

what I have attempted to do and what I believe I have accomplished and place them against the mistakes, which I am afraid are sometimes advanced for political purposes only. I believe that while I may have failed in some directions, I have succeeded in other ways to an extent that does me some little credit.

Question put and passed; the Address-in-reply adopted.

BILLS (11)—FIRST READING.

1. Licensing Act Amendment.
2. Closer Settlement.
3. Industrial Arbitration Act Amendment.
4. Married Women's Protection.
Introduced by the Premier.
5. Wyalcatchem Mt. Marshall Railway Extension.
Introduced by the Minister for Works.
6. Miners Phthisis.
Introduced by the Minister for Mines.
7. Agricultural Seeds.
8. Broomehill Racecourse.
9. Dairy Cattle Improvement.
10. Dairy Industry.
Introduced by the Minister for Agriculture.
11. Administration Act Amendment.
Introduced by Mrs. Cowan.

The House adjourned at 11.15 p.m.

Legislative Council,

Tuesday, 29th August, 1922.

	Page
Questions: Agricultural Department, Staff appointments	412
Torbay-Grassmere drainage	412
Select Committee, Electricity Supply, Extension of time	412
Address-in-reply, Sixth day	412

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

QUESTION—AGRICULTURAL DEPARTMENT, STAFF APPOINTMENTS.

Hon. J. EWING (for Hon. C. F. Baxter) asked the Minister for Education: 1, What are the qualifications of the following officers appointed to the wheat branch of the Agricultural Department:—(a) Wheat Experimentalist, (b) Field Officer, (c) Agricultural Adviser? 2, Will he present a return showing a saving of £2,000 has been effected by retirements and transfers after allowing for the above-mentioned new appointments?

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION replied: 1, (a) Aptitude for experimental work, a thorough training as professional draftsman and computer, several years W.A. farming experience as owner, and two years' experience assisting the Wheat Commissioner with experimental work. (b) Practical farming experience as manager and owner. (c) Graduate in Agriculture in W.A. University. 2, The saving referred to was effected by the following abolitions, retirements, and transfers:—Under Secretary; Agricultural expert generally assisting. Retirements: Accounts clerks (3); fruit inspectors (2); stock inspector (1). Transfers: Accountant; sub-accountant; accounts clerks (4); correspondence clerk (1).

QUESTION—TORBAY-GRASSMERE DRAINAGE PAPERS.

Hon. J. A. GREIG (for Hon. H. Stewart) asked the Minister for Education: Will he lay on the Table of the House the report by Mr. W. H. Shields, B.Sc., consulting engineer, on the Torbay-Grassmere drainage scheme, and all papers relating to the report.

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION replied: Yes.

The Minister for Education laid upon the Table the papers referred to.

SELECT COMMITTEE—ELECTRICITY SUPPLY.

Extension of Time.

On motion by Hon. A. Lovekin the time for bringing up the report was extended to Tuesday, 19th September.

ADDRESS-IN-REPLY.

Sixth Day.

Debate resumed from the 24th August.

Hon. J. E. DODD (South) [4.37]: In endeavouring to say a few words this afternoon, I desire at the outset to offer you, Mr. President, my hearty congratulations on the position you have attained. I am sure your long public career has fully justified the House in selecting you for that position. I hope you may be long spared to preside over the deliberations of this Chamber. In saying that, however, I also desire to express my sincere regret at the defeat of Mr. Kingsmill. I am sure his defeat was a great loss to this Chamber. He was a man who knew practically every part of the Constitution and was thoroughly conversant with the Standing Orders. I am sure we shall feel his loss very much. I extend a hearty wel-

come to the new members. While saying that, I also very much regret the loss sustained through the defeat of Mr. Panton and Mr. Cunningham, especially Mr. Cunningham. He was a gentleman with whom I had worked for a great many years. Although we belong to different parties at the present time, I can honestly say of Mr. Cunningham that he was one of the most loyal of men with whom I had come in contact. He was a keen, logical thinker and speaker, and this Chamber is the poorer for his loss. I can say the same regarding Mr. Panton. I would like to draw attention to the state of the Legislative Council electoral rolls during the last election. I sincerely trust that for any future election, the Government will take some steps to see that the rolls are in a better condition than they were last time. I can safely say regarding the Metropolitan-Suburban Province that at least 5,000 or 6,000 names are absent from the roll, although the persons affected are entitled to a vote. If the locality where I live is any criterion regarding those rolls, there must be a larger number of names than I quoted, off the roll. I suppose more than half the people living in the locality where I reside, and who are entitled to a vote, are off the rolls. I cannot understand why that should be so. I can understand some cases where the people are continually shifting from one place to another, but I cannot understand the names of taxpayers who have regularly paid their dues being struck off the rolls. There are hundreds of such cases. A man who lives a few doors away from me has his name on the roll for that property, while a man who has been away from the house for 10 or 12 years is still on the roll for the same property. There is a member of the Legislative Assembly who is on the roll for my particular house. How his name was placed on the roll, I do not know. That gentleman stayed with me for a little while. He has another property, yet he is on the roll for my house. I can quote numbers of instances like that as applying to the Legislative Council rolls. In the North-East Province something like 900 names were put on the roll and probably the same number would have been put on the roll had there been an election in the South Province. That should not be permitted. In my opinion, no candidate should be allowed to put names on the roll. That should be the duty of the electoral officer. I trust that the newly appointed electoral officer will see that something is done to remedy this state of affairs. Coming to the Governor's Speech, I will deal first with the immigration policy. While I consider the Premier, Sir James Mitchell, is entitled to every possible congratulation we can extend to him, I do not think either the Commonwealth Government or the British Government have erred on the side of generosity to Western Australia. It is said that we are to get something like £6,000,000. The British Government have spent £100,000,000, or more, since the armistice in unemployment doles.

It will be a good thing for the British Government if they can get rid of some of their surplus population, and the little they pay towards the immigration scheme will not balance the amount they pay for unemployment doles. As to the Commonwealth Government, it seems to me that their action amounts to the essence of meanness regarding the sum advanced to Western Australia. The Commonwealth reap the greatest advantage so far as taxation is concerned and the State has to do the work. The Government will be well advised if they take every possible step to see that the immigration policy does not increase unemployment. I do not think it will. It should not do so, but rather it should make for more employment. Should it tend to increase unemployment, we shall be in for a bad time. It is possible that during the debate on some of the Bills mentioned in the Governor's Speech, I may not be in the House. There are one or two matters regarding which I would like to say a few words. One is the Closer Settlement Bill. We are promised that a Bill on similar lines to that introduced last year will be presented. I notice that the Leader of the House, when speaking during the recess in the country districts, stated that the Bill was defeated in the Upper House by the two extremes of opinion, namely, those who believed the Bill was confiscatory and those who believed the Bill did not go far enough. Had I been in the House I would have voted against the Bill, because it did not go far enough. I do not believe in piecemeal taxation. When the Government set out to tax one part of the country and not the other, they are doing something altogether unjust, especially when it applies to land values taxation. I fail to see why the Government should bring in a Bill to put an unimproved land values tax on large estates in the country with a view to breaking them up, and yet allow the large estates in and around the city—not large in area perhaps, but large in value—to escape this taxation. We talk about closer settlement in the country. There is just as much need for closer settlement in and around the city. Surely when we have before us the examples to which I have drawn attention in this Chamber many times, the necessity for adopting some system of taxation which will give to the community the values they create is appraised. The Government are wrong in trying to apply a measure of this description to one part of the country and not to the other. Mr. Macfarlane is well aware that the city council are paying £1,000 interest on the purchase of a large estate near the endowment lands. That estate was of no more value than it was 100 years ago except that people have settled around it and that millions of pounds of public money have been spent and have created its value. The Government have an example in Herdsman's Lake, for which they had to pay £10,000. It was unimproved property; nothing had been done to it. I have

previously mentioned quite a number of estates. Mr. Lovekin had to pay £2,500 through his public spirited generosity for Keane's Point—again, values created entirely by the State, by public money and the settlement of population around that place. Yet the Government allow these estates to go untouched by taxation. We want closer settlement around the city. Surely when we have to take our trams and every public utility—sewerage, lighting and water—past hundreds and hundreds of unimproved blocks, necessitating the expenditure of much more money than would otherwise be necessary, there is need for a system of unimproved land values taxation in the city as well as in the country to break up large estates. Attention has been directed to the railways. Every year almost we hear the question, "What is wrong with our railway system?" I am satisfied that if the Government would only take a bold step and introduce the system of land values taxation—that is tax land according to the value created by the expenditure of public money—we should very soon have a paying railway service and we should not hear so much about the undeveloped lands alongside existing railways. I do not think there are many non-alienated lands, but there is a large area of unimproved land. I hope the Government, in introducing a Closer Settlement Bill this year, will seriously consider the justice of making the tax apply to the whole State and not to one part of it. The Premier, in addressing the New Settlers' League, referred to this very question, and Mr. Lovekin in his speech before the House, also drew attention to the same thing. Both of them said the expenditure of six millions of money in the country for bringing out 75,000 immigrants would immensely increase city values and enhance the value of city property. Why should the country be the only part to be penalised by taxation ostensibly to break up large estates, when the city will reap as much or more benefit than the country? I understand that the Licensing Bill is to be reintroduced. The Commission who inquired into this matter no doubt brought to bear on their work their very best ability. The only point with which I wish to deal is that relating to the 85 per cent. poll which the Commission recommend in the case of a State poll. I hope the Government will not adopt this recommendation. An 85 per cent. poll is almost an impossibility. I doubt if there has been one election in this State where 85 per cent. of the electors on the roll have voted. I think that Boulder last year came very close to it. Although compulsory voting is advocated, to fix the limit at 85 per cent. will be only another way of entirely defeating the principle. I understand the Government intend to introduce a Bill to amend the Arbitration Act with a view to appointing a permanent president of the Arbitration Court. It would be a good thing if we could secure greater permanency for the

president of the court. The continual changing is no good for those who have to appear before the court. I must refer to the attitude of the Government regarding Government workers. It seems to me that someone made a most inexcusable blunder regarding Government workers and wage reduction. A notice was posted just a few hours before knock-off time one day, stating that men had to work 48 hours and a reduction would be made on the following day. How in the name of goodness any Government, with all the knowledge before them, could commit such an inexcusable blunder I cannot understand. I doubt whether a Minister was responsible for that blunder. Suppose any private employer had taken the same attitude, what would have been the position? No doubt the Government would have prosecuted him, and they would have been quite right in so doing. Suppose the men had taken similar action. Every newspaper in the country would have placarded them as wild extremists taking at almost a moment's notice action which resulted in a strike. To the credit of the men be it said they took the best means to put the Government right. Whoever was responsible for posting such a notice deserves the utmost condemnation, not only of the Government but of Parliament. Reference has frequently been made to the state of the mining industry, and to the men working in the industry. Reiteration must be almost painful to members. Still, those who represent the industry must endeavour to focus the attention of Parliament and the public on the state of the industry, the causes contributing to its decline and the terrible disease ravaging those working in the mines. I have spoken strongly in this House of my opinion of the Federal Government's attitude to primary industries. I am not one of those joining in the hue and cry for Federal members' heads, and I do not believe that our best course would be to secede from Federation, but still I hold strong opinions regarding the treatment meted out by the Federal Government to the States and particularly to Western Australia, especially in regard to the mining industry. There is not an article in use in mining but is taxed by the Federal Government up to the hilt. The tariff is a thing which works wheels within wheels that we never know what will be the result of new duty placed on a certain article. There is not the slightest doubt that the operation of the tariff is contributing very materially to the decline of the industry. If only the people of Australia could be induced to see that their primary industries are all going to the wall, I am satisfied they would not vote every time for high protection. I have said that the miners are being sacrificed to the interests of manufacturers and others in Melbourne and Sydney, and I repeat that statement. The miners are being absolutely slaughtered, and slaughtered to such an alarming degree that it would aston-

ish members who do not take a keen interest in this matter if they looked up the figures and learnt of the number of men who are going out day by day through working in the industry. I am safe in saying that not a man working in the deep mines of Western Australia at present could stand more than five or six years. There are hundreds of men afflicted with miner's disease; many of them are dying. The Federal Government intend to establish a laboratory at Kalgoorlie, which no doubt will be very useful in helping the industry, especially in regard to the disease. It is a very wise step and it is a great pity that it was not taken 10 years ago. I congratulate Mr. Cornell on the admirable report he presented to the Government on the operation of various Bills and systems of compensation in South Africa in respect to miners' phthisis. If the Government will only endeavour to act upon that report, nothing but good can follow. I do not say it is possible at present for the mining companies of Western Australia to adopt similar means to those being adopted in South Africa, but I do say that had the proposals of the Labour Government been carried in 1912, making miners' complaint an accident and the mining companies responsible for it, we should not have had so many cases of phthisis as we have to-day. If the mines were made responsible for the mitigation of miners' phthisis every possible step would be taken to provide a better supply of air and better means of sanitation and ventilation in the mines.

