlier of retrenchment, but I realise that we have some magnificent men in the Public Service, men who should be recompensed rather than retrenched. At least their true value should be recognised and this applies particularly to the type of man whom Sir Edward Wittenoom was rather depreciating in this House to-night—the man who is an investigator like Dr. Simpson, like Dr. Stoward, a former officer, and like Mr. Sutton. Much as these men need pounds, shillings and pence like the rest of us, the recognition of their work is almost as much to them as recognition in form of solid cash. The Agricultural Department is connected in my mind with the application of science to industry. I wish to express full appreciation of the efforts of the Honorary Minister in connection with that department by

the addition to his staff of a dairy expert, and a wool expert, by the establishment on the advice of his technical officers of winter classes for farmers at the Narrogin School of Agriculture, by the improvement of the course of education at that school until at the present time it is unable to take in the number of applicants for admission. There is an instance entirely opposed to the suggestion of Sir Edward Wittenoom who objects to education. Here we have elementary or rather economic agricultural education. It is not of the higher degree that would be given by an agricultural college such as, it has been suggested, we should establish in this State. The Narrogin School of Agriculture has numerous applications from the sons of farmers because the farmers realise, as the result of the research work and the experiments of the Commissioner for the Wheat Belt, that valuable help can be rendered to the agricultural industry by some correct knowledge of agricultural science. Under the authority of the Minister also quite a number of bulletins have been published by the Commissioner for the Wheat Belt on seed wheat, wheat diseases, oats and sheep feeding experiments. Mr. Sutton has conducted over a period of years experiments with the different varieties of wheats and oats and thereby he has established what varieties are desirable in the different portions of the State. Although it is only about two years since stud wheat in any reasonable quantity has been available and only one year since Mr. Sutton's fancy varieties of oats have been available, the demand for these stud seeds by those who have tried them is so great that he cannot keep pace with the applications made by farmers in the eastern Wheat Belt and along the Great Southern Railway. I do not know whether his work is so fully appreciated on the Midland line and in the Geraldton district; but in the portions of the State with which I am conversant it is recognised that Mr. Sutton by his valuable information has contributed to the welfare of the agricultural industry, has helped to increase the incomes of the people engaged in growing cereals and has contributed to the increased production and revenue of this State. With such an instance before them and having regard to the result of the work of the Narrogin School of Agriculture the people in the agricultural districts take a directly contrary view to that of Sir Edward Wittenoom. They are coming round to believe what every enlightened country on the face of the globe now believes, that if one is to get the best results, one must get them not by rule of thumb methods, but by the application of science and research guided and associated with sound practical knowledge and experience. It is recognised that one must have that combination in order to achieve the best results. We must have that combination in order to hold our own in competition with other countries. The interest of the agricultural community

is shown by the demand which has arisen for the establishment of an agricultural college. When it comes to the expenditure of money, I am one who does not like to ask the Government for anything under our present financial conditions. I have offered criticisms on financial administration, and before the Government launch out into certain avenues of expenditure, they must remedy various evils which I have on previous occasions pointed out. But we cannot absolutely stand still. We know that agricultural education will pay for itself far more handsomely than continuation classes in bookkeeping, millinery, typewriting, and other similar things that can be learnt in the city. Residents of the city can be educated without Government continuation classes, because they have the technical colleges handy. I am not speaking against education as a whole, but I think we are reaching a position when the total amount of money devoted to education in this State is not being spent in the best way. According to figures published in the "West Australian," £414,000 was spent by us in primary and secondary education last year—taking in, I presume, the Perth Modern School and the district high schools and the continuation classes. In juxtaposition with that, we have an annual grant of a paltry £13,000 to the university to carry on twice as much work and deal with twice as many students as was the case only a few years ago; and meanwhile the cost of doing the work has doubled. Then we have the demand for agricultural education. Let me refer to the report of "The Joint Committee" on agricultural education which comprised representatives of the Education Department, the University, the agricultural industry, and the Government. That report, which I know had the endorsement of the Minister for Education, pointed out that agricultural education was warranted, and was necessary. I believe it was on the 4th June, 1918, that the Minister for Education, in a Press interview, expressed the hope that this report would satisfy Parliament and would satisfy the public of Western Australia that the establishment of an agricultural college was necessary. But if the great bulk of the people of Western Australia, and especially of those engaged in our various industries, adopt the attitude of Sir Edward Wittenoom, it is not a bit of use our spending the amount of money on education that we do devote to that cause, because it will be simply thrown away. To judge from the actions of the Government, they share the view of Sir Edward Wittenoom. Just after Parliament rose, we saw in the "West Australian," on the 8th December, a notification that the Agricultural Department were about to appoint six cadets in dairying. The new applications provide that the applicants must be not more than 20 nor less than 16 years of age, and that they will have to be approved by

