

cannot agree to an adjournment for a week because so little business has been done. Much as I would like to meet the hon. member's wishes, I should not feel justified in doing so on this occasion.

Question put and passed.

*House adjourned at 4.54 p.m.*

## Legislative Assembly,

*Thursday, 2nd August, 1923.*

	PAGE
Questions: Police recruits ... ..	89
Migration, State control of officers ... ..	89
Hospital for Insane, extension ... ..	89
Kendenup settlers ... ..	89
Wheat <i>ex</i> Narrogin ... ..	89
Geraldton harbour works ... ..	89
Address-in-reply, third day ... ..	89

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

### QUESTION—POLICE RECRUITS.

Mr. CORBOY (for Mr. Munsie) asked the Minister controlling Police: 1, Is it a fact that a recruit, or recruits, for the police force have been employed painting and calsoining the Perth Police Station within the past six months? 2, If so, is it the intention of the Government to continue this practice?

The MINISTER FOR MINES replied: 1, Yes. 2, When necessary for hygienic purposes. The police regulations provide that members of the force are engaged not only for police duties, but for fatigue or any other work they may be ordered to do.

### QUESTION—MIGRATION, STATE CONTROL OF OFFICERS.

Mr. J. THOMSON asked the Premier: In view of the general dissatisfaction regarding the selection of migrants to this State, will he confer with the Prime Minister when he passes through Fremantle on his way to the Empire Conference, and point out to him (Mr. Bruce) the urgency and the distinct advantage it would be to this State if we returned to the old system of having our migration officers under the direct control of the Agent General for Western Australia?

The PREMIER replied: No. We have our own migration officers at Australia House.

### QUESTION—HOSPITAL FOR THE INSANE.

Mr. J. THOMSON asked the Colonial Secretary: 1, Is it a fact that the Government propose to build at Point Resolution an extension of the Hospital for the Insane? 2, If so, before starting the building, will he allow this House to discuss the proposal?

The COLONIAL SECRETARY replied: 1, The Government contemplate erecting a Mental Reception and Convalescent Home at Point Resolution. 2, Parliament will have an opportunity of discussing the proposal when a Bill to permit a portion of the Class A Reserve to be used for the purpose is before the House.

### QUESTION—KENDENUP SETTLERS.

Mr. HICKMOTT asked the Premier: 1, Has his attention been directed to a paragraph which appeared in this morning's "West Australian," describing the distress of settlers on the Kendenup estate? 2, If so, what action does he propose to take to relieve the situation?

The PREMIER replied: 1, No. 2, The Government have done all that is possible to help the people of Kendenup. £1,550 has been expended on relief works.

### QUESTION—WHEAT *ex* NARROGIN.

Mr. MONEY asked the Minister for Railways—What quantity of wheat has been: (a) Railed from and through Narrogin to Fremantle during the 12 months ending 30th June last? (b) From and through Narrogin to Bunbury during the same period?

The MINISTER FOR RAILWAYS replied: (a) The tonnage of wheat railed from and through Narrogin to Fremantle for the 12 months ended 30th June was 11,939. (b) From and through Narrogin to Bunbury during the same period the tonnage was 16,356.

### QUESTION—GERALDTON HARBOUR WORKS.

Mr. WILLCOCK (without notice) asked the Minister for Works: How many men are employed on the Geraldton harbour works at the present time?

The MINISTER FOR WORKS replied: There are 22 actually in Geraldton, and 19 at the quarry. The number may fluctuate, according to requirements. A larger body of men will be put on as soon as we have our plans in order.

### ADDRESS-IN-REPLY.

*Third Day.*

Debate resumed from the previous day.

The PREMIER (Hon. Sir James Mitchell—Northam) [4.38]: We listened last night to a speech from the Leader of the Opposition

which, for the most part, was excellent. I propose to-day, by stating the exact position, to refute many assertions that have been made. This is the last session of the present Parliament, and in discussing all matters during the session members will have their eyes on their respective electorates. It is always so in the last session of a Parliament. I think it will be found that day by day the inhabitants of this State are growing more experienced in politics, taking a very much keener interest in public affairs. Time was when very few of them took any interest in public questions. But, naturally, as the years go by people become better versed in all questions of public interest. I do not think there can be any comparison between the interest people now take in public affairs and that which they showed 14 or 15 years ago. Of course, this is a very good thing for the State. It is realised that this Parliament has been exceptional. Members have not merely supported me as Premier, but have supported all measures for the good of the country, often in disregard of party interests. The present Parliament in its legislation and discussions has recognised the rights of all sections of the people. So effective has the work been in the interest of the State, that I could almost wish every member of the House might be returned at the next election. Of course, I do not expect my friends opposite to agree with that.

Hon. P. Collier: Not unless a number of your supporters are prepared to change over.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: I think some on the Government side would not agree.

Hon. P. Collier: It would be a good scheme to have us all here in perpetuity, but taking turn about on the Government benches.

The PREMIER: I for one should not like to be here for ever. The hon. member in his speech mentioned finance. I suppose he did that also with his eye on the electorates. He complained that the "West Australian" does not state very frequently the total deficit. To my mind the "West Australian" states it far too often.

Hon. M. F. Troy: Your July statement was amusing.

The PREMIER: It might amuse the hon. member.

Hon. M. F. Troy: And the people in the country. They have dropped to your June surplus. I agree that they are taking an interest in politics.

The PREMIER: The people take a keen and intelligent interest in politics, if not in the hon. member. We have had a war, and the usual crop of troubles has followed.

Mr. Corboy: Is it not time to stop blaming the war for your deficits?

The PREMIER: We have had troubles because of the war. There is in Perth a newspaper entitled "The Worker"—an excellent paper. Many people have to take it whether they like it or not.

Hon. P. Collier: So, too, with the "West."

The PREMIER: "The Worker" has a blackboard, on which it gives some information in respect of finance. The first line tells

us that the Labour Government in their first five years had a deficit of £1,374,264. The paper forgets to say that the Liberal Government, for the five years preceding the advent of the Labour Government, had a surplus of £183,199, and that for the last five years the deficit has totalled £3,144,351.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: The Liberal Government had a deficit of £80,000 when the Labour Government took office.

The PREMIER: I am giving the actual figures for the five years. The Labour Government compiled a deficit of £134,400 in their first year; of £190,404 in their second year, and of £135,411 in 1913-14. Then the war came. The war has had many disastrous effects. In the first year of war, 1914-15, the deficit was £565,817.

Mr. Corboy: That was through the drought, not so much the war.

The PREMIER: For the next year the amount was £343,223.

Mr. Corboy: That was another drought year.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order!

The PREMIER: Surely I am entitled to state these things, just as the Leader of the Opposition was entitled to criticise our position last night. When the war came upon us we had a small deficit, but we had years of war and years of drought, and we are suffering to-day because of the aftermath of war. Our invested money, which represents a considerable sum, was expended on railways and other public facilities. Naturally, with the tightening up of trade due to the war the revenue from these activities suffered considerably. When once a deficit is set up it is difficult to break it down. Expenditure cannot be reduced on such things as hospitals, education, and all the other free services. Year by year these free services cost us more and more. Public utilities are largely responsible for the improvement in the finances this year. It is only right I should anticipate that every member in the House will be gratified with the improvement. It does mean real progress. It has been a terrible struggle to get these trading concerns into anything like a paying position. When the Liberal Government left office in 1911, the earnings of invested money almost paid the interest and sinking fund. Undoubtedly the war did affect these invested funds. When we came back into office in 1916 the shortage, that is the amount that the revenue had to make up in order to pay interest and sinking fund, was £700,000. To correct this has been, and still is, a struggle. When members realise that this amount represents loss on invested money, largely due to the war, they will understand that to square the finances we must place these concerns in a paying position. I will now refer to the loan expenditure during the time the Labour Government were in office. Between the years 1911 and 1916 the loan expenditure was

£12,738,000. The advances for agricultural development during those years was £2,012,000, or 16 per cent. of the total borrowings. Our policy has been to increase development and production. For the five years between 1918 and 1923 our loan expenditure was £12,399,867. Of that amount £7,650,000 was advanced to farmers for agricultural development, representing 61 per cent. of the total borrowings during those five years. This means that the interest upon this money is borne by the people who get the loans. I hope members will realise where the money has gone, and agree that it could not have gone in a better direction. The Leader of the Opposition said something about the amount expended last year, £3,644,699. Of this £2,368,428 has been advanced in the way I have indicated, 65 per cent. of the total borrowings for last year having been loaned to people who will carry the interest. That means that our public utilities will benefit very considerably, bit by bit, as the land is brought into production. In that way, also, traffic is being made for the railways, and the general public receive an indirect benefit from the borrowed money. I do not know how to estimate the benefit derived from money that is going to individuals for the development of agriculture, mining, or any other industry, but it must be considerable.

Mr. Lambert: It would be much sounder to put the money into actual production.

The PREMIER: To get money from production we have first of all to prepare the way. During the war we could not get done the work we expected to have done. It must not be forgotten that 40 per cent. of the able-bodied men of the State enlisted. How could the work go on in such circumstances? Seeing that the Budget will be brought down in a few days, I do not wish to discuss finances at any length this afternoon. I have just been to the Premiers' conference, but I am sorry to say nothing has resulted from it. The Prime Minister came to this State. I am afraid the public thought from his speeches, and I think he meant what he said, that they would benefit very materially by some new arrangement. I submitted certain proposals to the conference. Under one of these we were to be £100,000 better off. The proposal, however, has fallen through. First there was a proposal that the Federal Government should evacuate the right to tax incomes over £2,000, and that we were to forego something on our part. Further, there was a proposal that we should tax the individuals and they should tax companies. That, too, went by the board.

Mr. Munsie: Then there is no agreement at all?

The PREMIER: Nothing was done. I did ask for the £100,000, which the Prime Minister said he thought we ought to get.

I think we should get considerably more, but we have not been successful there either.

Mr. Munsie: How about the per capita payment?

The PREMIER: We shall get that; we must get it.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: He said the other day this was only postponed.