Hon. A. Sanderson: Hear, hear!

Hon. J. E. DODD: Unfortunately the legislature in 1912 would not agree to the proposals of the Labour Government and other means had to be adopted to combat the disease. I would very much like to review the matters relating to miners' phthisis, but I cannot do so on this occasion. We have heard so many statements by individuals who know nothing about it—individuals who are very late comers in regard to the workers in the mining industry—that it is well to look back and see what has been done in years past and to recall some of those responsible for endeavouring to bring about an alleviation of the trouble. However, I understand that Mr. Scaddan is bringing in a miner's phthisis Bill, and on that measure we shall no doubt have an opportunity of fully discussing the subject. I trust that the Bill will provide for doing something in behalf of the sufferers from miner's phthisis if it lays down that those sufferers must leave the mines. Mr. Sanderson, I understand, has decided to link up with the Country Party. My reason for referring to the matter is not so much to congratulate the hon. member on that step, as to congratulate him on linking up with what I may describe as the socialistic policy of the Country Party. Many times in this Chamber have I directed attention to the socialistic leanings of the various members whom I see sitting around me. Al-

most every member of the House has capitulated to socialism, but Mr. Sanderson always stood out. We always looked upon that hon. member as the strongest of individualists. Now, however, he has joined up with the Country Party.

Hon. A. Sanderson: Hear, hear!

Hon. J. E. DODD: I remember one statement made by the hon. member in this Chamber time after time, that while the Labour Party were out to rob the few for the many, the Country Party stood out to rob the many for the few. And now I find Mr. Sanderson joining these robbers. In the future it will be most interesting to hear Mr. Sanderson declaiming with Mr. Monger against State trading concerns such as the timber mills and the brick works, and on the other hand crying to the Government, "Give, oh give, us £60,000 for the freezing works!" I can imagine the hon. member condemning the Wyndham Meat Works and those other socialistic establishments of the Labour Government which, according to the present Minister for Industries, have returned a fair surplus. I can see Mr. Sanderson still condemning them, but on the other hand crying, "Save, oh save, the implement works!" It will be most interesting in future to hear Mr. Sanderson backing up the Country Party, the superlative socialists of Western Australia. I cannot say much more this afternoon, but I trust the immigration scheme will not miscarry, and I sincerely hope that Ministers will get down to work before the next election and see what they can do to reduce the deficit. I have been waiting a long time for the results of that business acumen which was to be brought to bear when the Labour Government went out of office. I hope the results will come to light before the next session. We have here some able critics of the financial policy of the Government. In Mr. Sanderson, Mr. Holmes, Mr. Lovekin, and Mr. Kirwan we have financial critics to whom one listens with respect. But before I can follow Mr. Holmes, for instance, I want to know that Mr. Holmes has something else to propose besides a poll tax; and before I can follow Mr. Lovekin I want to know what else he proposes besides keeping children under eight years of age from school and thereby saving £340,000. If those hon. members will show me in what way we can save without doing injury to the country, I am willing to follow them to the fullest extent in any motion they bring before the House. But I must know something more definite and more concrete and more useful than the two proposals I have mentioned. Mr. Macfarlane is going to show us how we can save £50,000 a year. I can show how to save £200,000 a year, but I do not know whether the saving would be for the benefit of this country. If in this House any member can propose any action which will bring the Government to a fuller sense of their duty in the matter of finance, I am prepared to follow him, provided he shows me something better than I have been shown so far.

Hon. F. E. S. WILLMOTT (South-West) [5.7]: I see that Dr. Saw is not in his place. That hon. member spoke of Mr. Sanderson and Mr. Lovekin as Job and Jeremiah. I suppose he will refer to me as a Lazarus, or something worse. The main feature of the Governor's Speech is, of course, the immigration scheme. Undoubtedly, it is absolutely imperative that Western Australia should increase its population in order that it may continue as a sovereign State. We shall get no justice from the Federal Government until we are sufficiently strong in numbers here to demand from the Commonwealth Parliament that to which we are justly entitled. The only way to get the necessary representation is through numbers. We have the land, any amount of it; it only wants settling. As to the cost of the proposed scheme, I consider that Mr. Lovekin if anything under-estimated. Let hon. members consider what the scheme means. It means not only sufficient money to settle men on farms, but also money for all the other expenses which necessarily attach themselves to such a proposal. Even under the group settlement scheme, which undoubtedly represents the cheapest method of settling the south-western corner of this State, huge expenditure will have to be incurred for roads. In a country such as the South-West, with innumerable watercourses, there will be enormous expenditure for bridges and culverts alone. And that is as regards group settlement. In the old days, when people went out many miles and settled singly, the expense of connecting them up with roads was enormous. But in those days people were prepared to help themselves far more than they are to-day. Even then, however, they had to be provided with certain facilities. It will be found, too, that before sufficient land has been made available to settle anything like the number of immigrants foreshadowed, further railways will have to be built, in addition to those already authorised. Take that huge stretch of country between Cape Leeuwin and Pemberton. It is without railway communication of any kind, and most of the very few roads it has are indifferent. Before that portion of the State can be settled, transport facilities will have to be given. Again, if these immigrants are settled under the group system, they will have to be provided with schools; and schools are an item which in itself will represent no insignificant sum. A vast area of land will be required even for settlement of the immigrants in that district, which will be the home of small holdings. There is a railway line from Busselton to Margaret River, but the small area of country served by it will soon be absorbed. Many groups have been established there already. Therefore in the very near future we shall have to turn our attention to opening up additional country by further railways; and railways to-day cost a great deal of money. I entirely support Mr. Lovekin's contention that the expenditure involved in this scheme will be

vastly more than most people imagine. Some people have an idea that we can settle a very large number of immigrants between Fremantle and Bunbury on the land immediately adjacent to the coast. I have interested myself in that matter, and thanks to the courtesy of the Leader of the House have been enabled to go through innumerable files bearing on it. The information which I thought to find there is lacking. On the land between Fremantle and Rockingham we have only the report of an engineer. I have not had time to go right through that report.

Hon. J. Ewing: Who is the engineer?

Hon. F. E. S. WILLMOTT: Mr. Oldham, late of the Public Works Department. He divides the land into 10 classes, and says that between Fremantle and Rockingham there are 19,470 acres of land which he recommends should be treated by means of a drainage scheme. The estimated cost of that drainage scheme is £32,900. But on looking into the matter what does one find? The same old tuppenny-hapenny way of doing things, draining one swamp into another, drowning two men to make one man's land dry. Mr. Potter described the other day what was being done in the Jandakot area, and I fully bear out every statement made by the hon. member. I have seen the land, and I know that it is as he says. There is only one way to treat that country, namely under a big comprehensive scheme, draining all those lands into the sea. That will cost, not £32,000, but millions! A great deal of the swamp land is like the Harvey flats which, when drained, have proved to be excellent for the growing of subterranean clover. Unfortunately we have, interspersed through the area, a lot of light, sandy country which is not known to be of any value whatever. But we have a chain of rich swamps, and some rich tuart land down there. I ask the Leader of the House to make a note of the fact that there is in the Lands Department no information about the whole of the coast lands between Fremantle and Bunbury. It is most desirable that this information should be obtained, and a comprehensive report made by a skilled engineer. I have gone through hundreds of files, and I find that Mr. Oldham's report is practically the only word on the subject. During the recess we were told by the Minister for Agriculture that we must get on with production. I entirely agree with Mr. Sanderson and Mr. Dodd that the Federal tariff does not offer much inducement to agriculturists to increase production by using up-to-date machinery. It is all very well to exhort us to get on with production by using more scientific methods, more up-to-date machinery, but just think of the cost of such machinery in Western Australia as against the cost in America! There the machinery is turned out on standard lines, and when a machine has done a fair share of work it is scrapped, and another purchased in its place. Here it is impossible to scrap it; it has to be repaired, which is an expensive process.

Now Mr. Bruce is holding out some little hope of a reduction of the tariff on tractors. I am afraid that where the reduction will be made is in respect of immensely powerful tractors, such as are used by large companies or by Governments, but which are altogether beyond the needs of the man on the land. I warn the Government that while providing everything necessary for the new settler, they are apt to overlook the requirements of the old settler, the man who by pioneering in the early days made possible the settling of the new immigrants to-day. What facilities have been afforded the orchardist for the marketing of his fruit? Orchardists at Bridgetown, 170 miles from Perth, instead of sending their fruit to Bunbury, where there are no facilities for the shipping of fruit, have to pay freight on 115 miles extra haulage to Fremantle. At Fremantle, unless they make arrangements for private cold storage at some distance from the wharf, they have to leave their fruit in trucks on the wharf, where it quickly perishes. If the fruit export trade is to be built up, it is imperative that one of the sheds on the south wharf at Fremantle be insulated for the storage of fruit. I shall be told by the Leader of the House, if he deigns to reply to my remarks, that we have freezing works, erected at huge cost in the neighbourhood of Robb's Jetty. But those works are not worth a tuppenny dump to the export fruit grower. The grower who puts his fruit into those works, hoping to be able to get it out in reasonable time for transference to a boat, will fall in. A boat, when it comes into Fremantle, stays only a few hours. Suppose one desires to put 10,000 cases on board that boat. How is he to get 10,000 cases out of the Robb's Jetty freezing works, put them into trucks, get them up to the ship's side, and load them into the ship within the time? It is an impossibility; and so those freezing works are quite useless for the purpose of export—and we must have export if the orchardist is to be successful. Therefore I say it is imperative that we should have an insulated shed on the Fremantle wharf, so as to provide for speedy loading in decent conditions. Following on the Largs Bay shipment of fruit, various Ministers for Agriculture got together and declared that greater care must be exercised in the selection of fruit shipped from Australia. What did that mean? It meant that the failure of the fruit on the Largs Bay was due to the orchardist putting up inferior quality stuff. Those Ministers for Agriculture knew nothing about it. There never was a better shipment of fruit from Western Australia than that on the Largs Bay. Any fruit inspector will admit that the fruit in that shipment was perfect. Yet it arrived in a rotten condition, and then the Ministers for Agriculture attempted to throw the blame on the orchardist, when, as a matter of fact, the trouble lay entirely in the impossible condition under which that fruit travelled to England, in a temperature of 70 degrees instead of 34. It was one of the greatest scandals that has ever been per-

petrated on the fruit-growers. They were robbed of thousands of pounds by the action of the engineers on that ship, engineers who knew so little about their work that they could not reduce the temperature of the freezing rooms below 70 degrees. Little wonder that the fruit arrived in a state of mush! I, with others, received a little bill for the services of an incinerator, and that after paying 6s. per case to have the fruit carried in cold storage on the ship! We now know that we paid 6s per case to have the fruit cooked, so that it might arrive in England as baked apples. What are required are self-registering thermometers in the ships' refrigerating chambers, so that an undeniable record might be kept, showing how the engineers have run the chambers. Until that is done, we have Buckley's chance of making a profit on the export of fruit to England.

Hon. J. Duffell: Don't they keep a log?

Hon. F. E. S. WILLMOTT: I do not trust logs, whereas there is no getting away from the record of a self-registering thermometer. Certain of the ships that ran from Australia had self-registering thermometers installed, and significantly enough those ships carried their fruit in perfect condition.

Hon. J. Nicholson: Would it not pay to send a representative of the fruit-growers with the shipment?

Hon. F. E. S. WILLMOTT: I do not think so. The cost of sending a case of fruit Home last year was 10s. 2d., and it brought 12s. in England; so there was not much left out of which to pay a representative. Surely to goodness it is enough to pay 6s. freight, without having to pay a man to go and look after the fruit! If the people who are to settle in the South-West—say half the 6,000 settlers—are to go in for orchards of, say, 10 acres, then in six years' time they will be producing 3,000,000 cases of fruit. I hope when that time arrives those orchardists will get better treatment than the fruit-growers are getting to-day. At Bridgetown we asked for a shed at the railway station. Last year, day after day there were as many as 25 wagons at a time waiting to unload into the railway trucks. There was only one porter, and he had to handle every load. The man who pulled in at 7.30 a.m. was lucky to get out before midday. We placed the matter before the Premier prior to his departure for England. He said the facilities must be provided, and would be provided. An engineer was sent down, who looked into the matter with a view to making things a little easier for the orchardists. He drew plans of a shed, a ramp and an extra siding. The plans were excellent and were approved by the fruitgrowers of the district. Then the powers that be took a hand. The last thing I saw was a shed 20 feet by 10, which apparently was meant for the handling of 50,000 cases of fruit at Bridgetown. As soon as we saw it we telegraphed to stop the waste of money, stating that it was perfectly useless and ludicrous to put up such a shed, and asking that the matter should be dropped. We preferred to wait until we could

get someone in power who would see the necessity for providing the facilities required by the fruitgrowers of the district.

