unsettled South-West. It is a scandal that, intelligent as we are and capable as our experts are, we have been unable to settle the South-West. The stumbling block, no doubt, is the clearing; but that can be overcome. The conditions of our land legislation, which are utterly inapplicable to the South-West, should be amended. I do hope that the Minister for Lands, when he decides to open up the South-West, will hurry along the new railways which are proposed, and that when those railways come before this House hon. members will be seized with the absolute necessity for further railway construction to enable us to settle on the land those men who are so anxious to take up farming.

Mr. Lambert: I presume that defines your attitude on the Esperance Railway?

Mr. PIESSE: In the interests of the Esperance settlers themselves I say that the construction of the Esperance Railway should be deferred, even indefinitely deferred.

Mr. Lambert: We will not vote for one railway in this State until the Esperance line is built.

Mr. PIESSE: In the interests of the country the House ought to annul that resolution relative to the Esperance railway, and build agricultural lines——

Hon. P. Collier: In your constituency.

Mr. PIESSE: No; in the Avon constituency.

Hon. P. Collier: That is next door to you.

Mr. PIESSE: I have for years advocated the construction of the Ucarty-Yorkrakine-North Baandee railway. I hope I shall have the pleasure soon of taking a train load of members through the agricultural districts. The leader of the Opposition once travelled through my district, and, notwithstanding that his vision was limited to three or four miles on each side of the railway, the area under cultivation staggered him. That journey considerably enlightened the hon. gentleman, and I hope he will speedily come to the district again and be further convinced. I wish to congratulate the member for Canning (Mr. Robinson) on the interesting and instructive speech he gave the House this afternoon. Undoubtedly, that gentleman has rendered good service to the State as Minister for Industries, giving encouragement to those desirous of investing capital in the establishment of secondary industries here. His speech this afternoon was extremely valuable. I regret that the hon. member has not been given more credit for the work he has done. I hope that, like the Under Secretary for Lands, hon. members and also the Managing Trustee of the Agricultural Bank will have their eyes opened at no distant date as to the capabilities and possibilities of our great inland areas.

On motion by Mr. Troy debate adjourned.

House adjourned at 10.8 p.m.

Legislative Council,

Tuesday, 19th August, 1919.

	PAGE.
Questions: Influenza, travelling permits	204
Tramways Industrial Agreement	204
Papers laid on the Table	204
Address-in-reply, eighth day	204

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

QUESTION—INFLUENZA, TRAVELLING PERMITS.

Hon. R. J. LYNN (for Hon. V. Hamersley) asked the Minister for Education: Has the time not arrived when the policy of permits to leave the city for the country should be abandoned?

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION replied: The regulations regarding permits were cancelled on Thursday last.

QUESTION—TRAMWAYS, INDUSTRIAL AGREEMENT.

Hon. J. E. DODD asked the Minister for Education: 1, Whether, under the last agreement made between the Government and the tramway employees' union, provision was made for the appointment of a reference board or committee, representative of both parties, to advise on matters concerning the working of the tramways? 2, Has the committee been appointed? 3, If not, why not?

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION replied: 1, No. 2 and 3, See No. 1.

PAPERS LAID ON THE TABLE.

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION (Hon. H. P. Colebatch—East): In regard to the question raised by Mr. Sanderson, on Thursday last, I should like to explain that it was purely an inadvertence that those balance sheets were not sent along to this House at the same time as they were sent to another place.

ADDRESS-IN-REPLY.

Eighth Day.

Debate resumed from the 14th August.

Hon. H. STEWART (South-East): I desire to express regret at the loss we have sustained by the death of the late President. I wish to congratulate you, Sir, on your elevation to the Presidency, a position for which you are eminently fitted. Also I wish to welcome Dr. Saw after his war service in defence of this country. I am glad of the opportunity of extending a welcome to Mr. Panton, and I feel sure that he will

prove an acquisition to the House. I am confident that on experience he will find that this Chamber is not of the character which so many people are led to believe it is. The feeling of thankfulness expressed in His Excellency's Speech is, I think, eminently representative of the feelings of the whole of the people of Western Australia. The State has a record of war achievement of which one and all are justly proud. Now the great struggle is over and we turn to the task of overcoming post war problems, we have grounds for confidence that we shall achieve a measure of success greater than many of us in the past believed possible. We shall only achieve that result by a combination of the various forces, by full consideration of the views of one another, and by working wholeheartedly together as we did during the war. I am pleased that we have a Premier who, at any rate, is doing something. But we must guard against injudicious actions which might mean that while we achieve a great measure of success in land settlement yet the mistakes made would prove very serious to individuals. I do not wish to see along the track of successful land settlement carried out by the Premier any of those things which he left in the wheat belt, such as wrecked lives and wrecked communities, due to inefficient work by the Agricultural Department and an improperly organised system of settlement—wrecks of families and of communities who in themselves have been in no way to blame, but who have been the unfortunate victims of circumstance. Last year hon. members were surprised when, on the occasion of the Returned Soldiers Settlement Bill being before the House, I pointed out the large number of returned soldiers holding the qualification certificate but unable to get land. At that time there were between 150 and 200 men so circumstanced, certificated men permanently waiting for land, and drawing sustenance the while. That number has now been increased to 718. We find that there have been 2,703 applicants for land, of which number 169 have been rejected or deferred; while 655 have been settled, out of 1,373 to whom certificates have been issued. It shows that the position is not being coped with as it should be. The drawing of the attention of the public to the number that have been settled serves to blind the public to the fact that so many certificated men cannot get land. It would appear that not all avenues are being exploited with a view to pushing this settlement forward more quickly. Recently the Premier informed another place that, as far as practicable, it was to be accepted as a fixed principle of repatriation that soldiers and sailors, if they so desired, should be settled on land in the districts from which they had enlisted. That was on the 8th of this month. There is a fine district west of Narrogin, known as the Williams. The Williams repatriation committee make to each soldier who, having enlisted from the district takes up land in the district, a free gift of either 100 or 200 sheep, the cost of which is provided by the people of the district. Mr. Greig knows all about this.

Hon. J. A. Greig: They give 100 breeding ewes.

Hon. H. STEWART: That gift is on offer to each returned soldier who takes up land in the district. But the advice and suggestions of the local repatriation committee are overridden. There are in the district suitable estates available which, however, are not being used, and so men who enlisted in that district cannot be settled in the district. The same experience has been met with in connection with the work of the Wagin and, I think, the Katanning repatriation committees. Katanning and Wagin both formed repatriation committees before the Federal Parliament had passed the Repatriation Bill. Katanning has raised over £5,000, and Wagin has raised over £3,000, in addition to their liberal contributions in men and money for direct war purposes. The Wagin repatriation committee have on their books numbers of men who have obtained the certificates of the soldier settlement board, but for whom no land can be found in the district, notwithstanding that suitable properties could be acquired down there. In no case has the recommendation of the local repatriation committee been accepted by the department, save in two instances, where the committee advised that the applications should be turned down. When the committee's report was unfavourable to the settlement of the soldier, the department accepted it, but when the committee's report was favourable to the proposition, the departmental inspector has almost always turned it down. The work of these committees in connection with such settlement is simply so much wasted effort.

The Minister for Education: Are you referring to Wagin?

Hon. H. STEWART: Yes. The following is a letter received by the secretary of the local repatriation committee of Wagin from the controller of the Soldiers Settlement Scheme, regarding the application of a Mr. W. H. Bevan—

> July 7th, 1919. I have received your application on behalf of the above returned soldier for the sum of £2,510, and I regret to inform you that this amount is quite outside the scope of the scheme, which aims to settle individual soldiers at from £1,200 to £1,500. This amount should include the purchase of land with stock and machinery. It will therefore be necessary for Mr. Bevan to submit an application more in conformity with the lines of assistance.