The PREMIER: All the proposals are postponed. There is not much chance of getting the £100,000. We were to receive some advantage in connection with the interest on money borrowed by the Federal Government for soldier settlement. I hope we shall get this. We are paying interest at the rate of £6 7s. 10d. per cent. on money advanced for soldier settlement, namely, £4,532,115. That interest was to have been brought down to 5 per cent. as from the 1st January next. We cannot loan money at a reasonable rate of interest to soldiers if we are charged £6 7s. 10d. per cent. We are charging 6½ per cent. Unless this is altered, I do not know what we shall do. I told the Prime Minister something must happen, that we could not pay this high interest and lend money at 6½ per cent. It is not fair to ask us to do so. We did the work of repatriation so far as the land is concerned, although it is really a job for the Commonwealth. For the repatriation of soldiers the people of Australia are being taxed by the Federal Government. We, as a State, have no chance of raising special revenue for this purpose. There is no reason why we should do so. The Federal Government have the right, and did raise the money. To give soldiers money at a reasonable rate is a responsibility the Federal Government ought to take.

Hon. P. Collier: You have an undeniable claim there. We did a lot of their work.

The PREMIER: They get the credit and we lost the cash. That is not a fair deal. I am still endeavouring to get this rate reduced, and I am sure every member will support me in this connection. The Prime Minister recognises that our financial position, due to Federation, is a difficult one. We are subject to a high protective tariff. We pay, because of this tariff, a very much higher price for most of the things we buy. We benefit very little by it, because we manufacture so little ourselves. It is a fearful load to carry, not only for the man who buys machinery, but for the man who buys a coat to put on his back. They both have to pay more than they would because of this high protective tariff. I am not advocating free-trade, but we should have sufficient protection for the development of industry and no more. The Eastern States do benefit by this prohibitive tariff. I refer particularly to Victoria, New South Wales, and South Australia. The result is seen in the Victorian finances. Trade activity always brings something into revenue. It is no wonder that we in this State, who do not benefit, have trouble in carrying our burden, whereas in the other

States they have very little trouble at all. In New South Wales they have a credit balance for the year of over a million pounds.

Hon. P. Collier: And the Federal Government have a big surplus, while the States are in financial difficulties.

The PREMIER: I had forgotten that point. The Federal Government have a credit balance of seven million pounds.

Mr. Underwood: Almost as much as our deficit.

Hon. P. Collier: By invading our sphere of taxation.

The PREMIER: Every State has had bad times financially. If the Federal Government had returned to the States, as they should have done under the Constitution, their surplus revenue, the amount would have pretty well wiped out the deficit in all the States put together. It is astonishing that we should have to submit to this treatment, but there is no way out of it. Under the Federal Constitution we were to get at least three-fourths of the Customs Revenue returned to us, and the unexpended part of the other fourth. Under the Surplus Revenue Act, 1910, we have paid to us 25s. per capita, but the States should also have the surplus revenue of the Federal Government. They have refused to give it. They now want to reduce the per capita payment as well. They have no consideration at all for this State.

Mr. Marshall: They will soon want another increase in their Parliamentary salaries.

[Mr. Munsie took the Chair.]

The PREMIER: I wish to refer to the smaller States question. I am sure the member for Kanowna (Hon. T. Walker) would tell us what this smaller States proposal means. There is a proposal to divide the existing States into smaller States, to take away a part of the area we possess as a sovereign State. Further, the proposal is to make each of the smaller States to be created far more subservient to the Federal Government than we are. Unification is the ultimate aim. Indeed, under any system of smaller States the position would amount to unification, because the whole of the power would centre in the Federal Government. Is there in this State anyone who wants to transfer power from Perth to Melbourne? If there be such a one, let him judge by our experience, by the little consideration that we receive from the Federal Government, even in so small a matter as that of interest on soldiers' funds. Federal taxation is strangling the States. Everybody knows that the Federal Government do not come into our daily life. The member for Sussex (Mr. Pickering) said by way of interjection that we are all sovereign States. That is true. We are left with the responsibility of doing all that is necessary for our people. We control our territory absolutely, and are responsible for everything that counts outside the Post Office, Customs House, and Defence. Federation need not be a burden,

and if the people would demand obedience to the letter and the spirit of the Constitution, I do not think it would be a burden. Under Federation there is no overlord. Under Federation there can be no partnership, but there can be co-operation. The Federal Government have their responsibility, and we have our responsibility, each well understood and each well defined. The Federal Parliament have no right to assume a dignity and importance which are not theirs. Why cannot they accept their responsibility and stick to that as defined by the letter and spirit of the Constitution, and leave us with our responsibility?

Mr. O'Loghlin: It is human nature to take all the power you can get.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: They get judges to alter the law.

The PREMIER: We are quite willing to co-operate if the Federal Government will co-operate. The Federal Government ought not to assume a position which is not provided for in the Constitution. Our powers as a sovereign State are greater than the Federal powers, but of course the Federal Government have the right to tax anything whatever and every avenue of taxation is open to them. The position is very serious, and unless the people of all the States wake up to it, I fear it will become still more serious. I did think that when Mr. Bruce became Prime Minister we should get better treatment from the Federation; but we have had Federal Government after Federal Government, representing every section of the Federal Parliament, and they have all been the same. When a Prime Minister comes to a conference, he finds that he is not quite all he would like to be, because the Premiers are Premiers of sovereign States, and naturally we control our own affairs.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: It is our House of Lords that is driving the people into the arms of the Federal legislators.

The PREMIER: I consider that our House of Lords, as the hon. member terms it, would compare favourably with the Federal Senate. I wish I knew some way of convincing the people of the position between Federation and the State, of getting that position before the people, because I am sure it is not understood. Now I am about to deal with land settlement, by way of replying to the statement prepared by the member for Hannans (Mr. Munsie). In 1909-10 the area selected was 1,891,367 acres; in 1910-11, 1,923,172 acres; in 1911-12, 1,970,082 acres; in 1912-13, 1,411,597 acres; in 1913-14, 998,850 acres; in 1914-15 the area selected went down to 502,551 acres, and in 1915-16 it fell to 308,590 acres, and in 1916-17 to 235,640 acres, which was the lowest figure. In 1917-18 the area selected was 546,576 acres; in 1918-19 it was 610,249 acres; in 1919-20, which was my first year of office, it was 1,488,051 acres; in 1920-21 it was 1,726,515 acres; in 1921-22 it was 1,922,540 acres; and in 1922-23 it was, inclusive of

group settlers, 1,943,681 acres, or only a few acres under the record year. In 1922-23 the number of group settlers' blocks taken up was 933, and the number of ordinary selectors was 2,997. In the early years I have mentioned every man was allowed to take two blocks, and in the wheat belt he was allowed to take, in addition, a homestead farm, so that my last year will, I think, be as good as any year in the State's history. I make these statements because it has been alleged that we are not settling and developing our lands. It has been asserted that we have no lands to offer. There are about 1,600 blocks surveyed now. The area surveyed is some indication of what is going on. In 1910-11, which was the year of the maximum area, the acreage surveyed was 3,195,419. In 1911-12, 3,003,301 acres were surveyed; in 1912-13, 1,413,344 acres; and in 1913-14, 612,852 acres. The acreage went down to as low as 97,918 acres for 1916-17. It has gradually worked up again, until last year we surveyed 1,436,467 acres. We have been surveying land into smaller blocks, so that the number of holdings represented by later surveys is probably as great as before. I would like to say in this House that I urged that the surveyors be kept at work even when land selection was not very active. I recollect that a former member for Nelson ridiculed the idea, but I hold that we would be in a very much better position now if the surveys had been continued. With regard to group settlement, we now have 69 groups, on which there are 1,340 men, and 5,000 people—more people than will be found in any country town of the State. Those people have been settled in groups during the last couple of years. We hope that two additional groups will get going next week. Of migrants under the immigration agreement on groups there are 320, and the total of migrants in group settlements is 623. The total expenditure on group settlements up to date has been £450,539. As regards soldier settlement, we have 4,936 settlers, and the total expenditure amounts to £5,497,611. Something was said about area under crop in the document prepared by the member for Hannans (Mr. Munsie). It is true that in 1916 there were under crop 2,189,456 acres, and that that area fell very considerably. The war started in August of 1914, and took a tremendous number of men from the land. Naturally, the area under crop fell off. In 1918 it was reduced to 1,679,772 acres, and in 1919 to 1,605,088 acres. Since then the area under crop has increased year by year. Men came back from the war and got on their holdings again. By the way, many of the holdings had gone back in the meantime, and had again to be prepared for the plough. In February of 1922 the area under crop had increased to 1,901,680 acres, and in February, 1923, to 2,273,735 acres; this year it is estimated there will be 2,773,735 acres under crop, or 1,100,000 acres more than when the present Government came into office.

The Minister for Agriculture: Not a bad record for a population of some 340,000.

The PREMIER: We judge by the amount of fertiliser that has gone out to the farmers. It is estimated that enough fertiliser has gone out to sow 600,000 additional acres.

Mr. Pickering: Was there not a lot of sard-plain country that went out of cultivation?

The PREMIER: I daresay there was. It is important, however, for the public to know that there has been an increase of 1,170,000 acres under crop in the last four years. Now I should like to make a special reference to the Esperance district. The member for the district is asking for another railway.

Hon. P. Collier: He is always wanting more.

The PREMIER: When hon. members opposite have some wants, it shows that they are thinking of doing something, anyhow. In the Esperance district 440 blocks have been selected; and if those 440 blocks were cleared and grubbed in a reasonable way, all would be well with the Esperance railway. There are 138 blocks open for selection. There are 142 settlers in occupation at and north of Seaddan. Surveys totalling 200,000 acres had been made prior to the coming into office of the present Government, since when 400,000 acres have been surveyed. Classification of an additional 650,000 acres has been made by the present Government. Agricultural Bank assistance is given to the Esperance settlers, and I should like to say that we have never done more for settlers than we have for the Esperance district settlers, the special reason being that they are cut off. We have had contractors out to plough a good area for the settlers this year, so that they may have horse feed and seed for next year's crop. We have provided water supplies, cleared roads, built the railway and in every possible way we have encouraged the people to cultivate their holdings. It was the obvious course for us to pursue, seeing that the railway was being constructed. Until the crops are growing, nothing can be done to provide freight for the line. The member for Kanowna (Hon. T. Walker) knows full well that I opposed the construction of the Esperance Northwards Railway, but the House decided that the line should be built. Having come into office, we have gone on with the line and we have treated the district well. We have done everything possible for the people there, since we started to build the line.