Hon. J. Ewing: Was that the Railway Department?

Hon. F. E. S. WILLMOTT: We complained, but we were told that we had nothing to grow about. They said we were given the same facilities that were accorded to people at Brookhampton. They might as well have told the people in Perth that they did not require any more facilities in their railway yard than were given to people at Bulla Bulling. For every case that goes into Brookhampton at least 1,000 go through Bridge-town. This sort of thing makes one rather tired. When speaking in Bunbury the Leader of the House took us to task over what happened in connection with the Closer Settlement Bill last session. If the Bill that it is proposed to bring down this session is not a better one than that, it will be a poor old thing.

Hon. C. F. Baxter: It can be made a good Bill, and will be made a good one by amendment.

Hon. F. E. S. WILLMOTT: Yes. It must include conditional purchase land. I have been told, if it includes these lands, we shall be doing something wrong and shall be breaking contracts. I would ask this question. Of all the estates that have been purchased, how many were freehold at the time? I venture to say very few of them were. There may have been three or five years still to run. An estate of 10,000 acres with five years of rent still to be paid has become freehold upon purchase by the Government. This has been done automatically. As the purchase money was handed over for the property, the late owner immediately made it freehold. That has been done in scores of cases; why cannot it be done in other cases? A man may hold 1,000 acres of conditional purchase land in the Manjimup district. He may be willing to retain 200 acres as being sufficient for himself and his sons to look after. What is to prevent the State from resuming the balance by paying the owner a reasonable price? The thing is simple enough.

Hon. T. Moore: Are there 1,000 acre blocks in Manjimup?

Hon. F. E. S. WILLMOTT: Yes, they were taken up many years ago.

Hon. T. Moore: And has nothing been done with them?

Hon. F. E. S. WILLMOTT: Perhaps a little has been done in one corner. In that heavily timbered country, a man would require the resources of a multi-millionaire to develop the whole of the block, or else he must concentrate on 50 acres leaving the balance to look after itself. Land in the neighbourhood of Pinjarra has been discussed during the debate. When going through the files today I discovered that, with the exception of Blythwood, owned by Mr. Duncan McLarty, consisting of 5,000 acres, there is only one other big estate in the district. That is an

estate extending from North Dandalup to Mandurah and as far as Pinjarra, comprising 63,000 acres. It has been offered to the Government on many occasions between 1911 and July, 1922, at 7s. an acre. According to the report, the eyes have been picked out of it. I was amused to notice that the last gentleman who reported on it said there was no first class land on it, and it was only a rough run for stock.

Hon. T. Moore: Is that not some of your swamp land?

Hon. F. E. S. WILLMOTT: No. It was offered for 7s. an acre but the offer was turned down. Blythwood has some £10,000 worth of improvements on it. It is, therefore, not lying idle. The other estates range from 2,000 to 400 acres. Much of the country is suitable for closer settlement and is being worked. I see from the files that the improvements around the Pinjarra holdings are very good. This will come as a surprise to Mr. Moore.

Hon. T. Moore: It is still a surprise. I have not seen any improvements.

Hon. F. E. S. WILLMOTT: They are all stated on the file.

Hon. T. Moore: Yes, on the file.

Hon. F. E. S. WILLMOTT: We have said we must look after the old settler. In the neighbourhood of Big Brook the old settlers are complaining bitterly. The Scaddan Government built a shunt from Jarnadup to Big Brook, a distance of 17 miles. This was done without Parliamentary sanction. The line cost over £60,000. It was handed over to the State Sawmills, who refused as a business proposition to pay interest on that amount. They said they could have built it for £30,000, and from that time to this have only paid interest on that amount. The settlers who use the line are at the mercy of the State Sawmills, who can lift their stuff, or refuse to do so, as they please. It costs as much to take a plough from Jarnadup to Big Brook as it does from Perth to Jarnadup, a distance of 220 miles. I do not say the State Sawmills are making an undue profit out of the settlers. Directly the truck containing a plough leaves the Jarnadup siding on the Big Brook line, the Railway Department charge demurrage because the truck is out of their hands. We are placing hundreds of men down there in group settlements. When they realise how they are being treated, they must become discontented. I advise the Government to allow the Railway Department to take over the line as soon as possible. The Minister for Works says the State sawmills cannot run logs over the line and keep to a time table. Years ago, at the Newlands mill, logs were run down from Mullalynup over the Government line without interfering with the time table. If that could be done in those benighted days, why can it not be done now?

Hon. V. Hamersley: Where there's a will there's a way.

Hon. F. E. S. WILLMOTT: Yes. So long as the line is controlled by the State Sawmills injustice will be done to the people

there. While we are thinking of preparations for new settlers from overseas, are we providing the people who already live here with land as they want it? At Big Brook there were 23 men who wanted land, all axemen and good bushmen. They were all sons of the soil and the very stamp of men likely to make good down there. Not one of those men could get an acre of land because it had all been set aside for group settlement. Surely we are going to look after the people who are already here! But it seems not. I brought the matter before the Premier.

Hon. C. F. Baxter: Were they refused land?

Hon. F. E. S. WILLMOTT: The Premier said that land would be found for these men in due course, but many of them had been waiting for 12 months to secure land.

Hon. V. Hamersley: Many are leaving the State because they cannot get land.

Hon. F. E. S. WILLMOTT: What I want to know is, how can Sir James Mitchell be Premier of the State, Treasurer of the State, Minister for Lands, Minister in charge of the Agricultural Bank, and Industries Assistance Board, and God knows what! Has he any possible hope at all of giving to these departments the attention they should receive? There is no man in this world who is capable of doing it.

Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. F. E. S. WILLMOTT: We know that Sir James Mitchell is in possession of good health and a good physique, but after all he is only one man, and he has bitten off more than he can chew. It is high time that another Minister was appointed.

Hon. J. A. Greig: Two or three of them.

Hon. F. E. S. WILLMOTT: One more anyhow. The Lands Department at the present time is one of the most important in the State, and I declare unhesitatingly that the Premier, with all the work he has to attend to, cannot look after that department as it should be looked after. Do not let me be misunderstood. I do not say that Honorary Ministers should be appointed, because in my opinion it is quite unfair that the members of the Ministry should be called upon to find the funds out of their own emoluments with which to pay the salaries, or even to help to defray the expenses of Honorary Ministers it is not right. Let there be provision made for the payment of an additional Minister, or two if necessary.

Hon. C. F. Baxter: We must alter the Constitution.

Hon. F. E. S. WILLMOTT: Yes, it is absolutely necessary. If we are going to have departments properly supervised by Ministers, then we must have additional Ministers. If we do not, we shall have the departments run by civil servants.

Hon. J. Ewing: They are doing it now.

Hon. F. E. S. WILLMOTT: There is nothing worse for the departments or for the country than that. I hope we shall see in the immediate future a Bill brought down to amend the Constitution to provide for the

appointment of at least one additional Minister. There are very few of us who are in a position to give their time to the affairs of State in a truly honorary capacity. The whole of one's time is taken up in giving attention to one's private affairs. Therefore let us have Ministers properly appointed under the Constitution. I wish to say a few words about the trading concerns. It is high time this question was determined in one way or another. During the 10 years or so that I have been in Parliament there has been a continuous wrangling over the State trading concerns. The Minister for Works in another place the other day quite proudly stated that the sawmills had done three million pounds worth of trade. But, I ask, has anyone received one load of timber, or even one cubic foot of timber 1s. cheaper on account of the existence of the State Sawmills?

Hon. J. Ewing: They are in the combine.

Hon. F. E. S. WILLMOTT: According to the evidence given before the Forests Commission the other day, they are part and parcel of the Sawmillers' Association.

Hon. F. A. Baglin: And who is getting the profit?

Hon. T. Moore: They are now what your party have made them.

Hon. F. E. S. WILLMOTT: Not at all. If there is anyone, and I do not know of anyone, who is in favour of State trading concerns, it is the person who believes that the State trading concerns reduce the cost of the article to the consumer, not at the expense of his fellow citizens, but by doing away with the profits of the middleman. But we do not find that that is the case.

Hon. F. A. Baglin: Your party do not understand the principle.

Hon. F. E. S. WILLMOTT: Before the advent of the State sawmills, we used to get fruit cases for 6d. from that awful blood-sucking firm Millars' Timber & Trading Company.

Hon. F. A. Baglin: Do not you get them to-day at that price?

Hon. F. E. S. WILLMOTT: The State Sawmills came in and said, "You must be mad to be supplying fruit cases at that price; let us get together and squeeze the fruit-growers." And they did so, and the price of fruit cases went up to 1s. 1d.

Hon. T. Moore: Did Mr. George say that? Who said that? Your imagination is vivid.

Hon. F. E. S. WILLMOTT: My imagination is not vivid.

Hon. T. Moore: Very vivid.

Hon. F. E. S. WILLMOTT: The price of fruit cases went up from 6d. to 1s. 1d., and the State Sawmills gloried in the increase. I listened to the Minister for Works when he was speaking in another place, and if ever a man appeared proud of having collected thousands of pounds profit from the trading concerns, it was Mr. George.

Hon. F. A. Baglin: There is no unfair competition from the State point of view.

Hon. F. E. S. WILLMOTT: The time has arrived when we should cease to wrangle, and if nobody else will move, I certainly will do so in this House, in the direction of trying to bring about a definite decision regarding the trading concerns, so that we may waste no more money. I am pleased to see that many new industries are being established in Western Australia. Cups and saucers and all sorts of things are to be seen in the lobby of Parliament House. There is one matter, however, that is quite new to me. I can remember in my boyhood days being told to go and buy strap oil and pigeon's milk. Of course, I never knew where these commodities were made. Recently I picked up a copy of the "Primary Producer" of the 25th August, and I saw this advertisement—

Wanted one merino shorthorn bull calf . . .

Now I know where we get bull's wool. I have always wondered where bull's wool came from.

The Minister for Education: And that is your party's official organ.

Hon. F. E. S. WILLMOTT: The advertisement continues—

. . . pure bred, or one 12 months old Full particulars, Stock Department, Western Australian Farmers Ltd.

That is another industry which evidently is going to be established here—the growing of bull's wool. In days gone by we were taught all about "baa-baa black sheep, have you any wool." It will now be "Bellow bellow black bull, have you any wool, yes sir, yes sir, one bag full." I only wish to say in conclusion that I trust Sir James Mitchell's scheme of immigration will prove a success. There must be all sorts of trouble to be encountered; nobody knows it better than I do, being so familiar with the South-Western part of the State where the immigrants are to be settled. We must, however, be prepared to see mistakes made and money lost, but in the end I am sure it will be found that the State will gain substantially.

Hon. J. MILLS (Central) [5.55]: In common with other members I desire to congratulate you Sir, on your elevation to the position of President of this Chamber. I think I can claim to have known you longer than any other member present. I remember you blazing the track as one of the pioneers of the Murchison and later on entering into commercial and public life. I was always sure that when the mantle of President fell on your shoulders, that high office would not in any way suffer at your hands. The Governor's Speech refers to soldier settlement in these terms—

Soldier settlement operations indicate that the repatriation of ex-soldiers on the land is nearing completion.

