

sible for putting men on the sandplain country at Northliffe.

Mr. Thomson: Who put them there? It was the Government.

Mr. J. H. SMITH: It was not our Government. As I shall have an opportunity to speak on group settlement at a later stage, I shall not delay the House longer on this occasion.

On motion by Mr. Lindsay, debate adjourned.

House adjourned at 10.52 p.m.

Legislative Council,

Thursday, 11th August, 1927.

Leave of absence	PAGE
Papers: Railway, Fremantle to Esperance	241
Address-in-reply, seventh day	241

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 granted to Hon. Sir E. H. Witenoom (North) for six consecutive sittings on the ground of urgent private business.

PAPERS—RAILWAY, FREMANTLE TO ESPERANCE.

On motion by Hon. H. Stewart, ordered—That the report of the Engineer-in-Chief, recommending a main trunk railway line from Fremantle to Esperance in P.W.D. file 1863/23, be laid on the Table of the House.

ADDRESS-IN-REPLY.

Seventh Day.

Debate resumed from the previous day.

Hon. C. F. BAXTER (East) [4.35]: Once again we have had the pleasure of listening to a Governor's Speech. I congratulate the sponsors of the Speech, but

further than that will not go. Those who frame these Speeches seem to lose sight of the necessity for curtailing the subsequent debates. The documents cover almost every subject that could be imagined, and are responsible for the lengthy debates that follow. Reference is made at the beginning of the Speech to the retiring Agent General, and to his successor. Western Australia is fortunate in having had as Agent General such an able man as Sir Hal Colebatch. It is also favoured in respect of its new Agent General, Mr. W. C. Angwin. In the latter gentleman we have a really good representative, and there is nothing lacking in him from that point of view. Good service was certainly given by Sir Hal Colebatch. It is time, however, that Parliament turned its attention to the duration of the term of Agent General. Sir Hal left Western Australia some three years ago to represent this State in England. Members of Parliament know it takes considerable time for them properly to settle down to their work, and to do justice to their positions as representatives of their constituents. Far more is that the case with the gentleman who is appointed to the position of Agent General. His duties are far wider and more far-reaching and important than those of a member of Parliament. It must take him fully two out of the three years to get properly into harness, and to become widely known.

Hon. J. Cornell: The same thing might be said of members of Parliament.

Hon. C. F. BAXTER: Members of Parliament have an opportunity of being returned in order that they may carry on their work, but an Agent General has no such opportunity. From the point of view of the State it is bad that an Agent General should serve only for three years, and it is worse for the individual himself that he should be appointed for so short a time. An Agent General proceeding to England has to break up his home and his business connections, if he has any. A man who is fit to occupy that position is generally one who is connected with some important business affairs. In the case of Mr. Angwin I believe that this did not arise because he gave up his whole time to politics. As a rule, an Agent General has to break up everything when he goes Home, at tremendous sacrifice to himself. Although Mr. Angwin belongs to a different political faith, I say in justice to him, and for the sake of the State itself,

his term of office should not be less than six years. It should be laid down as a hard and fast rule that an Agent General should be guaranteed that his term of office will not be less than six years.

Hon. J. R. Brown: What if he is a failure?

Hon. C. F. BAXTER: Every care is exercised in selecting the man for the position. The Government know that he possesses ability, and are sure that he will occupy the position with credit to himself as well as to the State.

Hon. J. Cornell: It is always a political appointment.

Hon. C. F. BAXTER: I do not know of any case in which there has been any regret concerning the Agents General who have represented Western Australia. It seems a ridiculous thing to send a man Home for only three years. Reference is made in the Speech to land settlement and to the development of Western Australia. A lot has been done in this direction, but a lot remains to be done. We are in the unfortunate position of having thousands of acres of good land which cannot be settled because they are not served by railways. Worse than that, there are thousands of good applicants amongst our own people and others in the Eastern States who are willing to take up our virgin land, but we have not enough land to put them on. I am not criticising any Government. The present Government are doing good work, as previous Governments have done. It behoves Ministers, however, to go ahead with the policy of railway construction, and to refrain from holding up any lines once they receive the authorisation of Parliament. When a railway is passed, let it be gone ahead with, on borrowed money. Let us make the land revenue producing as quickly as possible by getting people settled upon it, and away from the towns which are becoming so rapidly congested. A large amount of capital is at present coming in for the acquisition of improved properties, though not to such an extent during the last few years. No drawbacks should be placed in the way of purchasers of these properties. There is, however, one important drawback, and that is the stamp duty. Section 2 of the Stamp Act of 1925 is interpreted by the assessors in a way that causes it to bear very harshly upon those who are dealing in property. It forces purchasers to pay double stamp duty. I am sure that this was never

intended by Parliament. The position is an important one, and should not be allowed to continue. Early steps should be taken to amend the Act. In order that members may fully understand the position, I would cite one or two cases without mentioning any names. They are bad cases and are authentic. The section is so worded that the assessors cannot be blamed for what is done. My first illustration is with regard to "C" and "G." These persons are in partnership and purchased a certain property in the city. After paying a deposit, they sell the property for an increase of £5,000 over their deposit, and this profit is paid to them. The purchasers take over the liability for the balance of the purchase money payable to the original vendor. Owing to the construction placed upon Section 2, they are compelled to pay full duty. This amounted to £400, whereas under the contract for sale it should have been £50, at the rate of £1 per centum on the equity. Duty on the transaction was, however, charged on the whole amount, namely £85,000, whereas all the money involved in the purchase was £45,000. The two sets of figures work out in this way: The purchase price paid by "C" and "G" was £40,000, and they sold for an advance of £5,000, namely £45,000. This made a total of £85,000, and stamp duty was charged on the whole. The purchase price was really £40,000, and the deposit paid by the purchasers was £5,000, there being a balance owing to the vendor of £35,000. There was, therefore, a sum of £10,000 involved, namely the £5,000 deposit and the £5,000 profit on the equity, making the total £45,000, and yet stamp duty was charged on £85,000, assessed as follows:—Purchase price: "G" and "C," £40,000; sale price by "G" and "C," £45,000, total £85,000.

Hon. J. J. Holmes: Does that apply to city properties?

Hon. C. F. BAXTER: Yes, and it applies equally to country properties. There are many other instances and those I am quoting are merely for the purposes of illustration. There is stamp duty amounting to £1 per £100. No one will complain of that duty, but when the assessments are such that people are charged on double the amount that should be taken—after all, it is merely the equity that changes hands—it is wrong. It was never intended to operate in that way when we passed the amending legislation. Here is another instance concerning a

smaller transaction. I will give assumed names; the proper names are available if necessary. The particulars are—

Jones sold to Smith a small suburban house property for the sum of £730 of which Smith had paid £150 and then sold and assigned his interest in the contract to Brown, a widow, for £150, Brown taking over the liability of £557 owing to Jones. Brown, by reason of the construction placed on Section 2 of the amending Stamp Act, is compelled to pay stamp duty of £7 5s. on the assignment and when she has paid off the balance owing to Jones and obtains a transfer she will have to pay an additional sum of £7 10s. and 10s. or a total stamp duty of £15 5s. on a purchase price of £707.

The figures in this case worked out as follows:—

	£	s.	d.
Sale price to Smith ...	730	0	0
Smith paid off ...	153	0	0
Leaving owing to Jones ...	557	0	0
Smith sells to Brown his interest for ...	150	0	0
Brown takes over liability to Jones ...	557	0	0
	707	0	0

Brown pays on assignment of contract to her £7 5s. plus duty on transfer to her from Jones £7 10s. or £14 5s., and an additional 10s. duty on the transfer by reason of adjudication. It will be seen that all the money actually involved in the transaction is £880.

Hon. J. Cornell: That was intended to get at the speculative dealers.

Hon. C. F. BAXTER: This was not a speculation. In one instance the sale was made at a loss because it had to be effected. The tax was worked out in this way—

	£	s.	d.
Sale price to Smith ...	730	0	0
Paid by Smith ...	153	0	0
Owing by Smith and taken over by Brown ...	577	0	0
Paid by Brown to Smith ...	150	0	0
	727	0	0
Add paid by Smith ...	153	0	0
	880	0	0
Duty has to be paid on ...	730	0	0
Plus ...	727	0	0
	£1,457	0	0

or £14 15s. against £9. In this case Smith sells at a loss.

Hon. J. J. Holmes: Does this refer to the latest amendment of the Act?

Hon. C. F. BAXTER: Yes.

Hon. J. J. Holmes: Was that not passed to catch these people?

Hon. C. F. BAXTER: Perhaps it was, but it was not intended to charge them double stamp duty. Here are particulars of the taxing of a farming transaction—

K. purchased from a company certain farming land for £1,432 10s. 5d. and, having paid off the sum of £315 16s. 5d., sells his equity to C. for £839. C. taking over the liability to pay the Company £1,116 14s. owing for balance of purchase money. C. is compelled to pay £19 5s. on his assignment from K. and when he has paid off the balance owing to the Company and obtained a transfer, he will have to pay the sum of £14 15s. plus 10s. on the transfer.

The figures in this case work out as follows:—

	£	s.	d.
Purchase price from Company ...	1,432	10	5
Paid by K. ...	315	16	5
Taken over by C. ...	1,116	14	0
Paid by C. to K. ...	839	0	0
	1,955	14	0
Paid by K. ...	315	16	5
	2,271	10	5

which would attract a duty of £22 15s., but duty has to be paid on £1,432 10s. 5d.

Plus ...	1,432	10	5
	1,955	14	0
	3,388	4	5

and amounts to £34, but actually the total money passing and therefore the true consideration between all three parties, is £2,271 10s. 5d.