Undoubtedly that is a large sum. The board consider in some cases that there is ample security in the property, and taking into consideration the stock, plant and machinery which go with it, and their knowledge of the man, they say the men recommended can make good. The reply of the department in this case is that the

property in question is too big to be considered by the scheme. The note from the secretary of the local repatriation committee, who is au fait with the Discharged Soldiers Settlement Act, is as follows—

> This statement about maximum expenditure is incorrect according to the Premier and is *not* warranted either by the Act or regulations. If the land in this district is not worth 30s. an acre with improvements, the unimproved value must be extremely small.

As Mr. Bevan was not able to get that property he applied for Mr. Maller's property, the latter settler having to leave the district for family reasons. This property comprised 941 acres, 831 of which were fenced with six wires and sheep proof. The price of the property was £350 and there was a mortgage of £246 with the Agricultural Bank to be taken over. The Controller of Repatriation writes to the District Inspector at Narrogin—

> I shall be pleased if you will inspect this and let me have your report and recommendation at your very earliest.

To the hon. secretary of the local repatriation committee, Wagin, the Controller writes—

> The above is a copy of instructions issued to the district inspector. I should be pleased to receive your committee's report on this application at your very earliest.

Later on this letter was received by the local committee—

> Re Mr. W. H. Bevan, in reply to your letter of the 24th ult., No. 645/18, I have to advise you that our lands committee have reported as follows—"We have to report that we have not inspected the block but know that the present owner's reasons for desiring to leave are purely family ones. From particulars furnished by the Department we estimate the improvements, including £50 equivalent for the water supply, at £433, allowing about £80 for the unimproved value of homestead and about £80 rents paid on the C.P. leases the value with improvements would be approximately £593. In our opinion the proposition is a good one from the grazing point of view, and we strongly recommend the application, and knowing the applicant we are of opinion that he would be successful provided provision is made for a stock advance." In adopting this report my committee presume the applicant is making arrangements for stock and necessary implements.
> Yours faithfully, hon. sec.

Later on this letter was received by Mr. Bevan—

> With reference to your application for assistance to purchase Mr. G. Maller's property, I regret to inform you that in view of the unfavourable report the Board is unable to approve of same. The reports indicate that the property is not a living proposition for a soldier, and that the price demanded is considerably in excess of its value. The Board will be pleased to consider any further proposition that you submit.

Hon. J. Ewing: That is absolutely incorrect.

Hon. H. STEWART: In the first instance the price was too high, and the committee said the assets were quite good enough, and in the second place the committee said the price was well below the maximum permissible, and the inspector said a man could not make a living from it and that the property was too small. This scheme for an extended settlement of people on the land, which the Premier is bringing in, is similar to that which he brought in before, and it will result in trouble unless there is a reorganisation of the Agricultural Department to meet the requirements, and unless it is seen that all the officers of that department are efficient. At present the officers of the department are unable to give advice which is sound and which can be relied upon by all those engaged in the agricultural industry who require it. The instances I have quoted are sufficient to show that the local committees are not getting the consideration they deserve. Mr. Allen indicated that the Government should help in establishing new businesses and avenues for men who could not be dealt with under the Discharged Soldiers Settlement Act and the returned soldier settlement scheme. The Minister for Repatriation has laid it down that there is no case which cannot be dealt with under the Act. In my opinion the settlement of men in some business is the particular sphere of operation for these local committees. In some cases, if a man were to be properly treated, it would take a long time to establish him under the usual procedure, whereas these local committees with the funds they have raised could save all that delay, and as individuals of the State, redeem the promises made by the leaders of the people. These places are raising their own money as well. Next month in Wagin we shall be devoting a day towards the raising of from £300 to £500 to augment the returned soldiers' fund. Out of that fund we can advance money to put men into a business, because the letter of the law will not allow certain cases to be dealt with. Perhaps that money will be refunded by the Federal authorities later on, or perhaps it will not be refunded. If the people in the out-back districts raise money through their local committees to deal with special cases, which will overcome many of the difficulties that at present exist, they should be allowed to do so. Should their assistance not be accepted in land settlement also?

Hon. A. H. Panton: That is the responsibility of the Government.

Hon. H. STEWART: The Government cannot deal with everything. Can any legal enactment cover every case? It is a very little matter to deal with exceptional cases promptly by the means I have put forward. Whilst those people are helping in this manner and doing things which the Repatriation

authorities cannot do without reference to Senator Millen because they are bound by regulations, there is all the more reason for the State to retain the services of these local committees, who have proved their bona fides in such a substantial way. I would quote one way in which some of these local committees have raised money. Some time ago in some of the Great Southern towns the picture shows were run by private enterprise. In the case of Albany, Katanning, Wagin, and Narrogin these are now run by local committees for returned soldiers. Formerly they were run by the Returned Soldiers Association, which had no Government recognition. From these sources about £250 annually is raised in Wagin. Immigration has been touched on by Mr. Sanderson in connection with ex-soldiers coming out from England. I hope when these men come here they will not be sent out to new conditions and on land where many of them will have to live in misery and probably end in being classed as unsuccessful farmers. If these men are sent out here with so much money per head which is found by the British Government, they should be given 12 months' experience, that is, the season round on some other property, in order that they might see what work should be done and how it should be done. At the end of that time they should be in a position to start on their own holdings with their capital intact and with very much better chances of succeeding.

Hon. J. Ewing: They are to come here at the rate of 12,000 a year.

Hon. H. STEWART: It behoves the people in the different districts, and the Government to co-operate with them to bring about a better state of affairs than at present exists with regard to the difficulties which face motherhood in the out-back places. So far, the Government have been most unsympathetic where without great expenditure they could have rendered a considerable amount of help. I refer to the lack of facilities afforded by the telephone department of the railway service, which could be given in cases of emergency along some distant lines. I plead for fuller consideration on the part of the Government and the department in this matter. I was very much struck by the extract read by Mr. Sanderson in which the Premier is reported to have said—

> I have been through the Darling Ranges——

The PRESIDENT: Is the hon. member reading from "Hansard"?

Hon. H. STEWART: I apologise. Mr. Sanderson referred to the fact that a certain gentleman in a highly responsible position in this State made the remark that the Government should guarantee the productivity of the soil. It was not Mr. Sanderson who said that the Government should do it; it was someone in a high and important position. A little later on I hope to give instances to show that verbal assurances were given guaranteeing the productivity of the soil, but no one has been able to realise those assurances which were given either by the Government or by Government officials. The result is that to-day there are many ruined and broken-hearted men and women. Although I say these cases of injustice and hardship have taken place in connection with land settlement and Government engineering schemes, I am a firm believer in the future of this State, and particularly in the expansion of the agricultural industry. I firmly believe that with a reorganised Agricultural Department and a sound and systematic policy of encouragement of the agricultural industry, that instead of a production from the soil totalling 10 millions annually, as is at present the case, in another 10 years that will be doubled, but it will not be doubled if better measures are not followed than those which are being adopted at the present time. The remarks of other hon. members point to the same conclusion. The two main features in the Governor's Speech are the financial position of the State and how to improve it. There is a consensus of opinion that this can only be done by increased production. This, as I have already indicated, I believe will follow on increased settlement under a well organised Agricultural Department and a modern policy. Another important point is the abatement of the industrial unrest so that post-war problems may be adequately dealt with. That abatement of industrial unrest can in my opinion be dealt with in two ways. The first is by increased production and the second by raising the standard of the comfort of living. With regard to increased production, that is, production generally, I have read a good deal and have thought a good deal about it, and I can see no reason, with the experience we have of the great success of the Ford motor car works and of Lord Leverhulme and the achievements of big institutions in connection with profit sharing—I can see no adequate reasons against legislation being introduced in favour of compulsory profit sharing. I may startle hon. members by that announcement, but I make it in all soberness. There is no doubt about it that many hon. members do not believe in Government control of industrial establishments. I submit only what has been proved, and it is that if we have industrial profit sharing, then we have the full incentive to work to combat the arguments of those who favour slowing down. Later on I propose to elaborate somewhat on that question. We cannot perhaps see a complete way of overcoming all the difficulties, but if we can see a move which will have the effect of alleviating the position and leading to an improvement, we should have recourse to it. If there is not a panacea for all ills, that fact is not a sufficient argument against adopting methods which will have the effect of bringing about a great improvement. It is, in my opinion, infinitely more difficult to introduce legislation in connection with price fixing which will have the effect of achieving the object that those who bring it in have in view. It would be easier to bring about a beneficial

result by means of compulsory profit sharing. We all listened with attention and interest to the speech delivered by Mr. Dodd. The motion which that hon. member has placed on the Notice Paper is, I take it, an indication of what he believes will considerably improve the existing state of affairs. With certain reservations, I agree with the hon. member that benefits will result. With regard to the present Government, I have already indicated that their price fixing measure will probably prove extremely difficult and will fail to achieve the object they have in view. Let us see the remedies which have been suggested by the Australian Labour party. Reading from their platform two of their proposals are the taxation of land, a graduated income tax with a £250 exemption. Then under "Industrial" they have a six-hour day and a five-day week. That part of their platform is covered by the letter (a). I need not bother about (b) and (c). The letter (d) deals with the right to work. What I have always thought about Australia is that the man who wants to work never need go hungry.