Further on we find a reference to the fact that 7,288 soldiers have registered and that 4,547 have been assisted, leaving 2,741 registered

and not settled. Surely that is not as it should be. In the Province I represent, there are many men who are seeking to be settled, but who at present cannot obtain land. The men in the far North will not come down to the South-West, and neither will those in the South-West go to the North. Therefore, land should be made available in both those parts of the State, or wherever those who desire to take it up require it. I wish to touch upon the Premier's immigration and land settlement scheme, but not to any great extent, because at the present time we hardly realise what it means. In 1910 the present Premier, in conjunction with the then Premier, Sir Newton Moore, launched a land settlement scheme for which I think every person in Western Australia to-day must be truly grateful, and but for which I do not know what the position of the State would be at the present time. Sir James Mitchell's scheme will receive the generous assistance of everyone in the community, including members of Parliament, in order that it may reach a successful issue. It is, however, fraught with great difficulties. But we can leave it with safety in the hands of the Premier who has done so well in connection with land settlement in the past. He knows what he is about and I am prepared to trust him. It is desirable that our empty spaces should be filled, for defence purposes, we are told. There is no doubt about the correctness of that, but I do not see that it is the duty of the State with a population of only about 350,000, to carry on this important work. It is the plain duty of the Federal Government. We are taxed heavily, almost bled white, and one of the purposes of taxation is to provide defence. Therefore, if it is necessary to fill our empty spaces, the work should be carried out by the Federal Government. I do not think we should get out of our stride in settling our country and running headlong into difficulties, because we are told our spaces are empty. It is certainly the duty of the Federal Government to attend to that matter. Each Government in succession has urged us to produce more of these things that we require, particularly butter, bacon and so forth. If each Government for the past 15 years had given the same amount of attention and spent as much money along the Midland railway line from Moora northwards to Geraldton, as they have done in the South-West, I consider very little dairy produce would be imported into Western Australia to-day. The land from Carnamah is particularly adapted for dairying and, in fact, that part of the State should be the dairying country of Western Australia. There are at least 20 big estates averaging quite 10,000 acres. One can travel from Carnamah to the Geraldton-Mullewa line and not put foot on anything but first class land. At least from 60 to 65 per cent. of that land would be regarded as first class agricultural land. Despite that fact, hon. members could

count the farms held in that part of the country on the fingers of both hands. The owners of those properties are mostly people who used the holdings as depots for their sheep stations in years gone by. Owing to the increased railway facilities, they are not so urgently required for that purpose nowadays, and I think the owners would be prepared to negotiate with the Government with a view to the disposal of the holdings. It is plainly the duty of the Government, from my point of view, to see that the lands already traversed by railways are settled. Particularly should this be so, seeing that so little money will be required to settle people there as compared with the South-West.

Hon. J. Duffell: Is any drainage scheme required there?

Hon. J. MILLS: That is one of the things that will be avoided in the part of the State to which I refer. We heard Mr. Willmott say that there was so much water in the South-West that it necessitated expenditure in reclaiming the land and making it available for settlement. Why trouble with that aspect when we have such beautiful country in the Midland district? Why not leave such work to posterity? There is plenty of land available in the Midland areas without any such huge expenditure being required to make the land available for settlement. Mingenew is at present but a country village; it should be one of the finest provincial towns in Western Australia by virtue of the magnificent country that extends right up to its threshold. From Carnamah to Tenindewa is over 100 miles, yet throughout that whole distance one need not set foot on anything but first class land.

Hon. J. Ewing: Why condemn the South-West?

Hon. J. MILLS: I am not.

Hon. J. Ewing: Why not develop both?

Hon. J. MILLS: According to Mr. Willmott's description to-night, he says it will ruin the country if we proceed with the development of the South-West. He did not say so in as many words, but what he said was tantamount to that. I do not object to opening up the South-West, but if it is to cost £100 an acre to clear the land there, whereas it will cost only about £2 an acre to clear the land to which I refer, I think the comparison is in favour of the Midland areas. In addition to the very fine agricultural and pastoral lands in that part of the State—we have some of the most beautiful pasture lands to be seen in the South-Western division of Western Australia—we have the coal deposit pierced last year by a Government bore. That plant was all too hurriedly withdrawn from the vicinity of the coal discovery. We have the authority of Professor David for the statement that the deposit is in an anticline with branches extending to the east and to the west. The bore pierced the coal seam at probably its greatest depth to the eastward, where it reached a depth of 530 feet. The quality of the coal was, I am sorry to say, not as good

as it might have been, but the authorities tell us that we can get coal of an inferior type at one spot and get far better coal a short distance away from that spot. It is to be regretted that the Government withdrew that plant so quickly, as the coal was tapped at the deepest spot; the seams should have been tested at some of the other spots where they would be nearer the surface. We hope that something will be done in that direction in the future. If we wish to establish people here, they will probably not all embark upon agricultural industrial pursuits. We want secondary industries as well, and the development of the Irwin coalfields should be attended to.

Hon. J. W. Hickey: We will have to trust to luck.

Hon. J. MILLS: That is no good. In support of my contention that the land along the Midland Railway comprises some of the best in Western Australia, I am reminded that when many years ago the late Lord Forrest—he was Mr. Forrest in those days—crossed the country from Western Australia to the overland telegraph line in South Australia, a grateful Government in this State offered him the freehold of 5,000 acres of country in any part of Western Australia. Lord Forrest was a native of Bunbury and a surveyor by profession. He was a man who had a very extensive knowledge of the South-West. Did he select his 5,000 acres of land in the South-West? No; he went to the Irwin district and last year that same paddock that he selected had over 1,000 head of cattle on it. That is a record quite as good as any to be found in the South-West. I think Mr. Burvill mentioned 20 cows depastured on 27 acres for 12 months by people providing fodder valued at £50.

Hon. C. F. Baxter: At any rate, it is a question of the lower cost in the development of the country.

Hon. J. MILLS: The hon. member has not been there.

Hon. J. Duffell: He knew the quality of the land when he went there.

Hon. J. MILLS: Certainly, it is beautiful land. I urge the Government to re-purchase these estates in the neighbourhood of Mingenew. The Government have purchased some, but I want them to go further with the matter. This land is some of the best agricultural country in the State, already served by a railway. It has an assured rainfall and a good climate. To give some idea of what the repurchasing of estates means to the country, I would refer to the four estates in the Geraldton district which were bought by the Government. I refer to the Bowes, Oakabella, Mount Erin, and Narra Tarra estates. These were sheep stations and had only four homesteads. At no time were there more than from 120 to 130 persons on the four estates, and that would be during shearing operations. At other times, the number would be reduced by 50 per cent.

Hon. J. Duffell: What area is represented?

Hon. J. MILLS: About 150,000 acres. There was a great clamour for land there and

the Government decided to repurchase these estates and cut them up for settlement. Instead of four homes on those properties, there are now 152 farmers settled there engaged in mixed farming operations. They carry a third more sheep than were held when the properties were run as sheep stations and they are sending to market every year from 80,000 to 100,000 bags of wheat, while there still remains more land awaiting development there. That is a pretty good instance of the benefits accruing from closer settlement. In addition, there were 152 people with an average of about five on each holding, giving a total of 760 people on those properties, as compared with the 120 at the outside when the areas were run as sheep stations. Between Mingenew and Mullewa there are some fine properties. There was a proposal some years ago to construct a railway to serve this part of the State, and I understand the proposal was lost by one vote. I think it was a great mistake that that railway was not built. If that country is to be taken over and opened up, it will be necessary to afford railway facilities. Such a railway would not only serve the agricultural areas which would be opened up, but it would also pass the coalfields to which I have referred, and where there are seams running up to a width of 12 feet in parts. The line would have to run for a distance of from 50 to 60 miles through country which presents no engineering difficulties. I would also advocate the establishment of dairies on State farms. A number of people who do not go in for dairies would do so if they knew how to manage them and what was really required. Farmers are a hard-working section of the community and they are rather afraid of the improvements that they consider would be necessary. They probably are afraid that the health regulations will be too stringent. For that reason, I think the Government should establish small dairies on the State farms. They could be established for educational purposes so as to let farmers see what can be done by running them as economically as possible. Silos should also be provided in connection with those State farms. Many people read about silos but do not know anything about them, nor do they know how they should be constructed.

Hon. J. A. Greig: Is there not a dairy on each State farm?

Hon. J. MILLS: I do not think so. For instance, on the Chapman State farm, from what I could see, they were nearly all bulls there! At any rate, I think the step I advocate would be one in the right direction. The dairies should not be run expensively, and we could make use of agricultural students to assist in the work. At the Chapman farm there used to be 20 or 30 agricultural students. To-day there are only the manager, who is an excellent man, and two employees. Why should we not have a few agricultural students there?

Hon. J. W. Hickey: Ask the Minister for Agriculture.

Hon. J. MILLS: We will do so presently. For the past seven years, I have endeavoured to induce the Government to appoint committees or boards to inquire into the position of I.A.B. farmers, more particularly those whose accounts are in a hopeless and irretrievable position. I refer to farmers who have become so involved through no fault of their own, but who have been settled in districts unsuitable for the growing of cereals. The object of such committees would not be to whitewash unworthy men, but to give relief to farmers who have been asked to establish themselves on areas where they have no hope of succeeding. Men have lost hundreds of pounds through no fault of their own. I know an instance where a man lost £2,000. He was settled by the Government on the land he was attempting to farm. I believe no Government would ask a farmer to settle on land unless there was a reasonable certainty that he would be able to make good. I know that the settlement of our agricultural lands is largely of an experimental nature. I do not blame the Government but, seeing that the Government were mainly responsible for these mistakes, I think the Government should assist in rectifying them. During last session I waited on the Premier with a deputation and asked for the appointment of the committees I have referred to. The Premier refused to do so, saying that he would treat each case on its individual merits. As there are scores of such cases, however, that would be rather a long process. I think the Acting Premier consented to the appointment of committees. At present, however, nothing has been done. I understand it is necessary to amend the Industries Assistance Act to give effect to any recommendation from such a committee. I want to remind the Leader of the House that we expect such a Bill to be introduced this session.

Sitting suspended from 6.15 to 7.30 p.m.

Hon. J. MILLS: I have been informed by a returned soldier that he was farming before the war. He got into difficulties owing to the drought of 1914 and the rust of 1915. He enlisted and before leaving renounced all further claims to his farm. Fortunately he got back to Western Australia, and was repatriated on the land, but he has now been handed the debts of his old farm. There may be some reasons for this which I do not understand, but it seems hard that a returned soldier should be treated in this manner. I hope the Minister will inquire into this case.

The Minister for Education: Give his name and particulars.

Hon. J. MILLS: I shall do so later on. Adverting to my earlier remarks regarding the Irwin as a dairying district, I have it on the authority of Mr. Macfarlane that the biggest cheque he has paid for cream during the last four months was paid to a farmer in that district.

Hon. J. M. Macfarlane: The biggest cheque paid in any year for the last four years.

Hon. J. MILLS: I might add that the biggest estate ever accumulated in Western Australia—and not through the aid of Tattersall's or a gold mine—was one of £600,000 at Dongarra. The man started with small means, and died the wealthiest man in Western Australia. No better proof than this is needed of the quality of the country. Mr. Willmott referred to the inclusion of conditional purchase lands in the Closer Settlement Bill. The Government are already under a contract with conditional purchase holders. If the land is granted under Section 55 of the Act, namely, with residence, the holder has to expend in improvements a sum equivalent to the cost per acre. If the land is taken up under Section 56, non-residence conditions, the holder has to expend in improvements a sum equal to double the purchase money. Provided the holder conforms to the requirements of the Act, the land is his for 20 years. There are specific provisions as to what must be done, and I do not see how it is possible to dispossess such a man during the period of his lease. I am not hostile to the compulsory acquisition of conditional purchase lands which, in some cases, I can conceive might be advantageous. There are a few matters affecting my province to which I must refer. One relates to the harbour works at Geraldton. If these works are mentioned to any of the authorities, they at once become serious, twist their thumbs and make insinuations regarding the trade of the port. If the trade of the port has decreased in the last 15 or 20 years, it is attributable to the centralisation policy of successive Governments. I am not referring to the Mitchell Government; they are the least of the offenders, but perhaps the opportunity for them to offend has not been so great. Wheat grown at Three Springs has been borne to Fremantle, a distance of 200 miles, though the distance to Geraldton is only 111 miles. Wheat grown at Gutha, on the Wongan Hills-Mullewa line, instead of being railed 100 miles to Geraldton, is hauled 230 miles to Fremantle. Lead produced 70 miles beyond Northampton is hauled to Fremantle to be smelted. Meat produced on the Murchison is brought to Fremantle to be frozen instead of being treated at the natural port of the district, Geraldton. Many thousands of bales of wool produced on the Murchison, which used to be shipped at Geraldton, now go to the Fremantle sales. If the trade of the harbour has decreased, it is due to the centralisation policy and not to any fault of the district. Thirty-five years ago Sir John Coode visited Western Australia and we were promised a harbour scheme. Each succeeding Government has given us an idea that we would get it. All we have got towards it so far is a viaduct which cost about £27,000. I do not know what the proposed scheme was further than that we were to have an island breakwater. The scheme was evolved by the

Labour Government just prior to their going out of office. They had been in power for about five years and just when everyone knew they were going out—even the boys in the street knew it—

Hon. T. Moore: They knew it for a good while, then.

