

The Minister for Railways: That was the A.W.U. official's motor.

Mr. LINDSAY: One of these men is an A.W.U. official, and the other is a Labour Bureau official. The Labour Bureau official should not have been there.

The Premier: The object of that official was to try and establish branches of the Labour Bureau in country districts to meet the situation which has been mentioned.

The Minister for Mines: He was sent there for that very purpose.

Mr. LINDSAY: If he established a branch of the Labour Bureau at Kununoppin, the result is that not a man has been engaged there. I admit that in the district I see a great number of Southern Europeans.

The Minister for Mines: I bet you saw a few in work.

Mr. LINDSAY: It is peculiar that I saw very few in work, the reason being, I think, that the district is newly settled, and settled mostly by Agricultural Bank clients, whilst the Minister's policy is to refuse to allow Agricultural Bank money to be paid as wages to Southern Europeans. I believe the Southern Europeans are camped there in the hope of getting work in future. Eventually there may be serious difficulties to contend with as regards those Southern Europeans. If we do not like to have them in the country and will not allow them to work here, we should repatriate them to their own country.

The Premier: It is not the responsibility of this Government to look after foreigners.

Mr. LINDSAY: I have dealt with various subjects this evening, but I have not dealt with any of the customary small requests from my electorate. My hope, notwithstanding that omission, is that Ministers will in future agree, as they have always agreed in the past, to certain requests submitted by me. I expect to put up quite a number of them presently. My position is that of representative of the largest agricultural electorate in the State, in which there is more new settlement going on than in any other portion of Western Australia. In discussing the 3,500 farms scheme and new railways, members are apt to forget that there is country north of Southern Cross as well as south.

The Premier: There are some bad roads in your electorate, too.

Mr. LINDSAY: Yes. Probably more than 500 of the 3,500 farms are situated in my

electorate. Three years ago I gave the House some figures as to the production of the Toodyay electorate, showing that it produced a quarter of the wheat grown in Western Australia. The quantity then was 5,000,000 bushels. I have obtained the corresponding figures for the year just closed, and they show that Toodyay for that year produced 8,600,000 bushels of wheat, in addition to other commodities. Therefore I am compelled to throw myself on the mercy of the Government. I come to them with so many requests because I have a much greater proportion of the State to represent than have many other members. I understand it is the Government's intention to bring down a Redistribution of Seats Bill. I hope that the measure will be on just lines, and that before it is debated an attempt will be made to get people in outlying country districts on the rolls.

On motion by Mr. Chesson, debate adjourned.

House adjourned at 9.53 p.m.

Legislative Council,

Wednesday, 15th August, 1928.

	PAGE
Leave of absence	170
Bills: Navigation Act Amendment, 1R.	171
Pearling Act Amendment, 1R.	171
Whaling, 1R.	171
Address-in-Reply, sixth day	171

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

LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

On motion by Hon. G. W. Miles, leave of absence for six consecutive sittings granted to Hon. Sir Edward Wittenoom (North) on the ground of ill-health.

BILLS (3)—FIRST READING.

1. Navigation Act Amendment.
2. Pearling Act Amendment.
3. Whaling.

Introduced by the Honorary Minister and read a first time.

ADDRESS-IN-REPLY.*Sixth Day.*

Debate resumed from the previous day.

HON J. CORNELL (South) [4.38]: It can be said of Governors' Speeches that in most respects they resemble pulpit sermons, except that a Governor's Speech is never prepared by the individual who reads it, whereas generally a sermon is written by the minister who delivers it. Both types of utterances endeavour to depict the past and foretell the future, and each ends with a divine invocation that some of us are sadly in need of. At the outset of my remarks, I desire to deal with the question of unemployment. The Governor's Speech tells us that the wheat yield for last season was a record for Western Australia, but it omits to tell us that at that particular time unemployment had reached its highest peak in the history of the State. Despite what is said for and against unemployment, I think it can truly be said that up to the present, like the poor, it has always been with us. Many and varied reasons have been advanced in explanation of the causes of unemployment. I am going to advance a reason for it, in my own opinion a very potent reason too, and the phase I shall refer to has not yet been touched upon by any other hon. member in this Chamber, while very little has been said on the point by those who profess to have knowledge of the causes of this great problem. I refer to motor transport. We are living in an age that is very little concerned about to-morrow. The prevailing desire to get the best out of to-day, day by day, and to let to-morrow take care of itself. Hon. members need no reminder from me as to where we would be likely to land ourselves if we applied that policy to our own domestic affairs. We all know that for most of us there would come a time when the limit would be reached and the storekeeper, for instance, would say, "I have been glad of your custom to date,

but I can carry you no further." In Perth to-day it may be said that those who drive motor cars for pleasure, consider those who do not possess cars are persons of no class. It is generally admitted that motor transport is an essential in most industries, but it is just as generally admitted that even in industry to-day motor transport is overdone, and involves unnecessary waste of time and expense, all of which adds to the cost of industry itself. It is recognised that motor transport is necessary for farmers, particularly those who are operating in remote localities, but it is also accepted that most farmers who possess cars, either on time payment or otherwise, spend too much time in travelling about in them. That form of conveyance has annihilated distance, but has brought disadvantages in its trail. I have instanced one disadvantage, that of the farmer travelling about for pleasure and spending time in his motor car that could more profitably be spent upon work about the farm. It may also be regarded as an undisputed fact that thousands of people in receipt of salaries of less than £7 per week possess, but do not own, motor cars for the purpose of pleasure. I tried that game out for three months, and I receive more than £7 per week. I found I could not do it. If I persisted, I realised that it would be a case of all for to-day and nothing for to-morrow. Still, there are people who blindly follow the policy of owning a motor car merely for the purpose of indulging in the psychology of motion. Another reason influencing such people is the fact that their neighbour owns a motor car as well. Hon members will admit that no individual, even in the metropolitan area, who has domestic obligations, can rear a family, provide something for the future, and run a motor car, if he is in receipt of a salary of only £7 a week. It has been urged that because one person in four in some States of U.S.A. owns a motor car, we in Australia should follow a similar course. There is this fundamental difference that has to be taken into consideration. Whereas Americans make motor cars and consequently the money expended in making them circulates amongst the American workmen and the American people generally, quite 75 per cent. of the original cost of motor cars bought in Australia, together with the money spent upon

accessories, repairs and general running, leaves Australia, never to return except in the form of a loan.

Hon. E. H. Gray: You would not have the farmer go back to a pony?

Hon. J. CORNELL: I am not suggesting something for the foolish. If we did manufacture motor cars in Australia, the money spent on their purchase, even by those people who would be better without them, would be advantageous to the community in that it would be circulated through the various trades and industries of Australia. But to-day the money for motor cars goes out of the country and does not return except, as I have stated, in the form of loans. It has been said that booze gradually drives some people to insolvency, to the asylum, to a hospital, to a gaol, or to the grave. I think it can be safely said that for every person booze drives to either of those places, at least five persons nowadays will drive to the same destination in an automobile. I have stressed that phase of extravagance because I consider it is one of the fundamental reasons for so much of the unemployment prevailing in Australia to-day. The same extravagance is illustrated by the craze for player pianos and other luxuries that the Australian thinks he is entitled to have equally with the people in the countries where they are made. That is where the difference comes in. They are not made in Australia, but good Australian money is sent out of the country for their purchase. The Australian enjoys the pleasure of them, whereas the people who make them have the advantage of the money being circulated in their country. The effects of these desires for pleasure are coming home to roost with a vengeance. Let me now turn to the problem of unemployment. It is worth considering whether any particular brand of party Government can remedy this state of affairs. We have been told—and I have said it myself—that with a Labour Government in power unemployment would become a thing of the past.

Hon. C. B. Williams: You believed it once, too.

Hon. J. CORNELL: I did, but I no longer believe it.

Hon. C. B. Williams: Not many people believe you, either.

Hon. J. CORNELL: Perhaps it was one of my shortcomings. The hon. member has supporters who believe in his shortcomings; otherwise he would not be occupying a seat in this House. It has frequently been said that when Labour came into power, unemployment would vanish. I have no desire to make a tilt at the present Government, or at any other Labour Government. I desire merely to take a retrospective glance and to point out that the goal sought is as far off as ever it was. The problem of unemployment involves something bigger than mere party politics. I think the Leader of the House will agree with me, even if Mr. Williams does not, that that is a reasonable standpoint for which to approach the question. We have had two periods, each covering $4\frac{1}{2}$ years, of continuous Labour Government, nine years in all. Yet we find that after the second $4\frac{1}{2}$ years period of Labour Government, unemployment has reached the highest peak in the history of the State.

Hon. C. B. Williams: Because of the introduction of so many foreigners whom you eulogise.

Hon. J. CORNELL: If we turn to the other States that are not governed by Labour, we find that exactly a similar position prevails there. It is not time that we, who are supposed to be able to advise the citizens of this country, came to a common understanding that the problem of unemployment is purely an economic one, and that no Government has ever been able to find a satisfactory solution of it? Let me refer to another phase. I do not mention the Labour Government with any idea of having a tilt at them, but I do wish to refer to their inconsistency. It was said that, with Labour in power, never again would the police be used against the workless as it was by the capitalist or landed-gentry type of Government. Only a few weeks ago I witnessed in Perth the spectacle of the police being used in such a way as was comparable only with their use during the shearers' strike 35 years ago.

Hon. E. H. Gray: Did you see the police used 35 years ago?

Hon. J. CORNELL: I was in that strike and I ought to know. I say that the police were used against the unemployed with less justification than they were used against the workers 35 years ago.