There is no question in my mind that it was never contemplated that Section 2 of the amending Act would be applied in that direction. If it was intended to operate in the way suggested by Mr. Cornell, I do not think anyone else realised that fact. To levy the stamp duty in the way I have indicated, cannot be regarded as reasonable. As usual, there are references in the Governor's Speech to the harvest. There is no doubt that the harvest was a good one, for it represented a record for the State. I trust that the next harvest will be better still. If the season continues as it has to date, and we get some light rains next month it will most assuredly be better.

Hon. A. J. H. Saw: The date for the meeting of Parliament is fixed late so that Governments will know what the season is likely to be.

Hon. C. F. BAXTER: At any rate, there is every appearance of a good harvest this season, and I hope we will be blessed with good prices for our wheat. To all appearances we shall receive good prices, but that

will be at the expense of other countries of the world. Naturally, we have to regard that question from a rather selfish point of view.

Hon. A. J. H. Saw: I think this is the first Government to refrain from taking credit for the rainfall!

Hon. C. F. BAXTER: Everything came their way, so there was no need for the Government to do that. While looking forward to a record harvest, we are nevertheless faced with a problem. I do not desire to strike a pessimistic note, but the question arises as to how that harvest is to be handled. I am aware that the Government are making provision for extra rolling stock, but we are short in that direction and will still be short during the coming season. What is worse, however, is this—

Hon. W. T. Glasheen: It is all right, the wheat will be conveyed to the ports soon by means of motor trucks.

Hon. C. F. BAXTER: I am afraid that people who are using tractors and motor trucks will yet reap the whirlwind. In a few years, I am afraid, they will realise that it does not pay to transport with the aid of motors.

Hon. A. Burvill: Motor traction is quicker, but not cheaper.

Hon. C. F. BAXTER: They are pursuing the line of least resistance.

Hon. W. T. Glasheen: What about the latest six-wheeled vehicle?

Hon. C. F. BAXTER: That will be a costly affair, too. If Mr. Glasheen looks into the question he will see that other countries, where the farmers have gone in for tractors and so forth, are quickly getting back to horses and getting rid of their tractors altogether. It is all very well to say that a tractor can put in so many hundred acres, and so forth. The farmers will soon realise that they have to conserve their funds and farm in a different method.

Hon. A. J. H. Saw: I thought Henry Ford said that the horse was as extinct as the dodo.

Hon. C. F. BAXTER: That is why one of the largest carrying firms in America sold their fleet of motor wagons the other day and purchased 15,000 horses in one week. Henry Ford is at the head of a concern depending upon the sale of a certain type of conveyance—

Hon. J. Cornell: That will have a short reign.

Hon. C. F. BAXTER: Yes. It is all to Henry Ford's benefit to speak in a derogatory fashion regarding horses, and to praise motor traction. In Canada, where much cheaper power is available than is possible in Western Australia, and where the cost of oil, spirits and so on is about one-third of the price we have to pay, there is a great move in the direction of selling motor vehicles and getting back to horses. Canada is not in such a happy position as we are in Australia, where we can turn our horses out into fields. That is not possible in Canada for six months of the year, during which the horses have to be stall-fed. I am not looking forward to such great success respecting motor tractors as, apparently, some hon. members do; in fact, I believe it would have been a Godsend if the motor truck and tractor had never been introduced into this country. If hon. members have regard to the appalling figures showing the money that has to be found from production in Australia every year to pay for motor cars, tractors, and wagons, they will probably wonder what is to happen in the future. I have been studying that question for years.

Hon. A. Burvill: You will not be a believer in the 16½-mile radius for railways, with the provision of motor traction for conveying wheat to the railways?

Hon. C. F. BAXTER: No, I have never believed in that. On the other hand, I played an important part in determining upon the 12½-mile radius.

Hon. W. T. Glasheen: But you have bought a couple of motor cars and used them!

Hon. C. F. BAXTER: I do not object to motor cars as such.

Hon. W. T. Glasheen: But you object to the other fellows using them.

Hon. C. F. BAXTER: No, I am referring to the commercial standpoint, and to motor wagons and tractors in particular.

Hon. J. J. Holmes: But in America you say they are getting back to horses and disposing of their tractors.

Hon. C. F. BAXTER: That is so. When I was interrupted by these interjections, I was dealing with the railways and the unfortunate position confronting those in control of that system. I refer more particularly to the Perth bottle-neck. With that hindrance existing, it means that heavy freight traffic is held up during the day time when the service is run for the passenger traffic, and wheat and other heavy freight

can be conveyed through only at night. That is an unfortunate position for any commercial concern like the railways to be placed in. Last season's harvest of 30,000,000 bushels was difficult to handle and the Railway Department deserve every credit for the manner in which they overcame the existing difficulty. Fortunately there was no rush period, with a large number of boats at Fremantle waiting for loading. Had there been, chaos would have reigned because the railways could not have transported the wheat.

Hon. A. Burvill: The remedy is to use another harbour.

Hon. C. F. BAXTER: We have experienced that difficulty in the past. During the time I was Minister in charge of the wheat scheme I had occasion to thank the Railway Department time and again for the way they had handled the traffic. Notwithstanding that, however, ships were held up from time to time for days, during which waiting time had to be paid. We could not blame the railways for they could not give quicker despatch owing to the existing circumstances, particularly because of the bottle-neck at Perth. I know there are remedies for the position. We attempt to transport two-thirds of our harvest through that bottle-neck, but, as I have already pointed out, the lines are only available for that heavy traffic between midnight and 6 a.m. Why should that be? One way of overcoming the difficulty would be to divert the traffic. If the Brookton-Armadale line were constructed, that would relieve the position. That would open up country that has been held back for years. That line was first suggested 30 years ago. A survey has been made from Brookton but that does not carry us very far. If the railway were constructed right through to Armadale, pretty well a third of our wheat would be taken along that route to the port, instead of going through the bottle-neck in Perth. There were no better grades in the State than those along the suggested route, whilst the land adjacent could be opened up with advantage for dairying and closer settlement. That land is now carrying merely a few sheep and nothing else. On the Brookton-Dale line there is good land, and I urge the Government to take the earliest opportunity to relieve the position, otherwise we shall have a terrible

congestion. We shall probably have a 35,000,000 bushel harvest this season and the time is not very far distant when the figures will be 60 or 70 million bushels. How on earth will the railways handle such crops unless a commencement is made now in the direction of providing other routes for transporting the wheat to Fremantle? It will be absolutely impossible for the railways to do so. The small percentage of wheat then remaining to be sent through the bottle-neck could be handled successfully. I am a strong believer in the zone system, provided, of course, it is always possible to get ships to go to those ports to pick up the freight. After all we know that vessels will always go to the ports where they can get the best loading. All these things must be taken into consideration. We were given a treatise on group settlement the other evening by the member for West Province (Hon. G. Potter). I am sorry he is not in his place just now. Mr. Potter has blossomed out as a new champion on group settlements and an adviser as well. I was astonished to hear that gentleman say half a dozen times that group settlement was an experiment. I think if he will look up the Victorian records of 40 years ago, he will find that group settlement in this State is not an experiment. It may have been designated in some other way in Victoria, but it was carried on in exactly the same way as we are carrying it on here to-day.

Hon. J. Ewing: The same scheme?

Hon. C. F. BAXTER: No, thank God, theirs was not the same scheme. In Victoria the smallest acreage I know of was 10 acres, but it was rich land which could be made very good use of. The Gippsland country was what might be called sweetened land, that is to say, on killing the timber it was possible to grow English grasses straight away.

Hon. J. Cornell: My experience of settlement in Victoria was that people were put on land that no one else would have because it was so poor.

Hon. C. F. BAXTER: Some of the land that was utilised for group settlement was very rich.

Hon. J. Cornell: I am referring to Kyabram.

Hon. C. F. BAXTER: And I can refer the hon. member to Korumburra. Mr. Potter told the House the other day that the re-

sults of the group settlements in this State would satisfy even Mr. Baxter. Why even me?

Hon. A. J. H. Saw: He was a bad prophet.

Hon. C. F. BAXTER: Was it because I had the temerity to launch out against the group settlements' administration three years ago last January? I warned the people against the administration of the group settlements and because of that I was held up as one who was opposed to the scheme. I refer members to my speeches as recorded in "Hansard" and also to Press criticism, to ascertain for themselves whether I made a single mistake when I set out the actual position. What I said then has since been proved to be correct.

Hon. J. Cornell: I would refer the hon. member to the Commission of which Mr. Holmes was chairman, which sat before his criticisms were made.

Hon. C. F. BAXTER: The memories of some people are short. Mr. Holmes' commission sat after I had criticised the scheme. My challenge was made 3½ years ago.

Hon. J. J. Holmes: My challenge was made four years ago—December, 1923.

Hon. C. F. BAXTER: I will ask hon. members to learn for themselves when I actually began my opposition to the administration of the group settlements. It was prior to any commission or committee conducting an investigation. Members can look up the records or the newspaper files to see for themselves that what I am saying is correct. I can supply the dates if necessary.

Hon. A. J. H. Saw: You sat on the group settlements before the commission did.

Hon. C. F. BAXTER: Why should Mr. Potter say that it would satisfy even me? I know that the land will produce, and that it can be made to pay, but what I have always hit at has been the administration which has been bad right through. I congratulate the Government on taking the stand they have adopted, even at this late hour. The Minister for Lands is working now hard now to put the groups on a sound footing, and what he is doing will be a good thing for the South-West.

Hon. J. Ewing: The groups are a wonderful success.

Hon. C. F. BAXTER: Gracious me, when will some people wake up? Really some

people die very hard. I do not deny that one or two of the groups are a success, but through wrong methods and selecting poor land there are many that never will be a success. The settlers who are on good land will be successful. Everyone knows that.

Hon. J. Ewing: Why do you condemn the groups?

Hon. C. F. BAXTER: I am not doing so.

Hon. J. Ewing: You are condemning them now.

