

offered a profit on those Eucla leases. If that be so, and if he is honest in his convictions, I say he should disgorge that unearned increment, and give it to the State, to which it belongs.

The Premier: We have a Bill coming down to tax us.

Mr. MALE: If the boot were on the other foot, and the leader of the Opposition held those leases—

The Premier: Refer to the member for Northam, and you are on good ground.

Mr. MALE: I do not care who it is—we would have found members on the front bench talking eloquently on the subject. I am reminded that there is some explanation required from the Attorney General in respect to the delay in deciding the case of Spargo. I contend that an explanation is due from a gentleman who at all times waxes eloquent on the claims of humanity, for keeping this man in suspense for so long a time. That man was condemned to be hanged and not to be tortured, and while Ministers were touring the country he was left in torture that was far worse than hanging.

The Minister for Mines: For how long?

Mr. MALE: For some considerable time.

The Minister for Mines: How long?

Mr. MALE: He should not have been kept in torture for one single day.

The Minister for Mines: How long was it? You do not know what you are talking about.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. MALE: I say let us for mercy's sake deal mercifully even with our criminals. The affairs of party may wait, the affairs of State may wait, but when it comes to deciding the taking or not taking the life of a man it is a far more solemn obligation.

The Minister for Mines: You are hard up for something to talk about.

The Attorney General: There was no waiting for longer than could be helped. As soon as the reports of the judges could be got a meeting of Cabinet was held, and the man's fate was decided. He was told the same day.

Mr. MALE: It was absolutely scandalous.

On motion by Mr. Dwyer debate adjourned.

BILL—SUPPLY (No. 1), £1,324,130.

Returned from the Legislative Council without amendment.

*House adjourned at 10.49 p.m.*

## Legislative Council,

*Thursday, 31st July, 1913.*

	PAGE
Papers presented .. .. .	165
Questions: Food and Drugs regulation .. .. .	165
Government Trading Concerns Accounts .. .. .	166
Railway Bridges at Fremantle .. .. .	166
Powellised sleepers, agreement .. .. .	166
Perth Tramways purchase money .. .. .	167
Bill: Game Act Amendment, 1A. .. .. .	167
Address-in-reply, fourth day .. .. .	167

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

### PAPERS PRESENTED.

By the Colonial Secretary: L, By-law of the Yilgarn Roads Board to regulate hawking.

### QUESTION—FOOD AND DRUGS REGULATION.

Hon. W. KINGSMILL asked the Colonial Secretary (without notice) is he prepared to make a statement regarding the action contemplated by the Government in respect to Regulation 62 under the Health Act, 1911, laid on the Table of the House on the 26th June, and in respect of which notice of motion of disallowance was given on the same day. If not, when will he be so prepared.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY replied: Yes. I will make a statement at the next sitting of the House.

Hon. J. F. Cullen: Why not make a statement to-night?

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: I cannot. I have to consult Cabinet, and Cabinet will not meet before the next sitting of the House.

Hon. J. F. Cullen: Are prosecutions going on meanwhile?

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: There was a prosecution to-day.

#### QUESTION—GOVERNMENT TRADING CONCERNS ACCOUNTS.

Hon. M. L. MOSS asked the Colonial Secretary: 1, Have any Orders in Council been made under Section 2 of The Government Trading Concerns Act, 1912? 2, If so, to what undertakings, works, and services do any such Orders in Council relate? 3, Have the accounts of any, and if so for which, of the Government Trading Concerns been balanced to the 30th June last, or other prescribed date, as required by Section 18 of the Act? 4, Have balance sheet and profit and loss accounts for such concern, and if so, for which to the 30th June last, or other prescribed date, been prepared as required by Section 19 of the Act? 5, Have the documents required in questions 3 and 4 been submitted to the Auditor General as required by the Act? 6, Will the Government without waiting until the same are audited lay copies of such balance-sheets and profit and loss accounts on the Table of the House?

The COLONIAL SECRETARY replied: 1, Yes; on the 22nd May and 15th July last. 2, The following undertakings: Government Refrigerating Works, Abattoirs, North Fremantle Sale Yards, Perth City Markets, Government Meat Stall, Albany Cold Stores, Land Clearing Operations, Boya Quarries, Workshops, Water Supplies, State Steamship Service, Aborigines Cattle Station, Perth-South Perth Ferry Service, Milk Supply, State Hotels (including Rottne Hostel and Caves House), State Batteries. 3 and 4, The accounts of the Departments concerned were closed on 30th June, and instructions have been issued for a balance to be prepared

at the earliest possible date. 5, See reply above. 6, The Government do not consider it advisable to submit balance-sheets and profit and loss accounts to Parliament until they have been audited and certified to as correct by the Auditor General under the Government Trading Concerns Act, 1912.