Hon. J. MILLS: Quite so, and when the Government had accumulated a deficit of £1,000,000 they remembered there was a place called Geraldton which had been promised a harbour for years. In order to ingratiate themselves they started a scheme which they knew they could not complete, and which could not be completed for many years. To-day we have the viaduct which the tories has pretty well destroyed. We require an overhead bridge at Mullewa. When the Wongan Hills-Mullewa line was linked up with the goldfields line, it was found necessary to increase the accommodation at Mullewa. The railway station was then about 20 yards from the street on the town side. The yard has since increased very much and the station is now on the opposite side of the town, there being an island platform. To get to the station from the south side it is necessary to journey about 25 chains passing over a level crossing and across one line. If the passenger is not there before the train arrives, he has to cross the train. Representations have been made by members and local authorities for a long time to get this matter rectified but all efforts have been unsuccessful. It is certain that sooner or later a shocking accident will occur involving heavy expense, because people cannot be prevented from crossing the railway yard. There are some 10 or 12 lines with trucks often shunting in the yard and it is a common sight to see three trains there at a time and people picking their way through. I hope that in the interests of the people and of the Government something will soon be done in the way of providing an overhead bridge or a subway, the latter for preference. For many years there has been talk of extending the Yuna line. The Yuna railway opened up a nice piece of country beyond the Bowes estate, and all the farmers settled there have been very successful indeed. Six miles beyond another patch of good country begins, and continues for a considerable distance. If the railway were extended for 15 miles to the valley of the Greenough River a lot of first class land would be made available. I was through a good deal of it a fortnight ago, and it is really good agricultural land which should be developed. The difficulty at present is that the distance for carting is too great. In view of the number of immigrants coming to the State, the Government might turn their attention to this land. It would be wise for the Government to stick to land in the wheat belt which they know will give a speedy return, in preference to doing too much work in the South-West which will take a longer period of years to produce returns.

Hon. J. W. Hickey: Has any Minister for Lands been across that land?

Hon. J. MILLS: I do not know.

Hon. J. W. Hickey: I think W. D. Johnson crossed it.

Hon. J. MILLS: Just a word or two regarding bush mothers. I understand the Government have under consideration the reduction of fares for prospective mothers to country maternity hospitals. While we are spending a great deal of money to bring immigrants to Western Australia, we must not lose sight of the immigrants who come to our door regularly, the best of all immigrants; nor should we lose sight of the care and attention to which they are entitled. I am pleased that the Minister for Mines has a scheme in view and I hope he will give effect to it. I have pleasure in supporting the adoption of the Address-in-reply.

Hon. C. F. BAXTER (East) [7.43]: Before proceeding to discuss the Address-in-reply, may I add my congratulations to you, Mr. President, on your elevation to the Chair. It reflects very great credit on you and is a fitting triumph to a life of usefulness in the service of the State. When on the floor of the House you set a great example, more especially to new members, for whom you had always a kindly word of advice which made each one feel that he had come among friends who would assist him in his duties to the country. You have a peculiar facility, Sir, of gaining your ends in a most pleasant way, and one cannot but envy you in the success which has attended your efforts on behalf of your constituents. As a member of some years standing, I regret that we have lost the services of our former president, Mr. Kingsmill. He was an authority on constitutional matters and his knowledge of Parliamentary procedure was probably not equalled by that of any other member of the House. I hope the time is not far distant when Mr. Kingsmill will be successful in gaining a seat in the Federal Parliament, where he will do very good and useful work for the State in which he has so much confidence. I desire to take this opportunity, too, of welcoming Mr. Macfarlane. Knowing Mr. Kingsmill and Mr. Macfarlane both so well, my only regret is that we have not the advantage of the services of both gentlemen in this Chamber. Mr. Macfarlane has had a long and successful business career, and need take second place to no man in Western Australia as regards assistance rendered during a lengthy term of years to our very important dairying industry. With regard to the Governor's Speech, there is not very much in it apart from the usual padding. There are, of course, the references to the supremely important subject of immigration. That subject altogether overshadows everything that has been urged so frequently on the score of economy. Undoubtedly it will be a splendid thing for this State if the immigration policy is carried out successfully. Up to the present, however, we have had but meagre details of the scheme.

Hon. T. Moore: Meagre and hazy.

Hon. C. F. BAXTER: Unless something is being proceeded with unknown to us as representatives of the people, I fear that the immigration scheme will fall flat. That would be a great pity. Our finances are in such a perilous condition that something is needed to remedy the position. As an old goldfields resident, as one of the first goldfields residents to purchase a farming property, I have in mind one man who has been overlooked in this connection, a man who played a very important part in land settlement here; in fact, the first man to push land settlement in Western Australia. I refer to our old friend John Marquis Hopkins. Mr. Hopkins, when Minister for Lands, started the first energetic scheme of land settlement. He had wonderful confidence in this country, and that confidence has ever since inspired the people of Western Australia. Much credit attaches to the late gentleman's name in that connection. The Governor's Speech states that it is the intention to settle 6,000 men on the land, chiefly in the South-West portion of the State. Having been born in Victoria, having seen there the privations and struggles of three generations who were settled on Victorian lands of a similar character to our south-western land, I am just wondering whether we shall achieve great success with our immigration scheme. In Victoria it took three generations to achieve success on such land. I do not agree with Mr. Mill's idea that we should push forward in the wheat area with cereal growing and dairying to the neglect of the South-West. The south-western portion of this State is extremely valuable, and certainly calls for development; but it must be development on gradual lines. If we are going to place the major portion of the newcomers on south-western lands, then pity help our finances in a few years hence!

Hon. J. Ewing: They are all going there.

Hon. C. F. BAXTER: In that case I, as a representative of the taxpayers, feel that the position is very serious indeed. Our financial drift to-day is something alarming, and if we are about to settle all those people in the South-West, we are going to accelerate and increase that drift. To settle the whole of them in the South-West, why, the thing is ridiculous! I have read a good deal about the scheme, and I have read into it that those who benefit by it most are the Imperial and Federal Governments.

Hon. A. Lovekin: Hear, hear!

Hon. C. F. BAXTER: It is a good thing for the Imperial Government to get out of a considerable portion of their unemployed difficulty at such a low rate of interest.

Hon. A. Lovekin: Colonel Amery says it is a good deal for the Imperial Government.

Hon. C. F. BAXTER: It is an excellent deal, especially having regard to the fact that America cannot absorb these people. For the Federal Government, too, it is one of the best business deals ever made by the Prime Minister. Mr. Hughes does not make many good business deals, but here is one he has

made at the expense of Western Australia. However, this country having made the bargain, we want to be helpful, instead of merely critical. Still, we want the loan money to be expended wisely, or else we shall find ourselves in the position of having borrowed and spent beyond our reach. The settlement of these people on the land will be merely a commencement. We shall have to follow that up with all kinds of necessary facilities, and we shall have to carry those people on. We have had lessons before, and surely it is time the business of land settlement was taken in hand properly. Wild schemes on extensive lines should not be proceeded with, such as the settlement of all these immigrants in the South-West. Searching for knowledge as to what has already been done in the South-West, I asked a question as to the amount of money expended on the Nornalup area, and I learnt that it is no less a sum than £40,000. One of the great drawbacks to our railways, one of the features which cause the railway expenditure to exceed the railway revenue, is that we have a network of lines over a sparsely settled country. Most of those railways, especially the lines in the wheat belt, were constructed cheaply. But they were constructed on wrong principles. That is the fault of past Governments, not of the present Government. The lines were constructed before ample settlement had taken place. Now it is proposed to build more lines through the South-West, regardless of the fact that along our existing railways there is far more country available than will be needed to settle all the immigrants. Those lands may be in private hands to-day; but would it not be far cheaper to reacquire them than to run railways through new country? A huge sum is to be expended on the extension of the Nornalup railway. Now, take a district only 90 miles away from Nornalup; I refer to Denmark. Look for success among the Denmark settlers. We do not find that any of them have retired, unless it be such as have retired after throwing their holdings back on the Industries Assistance Board.

Hon. A. Burvill: The Denmark settlers have only just started.

Hon. C. F. BAXTER: Denmark has been going for a number of years, and though many of the people there have done very good work, the expense of development has held them back. There is a wonderful regrowth there which follows on the clearing of land, and one has to keep on continually spending money to deal with the regrowth. Seeking for information regarding what is to be produced in the South-West, I learnt from the Leader of the House that the products are to be dairy products, fruit, pigs, potatoes, fodder, and vegetables. Let us take the last first, vegetables. To-day the vegetable market is such that one can buy a bag containing 12 large cauliflowers for 1s. 6d. During part of the year a profit is made out of vegetables, but the thing has got to such a stage that there must be a large increase

of our population before the vegetable farmer can hope to succeed financially. For most vegetable growers it is to-day a struggle just to exist. As to fodder, I do not think the South-West will ever be in a position to grow fodder as cheaply as our wheat and oat growing areas. The clearing of land, and its subsequent operation, are so much cheaper in the wheat belt. We might increase our potato production with some advantage, but with few exceptions our potato growers do not make much profit, taking year in year out. Potatoes are a very precarious crop. From experiments which I caused to be made, and from inquiries which I directed throughout the world, when I was administering the Department of Agriculture, it seems that potato growers do well to look for an alternative crop in flax. In that connection I know the Government are willing to assist growers with machinery. That is by the way. But one cannot look to potato growing in the South-West to afford the opportunity for a considerable settlement like the immigration scheme. When it comes to competition with Victorian growers, our potato growers fare very badly indeed. Mr. Burvill will have full knowledge of that fact. In the first place, the cost of manuring is £2 per acre cheaper in Victoria than in this State. That is a very big advantage, and overcomes the question of freight charges and losses in shipment from Victoria to this State, as well as commission on sales and so forth. Therefore, Victorian growers are in a position to compete successfully with our potato growers. Still, we can increase our yield so as to overcome the need for importing. However, it is only a small matter. Let us get to pigs. When it comes to growing pigs in the South-West, a dairy must be worked in with pig raising. Some little return may be expected in the South-West from pig raising. Fruit is another great factor in the South-West, but the fruit will have to be of export variety, and it takes six years to produce a crop. Mr. Willmott, a South-Western representative, to-day made reference to the position of the fruit industry. Of course, the difficulties of that position can be overcome, and it is up to the Government to try to overcome them.

Hon. J. Ewing: The South-West is wonderful country for fruit.

Hon. C. F. BAXTER: Unquestionably; but mention has been made of what can be done with regard to jam. I say very little can be done in this country with jam manufacture unless suitable fruit is grown for it. We have a jam factory here now starving because it cannot get the right sort of fruit, and hence can turn out only a few lines of jam. During war time the Federal Government took a large contract to supply America with plum and other lines of jam which we could not supply, but which Victoria and Tasmania could supply. The Government of this State went to the trouble of impressing on the Federal Government the necessity for giving us a share of that contract. On those repre-

sentations the Prime Minister wired to America, offering to supply fig jam. The offer was readily accepted and a contract was arranged for this State. However, when it came to getting the order together, it was found that we could not supply at all. Not a ton of jam was supplied from this State under that contract. In time to come the South-West will be a wonderfully good country for dairying. But we have a great many difficulties to overcome before we reach that stage. We require to start on modest lines. One of the most important factors in dairying is the possession of old pastures. New pastures will not turn out a cream from which a good-keeping butter can be made. For some years past the Government have been doing all they can to remedy this. Another factor needing improvement is the care expended on their cream by the producers themselves. Mr. Mills stressed the quality of the country in the Geraldton district. Certainly there is no part of the State more suitable for dairying and for the production of a good-keeping butter than is the Geraldton district. It is a shame to see the Greenough flats and the Irwin River flats growing a little wheat and grazing a few sheep. The whole of those flats are eminently suited for dairying purposes. The Greenough flat alone could run a large butter factory. I urge on the Government the necessity for assisting dairy farmers with the erection of silos. As the result of inquiries made in Victoria, it was found that they are there using our jarrah for the construction of silos at a cost of about £100 each. The Government could render great assistance by building silos for farmers and spreading the cost over, say, three years. Silos are of the utmost importance to a dairy farmer, because just when the pastures are going off the ensilage in the silo allows the farmer to make good profits. A silo would pay for itself within the first two years. Let us consider dairying generally in relation to the immigration scheme. Suppose that of the 6,000 persons to be settled each year, 2,000 take up dairying in the South-West. With a maximum number of 10 cows each, it will mean that we shall have to find 20,000 dairy cows per annum. How can it be done, seeing that if 250 dairy cows were wanted to-morrow, they could not be purchased in this State? Then consider the cost: 20,000 dairy cows at £15 per head means £300,000 per annum, or, in three years, close on a million of money. During the past six or eight months good dairy cattle have been destroyed in this State owing to the poor results from dairying. Of course, I hope the whole scheme will be worked on very different lines down the South-West. It is necessary that the Government should advise settlers how to carry on dairying by proper scientific methods. This applies also to other industries. A little time ago, when we used to see the daily newspapers, it was reported that Sir James Mitchell, addressing the Commercial Travellers' Association, said the

Government would be putting 12,000 settlers on the land within a couple of weeks or so. I should like to hear from the Minister where those 12,000 persons are to be settled.