Hon. P. Collier: Have you any idea of the area under crop this year?

The PREMIER: The area is small.

The Minister for Agriculture: About 8,000 acres are under crop.

The PREMIER: Of course, the area could not be very considerable, because the settlers had to get their fertiliser supplies before they could expect to get crops. There is no doubt that the land from Salmon Gum to Norseman is a rich area and if the rainfall is sufficient, a magnificent opening for farming will be

provided in that part of the State. A little east of that district, a vast area of good land has been reported, comprising nearly 3,000,000 acres of salmon gum country extending almost to the sea. At the present time, our officers are carrying out investigations to ascertain if the rainfall there is sufficient to make the area suitable for wheat growing. I hope it will be found possible for us to develop that section of the State. It may be said that it is a strange thing that the existence of this vast area was not known long ago. Even people who have stations in that part of the country did not know much about it! Certainly, the existence of such an enormous stretch of salmon gum country was not known to Government departments. It would be a good thing if it were proved possible to extend our wheat production from Ravensthorpe right through this vast stretch of country.

Hon. P. Collier: Was this discovery made only last year?

The PREMIER: It was made within the last few months. It seems strange that we did not know of this before.

Mr. Lutey: A good many people have heard of it.

The PREMIER: The hon. member should not have kept the information to himself.

Mr. Lutey: We have been talking about it for the past 20 years.

The PREMIER: As to the mining industry—the Minister for Mines will deal with the industry more extensively—we have to recognise that troublous times have befallen mining throughout Australia and, indeed, throughout the world. Although our output in Western Australia has decreased considerably, we still produce more than the rest of Australia put together. At Kalgoorlie those connected with mining have encountered that difficult time that comes to all mine fields. We must help the mining industry and assist it to become re-established, if possible. We have our gold-fields railway line and our water supply scheme; we have in Kalgoorlie our public buildings and everything that goes to make a town of importance. That being so, if anything can be done to assist the mining industry, it must be done. The railway revenue from the mines fell last year to the extent of £252,000 as against the revenue derived from that source in 1913. That is a serious matter.

Hon. P. Collier: What do you mean by railway revenue?

The PREMIER: I mean the railway earnings on all the mining railways. This fact shows how serious the position is. Mining companies would work if they could work; the fact is, the trade is not there for the railways. What can we do to rectify the position? We can cheapen the water supplied to Kalgoorlie but that will probably mean a change in our method of financing the Coolgardie Water Scheme. In 1927 we shall not have to pay interest on two and a-half millions of the money involved in that scheme. The sinking fund is sufficient to pay off the debt. In fact, the liquidation

of the debt respecting the big water scheme loan is provided for now, and if we could only get the advantage now regarding the interest payments, it would be a splendid thing. The Treasury officials are going into the matter, and it may be that we will be able to make a proposal to Parliament. We must risk something fairly considerable if the mining industry is to be successful. To make any appreciable effect in the cheapening of water, for instance, would mean the finding of probably £50,000.

Hon. P. Collier: Some of the big mines worked on a margin of 3d. per ton profit.

The PREMIER: Mines will always be run if both ends can be made to meet. The machinery is there and to stop operations means to lose everything, while to continue means giving the mines a chance.

Hon. P. Collier: The Great Boulder Perseverance Mine employed 700 men and ran for several years on a margin of 3d. per ton.

The PREMIER: Yes, because if the mine stopped, it was done.

Hon. P. Collier: And 700 men made a tremendous difference to the district.

The PREMIER: I hope we will be able to do something for the Kalgoorlie district. We have helped in ways that cannot be continued for many years because money put into prospecting and into proving mines at greater depths is often lost altogether. Very seldom as the result of such work in old mines, do we strike much of value. At the same time it has to be conceded that it is worth while taking a risk. If by taking that risk we are able to prolong the life of a mining district and so provide freight for our railways, it is better to take that risk than to refuse it, for a refusal means that the mines have to cease. The Leader of the Opposition knows that the Minister for Mines has spent a good deal of money in helping the mining industry by developing mines at depth and in financing prospecting parties.

Hon. P. Collier: That is so.

The PREMIER: We must do it, or else lose very considerably. If we can only keep our railways going, our mines working, and the water in our pipes, it is worth doing. The Government are anxious to do that work. The trouble is to know just what to do to achieve that end. I do not know that it has ever happened anywhere in the world that an old mining district has been revived to an extent equalling its prosperity in earlier days. I will not say much about sandalwood at this stage because I hope the Minister for Mines will be able to satisfy the House, when tenders are accepted, that the cutters will be well protected and well off indeed. When tenders were called, I had not the faintest idea of the value of the sandalwood, no idea we could get the royalty or that the cutters could get such a reward. I think it must be the first time that the interests of the cutters have been recognised in such a way. These men are operating in the bush, and in the past they received a small amount for the sandalwood they procured.

Under the new system they will get an excellent reward for their labours.

Mr. Lambert: In India, the industry is made a State monopoly.

Mr. Marshall: The pullers themselves do not desire any amendment.

The Minister for Mines: They do not know anything about it.

The PREMIER: The member for Murchison (Mr. Marshall) does not know anything about it, nor did we know what would happen to the pullers, nor yet did the pullers know, until tenders were called.

Mr. Corboy: You took it on the blind?

The PREMIER: No one knew. The member for Yilgarn (Mr. Corboy), wise and all as he is, did not know. Hon. members will believe me when I say that all we have asked is that the best royalty possible for the State and a good price for the cutter shall be secured. Of course, hard things have been and are being said, things that men should be ashamed to say, and if those men were not capable of doing mean things themselves, they would not say them. However, that does not disturb us at all. Tenders were called in the most public way possible, and everyone had a chance to tender on precisely the same basis. Tenders were received by the Forests Department, opened and considered by the department, and on the recommendation of the Forests Department the tenders will be dealt with. The whole thing has been unpleasant, but it will have been worth while if the cutters can get a decent livelihood. The Leader of the Opposition said that the financial results in connection with the railways had not been achieved without starving maintenance. That is not so. Maintenance has been attended to and our railway lines are in better order now than they have been in for years past. For his first year or two of office, the Commissioner, Colonel Pope, had to spend a lot of money to bring the rolling stock and the lines into order. Material could not be bought for that purpose during the war period owing to the abnormal costs, and therefore the engines had to go unrepaired. The hon. member also said something about my visit to North Perth in connection with the water supply. When the hon. member himself was Acting Premier, he made many announcements of policy. I can remember some meetings he addressed. I had a perfect right to tell the people of North Perth what the Government proposed to do. Parliament voted a large sum of money last session for improving the water supply, including money for the reservoir at Mt. Hawthorn. The water supply question has been dealt with fully for several years past. While money was so dear, not much could be done, for money at 6½ per cent. interest made a big water supply scheme impossible. Now that money is cheaper the scheme can be undertaken. Perth is increasing in size very rapidly and a hills water supply must be obtained to cope with the increasing demands. With cheaper money available something can be done, seeing that the people will be able to pay for it. Water

trouble is present in every city in Australia to-day, and when I was in Melbourne a month or two ago the water was quite as dark as it ever was in North Perth—not that that justifies North Perth receiving a bad water supply. The complete water scheme, which has been outlined, will fulfil requirements for many years to come and the expenditure will be spread over many years. Some day, Perth may get its water from the Murray River.

Mr. Lambert: That is fantastic.

The Minister for Mines: Not when you consider what the population may be 20 years hence.

The PREMIER: The member for Coolgardie (Mr. Lambert) is so innocent! I am coming to the question of immigration, and I want hon. members to follow the facts. Last year the Agricultural Bank authorisations were sufficient to provide employment for 5,000 men. Railways are being built, roads laid down, drainage and water supplies attended to. All this work is consequent upon our immigration policy, without which we could not have provided the work. In this work our assisted male immigrants could be employed three times over. But, of course, they come here to go into the country. However, were it not for this policy of development there would be no work for our own people. That is the point. Last year the Agricultural Bank authorised an expenditure of £1,077,000.

Hon. P. Collier: Was that actually advanced?

The PREMIER: No, I will tell you about that presently. At June, 1922, the bank had outstanding authorisations of £1,100,000, and the total authorisations outstanding on the 30th June last amounted to £1,500,000. The sum of £374,997 was actually advanced by the bank last year. That was for clearing, fencing, building, water supplies and other purposes. There is all this work to be done, and we are not getting it done, although we want it done as speedily as possible. Of the outstanding authorisations at the 30th June last, at least £750,000 is for actual work to be done. Some hon. member stated that the farmers are not accepting the money. As a matter of fact they have applied for this money and it is authorised. It was said that we are charging 7 per cent., and giving only 10 years for the repayment of the loan. That is not so. The ordinary bank conditions apply to the first 600 acres. A loan for the clearing of land beyond 600 acres may be repayable in 10 years. That is quite reasonable. We want the land cleared, and so in some cases we advance this 10-year loan. In other cases 30 years terms are given, as for the first 600 acres. The farmer has his machinery and his house, and his farm is a going concern, so surely it will pay him to take the money for 10 years. If he cannot get it back twice over in 10 years, I shall be very much surprised. For the four weeks ended 31st July we have authorised advances totalling £74,000. That means a lot of work for a

lot of men. It is quite apart from the group settlement. Nearly all the money I have alluded to is for the wheat belt. During the year we have settled 933 men in 45 groups, or, say, 3,000 persons in all.

Hon. P. Collier: Have you any idea how many migrants are amongst them?

The PREMIER: I think, 600. I have already given the figure. Of course, there are these other migrants who have been here for some years.

Mr. McCallum: Do you include the Peel estate in the group settlements?