#### QUESTION—RAILWAY BRIDGES AT FREMANTLE.

Hon. M. L. MOSS asked the Colonial Secretary: 1, Are the Government perfectly satisfied that both the railway bridges over the Swan River at Fremantle are safe for traffic? 2, Have the engineers of the Public Works Department decided the distance from the bridges at which dredging shall be discontinued? 3, At what distance from the western bridge is dredging now taking place? 4, To what depth is it intended to dredge in the vicinity of the bridge? 5, To what depth have the piles in the western bridge been driven?

The COLONIAL SECRETARY replied: 1, The working railways, under whose control these bridges are, advise that they are considered safe. 2, Yes. 3, 200 feet from the southern end and 600 feet from the northern end of the bridge. 4, To 36 feet outside of the limits stated in No. 3. 5, To an average depth of 15 feet.

#### QUESTION—POWELLISED SLEEPERS AGREEMENT.

Hon. H. P. COLEBATCH asked the Colonial Secretary: 1, Has his attention been directed to the publication in the *Sunday Times* of June 8, 1913, and the *West Australian* of the following day of certain matter purporting to be a copy of an agreement entered into between the West Australian Government and the Westralian Powell Wood Process, Limited? 2, Is this matter an accurate copy of the agreement? 3, If so, will the Minister explain the apparent discrepancy between the terms of the agreement and the answer given by him

to a question asked by me in this House on October 29, 1912, in regard to the rate of royalty to be paid to the said company on powellised sleepers to be sold by the West Australian Government to the Federal Government for the purposes of the Trans-Australian Railway?

The COLONIAL SECRETARY replied: 1, Yes. 2, Substantially correct. 3, The royalty to be paid by this Government for timber used within the State is 9d. per 100 super. feet. The royalty to be paid with respect to Transcontinental Railway sleepers was arranged between the Commonwealth Government and the Powellising Company, and is fixed, as stated by me on 29th October last, at 1s. 3d. per 100 super. feet.

#### QUESTION—PERTH TRAMWAYS, PURCHASE MONEY.

Hon. H. P. COLEBATCH asked the Colonial Secretary: What proportion of the purchase money of the Perth Tramway Company was paid in—(a) Cash; (b) Bonds?

The COLONIAL SECRETARY replied: Details have not yet been received from the Agent General. The information has been cabled for.

#### BILL—GAME ACT AMENDMENT.

Introduced by the Colonial Secretary and read a first time.

#### ADDRESS-IN-REPLY.

##### *Fourth Day.*

Debate resumed from the previous day.

Hon. J. CORNELL (South): I desire at the outset to congratulate you on seeing you again in your place as President of this Council after your illness during recess, and I sincerely hope that you will long be spared to preside over the deliberations of the Council. I also desire to congratulate hon. members who are around me, and who have not suffered to any degree I hope—and by their external appearances it does not look as though they had suffered—from the effects of the

pessimistic views which were uttered by them during last session and from the results of the work of the Parliament and the legislation which has been passed by it. As a new member in this Chamber I was struck on the first occasion, and I have again been struck on the present occasion, by the inutility of the procedure known as the debate on the Address-in-reply. I think if the Address-in-reply could be so altered as to confine the debate to one member on each side of the House a good deal of time and worry would be saved, and last but not least, a good deal of talk also. I hold that for all practical intents and purposes the Address-in-reply is an old and stereotyped institution, and has outlived its usefulness. I hope, ere I go out of this Parliament, that the debate on the Address-in-reply such as we have it, will be abandoned altogether, but I hope hon. members will pardon me if I, at the same time, and because it is the practice, avail myself of its provisions. Hon. members who have preceded me have referred to the barrenness of the Governor's Speech. They have said it contains nothing, and that it is a barren affair altogether. This is my second session of Parliament, and it appears that whether the Governor's Speech be fruitful or barren the same amount of criticism is levelled at it, and the same opportunity is taken by members to speak on the Address-in-reply. It has been said by hon. members of this Chamber that the barrenness of the Governor's Speech could be attributed to the Triennial Trades and Labour Congress, which was about to be held at the time Parliament met, while some members drew attention to the fact that the congress and the meeting of Parliament occurred simultaneously. Hon. members have said also that the Premier waited for orders from the Congress and one hon. member (Hon. Mr. Colebatch) said that this was the first time in which the occasion presented itself when the two came close together. I think during the time of the Daglish Government, which was known to a certain extent as the mark-time Government, Parliament was in session when the Trades and Labour Congress met in Perth