The Minister for Education: I did not see any such statement.

Hon. C. F. BAXTER: I saw it in a newspaper. The Government have sent men to Newdegate clearing the land. One would have thought that before doing anything of the sort the Government would have assured themselves on two main issues, namely, that there was a sufficient area of good land available in the district, and that they would extend the railway from Lake Grace to Newdegate. When, about three weeks ago, I asked in the House whether the Government intended to extend that line, the reply was that the question had not been determined. Why, then, are the Government spending money in clearing the land at Newdegate if they have not yet determined to extend the railway to that area? A surveyor with an intimate knowledge of that country is very emphatic in stating that the area of good land in the district is strictly limited. If that be so, what is to be the position there, 40 miles from the existing railway? Again, we have been repeatedly told that the 40 miles of country between Lake Grace and Newdegate consists of poor land. Surely, then, it is not wise for the Government to go on clearing land at Newdegate! It seems to me nothing but a wilful waste of money. They should first determine whether the country warrants the extension of the railway from Lake Grace. As it is, they are simply groping in the dark.

Hon. T. Moore: Your party is agreeing to it, and keeping the Government in power.

Hon. C. F. BAXTER: It is essential that the best possible advice should be given to producers with a view to their getting the best they can out of the land. We not only require a better quality of product—I am not referring to wheat—but we require also an improvement in our average yields. Our wheat yields are very low, but can be increased by at least two bushels per acre.

Hon. J. M. Macfarlane: Three.

Hon. C. F. BAXTER: Suppose they can be increased by only one bushel; consider what it would mean to the State! We have, say, one and a quarter million acres under wheat. Taking the price at 7s. per bushel, an increase of one bushel per acre would represent £300,000 per annum, which in three years would mean £900,000. Surely that is worthy of consideration! Let us see what is being done to assist the man on the land to increase his yield, to advise him of scientific methods, which in other countries have made such progress during recent years. There is an officer in this State who was engaged as Commissioner for the wheat belt. He knows his business and he can do a great deal in the way of increasing the yield by the one bushel per acre per annum I have spoken of. He is not in a position to do so owing to circumstances. Most of his time is spent on boards and in other directions, except in the

one business that he is engaged for and knows most about. He is equal to anyone in Australia in the matter of knowledge of wheat. Mr. Sutton can do good work amongst the farmers, but with all his knowledge and experience he can do nothing to increase the wheat yield so long as he has to stay in his office as director of agriculture. If the Government want Mr. Sutton as a director they should get another officer to act as wheat Commissioner. I was searching for information to-day and asked a question regarding the officers appointed to this particular branch of the Agricultural Department. I asked what the qualifications of the wheat experimentalist were. I was informed that they were "Aptitude for experimental work, a thorough training as a professional draftsman and computer, seven years' W.A. farming experience as owner and two years' experience assisting wheat Commissioner with experimental work." Is this the kind of man who has to advise the farmers what to do with their land? Ninety-five per cent. of the farmers know more about the business than he does. It is remarkable that this gentleman should be appointed to that important position. I understand he was not even a success on his own farm.

Hon. F. E. S. Willmott: What is the officer's name?

Hon. C. F. BAXTER: I am not prepared to give his name.

Hon. J. A. Greig: Are you referring to the field officer?

Hon. C. F. BAXTER: I refer to the wheat experimentalist. The Government tie Mr. Sutton to his office, and send out a man with limited knowledge and practically no experience to advise the farmers. How can we expect good results from such an action? Almost every country engages the best possible men to advise in these matters. The field officer referred to by Mr. Greig has had practical farming experience as a manager, and probably he is qualified to hold that position. I have nothing to say against that officer. Then we come to the agricultural adviser. A graduate in agriculture of the Western Australian University, a boy sent out to advise the farmers what to do! Is it any wonder they laugh at him? The whole thing is ridiculous. To my knowledge the most important department of State to do with agriculture has been starved for 20 years, and is being starved to-day. The sooner the Government wake up to their responsibilities and engage officers who are trained and who know their business, the sooner will our yield increase as well as our revenue. I suggest the Leader of the House should advise the Minister for Agriculture that, instead of conducting a campaign of increased production and merely asking the farmers to increase their acreage under crop, he should turn his attention to increasing the wheat yield per acre. Our farmers responded loyally when asked to produce more during war time, but they are not going to do that to-day unless they have a guaranteed market for their produce, or an assurance of lower costs of production. They

want something more than a request from a Minister. If one talks to them they merely smile, and unless it is their intention to increase the acreage under crop they will not do so at the mere request of a Minister. Let us put facilities in the way of advising them on scientific lines to increase their yields. There are other ways of assisting the immigration scheme. One is by constructing railway lines to provide facilities for settlers. I do not know why the line to Dwarda was ever agreed to. There is no settler in that part of the State who is more than 15 miles from an existing railway. I hope the line will not be laid down, because it will be of no value. The country does not need it. Other parts of the State do need a railway and the people are perishing for want of one.

Hon. J. A. Greig: The construction of the line has been stopped since I spoke in the House concerning it.

Hon. C. F. BAXTER: I am glad to hear it. I congratulate the Premier on the step he has taken, for it would only have meant a waste of money.

Hon. T. Moore: He has already wasted some money and yet you congratulate him!

Hon. C. F. BAXTER: That was before he knew the circumstances. The Premier cannot be expected to know everything.

Hon. J. A. Greig: Other Ministers must be responsible. Someone is to blame.

Hon. C. F. BAXTER: The line was agreed to by Parliament, and one cannot blame any Minister for carrying it out unless he is forewarned as to the position. The Premier has had the matter brought under his notice and he has stopped the work. I must therefore congratulate him, and show my appreciation of his efforts. There is a great curse within our midst in the carnation weed. The position is an alarming one. Even the star thistle is as nothing compared with the carnation weed, which is spreading to a most alarming degree.

Hon. J. A. Greig: Will not sheep eat it?

Hon. C. F. BAXTER: Nothing will touch it. Dr. Stoward says it is poisonous. If one pulls it up and the milk touches one's hand, the skin comes out in sores. It is confined at present to the Geraldton district, but it is spreading very fast. A few weeks ago I noticed that the Government had asked the South Australian Government if the weed constituted a danger. I have had a long experience of this weed, which was considered by the officers of the Agricultural Department to be one of the most serious pests that had ever entered this country. I was exceedingly surprised, therefore, to see this reference to the South Australian Government. I find from the records that attention was drawn to the position by Mr. Constantine, of Geraldton, in 1915. He is to be commended for his action. He has hammered away at the subject for many years, even in opposition to his own municipal council. The Geraldton council constituted themselves passive resisters against the handling of this weed, for they did not think it would be dangerous. This

gentleman kept in touch with the Government all the time. Dr. Stoward visited Geraldton in 1915. He said the weed was spreading, but he did not take a serious view of the position. In 1917 he went back to Geraldton, and then said the weed was poisonous to a certain degree and that it was a serious and aggressive pest. In 10 years it had established itself over a large area, and if left unchecked threatened to overcome the agricultural areas. During the same year Mr. Mackenzie Grant pointed out the weed had spread very much, and that there was grave danger of the whole country being affected. Mr. Grant knows what he is talking about, and is not an alarmist. This matter was referred by the residents of Geraldton to Mr. J. H. Maiden, Government Botanist of Sydney, who is looked upon as one of the best authorities in Australia. In 1917 Mr. Maitland said the weed was difficult to control. Here was another warning. In November, 1917, the Commissioner for the Wheat Belt, Mr. Sutton, sent two photographs which had been taken of the weed showing its progress, and pointed out that it was encroaching upon and destroying pasture, and that, although attempts had been made to check it, it had over-spread Geraldton and was extending to the agricultural areas. When I was at Geraldton I travelled round the countryside, and was alarmed to find that the weed had practically taken control at Geraldton and the neighbourhood. I even saw plants at Mingenew. It is said that cultivation will check it, but if the farmers have to plough every acre of their land every year in order to check it, it is hard to see how they will ever do so. Notwithstanding all the warnings the Government have had, they write to Adelaide to find out if there is any danger in the weed, after it has become such a danger that the whole question is of national importance. If it is not taken in hand at once, it will extend to the agricultural areas and be as bad as the rabbit pest.

Hon. J. Mills: Worse.

Hon. C. F. BAXTER: We all know about the curse rabbits are and how great their inroads have been in Western Australia. If they had been taken in hand in 1895, there would be no rabbits in the State to-day. The expenditure of a few hundred pounds around Geraldton would check the growth of the weed and would possibly have the effect of destroying it. The Government have done a fair amount towards its destruction, and at the present time they are doing the only thing that can be done this year. But operations were started too late and they sent to Adelaide to find out what they already knew. If every attention is paid to the outlying areas where the plant will be found it may be possible, with the assistance of the Geraldton council and the adjacent road boards, to eradicate it. In supporting the Address-in-reply I wish to stress the necessity for securing advice on right lines in the direction of obtaining dairy cows for those who are going to settle in the south-western portion

of the State. It will be found that there will be required 60,000 cows for the 6,000 people it is proposed to settle on dairy farms. That represents only 10 cows for each settler and even that number may not be enough. I am not criticising the Government; I wish to be helpful with my remarks when I urge the Government to give this matter serious attention. The present is not the time when one should indulge in destructive criticism. What is required now is constructive criticism, and my desire is to help the Government to carry out the scheme they have in view, in the hope of increasing our revenue.

Hon. T. MOORE (Central) [8.35]: I wish to congratulate you, Mr. President, on your elevation to the high position you now hold. I agree with other members that you are specially fitted by your long years of experience in this Chamber to carry out the duties which will be imposed on you. I wish also to extend a welcome to the new members and to express the hope that in the days to come we shall all get along well together and do something good for this State of ours. So far as this particular end of the Legislature is concerned, to my mind the new members will be sadly disappointed if they hope to achieve anything by sitting here. I always regard this place as the dead-end of politics as far as Western Australia is concerned. And I have been thinking seriously while listening to the speeches here of the futility of it all, and the little interest that is being taken of what is said in this Chamber.

Hon. J. Ewing: That is the trouble.

Hon. T. MOORE: The hon. member knows that that is so.

Hon. J. Ewing: I do not.

Hon. T. MOORE: Then why say that is the trouble? I also regret the loss of those members who were defeated at the last election. I regret especially the loss of our former President and also the defeat of Mr. Cunningham and Mr. Panton, whom I regarded as men of high intelligence who were endeavouring to do the best they possibly could for their country.

Hon. C. F. Baxter: They will come back again.