The PREMIER: Only partly. We have brought out during the year no fewer than 3,678 men, 1,013 women, and 575 children. The migrants who paid their own passages to the State, numbered 2,933. I mention this to show that we have a great many migrants who have not been sent out by our own officials.

Hon. P. Collier: Are they given the same facilities for acquiring land?

The PREMIER: Yes.

Hon. P. Collier: Last year many complained that they were at a disadvantage because they had paid their own fares.

The PREMIER: We took a certain number of Imperial soldiers under the Soldier Settlement Scheme. They compared their treatment with the treatment of those soldiers who came out under the migration scheme, men who were given slightly better terms. Now I want to deal with the question of population and the census. Until the hon. member mentioned the excess of departures over arrivals I did not go into the question. Since the per capita payment has been made to the State, the Commonwealth Government have attended to the census. We no longer look to it. From 1901 the figures recorded from year to year were 293,416 persons in 1911. However, the census of 1911 gave a return of 282,114 persons, or a shortage of 11,302. From 1911 the figures recorded from year to year showed a total of 337,902 persons. But the census of 1921 gave a return of 332,213 persons, or a shortage of 5,689 persons. It must be understood that the responsible Commonwealth officers load the figures. Every quarter they deduct from the figures 220 for unrecorded departures to the Eastern States. Also they add to the recorded departures 1 per cent. for men and 4 per cent. for women, as unrecorded departures overseas. That is additional to the 220 persons deducted per quarter for unrecorded departures to the Eastern States. But nothing whatever is allowed for unrecorded arrivals. Is not that an extraordinary thing? I do not suppose South Australia gets any credit for the 220 persons per quarter deducted from our figures.

Hon. P. Collier: They evaporate!

The PREMIER: After the census of 1921 the loading was 4,786 persons, and the shortage 5,689.

Mr. Munsie: You will get one extra, that chap who proved that he had not died.

The PREMIER: It is very interesting the way these figures are kept. In the 20 years the total shortage has been 16,991 persons. After a loading of 4,786 the so-called unrecorded departures mean to the State a loss of per capita payments of at least £212,387.

Hon. T. Walker: Then this evaporation is of considerable advantage to the Commonwealth.

The PREMIER: Of course it is. There is another feature: every person who failed to send in a census form cost the State £12 10s. Scattered as the people are, from Wyndham to Eucla, it is impossible to get a correct census in this State. I am afraid the census is not correct even in the towns. As my friend the member for West Perth (Mrs. Cowan) knows, ladies do not like writing their age on the census forms. Moreover, the form is unnecessarily cumbersome, and so many people neglect to fill it in. I think we can take it that all those unrecorded departures, those missing men and women, are in the State.

Hon. P. Collier: Has the position been represented to the Federal authorities?

The PREMIER: Yes, we are corresponding with them even now. They load the figures bit by bit. In June, 1921, we had an increase of 1,800 persons, but when the final figures came out that number had been reduced to 800. The Commonwealth have absolute control of the figures, and that is how the work is done. Every quarter 220 are deducted from our population as unrecorded departures to the Eastern States.

[The Speaker resumed the Chair.]

Mr. Corboy: We get no unrecorded arrivals credited to us, I suppose?

The PREMIER: No.

Hon. P. Collier: That is high-handed, arbitrary action.

The PREMIER: Of course, and it costs us a lot of money.

Mr. Corboy: Does that apply to all the States?

The PREMIER: I suppose it does.

Mr. Corboy: You ought to get the other Premiers to assist you to prevent it.

The PREMIER: We have been trying, but it is not an easy matter.

Hon. P. Collier: There is a much greater probability of unrecorded departures between the other States than here, because it is much easier to cross the borders there.

Mr. Pickering: In the East anyone could walk across the border.

Mr. Heron: So they could here.

Mr. Pickering: I would not like their chance.

The PREMIER: I am glad the hon. member mentioned the point, because I wanted to make the position clear. Coming to immigration, this is no new thing. The member for North-East Fremantle (Hon. W. C. Angwin), when a Minister, was proud of his immigration policy, but the policy of the La-



bour Government was, as I have shown by the percentage of advances to farmers, a public works policy, not a land settlement policy. I think that is where the mistake was made. If war had not come, there would have been serious trouble, because no country can go long on a public works policy. With a land settlement policy, however, it can go on indefinitely. In 1910-11 the Labour Government brought in 7,744 migrants; in 1911-12, 9,780; in 1912-13, 7,265; in 1913-14, 4,317; and in 1914-15, 4,323. Then a stop was put to immigration by the war. There was unemployment, of course, but that did not deter my friends, who believe—as I do—in a white Australia and who know—as I do—that we cannot have a white Australia unless we people the country. The war stopped this war; nothing else. What has come over the scene to warrant a change? In power my friends of the Opposition, especially the member for North-East Fremantle, said we must have people.

Hon. P. Collier: I say so to-day.

The PREMIER: Good.

Mr. Munsie: So does every one of us.

The PREMIER: But you do not mean it.

Mr. Clydesdale: Yes, we do.

The PREMIER: The member for Canning does, but the Leader of the Opposition does not. I have quoted the statistics regarding the people brought in by the Labour Government.

Mr. Corboy: It is unfair to suggest that we are against immigration.

Mr. Munsie: There is no justification for such a statement.

The PREMIER: Then, I shall withdraw it with pleasure; I made a mistake in accusing the member for Hannans of being opposed to immigration.

Mr. Munsie: Take that circular—I did not draft it—and you cannot show that it contains a work against immigration.

The PREMIER: This, then, was the position under the Labour Government; immigration for public works, little land settlement, unemployment. The Leader of the Opposition asks, "What is our policy?" Our policy is a white and safe Australia, a land development policy; and I say that our policy is well understood. The Leader of the Opposition understands what is happening. The Deputy Leader of the Opposition has visited almost all the groups with me, and has gone into this matter forty times with me and he knows what the policy is. I have told members to-night, as I have told them many times, that all activity must follow land development at the moment. I ask the people that say there is no work to do whether they are content to eat the butter produced in the East. Last year we imported £1,936,000 worth of foodstuffs. Over a period of 20 years we have imported £29,958,000 worth of foodstuffs. Are not we ashamed of having to import food in such quantities? Is it not a reflection on our energy and industry that we depend on the Eastern States for food after all these years?

If we had fed the goldfields, we should have been the richest of all the Australian States. Is this state of affairs to continue? I ask, in all seriousness, whether anyone in this House is content for Western Australia to go on paying out this large sum of money for food year after year? It is no wonder we are not well off. We have the land, notwithstanding the hon. member's statement. We have the climate.

Mr. Munsie: You have 60 odd settlers waiting to be placed in groups.

The PREMIER: We have not got the men.

Mr. Munsie: You have the people and they cannot get into groups; 62 are waiting to be placed.

The PREMIER: Let the hon. member show a little reason.

Mr. Munsie: I am only stating facts.

The PREMIER: But the hon. member is stating the facts to suit his argument.

Mr. Munsie: I would be foolish if I did not.

The PREMIER: The trouble is they are only half-facts. There is no opportunity lost by some people to damn immigration, no matter what ideas they really hold. There were hundreds waiting in the old days. There may be 60 people waiting now, but they are being settled gradually. Two groups are going in this week.

Mr. Munsie: I am pleased to hear it.

The PREMIER: It has not been possible to get people out into the South-West because of the excessive rain. The Peel estate in two months has recorded 10 inches of rainfall above the average. How is it possible to get people there at the moment? There are 1,600 blocks surveyed and others will be ready as soon as the weather becomes fine enough to enable us to get the people out. I have given the record of land settlement last year. Is not that satisfactory? It was almost a record for the State. Are we content to eat Eastern States' foodstuffs? Are we content year by year to bring in millions of pounds' worth of manufactured goods? Last year imports from the Eastern States, exclusive of foodstuffs amounted to £5,793,000.

Mr. Munsie: We want a few secondary industries, so that we can manufacture what we require.

The PREMIER: We do, and we are getting a few, but very slowly. Some of our engineers went East last year when the strike was on, and so they were lost to this State. We want factories, large factories too; and if we get them, they will always assist to keep the wheels of industry going. Other States have their factories, long established, set up in much cheaper times before the days of high protection, and paid for. A man starting a factory here now has to pay more for the building, more for the machinery, more for his raw material. The additional cost is due to high protection, the benefits from which accrue to the Federal Treasury. All along the line he is handicapped. A man starting a factory, which costs a lot of money,

has to borrow money and owe it for some years. In the Eastern States manufacturers have doubtless got over that stage; the factories are paid for and the owners are wealthy men. Here a man has to risk not only his own capital, but also borrowed capital, and there seems to be some apprehension regarding industrial troubles. Whenever I have heard people express doubt on this score, I have told them there is no greater fear of industrial troubles in Western Australia than in any other part of the Commonwealth.

Hon. P. Collier: Not so much.

Mr. Heron: It is merely one of their bogeys.

The PREMIER: Let us lend a hand to get these factories established and, when they are established, let us do all we can to keep them going. I regret to have to explain again the arrangement with the other Governments for the financing of this scheme. We have arranged for the Federal Government to bear all the expenses of advertising and of landing the migrants in this State. For 75,000 migrants, this will mean a saving of £900,000 to the State. We have two officers in London, appointed by the State but paid by the Federal Government, as well-tried and useful men as could be sent.

Mr. J. Thomson: Hear, hear! I saw them.

The PREMIER: I asked the member for North-East Fremantle (Hon. W. C. Angwin) whether he would go to London to select immigrants for us. I am sorry he could not go. The two officers select the migrants. I remind members that we stood out of the agreement entered into by the other States until we secured the right to nominate our officers to select the migrants for this State. Western Australia, therefore, is selecting her own migrants. The Imperial Government and the Federal Government between them are to pay two-thirds of the interest on £6,000,000 for five years. At the present cost of money this will mean a saving to us of £1,000,000. For the first time in our history we are being helped in our immigration policy, and £1,900,000 will be saved.

Mr. Munsie: It is the first time in our history that such circumstances have arisen.

The PREMIER: I am stating the facts.