Hon. C. B. Williams: There was no justification for their use on either occasion.

Hon. J. CORNELL: I am endeavouring to point out the inconsistency of Labour, and to show that, despite the statements that the police would not be used against the workers, they were used; and I maintain there was no necessity for it. A few years ago there was a strike of tearoom employees in Perth. On that occasion I denounced the action of the police and the Government, and I make bold to say that individuals now want to condone the use of the police against the unemployed were not too scrupulous in obeying the law during the strike of tearoom employees. The police were not over-zealous in putting the law into operation against those people.

Hon. E. H. Harris: That is a very nice way of putting it.

Hon. J. CORNELL: I always try to be gentlemanly. I claim that there was as much need to use the police during the tearoom strike in order to uphold the rights of citizens as there was during the unemployed demonstrations. I was not present at the celebration when Sir John Forrest received a poke in some part of his anatomy, but I can say that during my 30 odd years in Western Australia I had never before seen the police turned out—mounted police equipped not with rifles and bayonets but with batons—to prevent a few unemployed from making a demonstration.

Hon. E. H. Gray: You have not seen them like that before?

Hon. J. CORNELL: No.

Hon. E. H. Gray: Then you have not been to Fremantle.

Hon. J. CORNELL: I had the good sense to keep away from Fremantle because I did not approve of the methods used, and I do not approve of them now. I have always held the opinion that where reason will not prevail in a British community, force is not going to succeed. What were the unemployed doing? They were merely availing themselves of the traditional right of British people to demonstrate for the purpose of airing their grievances.

The Honorary Minister: We have never denied them that right.

Hon. J. CORNELL: It is said that they broke the traffic regulations. If the unemployed infringed the traffic laws, the people concerned in the tearooms strike

were ten times worse, but nothing was said or done in their case. It is an inherent right of the Britisher to demonstrate and give vent to his feelings, so long as he commits no violence against constituted authority. That is all the unemployed were doing, and had they been spoken to sensibly, and met, as they should have been, there would have been no need for the police to be used as they were. All history teaches us that British people find a safety valve, not in resorting to violence, but in hearing from some leader a recital of their grievances. If the unemployed erred against the traffic regulations, they erred only as Britishers have done for a century, and they did not err to any greater extent than many others have done in this city even during the last five years. As far as the unemployed are concerned, I desire to extend my congratulations to Mr. Fraser for speaking as he did. The occasion warranted the remarks he made, because if anything that is not compatible with good citizenship and good government comes from any section of the community, a member of Parliament is entirely lacking in his duty if he does not utter a protest. Turning to land settlement, the Speech sets out that the demand for land was never greater than it is at present. But it omits to say that during the first three years of the administration of the present Government, that Government did very little, if anything, to carry on the policy of opening up the eastern wheat and sheep lands as Sir James Mitchell did. It was not until Mr. Troy took over the control of the Lands Department that anything really tangible was done in the way of opening up the wheat lands eastward and northward. I give Mr. Troy the credit that is due to him for discovering, as soon as he assumed control of the Lands Department, that if the progress of the State was to continue, it could only be continued by the adoption of a vigorous policy of land settlement and development. I am not here to apologise for Sir James Mitchell, but while we hear a good deal about his failings and shortcomings, we never hear anything about his virtues. He may not have any, but in my opinion he has one.

Hon. J. R. Brown: His love of cigarettes.

Hon. J. CORNELL: That may be a weakness, not a virtue. No man, living or dead, in the State has done so much to open up the agricultural resources of a State as has

been done by Sir James Mitchell, and I think credit is due to him for that from friend and foe alike. There is a reference in the Speech to railway rates and the record wheat yield, and I think that what has been achieved can reasonably be attributed to the policy embarked upon by Sir James Mitchell during the period he was either Minister for Lands, or Premier of the State. The worst I wish Mr. Troy is that he will continue vigorously to open up our available wheat and sheep lands and follow in the footsteps of Sir James Mitchell. If he does that there will continue that prosperity that we have been enjoying during recent years. Mr. Williams, by way of interjection, touched on the subject of migration.

Hon. C. B. Williams: I want you to explain your attitude.

Hon. J. CORNELL: My desire is to be concise. I am aware that the Standing Orders set out that no member may read his speech, but as this is a subject on which I desire to carefully choose my remarks, because I have been so entirely misrepresented—

Hon. C. B. Williams interjected.

Hon. J. CORNELL: If the hon. member will keep quiet, he will hear what is coming.

The PRESIDENT: Order!

Hon. J. CORNELL: As Mr. Williams is a new member, I, as an old member of this House, will give him all that consideration and tolerance that is due to him.

The PRESIDENT: Hon. members will have ample opportunity to reply to Mr. Cornell's remarks if they so desire.

Hon. J. CORNELL: Regarding the policy of the Agricultural Bank, loans are granted only in those cases where British labour is employed. I was the first Parliamentarian in this State to tackle this question fairly, squarely and honestly, and when I did so, I was only giving utterance to what was thought by other Parliamentarians, who were afraid to give expression to those thoughts.

Hon. E. H. Gray: I question that.

Hon. J. CORNELL: I notice of late that shy Parliamentarians, who thought that the question might be brought up at election time, have got over that stage of nervousness and are now coming out into the open and saying something similar to what I said a year ago. We can put aside altogether the question whether Britishers or Southern Europeans shall clear the land or enter into business such as the selling of fish or the opening of fish shops. That, however, is not

the question. The real issue is as to what we are going to do about Southern European migration. Are we going to stand for the total exclusion of Southern Europeans, or are we going to admit an annual quota?

Hon. J. R. Brown: It does not make much difference to us.

Hon. J. CORNELL: Those are the only two logical standpoints. Members will admit that the fundamental question is whether we are going to stand for total exclusion or admit a quota. Let us assume and also agree that the question whether we shall have total exclusion or admit a quota does not concern this Parliament; it is a Commonwealth matter. We will assume, for the sake of argument, that the Commonwealth Parliament to-morrow favoured the total exclusion of Southern Europeans. Would that be practicable? Could it be given effect to? If members want an illustration as to whether or not the total exclusion policy could be given effect, to which country would they turn? They would turn to the great United States of America. What do we find there? The United States has a population of 120,000,000; the country has an enormous navy and enormous resources. Do we find that great country adopting a policy of total exclusion? No. Why? Because the policy of total exclusion carries with it international complications with the probable inevitable result, war. If the United States, in its wisdom, and with its 120,000,000 people, considered it could not stand up to the policy of total exclusion of all the foreign races, how could Western Australia hope to do so? What did the United States do? That country adopted the quota system. Some hon. members might say that we would go to war. If we did, we would ask who were going to help us. Should Japan or Italy take us up? It is known and accepted to-day that even the British Labour Party, led by Mr. Ramsay MacDonald, does not believe in a white Australia policy, let alone the exclusion from Australia of other nationals. We have to face the position as it stands. Whether I go up or down in the public life of this country, I think the time has arrived when honest men should take a stand. I will not stand for a policy of total exclusion, because it is not capable of consummation. What is the other alternative? It is the adoption of the quota system, that every year we shall admit to Australia a certain number from other countries.

Hon. C. B. Williams: And employ them before our own countrymen!

Hon. J. CORNELL: If we accept the policy of the quota—I know that I have not many supporters of the policy of total exclusion—

Hon. E. H. Gray: You never heard me advocate that.

Hon. J. CORNELL: If we accept the policy of the quota, it logically and automatically follows that the nationals we permit to enter Australia should have the right to work and enjoy the citizenship of the country that permits them to enter.

Hon. C. B. Williams: Would you give preference to the native-born Australian?

Hon. J. CORNELL: That does not enter into the question I am arguing at this stage. I am arguing that if we adopt the quota system, it automatically follows that it is the right of the nationals we admit, to live and work and enjoy the full citizenship of the country. Then it becomes the choice of the individual who is going to offer employment whether or not he will employ his own kith and kin or employ other nationals. The question as to who shall employ the foreigner is not a matter for the Federal or State Legislature and therefore should not enter into this debate.

Hon. E. H. Gray: It then becomes a question of patriotism.

Hon. J. CORNELL: As the hon. member interjected, it will depend on the patriotism of the people. We have admitted that total exclusion is not capable of consummation. It is also admitted that if we allow nationals to enter this country, they must have the same rights as we enjoy. Whether or not those people can avail themselves of those rights will rest with the citizenship of the country to which they come. Mr. Gray, by way of interjection the other night, said the Federal Government were largely responsible for the existing unemployment. My interpretation of that remark is that if it be so, the same charge can also be aimed at the Federal Government on the admittance of aliens. I am not going into the argument whether or not the alien has been the cause of unemployment in Australia. That is a highly debatable question. I have heard from Mr. Gray, and from the Premier, and from Sir James Mitchell and others that when migration into Western Australia was at its highest peak, unemployment was at its lowest. If members will take the trouble

to refresh their memories they will find that during the highest peak of migration into Western Australia, the gold mining industry was near its zenith. And at that period there were as many Southern Europeans coming into Western Australia as there are to-day. So the question of unemployment is much more fundamental than the mere question of what nationals we shall admit into the country. Assuming for argument's sake that if the Southern European migration to Australia is as Mr. Gray has said, a cause of unemployment, we find ourselves in this position: Recently Mr. Bruce declared against any policy of total exclusion of Southern Europeans, and said his Government intended to continue admitting them on such a basis as would maintain the Australian citizenship at a standard of 98 per cent. British origin. That was a definite statement from the Prime Minister of Australia. He is against the total exclusion of aliens, but he favours keeping the Australian population 98 per cent. British origin. Let us turn to the Leader of the Opposition in the House of Representatives, Mr. Scullin. I have already said that this is a question of nationals, and whether or not they shall be admitted. We must take as a criterion of the future the policies of the two leaders in the Federal arena. I have read all that Mr. Scullin has said on the subject, but I have yet to learn that he, the Leader of the Federal Opposition, who some day may be Prime Minister, has made a definite declaration as to whether he is in favour of Mr. Bruce's policy of admittance, or whether he prefers the policy of total exclusion.