Hon. T. MOORE: I hope so, but not to this place. They can serve their country elsewhere better than they can in this Chamber. I have been struck by some of the speeches made here. We have an alarmingly large deficit and it is growing steadily. Yet very little reference has been made to it. In speeches which have been made during recent years, the deficit was the main topic. Just now it is barely referred to despite the fact that it is worse than ever it was before. Perhaps members are getting used to it, and are prepared to pass it without reference, and to hope for the best. If the critics of the days gone by knew anything at all when they said this country was being plunged into bankruptcy, when we had lost a million and a half, how much worse off are we to-

day? And why are those critics so silent to-day when the deficit is being built up so rapidly? There can only be one end to the existing state of affairs, and it will be as Mr. Sanderson has put it, that the people will rise in their wrath and cast the Government into oblivion. Taxation will be made so high that they will awaken to a sense of the real position of things and will determine that a change of Government is necessary. The Government have promised so much and have accomplished so little; they have failed in their duty, and therefore must pass on and allow someone else to take their places. We find that the whole thing has been successfully camouflaged to-day. I realise that government is not being carried on by Parliament; it is entirely government by the Press. To-day, however, the Press is silent. We now have a hope of doing something on account of the silence of the Press. The newspapers cannot now continue to bolster up the supposed acts of statesmanship of Sir James Mitchell. When Sir James Mitchell was at Home we were led to believe by the glowing reports of his speeches that he was doing wonderfully good work. We saw in the Press that everything was going to be well when Sir James Mitchell returned with six millions of money. I was struck by the fact that one of the new members, speaking in this House, considered that it would be something wonderful to receive two millions annually to spend in this State. That hon. member before long will find that we vote that sum of money, and perhaps more in practically a few minutes. During the past few years we have been borrowing at the rate of more than two millions. What I wish to know now is why there should be the existing wave of optimism? Why should we expect things to be better when we are going on in the same slipshod manner as we have followed in the past? So far as the money which we are supposed to be borrowing from England on specially good terms is concerned, I do not hesitate to say that Britain is doing very well indeed to get rid of her surplus population, and I have no doubt her waste population. We are likely to get Britain's unemployed, and on that account I do not see that we should be so cheerful over the loan that she is making to us. At the end of the period of this loan, I have no doubt that the price of money will be back to what it was in pre-war days, in which case it will be possible to borrow at lower rates of interest than exist to-day. I contend that the Premier has done very little for us in connection with the immigration scheme. He has certainly relieved, or is likely to relieve in a sense, England of some of her surplus population. England is being enriched by getting rid of that surplus population, and we are supposed to be becoming enriched by receiving it. Ministers will say that Western Australia needs to be developed and that the State can carry millions more than we have at the present time. But the country the immigrants are leaving is also a country

which can carry many more people than the actual number there at present. I have been there and I have been struck by that fact. Why should Britain be pleased to get rid of her surplus population? Is the social system so built up that Britain can only do well for her population by getting rid of it?

Hon. C. F. Baxter: This is not a social matter; it is commercial.

Hon. T. MOORE: Built up by a system which the hon. member believes is the salvation of the country. When those who fought in the war went back they were told they must go overseas and build homes for themselves there. Those who were able to look after themselves were all right. Now, whilst the Press is content to boost the Mitchell Government, everything is going to be well. To-day the Government are in the hands of the "West Australian"; they take their orders from the "West Australian"; there is not the slightest doubt about that. If hon. members follow the leading articles they can tell what the Government are likely to do. If we get a Government in power who are prepared to take the advice of newspapers and not the advice of those who are sent to Parliament to represent the people, we shall drift into a dangerous channel. The existing optimism is being built up by Press articles.

Hon. C. F. Baxter: All in the best interests of the State.

Hon. T. MOORE: A special Press correspondent was even engaged to report the speeches made by the Premier in London. He is reported to have made rousing speeches. I have the greatest respect for Sir James Mitchell, but I cannot imagine him making anything in the nature of a rousing speech. I do not know that he could have made a speech any better than one made by Sir James Connolly, who represents us in London at Australia House.

Hon. A. Sanderson: Savoy House.

Hon. T. MOORE: I am sorry that the name has been changed.

The Minister for Education: We have never been in Australia House.

Hon. T. MOORE: I must have been led astray by the fact that the other States are at Australia House. We did not think when Sir James Mitchell went Home he would be able to deliver speeches that would electrify people and that he would be able to tell people in the Old Country what they would come to if they emigrated to Western Australia. At any rate the Agent General, Sir James Connolly, knows this country well. We understand that he went Home to do a certain thing. Again, we had the Commonwealth immigration experts, who were also another staff to look after the same thing. These people were doing the work there but owing to the fact that Sir James Mitchell went Home with a burst of enthusiasm, we are given to understand that the whole scene altered. I do not believe the whole scene altered. I am not prepared to believe the Press articles at all. I think the work at Home, with a little propaganda and money spent upon advertisements and arti-

cles in the Press could have continued, and the whole thing would have been done quite satisfactorily. I do not find fault with Sir James Mitchell being sent Home. I would like to see every Premier sent Home at once, as soon as he has attained that position. I realise that travelling means education and it is only by knowing the world as it is, that a man is able to understand exactly what part Australia, or any part of Australia, has to play in the world. I listened to hon. members speaking in this Chamber and getting down to one or two matters that they consider would be the salvation of this State. Western Australia has a certain part in the organisation right throughout the world in a commercial sense, and it is only by getting away from the State itself that our statesmen will understand the real position. They will understand that by doing some petty things in the fostering of primary production, by which means they consider Western Australia will become a great State, this country will, after all, only take its share in that organisation to which I have referred. As to immigration generally, I join with other hon. members in the contention that the details of the scheme are still needed. Mr. Baxter said that details were needed. For my part, I think we have had too many tales.

Hon. J. A. Greig: Plenty of tales, but little details.

Hon. T. MOORE: We have a hazy idea of what the scheme really amounts to, and I think the Premier is in much the same position. He has a hazy idea that something should be done, but I am certain he has not got down to bedrock and that he does not know exactly where we will land these people. He is satisfied that if we can get them, all will be well. At the time when Sir James Mitchell was at Home, painting a glorious picture of what Western Australia meant to the people who came to these shores, we had information to show that for the two years preceding that time, 6,000 people had been settled on the land here. We spent £17,000 in bringing immigrants to Western Australia, but at the end of two years, we were worse off so far as the arrivals and departures were concerned. We cannot continue in that way. Last month 53 more people left the State than came into it, and yet we are told that an immigration scheme will save the country. Are we to be blinded by the reiteration of such a statement? Shall we blink our eyes to this condition of affairs and believe all is right, when all is wrong? If men and women come here, they are doing one of two things. Either they come here and leave shortly afterwards to go somewhere else, or other people leave to make room for them. We cannot get away from statistics. I am satisfied that the immigration scheme has not been properly thought out. I do not think one member in this Chamber understands the immigration scheme. We do know that the Prime Minister, Mr. Hughes, came here and stated he was very struck with the scheme

when it was outlined to him. No hon. member of this Chamber can say that he is satisfied with the scheme as outlined to us. We have just as much intelligence to understand the details of an immigration scheme as has Mr. Hughes. Regarding our recent settlement, this is one of those trials we are encountering. The Government started a scheme by buying out experienced farmers and replacing them by inexperienced farmers. We know that that scheme has not been a success. In days gone by the present Premier, who as Mr. James Mitchell was Minister for Lands in an earlier Government, did not have the South-West scheme in his mind. In those days the great wheat areas were to be the salvation of the State within a few years. We had in those days men settled from 25 to 35 miles from a railway and they were settled with that assistance of advances from the Agricultural Bank for the purpose of growing wheat. That is what this supposed statesman did in years gone by. Having failed in those days, these men had to be brought back closer to the railways and they brought their debt back with them and paid it off as the result of their work on lands closer to the means of transport. It demonstrates that the men in those days did not get fair treatment. They were asked to make wheat farming pay at a distance from the railways! It seems that these people are to be settled in the South-West, according to the authority of Mr. Ewing.

Hon. C. F. Baxter: That statement appears in the Governor's Speech.

Hon. T. MOORE: I am doubtful as to where they can be settled in that part of the State. I know the South-West pretty thoroughly and I would not advise men to rush to the land there, knowing what difficulties will confront them there. Mr. Burvill says the Denmark country is attractive. I do not know that he has farmed in that part of the State.

Hon. A. Burvill: I do though.

Hon. T. MOORE: I am glad to know that he has been able to do it successfully but, at the same time, Mr. Burvill must know of the many failures that have occurred in this south-western area. We know if we put men on this class of land after 12 months' experience in farming here, they are likely to be failures. If we put a newcomer to work clearing karri country, how will he get on? It is a very doubtful scheme.

Hon. A. Burvill: Not on the group settlement principle.

Hon. T. MOORE: They are getting 10s. a day there. I know what the men are saying there, too.

Hon. C. F. Baxter: That is only the start.

Hon. T. MOORE: That is so. Mr. Mills spoke on the Closer Settlement Bill last year. He then expressed quite a different opinion of the lands of Western Australia than he gave us to-day. In a few short months, he

has changed his front altogether. He said to-night that there were many large estates in his own particular district which could be cut up. He mentioned nine. Last year he said—

From Gingin north, a district with which I am familiar, are to be found some very fine estates. For the most part they are developed, although not perhaps as highly as the board might require; still I think they are put to as good use as anybody else is likely to make of them.

To-night he has changed his tune. Again, Mr. Mills said last year—

I realise that where big estates are not properly developed, some pressure should be brought to bear.

Hon. F. E. S. Willmott: Where are they?

Hon. J. Mills: I do not know, unless they are in the South-West.

I am pleased to know that Mr. Mills has realised the attractions of his own constituency which I also represent. I am pleased to think that he has discovered the very fine land that exists in that part of the State and also the great possibilities ahead of us there. We have much fine land there and I hope a considerable amount of the money under this immigration scheme will be spent in that part of the State. I think the time is ripe for the Government to take into consideration the purchase of the Midland railway. The Government should see what are the best conditions upon which that line can be purchased. Much good land is being held up under the conditions. There would certainly be a quicker return by spending money there, than will be experienced if we face such a huge expenditure in the South-West, where, as Mr. Baxter has said, it will take years if the settlement is to be a success.

Hon. F. E. S. Willmott: You should have bought the Midland line when the Daglish Government were in power.

Hon. T. MOORE: We are not responsible for what took place then but we are to a certain extent responsible now.

Hon. F. E. S. Willmott: It was only the newspapers that stopped the purchase then.

Hon. T. MOORE: Whether that is so or not, it was a mistake not to purchase the line in those days. It is a mistake to let the present condition of things continue to-day. The land referred to by Mr. Mills to-night must have railway communication from the Midland railway through to Mullewa. We do not want dead-ends in connection with our railway system and the repurchase of these estates will necessitate the building of a line. We must either leave the land alone because it is too far from an existing line, or we must consider the advisability of purchasing the line and extending a railway as I have suggested. I do not think a prohibitive price would be asked for the purchase of the line, for the Midland Company are not doing well either with the line or the land at their disposal. I hope representations will be made

to them in that direction. I wish to reiterate what I said last year. The idea of starting in the South-West is wrong because we are commencing at the end of the railway system. We are going beyond Jarnadup 200 miles from Perth, and the exorbitant freights charged there will put the Perth markets out of reach, so far as many of the commodities which it is proposed shall be grown there are concerned. The proposal, however, goes beyond even that and it is altogether wrong.

Hon. A. Burvill: It will connect up two dead-ends of the railway system as they exist at present.

Hon. C. F. Baxter: They will not return any revenue.

Hon. T. MOORE: We should bring the land alongside existing railways into use. We realise that there is some poor land alongside the existing railway lines. We cannot blink our eyes to the fact that that land is there. We realise that we have to run railways through stretches of land from which no return can be obtained. If we could run our railways through all good land, we might be able to carry on successfully the present railway system and make it pay by allowing the people to produce anything they desired to go in for. But when we have to run through sandplains extending for 20 or 30 miles, which sandplains produce nothing, it only emphasises the necessity for making every acre that is capable of being cultivated produce to its full extent. Not one acre should be held up if the railways are to be made to pay. To-day the railways are not paying. The Government wanted to know why they are not paying and whether any change could be effected. Mr. Stead was appointed a Royal Commissioner and was asked to report on the running of the railways. He has been paid up to date £2,000 for his report. He reports in due course and the man who is in charge of the railways, and who is paid £2,500 a year, informs us that the Royal Commissioner's report is inaccurate. Seeing that the Government are so fond of appointing Royal Commissions, I suggest that another one should be appointed to see which Commissioner is right. It was farcical to appoint a Royal Commissioner to inquire into the running of the railways if he was not a man in whom we had every confidence and who would be able to set up a new system to show how the railways should be run for a profit. The trouble to-day is that we are running far too many miles through poor land to make our railways pay. I am not finding fault with the present Commissioner of Railways, Mr. Pope. When there is so much idle land alongside our railways and when our railways have to run through so much poor country, I contend that these aspects are mainly responsible for the railways being non-payable to-day. Some of the minor points in Mr. Stead's report might be of use if one could only decide which of the two Commissioners is right. We have got to the stage when we have set up a system of land settlement which has not been followed in any

other part of the world. We have approached as near to socialism as it is possible to get. We set out to find the land—to-day we are told this is very difficult—and we have gone overseas for the man and for the money. Despite the fact that land values in this State are low, for some reason no enterprising men will come here. The Premier says that many men with money are coming here. I have failed to find such men, and I travel as much as most people in this State. All we are doing so far is setting out to find the land, the man and the money. It is a huge experiment in farming. Those members who do not believe in State enterprise, however, are silent on this occasion. They do not believe that we are interfering with private enterprise though we are interfering with banking, the greatest enterprise of all. Why do they say that for farming, State enterprise can do everything for the man, while in connection with other industries the State must keep right out? Where is the consistency of the Country Party in advocating State aid for everything connected with farming?