and Parliament did not adjourn on that occasion in order to get a mandate from Congress. I would like to be candid and congratulate Mr. Colebatch on the interest he has taken in the Congress, and I believe that if members were to take a similar interest in our doings there would be a better understanding of our aims and objects, and ultimate doings.

Hon. C. Sommers: Why do you not give more publicity to your doings?

Hon. J. CORNELL: There has been publicity given. We know of course that only a section of the Press was admitted to the Congress.

Hon. C. Sommers: Why?

Hon. J. CORNELL: The hon. member had better ask the delegates. I believe the chief argument used against the exclusion of the Press was that the Press were not admitted to the congress of the Liberal League. I opposed the exclusion of the Press, and I contended that what was good for the Liberal congress was not good for us. If the Liberal congress declined to permit the Press to attend their deliberations, that was no reason why we should not have them at ours. If they had something to hide we did not. However, the course was taken of fully reporting the proceedings in the Labour organ, and the man who reported the Congress is well known to Mr. Colebatch. That gentleman had an absolutely free hand in the preparation of the report which was published in the *Westralian Worker*. If hon. members did not avail themselves of the opportunity to read our organ and get an insight into our doings, I am sorry for them. I always read the organ of the Liberals, and so become familiar with their doings. I believe that Sir Winthrop Hackett gets a copy of our journal at his office in exchange for the copy of the *West Australian*, so that hon. gentleman at least should be familiar with what our party are doing. Hon. members must not run away with the idea that the Labour Congress is going to bind or has anything to do with the life of this Parliament. The Congress has finished its deliberations at Fremantle, and has formulated a policy and a platform on which the Labour party will go to the country at the next elections,

and the party as constituted now is not bound by the resolutions passed and the platform adopted by the conference, and consequently the work of that Congress in no way interferes with the work of the party during the life of this Parliament. Mr. Colebatch has referred—I do not know whether with sorrow or with mingled feelings—to the defeat of the Ministers and several of the proposals they propounded at the Labour Congress. Let me say that in my experience the defeat of Ministers and past Ministers and would-be Ministers is not confined to the Labour party. We have, I believe, very nearly a majority of past Ministers of the Crown in this Chamber, but one thing we do at the Labour Congress is to place a Minister on the same footing as any other delegate. It must not be supposed that because a man is a Minister of the Crown he of necessity possesses all the knowledge of the Universe or all the knowledge in any particular movement.

Hon. Sir E. H. Wittenoom: But experience is worth something.

Hon. J. CORNELL: It is worth something, but experience does not teach, although it often teaches men how to get out of a thing, and that is what sometimes happens to Ministers. At Congress they do not get out of it. A Minister there has no more say than any other member. I do not know whether it is right that we should disagree with Ministers when they attend Congress, but I say it is democratic that Congress should be so constituted. I view Ministers of the Crown, whether they are Labour or Liberal, as very likely to become crystallised and conservative, and not only to develop these two characteristics, but also to become dogmatic and to hold themselves above suspicion, and I do not know of any right-thinking Minister, whether he has been Liberal or Labour, who does not welcome criticism by the rank and file and the public generally. We find right through the pages of history that the more trust we repose in a man and the more power we give him, the more power he will endeavour to take, and I and others in the Labour movement are not going