Hon. C. F. BAXTER: Nothing of the kind. It does not matter to which country of the globe you go, you will find good land and poor land. The mistake made in Western Australia was that in so many instances poor land was selected. Mr. Potter referred to what could be done with poor land. Yes, on a commercial basis, but you cannot spend hundreds per acre on sand and expect it to show a return. The position, I am glad to see, is now being rectified and that is all I want. That is what I have wanted from the very first. At the same time, it is passing strange that a whole term has been allowed to pass, by the present Government without an effort being made to put the groups on a sound footing. Mr. Angwin, who is now Agent General, when he had charge of the groups, moved along in the same old way. Everything was all right, in spite of the criticism that was offered. Mr. Troy, however, soon after being appointed Minister for Lands, took up the matter and found that everything was not all right. He intends to make an effort to put things right, and I congratulate him on his attempt to do so.

Hon. J. Cornell: Do you think he will put them right?

Hon. C. F. BAXTER: He is going along the right track to do so. I may be wrong, but it seems to me that in sending Mr. Angwin to England, the party may have said, "We will send him Home and we will make an effort to straighten out the groups." Mr. Angwin was the first to criticise my public utterances and said they were wrong. Now we know that everything was not what we were led to believe.

Hon. J. J. Holmes: The land was good, the rainfall was good and the climate was good, but the settlers did not know their job.

Hon. C. F. BAXTER: Reference is made in the Speech to several new railways. All that is very pleasing, but there are not enough to open up the land that is required for those who are seeking it. In that con-

nection, too, I do not know why it is that promises made as far back as 20 years ago have not been honoured up to the present time. I have in mind a promise made regarding the construction of the Yarramony-Eastward line. Unfortunately when the Dowerin-Merredin loop was constructed, those responsible for it went out such a distance, that they left a lot of settlers as far as 22 miles away from the line. Those unfortunate people are in the position to-day of having to cart their produce over that distance to the railway. True, some may have motor trucks, but there are many there who, like myself, would prefer horses were it not for the time that is occupied by carting in that way. In that part of the State there are thousands of acres of very rich land and the rainfall is excellent, but it is hopeless to expect development to proceed without railway facilities. Members can talk as much as they like about motor transport, but it cannot compete with the railway system. The railway expenses have to be met out of what we can produce; the railways belong to us and as such we should not enter into competition with them more than we can avoid. We should do our utmost to assist to make them pay by letting them handle our produce. Regarding the particular railway to which I have referred, it is 20 years since the first promise was made that it would be constructed. Soldier settlers in that part of the State were assured that they would get railway communication and some of them are sick and tired of waiting for it. I read in the Press the other day that another meeting was held there to protest against the delay. I do not know how many deputations have waited on the Government. I think the number is either 17 or 18, but all seem to have been futile. At the meeting to which I have referred the secretary was asked what warrant he had that the Collier Government would build the line. He replied that he had asked Mr. Collier for a clear statement of his attitude on the proposed Yorkkrakine-North Baandee railway, and Mr. Collier had written—

My answer is, that if returned to power at the elections, a Bill for the construction will be brought forward, and if still in opposition, the railway will have my support, believing that when Governments place settlers on the land it is their duty to provide all necessary facilities to enable them to market their products without imposing on them undue labour or expense.

Hon. J. Cornell: What was the date of that?

Hon. C. F. BAXTER: Unfortunately the date is not given. It appears to have happened at the time of the elections over 3½ years ago. There we have a promise from the present Premier that if returned to power he would bring forward a Bill for the construction of the line, or if still in opposition, he would support such a Bill. To-day we are no further advanced. I notice in the Governor's Speech that £500,000 is to be made available as the Federal grant for roads. We are indeed pleased to get this money from the Federal Government, though it only means giving us back a little from what we pay in Customs duties on motors, tractors and so forth. What we are chiefly concerned with is the judicious expenditure of the money. Latterly, on account of indifferently health, I have not travelled as much in this State as I used to do, but the few trips I have taken through the country have convinced me that there is expenditure of money that is not justified. One trip I made was down the Perth-Bunbury road, and I consider that the work being done there would be warranted if it were being done somewhere near the city of London. I cannot regard the grubbing of trees by the roots over the full width of the road as justified. I could understand the trees being chopped down, so that there would not be even a remote danger of their falling on the road; there are tall trees in that district. But to grub them out by the roots is to incur expenditure that is not necessary for a hundred years to come.

Hon. J. Cornell: It is a statesmanlike policy to look forward a hundred years.

Hon. C. F. BAXTER: If that is the new statesmanship, we can do with less of it. So many roads require money spent on them, that we ought not to expend money in such a useless fashion. The work itself is far more costly than it should be. However, criticism on that point is useless. The board say they are making good roads, which will last for years. Then there is the deviation of the Perth-York road at a place called Cut Hill. Thousands of pounds have been spent on that deviation, whereas one-fifth of the amount spent in another quarter would have achieved the same end. These are matters, it seems to me, for further inquiry. My view is backed up by men who have handled the affairs of country road boards. They agree that money has

been wasted when it could have been spent to better purpose. The costliness of the work of deviations made under the Federal road grant is absolutely ridiculous. No wonder the road boards are put to shame: they cannot hope to compete on the revenues they collect. They can only do what is good, sound and businesslike. The highways that are being constructed by the Main Roads Board are positively ornamental.

Hon. J. J. Holmes: Is that where they had the men in the Toodyay district and thought they had them in another district?

Hon. C. F. BAXTER: No. In that part money has not been wasted so badly.

Hon. J. J. Holmes: We are told that all the road work has been stopped.

Hon. C. F. BAXTER: That is not so. No doubt the Government were very eager to find work for the unemployed just prior to the elections.

Hon. H. Stewart: Surely the men who had no tools stopped work!

Hon. C. F. BAXTER: I know that other speakers are waiting, and I will not detain the House longer. I do hope that the present season's prospects will continue good, and that the result will be a record harvest and a record wool clip, both of which are badly needed. People who have invested money in our industries deserve to be well recompensed for their outlay.

HON. A. J. H. SAW (Metropolitan-Suburban) [5.20]: May I first congratulate the Chief Secretary on his reappointment to the position he has filled during recent sessions with such eminent satisfaction to the House. I am sure all members heard the news of his re-election with great pleasure. In the Governor's Speech I noticed a statement that we are to be called upon to legislate in connection with the hospitals of this State. The measure, I presume, will be one dealing with finance; but we have no particulars, and so I cannot say. Undoubtedly our hospitals are crippled for want of funds, and probably this House acted unwisely in rejecting the Mitchell Government's Hospitals Bill, which undoubtedly would have had the effect of strengthening the financial position of the hospitals.

Hon. J. R. Brown: What about the lotteries Bill?

Hon. A. J. H. SAW: I am not referring to the lotteries Bill, which I do not think

was a measure of the Mitchell Government. No doubt it received the support of the interjector. At present the Perth Hospital, particularly, is overcrowded. There is a crying necessity for increased accommodation, and undoubtedly the Government will have to face the position of a new hospital being required in the metropolitan area. When they do build that hospital I hope they will make some provision for an intermediate class of patients. In all countries those who are in a position to pay something towards medical fees and something fairly substantial for hospital attention do not receive that consideration to which they are entitled. The very poor are fairly well served, but those who do not wish to go into a hospital and be dependent on charity, especially as regards medical service, have a fairly hard time, because they are compelled to enter private hospitals and the increased expense is very considerable for them. They are a portion of the community that undoubtedly should receive greater consideration than they get. When the Government do determine on a new hospital, I hope it will be put in a convenient situation. With the advance of the University we shall soon—when I say soon I do not mean the near future, but some five or ten years hence—be able to have a medical school; and it is important that when a hospital is built it shall be situated conveniently and fairly close to the medical school, also having regard, of course, to the other great consideration that it shall be placed in a situation where it will meet the needs of a large population. I think there is such a site which the Government could acquire and which is at present unbuilt-on, a site which would fulfil the conditions. I refer to a portion of the University endowment lands situated west of King's Park between West Subiaco and Nedlands. There we have an area of about 91 acres, on a portion of which the hospital could be built, with due provision for recreation and exercise grounds for the patients, and also sufficiently removed from the road, so that the noise of passing traffic would not be a nuisance, and where there is also room for the erection of a medical school. The situation would be quite convenient as regards the University, and I have no doubt that the University authorities would be prepared to negotiate with the Government in order that those endowment lands, subject of course to

the consent of Parliament, might be utilised for such a purpose. Mr. Kitson was sorry that the Governor's Speech contained no reference to the Fremantle bridge, or the new bridge which is to be erected, I suppose, somewhere in the vicinity of Fremantle, the site not yet being determined. Whilst I quite admit there is a necessity for that bridge, I am sorry to see no reference in the Governor's Speech to the subject of education. During the time of the Mitchell Government I had the honour of serving on a Royal Commission on education, and my investigations showed me that in this State we undoubtedly have an excellent system of primary education, but that the technical side of education is weak and needs strengthening. While on that subject I would like to point to one deficiency in the Technical School—that whereas a young girl can get instruction in millinery or dressmaking, there is absolutely no provision whatever for the teaching of cooking; nor is there any provision in the metropolitan area for the teaching of cooking to girls who are beyond school age. There is some such provision in the primary schools, but from what I have heard I think the provision is insufficient. It seems an anomaly that whilst people should be able to learn millinery for their own private use, there should be no provision for the teaching of cooking. I quite admit it is desirable that the female bird should by her plumage attract the male bird, but I would like to remind her that something more than attracting is required, and that if she requires to keep the affections of her husband, then the best means of doing it is to minister to his creature comfort and see that he is well fed.

Hon. Sir William Lathlain: That would be a greater attraction.