Mr. Hughes: Why not state all of them?

The PREMIER: I have mentioned £1,900,000; what more does the hon. member want?

Mr. Hughes: You have said that this is the first time in our history in which we have received such assistance. Why not say it is the first time that there has been an opportunity?

The PREMIER: It is the first time that assistance has been asked. During the last four years the deficit has been £2,492,000, and of this £1,113,000 has gone into sinking fund. When we recollect the saving of £1,900,000 on this work for four years, it will be seen that our immigration policy has not cost the country so much. Our policy is work on the land; settlement on the land. Our policy is to double wheat production as quickly as possible, and I have shown how we are

exerting our energies to that end. Our policy is to continue clearing good land in the Wheat Belt. There is no better investment. Our policy is to open up new areas of wheat land, to fence land, and to stock land. That is our policy in the Wheat Belt. Wherever there are good areas to be cleared, let the farmers clear them. The money can be found and can be repaid. The applications cannot be too big. Members understand the scheme for the development of the South-West because we have discussed group settlement so often. Is there any other place in Australia where more is being done than we are doing in the South-West to-day? There is not. Ours is a wonderful country. It is said in the remarkable document we heard read by the Leader of the Opposition last night that there is no land left.

Mr. Munsie: The document does not say anything of the kind. That is another of your wild statements.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order!

The PREMIER: It is possible to grow crops in the South-West all the year round. Men on the groups can live a happy and contented life. They are working very well indeed, but of course they will have some troubles. They will not sail right into comfort when the clearing is over. They will have to be helped and shepherded, but they will ultimately make fine homes for themselves. I saw in the Eastern States land, bringing £100 an acre, that is not as good, although it is cleared, as the land the men on the groups are getting for nothing. If that land were situated in any other State of the Commonwealth, having the rainfall, the soil and the facilities it has, it would be bringing not less than £10 an acre. We are giving it to these settlers. The policy is to open up the country, to produce this two million pounds worth of food ourselves. I have heard people ask what is to become of all the stuff the settlers will produce. That will be used to feed the people of the metropolitan area and of the State generally. By the time the 6,000 settlers have their places in a fair state of production, there will be a market for all they can produce. Is not that right policy? This House agreed to the building of a railway to open up further lands between Pemberton and Albany. Thousands of people can be settled there. The policy is to settle them in groups. There are some people, not in this House, who say we are doing too much under this South-West policy. We should no longer ask men to live on the land in discomfort. Men who are battling on the land are doing a national work and ought to be helped. What is the difference between the amount that will be necessary in order to fix them up in comfort, and the amount they would have to be paid if they went on under ordinary conditions? It is no new thing to advance money for clearing. We have always done it and are doing it still. In the South-West, however, we are doing it under supervision. The men on the groups at the end of two years will be well trained. They will have

considerable knowledge of how to grow stuff in the South-West. We have selected, surveyed and settled nearly all the Crown lands available between Busselton and Augusta, and from Bridgetown to Pemberton. We still have the lands between Pemberton and Denmark. Practically all this is Crown land. A small area at the Denmark end has been sold and a little at the Pemberton end. Practically the whole of the 110 miles of country between Pemberton and Denmark is held by the Crown for subdivision for closer settlement. That will accommodate thousands of people. When that area is settled there is further land between Bridgetown and the Great Southern railway, as well as between Pemberton and Augusta. There is land and to spare. This scheme will go on for years. I have been very gratified by the support this scheme has met with on both sides of this House. I do not think it has ever been objected to here. Outside there have been objections, but members know it and support it.

Hon. P. Collier: The Executive may support it when they know what the scheme is.

Mr. Latham: What executive?

Hon. P. Collier: Yours. They may support it when they understand it.

The Minister for Mines: They will understand it next week.

The PREMIER: The Minister for Agriculture acted for me for a considerable time during my absence, and we are in close touch with each other all the while.

The Minister for Agriculture: If we can only induce the other executive to support it.

Mr. Pickering: We have not written any document condemning it.

Mr. O'Loughlen: Why did you not publish Harper's document?

Mr. SPEAKER: Order!

The PREMIER: There is in this territory room for the accommodation of all who come from the Old Country for the next few years. The North-West is to be developed. I hardly know where the people are to come from for that part of the State, but I believe we can get them.

Mr. Lambert: Probably they will drop from the skies.

Mr. Munsie: Or walk in across the border.

The PREMIER: I have said something about mining and the secondary industries. The latter will follow agricultural development.

Mr. Pickering: What about banana plantations?

The PREMIER: I do not know if that is a satisfactory reply or statement of the position as it is. I do not know if members will be satisfied that there is a policy, and that this provides for the absorption of everyone brought into the State. On land settlement alone we have put out as many people as we have assisted into the country.

Mr. Munsie: How many of these have been bought out to make room for others?

The PREMIER: I am talking about Crown lands. The only men for whom we are buying land are returned soldiers.

Mr. Munsie: Are they not included in the total of those settled on the land?

The PREMIER: The hon. member did not know of these figures when he signed that document. I am endeavouring to inform him now. The House is entitled to know that work is being made for as many people as we are bringing into the State.

Mr. Munsie: The workers are entitled to know also.

The PREMIER: We have made work in land selection. We have made work for more than we have brought in on the improvement of farms already held. On roads, railways and public works consequent upon this development there are nearly as many men employed as we brought in last year. We have also settled men from the goldfields when there has been a slump there. We have sent officials from Perth to talk with them and have done all we can to keep them in the State. I hope members will realise that. Numbers of these men are working on the land and on public works. If they have gone to the Eastern States they have gone for a good reason, and not because we were unwilling to have them down here and give them every opportunity of earning a livelihood. The newcomer is cared for on arrival. The New Settlers' League has been criticised. It is a splendid organisation and there are many self-sacrificing men engaged on it. The organisation is assisted by the Federal and State Governments. Its members give their time to the immigrants for nothing. There never was an organisation in the State so helpful to newcomers as this one. A few years ago there was no such body of men and the new arrivals had to fend for themselves. The League not only endeavours to secure work for these people, but to see the kind of men who are going to employ them. They keep their eye on the newcomer. When a man leaves a job the League help him to get another and interview the farmers who are offering the employment.

Mr. Lambert: Do you think that is the function of private individuals?

The PREMIER: I do not know why men should criticise the work of the Government, and why they should not help in that work. If this organisation is willing to do this, why should it not be encouraged? So long as I am here I will encourage it. The work is done better than cold officials could do it.

Mr. Lambert: It should not be the serious adjunct to government that it is.

The PREMIER: It only happens that everything can be wrong.

Mr. Pickering: When you have representations on it, it will be all right.

The PREMIER: I must express my appreciation of the work the league is doing, not only as a league but as an Ugly Men's organisation.

Mr. Munsie: Do not class the two organisations together.

The PREMIER: It is a pity if men who are willing to do something for the country cannot be allowed to do it.

Mr. Hughes: They had a lot of liberty as Ugly Men that others did not have. I object to their having liberties which are not accorded to others.

Mr. Mann: You had the same liberty.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order!

The PREMIER: Experienced men who come out with their families can go right through to their settlements, but others must have a year's experience. Something has been said about the type of immigrant. I do not think there is much to complain about in that respect.

Mr. Clydesdale: You must admit the type could be improved and should be improved.

The PREMIER: All men could be improved. I know that in England the men are comparatively small, but they are good solid men.

Mr. Lambert: There are not many who are 16 stone.

The PREMIER: Out of all the men who have come how many are there to whom any objection can be raised?

Mr. J. Thomson: How many indeed? Nearly all of them.

*Sitting suspended from 6.15 to 7.30 p.m.*

The PREMIER: Before tea we were dealing with the selection of migrants. I consider that we are getting a carefully selected type, even if they are not as big as Australians. They are extremely useful, and surely our own flesh and blood ought to be good enough for us. It is not so long since our fathers came from the Old Country.

Mr. Money: And some of them were very small.

The PREMIER: That is so. Now I want to read what Mr. Garden, of Sydney, a delegate to the Soviet Conference, said about the people of England. This is what was published—

Labour's attitude towards the subject of migration has been well defined in the past. Mr. Garden has returned an expressed convert to the necessity for migration. He said that labour conditions in England were in a terrible state. The working classes' only avenue of escape from slow starvation was migration. "The industrial movement of Australia," Mr. Garden declared emphatically, "will have to give more earnest attention to the problem of migration. Labour's policy must not be one of negation; it must be one of active participation in migration movement. The people will come to Australia whether Labour leaders like it or not. It has now become necessary for Labour to see that Australia gets the right type of new settler."

Mr. McCallum: Garden is a "pommy" himself; he has not been long in Australia. I do not think he has any right to speak for the Australian workman at all.

The PREMIER: I do not know Mr. Garden.

Hon. P. Collier: You have not lost anything.

The PREMIER: I do not think Mr. Garden's statement can apply to the leaders in the House. I shall now refer to a statement made by my distinguished friend the member for Claremont (Mr. J. Thomson). It was to the effect that no migrant is admitted to Victoria without proof that he possesses at least £300 in cash, whereas men possessing little or no capital are sent to Western Australia and other States. This is not so. I take the following facts from the "Australasian" of the 7th July last, the newspaper having obtained them from an official source:—During the half year ended 30th June, 1923, Victoria received 4,443 immigrants, who introduced with them a total declared capital of £95,500. This works out at an average of £21 per head. During the same period Western Australia received 3,194 immigrants. These brought with them £83,400 declared capital, which gives an average of over £26 per head—£5 per head more than Victoria. These figures conclusively disprove the statements of the member for Claremont.

Mr. J. Thomson: I was talking about the scheme signed by Lawson, the Victorian Premier.

The PREMIER: If that scheme is better than ours we should get the same terms; but I do not think it is as good as ours. I must say a word or two regarding the statement on immigration read by the Leader of the Opposition yesterday. As regards that statement, "the voice was the voice of Jacob, but the hand was the hand of Esau." The statement was not prepared by the Leader of the Opposition.

Hon. P. Collier: I did not say it was.

The PREMIER: No; the hon. gentleman made that quite clear. It was a statement sent to him by the representatives of the Trades Hall.