Hon. Sir William Lathlain: He dare not do it.

Hon. J. CORNELL: He has a public duty to perform, namely that he shall boldly stand either for the policy of total exclusion, or for the policy of admittance of a definite quota which shall not reduce the citizenship of British origin below a certain percentage. That cannot be said to be unfair criticism of Mr. Scullin. The point to be decided is whether we shall admit those nationals and if so, in what numbers? So much for alien labour. I feel that I may be misinterpreted as criticising the Government unduly. But let us take railway construction. Since the present Government came into office, 94 miles of railway have been constructed and handed over to the

Working Railways Department. I know that money has been tight and that the Government have had other difficulties to confront. Yet I do not think the most friendly supporter of the Government is satisfied that the construction of the Norseman-Salmon Gums railway and of the Lake Grace-Newdegate line marks a rate of progress in railway construction commensurate with the requirements of Western Australia. In this respect the Government have been a little too tardy.

The Honorary Minister: Your figures are wrong.

Hon. J. CORNELL: What other lines have been opened besides the Norseman-Salmon Gums, and the Lake Grace-Newdegate—both fortunately in my constituency? Certainly that rate of railway construction is not commensurate with the requirements of this State. Let me refer to the projected Kalgarin railway. Two years ago the people of Kalgarin were promised a railway if the Railway Advisory Board reported favourably before the closing of Parliament. That promise was made by the Premier. Yet I exonerate the Premier from all blame for what happened afterwards. The Premier promised that a Bill would be brought down to authorise the construction of the line, and that he would put £10,000 on the Loan Estimates for the preliminary survey. He did that, but he was over-ruled on the point of bringing down a Bill for the construction of the railway.

Hon. W. J. Mann: Then he, too, must have his bosses.

Hon. H. A. Stephenson: Who stopped him?

Hon. J. CORNELL: The Leader of the House can convey to the Premier the assurance that the people of Kalgarin think as I think, namely, that the Premier was not to blame for the non-fulfilment of his promise. The position at Kalgarin is this: Its nearest railway point, Kondinin, has the record as a wheat-receiving station in Western Australia. Over 50 per cent. of that record quantity of wheat was grown in the Kalgarin district, and hauled distances averaging 26 miles and as far as 52 miles over roads that the Chief Justice described in this way: "For want of another name we call them roads." On the promise of a railway, the Agricultural Bank advanced full loans to the settlers up to 35 miles from Kalgarin. Fortunately for the bank, there is down

there an excellent type of settler, and the district is a good one. The trouble was that the Kalgarin district had very little in common with the 3,500 farms scheme. As a matter of fact, the Railway Advisory Board recommended the construction of the Lake Grace-Kalgarin railway before the 3,500 farms scheme was adopted. Exactly the same may be said of the Bullfinch-Lake Brown railway. The trouble was that the Premier could not control the trend of events, and so it became impracticable for him to fulfil his promise to the Kalgarin people. However, I trust that railway will be authorised this session, for I am certain the Premier will agree that the building of the line is better warranted to-day than it was two years ago. I wish to refer to the Lake Magenta settlers, who are 35 miles from anywhere. That district is 35 miles from Pingrup and 35 miles from Newdegate. The settlers there have been allowed to go out on the land, but the Agricultural Bank, having been caught once over the Kalgarin district, is not going to be caught again. So those settlers, equal to the best settlers anywhere to be found in Western Australia, are to-day stranded 35 miles from a railway, and without any support from the Agricultural Bank. It is up to the powers that be to tell those people what the future holds for them. Then there is the position of the Ravenshorpe settlers. The Ravenshorpe and Hopetoun settlers have a railway, it is true, but it is of little use to them. That railway was constructed for mining purposes. If a man grows wheat at Ravenshorpe he is mulcted in a freight and handling charge of 11½d. per bushel, which, all farmers will agree, renders his position impossible. The continuation of the Newdegate railway eastward into the Lake King country, and thence south to Ravenshorpe, 30 miles, would take in the south end of the 3,500 farms scheme and link up Ravenshorpe with the main railway system. That would give to the settlers there an equal chance with those in other parts of the State of growing wheat at a profit. The Leader of the House knows that the position down there to-day is quite untenable, and that the Ravenshorpe people are only hanging on in the hope of better days. Then the Phillips River people should be told plainly whether or not there is any hope of a harbour being made at Hopetoun or, failing Hopetoun, at Culham

Inlet. If there be no chance of making a good harbour at either place they should be told which is going to be their nearest port. Some say that Hopetoun can be made into a harbour, while others hold that it cannot. Mr. Stileman is the man to give a decision, and the people of Phillips River would be perfectly satisfied with his finding.

Hon. G. W. Miles: Failing that, should they not connect with Albany?

Hon. J. CORNELL: No, with Esperance. I congratulate the Government on their settlement of miners at Southern Cross. No doubt many of these men will make good. Some of them, however, are as much as 35 miles from a railway, and are in an impossible position. If they are to be left there under such conditions, it were better they had never been sent there. Railway communication must be given to them as early as possible.

Hon. J. R. Brown: And so it will be.

Hon. J. CORNELL: There again a length of railway to serve them could be utilised to serve also a portion of the 3,500 farms scheme and eventually extended south-east to Salmon Gums, if the country in between is what the 3,500 farms area is said to be. I now come to the question of the Esperance harbour. Long and patiently have the local people waited for something to be done. It is expected that, as a wheat-growing proposition, the Esperance district will come into its own this season. If the Chief Secretary and I have little to thank ourselves for, we must appreciate the fact that though we are both older than the Esperance jetty, neither of us has yet become as decrepit. Anything is likely to happen to that structure. Reasonable harbour facilities should be given to the wheatgrower in the Esperance district as early as possible. The lack of such facilities must cause delay and add to the cost of handling. I also wish to refer to the Bullfinch, Turkey Hill, Wheatly water schemes. These schemes have hung fire more than two years. Whilst I congratulate the Government on their endeavour to proceed in a logical manner with the work of providing reasonable water supplies for the agricultural districts, I urge that some early consideration should be given to the settlers in these localities. They should be told whether or not reasonable water facilities are feasible, and at what cost. I understand it is proposed to provide water on the gravitation basis.

This will suit some of the farmers, but will not serve others. If I know anything of the future of that district, it will eventually become a mixed farming proposition, for wheat and sheep, and be one of the best in the State. Whilst people can grow wheat profitably on a limited water supply, it is impossible to run sheep unless there is an adequate supply of stock water available. A good deal of progress has been made in the district, and the settlers are grateful for what the Government have done, but the position warrants something more being done, and an early decision being arrived at with regard to water supply. That which has been done in the way of development in the last four years is an eye-opener. It brings home to anyone the responsibility that is entailed upon the Government to keep up with the ever advancing progress of the State, and provide those requirements that are so essential to its continued prosperity. Mr. Mann dealt in an admirable way with the South-West. I now wish to refer particularly to the Peel and Bateman Estates. As Mr. Holmes has probably told the House, he was chairman of the Royal Commission which made certain recommendations concerning the estates. Mr. Gray was also a member of the Commission. The report of that body was unanimous. I think I am safe in saying that the main consideration of members of the Commission, when they met to frame their report, was not as to what would be said, but as to what should not be said lest such statements might damage the reputation of the State.

Hon. A. Lovekin: That is so.

Hon. J. CORNELL: The Commission did not express one-tenth of the thoughts its members would have liked to express.

Hon. A. Lovekin: Quite correct.

Hon. J. CORNELL: It did not desire to damage the reputation of the State. Members who will take pains to read that report will find that, although the Commission consisted of laymen, practically everything that was said has come to pass. The mistakes and the continuation of the mistakes are chargeable to both Governments. Before the report of the Commission was available I heard the Minister for Mines (Hon. S. W. Munsie) using as a lever for the defeat of the late Government the evidence that was tendered before the Com-

mission, and putting it forward as the reason why the previous Government should be convicted of mal-administration, in respect of the Peel Estate if of nothing else. The Peel Estate has been carried on for almost four years since that eventful day, and the Minister in question has been a member of the Cabinet ever since. It is idle for the present Government to blame the previous one, or for the past Government to blame the present one. They are equally culpable. If they had taken the advice even of laymen they would not have landed the State in the position in which it now finds itself. The only thing to commend the estate is its proximity to the city. It is alleged that the engineers are at fault regarding drainage. Some members of the Commission said that if the drains constructed would be capable of carrying away the rush of water from the hills, then no commissioner knew enough about drainage to drain his own backyard. Not only has the scheme from the dairying point of view been condemned, but all the provisions that have been made for drainage and the prevention of flooding have also been condemned. All these failures are referred to in the report of the Commission, which was treated as so much waste paper. The main argument used against Mr. Holmes, Mr. Lovekin, and the Commission generally was that they were anxious to get even with Sir James Mitchell and put him into Opposition. I have never believed that statement. Sir James did get into Opposition, but this did not do away with the many facts the Commission sought to bring forward. The Commission recommended over four years ago that a board should be appointed, practically on the same lines as the board which has been appointed. The Commission was of opinion that if a board were appointed, its members should be paid higher salaries than any set of individuals ever received in this State, and that before long the State would be money in pocket, as the outcome of the economy that would be exercised in purchasing the requirements of the estates. That has truly come to pass. The money that has been squandered in making the purchases, without the direction of men who ought to know, has been tremendous. With regard to the 3,500 farms scheme, I am of opinion that, reasonably managed,