Hon. A. J. H. SAW: Possibly, but I happened to be at a wedding last night, and as one of the guests I do not know that there was any great demand on domestic science. I did notice, though, that the young men there were very much attracted by the personal appearance of the ladies. There is another point as to which, in connection with education, I wish to draw attention to the needs of the University. In 1912 the vote for primary education was £238,000, whilst for the University a sum of £13,500 was set aside. In 1926 the vote for primary education had increased to £640,000, whereas the University got only £21,000. That is to say,

the University vote in 1912 bore a ratio of 5.5 per cent. to the Education vote, whereas in 1926 it only bore a ratio of 3.3 per cent. Now is the proper time, in my opinion, for the Government to take advantage of the munificence of the late Sir Winthrop Hackett. The University authorities are embarking on a scheme of building at Crawley. Within a month or so we shall be looking at the designs which have been invited from the architects of the world, and we hope before very long to see buildings from the Hackett bequest that are worthy of the State. But those buildings will be of little use unless the Government do their part by putting up permanent buildings and thus relieving the University from the continuance of its teaching under the difficult conditions which obtain in the tin buildings in Irwin-street. I do hope the Government are seized of the fact that now is the time when, in consequence of the Hackett bequest, they should move rapidly forward in the direction of providing permanent University buildings on a permanent site. In Western Australia really we are poorly off in respect of the University, as compared with other countries. Canada has 40,000 students, and since her population is ten millions, it means one student to every 250 of population. In Western Australia we have 360 university students, which is about one to every thousand of the population.

Hon. J. Cornell: One of the difficulties is the period between the junior examination and the leaving examination. Not all can afford it.

Hon. A. J. H. SAW: But in Western Australia we have free education, including the University; and also through the Hackett bequest we shall have numerous bursaries. So the poorer students will undoubtedly be well catered for; because one of the conditions of those bursaries is that they shall be applied to deserving necessitous students. So there should be a considerable increase in the number of students if we had the accommodation. Then I come to the students in Toronto. I think the conditions in Canada fairly comparable to those in Australia. I will not refer to America, for that is the land of dollars and there can be no comparison. Still, I claim that with Canada we have a fair comparison. Toronto gets an annual grant of two million dollars for the province of Ontario. The University of Alberta, for extension work alone, has an annual grant of fifty thousand dollars. Look-

ing at those huge sums expended in other parts of the world on university education, it must be admitted that we here are making a very poor show. There is another subject I wish to refer to. The other day a deputation from the dairying industry waited on Mr. Millington, the Honorary Minister, about the parlous condition into which the dairying industry is drifting in this State, and especially with reference to the supply of milk in the metropolitan area. Whilst I was in New Zealand last summer I had the privilege of going over the milk factory at Wellington, which is under the control of the Wellington municipality.

Hon. J. Cornell: Here you can quote Toronto again, with a 600,000 population.

Hon. A. J. H. SAW: As I happened to go over the factory at Wellington, naturally that was the instance I first seized. In July of 1922 the municipality of Wellington got control of the milk distribution of Wellington and set up a system of pasteurising the milk and distributing it in sealed bottles. One of the medical officers of health attached to the Government service of New Zealand went over this factory with me, and in conversation he told me that when first the idea of pasteurising the milk was mooted he was not in favour of it, but that his subsequent experience of it had converted him into a believer in the system now adopted in Wellington. The system of pasteurisation now adopted, not only in Wellington but in practically all big cities, lies in bringing the milk to a temperature of 145 F. for a period of 30 minutes and then rapidly cooling it, after which it is distributed in sterilised sealed bottles. I have culled a few statistics concerning the improvement that has resulted in the health of infants in Wellington, which I think can be justly attributed to the method of pasteurising and distributing the milk in sealed bottles since 1922. I find that in 1918 Wellington had an infantile death rate per thousand registered births of 71. Now those figures are probably abnormal for that year in Wellington, because you will remember that in the latter half of 1918 there was a virulent outbreak of influenza in New Zealand which, no doubt, increased the mortality rate for that year. I find that in 1919, although I cannot get hold of the statistics for Wellington, the statistics for the whole of New Zealand showed an infantile death

rate of 48 per thousand registered births. In 1918 Perth had an infantile death rate of 76 per thousand registered births. In 1922, as I said before, Wellington took control of the milk, pasteurised it and distributed it in sealed bottles. In 1924 the Wellington infantile death rate had fallen to 38 per thousand registered births. It was the lowest rate of all the cities in the world, with the exception of Amsterdam, which that year was 34 per thousand. In 1924 the mortality rate in Auckland, which has not this system of milk control, was 46 per thousand registered births, while in Christchurch it was 48 and, I am glad to say, Perth had dropped from 76 in 1918 to 53, but of course was still above the towns in New Zealand.

Hon. J. J. Holmes: What was the rate in Wellington that year?

Hon. A. J. H. SAW: It was 38. When we compare Wellington's 38 with Auckland's 46 and Christchurch's 48, two years after the adoption of this system of treating the milk, it can be fairly claimed that the improvement in the death rate was due to that factor. I can see no reason why there should be any difference, apart from pasteurising the milk, between the mortality rate of infants in Wellington and in Christchurch, for I should imagine the climatic conditions to be very similar, and also the respective types of residents. In 1925 Wellington had pride of place of all the cities of the world in the mortality rate, being down to 35 per thousand registered births, whereas Amsterdam was 36, Christchurch 48, Auckland 51, while Perth, unfortunately, had risen to 66. I think these figures undoubtedly go to show that the introduction of this system of milk control in Wellington has been seized with the greatest importance to infant welfare in Wellington, New Zealand. I hope the Government here will make inquiry into these facts I have brought before the Minister to-night and will see whether my contention cannot legitimately be made, namely that this improvement in the mortality rate is almost entirely due to the fact that Wellington has adopted municipal control and introduced this system of pasteurisation. As we all know, many diseases are conveyed by milk. Certain forms of tuberculosis are always referred to in the medical profession as

tuberculosis of bovine origin. They include affections of glands, bones, joints, meninges, peritonitis, and the skin disease of lupus. It has been definitely proved that very large numbers of cases that affect those organs I have referred to are due to the bacillus directly derived from the cow through milk. Cows suffer heavily from tuberculosis, in some countries more than in others. In England it is estimated that from 20 to 50 per cent. of cows in the individual herds are affected with tuberculosis. In the United States and also in Australia the incidence of tuberculosis in cattle is nothing like so great as in the Old Country, due, no doubt, to the fact that cows here, instead of being stall-fed, are allowed to be out in the fields. It is when the udders of cows are affected by tuberculosis, or when the cow is in an advanced stage of tuberculosis, that the milk is particularly dangerous. Just as important as tuberculosis are certain acute diseases, especially in hot climates. The condition known as acute gastro-enteritis is probably even more important from the point of view of infant welfare than is tuberculosis. Other diseases, such as dysentery, typhoid, scarlet fever, diphtheria, infective sore throat, Malta fever and cholera, all are conveyed through the medium of milk, and it is particularly in the instance of gastro-enteritis and dysentery that so many of our children die, especially during the summer months, and in consequence so many homes are rendered desolate. Apart from this incidence of disease conveyed by milk, there is the question of the value of milk as a food. Milk should be rated very highly as a food, particularly for infants and growing children, but in consequence of milk so often being the medium for conveying disease, the medical profession are chary of insisting that their patients and those they advise should make milk an important element in their dietary. If those dangers were removed from milk it would give a great stimulus to the consumption of milk, and with great benefit to the health of the community. The remedy for those diseases is pasteurisation. That, Sir, is in force in 98 per cent. of the great cities of the United States. I have begun to think that, in health measures, the United States leads the way and the rest of the world drags rather painfully behind. To show the in-

fluence that pasteurisation has had in the big cities of the United States over the mortality rate, I cannot do better than quote the words of Dr. Nathan Raw, of England, one of the pioneers on this question of milk and bovine tuberculosis in relation to the health of the people, and who says from his own investigations in America, that in New York tuberculosis of bovine origin has diminished by 300 per cent. Dr. Raw says—

The infant population thrives on pasteurised milk.

In some circles there is a prejudice against pasteurised milk because people think the process diminishes the butter fat content and causes some diminution in the vitamins. Under this scheme of pasturisation those evils are reduced to a minimum. Nathan Raw also says—

Epidemics due to milk have entirely disappeared. Another authority is Dr. C. H. Mayo, of Rochester, U.S.A. He is one of the most famous surgeons in the world—one of the Mayo brothers who, a good many years ago, started a clinic in Rochester, which has since become a city in consequence of the clinic they started. Their clinic at Rochester has become the Mecca for practically every surgeon who wishes to keep abreast of the times. According to the "North-West Health Journal" of November, 1926, Dr. Mayo says—

Pasteurisation is the best of all known treatments for the nation's milk supply.

He concludes his article by saying—

The protection of the public can be ensured by pasteurisation. It is the only safe way.

None of the advocates of pasteurisation believes that it is the be-all and end-all in the treatment of the milk supply. It is meant to supplement and not to supersede other measures. Those measures, of course, include the testing of herds by the tuberculin test. That is being carried on on a very large scale in America and tuberculosis has to a great extent been eliminated from the herds. Also there is the same necessity for cleanliness in milking and transport and in the cooling and quick delivery of milk. Apart altogether from the question of health, I consider there is great necessity that some form of control and regulation should be applied to the dairying industry. I suppose all members have seen letters in the Press stating that if the dairying industry is allowed to continue

unregulated, it will not be long before we reach such a bad economic condition that the herds will decline and a great number of people who have started in the dairying business will be ruined. We are undoubtedly relying on the development of the dairying industry to give the State a big lift forward. If, through want of proper organisation and control, those economic evils are going to fall upon the dairying industry, it will be a bad thing for the State. There is one other question mentioned in the Governor's Speech to which I wish to refer. I am glad the Government intend at last to introduce a Bill to deal with town planning. We all believe that Perth is destined to become a very large city, and we cannot too early begin to make plans for its future development. I notice that some members of the City Council are advocating that if a town planning Bill is introduced, Perth should be excluded from the scope of its operations. That, to my mind, would be like the play of Hamlet without the Prince of Denmark; in fact, the whole necessity for a town planning Bill is for the city, for the port and generally for the metropolitan area. No doubt it will be advisable to apply it also to the larger towns in the country, but certainly there is not the same need for it in the country as there is in Perth itself. I hope this session will be devoted largely to measures that will ensure the social amelioration of the people, and any measures brought forward with that object in view will undoubtedly receive my sympathetic consideration and support.