Mr. McCallum: The statement carries a signature.

The PREMIER: And a very respectable signature, too.

Mr. Lambert: Would you tell us who compiled the reply to that statement?

The PREMIER: I am trying to avoid giving offence to anybody. I say the statement was signed by the member for Hannans, Mr. Munsie, as President, and by Mr. Millington as General Secretary, of the Labour executive for this State. In saying that, I do not wish to be offensive.

Mr. Munsie: I am proud of having signed the statement.

Mr. McCallum: When the Premier referred to Esau, he was referring to some deception. Where is the deception?

Mr. O'Loughlen: Why should the Premier bring his relatives into this?

The PREMIER: I meant that the words of the statement were not the words of the Leader of the Opposition.

Mr. McCallum: He did not say they were his words. The document carries a signature.

The Colonial Secretary: They were not his sentiments.

Mr. McCallum: He did not say that. He can speak for himself.

The PREMIER: The statement contains the following:—

It is, in the opinion of this organisation, absurd to say that the miners would not be content with any other form of useful and decently-paid employment. Their fitness as potential settlers on the land is immeasurably ahead of those who are being brought from the cities of Great Britain to undergo agricultural experience in circumstances which will be dealt with later in this report.

I have already said that so far as we can, with the help of hon. members sitting opposite, we have induced as many out of work miners as possible to come to this part of the State. At the request of various hon. members the Government has sent up officials to the goldfields with that object in view. A number of these miners have come down, and they do make excellent settlers—none better—and if we could get more of them I should be delighted. I have been to their homes, and have seen them at work, and they certainly are first class settlers. They of course know what Australian life is, and they make themselves comfortable in a way no other people can in the rough shack houses on the group settlements. They have come down to work on railways and roads, and there have given excellent service. If all the people at Kalgoorlie are of the same class as these, we are in a very fortunate position. Next I must take exception to this statement—

The greater part of the land included in classification No. 3 is held under pastoral leases for extended periods, and may also be said to be beyond State control. It will thus be seen that although approximately 50 per cent. of the land of Western Australia is still held by the Crown, that its productive character is so doubtful, or its remoteness from settlement, means of transport, and market facilities, so great, as to put it beyond the region of economic utilisation for many years.

Mr. Munsie: That is a fact, too, a plain statement of fact.

The PREMIER: It is a very plain statement, but it can be so easily misunderstood. I have no doubt that in the hon. member's mind this 50 per cent. of the land is in the North-West.

Mr. Munsie: No.

The PREMIER: As a matter of fact, it covers the whole of the South-West.

Mr. Munsie: That was not in my mind at all.

The PREMIER: Then it is a very plain and easily understood statement.

Mr. Munsie: You are right there.

The PREMIER: "Its productive character is so doubtful."

Mr. Munsie: Will you say there are not millions of acres of land in this State the productive character of which is doubtful.

The PREMIER: There is no uniformly good land in any country in the world. The soil of every country in the world changes, and changes fairly rapidly. But to say that the productive character of this land is doubtful, is to say what is wrong. There is no doubt as to the productiveness of millions of acres of land which is still in the hands of the Crown. Again, the statement as to its remoteness from settlement is not justified at all. This House has authorised the building of sufficient railways to accommodate all the people who can go on our lands for some time to come. They will have means of transport. Market facilities are adequate, because the question of an overseas market for products does not arise so far as these new settlers are concerned. As I have endeavoured to point out to-night, there is a tremendous gap to be bridged over in this State, as regards the local market.

Mr. Munsie: Where are the Kendenup settlers to get their market now?

The PREMIER: The Kendenup settlers are not referred to by the hon. member when he speaks of land in the hands of the Crown.

Mr. Munsie: But you said there were ample markets. If so, why have not the Kendenup settlers a market?

The PREMIER: They would have a market if they produced butter and bacon and other things of that sort. They expected, of course, to sell their tomatoes and so forth to the dehydrator, and make money in that way. However, I do take exception to the statement I have read, and I am sure the Leader of the Opposition does not agree with it either. Then there is a paragraph dealing with depopulation of our rural areas since 1911. The district I come from is referred to. That district was fully developed in 1911, and the only thing that could happen to increase the number of people there would be the devising of some means whereby comparatively small areas could be used for dairying, pig-raising, and so on. As a wheat growing proposition, the Northam land is fairly cut up now, and has been fairly well developed. Therefore I consider the reference to depopulation unjustifiable. Of course it may be said that the man who has the land has too much, but as regards the talk of further clearing and development in the district of Northam, well, it is not possible, because the land has been cleared for years.

Mr. Munsie: If the Avon Valley will only support the number of people there now, God help Western Australia as an agricultural country!

The PREMIER: I have already said that the only way of increasing the population there would be to devise some means of mak-

ing a living off a very small area. In the Toodyay district I think men are making a living by growing ten acres of oranges and where there is water in the Meekatharra district one could probably do equally well. All our lands, however, are not suitable for intense cultivation of that description. Another statement contained in the document was in effect—

People are leaving this State and, as we cannot maintain them here, what is the use of bringing people to Western Australia? I hope I have satisfied hon. members that there is some justification for saying that these people have not walked out of Western Australia. Departures by sea or by land have been recorded. Although the census does not disclose the fact, a great many people in this State are unrecorded, and that means a loss of revenue to Western Australia. Very many people are missed when a census is taken. The census form should be easily understood, but the fact remains that many people do not return the forms that are sent to them when a census is taken. Census forms should be made as simple as possible so that people can fill them in without any difficulty. It is easy for people in the towns to get assistance in filling up their forms, but it is a difficult matter for those in the outlying districts. I am sure these people are here and we should be paid for them. The only other statement I wish to refer to relates to the selection of immigrants. We have our own people at Home selecting them. I have said that I endeavoured to induce the member for North-East Fremantle (Hon. W. C. Angwin) to go to London to represent us there. I do not consider that a board is necessary for selecting immigrants, nor do I think the composition of any board suggested would work satisfactorily.

Mr. O'Loughlen: According to the member for Claremont (Mr. J. Thomson), there could be an improvement.

The PREMIER: There can always be room for improvement in anything. For instance, there is room for improvement in the selection of members of this Chamber. If people are doing their best, what more can we expect?

Mr. O'Loughlen: It is possible to do better.

The PREMIER: The hon. member knows it is always possible to do better. We have two capable, experienced men in the Old Country and they are at work selecting migrants for us. It is not so easy to get experienced agriculturists from the old land.

Hon. M. F. Troy: They are not there.

The PREMIER: No. They produce enough food to provide for about 10 weeks in the year, that is all. There are some farm labourers but they are comfortably placed. There are some tenant farmers who come away, but they are few.

Mr. J. Thomson: According to the Agent General, in one place there are over 6,000. That is in his report.

The PREMIER: There may be 6,000 or more in one place.

Mr. J. Thomson: And they are experienced farmers.

The PREMIER: They cannot be far apart in England. At any rate, suitable farm labourers are not to be secured as migrants. The Englishman is far more intelligent than we give him credit for. He can and does adapt himself to his new conditions. In the early days of settlement in Australia they were all Englishmen.

Mr. J. Thomson: All what?

Hon. P. Collier: Scotland took no part in it!

The PREMIER: They made good citizens and good workers; they have always been noted for that for the last 100 years.

Hon. P. Collier: The average healthy European is very adaptable.

Mr. Underwood: Keep the Ugly Men's Association, the migrant reception committees, and all other rubbish out, and you may do well.

Mr. Clydesdale: What about yourself?

The PREMIER: I doubt if the migrants should be criticised as they are. I get letters from them in the country and in Victoria. I dare say we have had letters read in this House from people in Victoria. It is not a bit of use talking about a White Australia unless we are prepared to settle our country with white people.

Hon. M. F. Troy: Are you prohibiting Irish migrants?

The PREMIER: Certainly not.

Hon. M. F. Troy: Why are they not coming here?

The PREMIER: I do not know if the hon. member would have liked to go to Ireland to select migrants a few months ago. I do not think I would have liked the task.

Hon. M. F. Troy: I read an article by Count Plunket, who said there were thousands of young men willing to come out.

The PREMIER: They can come here; some are doing so.

Mr. McCallum: Do the assisted conditions apply to Irishmen?

The PREMIER: Yes.

Mr. O'Loughlen: Not since the Free State Government were installed.

The PREMIER: Yes, we have got them here now.

Mr. O'Loughlen: Why was a contrary statement published in the Press?

Mr. McCallum: I have had particulars of a definite refusal of that assistance referred to me.

The PREMIER: I do not know of the case. I only know these people have come here.

Mr. O'Loughlen: The statement was published in the Press, since the Free State Government came into power, that the conditions do not apply.

The PREMIER: I do not know of such a decision. We will be glad to welcome them here in Western Australia. However, I am sorry that this statement has been prepared by the Trades Hall and that it has been published on the eve of the arrival of the delegation from the Old Country. Those people

have come to spy out the land, to see what opportunities are available for people from England who may be encouraged to come to this State.

Mr. Munsie: We intend to present members of the delegation with a copy of the report.

The PREMIER: Owing to the unsettled industrial conditions at Home, vast numbers of men are not likely to get back to work for some time. Those men are our own flesh and blood but they are separated by thousands of miles from the food supplies they so urgently require. I believe there are 10 millions too many people in the Old Land. Here we have space for them. We have work for them. Why cannot we face our responsibilities? We are part of the Empire. Why cannot they be welcomed here?

Mr. Munsie: They are welcome.

The PREMIER: They should be welcome, too. Why not do the best that is possible for them? The Labour pamphlet is prepared on the eve of the arrival of the delegation. Why is that?

Mr. Munsie: To present it to the delegation.

The PREMIER: The statement does not present the true case in its proper light.

Mr. Munsie: You have not shaken the pamphlet much yet.

The PREMIER: I have said something in reply to the Labour Party's statement. I shall continue saying it too. It will always be possible to say: "Let this country remain in our hands and let no one else come in." That would be a wrong and a selfish policy.

Mr. Munsie: I agree with you.