the areas in the South Province will deliver the goods. I am also of opinion that too much publicity has been given to the proposal. There has been a tendency to fly our own kite too high, and talk of the greatness of things which cannot be great for seven or eight years. I contend that has been another factor in adding to misconception in Western Australia, inasmuch as it has induced many men to come here who would otherwise have stayed away. I also wish to stress a point with regard to the use of migration money. If it is a contingency that 50 per cent. of migrants shall be brought into this country and given farms in that scheme, before the State receives the migration money, then I am opposed entirely to the principle. I consider there are enough Western Australians and Australians and other British people now domiciled in Australia to settle all that country. They should be given the prior right to take up the land, in preference to those who may be brought here and put upon it. If we turn our memories back we will recollect that all our agricultural development has been carried out with ordinary loan funds, and that our citizens have been given the opportunity to which they were entitled. I have yet to learn that any loss has been incurred by this method. If there has been a loss, it is generally speaking infinitesimal. We have at all events been able to develop our agricultural resources in the past. We do not know what we are doing if we take this cheap migration money, and agree that a sine qua non to getting it is that we shall bring a number of migrants from the Old Country, and put them on our wheat and sheep lands on the basis of fifty-fifty with our own Australian citizens.

Hon. A. Lovekin: It is really not cheap money.

Hon. J. CORNELL: No. All that cheap money is needed for is for the development of parts of the South-West where it takes a long time to bring land into a state of productivity. Our wheat and sheep land becomes reproductive, as many farmers know, almost from the start. The loss there is almost infinitesimal. I now come to the question of the recent revival of the mining industry in the Kalgoorlie district. I am pleased to see the signs there. Whether Kalgoorlie is destined to come into its own is mainly a question for the people concerned, plus reasonable Federal or State assistance, and all the high technical advice it is possible to ex-

tend to them. With regard to the dust troubles, and their effect upon miners, I have no fault to find with the medical examinations or the compensation side of the question, but I have some fault to find with the prevention side. Since the Miners' Phthisis Act was proclaimed, through Dr. Nelson we have conceived some idea of the medical side, but we have no idea of what is to follow on the other side, nor do we know what progress is being made in the methods to be adopted to arrest the disease and eliminate it from the industry. The essential side of miners' phthisis is not the medical inspection or compensation aspect; the essential side is the prevention of the cause which brings about the disease. Then there is the question of bringing a few old battlers now outside the pale within the scope of compensation, to which they are entitled without a shadow of doubt. It is only because of a mere technicality that they are excluded from the provisions of the Act. More humane consideration should be extended to them. The costs involved would not be great, and they certainly should get the benefit of any compensation that is available for them. I know of two men who together worked a show for years. One man gave it up and, with assistance from the prospecting board, went prospecting about two miles away. Later the other man threw up the mine, and his wife took it up in conjunction with another man and worked it as a prospecting area, the husband working for his wife. He underwent a medical examination, and as a result he is to-day receiving compensation. How he underwent medical examination I do not know, but he was medically examined and thus brought within the purview of the Act. The first man did not undergo a medical examination, and to-day he is at Wooroloo, drawing 4s. per week. Mr. Williams is conversant with that case, and I think he will say it is one upon which he can agree with me. Now I desire to refer to the use of Government motor cars. Recently there has been comment upon the use of Government motor cars for other than Government business. But what about the big guns? What about the Premier putting his motor car on the train and taking it off at Coolgardie to go to Esperance, going there in the interests of a party candidate, not even accompanied by the member for the district and without extending an invitation to the members representing the province? The Premier returned with his car to Kalgoorlie, and during the

whole of the trip he had with him the selected Labour candidate for the Senate. If the Premier can use a Government car in that manner and to that extent, it is time we were told what is the limit of Government officials in the same regard.

Hon. J. R. Brown: I suppose you use Government stamps on all those wires you send.

Hon. J. CORNELL: How about another Minister, who for a long time kept his motor on his own premises, driving it where he liked and when he liked? When comments are being made upon departmental officers using Government motor cars unduly, it is time someone had the temerity to complain of the use of motor cars by Ministers. I can give another instance, in which a Government motor car was in front of an hotel at midnight. I am sure that was not on Government business. It is well these things should be told, not for the purpose of hitting at any Government, but for the sake of common justice and by way of showing that the lesser offenders are not the only sinners. I desire to refer to three subjects of contemplated legislation that are mentioned in the Governor's Speech. One is redistribution of seats. Redistribution is generally accepted to be necessary from an equitable point of view, though it may be otherwise from the political aspect. However, we shall wait and see, as Mr. Asquith did. One vote one value would, in my opinion, be much better than the present position, though the principle is difficult to apply in a large area like Western Australia. The distribution of Assembly seats is hardly a matter in which the Council should interfere, unless the boundaries fixed were outrageous. We ought to allow the Assembly to fix the boundaries of its own seats without undue interference from this Chamber. If a redistribution comes about, the Kalgoorlie and Boulder district seats should be placed on the same basis as other country electorates. In that respect an anomaly exists, and the present arrangement is decidedly unfair. Now as to the proposed Bill for prevention of profiteering. The term "profiteering" has about as much to commend it as has the phrase "the right to work"; that is to say, from the point of view of legislating. It is my belief that anti-profiteering legislation in operation would prove just about as useful as price-fixing proved during the war. In other words, such legislation would defeat itself. Again, the term "profiteer" is about as

ambiguous as the term "wowsers," and has been given as many definitions. Wowsers generally confine themselves to two spheres—booze and badness. According to Mr. Brown, Babel was not in it, as numbers go, with the profiteer. I shall not follow up Mr. Brown's references to the quick and the dead, meaning law and medicine, except to suggest that Mr. Brown bring in a Bill authorising doctors to prescribe in peace, as they do in war, "medicine and duty," which would be equivalent to telling a patient to go back to work. As regards hospitals, my considered opinion is that care of and attention to the maimed, sick, and indigent is and should be a charge on the whole of any well-ordered and humane community. In regard to the contemplated Bill dealing with hospital finance, I say, therefore, that there is only one way to carry out the obligation—by imposing an equitable tax on wages and income, and not by cadging or gambling or speculative methods.

HON. C. B. WILLIAMS (South) [5.53]:

In the first place may I thank you, Mr. President, for the kind assistance you have rendered to me as a new member, and may I also thank hon. members generally, irrespective of politics, for the courteous consideration extended to me. The last speaker suggested that a little latitude was granted to new members. With all respect, I do not ask for any latitude. I am here to represent the electors in the same way as any other member, and if I have not the ability to hold up my end without being granted any latitude, I must fail. I desire to congratulate the Government on some of the work they have done during their last two or three years of office. I refer chiefly to the Miners' Phthisis Act, which has proved a great blessing to the unfortunate men in Kalgoorlie who, having developed tuberculosis, were compelled to leave the mines. There are now 600 or 700 of such cases, and the expenditure of the Government in this connection totalled, up to the end of last year, about £37,000. That is a burden which has been removed from the mining industry and placed on the State as a whole. The Governor's Speech contains some references to the mining industry, and I, as a representative of a province half mining and half farming, whilst appreciating the Government's efforts on behalf of the mining industry, still have to express the hope that the Government will

not contribute another penny towards that industry until the industry has done a certain thing for the State. The Government have granted assistance to the extent of £75,000 to the Sons of Gwalia mine, to prevent it from being salvaged, whilst they see Kalgoorlie mines being salvaged all the time. I do not know how members representing the district in which the Sons of Gwalia mine is situated have been able to convince the Government that it is essential for that particular mine to be assisted, while members representing the Kalgoorlie district are compelled to stand idly by and see the mines there being salvaged. It is a regrettable fact that the existing prosperity in the Kalgoorlie district is due to the fact that the largest mines there are being salvaged by way of tributing. I have nothing against tributing, which is a stage to which all mines must come eventually; but it is highly regrettable that the Government have put up so much money to assist the mining industry in regard to its industrial casualties. The amount of £37,000 which I have mentioned would have been, as it should have been, borne by the mines if this Chamber had done its duty about 16 years ago. However, that is too far to hark back to. To-day the Kalgoorlie mines are being salvaged by tributers, and 15-dwt. ore is being buried. On the other hand, Wiluna is being boomed as a low-grade proposition. The burying of ore at Kalgoorlie is due to the excessive terms demanded by the companies. Meantime the Government sit idly by instead of amending the law relating to tributing.

Hon. E. H. Harris: I suppose you know they promised to amend the law?

Hon. C. B. WILLIAMS: I understand that is so. I have had an opportunity of bringing the matter under the notice of the Minister for Mines, and I believe he will do something to remedy the position. It is a matter of urgency. Thousands of tons of 15-dwt. ore in the Kalgoorlie mines are being buried. The tributer is compelled to bury that ore because tributing charges are so exorbitant that he can get nothing out of it.

Hon. E. H. Harris: The South Kalgurli mine treats 9-dwt. ore.