a board consisting of the Public Service Commissioner, the Under Secretary for Agriculture—two clerical men—and the dairy expert. The remuneration is fixed at from £40 to £120, and the cadetship is to cover a period of four years. The Minister for Education will agree with me when I say that that policy of appointing cadets, whether it be to the Agricultural Department or to the Works Department, is absolutely wrong and is a generation behind the times. The Department of Agriculture of Victoria, early this year, announced that during the next six years, 30 graduates in agriculture would be appointed to the Department of Agriculture at the rate of five per annum, and that the remuneration would be £300 per annum each. Last year I pointed out that five graduates in the Department of Agriculture of Victoria were so badly remunerated that they went into that department at practically what were labourers' wages. They all but one decided to enlist and at the termination of the war they remained in the old country or went into other services, where they were able to get three or four or even six times the remuneration they received from the Victorian Agricultural Department. The Government in Western Australia are now adopting a policy of what was done elsewhere 20 years ago. It is impossible to properly train cadets in a Government department. There are not the facilities there, and not only that but the man who is being trained gets into a groove and the ground work of that training is not such that will assist him in the various branches of the industry he is supposed subsequently to be able to deal with. Here is an illustration. The University in Perth is turning out students in agriculture and engineering. The first student to win a diploma of agriculture in this State, according to the "West Australian" of the 10th May last, was unable to obtain employment in Western Australia at a satisfactory remuneration, and he went to the Malay States as an agricultural inspector. This student did not seek to get into any of the departments in the State as soon as he graduated, but he had several years of practical experience after completing his course. It is no good training men in agriculture and engineering subjects if they have to go abroad after graduating. Unfortunately Sydney is training men in this direction and they are going by the hundreds to the Malay States and the Orient to fill positions as engineers, etc. This year two graduates in engineering in the University of this State have gone to America. Let us hope they will come back better for the experience and that their services will then be utilised to advantage. In my own case, lacking recognition in Australia when I was a young man, I declared that if I could not get £400 a year here I would go abroad. In countries outside Australia it is recognised that science is necessary in conjunction with industry, and where one has the versatility of an Australian combined with general experience, there

is no difficulty in securing positions. Go where people know the value of science applied to industry and it is possible to get five or six times the salary that one can earn in his own country. The present system of training cadets is wrong and bad. I heard only last week that it is proposed in the Works Department of all departments to put on nine cadets. In the course of casual conversation I heard also only last week that a certain officer went down to a part of the country to inspect the roads. That officer had been a cadet in the drafting office, and yet he is sent out to do this work when the University is turning out trained men and those trained men are not taken any notice of. I would like to read a report of a work which was constructed a few years ago in the Wagin district. This work was a dam, which was to conserve 12 million gallons of water. The report is from the "West Australian." It reads—

At the last meeting of the Wagin Water Board the secretary (Mr. C. C. Keyser) reported that the Badjerring dam contained about 4½ million gallons of water. It was resolved to write to the Public Works Department pointing out that their engineer had reported that the dam would fill on a 12in. rainfall, and that, although they had had over 12 inches this year, the dam was only a quarter full. It was also resolved to write to the Minister stating that the work now being carried out at the dam was not productive of any apparent good, but, on the other hand, appeared to the board to be a waste of public money. The Acting Under Secretary for Water Supply wrote to the effect that investigations with regard to the scheme were now in hand. Until these were complete the engineer was not prepared to express a definite opinion on the scheme.