Hon. J. Cornell: I wish you meant it.

Hon. H. STEWART: I do not think we have had a helpful suggestion from the Australian Labour party as to how we can remedy the industrial unrest whilst increasing the standard of comfort and increasing production also. The reason why I am taken with the principle of compulsory profit sharing is that to the people as a whole we can offer every inducement to produce to the fullest extent, and in that direction, I think, the people of Australia can hold their own with anyone in the world. In connection with the Government proposals for vigorous land settlement I want to call the attention of hon. members to some of the things which have occurred in parts of the province I represent. In four different electorates of that province there are communities composed of settlers than whom a better type could not be found in any community. Yet these unfortunate people have suffered and are ruined. Let me refer first of all to the Torbay-Grassmere drainage scheme. Prior to 1913 there were 475 acres under crop and 70 settlers occupied areas there. The Government completed the drainage scheme which was going to improve conditions for the people. That scheme was carried out in 1913.

Hon. J. E. Dodd: Was it not initiated in 1913?

Hon. H. STEWART: I do not know when it was initiated, but according to the evidence given before the Royal Commission on Agriculture what I am going to relate took place in 1913. John Charles Henry Ewert, market gardener, Torbay Junction, gave evidence as follows:—

> I bought the land without any improvements on it for about £450. In 1910 I got very little crop, and in 1911 I had 17 acres in and took off £380 worth of produce. In 1912, off 15 acres I took £360 worth of produce.

He was then asked why he could not make a living now and the answer he gave was—

> In 1913 I was flooded out and the Government estimate that I lost £500. I lost 11 acres of potatoes and 2 acres of cabbages on one occasion. The drainage was done in 1913 when the flood gates were put in. That is what caused the loss. The water is run past my land and the water deposits minerals on the land. Until the first rains we cannot grow anything.

Since the completion of that scheme, instead of 475 acres being under cultivation there are barely 70, and instead of there being 70 settlers I doubt whether there are more than seven. Instead of a special engine and trucks being run out there from Albany to transport the produce to the metropolitan markets the engine and the trucks are elsewhere.

Hon. J. J. Holmes: What did the scheme cost?

Hon. H. STEWART: Prior to the scheme being inaugurated either the Public Works Department or the Lands Department used to allow £14 per annum to the settlement to scoop out the bar where the natural drainage system passes to the sea at Torbay Inlet, and once it was scooped out the natural scour kept the bar open for the remainder of the season. Since the scheme was completed, it has cost the Government £100 per annum for supervision and for scooping out that sand bar and the bar closes again in from two days (minimum) to 17 days (maximum) after the opening has been made. They have spent £15,000 capital, and have now a greater annual expenditure by about seven times than they had before the scheme was inaugurated. The settlers have, to a large extent, been driven away and have had to find other means of earning a livelihood—lumping at Albany or working on the permanent way—until something is done to release their land from the flood water caused by the scheme, or until some other arrangements are made for them. It is bad enough for such a scheme to have been inaugurated but is not it far worse that this has been allowed to go on year after year without something being done to ameliorate the conditions of the settlers and that their produce should be lost to the State? Since the result of the scheme has proved worse than the conditions which previously existed, it would be better to revert to the position of 1913 than leave the place as it is. Having visited this district, I believe there is a solution of the difficulty. If certain steps are taken even now, the condition of the settlers can be made better than it was prior to the inauguration of the scheme.

Hon. J. Cornell: Someone in the Public Works Department, or in the Public Service should be sacked.

Hon. H. STEWART: The interjection is very much to the point. I hope the Government will deal with this matter promptly. There are three places—Kulin, Kukerin and Ongerup—where people were settled to grow

wheat. There are but few settlers at Ongerup now. At Kukerin, where land was sold as first class and where, under the guidance of the Agricultural Department, the settlers tried to grow wheat on improved methods, the average production of that so-called first class land has been between five and six bushels over a period of four or five years, and some of the seasons have been normal. The land, the methods of settlement, and the advice given to those settlers were bad. These people are suffering an injustice. At Kulin, as in many other places, there were light land and forest land. The progress report of the Royal Commission on the agricultural industry points out that a great mistake was made by officials in advising, as also did the present Premier, the policy of clearing the lighter land, which was cheaper, and then, with the profits made, clearing the forest country, which was better land. I know from my own experience that the Commissioner of the Wheat Belt has never been in favour of that policy. Ten years ago, in connection with my own farming operations, his advice on lines of general policy was to the contrary, and I have proved it to be sound. There is no doubt this information was given to the settlers. The Kulin settlers went on the land with capital, cleared the light land, and their average crops have been under six bushels. Those records cover 3,000 acres, some of which has been cropped from one to four times. If it had been anything like reasonable land, it cannot be said to have been over-cropped. On the average the same land would not have been cropped more than twice. Therefore, if land farmed during the last four years will not average six bushels, even under methods approved and advised by the department, the settlers concerned are deserving of our sympathy. They have been sold a pup. It is impossible for them to make good. In January last they presented a memorandum pointing out the justice of their claims to consideration. The memorandum asking that the matter be investigated by the Minister or his officials, was sent to the then Premier, and I believe it has been brought before the notice of each succeeding Premier. But what has been the result? Seven clear months have gone and nothing has been done. It is of no use to the State, or to the settlers, to go on cropping that land under assistance from the Industries Assistance Board when they have been able to get less than a six bushel return. What is the alternative? The Wheat Belt Commissioner has advised them to leave that land for grazing and to clear the forest land, but they cannot get advances. They are ruined men. There is another community at Kukerin and another at Ongerup whose unfortunate position is due to no fault of their own. Better settlers cannot be found anywhere. I want the Government to give attention to such matters as these. If members want further evidence, I can show them the memorandum sent to the Premier in which the settlers asked for a revaluation of their land, and for the rent, paid in excess, to be credited to the Industries Assistance Board. Is not that fair? I think it is a reasonable request. But, to my knowledge, it has not received consideration. I wish to see a progressive policy for the settlement of our people on the land, and a reorganisation of the Department of Agriculture with trained men and, when I say trained men, I mean it. In other countries it has been proved, alike in industrial and agricultural activities, that it is impossible to make anything like considerable progress without expert advice. I want to see an agricultural college established to train men who can go out with a real message to the farmers. I want the men who go out to the farmers not to talk vague general principles, but, having learnt from research in a well-equipped agricultural college, to teach the farmer how to grow five bushels more than he is growing to-day, and how to fatten livestock in the most economical way. I must speak plainly. The Department of Agriculture has over 100 officers, 53 clerical, 10 technical, and the balance are called general. What are the qualifications for a man to take the position as expert? Some practical experience. In the second progress report of the Royal Commission, we find the following evidence given on oath, the witness being John Mowforth, farmer, of Torbay Junction—

> In regard to potato crops and in the matter of Irish blight, I was making a good living before the department stepped in. Three years ago Irish blight occurred and Mr. Bratby, the potato expert, advised that it was necessary to root up the crop, spray the land, and not crop that land again for another three years. I did this, but one of my neighbours refused to do it and he did well. I destroyed about £300 worth of potatoes. Dr. Stoward came along afterwards—

Dr. Stoward, whose dismissal by the Government this House deprecated, was ousted through the indirect machinations of an officer in the Public Service to whom I referred in an earlier session, an officer who has been continually cropping up and to whom you, Sir, referred as a stormy petrel, causing trouble wherever he went, trouble which was prejudicial to the State. Dr. Stoward was the man who knew and all trained people were prepared to accept his credentials.