Hon. C. B. WILLIAMS: Yes, and shows a decent profit on it every month. No other mine there treats less than ½-oz. ore. However, the tributer cannot treat ore under 15 dwts. While that state

of affairs continues, the Government should not contribute another penny-piece to the assistance of the gold mining industry, notwithstanding what that industry did for Western Australia years ago. I trust the Government will introduce such an amendment of the law relating to tributing as will permit tributers to work the ore in question. My main concern in this matter is that the Act should be so amended that the tributer will get 50 per cent. of the proceeds of ore landed at the shaft. On the Great Boulder mine he gets a little more than that, but on the Lake View and Star he is lucky if he gets from 30 to 33 per cent. A tributer has to work pretty well ounce stone before he can make wages. If he works 2-oz. or 3-oz. stone, he probably makes £10 or £12 per week. The waste resulting from the inequitable conditions is terrible to contemplate. Hon. members will understand that I am speaking of sulphide ores. I trust some notice will be taken of my remarks. No doubt it is peculiar that a mining member should express himself as opposed to the granting of any more assistance to the mining industry, but I say in all sincerity that such an attitude should be maintained until the mining companies show some initiative in working their mines for the profit of the shareholders. At present men investing money in Kalgoorlie gold mines may as well say good-bye to it. They have not the slightest hope of getting their money back in view of the present methods adopted in working the mines. I say that as a practical miner and as the organiser of the union that is mostly concerned with mining operations. I know the ramifications of the industry from A to Z.

Hon. W. T. Glasheen: Do you suggest inefficient work in the mines?

Hon. C. B. WILLIAMS: No. I suggest that there has been inefficient management of the mines for years past, not inefficient work. I will refer to that phase more fully when dealing with the foreign question. Touching upon that phase of mining operations, I do not agree with the remarks of Mr. Hamersley and others regarding the employment of foreigners. Since I have been in the State, some 18 or 19 years now, I have worked with foreigners in the mines and elsewhere. I have probably seen more foreigners than most of the other hon. members of this Chamber. I have seen 400 of them in one camp. I have nothing against

the Italians or the Slavs. I found fine mates and splendid men amongst them, but my first duty is to the race from which I have sprung. When I have seen Britishers unable to get work while foreigners were able to secure jobs, it has roused my ire. I have seen alleged Britishers employ foreigners who have scarcely been able to speak English sufficiently to enable them to go underground. In some instances the men really could not speak enough English to warrant their employment in mines. Yet those men could get work and good Britishers had to join in unemployed demonstrations! No wonder it is time that these things were looked into. Mr. Hamersley said that the foreigners were only fit to clear land. I understand that Mr. Hamersley belongs to one of the oldest families in this State. Who farmed the land in the early days? Did Italians clear the land for the early settlers? No, it was the British settler who did that work! In the circumstances did not the remarks of Mr. Hamersley cast a slur upon the race from which he has sprung? Was it not a slur upon our race when he said that only foreigners were fit to do the work?

Hon. V. Hamersley: I did not say that the foreigners were the only men fit to do the work.

Hon. C. B. WILLIAMS: That is what I understood the hon. member to say. If I am wrong, I will willingly correct the statement.

Hon. V. Hamersley: Further than that, I am not employing foreigners.

Hon. C. B. WILLIAMS: That is all to the credit of the hon. member. I assumed from his remarks that he had employed them.

Hon. V. Hamersley: But I want to get the land cleared somehow, for the more land we get cleared, the more work there will be provided.

Hon. C. B. WILLIAMS: Evidently the hon. member has more brains than to waste his time employing these foreigners. Who cleared the land in Western Australia? Did the Italians or the Slavs do that work?

Hon. V. Hamersley: A great deal of it.

Hon. C. B. WILLIAMS: Only latterly.

Hon. V. Hamersley: And latterly they have cleared land for the Government!

Hon. C. B. WILLIAMS: I agree with the hon. member that it is regrettable the Government should have employed 200 or more foreigners.

Hon. G. W. Miles: And that a Labour Government, too.

Hon. C. B. WILLIAMS: I am not concerned whether it was a Labour Government or any other Government. The Labour Government represent the workers just as I do, and I do not worry about them any more than they worry about me.

Hon. W. T. Glasheen: Do you admit these foreigners to your unions?

Hon. C. B. WILLIAMS: Yes. I have already said I have no fault to find with Italians or Slavs, but I intend to stick up for my own country and to see that in the land of my birth, people of British stock shall have the prior right to work that is available. I would not disown my Motherland nor would I expect my Motherland to disown me, when it came to providing me with employment. If we were in a foreign country, we would not receive that preference. How many men have made fortunes out of the employment of Italians in the mines? How many shift bosses and underground managers have made fortunes by employing them at so much per head.

Hon. E. H. Harris: Shift bosses?

Hon. C. B. WILLIAMS: Yes. For instance, there was a job at the Gwalia mine. The Britisher was killed and the price of his job was a gold watch and the foreigner stepped in.

Hon. W. T. Glasheen: Yet you admire men who would do that sort of thing?

Hon. C. B. WILLIAMS: I do not say that I admire men of that description. On the other hand, we have had the remarks of Mr. Cornell who is supposed to be so patriotic. For my part, I am supposed to be one of the worst of the red ragers. During the war I stood up only for men of my own race. Mr. Cornell is the patriot. I am not supposed to be a patriot at all. On the other hand, I am ashamed to hear hon. members advocating the employment of these foreigners, some of whom fought against our men in the war. Some of them came here with the blood of some of our poor fellows on their hands. Some of them were enemy subjects who fought against us during the war, but they came here and were provided with jobs. When I see that sort of thing happening and Britishers, who wear the returned soldier's badge—better soldiers than ever Mr. Cornell was—walking about and unable to get work, and then hear remarks such as we have heard in Parliament

about the employment of foreigners, I certainly feel hurt. It has not pleased me to see in the city 300 or 400 men, many of whom came out from England with the promise of wealth in store for them here—I do not say that the Labour Government brought them out or the Federal Government—marching in unemployed demonstrations. In this House we have heard members of Parliament and outside there have been business people too, who have advocated the employment of foreigners to the detriment of their own flesh and blood. Will men of that type look at their children and be able to say, perhaps when they are going to their last long rest, to them, "I was not one of those willing to see foreigners provided with work while those who fought for the country were not able to secure employment." I claim that many of these mines never could be made to pay while the present system continues. The Golden Horsehoe and the Sons of Gwalia mines were unable to show a profit. Why is that? It is because those mines were manned underground to the extent of 98 per cent. foreigners. In such circumstances, those mines never could be made to pay because those foreigners lack the initiative of the Australian or British miner. I had one experience on the Horsehoe. I was out of work and was supposed to be one of those agitators. I was friendly with the bosses, yet I could not get a job. Underground there could not be found one Britisher to 20 Italians. When I spoke to one of the bosses he said, "I do not think we will put you on underground. You ought to have a job on the surface." I told him I was a miner and did not seek a surface job. I did not get a job, and I was three months out of work. The moment my back was turned, however, eight foreigners were taken on.

Hon. E. H. Harris: What would you advance as the reason for that?

Hon. C. B. WILLIAMS: Possibly the manager could have said that I was an inferior miner.

Hon. E. H. Harris: He might not have been able to say that.

Hon. C. B. WILLIAMS: I know he would.

Hon. J. R. Brown: Look out, he is trying to trap you!

Hon. E. H. Harris: But surely there was a reason.

Hon. C. B. WILLIAMS: Of course, and it was to be found in the palm-oil the foreigners put in the hands of the boss and thus secured the job. That was the explanation.

Hon. J. Nicholson: Had you not better justify that statement?

Hon. C. B. WILLIAMS: Of course I can.

Hon. J. Nicholson: I do not think it is a fair thing to make such a statement about people on the goldfields unless you can justify your allegation.

Hon. C. B. WILLIAMS: I have already told the House that I happen to know the ramifications of the industry, and I know what these people do.

Hon. J. Nicholson: Have you one instance you can give us of such a thing having been done?

Hon. C. B. WILLIAMS: If I had an instance that I could have proved, I would certainly have done so long ago. As a lawyer, the hon. member will admit that if I were to offer him £5 to do a job for me, it would be very hard to produce a third person to prove that I had made that offer.

Hon. J. Nicholson: Why make an allegation like that, when you say you cannot prove it?

Hon. C. B. WILLIAMS: Because I know. While I know that my statement is true, I also know that it is extremely difficult to prove such an assertion. As a lawyer, the hon. member will admit that it is often possible to know that a thing is true, and yet not be able to prove it.

Hon. J. Nicholson: Such allegations as you have made should not be made unless you have proof.

Hon. E. H. Harris: Has the hon. member ever said that outside?

Hon. C. B. WILLIAMS: Yes. I have said it and will say it again any time I like. I do not know what protection I am afforded by the Standing Orders of the Legislative Council. I have not been here long enough to learn that. I am not afraid to make my statements outside.

Hon. J. Nicholson: It is a most unjust charge to make against the mine managers and others to whom you have referred.

Hon. J. R. Brown: It is done every day in Kalgoorlie.

Hon. C. B. WILLIAMS: I am not making any unjust charge against them at all. I say there are men in the industry who would not employ these men and give them preference unless there was the reason that I have given.

Hon. J. Nicholson: You are accusing them of bribery.

Hon. C. B. WILLIAMS: I am.

Hon. J. Nicholson: Then you should justify that charge.

The PRESIDENT: Order! I must ask hon. members to allow Mr. Williams to proceed with his speech.

Hon. J. R. Brown: Look out for the legal mind.