to agree with Ministers simply for the reason that they are Ministers. Last session when I came into this Chamber, caucus was trotted out by several speakers. We were all said to be caucus-bound and we heard of caucus on all sides. I must congratulate members who have spoken on having dropped caucus, but attention has now been turned from caucus to Congress. Heretofore we were charged with doing everything inside four walls with forty Parliamentary delegates, and now we are charged with framing our policy at a congress of delegates representing 30,000 men and women in this State. If that organisation is not representative enough, I do not know what is, especially when it is remembered that these 30,000 people extend throughout the length and breadth of the State and that many of them have as many as eight or nine children eligible to vote. It must not be thought that because our delegates represent only 30,000 members that is the extent of our strength. I would congratulate the Liberal League if they had 30,000 members. They would be getting close to hand and would be better organised and united as the Labour section is, and not continue to be, as a big number of electors in this State undoubtedly are, the fifth wheel of a coach, and nothing else. They would not be so likely to turn just as the wind blows or as some oily-tongued gentleman persuades them. I now desire to congratulate hon. members on the mildness of the speeches delivered this session. I think it must be admitted that the debate up to date may be summed up as a meaty argument by meaty men, and the biggest meaty man has yet to come. The whole argument has centred in State steamers and the stock they carry, which eventually gets into the State butcher shops. Last session the chief feature of the Address-in-reply was beef buccaneers and meat, and so far the debate this session has been very nearly on the same plane. One feature that struck me last session was the antipathy of members towards the national Parliament and the party that occupied the Ministerial benches. But what do we find on this occasion? I attribute a good deal of the

mildness of hon. members who have spoken to the sop that was received by the Liberal party at the last election by the return of the Hon. J. Cook as Prime Minister with his one ewe lamb. It is now in dispute as to who is to be the lamb. Mr. Gregory claims that he is, and later on we will find many more claiming to be the lamb. But, if the Federal elections did nothing else but tame down members of this Chamber, they have done much good so far as this House is concerned. Dealing with the policy contained in the Governor's Speech, some hon. members said that it was barren. I have yet to learn that the Liberal party in this State have got a policy, or if they have one I have not yet located it, and I would like to know where the great Liberal policy is. In the Federal arena the Liberals met and framed a great policy—and I claim that the Liberals in Western Australia are either the tail or a wing or a joint or an arm of the Federal Liberal party—and I hope that in framing their policy they are not met with the difficulty which the Federal party experienced. The Liberal party of Australia, as I said, endeavoured to formulate a platform. They succeeded, but when it was sent along to some of their members the brainiest man in the party to-day, if not the brainiest man in Australian politics at the present time, the Federal Attorney General, likened the platform to "a gelatinous compound from which all the bone and hard substance was removed and which was calculated not to injure the digestion of the weakest individual in the State." As a result of Mr. Irvine's criticism the party dropped the policy and were returned to power without a policy, and whatever the Cook Government do to the electors of Australia will be good enough for them, when the people will return to the national Parliament a party without a policy and with a blank cheque, over the head of the late Prime Minister who went before them with a definite policy, a record of three years' service, and a surplus in revenue of two and a quarter millions. After that anything is good enough to happen to those who supported the Liberals at the last election.

We find that this great Liberal party met in the national Parliament and in the Governor's Speech admitted that they had no policy. They are locating that policy now. The Speech before hon. members has been termed barren, but I would term the Governor General's Speech a desert, because we might find some bright patches in barren territory, but I do not think we will find any in a desert, and I have yet to find any proposal which the Liberal party are prepared to put before the people of Australia. I will read one paragraph from the Speech of the Governor General—

It is owing to my present advisors having so recently been returned to office that they have not yet been able to mature the proposals placed by them before the electors, and it is therefore intended to ask for a short adjournment to enable them to do so.

It is remarkable that after three years of opposition the Liberal party cannot find a policy. There is one portion of the Speech before us that needs the earnest consideration of the House.

Hon. E. McLarty: Taxation.

Hon. J. CORNELL: I know that will hurt the hon. member. I was referring to constitutional reform. As hon. members know we are pledged to abolish this House, and it is not a question of talk about it, but of doing it.

Hon. H. P. Colebatch: That is what Congress told you. You are to get busy on it.

Hon. J. CORNELL: But Congress did not tell us how to do it. One delegate put forward three alternatives, one dynamite, another a gun, and the third starvation, but I do not think that this would be in any way effective. But I say that if this House is not prepared to abolish itself—if it had any sense it would—it is just about up to the Chamber to bring itself into line with the House of Lords.

Hon. E. McLarty: The people will not allow us.

Hon. J. CORNELL: I have never yet found the people very anxious to stop constitutional reform if their representatives were in any way anxious to bring it about.

Hon. W. Kingsmill: If it were reform.