> —Dr. Stoward came along afterwards and advised that the instructions we had received from Mr. Bratby were all rot, and that it was not necessary to destroy the crops. Some potatoes which were left in the ground, germinated and gave me a good crop.

In most instances a pathologist is needed to detect these fungoid diseases. The other day we had an instance of potatoes having been condemned and some of the same crop were so fine that they were placed on exhibition in Sandover's window. The explanation of the Minister was that the officer who had condemned the rest of the crop was most astute,

in not notifying for what disease they were condemned; that he isolated the potatoes, and that a disease was found in them in the pathological laboratory. Was it Irish blight? I think I have indicated, so far as the time permits, that there is great necessity for reorganisation in the Agricultural Department and in connection with land settlement. But before we can put in the men who know, we much have the men who know, as has been demonstrated right up to the hilt in the United States; and we must train them ourselves for our own conditions. We cannot do until we have the proper institution. America in 1862 voted £168,000 per annum for agricultural colleges. To-day America is appropriating nearly 12 millions sterling for agricultural investigation and research. Of course this country is not the United States, and I do not expect any such expenditure here. But the United States started in 1862, and it took a long time to learn what was the proper thing to do. They had the type of college to be found in our Eastern States, such as Roseworthy, Dookie, and Hawkesbury, at which the principles of agriculture are taught, but vocational training and manual dexterity are unduly stressed. After decades of experience of those colleges, the Americans have scrapped those methods. In America they say it is not necessary to send a boy from a farm into a college for vocational training. They teach the boy from the farm the fundamental principles upon which results depend. For the city boy, however, they provide vocational training before he graduates by sending him to some well managed farm for practical experience. In no case, however, is a man regarded as qualified until he has both scientific knowledge and practical training. The result of this great improvement in the teaching of agriculture in America has been during the last 15 years an annual increase in agricultural products of 90 millions sterling for an annual appropriation of about 12 million pounds on agricultural education and research. Is not that a good result? Of those who actually go to the colleges in Iowa and to the Wisconsin University, the percentage going right back on the farms is from 55 to 60, and the total engaging in agricultural work is 95 per cent. Those who do not go on to farms go into agricultural departments, federal, State, or county, and into establishments for agricultural education. I contend that if we go the right way about it we can double our agricultural production in ten years. The more we expand the greater will be our ratio of production, and the more people we shall be able to settle. Under such conditions development will increase by leaps and bounds. Again, some of the men who pass through the American agricultural colleges become agricultural editors; and one does not find in America the type of man who, through the columns of the Press, sets himself up as an authority for all the different parts of the State, in respect of what they should do and what they should produce, while possessing perhaps little better qualification for the task than a facile pen and book knowledge. In America a field has been found for men capable of writing on agricultural subjects. Another phase of the question is that men, after years of hard labour on farms, attain a position when they are able to build a home, but instead of building it on the farm build it in the city. That is not as it should be. America has learned to put a premium on the development of farmers. In Australia the son of the successful farmer or pastoralist goes to the university for a higher education in law or medicine or engineering. In many cases he practises the profession only for a short time, and then returns to the family holding. That represents a great economic waste. With a proper agricultural education there should be an agricultural degree, and young men of the type I have indicated would not be devoting themselves for years to work which is of no practical advantage to them ultimately. Now let me draw attention to some of the recommendations of the Royal Commission on agriculture. One was the establishment of an agricultural college, which I have already stressed. While in the Eastern States I was pleased to hear from the Victorian Minister for Agriculture that the agricultural superintendent of the Victorian Department of Agriculture, Mr. A. E. V. Richardson, M.A., B.Sc., formerly of Roseworthy and the Adelaide University, was to be brought over here shortly by our Government to confer with the committee appointed in connection with the establishment of an agricultural college. I had the privilege of meeting Mr. Richardson, and I hope that his advice will receive great weight. He has spent a considerable time in the United States and Canada, and has published a very valuable digest of agricultural progress there. That publication is such as to stamp him as a man of outstanding ability and as a keen and correct observer. In order that hon. members may realise the value of the man who is coming here to advise us, I will quote an extract from the Experimental Station Record of the United States Department of Agriculture, Volume 40, No. 2:—

> Two reports have recently come to hand which are worthy of special mention. One of them is a report by Mr. A. E. V. Richardson, Agricultural Superintendent in the Victorian Department of Agriculture, and records the results of a personal study of agricultural institutions in this country and Canada on a six months' mission. It is a highly intelligent and accurate exposition of the American view of agricultural education and the spirit and motive of agricultural institutions. It is appreciative not only of what has been accomplished but of what has been passed through in the process of development. Mr. Richardson writes as one who has seen and understands, and who has weighed the results as now exhibited in full light of their evolution. This gives him advantage in making applications to his own country, and adds force and conviction to his re-

commendations. Incidentally the comparisons he makes throw an interesting light on conditions at present prevailing in Victoria, which in many respects parallel in opportunity the situation in this country before our system of agricultural advancement had been put well under way. Special interest naturally centres in the applications of his studies to Victoria. He explains that one great advantage which has come in America is a strong national sentiment towards agricultural education and agricultural development, which is lacking as yet in his country. He lays very strong emphasis on agricultural education, considered broadly, as an essential basis for development. He says, "The only way to secure a genuine and *permanent increase in output* from the land is to improve the farming methods of the country and apply the teachings of science to its agricultural production. In other words, the problem of agricultural development resolves itself ultimately into the problem of agricultural education. That is the clear lesson of experience in all the great agricultural countries of the world." A lesson cited from American experience is that "no matter from what angle the problem of agricultural education be viewed, it resolves itself ultimately into the problem of providing a sufficiency of trained teachers, agricultural specialists, and extension workers, and using them as units in an organised scheme of instruction, investigation, and extension." It took this country a generation or more to learn this; but it is one of the most fundamental lessons out of our experience, and it will be a saving of time and disappointment if it can be profited by in newer countries.

I have already tried to stress that we could save a generation if we benefited by the lessons which have been learned in connection with agricultural education and investigation in America. The University of Melbourne, I learn, has asked for the appointment of six trained investigators at a salary of £300 per annum. There were formerly a good many students of agriculture at that university, and the number of graduates rose to twelve, because it was anticipated that there would be work for them when they had completed their course. The Victorian Department of Agriculture, however, refused to employ those graduates except at an amount that would have to be paid to a farm labourer in Victoria. The number of agricultural students at the university immediately fell off. The Government were offering £140 per annum to those graduates, who had to pass in 24 subjects. The war broke out, and all but two of the graduates enlisted. The remaining two in the meantime have made good in such a way that whenever they make public statements to congresses of farmers in various parts of Victoria those statements are quoted in the daily Press extensively. Of the men who went to the Front three were not allowed to go into the trenches because their services in connection with munitions were too valuable. One was very soon a colonel and another a major. The other five made the supreme sacrifice; but of those three to whom the Agricultural Department of Victoria would not pay more than £140, all are now drawing salaries of over £500 a year. It is of no use our own University turning out graduates to qualify by applying science to industry unless the State department encourages those men. It is of no use our having a free university and turning out graduates to go to America or somewhere else; we require to utilise them here, and the way to do it is to provide cadetships in the agriculture or engineering departments of Government for those who, by their mere graduation, have shown that they possess certain ability and training. Because a man has graduated is not to say that he has a type of brain for which a ready avenue can be found in practical industry, but other positions such as research should be available where his work will be beneficial to production. I do not want it thought I believe that because a man has had education he is all right. There are many men who, without any educational advantages, have surpassed almost the most brilliant of educated men. But I say that almost any man who has not had educational advantages would have been even better with them. But if a man is to qualify in any of those courses he must have a certain standard of intellectual ability, and unless the departments recognise that they must utilise science in connection with such practical work as agriculture and engineering it is of no use our going to the expense of establishing such university courses. I have no doubt that, many years ago, the medical profession had just as much opposition to put up with in getting legal recognition for the trained man who had done the necessary course, and that before that legal recognition was given the man who in the early stages did train felt great difficulty in combating the prejudices which existed at that time in favour of the man who had acquired his knowledge by experience. I have pointed out that the Royal Commission on Agriculture which sat in this State recommended the appointment of a permanent board of agriculture free from Parliamentary control and also the establishment of an agricultural college, together with the appointment of a director ex officio on the board of agriculture. Another recommendation made by the Royal Commission was made also by the joint committee of the University, the Agricultural Department and the Education Department in reference to agricultural education. This report which I have here is very valuable and I can commend it to those who have not already perused it. Both the bodies to which I have referred stressed the necessity for the department utilising the knowledge of the trained graduates, and for the republication of the "Journal of Agriculture," in order that by its means the results of work being done on the State ex-