Hon. C. B. WILLIAMS: I am not worrying about legal minds or anything else. After all, a legal mind is merely a legal mind; justice is another matter. I have been sorry indeed to hear preference urged for foreigners while hundreds of our kith and kin have been unable to secure employment. If our own kith and kin could secure employment, I would not be speaking along these lines. The time may come when I shall be able to draw the attention of hon. members of this House to the unpatriotic stand they have taken on this occasion. In Kalgoorlie if we had, say, 700 Britishers employed instead of the foreigners it would mean at least an additional 1,500 souls to the population. Instead of the money paid to the foreigners going out of the country, the wages earned by the British workmen would remain in the country. Of course, I know that one who speaks along the lines I have adopted and protests against the employment of foreigners, is, politically speaking, asking to have his head cut off.

Hon. Sir William Lathlain: What is the proportion of foreign miners to the Britishers?

Hon. C. B. WILLIAMS: Underground from 20 to 25 per cent. At the Sons of Gwalia the percentage would be 95 in favour of foreigners. That was the position until the Government granted the management there an advance of £75,000 with the stipulation they had to employ Britishers.

Hon. E. H. Harris: That was merely a suggestion.

Hon. C. B. WILLIAMS: No. The Minister for Mines informs me that that was

the stipulation made. The same applied at the Horseshoe mine.

Hon. W. T. Glasheen: Has the Sons of Gwalia mine being paying?

Hon. C. B. WILLIAMS: No, not for years. That was due to the fact that the management would not employ British miners and they suffered in consequence, just as the Horseshoe mine and other mines have suffered.

Hon. V. Hamersley: Is that stipulation carried out at the Sons of Gwalia mine?

Hon. C. B. WILLIAMS: I understand that it is carried out and that any Britisher going there can get a job. Recently the secretary of the local union was at Boulder and we asked him that question. He told us that the stipulation was being observed and that if we had any British miners desiring employment, we could send them along.

Hon. W. J. Mann: What is the proportion at Kalgoorlie?

Hon. C. B. WILLIAMS: The percentage of foreigners there is about 20. The managements there require men with brains about their plants. They do not put foreigners in charge of the gold, but put them on to the rough work.

Hon. W. J. Mann: Then that bears out what Mr. Hamersley said.

Hon. C. B. WILLIAMS: I do not subscribe to the statements made by Mr. Hamersley, particularly when Britishers are out of work. We have heard mine managers advocating the introduction of black labour. They have said that work underground is not for white men. In view of the fact that 600 men have been taken out of the mines suffering from tuberculosis, I am inclined to agree that the work is not for white men. The fact remains that there are white men wanting that work and we do not want black labour introduced into this country. It is wrong to say that because there is rough work to be done, the Britishers cannot do it, but the foreigners can get the work. I know that the great reason for employing foreigners in land clearing is that they clear it cheaply.

Hon. J. R. Brown: Cheap and nasty!

Hon. C. B. WILLIAMS: They work long hours and do not demand the standard of conditions that Australians and Britishers require. If that policy is to be carried to its logical conclusion, we must learn from what has happened elsewhere. We can look

at what has happened in some parts of America and what is happening in Queensland. There the foreigners took control of the farming operations and that is what will happen in this State if we allow foreigners to get on the land and farm it.

Hon. Sir William Lathlain: But 2 per cent. only can come here.

Hon. C. B. WILLIAMS: That is all moonshine.

Hon. Sir William Lathlain: No. It is not.

Hon. C. B. WILLIAMS: Let the hon. member go to Kurrawang and see the hundreds of foreigners there.

Hon. W. J. Mann: And how long have they been there?

Hon. C. B. WILLIAMS: For years, and they are still going there.

Sitting suspended from 6.15 to 7.30 p.m.

Hon. C. B. WILLIAMS: I was dealing with the question of alien labour as it affected farmers, who probably want cheap labour. Let me point out where that is likely to end. If the farming land of this State fell into the hands of settlers coming from overseas and unaccustomed to our standard of living, probably the farmers would not be protected as they are to-day, but would have to sell their wheat without the Government assistance they have received for years. Probably the cheaper labourers might be able to undersell them in wheat, and then all their efforts at clearing the land would have proved unavailing. I think I have said enough to show that our people owe something to the land of their birth and to the race from which they have sprung. In all instances one should give preference to his own kith and kin before thinking of giving work to foreigners. I see quite enough of foreigners in everyday life to satisfy me, and I was astounded to hear members say that work should be given to those people while hundreds of our own race are walking the streets and clamouring for bread. I now wish to direct the attention of the Government to anomalies in the Workers' Compensation Act. One relates to the lump sum settlement for miners' phthisis under the third schedule. Under that schedule a man is entitled to compensation in the shape of half wages up to £750, but should he seek a lump sum settlement, after six months, a deduction of four per cent. is made. That is in accordance with a decision of the Kalgoorlie magistrate. He has allowed the in-

surance office—the State insurance office—four per cent. for a lump sum settlement.

Hon. G. W. Miles: Is the State Insurance Office still going?

Hon. C. B. WILLIAMS: Yes; I understand it is being carried on under the law of the land.

Hon. G. W. Miles: I do not think it is the law of the land.

Hon. J. R. Brown: It is under the law here.

Hon. C. B. WILLIAMS: I may be wrong, but I thought the Government obtained authority from this House to deal with workers' compensation insurance under the third schedule. Anyhow, such insurance is being carried on and fortunately so, for otherwise the people of the State would have to bear the liability. If the mining companies had to pay the premium that the outside insurance companies require, they would have to close down, not that that would do very much harm. Still, we need the gold and it has to be got, and the men engaged in getting it are entitled to their compensation. Should a man come under the third schedule, he has to face a court case. The State Insurance Office wanted six per cent. for a lump sum settlement, but the magistrate awarded four per cent. Still, it is an injustice that that deduction should be made. If a man loses two arms or two legs he receives £750, but a man who loses his health and has probably only 12 or 18 months to live—few of them live much longer than that—is entitled to a lump sum to enable him to start a little business which his wife and children might be able to carry on. I know that the Labour Government do not stand for that sort of thing, and I hope that an amendment will be introduced this session to rectify it. An amendment made to the Government Bill at the instigation of Mr. Seddon should be reconsidered. No doubt Mr. Seddon thought he was doing right when he moved the amendment embodied in Section 7 to allow of the payment of a percentage. Subsection 13 of that section reads—

Subject to the provisions of this section, if a worker, disabled by disease from earning full wages at the work at which he was employed, is found to be suffering from a disease to which this section does not apply, and also from silicosis, pneumoconiosis, or miners' phthisis, and his disability is partially caused by such industrial disease due to the nature of his employment, the worker shall be entitled to a proportionate part of the compensation payable under this section apportioned to the degree to which such disability is caused by

silicosis, pneumoconiosis, or miners' phthisis as the case may be.

When Mr. Seddon moved his amendment he might have thought he was doing something useful for the mine workers.

Hon. E. H. Harris: That would allow of men getting some compensation who hitherto could not get anything.

Hon. C. B. WILLIAMS: I should like the hon. member to tell me of any such case.

Hon. E. H. Harris: There are cases.

Hon. C. B. WILLIAMS: I should like the hon. member to tell me a case. I have been in close touch with this class of worker during the last few years and I am satisfied that the provision should be amended. There were a couple of men who were pronounced as having 50 per cent. silicosis and 50 per cent. something else, and who did not receive compensation, but at present they are receiving it.

Hon. H. Seddon: One of them has not got it yet.

Hon. C. B. WILLIAMS: Probably the hon. member knows the case. I think he is referring to a man named Davis.

Hon. H. Seddon: Yes.

Hon. C. B. WILLIAMS: Probably the hon. member is correct. That man was adjudged to be suffering from 10 per cent. silicosis. The provision as it stands in the Act has a boomerang effect. When a man suffering from miners' phthisis knocks off work, he does so on account of the phthisis and not on account of other complaints from which he might be suffering. He has probably worked for years while suffering from rupture, weak heart or even weak head. I sometimes think that all miners must be suffering from weak head or they would not go into the mines. When the doctors discover that a man is suffering from weak heart or some complaint of the kind, it is apportioned accordingly, but if any of the doctors in charge of the Government laboratory at Kalgoorlie are asked, they say definitely that they cannot define the percentage of silicosis in a man's lungs. Yet when it comes to a question of compensation, they can discover it and bring it down to a very fine point. Let me quote the case of a man named Tom Smith. The present doctor at the laboratory said he was suffering from ten per cent. silicosis. Of course that is nothing; it is neither here nor there. We had a medical board convened and Dr. Mitchell said that the doctor in the laboratory did not know what he was talking about. The three

doctors did not waste ten minutes in concluding that the man was suffering 100 per cent. silicosis and was incapacitated from working. I hope the Government will reconsider that subsection because it is of no benefit to anybody. The Act says that when a man is unable to follow his occupation and earn his usual wages, he shall be compensated. Although we have had to fight for compensation, we have eventually obtained it, but the provision in Section 7 is going to be of no use to any sufferers under the third schedule. I hope the matter will be considered this session so that it can be amended to give satisfaction to the men concerned.

Hon. E. H. Harris: The Government accepted the amendment without a word.

Hon. C. B. WILLIAMS: And when the miners' representatives approached the Government, the Government blamed Mr. Seddon and this House for it. I understand that Mr. Harris was one of the managers at the conference.

Hon. G. W. Miles: We are blamed for all their mistakes.