HON. A. BURVILL (South-East) [5.50]: I congratulate the Government on the good season experienced and on the bright prospects ahead.

Hon. C. F. Baxter: What have the Government to do with that.

Hon. A. BURVILL: The prosperity of the State cannot well be credited to one Government more than another. The prosperity that the State is at present enjoying is partly due to past Governments. The record harvest was not the result of merely last year's work; it was the result of many years' work and to the policy adopted by Sir James Mitchell and even by Governments that preceded his. To produce wheat and wool takes more than a year, and a period of at least six years is necessary before an orchard reaches the productive stage.

Last season was one of the most prosperous experienced in the fruit industry, particularly as regards apples and grapes, not only in the matter of prices but in the matter of the quantity produced and exported.

Hon. E. H. Gray: Germany helped the prices.

Hon. A. BURVILL: That is not material; the point is our orchardists produced the fruit. The prosperity of the fruit industry rests upon foundations that were laid years ago. The future prosperity of the State will be due not only to greater production but to heavier yields of wheat per acre and wool per sheep. We are dependent almost entirely upon two primary products—wheat and wool. The time will come when fruit will occupy a far more important place amongst our primary industries and the same applies to dairying. Mining is on the down grade and members representing gold-fields provinces have spoken of the causes of the decline.

Hon. V. Hamersley: You have not mentioned timber.

Hon. A. BURVILL: I hope the Government will see their way clear to remove some of the land taxation. Until a couple of years ago holders of land up to an unimproved value of £250 were exempt from land taxation, but that exemption was abolished. After listening to the various speeches about group settlement and dairying, in which activities the settlers are small land holders, I wonder why the Government do not give assistance in the shape of land tax exemption. Why bring people from the Old Country and immediately tax them for the land on which they are settled? Anyone who takes up a small holding having an unimproved value up to £250 must use the land. His land to him stands in exactly the same relation as a tradesman's tools stand to him. I cannot see why small land holders, or even larger ones for that matter, should be taxed on that out of which they make their living. The land holder has to pay vermin taxes, road board taxes, wheel taxes, and motor taxes, in addition to taxation on the unimproved value of his land. Exemption from land tax might well be granted because it is a big burden on the small land holder. The vermin tax should be altered so that its incidence shall be on a fifty-fifty basis between the pastoralist and agriculturist as was intended. At present the pastoralist is not paying one-half of

his proportion. The vermin tax should be a national rather than a class tax. Production in the agricultural and sheep areas depends upon the ability of the settlers to combat dogs and other vermin. It is a national benefit to secure the largest possible production from our primary industries, and the people engaged in those industries should not be required to pay the whole of the tax, especially as more than half of the State consists of Crown lands on which the pests breed. Further, I consider that the Commonwealth Government should assist us. There is no doubt that the vermin travels into Western Australia from South Australia.

Hon. Sir William Lathlain: Perhaps it goes into South Australia from here.

Hon. A. BURVILL: After the extraordinary increases of wages and other expenses, I was astonished to find that our railways ended the year with a profit. The return laid on the Table of the House shows that the average mileage of railways worked last year increased by 69, and the mileage open for traffic by 53. The number of miles run increased by 428,550. The earnings per ton mile show a decrease in respect of nearly every important item. In wheat, one of the biggest haulages we have, the decrease in earnings per ton mile is .6d. Last year it was 1.11d. per ton mile. This year, when the railways are showing a profit, the decrease is 1.05d. The same thing applies to our local timber. The earnings per ton mile also decreased. The same thing happened with fruit and vegetables. It is about the same with everything. There has been a decrease in earnings except on fertiliser. Notwithstanding this, there is an increase in earnings generally, and the railways have turned the corner in a more convincing manner than they did in the previous years. The management are deserving of congratulation. They must be meeting the extra cost of wages and the cost of the extra mileage by effecting economy in some way. There is an increase of only one in the number of locomotives. The management are using locomotives of greater power than they did before, and are thus economising in man power. Although we have a greater mileage of railways now, the average number of persons employed on the extra mileage and on the extra work done was last year 577 as against 584 in the previous year. Fully

75 per cent. of the income of the railways comes from primary production, which, therefore, is largely responsible for the railways being in a position to pay extra wages and to afford the extra expenditure. During the year before last a Main Roads Bill was passed. The question of the costs payable by road boards should receive immediate attention. There have been one or two conferences at Bunbury. Meetings have also been held in other places, protesting against the proportion that must be paid by road boards especially in the wet areas, which includes all the South-West and Denmark. When the Bill came before us it was suggested that the main roads should be made and maintained entirely by the State. The feeder roads should be constructed by the State with the aid of the Commonwealth money and maintained by the road board. I am not going to say anything about feeder roads. The road boards would probably be able to meet their liabilities in that direction. I particularly desire to refer to main roads, which in some instances should be termed arterial roads. The Act as finally passed lays down that 3/14ths of the cost of constructing all main roads shall be provided by road boards, not by individual road boards but by all of them. The maintenance is to be on the basis of fifty-fifty. The arterial roads would be altogether made and maintained by the Government. I cannot see how any of the country road boards in wet areas are going to withstand this cost. Let me quote the Albany Road Board as an instance. I was a member of that board for many years. The board asked that the position should be defined by the Main Roads Board and received the answer I have already indicated, namely, that they would have to pay 3/14ths of the cost and contribute fifty-fifty towards the maintenance on the distribution basis.

Hon. H. Stewart: Would they have to pay that on the capital cost in the year, or interest on the 3/14ths?

Hon. A. BURVILL: I visited the Main Roads Board the other day, and the case was put to me as I have indicated.

Hon. H. Stewart: That is not in accordance with the Act.

Hon. A. BURVILL: Other road boards may be in a better or a worse position. There are two main roads running through the Albany Road Board, the Perth-Albany road

and the Albany-Bridgetown road. One is 14 miles in length and the other 28 miles, giving a total of 42 miles of main road. I cannot find out what price per mile these roads will cost, but some people say the cost will be in the vicinity of £6,000 per mile.

Hon. W. T. Glasheen: What is the cost of the piece constructed between Mt. Barker and Albany?

Hon. A. BURVILL: I will suggest a price that cannot be an over-estimation. According to the manner in which roads are now being constructed, the cost will not be less than £3,500 per mile. Already 42 miles of main roads are proclaimed in the road board area. That makes a total outlay of £210,000, of which the road board will have to contribute 3/14ths.

Hon. G. W. Miles: The interest on 3/14ths?

Hon. A. BURVILL: No, they will have to pay the 3/14ths.

Hon. J. Ewing: Have they the money?

Hon. A. BURVILL: No.

Hon. H. Stewart: Is it not the interest on 3/14ths and 30 years in which to pay both interest and sinking fund?

Hon. A. BURVILL: It is as impossible that way as it is the other. There will be the maintenance of the main road. An allowance of £30 per mile will not be excessive and their share would be £1,260 per annum. The sum will have to be spent every year. It is no use making main roads unless they are maintained in good order.

Hon. J. Ewing: Will the maintenance cost as much as that?

Hon. A. BURVILL: A really good macadamised road that will be extensively used by motor traffic will certainly cost £30 per mile to keep in order.

Hon. G. W. Miles: Whom do you propose should pay that?

Hon. A. BURVILL: Under the Act the road boards have to do that. The feeder roads will be made by the Government and handed over to the road board, which will have to take over the full maintenance.

Hon. J. Ewing: They will have to impose taxes for that.

Hon. A. BURVILL: On a conservative estimate this road board will have at least 30 miles of feeder roads to maintain. The cost will be not less than £900 per year. In addition the board will have to maintain the by-roads leading to the feeder roads, and the mileage of these must be 100. If

we allow only £2 a mile, that comes to £200, making the total cost of maintenance £2,360 per annum. Three parts of the road board area belong to the Crown. Something will have to be done before these boards become bankrupt. I will show members how the main road question affects the State by quoting from Victoria. That is the most densely populated State in the Commonwealth. Our Act was in a sense copied from the Act of that State. Let me take highways first. The State pays half and the councils pay half the cost of construction, that is to say, each side contributes fifty-fifty, while the maintenance is entirely a charge upon the State. Maintenance is a continuous process. With their dense population they are better off than we are. Our maintenance charges will increase. We cannot afford to lay down bitumen roads, the upkeep of which is infinitesimal. In connection with main roads there, Victoria pays half the cost of construction and the Councils the other half. The Government of Victoria pay two-thirds of the cost of the upkeep, and the cost to the councils is only one-third. Development roads are treated in much the same way as the roads here. I have a cutting from an Eastern State's newspaper. The headlines are "Councillors confer," "Upkeep of main roads," "Problem of through traffic." This deals with a conference of the North-Eastern and Goulburn Councils Developmental Association at Beechworth. There were present representatives from Seymour, Benalla, Euroa, Goulburn, Namurkah, and a score of other places, representatives from a number of shire councils and boroughs, shire engineers, shire councillors, members of both Houses of the State Parliament, representatives of the country road boards, and the District Superintendent of Railways (Mr. Morris). Amongst the motions that were passed were (1) That the association strongly supports the principle that councils affected by through or foreign traffic should be relieved of the upkeep of main roads particularly in tourist districts. (2) That the association again ask that provision be made whereby shires will be relieved of all maintenance of those portions of State highways running through country townships.