Hon. V. Hamersley: I am farming and I am getting no State aid.

Hon. T. MOORE: I am speaking for the scheme for settling our lands and not what happened to lucky men years ago when they were able to get in and pick the eyes out of the country. The Country Party are inconsistent in this respect. After we have settled the men on the land the financial institutions can step in and make money out of the farmers. After we have borne all the losses of settling the men, the banks, which will not now advance 1s. to settlers, will be content to come along and take the good securities built up at the expense of the State. Regarding the money which the Premier is getting at 4 per cent., how is it going to be lent out? Does he propose to charge the settlers 7 per cent. or does he propose to reduce the rate of interest? Would not it be fair to say to the man on the land, "You are up against it; we will give you a chance by advancing the money at 4 per cent."?

The Minister for Education: Where do you get the 4 per cent.?

Hon. T. MOORE: I understand the Federal Government are paying 2 per cent. and the Imperial Government 2 per cent. Therefore we shall be getting the money at 2 per cent. I have a better case than I thought. Is it proposed to lend the money at 7 per cent. and make a profit? As the money has been obtained for a specific purpose, we are entitled to know the Government's intentions.

Hon. A. Lovekin: There will be a lot of failures.

Hon. T. MOORE: I am satisfied there will be many failures if 7 per cent. is charged. Anyone knowing anything about farming is convinced that it cannot be made to pay with money at 7 per cent. This is the trouble with many of our farmers to-day; they are loaded

up with capital at 7 per cent. which is altogether too high in view of the other burdens such as high freights and the high tariff. If we could only lighten the financial load the man on the land would be much relieved. Money at 5 per cent. doubles itself in 14 years so members will realise how hard hit our new settlers will be if they have to pay 7 per cent., particularly as they will get no return for some time. The Government should endeavour to get cheaper money. We often hear it argued that wages should be reduced, but representatives of capital should realise that if they want wages to come down, they should first bring down the interest rates. I compliment the Government on their workers' homes scheme. I was pleased to hear from the Leader of the House that this scheme is to be carried on. It will mean a lot to the men and women in the back country. Those who travel in the country have some idea of the disabilities suffered by the women. Immigrants are coming here from the agricultural areas of the Old Country where one sees nothing but fine homes, and to make the immigration scheme a success we should get houses erected as quickly as possible. If we ask these men to go into some of the shacks in our country districts, they will soon drift back to the city. It is too much for us to expect them to put up with those places. I hope many homes will be built so that the men who work in the country will be provided for. The over-population of the city is partly accounted for by the fact that men are working in the country while the women folk and children are living in the city, neither party enjoying the advantages of home life. Many farmers' homes are mere shacks. Why not standardise their houses and give them decent homes to live in? Many of their homes are a disgrace to the country. Owing to high freights and fares the mining industry 500 or 600 miles out is being killed. If the Government wish to do anything for mining in the Murchison district, they must endeavour to reduce freights and fares.

Hon. J. Ewing: What about the zone system?

Hon. T. MOORE: Some system should be evolved so that people living farthest from civilisation should receive some compensation. They should not be called upon to pay the exorbitant rates for commodities that they are paying to-day. The Government should realise that gold mining was the foundation of this country, and will yet play an important part. It is by no means down and out. The trouble is no one is giving it a hand. A certain section desire to foster one industry, but all industries should be fostered, particularly the mining industry, which has meant so much to the State. I was pleased to hear from Mr. Dodd that something is being done to improve the ventilation of our mines. It is absolutely necessary that steps be taken to make the lives of the miners a little brighter. It is remarkable that, although this industry has been our mainstay, the men who went out and did the pioneering work and endured

all the hardships have received less consideration than any section of the community, and we find so many of them ending up their poor lives in the Wooroloo Sanatorium. Mr. Sanderson recommended that the Sandstone line be pulled up. As a question of railway working, it might be the cheaper course to pull up that railway, but are we going to look at the question from that point of view? Are we to display no foresight at all? Because that line is not paying at present, is that sufficient reason why it should be pulled up? In a new country like this, is it time to start pulling up railways? No statesman would think of pulling up a railway in a district having such possibilities as the Sandstone district. Anyone who has seen the development in the pastoral industry of the Murchison must realise that it is going to be a great pastoral country. This industry is being built up and mining is by no means finished. I hope the Government will not entertain that proposal for a moment. Mr. Sanderson, in his speech, for once was illogical. After having found fault with the Government on account of the undertakings they have in hand, and having expressed the opinion that they were without any grace at all, he announced his intention of joining the party which is going to save the State, namely the Country Party. The hon. member was not logical because he is joining a party which is part and parcel of the Government. Notwithstanding all the talk about being up against the Government—talk which I hear all round me—when a vote is taken, the Country Party support the Government. There are 16 or 17 Country Party members and the same number of Nationalist members in another place. It is a coalition Government. Mr. Sanderson finds fault with them all and then announces that he has joined them.

Hon. C. F. Baxter: The Government were supported by the Labour Party, you know.

Hon. T. MOORE: I do not think they received much support from the Labour Party when the leader introduced a censure motion on the subject of the Lake Clifton railway. The hon. member's remark only tends to camouflage the position. That was one of the greatest scandals perpetrated in the State and it was glossed over by a Royal Commission. The ex-Attorney General, Mr. Robinson, had one of his friends, another solicitor, on the Commission and the result could be foreseen. I hope that if ever I get into trouble one of my particular friends will be appointed to decide what wrong I have done. I shall be quite satisfied to accept the result of such an inquiry. Reverting to the Address-in-reply, there is one phase of my remarks which I make with reluctance. That is in reference to the election for the North-East Province. I had never previously believed that legislation was necessary to ensure clean politics in this State. Recently, I noted the establishment in the Eastern States of a new party called "The Clean Politics League." I have come to the conclusion that there is a necessity for some such organisation in Kal-

goorlie. Every one of those who sat with my defeated colleague, Mr. Cunningham, knows that he is a very fine gentleman. I regret to have to say that some very low down tactics were used to procure his defeat. There is need for legislation to control the question of what propaganda shall be instituted at election times. Steps should be taken to do away with the eleventh-hour production of pamphlets of a scurrilous character. Legislation should be introduced to make the perpetrators of that kind of propaganda amenable to the law. That would be a means of letting the people know exactly what is the truth. When an election has been fought and the candidate of a certain party has been successful, we understand that he comes here with the approval of the people for his particular policy. At Kalgoorlie, however, the appeal was not to reason but to prejudice, one of the worst passions in human nature. I trust that during the remainder of the time I may spend in this Chamber, and ever after, there may be no occasion for a member to make reference to a pamphlet such as that which I now hold in my hand. It leads off thus—

North-East Province Elections. True Lovers of Your Country, pause and consider! Whittling away the people's liberties. Communist Cunningham cuts capers at the Brisbane conference.

Then it proceeds—

North-East Province Electors! Do not hesitate to label the O.L.P. candidate "4," and thus declare your detestation of the advocate of industrial and political revolution and all its attendant horrors.

Jesuitical revolutionary propaganda
Affirmed by Brisbane Bolshevik Conference.

Marx's and Lenin's pernicious doctrines
Embodied in Official Labour Party's Objective.

Soviet rule to replace free Australian institutions.

Cultivation of Communistic doctrine
Undermines and whittles away Imperial ties.

National Parliamentary representation
of the people

Negated by the "Workmen's Council of Action."

Industrial revolutionary methods,
Neglecting the needs of the nation,
Goading the workers to disruptive action.
Hamstrung Parliamentary institutions
Advocate abolition of private property,
Merging all under Soviet rule.

Note.—James Cunningham, seeking reelection, voted at Brisbane for the subservience of Federal and State Parliaments to the Super-Junta, the Elective Supreme Economic Council. An undoubted attempt to infringe upon the liberties of a free people.

And then there is the following "Addendum"—

Members of the Brisbane Bolshevik Conference were identical with those betrayers

of the best interests of their country who stoutly advocated the suppression of Australian State Parliaments and the Federal Senate, and the substitution of a House of Representatives embracing 100 members who would be invested with the power of creating Juntas for the government of divisions "into which the Commonwealth would be divided." Saturday, the 13th, will decide whether the National vote is strong enough to eliminate communistic influence from our Legislature.

Hon. J. W. Hickey: Who authorised that?

Hon. T. MOORE: It was authorised by H. A. Benaim, Kalgoorlie, and it was printed by Charles Massey, Kalgoorlie. I wish that leaflet to be recorded in "Hansard," so that the generation following us may realise how Parliamentary elections were fought at this particular juncture, when we are supposed to be civilised and educated. Those who follow us will, on reading that pamphlet, realise that at this time there were in this community some very small-minded people; and they will also realise that as a people we were not thoroughly educated, since we were open to an appeal to such prejudice as that to which the pamphlet is addressed. I have very good reason to believe that those responsible for the issue of that particular piece of propaganda had thoroughly scanned the Eastern goldfields electoral roll and had discovered the percentage of Roman Catholics in that province. Then they set out to prejudice electors of the Protestant faith. That is the reason why the pamphlet leads off with the word "Jesuitical"—"Jesuitical revolutionary propaganda." The word "Jesuitical" implies a reference to Roman Catholicism. Mr. Cunningham is a Roman Catholic, and does not deny the fact. The subject of religion was never discussed at the Brisbane conference: it never is discussed, I believe, in any political party. I always understood that religion is entirely outside the scope of political bodies. I can certify that such a thing as religion never enters into the consideration of members of the political party to which I belong. I have known men for as long as 10 years without learning, or caring to inquire, what religion they belonged to. But we are incensed when a party seeks a political advantage from references to an opposing candidate's religion, from the issue of a political leaflet like this at the eleventh hour, when there is no opportunity to refute it. Such a proceeding is like stabbing a man in the dark. I say to the gentleman who has been sent here to represent the North-East Province that he has done nothing to be proud of if he has been the instigator of this pamphlet, or has had anything to do with its issue.

The PRESIDENT: I do not think I would make it a personal matter.

Hon. T. MOORE: I am bound to say that we have in this House a representative who has got here not on any political principle, but on prejudice created in this manner.

Hon. H. Seddon: I think that statement is unwarranted. I take exception to a statement inferring that I have got in otherwise than on my political principles.

The PRESIDENT: I will ask you, Mr. Moore, to make your remarks as little offensive as you can.

Hon. T. MOORE: I do not wish to be offensive, but the matter is very awkward to handle without being offensive to the people responsible for it.

The PRESIDENT: You can speak in general way.

Hon. T. MOORE: Speaking in a general way, I understand Mr. Benaim is the secretary of the so-called National Labour Party on the goldfields, the party responsible for this pamphlet, because their secretary has signed it. Such tactics as these are adopted. Now, as regards "undermining and whittling away Imperial ties," Mr. James Cunningham during the recent war lost three brothers in France. Adopting the language of the pamphlet, I might say that those three Jesuitical brothers helped to maintain the Imperial ties. It is about the worst thing that could possibly be done to use methods such as these against a man who has three brothers lying in France, to accuse such a man of attempting to disrupt the Empire! If in the country of ours we cannot do away with our world prejudices, education has been of no use at all to us. To refer to any man's religion in connection with politics is a dangerous path to pursue, and I hope Western Australia will not tolerate such conduct. I consider that it should be possible to prevent the printing and distribution of any election propaganda that includes references to a candidate's religion. It is a disgrace to this country if such tactics are permitted. The subject is one that I hate to discuss, and refer to it only because I realise that an immense deal of harm will result if religious rancour is allowed to creep into the political life of this State. I give publicity to the matter in the hope that by doing so I may cause the practice to be stopped for ever. If necessary, legislation should be introduced to deal with culprits who adopt this practice of stabbing a man in the back. I trust that in the time ahead of us things will be brighter for Western Australia than they are at present. To-day we are under a very dark cloud. We cannot deny it. On all sides we see many unemployed. Many persons are inclined to treat the matter lightly, but from my own experience in travelling around the country, and seeing men carrying their swags, I am not pleased with the present prospect. During the last 19 years I have never known so many men to be travelling with swags. I have seen during the last year outback. I trust that times will soon improve, and that the cloud over us will be lifted.

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

House adjourned at 9.27 p.m.