Hon. C. B. WILLIAMS: I do not favour giving the mining industry another shilling of assistance until such time as the mines are worked on a systematic basis for the benefit of the shareholders and not for the few men who have control. I wish to support the remarks of Mr. Cornell regarding the railway lines required in the South Province. A big land settlement scheme is to be embarked upon in that province shortly. At present, large numbers of men are being settled there. In the miners' settlement at Southern Cross, there are between 80 and 90 men. We thank the Government for their humane action in taking those men out of the mines and giving them an opportunity to live a little longer than they would have done had they remained in the mines. Let me revert for a moment to the question of the foreigners. None of those men in the miners' settlement is under 40 years of age. All of them have worked from 25 to 30 years in the mines. Now they have gone to the miners' settlement and are able to clear the land and make a living while clearing it. They are paid 30s. a day. The payment was 25s. a day, but it was increased to 30s. on account of the men's health. None of those men is complaining except on the score of the water supply. It seems to me that Government undertakings are often carried

a certain distance, but not far enough. A line of pipes was laid and was stopped six miles short of where it was required. I am blaming, not the Government, but the officials. Those men have to cart water for distances up to nine miles and pay £3 per hundred gallons for it, whereas another six miles of piping would have served them. The men have offered to lay the pipes if the Government will provide them. It is a shame that men should be put on the land and should then have to pay such a charge for water when it could be made available to them at the expense of 6 miles of piping. I trust the Minister for Goldfields Water Supply will make available the six miles of pipes, so that those men will have the water brought within two or three miles of them. We are anxious to learn whether the line from the Esperance district is to be run from Salmun Gums westwards, or whether the strongest and longest pull will come from the Kalgarin or Ravensthorpe district. I hope that the settlers who are 30 or 40 miles from a railway will be given relief as soon as possible. The Government should display some of the broad vision that characterised our statesmen of 25 or 30 years ago. Sir John Forrest built the Fremantle harbour and the Goldfields Water Supply and trusted to posterity to pay for them. Those works were in the interests of the State, and on the prosperity of Kalgoorlie the State was practically built up. I hope the Government will not worry about showing any surplus and that next year we shall not hear the same cry about the unemployed. There are plenty of railway lines required in that district and I trust that as soon as the Government can get the money to build them, they will push on with the construction so that settlers will be brought within reasonable distance of facilities to carry their wheat to market. I have very little to say with regard to unemployment. It is one of the subjects, my views on which agree with those of Mr. Cornell. I have been associated with a few demonstrations in my time, demonstrations of unemployed and of other people, but I have always believed in law and order. Still, when a crowd of men march in orderly procession, such as the unemployed usually do, they try to show to the people the trouble they are in. In the recent instance, if the unemployed had not adopted the stand they

actually took, there would not have been any hurry-up to get them work. Everybody would have taken the subject of unemployment as a matter of course, and no notice would have been taken. As soon as the men demonstrated, the people and the powers that be took notice. With all demonstrations of this kind, as soon as the police begin to interfere and start to kick, well then there are kicks in return, and then perhaps a riot is started, and there follows a bad advertisement for the country. I am glad that the trouble in the recent demonstrations did not go very far. If there had been any desire to cause trouble, it would have been caused long before the police took a hand. It is not right that the police should be brought into the matter at all. It would be sufficient for one policeman to march with the men to keep them in order. One policeman could do just as much as a lot of galloping troopers. There is another matter to which I wish to refer, though it is hardly worthy of notice. Life is too serious to worry about trifles such as Mr. Cornell mentioned here, but in justice to the Premier I must allude to it. It is the question of the Premier using a Government car in going through the Esperance district and not inviting the members of the district to join him. I did not complain when the hon. member used Government stamps to warn everyone along the track that Mr. Collier was not game to address a meeting at Boulder, that he had left the train at Coolgardie to proceed to Esperance, and to beware of any eleventh hour promises that might be made.

Hon. E. H. Harris: They did not need that warning.

Hon. C. B. WILLIAMS: No, they did not. Mr. Collier never made any promises that he was not able to keep.

Hon. J. Cornell: I ask the hon. member to withdraw the statement that I used Government Stamps on telegrams I sent to Esperance. I sent the telegrams but did not use Government stamps.

Hon. C. B. WILLIAMS: I did not say you did; I asked whether you did. Anyhow, I will accept the statement that you did not. I do not know whether Mr. Collier used a Government car or not; I was only concerned about winning the election with his good assistance. Further than that, the hon. member may not know that Mr. Collier has received congratulations from

the Esperance Road Board for the good work he has done for the district and the State generally. The Esperance Road Board, the hon. member will admit, is far from being a supporter of the Labour Party. Neither did I mention that I have seen the Hon. James Cornell riding in a mines car at Coolgardie with an inspector of mines who should have been attending to his work at the Lloyd George Mine. I say nothing about that, and the hon. member should be the last to tackle the Premier of the State for using a Government motor car in the Esperance district. But is the country getting so paltry that the Leader of the Government must go cap in hand to the hon. member or to a member of another place before he can use one of the Government cars? I should have treated the remarks with the contempt they deserved. Other people see things, but they are not such nose-pickers. I will leave it at that. To my mind the hon. member's reference to this subject is paltry. For what Mr. Collier did in support of my election I am grateful, and he also did something for the State.

Hon. E. H. Harris: When he brought you in?

Hon. C. B. WILLIAMS: The hon. member knows that the Premier did something for the State when he brought me in. I am very pleased the hon. member realises that open confession is good for the soul; it is one of the best statements he ever made. I am not saying anything about the gentleman I defeated; he is a friend of mine. So far as the employment of foreigners is concerned, I appeal to the people as Britishers always to employ their own countrymen. I support the motion.

HON W. T. GLASHEEN (South-East) [7.50]: I again wish to join issue with the other speakers in extending a welcome to the new members of this House, and while doing that I desire to express regret at the absence of those who fell by the wayside. I also take this opportunity to congratulate the newly appointed Honorary Minister (Mr. Kitson). During my first association with him in this House I found him to be a good logical and analytical reasoner, moderate in his views, and I am sure he will adorn his new position in this Chamber. While saying that, I

congratulate the member who has just resumed his seat upon his maiden speech. It is because of what he said that I have risen to my feet. I had no intention of speaking to-night, but I thought that while his remarks were fresh in my mind I would like to make some comment upon them. Never during my brief sojourn in this House have I listened to such serious allegations as the hon. member made with regard to the mining industry. In effect he told us that the industry was absolutely seething with corruption, and the form the corruption was taking was a form of bribery. He said he considered the inefficiency of the mines at Kalgoorlie and at other centres was mainly brought into being because of the effect of inefficient labour, and that that labour consisted of what we on the goldfields called, not Italians, but dagos—the term by which we always knew the foreigners. The hon. member told us that on one mine there were employed 90 per cent. of these foreigners, and they had no justification for being there other than the justification of having got there by giving something in the shape of palm oil to the shift bosses. That is a most serious accusation to make, and I can only conclude that if that is so, and these men have been employed in the mines for a considerable time, it is impossible for the bribery business to rest with the shift bosses, that it must permeate the whole of the management as well, because no manager of a mine with any common sense of perception could long reign in his job without being well aware what was taking place. The hon. member told the House he was not afraid to make this statement anywhere; he would make it in the street as he was making it here, and he added, “Those people well know what I am speaking about because I suppose they read ‘Hansard.’” That is not the point. The point is that a statement made in Parliament is made under special privilege, and if it be libellous, no one outside has any redress. My suggestion is this, that if there is any truth in the statement, it is deplorable in the extreme, and the hon. member has his remedy. To be logical and to be complete he has no alternative but to put the necessary machinery in motion and move for the constitution of a Royal Commission to inquire into the truth or otherwise of the statements he made. With re-

gard to the management of the mines, all I can say is that I know one particular manager intimately. The gentleman to whom I refer has held a responsible position almost since the inception of the mining industry, that position being the chairmanship of the Chamber of Mines. I make this statement that he at least stands high above corruption, and having been associated with the industry for so long and so honourably, I cannot conceive that he would not have any knowledge of what the hon. member suggested had taken place. Anyhow, I am not saying that the statements are false or true: I am merely saying that they have been made in this House, and the only logical procedure to follow seeing that the accusations are so serious, is to go on with the job to its conclusion and conduct an inquiry through the medium of a Royal Commission. That is all I have to say about that. Some members have expressed regret that in the Governor's Speech the whole of the legislative programme of the Government was not outlined. I do not know that it is possible to outline the whole of the legislation in a Governor's Speech, because very often legislation comes along as the circumstances of the session unfold themselves, and it would be impossible to have any indication of the whole of the measures it was contemplated to bring before the House. There are at least two specific Bills referred to in the Speech, and they relate to redistribution and profiteering. The House was rather indebted to Mr. Brown for the speech he made last night in which he indicated in one particular instance the line that the suggested legislation was going to follow. I can only say that if that line is followed, doctors and lawyers are in for a rotten time. I was very sorry to hear the hon. member say that he had had an unfortunate experience with doctors. My experience has been just the reverse. My experience of the medical profession has been of the happiest kind and I will ever feel indebted to one member of it for an operation performed which saved my life. I do not care what bill is sent in—I have not received it yet—but when I pay it I will consider that I am paying good value for services rendered. Taking special instances, we may find, perhaps, that there are quacks amongst lawyers and quacks amongst doctors, and I would also venture to say there are quacks amongst members of Parliament who are not rendering services commensurate with