That state of affairs has been going on for the last four or five years, if not longer, and the department keep tinkering with the job that was never properly done in the first instance. The engineers responsible for the scheme are now out of the department, and I attribute the failure of the work to the old system of training. It seems to me that in connection with this work there has been an unsatisfactory expenditure of public money. I am trying to advocate a system which will obviate such occurrences in the future. Here is another. It will be remembered that last session I made reference to the Torbay-Grassmere drainage scheme. The Government estimated the cost would be about £10,000 to institute a system of drainage which would enable the settlers to get their crops in and off, instead of being subject to floods. There were 450 acres under crop before the scheme was commenced. It used to cost about £120 a year to open the bar to let the accumulated waters out. The result of the scheme after £15,000 was spent, was that some good was done but harm also, and the results forecasted were not realised. Instead of there being 450 acres under cultivation the extent of cultivation was reduced to about 70 acres. A large number of the settlers went away

and will not return until the position has been rectified. A deputation waited on the Premier in connection with this matter in August last year, and he promised to see that the matter was inquired into. As the position was not remedied another deputation interviewed the Premier at Torbay Junction last January or February, but up to date it has not been remedied. After that big expenditure of money and a considerable reduction in the area under crop, we find that it is still necessary to spend about £100 a year to keep the bar open. The Albany municipal council and the Albany Chamber of Commerce are joining with the settlers in the district in the matter now, and have informed me that by combination they will again endeavour to get justice for the people at Torbay-Grassmere. I have always taken an interest in the scheme, and I will do all I can to get a fair deal for these people. I do not think I can do better than urge that whatever we do for the primary industries is based on sound grounds. In the latest copy of the "Year-book" of Western Australia I note that the number of people served by the metropolitan water supply between Perth and Fremantle and as far as Armadale is 153,000. The total population of the State is about 330,000. Yet our production according to this book is 18 millions sterling from the primary industries and 2½ million pounds sterling from the secondary industries—7 to 1. I am pleased to be able to say that I think the secondary industries in this State are going to begin to move forward, but I do not want them to move at the expense of the primary industries. I do not think they will. But when we see the importance of those primary industries and realise also that in the Commonwealth 214 millions sterling comes from primary industries and 69 millions sterling from secondary industries, I say that the Government as a Government might well consider the advisableness of doing all they can to encourage the primary industries and enterprise and to make the conditions better—though not by increasing freights to the disadvantage of the country people. Why should the country people be compelled to buy single tickets on the railways while the fares on the suburban railways are not advanced? The result of this imposition was that only 37 per cent. of the burden, the increase of £448,000, was borne by practically 50 per cent. of the population enjoying the attractions of the city life, and the balance of 63 per cent. comes from the industries which are in the country. I am not talking about the farming industry only, but the primary industries, mining, farming, forestry, and so on. I make the suggestion based on a communication sent by the acting Premier, the leader of this House in May, 1918, to the then Premier, Sir H. B. Lefroy, in Sydney. The telegram is as follows:—

Party meeting yesterday strongly urged that you bring before the Premiers' conference in the interests of primary industries the necessity of requesting the Prime Minister to honour the undertaking to the

National party to remove or reduce the duty on all agricultural implements and requirements.