perimental farms, and bulletins of information from the departmental officers, should be sent down to the farms. On the 11th May of last year I noticed in the daily Press a paragraph to this effect—

> During the discussion at a meeting of the Parliamentary National party on Thursday afternoon the question of the duties on agricultural machinery was dealt with. Yesterday the Acting Premier (Mr. Colebatch) stated that he had despatched the following telegram to the Premier (Mr. H. B. Lefroy), in Sydney, "Party meeting yesterday strongly urged you bring before the Premiers' Conference in the interests of primary industries, the necessity for requesting the Prime Minister to honour the undertaking given to the National party to remove or reduce the duty on agricultural machinery and requirements."

In view of this, on the 25th November, I asked this question in the House—

> 1, What has been the result of the wire to the Premier at Sydney on the 10th May 1918, by you asking him to urge the Premiers' Conference to request the Prime Minister to honour the undertaking of the National party to remove or reduce the duty on agricultural machinery and requirements? 2, If there has been no result will the Government promptly urge the Federal Government to honour the undertaking?

I was surprised at the answer received, for it put on me the onus of proving that the undertaking was given. This was quite uncalled for. If the Government at a meeting of the National party learned that the party wanted the Acting Premier to wire to the Premier to have this undertaking of the Prime Minister's honoured, surely the Acting Premier would not have wired to the Premier unless he was satisfied that such undertaking had been given by the Prime Minister. If the leader of the House can give any information further than that which he did give, namely, that the matter was referred by the Premier to the Acting Prime Minister, and a reply was received to the effect that the Prime Minister knew nothing of such promise, I shall be glad to have it. The Minister, in his reply to my question, added—

> If the hon. member has any specific grounds for believing that such an undertaking was given, and if he will submit evidence of it to the Government, further representations will be made to the Acting Prime Minister.

I am making further representations now, namely, that he should give me the grounds he had for accepting the statement of the National party meeting that the undertaking had been given by the Prime Minister, and I should like him to move the Government to go on with the matter. Apropos of my statement in regard to trained men in the Agricultural Department, and, as bearing out all I have said, we find that the Royal Commission on Agriculture, in their first progress report, recommended as follows:—

> Inspectors acting for departments giving assistance to farmers should be practical men with a thorough knowledge of agriculture, able to discuss with and advise the farmer on the many problems that confront him. Candidates for these positions should have to pass an examining board before being appointed.

It shows that the Commission found that in many instances the settlers were not given the advice which they should have got. I also wish to draw attention to another recommendation of the Royal Commission to the effect that the income tax assessments of producers should be on the basis of crop returns extending over three years. It must be remembered that agriculturists and pastoralists are dependent on the season, and not on a fixed income. On page 8 of their first progress report the Royal Commissioners point out that in their opinion the Agricultural Department had failed to make good. They say—

> A most unsatisfactory feature, too, has been the failure of the Department of Agriculture to cope with the situation as it developed. The evidence in this connection is emphatic. In every centre representative men held that the Department of Agriculture had been of little or no service to the selectors. Surely the authorities must have known that he amateur settlers required the guiding hand of experience.

What I want to do is to bring about a better state of affairs. We cannot do that until we train our own men here in research work and let them learn the lesson peculiar to the conditions of a new country and then go out and preach it. It is of no use coming here and telling us what is done in Victoria or in the United States, except on general lines, and we want detailed experimental work with definite results. Take the question of that mallee land. Except it were done under the instructions of a Minister, nobody would survey a block in such fashion that it would include definite proportions of first, second, and third-class land. I am not aware that anyone in this State knew that the mallee land would give such poor results. But what the Government can do now is to give those people another opportunity. Without compensation they can provide those people with some other lands, put them on to better country and so help to alleviate the mistakes that have been made. In their report on mallee lands, the members of the Royal Commission state on page 8 of the first progress report—

> The mixed and patchy country in this State has opened out before settlers an endless variety of problems to be surmounted before success can be achieved. The various poisons, the Wodgil land, the Mallee land, the treacherous Morrel country, the methods of cultivation and the choice of seeds, are all instances where much good money, priceless time and labour have been hopelessly lost. The set-

tlers, in brief, have up to the present, conducted a vast experimental farm for the benefit of the State and posterity.

This has been the position in many instances. We can learn in any sphere of work much from the mistakes that are made just as from the successes achieved. The many unfortunate happenings to our settlers have remained an asset to the State, in that those failures have shown other settlers what not to do and those lands which could not be settled successfully following on the lines adopted. I deplore the fact that the bulk handling of wheat system has not yet been inaugurated. The price of cornsacks has increased from 9s. 6d. to about 13s. wholesale, and it will probably rise to 15s., which is equivalent to 5d. a bushel. This should convince hon. members that if the system had been inaugurated a large sum of money would have been saved to the State. With regard to the handling of our wheat by the Westralian Farmers Ltd., I would point out that the handling of wheat in this State is more efficient and better than in any other State of Australia. The individual wheat farmer in this State will get a greater return per bushel than the farmers in the other States. The losses and the cost of administration are less here than elsewhere in the Commonwealth. Each State pool stands by itself. It is known that the farmers of this State will get a greater return per bushel than the farmers in the other States, because of the reduced cost of administration of the Western Australian pool. I wish to give one or two illustrations of achievements in America in the direction of agricultural education and research. In my first speech in this House I dealt with the bureau of Washington. I am going to do so again. Wonderful results have followed the United States as a whole through its taking a certain course in this direction. I saw in last Monday's paper that the member for Dampier (Mr. Gregory) recently asked the Federal Government if the United States spent money in road construction in the country districts. The appropriation in the United States for this purpose is vast, and some millions of money have been distributed throughout the States under three headings. One-third is allowed on the basis of the length of mileage of roads in the State, one-third on the basis of the size of the State, and one-third on the basis of the population. The Federal Government's appropriation for road construction was expended as follows: In 1917, five million dollars; in 1918, 10 million dollars; in 1919, 15 million dollars, and the appropriation for 1920 is 25 million dollars. It is realised that it is in the interests of the people who are in the centres of population that they should have the cheapest form of transport in order that they may make their profits. The report I have here states—

> Moreover, the concentration of population in the cities and town has rendered of vital importance the transportation of food products for the cities, and of the manufactured products from the cities to the country.

Dr. Davenport, professor of the Illinois University and of the Agricultural College attached thereto, in describing the principle of agriculture in America says—

> The main features of agricultural education in America are the development of agriculture until it shall be profitable, productive, and permanent, until the country districts are comfortable and the rural people educated.

He also says—

> If this development of agriculture were merely the concern of the farmers we might leave them to provide for it themselves, or let matters rest as they are. But in the final analysis the development of agriculture is a public question. The farmers are interested, of course, and for selfish reasons, but even if they were not interested the nation should, for public reasons, insist that the agriculture should be developed to the utmost.