Sitting suspended from 6.15 to 7.30 p.m.

Hon. A. BURVILL: I was referring to the upkeep of main roads in Victoria and the protests that were being made by cer-

tain influential municipalities and boroughs at Beechworth. Besides the protests and the motions I dealt with before the tea adjournment, the following motion was agreed to:—

That the Government be urged to permit no further encroachment on the Country Roads Board's funds for the purpose of forming metropolitan roads board or for similar purposes.

That was on the 15th June last. The shire councils dealt with the question again at a subsequent conference that was held at Bendigo on the 11th June. That conference was held under the auspices of the Northern Municipal Roads League. I will not quote the report covering the whole of the proceedings, but merely the remarks of Councillor Buckland, of Huntly, who said—

The question of repayments warranted consideration. Huntly, a small shire, with a population, of 4,058, and an annual revenue of £5,988, had 299 miles of the main highway running through it, and it was impossible for the shire to pay its half quota of the cost of construction. Such roads should be paid for out of general revenue as a national work, and the shires not be called upon to contribute.

Mr. Thwaites said that when the Federal grant was made it was understood that this road would be constructed without costs to the shires through which it passed, but it was now found that the Act applied only to maintenance, and that construction of new roads would have to be made on a fifty-fifty basis. The Huntly shire had a good case, and should ask for a free grant.

The same league decided to enter an emphatic protest against the metropolitan municipalities encroaching further upon the motor registration fees, and they passed a motion calling upon all country Parliamentary representatives irrespective of party to oppose any such move. It would appear that in Victoria, with a population of 19.16 per square mile, the incidence of the Main Roads Board allocations is found intolerable. If that is so, what will it be in this State where we have a population of .38 per square mile? Before tea I gave certain figures dealing with the mileage of main roads in the Albany Road Board area. I wish to correct the particulars I gave then. What I should have said was that the road board there would have 42 miles of main roads, already declared, to make at a cost of not less than £3,500 per mile. That will represent an expenditure of £147,000, three-fourteenths of which would be £31,500. The Main Roads Board informed the Albany Road Board that they could borrow money to pay the interest on

that amount. That will mean merely deferring the evil day and when we consider the interest on the cost of construction, the total will represent an intolerable amount for a few ratepayers to shoulder. For the maintenance of those 42 miles of main roads, a cost of £60 a mile will be incurred. I do not think the work can be done at less than that figure and it has to be carried out on a fifty-fifty basis. In Victoria the Main Roads Board carry out the maintenance work altogether, but here the local authorities have to participate in the cost of maintenance. If we are to keep the cost of that work down to £60 a mile, we must commence the task quickly and not allow any pot holes to develop. Half the cost of maintenance would represent £30 per mile and that spread over the 42 miles, would make a total of £1,260. In addition, the Albany Road Board is concerned in the construction of at least 30 miles of feeder roads which will be constructed free of cost and handed over to the board. The trouble is that the board will then have to maintain those feeder roads for all time. They will cost about half the upkeep of the main roads and I put the cost down at £30 per mile for the 30 miles. That means another £900 to be found by the Albany board. They cannot borrow money for that purpose, nor can they borrow economically for the upkeep of the main roads. On top of all that, there are about 100 miles of by-roads to the feeder roads and they will cost another £200, bringing the gross figure up to £2,360. I am well aware that the money is to be distributed, but no matter how well that task is carried out, the burden will be a very heavy one upon the small country boards. There are some other expenses from which they cannot get away. The feeder roads and other roads will swamp up the whole of the revenue of the boards without taking into consideration the main roads at all.

Hon. Sir William Lathlain: You will have your traffic fees.

Hon. A. BURVILL: The Victorian road boards spend £150,000 annually in assistance rendered to settlers in remote or mountainous districts. The same thing should apply in Western Australia irrespective of any other help the settlers may get. It appears to me that with the 10 years' programme set out in the Commonwealth agreement, under which assistance is to be rendered to the various States, we will get £380,000 per annum. In view of that fact,

I consider the Minister for Works should give immediate consideration to the points I have raised. He should do that in conjunction with the Main Roads Board and representatives from the southern and south-western areas in particular, while other boards concerned should have some say as well. I wish now to deal with the question of grading fruit, vegetables, potatoes and so forth. Western Australia should fall into line with the other States that have legislation under which the consumer as well as the grower is protected. In order to give hon. members an idea of what I mean, I will draw attention to the statements made by the president of the Bunbury Chamber of Commerce and another at a meeting held recently. The report that appeared in the local Press contained the following:—

The president of the Chamber of Commerce (Mr. F. W. Roberts) stated at the meeting of the Chamber recently that, as a result of bad grading of potatoes, the S.W. had a very bad name amongst purchasers. We suffered and Denmark benefitted because of this unhappy state of affairs. Benger was endeavouring to improve the situation but until proper grading methods were adopted the honest producer suffered with the rest of them.

Mr. Kaeshagen said he recently purchased some potatoes. The potatoes at the tops of the bags were good ones, but the bottom contained bad potatoes, pig potatoes and yellow tails. At the same time he inspected a bag of Albany potatoes. They were well graded. That sort of thing was no good to the S.W. Albany had a magnificent name. Although grading would cost more, better prices would be obtained. The system had to be introduced to the S.W. The producer here, when approached, generally said the "digger" was to blame, but in Victoria and Tasmania one did not find bad grading. He thought well-graded potatoes would bring from £1 to 30s. more.

This question has concerned apple growers and potato growers for some considerable time past. The Potato Growers' Association has discussed the problem on various occasions. When potatoes are consigned from the Albany districts, 340 miles from Perth, or from other districts still more remote, and sent to the market in Perth, the buyers sometimes say that the potatoes are not f.a.q. and want to know what to do with them. The growers concerned cannot come to Perth to see if the potatoes are, or are not, of fair average quality, so the potatoes are put on the market for what they will fetch. Sometimes when the market is going down there is an inclination on the part of the buyer to say that the potatoes are not f.a.q. when, as a matter of fact, they are really up to standard. At the same time, there is an inclination on the part of some growers to

bag up poor stuff and try to pass it off as f.a.q. We have no legislation enabling punishment to be meted out to those offenders. The only remedy we have is through the Agricultural Department. The potato inspector informed us that if we communicated with him he would examine truck lots. An arrangement was made whereby the grower and the purchaser accepted whatever the officer's verdict happened to be. In that direction the department proved helpful. Trouble arose, however, regarding bag lots, and case lots of apples or tomatoes. The inspector could not be expected to examine those consignments gratis. If there is anything wrong, there is no redress. So far as the places outside are concerned, we cannot expect an inspector to examine them. We want this legislation not only for the protection of the grower but also for the protection of the consumer. I am going to quote several sections from the Victorian Act of 1914 to show what is done in that State to regulate the cool storage of fruit and vegetables and the sale of fruit cases. The sections of the Act of interest are these—

(1) No person shall sell—(a) The whole or any part of any lot of fruit or vegetables; or (b) any fruit or vegetables contained in a packet unless the outer layer or shown surface of the fruit or vegetables contained in such lot or package is so arranged or packed that it is a true indication of the fair average quality of the whole of the fruit or vegetables. (2) No person shall sell any fruit or vegetables contained in any package which also contains any foreign substance in a greater proportion than is indicated by the outer layer or shown surface of such fruit or vegetables.

I think legislation of that kind could with advantage be copied by this State. We need an Act of that description for the producer and consumer. It is only fair that when a man puts up a package of produce it should be of the same quality right through. I hope the Chief Secretary will bring the matter under the notice of the Minister for Agriculture to see whether the existing position cannot be remedied, especially remembering that production in the South-West is rapidly increasing. We are only just beginning the work of dairying, fruit growing and potato growing, and if such legislation were introduced now it would be much easier to get it through than when the production was greater. I congratulate the Government on the proposal to establish a pine plantation 20 miles from Mt. Barker, where an area has been purchased for that purpose. I under-

stand from Mr. Kessell, the Conservator of Forests, that it is intended to plant pines covering areas of 100 or 200 acres per annum, and that he is already planting for seedlings in the hope of increasing the annual acreage in the near future. I also noticed, while absent from the State, that the Government proposed to establish a prison farm in that district. At the time the notification was made a certain amount of misunderstanding arose, and a protest came from some people down there. The matter was referred to Mr. A. Wansbrough, the member for the district, and a public meeting was called. A motion was carried eventually welcoming the proposal in the Forrest Hill district. There was, however, still some misunderstanding, and I got into communication with the Chief Secretary, whose reply allayed the objections that were raised. I do not think there will be any further trouble. Mr. Drew in his letter wrote—

In reply to the request in your letter, I am now supplementing, for your information, the particulars given by the chairman of the road board by stating that only the better class of prisoners will be selected for the prison farm and, prior to being sent there they would be subjected to a period of close observation by the prison authorities, so that only those of whom the proclivities and disposition indicate they may be trusted would be sent. These will be men who, after undergoing the training and reforming influences on the farm are considered likely to become reputable citizens. . . . In regard to the district being a settled area, it cannot truly be stated that the area is closely settled. I have had a plan prepared of the estate and the surrounding settlement, and it is shown that by far the greater portion of the southern boundary is adjoined by pastoral leases which will now revert to the Government, and to that extent the estate is absolutely isolated. The eastern boundary is adjoined by a large estate in the names of McNeil and Martin, and a further large portion of the eastern boundary is adjoined by the holding of an absentee named Hitchins. The greater portion of the northern boundary is adjoined by a vacant holding, and nearly the whole of the western boundary is adjoined by the large estate of Mr. Roberts. Under these circumstances it is probable that, in the whole of Western Australia, it would not be practicable to select an area which it would be possible to use for the purpose of a prison farm and which would be less subject to the alleged disadvantage of surrounding close settlement.