Seeing that the acting Premier sent that telegram, I think that even if they have no sympathisers in the Governments in the Eastern States, if there is anything the Government can do to help our Federal members to combat this position in regard to the tariff on supplies, tools and machinery, used in the primary industries, they should leave no stone unturned to do it and achieve the object of securing an amelioration in that direction. In reading in the "Banking Record," the leading Australian financial journal, the review of the "economic consequences of peace," written by J. M. Keynes, I was struck by the great contrast between us in Australia and the people in European countries and the enormously inflated currencies of these European countries. France, by no means the worst off of the European countries, is to-day faced with an annual expenditure of something like 800 millions sterling, and from her various sources of taxation she cannot receive half of that amount to meet the position. We can therefore hardly wonder that the French say, "We must have an indemnity from Germany. What else can we do." France is not able within more than about 50 per cent of her resources to meet her expenditure of 800 million pounds. In view of this fact we have much to be thankful for. Although we have a deficit I have absolute confidence in the future of Western Australia, because of the people that are in it. I rejoice that we are in our present position, and although it is so favourable I still contend that the Government should introduce what economies they can.

On motion by Hon. T. Moore, debate adjourned.

House adjourned at 8.35 p.m.

Legislative Assembly.

Wednesday, 25th August, 1920.

	PAGE
Questions: Mining requisites	274
Hoe printing machine	274
Loyal citizens meeting	274
Oil, prospecting regulations	275
Workers' Compensation Act	275
State Children and Charities Department	275
Temporary Chairmen of Committees	275
Address-in-reply, eighth day	275

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

QUESTION—MINING REQUISITES.

Mr. HUDSON asked the Premier: 1, Has application been made to him to have mining requisites declared "necessary commodities" under the Prices Regulation Act? 2, If so, when? 3, Have such requisites been declared "necessary commodities" under the Act? 4, If not, why not?

The PREMIER replied: 1, Yes. 2, 15th January, 1920. 3, Yes. "Tools of trade," gazetted 8th January, 1920; "Explosives," gazetted 26th March, 1920.

QUESTION—HOE PRINTING MACHINE.

Mr. CHESON asked the Minister for Railways: 1, Was the Hoe rotary printing machine advertised for sale in the "Government Gazette"? 2, What other papers and journals was the machine advertised for sale in, and date of advertisements?

The MINISTER FOR RAILWAYS replied: 1, No, as the "Government Gazette" is not considered a good medium for such advertisements. 2, "West Australian," 17th to 23rd September, 1912, inclusive; "Sunday Times," 23rd September, 1912; "Kalgoorlie Miner," 19th to 25th September, 1912, inclusive; "Adelaide Register," 24th, 25th, and 26th, September, 1912; "Adelaide Advertiser," 25th, 26th, and 27th September, 1912; "Melbourne Age," 24th, 25th, and 26th September, 1912; "Melbourne Argus," 23rd, 24th, and 25th September, 1912; "Melbourne Mining Standard," 26th September, 1912; "Sydney Morning Herald," 24th, 26th, and 28th September, 1912; "Sydney Daily Telegraph," 24th, 25th, and 28th September, 1912; "Brisbane Courier," 26th, 27th, and 28th September, 1912.

Mr. Jones: All 1912.

QUESTION—LOYAL CITIZENS' MEETING.

Mr. VERYARD asked the Premier: 1, Is he aware that one Michael O'Dea, undertaker and a justice of the peace for Perth, did organise and lead a party of disloyal citizens, last Sunday afternoon, into a meeting being held in the Queen's Hall, consisting of loyal citizens of Perth, with the object of disturbing the peace and harmony of such meeting; Cr. J. T. Franklin, acting Mayor, presiding? 2, If not, will he cause full inquiries to be made into the question? 3, When Mr. O'Dea accepted the commission of the Peace, did he subscribe to the oath of allegiance to His Majesty the King? 4, If the facts are as alleged, is it not necessary that holders of such commissions, acting in such a manner, should be requested to forfeit same? 5, If not, what would be the conditions necessary to request the forfeiture of same?

The PREMIER replied: 1, Yes. 2, Yes. 3, Yes. 4, Yes. 5, Answered by No. 4.