As an illustration of the size to which these agricultural colleges grow and the extent to which they are appreciated, I desire to quote a few figures relating to a typical agricultural college. The colleges I speak of are of the same status and give degrees of the same relative value as degrees for other professions in our own universities. Just as is the degree of doctor or other professional man recognised when coming from our own colleges, so is the degree of agricultural graduate recognised when he comes from these colleges. As showing the influence which must have been exerted as a result of this agricultural education in America, I should like to mention two new novels and one magazine article I have read recently. The first novel I will refer to is that called the "Butterfly Man." This was an exceedingly good and interesting novel. The leading character in it, "The Butterfly Man," was an entymologist. He was taught entymology by an enthusiast, and the novel shows the value of the economic entymologist. The next publication I would refer to was an article which showed the value of forestry, in that settlement had been wrecked through misguided clearing in forest country. It tells how a storm came and wrecked a dam, and ruined the whole community. The magnate who had grown out of the settlement was practically arraigned for manslaughter. He lost his all. Prior to that a scheme had been put forward for the acquisition of the whole proposition, by which, under a well guided system of forestry in conjunction with agriculture, more efficient production was brought about. My third illustration is that of a book taken from the Parliamentary library called the "Brown Mouse." This deals with the Mendellion theory. It showed the value of an agricultural expert in an agricultural community, what such a man could teach, and how he could increase production by organising the agriculturists in the district. The mere fact that these three publications are put on the market shows that the public of America, as a result of this agricultural education have acquired an interest in matters about which the great

bulk of our people have no knowledge or appreciation. The "Brown Mouse" deals particularly with the agricultural college in Iowa. At this college there was a staff of 55 professors and a total staff of 308 persons. The number of students who took the course in 1916 was 7,000. The State of Iowa is a very prosperous agricultural one and is about two-thirds of the size of Victoria. Its population is 2¼ millions, and yet it can run a university and an agricultural college with a staff of 308, and 7,000 students. This college is now so crowded that it is necessary to limit the number of admissions. It specialises on what is called "animal husbandry." Even with the great knowledge of the stock industry possessed by Mr. Holmes, that hon. member would, if he were to read the publication I have here, realise what achievements this research work had been responsible for. In normally big seasons I think the wheat production of Victoria is from 40 million to 50 milion bushels. This American State of Iowa, area 34,000,000 acres, for the year 1915 produced 320 million bushels of maize, 5½ million tons of hay, 198 million bushel of oats, 16 million bushels of wheat, maintained 10 million pigs and four million cattle, of which 1½ million were dairy cattle. If it had not been for the organisation of the industry through this agricultural education and research, such an achievement by such a small population would have been impossible.

Hon. J. J. Holmes: It is evidence that it is time we woke up in this State.

Hon. H. STEWART: I quite agree.

Sitting suspended from 6.15 to 7.30 p.m.

Hon. H. STEWART: At the tea adjournment I was dealing with the influence that agriculture had on the American people as a whole. I now emphasise that in any policy this Government carries out I hope an initial step will be that they will set aside endowment lands in different parts of the State for agricultural education and research. Those lands may, at the present time, have no appreciable value, but they will in time to come prove a valuable asset, and the profits from them could go towards agricultural education and research. In referring to the Iowa State agricultural college, of which I gave particulars, I remarked that they made a speciality of animal husbandry, and whereas, according to pages 26 to 29 of Mr. Richardson's report of agricultural education and research, in the United States 12 years ago they had only 13 students in animal husbandry, at the time the report was written there were 125, and of that number 89 per cent. would go back direct to the farms. Mr. Allen advocated the centralisation of a district high school. I can leave the Minister for Education to deal with that from an economical and educational standpoint, but from the point of view of one interested in agriculture in this State, I think that one of the great advantages in connection with the establishment of agricultural high schools is that they enable children to get their education without having to go to big centres of population, where they might be weaned away from agricultural pursuits by superficial attractions of city life. There is, in my opinion, an undoubted tendency on the part of the children attending schools in the City to lose the desire to follow agriculture, however great that desire may have been when they first entered those schools. In the State of Minnesota, which is about the size of Victoria, they had ten agricultural high schools some 10 years ago, while to-day they have 186. With regard to agricultural investigation and research, in the United States this work is carried out both by colleges and by the Federal Department of Agriculture. Both the Federal Government and the States engage in the dissemination of information amongst the actual workers. There are some 60 research farms in the United States and they are well distributed. If we turn to page 49 of Mr. Richardson's report we can get some information as to the results. At the State of Wisconsin experimental station, since the Babcock fat test was invented in 1890 there has resulted a saving of more than half the fat which was formerly lost in the skim milk, and that has meant a saving of 1½ million pounds of butter annually. There have been also many other achievements and we can pass on to plant breeding, as a result of which they give to the farmers—and these are now being used by the farmers there—a new pedigreed barley which yields 4.9 bushels per acre more than the best barley they had previously produced, a pedigreed oat which gives 9.2 bushels more per acre than the common varieties, and a pedigreed rye which yields 35 per cent. more than the variety previously grown. Then the elimination of plant diseases also forms an important part of their work. Summing up the position, Mr. Richardson says—

> After several decades of waiting for recognition and appreciation the college has now come into its own. It is crowded with students and finds itself compelled to create an organisation—the extension or publicity department—to carry the truths and the lessons to every farmer's back door.

On page 50 we find 15 great achievements by the State college experimental station in connection with live stock. One is as follows—

> It has been demonstrated that self-fed fattening swine should return as high as a dollar per head more profit than when handled in the ordinary hand-fed manner. With the 10 million hogs that are annually marketed from Iowa this means an increased earning of millions of dollars per annum.

At that research farm they have bred two new oats, Iowa 103 and Iowa 105 which were distributed among Iowa farmers. It is estimated that the increased production resulting from these varieties has increased Iowan production by five bushels per acre.

In connection with the Department of Agriculture of Washington, which I dealt with in this House two years ago, they have found that the best disseminating force is not through bulletins and not through the Press but through trained men. On page 57 of the same we find some of the results of their achievements. It is stated—

> Pleuro pneumonia, which formerly did so much damage to cattle in the United States, has been eradicated. In 1906 the losses due to cattle tick in the United States were estimated at 20 millions sterling. During that year the Bureau received its first appropriation of £17,000, which has since been increased to £130,000. In 10 years the annual losses were reduced from 20 millions sterling to eight millions sterling, and 52 per cent. of the infected territory has been completely cleared of cattle tick.

One great contribution to medical science was made by the Bureau of Washington in connection with tick fever and it was, that infection could be carried through an intermediate host. This discovery opened up a new field of medical research, which had an important bearing on malaria work. The United States has been entirely freed from cattle scab. In regard to hog cholera, in 1907 the losses amounted to 14 millions sterling. In 1913 those figures were reduced to six millions sterling. The preventive remedy for hog cholera was discovered by Dr. Dorset, a member of the Bureau, who demonstrated that the disease was caused by a filtrable virus. It is estimated that his discovery has saved the country millions per annum. Besides that, an improved method of working has been followed in the United States which I think could be inaugurated here at the present time. I refer to farm management surveys. On page 59 of Mr. Richardson's report we see the results of the work which has been done by Mr. Spillman, who was professor in the college of agriculture in the State of Washington. It is stated that, in many instances science follows practice; practice achieves the result and science determines the season for it. An old aphorism of Huxley's is that science is nothing but trained organised common sense. Mr. Spillman inaugurated a system by which he made a management survey of the different farms in the district. Some men would be getting a 40 bushel average and others from 10 to 15. The trained investigator made inquiries into the various methods of cultivation and harvesting and then tabulated the results, from which he drew conclusions. In one instance where this was done he found in one district, comprising good and bad farms, that six of the farmers were getting good results by following the best practice and that they did not know the reasons for those good results. The investigations were such that he could then go to the bad farms and tell them what to do. The result of the investigations was the appointment of what are known as county agents. The county agents are provided for by parliamentary appropriation, State and Federal, and by the county authorities, and in each district the agent carries out the class of work inaugurated by Mr. Spillman. Potent results have been obtained. The outcome of these methods indicates that in the United States, prior to the inauguration of this system of farm management surveys, they had, like us, good and bad farms, and by this class of investigation they raised the average of production. It seems to me that we can get similar results. An illustration of this is found on page 65 of Dr. Richardson's report, dealing with Broome County, New York. It states—