I need not read the remainder of the letter except to say that the idea of giving prisoners a chance to reform in the manner proposed is a very fine one. One man who is settled adjacent to the suggested site of the prison farm was approached in the hope that he would raise an objection to it. His reply was, "I cannot do that, because all my life I have

advocated this kind of thing for prisoners." A majority of the people in the vicinity have no complaint to make about the proposal, and I congratulate the Government not only on having decided to establish a pine forest in a locality not far distant from the fruit-growers, but also on having done something to ameliorate the conditions of prisoners so that when they are released they will be so much the better for their existence on the farm. I would like to say something about the railway policy of the State. There will be quite a number of deputations from various parts of the wheat areas to-morrow and on succeeding days and weeks and months until the question is settled. What is required more than anything else in this State is that we should have a comprehensive scheme so as to determine the question of construction in a manner satisfactory to all. At the present time we know that when one section of the community is pulling in one way to secure a railway route in its direction, and another section is pulling in a different way, the Government are always able to make the excuse that the matter cannot be settled, because the settlers themselves are unable to agree on the question of route. In that way nothing is done.

Hon. J. J. Holmes. What about the great North that does not get any railways at all?

Hon. A. BURVILL: I have not heard of any deputations from the North asking for railways, nor has the hon. member ever advocated closer settlement in that part of the State.

Hon. J. J. Holmes: You will not have closer settlement there unless you get coloured labour.

Hon. A. BURVILL: The construction of railways is a non-party matter. Towards the end of last session the Advisory Board put up a report for a railway from Lake Grace to Kalgarin, Jilikin and other places, and I understood within a few weeks of Parliament dissolving that a Bill was to be submitted. The Advisory Board was brought into being with the idea of doing away with what I might call Parliamentary wire pulling. The board's report was in, but no legislation was forthcoming. The Engineer-in-Chief, in a report, submitted another scheme. As soon as he advanced that, the Premier rightly wanted the Advisory Board to report again. That of course delays matters. The report of the Advisory Board

has been laid on the Table of the House, and it has been read by members. Now, in consequence of what various members have done in approaching the Premier for a comprehensive scheme of railway construction that will give to every settler the opportunity to get to his nearest port and give to every port its natural trade, the matter is likely to be further delayed. I have approached the Premier by letter and in other ways. Mr. Wansbrough, the member for Albany, has received the following letter from the Premier's Department in regard to the proposed Newdegate-Albany railway:—

I have to acknowledge your letter of the 20th inst. regarding the inspection of the area between Newdegate and Albany by the Railway Advisory Board. In reply I have to advise you that this matter is involved in the large question of further trunk lines to meet future developments of the railway service to consider which the Government has appointed a special committee which includes the Engineer-in-Chief (chairman), the Commissioner of Railways, the Manager of the Agricultural Bank, and a representative of the Hon. the Minister for Lands. This committee is giving its careful consideration to the problems which have been presented to it, and a report is expected at a comparatively early date. It would clearly be unwise to proceed with further inspections of areas which may be involved in a much more comprehensive scheme of railway construction than that in the minds of your correspondents until a decision is reached upon the larger questions which will be done at as early a date as possible.

It would appear, then, that we have had the Advisory Board's report and Mr. Stileman's report, and now we are to have a committee's report. Upon the map placed on the Table there is marked a railway to run practically from Southern Cross parallel with the existing line about 25 miles away, and down through Lake Grace, and eventually to Ongerup and Albany. It is also intended to construct a railway from Newdegate to the Lake King country, to connect Ravensthorpe with Ongerup, and to throw out a spur line in the direction of Salmon Gums to the known good country there. In these deputations there has been made evident conflict of opinion between the Kalgarin people, say, and the Lake Grace people and the Kondinin people. The Lake Grace people want a railway to start from Lake Grace and go to Kalgarin. The Kalgarin people want a railway to go in the direction favoured by Mr. Stileman. On reference to the map hon. members will see that if a railway is constructed from Armadale to Brookton—a portion of this has been authorised—and from Corrigin to Kondinin, one will get from Kondinin to Fremantle in about 170

miles. If a railway is constructed from Lake Grace to Albany, or from Newdegate to Albany, the distance is 148 miles in a straight line. Of course one cannot get a railway in an absolutely straight line, but it should be easy to get a railway in 170 miles to Lake Grace. It is about the same distance from Kondinin to its port, Fremantle, as from Lake Grace to Albany, so far as one can ascertain, the line not having been surveyed. Its construction would mean that the Kalgarin area would be equally distant from both the ports of Albany and Fremantle, though from Bunbury it would be further away. As regards Esperance, I do not know the exact distance but one has not to go a great way east of Kalgarin before reaching the ambit of the port of Esperance. Then one gets to Ravensthorpe, the people of which consider they should have a port made at Hopetoun. So that there is much conflict of opinion as to where the railway should start, and of course everyone wants the particular piece of railway that suits him best, and everyone wants it as quickly as possible. I know that people from Ongerup and Needleup are about to approach the Minister with a request that he should visit and inspect their lands. A railway to Needleup was promised away back in 1914. Indeed, there was a still earlier promise, made in 1911 by the Hon. W. D. Johnson, when the Pingrup line was also promised. The Pingrup line has been constructed, but the other one has not. If any member of either House wishes to visit that country in September, I would strongly advise him to do so, in order that his mind may be disabused of the bad reputation the district has. If members go to the Needleup country, which runs up about 24 miles towards Ravensthorpe from Ongerup, they will see for themselves. Ongerup has a bad name for growing wheat or anything else; but, as a fact, it is one of our best sheep districts. The average wool per sheep there is as high as anywhere else in the State, and the quality is good. As regards wheat grown there, a Mr. Parkinson last year took first prize in the zone and second prize in the State. If hon. members will only visit that district, they will be agreeably surprised to find that Mr. Parkinson is not the only man who can grow wheat in Ongerup, where it was said wheat could not be grown at all. The Ongerup people have found out how to grow wheat and are growing it. I think the Borden people will

invite members to visit their district, and I would advise members to go there. Borden lies to the south of the existing line from Ongerup to Tambellup, and the area specially asking for the railway is 28 miles wide and runs about 22 or 25 miles south of Borden. Some of the families in the district have been there for three generations. The area held in this district, according to the Government Statistician, is 119,640 acres; the area under crop last year was 6,444 acres; the area under artificial permanent grasses was 344 acres; land fallowed, 5,358 acres; land previously cropped and now under grass, 16,270 acres; partially cleared land, 33,000 acres; land under wheat for grain, 3,339 acres, yielding 15,096 bushels, or an average of 15.3 bushels per acre. So the district stands second in the State for average yield of wheat. The district has 36,575 sheep, from which 296,753 lbs. of wool have been taken, an average of 8.1 lbs. per sheep. There are 16 tractors in the area. The area is south of the railway, and the people in question have to take their goods back to Borden by motor truck, a distance of 22 miles. They find that, as Mr. Baxter says, motor traction is not cheaper than horse traction, though the quickness of motor traction enables those who use it to grow a little more wheat than formerly. Motor traction costs from 10d. to 1s. per ton per mile to bring wheat in, and from 10d. to 1s. per ton per mile to take super out. Thus the area planted is, necessarily, greatly restricted. Borden is 134 miles from Albany by rail, but the district I have indicated is south of Borden, and if a railway were put through to Albany its residents would get to that port in 65 miles. Thus their railage could be reduced 65 miles by the construction of the proposed line, and in the case of the other people 22 miles away the railage would be reduced by between 70 and 80 miles. Below that district the land is reported to be very poor. A railway can get through the Stirling Range by going through the Pass, which is practically level ground, missing the Porongorup Range and going down the edge of the Kalgan River, getting a good grade all the way. Anyone who, having gone along that river, says the country is worthless does not know much about country. Good land exists there, but one cannot do much with it at a distance of 30 or 40 miles from a railway. I do not like to criticise

either the Railway Advisory Board, or Mr. Stileman, or the committee; but there is one point I must refer to. Mr. Stileman states that our railways could be placed further apart than they are at present, that instead of having an intervening distance of 12½ miles we could make it 16½ miles because motor transport with six-wheeled vehicles is coming in and making the cost of conveyance much lower. I am glad Mr. Baxter stressed the point that motor transport is going out in America. That fact goes to support what some of us have contended all along, that motor transport is not cheaper, and that it will not be much cheaper even with six-wheeled motors. The only difference six-wheeled motors can make is to expedite transit. Certainly there cannot be any reduction in the cost where roads are bad. Another point I wish to make is that the 12½ miles from a railway is always measured in a straight line, and that very few people 12½ miles in a straight line from a railway can get there in less than 15 or 16 miles. If the intervening distance is increased to 16½ miles, one would not get there in less than 20 or 24 miles in many cases. That is the weak point in Mr. Stileman's scheme. I consider we should not have our railways further apart than 12½ miles. I am quite sure that that is so in regard to potato transport. One potato grower in my district, who is situated about 12 miles from a railway and has a pretty good road, does not wish to sell but is quite willing to let his potato farm. Reading between the lines I infer that the cost of transport, especially when produce is at a low price, takes away all the profit. Exactly the same thing is going to happen in regard to wheat. It is all very well to make the intervening distance 16½ miles now while the product is dearer; but what will happen when the price of wheat goes down? The difference between having a railway close at hand and one a considerable distance away will then mean the difference between profit and loss. What is more, to increase the distance to 16½ miles will mean retarding the development of the land, especially from the aspect of the extremely heavy cost of super that has to be carted over long distances. The various reports stress the necessity for trunk lines. There may be a need for trunk lines, but in my opinion the greatest need