the salaries they receive. If that is the line the profiteering Bill is going to follow, I have not much hope for it. There is one big proposal, to my mind the biggest proposal ever undertaken in this State, or in any State of Australia—I refer to the 3,500 farms scheme. That is a colossal undertaking, and possibly when it is finished there will be an expenditure of £10,000,000 involved. I think it will eclipse the group settlement scheme in magnitude. We ought to congratulate ourselves on having such a splendid belt of country still unsettled and, judging by recent applications for land, that we have in our own population almost sufficient intending settlers to occupy the blocks to be allocated. But I would sound a note of warning. We have had experience of rushing pell mell into big schemes involving millions of money, and generally as time went on, we found ourselves in a position from which the only escape was the writing off huge amounts of over-capitalisation. Contemplating this scheme of 3,500 farms and a possible expenditure of £10,000,000, I would suggest that at the very initial stages the wisest thing to do would be to take warning by our experience of the group settlement scheme. In respect of that scheme, after having to write off a couple of million pounds, we conceived the idea of appointing a board of men who knew the job, and assigning to them the task of re-allotting the blocks in order to give each settler a chance to work out an independence and a home. The same grave danger underlies this new huge scheme. It is of no use making speeches and claiming that everything in the garden will be lovely. If we look up the returns of income taxation, a most reliable criterion, we shall find that the great majority of farmers, well established, with facilities at their doors, and more fertile fields to cultivate than those out in the new area, nevertheless have not had to pay any income tax, simply because they are not earning sufficient income. If that is so in our more fertile areas, with lesser railway freights, and with lesser fertility, it is going to be still more accentuated in those outer areas. If this scheme is not taken hold of at the very beginning, as the group settlement scheme has recently been taken hold of, we shall find it in much the same position in ten years' time as that other great project in the South-West. If we are wise, from the very initia-

tion of the work we shall appoint three or four, or five or six of the best and most practical men and say to them, "There is the job. It is your work to see that it is carried on along economically sound lines." If that is done, probably we shall avoid many grave mistakes that must otherwise occur. There is much that might be said regarding the existing system of railways and the present method of levying freight upon primary production. In looking over the Year Book for 1926, I found that up to that period the State had spent £20,000,000 on railway construction. Side by side with that I found an item of just under £1,000,000 representing interest on the capital construction. Alongside that again was an item showing that the total working cost of the railways in 1926—perhaps it is still more now—was £2,500,000. Setting that beside the £1,000,000 representing interest on capital construction, we find that it means between 30 per cent. and 40 per cent. of the total. The system is this: Freightage on the railways is based to meet running costs, administrative charges and interest on capital. If there is anything in our public service that constitutes what we might call a national facility, it is the railways. At the present time those who pay the freight are paying the capital cost of construction and paying also running charges. That is a false principle. The interest on capital expenditure on a national facility should be a charge against Consolidated Revenue, not against freight. If we take the £1,000,000 interest against the £2,500,000 running costs, and if we were to wipe that off and make it a charge against Consolidated Revenue, we could reduce the freight charges on primary production by between 30 per cent. and 40 per cent. Were that done we would find a tremendous revival in all things that constitute primary production. Light lands—and there are millions of acres of them—would be made profitable, and the mines of Kalgoorlie just below the point of production could be brought into active operation as the result of that 30 per cent. or 40 per cent. reduction in freights. Those mines, hundreds of them would employ thousands of men and come into operation again. And so we would get more revenue indirectly from that process than is represented by the interest on capital cost of railway construction. I suggest this might well be considered. I

do not think any part of the interest on the capital cost of the construction of railways should be embodied in the freightage charged on primary production. I have something I specially wish to mention, and I hope the Chief Secretary will listen attentively, for it is a subject that concerns his department. It has to do with the education of school children in the country. Some years ago it was thought that parents in the country, living more than three miles from a school were at some disadvantage, and the Education Department drew up regulations under which those parents would be granted a driving allowance of 6d. per child per day. That obtained for a considerable time. Then the Education Department found they were paying more than they had expected when the regulation was drawn up.

Hon. E. H. Gray: Because the regulation was largely abused.

Hon. W. T. GLASHEEN: It was never abused. Fresh regulations were made, to the effect that any parent with a net income of over £400 would not be able to claim the school driving allowance. I mention this because a particular friend of mine lately showed me his income tax assessment. That assessment revealed that he had a net income of £140. In view of this, he naturally concluded that he was qualified to claim the school driving allowance for his children, of whom he had six, all of school age. Since he was entitled to deduct £50 per child from his income tax return, a total reduction of £300, his net income for taxation purpose was only £140. But when he applied for the school driving allowance he got the astounding reply that he was not qualified at all, that although, according to the Taxation Department, his net income was £140, yet since the Education Department did not recognise any deduction for children in the assessment, his net income was, not £140, but £440.

Hon. E. H. Gray: Well, what is wrong with that?

Hon. W. T. GLASHEEN: Only that the number of children that man had, disqualified him from getting the school driving allowance. I specially draw the Chief Secretary's attention to that. Moreover, I want to draw his attention to this: In the city at present, irrespective of whether or not a man is a millionaire, his children attending the State school travel over the State railways, if not for nothing at all, at any rate

for a merely nominal charge. If a man in the city having a large income has also that concession in respect of his children, then if there is sincerity in the popular assertion that we wish to treat generously the people in the back country, let us give them their school driving allowance, irrespective of income. The £400 net income would not be so unsatisfactory if it were based on the income taxation assessment. But when the Education Department actually use a man's children to bring up his income to £440, I can only say I am amazed at such a policy. Before sitting down I wish to again draw attention to that 3,500 farms scheme. You, Sir, representing a portion of the great area to be developed by that scheme, must know the geography of that area just as well as I do. Consequently you will realise that, going through Narembreen and Kalgarin and around to Kulin, one strikes the Fremantle zone. In other words, all the products from that district must go to Fremantle. No scheme of that magnitude can ever be complete unless effectively linked by the shortest possible route with the port to which it will deliver its products. Knowing the district as you do, Sir, you will not need to be told that all the produce that comes from that huge area down to Kulin will have to go to Fremantle. When we consider the great cartage charges Kalgarin people for years have had to pay for lack of a railway to Kondinin, it will be seen that in the aggregate, those charges would suffice to build the railway. The point is that it has all to go, when Kalgarin and the surrounding districts are linked up with Kondinin, right around through Narrogin. It strikes the crow-line from Kalgarin and Brookton and on to Armadale. When it gets to Brookton there is another loop to Spencer's Brook, and each loop is approximately 40 miles in length, aggregating 80 miles of excessive freightage on all the products that will be delivered from that proportion of the 3,500 farms scheme. In spite of the statement of the Premier to a deputation a little while ago that he will not shorten any existing route while there are yet people without any railway at all, I assert that that scheme, which we all hope and trust will be entirely successful, will never be linked into effectiveness with a line straight through from Kalgarin to Fremantle. It has been

indicated that already the decision has been arrived at that a line should be run from Southern Cross southward, terminating at Lake Grace. Knowing the geographical position so well, and the great possibilities of that part of the country, for I live not far from it, and have been engaged for 17 years on the job, I breathe the hope that no authority on matters of railway construction will be so short-sighted as to stop at Lake Grace, and that the line will continue from there to the coast, and proceed until it reaches the Albany harbour. It is my earnest hope that this will be done. I have recently travelled over almost the whole of the wheat belt. During my many years' experience as a farmer I can truthfully say I have never seen better indications everywhere for a bumper harvest than I have seen lately. I believe that a 40-million bushel yield is in sight for this season, and that we can hardly fail to get it. With the possibility of a 40-million bushel yield, and with the great 3,500 farms scheme in view, founded as I hope it will be upon successful lines, placed under effective management, and supported by an efficient means of railway transport, without being unduly optimistic, I cannot take any other view than that a great future indeed lies before this wonderful State. I have pleasure in supporting the motion.

On motion by Hon. J. Nicholson, debate adjourned.

House adjourned at 8.18 p.m.

Legislative Assembly.

Wednesday, 15th August, 1928.

	PAGE
Questions: Fremantle Harbour schemes	181
Beef cattle supply	181
Western Australian dinner, London	182
Leave of absence	182
Address-in-reply, sixth day	182

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

QUESTION—FREMANTLE HARBOUR SCHEMES.

Mr. LINDSAY (for Mr. Thomson) asked the Premier: 1, What is the estimated cost of increased accommodation in Fremantle harbour to the proposed new bridge, and the number of berths provided? 2, What is the estimated cost of the outer harbour scheme suggested by Mr. Stileman, and the number of berths provided? 3, What is the estimated cost of the river extension, including Rocky Bay, as proposed by Sir George Buchanan, and the number of berths provided? 4, What provision has been made in the Stileman scheme as adopted by the Government for (a) a graving dock; (b) the suggested site; (c) the estimated cost?

The MINISTER FOR RAILWAYS (for The Premier) replied: 1, The information is given in the Engineer-in-Chief's report viz.—£2,000,000 and 5,750 feet of wharf. 2, Both the cost and the number of berths provided will depend on the probable requirements of the traffic when the time comes to put the work in hand. The design is one which will enable the work to be carried out stage by stage as and when additional accommodation becomes necessary to deal with the trade of the port. 3, Sir George Buchanan's estimate was £6,747,000. This figure, however, makes no provision for the dredging required, nor for land resumption, which would both add very materially to the estimate. Length of quay provided was 28,300 feet. 4, No site has been selected for a future graving dock. The probability that construction of such a dock or its equivalent will eventually be necessary is fully realised and provided for. The actual site will very largely depend on where suitable foundations are available, and these will almost entirely govern the cost.

QUESTION—BEEF CATTLE SUPPLY

Mr. SLEEMAN asked the Minister for Agriculture: 1, Has he seen the report of the butchers' meeting in the "West Australian" of the 14th, in which Mr. Warner says: that if he could get space on the State boats he could land cattle at £11 each? 2, Is the implication by Mr. Warner that he could not get space on the State boats cor-