> It was found that the labour income of the farmers, i.e., the net income after interest on capital and depreciation costs were deducted, averaged £70 per annum, and that it varied from £10 to £290 per annum. That is to say, the labour income from the best farms was £290, while that of the worst farms was but £10. This gave a fine opportunity for assistance, and the county agent was able to do much valuable work amongst those farmers whose labour incomes were below the average. Agricultural conditions in the county rapidly improved. The Secretary of the Cinghamton Chamber of Commerce described what had been done in his county before a national meeting of the Chambers of Commerce of the United States. The business men of the Chamber immediately saw a chance of co-operating with the local authorities for the betterment of farming. Mr. Rosenwald, of Chicago, was so impressed with the work that he offered 1,000 dollars to each of the first 100 counties who organised similar work, and hinted that there was a private fund of 1,000,000 dollars to back such work. Many counties immediately took advantage of the offer and installed county agents.

The result of that beginning was that £250,000 was raised by a private fund and then the State and Federal authorities joined in. A noteworthy point in Dr. Richardson's report was the development of markets under the bureau of agriculture, which showed that the cost of the middleman was made up of two things, profit and waste, and information was disseminated so promptly and extensively that it was possible to eliminate a large proportion of the waste, leaving to the middleman his profits, and so improving the return to the agriculturists. In concluding my remarks on agricultural education, I wish to read the paragraph from the "Experimental Station Record," U.S.A., Department of Agriculture, volume 40, No. 2, on agricultural education in Victoria—

> Mr. Richardson has caught the idea that in America agriculture is regarded as both a business and a mode of life, and that the development of agriculture is a public concern, hence money spent upon it is not an outlay but an investment. This, he explains, is the reason why State and Federal Governments are content to make large appropriations for agricultural education as an underlying means of develop-

ment. Based on this idea and the returns from it, he argues for a long-range policy which will look beyond the present and map out the requirements of the State, making provision for the steady realisation of these plans in the future. It does not necessarily follow that what is good policy for one country will be equally good for another, but the value of agricultural education and investigation has been given such wide and convincing demonstration as to show their soundness for new regions quite as surely as for the older settled ones. This excellent report will furnish a reliable basis for agricultural development through education and research.

The cost of installing the Iowa State college was £800,000, and on a population basis the comparative expenditure for this State would be £100,000. Regarding industrial unrest, I deprecate the pessimistic tone often adopted with respect to our industries, which we annually hear in the report of the chairman of the Chamber of Mines, Kalgoorlie. According to the newspaper report of his speech at the last annual meeting, he said—

> The cost of production is increased, and those of its products which are sent abroad cannot compete in the world's markets with the products of other lands; hence the slowing down policy which is preached by many Labour extremists is about the worst policy that can be pursued. The greatest enemy the worker has to-day is the man who follows the policy of "slow down" for, if it were adopted generally, it would result in the production of less wealth.

While not quibbling with the conclusions drawn, there is no doubt about the pessimistic tone annually adopted by the chairman of the Chamber of Mines. After reading that statement, I went through the mining reports for some years and was pleasantly surprised, in tabulating the figures, to find that the quantities of gold ore and coal produced per man working above and below ground has not fallen during the period of the war. For the year 1917 the coal output was the maximum for any one year, namely, 326,000 tons. I draw attention to these figures, because it is of no use being unduly pessimistic or jumping at unwarranted conclusions. The production of gold ore in tons per man employed below ground was —in 1913, 393 tons; 1914, 410 tons; 1915, 431 tons; 1916, 411 tons; 1917, 411 tons. Comparable figures for above and below ground were:—1913, 214 tons; 1914, 230 tons; 1915, 238 tons; 1916, 227 tons; 1917, 233 tons. Those figures show that the real position is much better than is generally believed. I do not say that the production of ore per man in a particular mine or in the mines of Kalgoorlie has not fallen off but, taking the State as a whole, we find that the quantity of ore produced per man was higher in 1917 than in 1913. Figures for the coal mining industry show that in 1913 the tons per man produced by men working below ground was 751; in 1914, 802; 1915, 764; 1916, 847; 1917, 758 tons. The tons produced per man employed above and below ground were:—in 1913, 561; 1914, 608; 1915, 575; 1916, 658; 1917, 572 tons. In reading the report of the firewood workers dispute, my attention was attracted by two requests made by the employees which were refused, though it seemed, in the light of information available, especially considering that it is desirable to work together to increase production, that more consideration might have been given to them. I quote from the "West Australian" of the 16th July—

> Two direct questions were asked by the union delegates, the first being:—Would the companies be prepared to revert to the prices for stores which prevailed when the agreement was made in 1916? The answer was an emphatic "No." The second question was:—Would the companies agree to allow the men to run the stores as a co-operative concern? Again the answer was "No." A proposition that hawkers and other persons should be allowed to trade on the woodlines was also turned down by the companies.

Not many suggestions are put forward with a view to increasing the mining production. Prospecting could be considerably stimulated by the Government offering a higher reward for a discovery. I firmly believe the mineral wealth of this State has hardly been touched as yet. Prospecting is a difficult matter, but at any time success in this domain might result in an increase of population and prosperity such as would not be brought about by another industry for many years. I would direct attention to the difficulty experienced by the mines, due to the alteration in the explosives. It is about seven months since those bodies conversant with mining, by deputation and correspondence, urged the Government to endeavour to get the restriction eliminated regarding the importation and sale of explosives prejudicial to the industry, which had resulted in an increase in the cost. That the use of sodium nitrate in the manufacture of gelignite is not detrimental to the safety of the workers is shown by statistics. Fatal accidents from explosives in 1905 totalled nine, and diminished until 1914. In 1915 there were six. In July, 1916, as a war emergency measure, gelignite with sodium nitrate was permitted to be imported, and about 50 per cent. of the quantity used in that year contained the sodium compound. In that year, 1916, there were no fatal accidents; and in the next year sodium nitrate was the only nitrate constituent of the explosives used, and in that year there were no fatal accidents. Therefore, on the ground of safety there was no reason for turning it down. Deputations from the Chamber of Mines and the Mining Association waited first on Mr. Hudson when Minister for Mines, and put the case before him, from the aspect of accidents and from the chemical point of view. A deputation which consisted of three mining engineers asked that the Government Analyst should be present. They proved

that sodium and potassium were practically sister elements. They provided the Minister with ample reasons on chemical grounds for making the alteration. That alteration has now been made, but it has taken six or seven months to combat the case put up by the officers of the department. When the deputation did not receive a satisfactory reply from the Minister, the Mining Association of Western Australia wrote to the United States Bureau of Explosives, to the corresponding department of the British Government, and to the Explosives Departments of the Eastern States. The deputation had stated to the Minister that there was no place in the world where this restriction was imposed except Western Australia. The restriction limits the use of sodium nitrate instead of potassium nitrate, as I have said, and nowhere in the world except here is that limitation imposed. Authorities were quoted for that assertion. Since then replies to the inquiries made have come to hand, and I will read a few of them:—

Department of the Interior. Bureau of Mines. Explosive Regulation. Washington, June 2nd, 1919. The Mining Association of Western Australia, St. George's House, Perth, W.A. Gentlemen, I am in receipt of your letter of April 16th asking what restrictions, if any, were imposed by our department on the use of nitrate of sodium. At the present time there are no restrictions on the ingredients of explosives, as far as this regulation is concerned. Very truly yours, (signed) Clarence Hall, Chief Explosives Engineer.