The PREMIER: It comes with bad grace from the hon. member who came to this country himself and has not done badly here.

Mr. Munsie: Western Australia is the best State in the Commonwealth that I have been in.

The PREMIER: Why cannot the hon. member tell his story? Why cannot he say: "I came here a few years ago. I secured work. I was asked to sit in Parliament and I have been engaged in framing the laws of the land. There is the same chance ahead of any one of your people who may be sent out to Western Australia."

Mr. Munsie: So there is the same chance. You should be careful or one of these people may win your seat.

The PREMIER: If any one can do so, he is welcome. I am democratic enough to know that anyone has the right to stand for election.

Mr. Munsie: It took a long time for you to agree to the member for West Perth (Mrs. Cowan) coming here.

The PREMIER: She would never have come here if you had had your way. However, I regret that this document has been prepared. It is inaccurate; it is wrong.

Mr. Munsie: You have not shown that it is wrong.

The PREMIER: I have shown it is wrong in every detail.

Mr. McCallum: Yours has been a very poor attempt.

The PREMIER: It is wrong that the executive of the Australian Labour Party should have done this thing. It is all very fine to say they are in favour of immigration; it is quite another thing to show that they are. In this pamphlet the Labour Party have shown themselves hostile to immigration. It is so easy to say that any statement in reply is unconvincing.

Mr. McCallum: You have not attempted to answer it.

The PREMIER: The hon. member, without having done more than reading the statement, will say that the facts I have presented are not correct.

Mr. McCallum: Is that all I know? I will show you.

The PREMIER: That is no good to any country. I have no more to say on this subject at present. But for the moderation of members opposite, and for the courtesy they have extended to me during the past four years, I should have had very much more to say in a very different way.

Hon. M. F. Troy: That is all nonsense.

The PREMIER: I do not know that it can be considered proper to write such a document. It should not be treated lightly by any member of the House. I hope the document will not have the slightest effect on the people who are coming here from the Old Country.

Mr. Munsie: It is to be hoped the document will have more effect than your attempt to answer it.

Mr. LAMBERT (Coolgardie) [7.57]: I would feel rather diffident about intruding myself upon the debate if it were not for the fact that some of the questions referred to, which undoubtedly affect the wellbeing of the State, call for incessant repetition in order that the Government may be persuaded to benefit by the advice tendered, and thus secure the whole-hearted support of all parties in promoting the best interests of the State. One statement that appeared lately is relevant to the unfortunate position we occupy in the Federation. Mr. McKay, of Sunshine, gave to the "West Australian" an interview containing some gratuitous advice to the people of Western Australia. After referring to the general position of agriculture in Victoria and Western Australia respectively, Mr. McKay made these remarks—

The true wealth of Western Australia lies in its agricultural production, not in its mining interests.

A man who comes here with something to sell, who has at Fremantle an assembling house for machinery, and who controls agents busily canvassing the agricultural districts has the impudence to tell Western Australians that they can afford to ignore the mineral wealth of the State! Mr. McKay may be a particularly desirable citizen in Victoria, but I do not know that as an importer of agricultural machines he could be classed as a desirable citizen of Western Australia. Probably Mr. McKay is not aware that in the course of a few years the mining industry which he, in

his own selfish interests, invites us to ignore, has produced no less than £156,673,839 worth of wealth. Notwithstanding that, the greater portion of our auriferous and metalliferous areas is yet practically undeveloped, if not unexplored and even unknown. Yet Mr. McKay comes here and advises the people that the mining interests of the State are of no importance.

Hon. P. Collier: He came to sell agricultural machinery.

Mr. LAMBERT: Of course. I should like to follow the benevolent attitude of my leader, and say that we on this side are not unmindful of all that the Mines Department has attempted and is attempting with a view to fostering the declining mining industry. But it appears to me that no systematic effort has been made to exploit many known mineral deposits of great economic and commercial value. A considerable sum has been spent in prospecting for gold, but I scarcely think the Mines Department have gone far enough in merely getting out a casual stock-taking of the many other mineral deposits. There should be closer relationship between the Railways and the Mines Department. The Minister for Mines is also Minister for Railways. I can scarcely concede that our railways are used for the assistance of the mining industry to anything like the extent they should be. The same can be said of the goldfields water scheme. I hope it will be realised that while agriculture will certainly play a lasting part in the life of Western Australia, for generations to come the mineral wealth of the State will be equally contributory to the State's prosperity. Because of that, the Government should regard the railways serving the goldfields rather as factors in the success of the mining industry than as revenue producers. To such an extent have railway concessions been made for the benefit of the agricultural industry that, probably, the deficit in our railway finances is due wholly to the low fares and freights charged to farmers.

Mr. Pickering: Why, the farmers are saving the position!

Mr. LAMBERT: In the same way as a burglar, stealing a man's food, might contend that he is saving that man from a bilious attack. It would be as well to make a survey of our mineral resources, which Mr. McKay tells us are of no importance to the State. It is extraordinary that a Victorian manufacturer should be so blind to the value of those resources. Take our iron deposits. I might remind Mr. McKay that Victoria is bankrupt of such deposits. Mr. McKay may be an excellent manufacturer of agricultural implements, but I deny his right to come here and say there is nothing of so much importance to this State as the importation of agricultural machines.

Mr. Underwood: Why did you bother to read his interview?

Mr. LAMBERT: Well, the "West Australian" thought him of sufficient importance to publish it.

The Minister for Mines: Surely you will not blame him for that.

Mr. LAMBERT: Probably the "West Australian" is equally to blame for interviewing him at all. I am surprised that the Minister for Works did not see fit to reply to that interview.

Capt. Carter: It was merely an advertising stunt.

Mr. LAMBERT: McKay did not give a cheap advertisement to Western Australia.

Mr. Underwood: He was advertising, not Western Australia, but himself.

Mr. LAMBERT: I know that.

Mrs. Cowan: Well, why give him another advertisement?

Mr. LAMBERT: I do not wish to give him any further advertisement.

The Minister for Works: At all events, give him credit for being a self-made man who has done well.

Mr. LAMBERT: The Minister for Works, through the State Implement Works, is trying to cripple him.

The Minister for Works: No, I am merely trying to stimulate him.

Mr. LAMBERT: Then, give him some of that North Perth water of yours. Attention should be directed to the mineral wealth of Western Australia, which should undoubtedly play an important part in the future progress of the State. We have an almost limitless area of mineral deposits lying practically unutilised, and it is time we settled on a properly conceived and directed policy to utilise this wealth. The member for Claremont (Mr. J. Thomson) knows that in the North, adjacent to deep water—

Mr. Underwood: Do not take it upon yourself to adopt us.

Mr. LAMBERT: I do not intend to. If I go to the North, I shall do so for pleasure and leave the problems to the hon. member. In the Federation, our position is almost helpless and hopeless, particularly when we make any effort to open up our mineral deposits or secondary industries. I hope the Minister for Mines will confer with his officers and endeavour to formulate a scheme, as a result of which information might be disseminated amongst interested people outside the State that might induce them to invest capital and undertake the development of our mineral wealth. The "Australian Manufacturer" of the 28th July, a journal that speaks for the manufacture of Australia, contained the following:—

Someone with a happy faculty for stating sound fact picturesquely has said that Western Australia is the importers' paradise. The truth of the aphorism cannot be denied. The fact is patent to every visitor to the business quarters of Perth and Fremantle. The importers' warehouse is in continuous evidence, but the local factory is visible only here and there.

It is regrettable that we cannot make this State reasonably self-contained and self-reliant as regards manufactures. Considering the vast field for expansion, it is regrettable what little public interest and support



is given to any proposition to increase our secondary industries. The Premier pointed out that of 12 million pounds of loan expenditure during the last few years, 61 per cent. had been lent to farmers to foster the agricultural industry.

Mr. Harrison: That means the Government will get principal and interest repaid.

Mr. Lutey: Perhaps.

Mr. LAMBERT: If the Premier, with his knowledge of finance, studied the statistician's figures, he would realise that the difference between our imports and exports annually bears a close relationship to the loan expenditure. In 1913 we imported £9,892,000 worth of goods, and our exports amounted to £9,128,000, a balance against us of about three-quarters of a million. In 1917-18 imports totalled £7,600,000 and exports £5,800,000, an adverse balance of nearly two millions. In 1918-19 imports amounted to £9,023,000 and exports to £10,922,000. In 1919-20 imports totalled £12,000,000 and exports £16,000,000. That was the best year in the history of the State, due to a big exportation of wool and other commodities. In 1920-21 imports totalled £14,000,000 and exports only £12,000,000. In 1921-22 imports totalled £12,037,000 and exports £13,600,000. If we send away only £5,000,000 worth of goods and import £6,000,000 worth, we must pay for the difference somehow, and the difference is being paid for by an indiscriminate spending of borrowed money. If a million or two of money was spent in a reasonably sane and well-ordered way to assist the secondary industries, it would give a quicker and more profitable return than sinking further money in land settlement.

Mr. Latham: The Government will get it all back again.

Mr. O'Loughlin: It is to be hoped so.

Mr. LAMBERT: I am not unmindful of the wealth produced by agriculture, but surely the policy of the Government does not end with the development of the agricultural industry! Surely their obligations are not restricted to assisting any and every farmer who comes to the Agricultural Bank and holds out his hand for a loan! We have croakers like the members of the Chamber of Commerce who, day in and day out, rail about the inroads of the State into private enterprise, but there are obligations on the private individual to open up essential industries if they desire the State to hold its hands off them. Yet they are not finding a shilling. Efforts have been made to get some of these people to realise their obligations to the State by supporting the establishment of a petty woollen mill, but deaf ears were turned to these appeals.

Mr. J. Thomson: What about the new paper?

Hon. P. Collier: It is a very deserving enterprise.

Mr. LAMBERT: Even those who have profited by the policy of the present daily would not hesitate to bite the hand that has fed them by taking up shares in the "Daily Sun." They will take up shares under the

guise of patriotism just as they took up war loans and subscribed to the trustee company recently formed. Wherever it is possible to parasitically batten on the people, such men are born patriots, but when they are asked to realise their obligations to the State by assisting to open up industries that will make this community self-supporting, they are also as responsive as so many frogs.