of all is the opening up of our lands in the shortest possible time, especially now that there is such a demand for them and produce is at such a high price. We have no guarantee that that price will be maintained. However, it seems likely to continue for a few years. I would suggest the bringing down of a comprehensive scheme for the whole of the State's railway requirements, so that settlers would know for certain that they were going to get a railway, and where that railway would be built, and when it would be built. Such a scheme would be much better for the country than the present system. Like Mr. Glasheen, I contend it would pay the Government and indeed be one of the best ventures the Government ever entered upon if they were to borrow sufficient money to carry out the whole of this comprehensive scheme at the earliest possible moment. Even if it took £2,000,000 it would be money well spent. I have been over a good deal of the district, and can vouch for what I have given by way of statistics, while other members can vouch for the remainder of the country. In the whole of that district we have the finest piece of wheat belt left in the Commonwealth, and so I say it would be good policy to borrow the money to immediately construct these railways. Provision should be made for the comprehensive scheme, so that it would lead to economy in the working of the load. The primary producer is the first man to be considered; he should have his produce transported by direct route to the nearest port, not as at present carried circuitously to Fremantle. Mr. Baxter and Mr. Kitson both stressed the need for further facilities in Fremantle harbour. If we had a proper scheme of railway construction to every port there would not be this necessity to carry everything through the bottle-neck of Perth and Fremantle. According to Mr. Baxter, two-thirds of the wheat grown in the State goes through that bottle-neck. If so, we are robbing some of the other ports. Pretty nearly all the requirements of the farmers in the wheat belt, of the people of Bunbury, Albany, Geraldton, Esperance and the goldfields, come into Fremantle first and have to pay railway freight afterwards. That, of course, all helps to choke the bottle-neck. If those outer ports were developed, and the wheat and produce taken out in the proper way,

we could also get in our commodities through the same channels. That would be the most economic way of developing the State. Recently I asked in the House what area of dairy country we had from Albany to Bunbury, including 50 miles on either side. The answer was that we had there 7,940,000 acres, but that it could not be stated how much of it was suitable for dairying. In this State butter and cheese making are only in their infancy. We have only one successful butter factory—that at Bunbury, where the production is now over 500 tons per annum. That factory has been in existence for 19 years, and for its first nine years it had to work without a profit. The Busselton factory has now been taken over by the Bunbury factory, and is beginning to pay. The factory at Albany has gone through the same vicissitudes, and I do not think it is doing much more than paying expenses. We have other butter factories and several cheese factories, and the time is coming when we shall be in the same position as Gippsland.

Hon. W. J. Mann: The factory at Manjimup is already paying.

Hon. A. BURVILL: I want to show what is happening in Gippsland, where they have about the same area of country as we have in the South-West. I have here a return issued under the authority of the Minister for Crown lands in Victoria. From that it is seen that Gippsland has 8,739,230 acres or slightly more than the area I have referred to. The area occupied at present is 4,438,386 acres, the number of occupiers 9,940, the acres of wheat 11,693, acres of oats 4,158, acres of barley 11,517, acres of potatoes 8,726, acres of onions 685, acres of maize 19,470, acres of orchards 1,456, dairy cows 159,472, other cattle 187,343, horses 41,333, pigs 84,833, sheep 691,710, butter produce 25,245,448 lbs., wool 4,990,284 lbs., and honey 121,000 lbs. Then there are grown in Victoria hops 269 acres, grown mostly in Gippsland; tobacco 1,228 acres, grown mostly in Gippsland; millet root 531 acres, grown mostly in Gippsland; and sugar beet 1,879 acres, grown exclusively in Gippsland. In point of butter production in Victoria only the Western Districts comes before Gippsland. What has been done in Gippsland can be done in our South-West. Any man who has been through Gippsland and who knows our South-West can support this. Dairy men from Gippsland who come here invariably declare that we have

one of the finest climates in the world for dairying, owing to the equable temperature. In Gippsland it is often very cold in winter and very hot in summer. The only fault to be found in the South-West is that it is very wet in winter and a little dry in summer. Those defects can be overcome by silos and root crops. I am certain that with proper management and proper top-dressing this country will be equally as good as Gippsland; and once it has been got into order, I think it will surpass Gippsland. When I left Gippsland 30 years ago, certain lands similar to some of ours in the South-West were regarded as being too difficult to clear and drain. That land, I found recently, has all been cleared and drained and is selling at a price often 50 per cent. above that of the best scrub and hill country elsewhere. I was shown some at Trafalgar, and from there away down to Warragul, where the country is selling at £100 per acre and upwards. I am not referring to drained swamp lands, for they are selling at a great deal more. The under drained flat lands there are thus free from any wetness or dryness and can maintain more stock for dairying than could be maintained on the hilly ground. The same thing is going to occur here on our lands at present lying idle between Albany and Bunbury, lands commonly called bottle brush country.

Hon. J. EWING: But that is all being condemned.

Hon. A. BURVILL: Well, whoever is condemning it is making a mistake. Instead of putting new settlers from overseas on to that country—which even our own settlers do not understand—we should put on to it men who know something about it. In Albany we had the Land Development Committee brought into being to experiment with that land. They got it up to a stage and handed it to the Government, who then left it. It would have been better perhaps had they never touched it. The Minister for Lands last night referred to a number of experimental farms he had started in sandplain country in various parts, some up North, some in the wheat lands, and some out from Esperance. But there has never been any experimental farm established in the South-West. An experimental farm put in down there would be one of the most successful of them all. Once the problem of utilising that bottle brush country is solved, it will prove one of the best assets we have in the South-

West. The point I would make is that this land will eventually be developed. In Gippsland its development has taken about 50 years. We know that dairymen and those raising pigs want the offal from the wheat, the bran and pollard, at the cheapest possible rate. If, as some expect, a trunk line is constructed from Fremantle to Esperance to take all the wheat to those two ports, the time is bound to come when the South-West will be developed from Bunbury to Albany. Our flour mills should be established as soon as possible in the dairying centres, and as nearly as possible to the sea ports. Further, provision should be made at once to take all the wheat in the Albany zone through the Albany harbour, and all that in the Bunbury zone through the Bunbury harbour. It should be the aim of the Government, not to export wheat, but eventually to export flour and use the bran and pollard to put back into the land. That system of agriculture obtained in the Old Country. In some parts not even the straw was taken off the land. It should be our policy to export not wheat, but flour. The bran and pollard should be made available at the cheapest possible rate, and that will be accomplished by sending the whole of the wheat in the Albany zone to Albany and the wheat in the Bunbury zone to Bunbury, because those will be our two big dairying centres. Mr. Glasheen, speaking of group settlement last night, said he had been informed that timber to the value of £400 an acre was being destroyed on groups at Denmark. I was working at Millars' mills when Denmark was first opened up and I know something of timber. Whoever gave Mr. Glasheen that information does not know much of the conditions applying to forestry and timber milling. It is not always economical to fell a few isolated trees and mill them. It would not pay to put in a mill and cut up the few isolated trees on the groups at Denmark. A good deal of timber that to the uninitiated appears to be nice and sound contains considerable waste and would not pay to convert into sawn timber to sell. In years to come when timber is scarce, isolated trees will be valuable, but it is impracticable to keep the land for two purposes. In the Eastern States it was proved beyond doubt that green timber and crops could not be grown together. It is necessary to kill the timber or retain the land solely for forestry purposes. The land cannot be used for the dual purpose of

forestry and husbandry. At present there seems to be overlapping between the Forests Department and the Group Settlement Department. I have known sleeper hewers to take 6,000 sleepers off the block of one group settler. The settler came to me and asked whether the value of the sleepers would be offset against the price of his block, but I could not tell him. I inquired of the supervisor, but he could give me no information, except that it was beyond his jurisdiction to prevent the hewers from going on the land. If that sort of thing occurs on many groups it must give rise to dissatisfaction. So far as I have been able to ascertain, the Forests Department have the right to send hewers on to the groups to cut the timber, and I am informed that the Forests Department can object to certain trees being rung. Either the Forests Department should control the land for forestry purposes, or the land should be entirely in the hands of the group settlement officials.

Hon. J. Ewing: The settler receives credit for portion of the timber sold.

Hon. A. BURVILL: The point should be settled definitely. There is some fine land in the Denmark groups. I do not know of one block that is not good, and I was interested to find from the recent report that not one of those blocks had been condemned. Still, I would not take the best of the blocks if the Forests Department had the right to say that I should not cut down a certain tree or if they had the right to take the timber off the land. I do not intend to discuss the administration of group settlements. I am still of the opinion I have held from the beginning, that as regards the Denmark blocks—I have not visited many of the others—I cannot see why the right men should not make good, provided the administration is efficient. Certainly heavy cost has been incurred and there has been some mismanagement. There has also been some friction between the management and the settlers. There are faults on both sides, but the great consideration is that the land is good and, provided the right type of man is put on the land, I do not see why he should not make good. During the last two or three years Denmark has been the scene of field demonstrations arranged by the old settlers, assisted by the Group Settlement Department. Outside settlers are invited to attend demonstrations to see new methods

of cultivation in the shape of top dressing, etc., and new methods of clearing adopted to cheapen costs. A demonstration of this kind is to be given on Saturday the 12th November, and I would urge members, before forming a definite opinion of the quality of the land, to attend that demonstration and judge for themselves. Some of the settlers have been in the district for years. There is a man on Group #1 who has an average block. He is running six heifers. Ever since the cheese factory was started five or six months ago, he has received from it £12 per month. By his piecework he has also earned £12 to £14 a month, and he has money in the bank against the time when the group will be disbanded. I got this information verified by the supervisors, and when I sought further confirmation from the manager of the cheese factory, he told me that this settler was making more than £12 a month. In July he actually received from the factory £15. Anyone, after seeing what that man has done, would be satisfied that others could do as well. So many conflicting opinions have been expressed that the general public are apt to conclude that the group settlements are in a far worse position than is really the case.

On motion by Hon. J. R. Brown, debate adjourned.

House adjourned at 8.40 p.m.