Explosives Office, New Law Courts, Johannesburg, 9th June, 1919. The Secretary, the Mining Association of Western Australia, P.O. Box 124, G.P.O., Perth, W.A. Sir, I have the honour to acknowledge your letter of the 17th April, and in reply to say that nitrate of soda is and always has been the normal oxidising agent of gelignite made in this country. I have the honour to be, Sir, Your obedient Servant, (signed) A. B. Deane, Chief Inspector of Explosives, Union of South Africa.

Chief Inspector of Explosives, 423 Flinders Lane, Melbourne, 29th April, 1919. The Secretary, Mining Association of Western Australia, St. George's Terrace, Perth. Dear Sir, In reply to your letter of 17th instant: Gelignite may contain either potassium nitrate or sodium nitrate as an ingredient, in accordance with the authorised list of explosives in this State. Conditions of authorisation in Victoria require all nitro-glycerine explosives (including gelignites) containing sodium nitrate to be wrapped in water-proof wrappers unless exempted therefrom by a special authority. Such an exemption was given to gelignite containing sodium nitrate, as it was considered that under all reasonable conditions of storage ordinary wrappers would be effective in the Victorian climate. The experience of the past ten years, during which period sodium nitrate has been largely used as an ingredient, has justified this exemption. The above provision to protect the finished explosive under excessively humid conditions of storage is the only distinction made between the respective gelignites, and as it has not been found necessary to enforce this by cancellation of the exemption the same restrictions are imposed throughout the State on gelignite containing sodium nitrate as are imposed on gelignite containing potassium nitrate. Further information on this subject can be obtained from the Chief Inspector of Explosives in your State, to whom a copy of this letter has been sent, and with whom you are no doubt in communication. Yours faithfully, (signed) Reg. J. Lewis, Chief Inspector of Explosives.

The Chief Inspector of Explosives, Government Chemical Laboratory, Perth. Dear Sir, A communication has been received from the Mining Association of Western Australia asking for additional restrictions, if any, in force in this State on gelignite containing nitrate of soda, to which the attached copy of reply has been made. Yours faithfully, (signed) R. J. Lewis, Chief Inspector of Explosives.

Department of Chemistry, Adelaide, S.A., 28/4/1919. The Mining Association of Western Australia (Incorporated). In reply to your letter of April 17th, I may state that no restrictions are imposed in South Australia on the use of nitrate of sodium in gelignite which are not also imposed on gelignite containing nitrate of potassium. In other words, there are no special restrictions on gelignite containing sodium nitrate. Gelignites containing sodium nitrate have been imported into South Australia every year since early in 1909. (Signed) W. A. Hargreaves, Chief Inspector of Explosives.

There are others, but I think I have read ample to show that the Chief Inspector of Explosives in Western Australia imposed restrictions of which he ought to have known the needlessness even before these opinions were gathered to be submitted to him. That officer is the gentleman who has been referred to here as a "stormy petrel," and who has succeeded in getting into his department an officer of the Agricultural Department, namely the Plant Pathologist, who ought to be in the Agricultural Department. Other States would not have allowed this latitude in the matter of explosives had it been in any way prejudicial to the well-being of those using the explosives. Finally with regard to compulsory profit sharing, let me briefly say that it would prove a simpler matter than getting satisfaction from price fixing. It could start with companies and firms. If successful it would doubtless be adopted in the case of private individuals, and perhaps in cases where legislation could not be imposed in the initial stages. For one thing, it would tend to the greatest effort being put forth by the workers who were participators in profits. Moreover, it might stop that great desire to get into the Government service which is shown by many people who lack

initiative. What I think a valuable suggestion is this: In any scheme of profit sharing the first requisite is that labour must get its minimum wage. Capital would also have to be recognised and get its minimum wage; that is to say, a fair and reasonable rate of interest cumulative on all capital put into the business and an adequate remuneration for the management. In addition, according to the nature of the business, whether it was a mining business with a wasting asset or an agricultural business with an improving asset, there would have to be sinking fund charges. After those items had been taken out of the revenue, capital would have received its minimum wage. Thereupon would come the basis for profit sharing between the two elements necessary to industry, namely labour and capital. Now, how is the amount of profit, which would be comparatively small per head, to be distributed amongst the workers? Take the case of a factory running with ample capital and proving extremely remunerative. Then take another factory in the same line of business just paying interest on its capital and sinking fund and poor remuneration for management. Lastly take the case of a factory making an actual loss. The suggestion is that the amount of profit accruing to the employees in the profitable business should be paid not to the employees themselves, but to a non-political industrial union, the idea behind being that those workers who are in a business which, perhaps through inefficient management, is not making good, would, by participating in results accruing from a similar business that is getting profitable returns, feel an incentive to improve their own business to the profitable point. I think we are quite justified in assuming that under these conditions the employees in the unremunerative business would be stimulated to greater efforts. I have much pleasure in supporting the Address-in-reply.

Hon. G. J. G. W. MILES (North): I deeply regret the death of our late President, Sir Henry Briggs. As one of his former pupils I feel his loss very keenly, and I want to thank the leader of the House and other members for the splendid but entirely just tributes which they have paid to the deceased gentleman's memory. It is on behalf of his old scholars I thank them. To you, Sir, I offer my congratulations on your election to the Presidential Chair. There is one regret, however, that I have in seeing you there; and it is that we lose your services on the floor of the House, where your speeches have been most interesting to hear. I wish to offer my congratulations also to the Chairman of Committees, Mr. Allen, and to congratulate Dr. Saw on his safe return from the Front. I desire, further, to thank Dr. Saw, Mr. Cornell, and Mr. Panton for the good work they have done for those of us who remained behind; and I welcome Mr. Panton as one of our new members. In reading the Governor's Speech, I was pleased to see that the present Government intend doing their utmost to repatriate our soldiers. Whilst I am glad to know that they intend doing all that is possible in the direction of land settlement, I regret that very little has been accomplished in the direction of repatriating soldiers to the mining, pearling, and pastoral industries. A little may have been done of which I am unaware, but in my opinion not sufficient is being done for these other classes of men who have given their services to the country and who should not be overlooked. With regard to the mining industry, I consider it is the duty of the Government to do all they can to have the embargo on the export of base metals lifted. At present Western Australia has to sell its production of these metals through the Metal Exchange of the Eastern States, and a continuance of that system will mean the killing of the primary industry in Western Australia. As Mr. Hughes and Mr. Watt will be here next week, I hope the Government will make it their business to obtain some assurance from those gentlemen that we shall be relieved of the embargo. It applies not only to our own district, but to other districts, such as Ravensthorpe, Northampton, Roebourne, Pilbara, and also the Murchison, where they are mining copper and lead ores and tin. If the embargo were lifted, the tin miner in my own electorate would receive up to £25 per ton better price than he is getting to-day. That means that poorer ground would be worked and more men employed. There is not only the agricultural industry to be developed in this State, but other industries also. The miners in the back country are a good asset. We do not seem to realise what we owe to the mining industry. Every man producing minerals is a good asset to the State and a really splendid asset to the farmer. In regard to mining supplies, unless something be done, the industry will be wiped out of existence. I was pleased to listen to the interesting address by Mr. Stewart, and I am glad to see that the Government have at last arranged to allow gelignite to come in as sodium nitrate. That in itself will, I think, tend to lessen the cost of mining and prevent the monopoly that has existed in the past. Strangely enough, as soon as the war was over people handling gelignite in this State put up the price. I do not know whether anything can be done, but something should be done if possible to fix a fair price on explosives in order to assist the mining industry. In regard to the cost of living, I have a few figures to quote by way of comparing prices with what ruled 15 years ago. I do not know whether it is due to profiteering, but certainly there is something wrong in Australia when the price of our own commodities go up to the extent they have done. Years ago we used to import tinned milk from Switzerland at 16s. and 18s. per case. To-day the Australian product costs 42s. per case. Milk, as compared with 15 years ago, has gone up 150 per cent. Flour has risen 50 per cent., jams and fruits 100 per cent., bacon 50 per cent., butter and sugar 100 per cent., and tinned meats 250 per