The Minister for Mines: That statement is not quite fair. I know a number who took up vendors' shares.

Mr. LAMBERT: My statement is not applicable to all. While members of the Chamber of Commerce and others are constantly urging the Government to keep their hands off trading enterprises, they do not exhibit the requisite enterprise to open up those essential industries which would mean so much to Western Australia. The importing habit in this State has grown parasitic. I am not using the term in the vulgar sense. With a policy of land settlement we must have a policy for the development of our secondary industries. The Premier said tonight that secondary industries would follow land settlement. He has admitted that we are suffering under the high protective tariff of the Federal Government. We must therefore endeavour to formulate a policy to counteract the detrimental effect of the high protection. At one time I was an ardent Federalist. I thought that with the federation of the States we should give birth to new sentiments and new aspirations. I now admit that it was a most fatal policy for Western Australia to adopt.

Mr. Latham: That is not what you said yesterday.

Mr. LAMBERT: Fully 99 per cent. of the people of the State will say the same thing. The Federal authorities are perfectly indifferent to our financial condition.

The Minister for Agriculture: We are the best Federalists of the lot.

Mr. Marshall: We have paid the most.

Mr. LAMBERT: We have paid the most taxation on a per capita basis. Instead of letting the Prime Minister at Parliament House, and telling him there was not much to grow about in our position, we should have told him that Western Australia can never float with her finances as they now are. He must realise that this State, with its small population and its deficit of nearly £6,000,000, is entitled to recognition at the hands of the Commonwealth. What have the Federal Government done?

The Minister for Mines: What indeed?

Mr. LAMBERT: Those who are acquainted with the time when a united Australia was first spoken of will remember that the Federal authorities were going to people the north. It is essential for the continuation of the policy of a White Australia that this should be done. Was ever a greater duty cast upon any central Government than the duty of peopling that part of the Commonwealth? They took over the Northern Territory, and members have seen the illuminating display they made in that connection. Seeing that the

North-West of this State is administered by us, we should be provided with sufficient money to encourage the development of tropical industries there. Possibly cotton, sugar, tobacco and other tropical growths could be successfully encouraged in that part of the State. They have been overlooked to a regrettable degree.

Mr. O'Loughlin: You are prejudiced against the Chamber of Commerce.

Mr. LAMBERT: No. There are some very deserving members in it.

Hon. P. Collier: The meeting last night broke up in disorder.

Mr. LAMBERT: I have been rather pained to learn that such a respectable body of men, performing what they believe to be useful functions in the State, should have held a meeting which broke up in disorder.

The Minister for Mines: I think the reporter got mixed up with some lecture that was going on.

Mr. LAMBERT: The headings appearing in the "West Australian" concerning this meeting are "Trade with the East," "Proposal to form a Corporation," "Meeting ends abruptly." One of the members of the Chamber, Mr. Malloch—

The Minister for Mines: I tipped it in one, though I had not read the report.

Mr. LAMBERT: Convened the meeting with the object of inducing members of the Chamber to approve the formation of a corporation to develop trade with Java, Singapore, China, India, and other Eastern countries. A year or two ago this unsophisticated gentleman moved an abstract motion at a meeting of the Chamber that the time had arrived when we could resume relations with Germany.

The Minister for Agriculture: That is not in the Speech.

Mr. SPEAKER: This has nothing to do with the motion before the Chair.

Mr. LAMBERT: I am merely bringing this forward as an illustration. Mr. Malloch did not get very far on that occasion, nor did he last night. Most of those present at the meeting yesterday represented Eastern States houses, which are already serving the Near East from Melbourne and Sydney. They have no desire for Western Australia to engage in that trade.

The Colonial Secretary: Mr. Malloch is to be commended.

Mr. LAMBERT: I am saying so.

Hon. P. Collier: The others broke up the meeting.

The Colonial Secretary: He is a good Western Australian.

Mr. LAMBERT: The manner in which the suggestion was received is shown by the fact that the meeting ended abruptly, and apparently in disorder.

The Minister for Mines: Members of that Chamber will receive letters of commendation from the Eastern States houses.

Hon. P. Collier: They represented Eastern States houses that are already trading with the Near East.

Mr. LAMBERT: These are the gentlemen who say the State should not enter the arena of private enterprise. They have no desire to establish these industries themselves. So long as the policy of their firms is to distribute goods in Western Australia, and so long as it continues to be possible for them to do this, they advise the State Government to sell every industry upon which they have embarked.

Mr. Money: Do you suggest that behind their request for the abolition of State trading concerns is their desire to establish similar industries themselves?

Mr. LAMBERT: No. Had they shown any desire to establish like industries no doubt the State trading concerns would never have been established. At that time the Government of the day felt called upon to establish certain industries which they felt the State should possess. It was a commendable action on their part. Notwithstanding that a small loss has been incurred, the benefit that the State has derived by the possession of these industries is no doubt considerable. I do not know that any good purpose would be served by my offering some suggestions for presentation to the Federal Government. They should show some public spiritedness towards Western Australia. Surely they are not unmindful of this undeveloped State, and of our right to a legitimate place in the affairs of the Commonwealth.

The Minister for Mines: We have our representatives there.

Mr. LAMBERT: I hope before the session ends a motion will be moved urging the Federal Government to contribute at least a million pounds a year for the next ten years to assist the State in counteracting the policy laid down by the Federal Government, and pointing out how detrimental that policy is to the industries of Western Australia. They are asking us to absorb population. To-day boys and girls are out of work. There is no avenue into which parents can direct their boys and girls for employment. We are heavily burdened by taxation, and by the amount we have to contribute to the Customs and Excise. In these circumstances, it would not be too much to ask the Federal authorities to recompense us by making the annual payment I have suggested, for investment in secondary industries in this State. I believe the Premier desires to see secondary industries spring up here. We have opportunities in fifty different branches of commercial activity for the profitable investment of money and the profitable employment of labour. But we are in the unfortunate position of not having had spare capital accumulating from early investments in industries, such as they have in the Eastern States. The earlier establishment of industries in the Eastern States enables them to place us in the position of not being able to rescue ourselves from the importing groups by establishing industries of our own on common sense lines. One is prone to speak on these matters year after year, but I believe that if all the members of

this Chamber would only act upon their personal promptings, knowing the position of Western Australia, they would unite in doing everything possible to increase the production of this State, not only in the direction of agriculture but also in every other direction. There can be no two opinions as to where the obligation lies to find some money to recompense Western Australia for the annual loss with which the State is faced as a partner in the Australian Commonwealth. I only hope that the Minister for Industries will do as he promised last session, namely, bring down a Bill to establish the Council of Industrial Development upon a more acceptable and a permanent basis. When that has been done, let all parties in this House devote, not one or two or three hours, but if necessary two or three weeks, to making the Federal Government realise their obligation to assist us as a young, struggling, and undeveloped State.

On motion by Mr. Latham debate adjourned.

House adjourned at 3.49 p.m.

## Legislative Assembly,

Tuesday, 7th August, 1923.

	PAGE
Questions: Melville reservoir, dismissals ...	107
Road making—1, Feeder roads. 2, Group Settlement facilities ...	107
Land Settlement, Westonia ...	107
Railway coal supplies ...	107
Address-in-reply, fourth day ...	108

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

### QUESTION—MELVILLE RESERVOIR, DISMISSALS.

Mr. HUGHES asked the Minister for Works: 1, How many men have been employed on the Melville reservoir? 2, How many men were dismissed during the last week? 3, For what reason were the dismissals made? 4, If it is necessary to put men off temporarily, would it not be possible to distribute the time off equally amongst the men?

The MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE (for the Minister for Works) replied: 1, 110. 2, Nine men stood down for one week; four men transferred to another work. 3, The excavation being practically completed. 4, No. Preference is given to married men.

### QUESTIONS (2)—ROAD MAKING.

#### Width of Feeder Roads.

Mr. LATHAM asked the Minister for Works: 1, Is it a fact that feeder roads 16ft. 6in. wide are being cleared to the proposed Narembeen-Merredin railway? 2, Is he aware that it is impossible to get up-to-date machinery along these roads? 3, Will he issue instructions to have these roads cleared 22ft., as has always been done previously?

The MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE (for the Minister for Works) replied: 1, Yes. 2, No. 3, Answered by No. 2.

#### Group Settlement Facilities.

Mr. PICKERING asked the Premier: 1, In view of the almost impassable nature of the roads to several group settlements, will he state what steps he purposes taking to place the roads in a condition to facilitate and cheapen transport? 2, To what vote is the cost of providing road facilities to groups to be charged?

The PREMIER replied: 1, Such steps as are possible at reasonable cost. Roads are in most cases new, and require time to consolidate. 2, Development of agriculture.

### QUESTION—LAND SETTLEMENT, WESTONIA.

Mr. HARRISON asked the Premier: 1, Has the land on "Sheet 6, locations near Westonia, Yilgarn District," been opened for selection? 2, If so, how many applications for these blocks have been approved? 3, Is it a fact that the Agricultural Bank will not advance to the selectors of these areas? 4, Are the reasons given by Agricultural Bank officers correct, namely, that the subdivision is outside the first and second zone of railways constructed or authorised? 5, Will he authorise advances to be granted on this area equal to those advanced on adjoining areas, seeing that if the present Bencubbin line were linked up with the railway system either at Merredin, Carrabin, or Bullfinch, this area would be within the 12½ mile limit? 6, Has his attention been drawn to the survey of this area with regard to facility for the transport of products?

The PREMIER replied: 1, Yes. 2, Six. 3, Yes. 4, The Agricultural Bank trustees have refused to advance on land more than 12½ miles from existing railways until they receive an assurance of provision of railway facilities within a reasonable period. 5, This is a matter for the trustees alone. 6, No.

### RETURN—RAILWAY COAL SUPPLIES.

On motion by Mr. Wilson, ordered—That a return be laid upon the Table of the House showing:—(1) The weekly coal orders (tonnage) by the Railway Department to each of the following mines (separately): Proprie-