Hon. J. CORNELL: The reform ought to be in existence now. I hold that the franchise is bad enough, but when it comes to people in the community having eight or ten votes throughout the State, the position is ridiculous to the mind of any right-thinking man or woman. I hope if this House will not give itself the death blow, it will have an opportunity this session of considering a reduction of the franchise and the question of the abolition of plural voting. I would suggest that the prerogative of this House is too great. It is even greater than that of the House of Lords. There is no question that the Parliament Act in the British Parliament has to a certain extent modified the prerogative of the House of Lords, and if we cannot have this House abolished we should tack on some other measure to the Chamber in the direction adopted by the British Parliament. Coming now to another question contained in the Governor's Speech, that of electoral reform, I notice that Mr. Colebatch, in dealing with the work of the Congress, did not touch on one very important decision—the decision relating to the question of proportional representation.

Hon. H. P. Colebatch: They only put that in the also-ran section.

Hon. J. CORNELL: The hon. member says that they put it in the also-ran section. I ask him whether if it comes down he will support it? Silence gives consent.

Hon. W. Kingsmill: He did not hear.

Hon. J. CORNELL: It is in the policy of the Liberals.

Hon. R. G. Ardagh: They are stealing our policy all the time.

Hon. J. CORNELL: I read in the *West Australian* that proportional representation is a part of the Liberal policy. I would like to have seen the Hon. Mr. Moss, when he was touching upon electoral reform, deal with the all-important question of the distribution of seats on a proportional basis. I claim that proportional representation can be applied on several systems to this House and the Legislative Assembly, and on the pres-

ent franchise if that is necessary. It could be applied to both Houses, and there is no question that proportional representation is a greater advantage and a greater benefit to any country than the system of single electorates that we now have. Anyway, proportional representation or no proportional representation, there has to be, as Mr. Moss says, a redistribution of seats. I would like to make my attitude clear concerning the manner in which the seats should be redistributed. First, I think a Redistribution of Seats Bill should be on the proportional basis, and as soon as possible one man one vote. This Chamber, I think, will not agree with that, but failing its doing so, I think single electorates should be as nearly as possible based on the principle of one vote one value, and we should get over the old stereotyped method of giving recognition to broad acres and ignoring mankind and womankind.

Hon. W. Kingsmill: What about industries?

Hon. J. CORNELL: Would the hon. member give representation to industries?

Hon. W. Kingsmill: I was asking what the hon. member would do.

Hon. J. CORNELL: Broad acres should be got out of mind and recognition given as nearly as possible to the principle of one vote one value. With reference to the Labour Congress and the non-alienation of lands, Mr. Colebatch said that Congress shoved up non-alienation of lands from the general platform to the fighting platform, despite the protests of some of the Ministers. Those protests however, go to show the independence of our delegates. The hon. member said this plank is staring us in the face as a fighting plank. I, for one, have always been an ardent advocate of non-alienation of Crown lands, and I claim that the greatest evil ever committed in society was the alienation of lands. In a new State such as Western Australia is I consider that the sooner we tackle this vast problem the better it will be for the State generally. There is in England a gentleman for whom some of our Liberal friends, I believe, have a great admiration. I refer to Mr. Lloyd George,

though perhaps he may be a little out of favour just now on account of the Marconi investigations. That does not, however, alter the man's policy on the land question. Mr. Lloyd George was formerly a land taxer, but he has turned to being a land nationaliser. When we find such a man as Mr. Lloyd George in the Liberal party I think the question of non-alienation of Crown lands is worth the consideration of hon. members who subscribe to that party. Possibly one of the reasons why it was moved from the general to the fighting platform was the attitude adopted by the Liberal party at the last general elections. At the last general elections the non-alienation of Crown lands stood on the general platform of the Labour party and it was not then considered one of the first and foremost planks that should be given effect to, but our Liberal friends in going before the country chose this plank as a bait and a bogey to frighten the electors with. That was the "long suit" of the Liberal party to frighten the electors, saying that we were going to take away their homes and that they could get no land. What was the result? The annihilation of the Liberal party. In view of the result of that election do not hon. members think it was reasonable and feasible to put non-alienation of Crown lands up into a position more prominent for the electors of Western Australia to see.

Hon. W. Kingsmill: Yes, it was a very good thing—for the Liberal party.

Hon. J. CORNELL: I hope that when the Liberal party go to the country again they will stick to that bogey.

Hon. R. J. Lynn: The long suit will then be trumps.

Hon. J. CORNELL: The Hon. Mr. Colebatch says we desire to abolish this Chamber, so as to bring about non-alienation of Crown lands. I will admit that this is one of the reasons why we desire to abolish it.

Hon. W. Kingsmill: The two effects will be simultaneous?

Hon. J. CORNELL: No. We recognise that this Chamber as constituted will not agree to the non-alienation of Crown lands, but that is no reason why that principle should be thrown overboard. A principle is a principle, and that of the

non-alienation of Crown lands stands as solid as a rock, if you will go into the question on its merits alone. I know hon. members of this Chamber fear this plank, and probably they see it in the night, if they have been eating corned beef, hovering over their heads; but I assure hon. members that they need not worry. I got into Parliament, and I have never owned an acre of land in my life.

Hon. W. Patrick: Where are all the workers' homes on freehold land?

Hon. J. CORNELL: I should have owned land; and I make this assertion, that I will never own an acre of land in my life.

Hon. H. P. Colebatch: You will soon.

Hon. J. CORNELL: If I can get a worker's home I will get it, and pay to the State the value of that land, and still continue paying it. I would like to refer to the position reached in Great Britain; every acre of land in the British Isles is alienated. What is the position there? One argument used here is that we should not have non-alienation as we would lose revenue from it, and the revenue by way of rent would not be so much as by way of purchase, but what revenue does the sale of land return to Great Britain? And if we go on as we are going on in Western Australia every acre of land will be alienated here the same as it is in the older countries of the world. We have every justification in moving this question up from the general platform to the fighting platform, and I hope to be one of those successful in carrying this great and far-reaching question to its logical conclusion—that is, give it a place on the statute-book of the State. Some hon. members may have passed away, but I can say with confidence that the question of non-alienation is coming as sure as the sun will rise. Whether hon. members like it or not it is going to come. Before departing from this question of non-alienation I would like to refer to the fact that the lands of the Northern Territory are not allowed to be alienated, and I notice that the Liberal Administration in the national Parliament are not endeavouring to stop land settlement in the Northern Territory just because those who desire to settle there cannot get freehold. We

find that the Hon. Mr. Glynn recently advertised for surveyors to cope with the work of surveying in the Northern Territory in connection with the demands for land. There is on the statute-book of the Federal Parliament an ordinance that no land in the Northern Territory shall be alienated, and if the Liberals were true to their convictions they would take that up as their battle-cry and bring down a Bill to revert to freehold in the Northern Territory. I know what the fate of such a Bill would be. It would have Buckley's chance of getting through the Senate, even if it got through the House of Representatives. Such a course of action would at any rate show that the Liberals were earnest on this question of the freehold of land. I hope some endeavour is made as it would serve to bring prominently before the people of Australia this great question of land nationalisation. With regard to immigration and the decision of the Labour Congress, I would like to say that I have always been consistent in this House on the question of immigration. I opposed immigration on the Address-in-reply last year. I submitted a question whether or not immigrants would be further assisted to Western Australia and I opposed the item on the Loan Estimates. I claim that immigration has not proved in other countries of the world of any great benefit to the masses of the community of those countries. The condition of the United States of America has not been improved by immigration, the condition of the Dominion of Canada has not been improved, and we find that despite the great flow of immigration from the British Isles to Canada and the United States, that in both of those countries, side by side with the advance that they have made in wealth, they have made a corresponding advance in poverty, vice, and crime. Let us turn to the country where the immigrant comes from—England, a European country, and you find that the same conditions prevail in the country which he has left, and the immigrant is no better off, is no more sure of work in America or in Canada than he was in Great Britain. We find that many immigrants lured to this country have been brought out



under false pretences, only to learn that the conditions here are no better than those they left. I claim it is not right to spend public money in the direction of assisting people to come to Western Australia when the Government are not prepared to deal with the people already here and who are only too willing to work. A good deal has been said in regard to the unemployed question. It has been declared that the agitation was got up by the Liberals as an election dodge. They may have had something to do with it, but there is no getting away from the fact that there are unemployed in Western Australia, and altogether too many of them. They have always been here, and will continue to remain unless we seriously tackle this great problem. As far as the question of immigrants coming to Western Australia is concerned, I have not the slightest objection to their coming here. I would throw open our ports to all European immigrants so that they could come to this country and make this country their home. But I have a decided objection to the money of the taxpayer being used to pay the passages of these immigrants when the Government will not consider the interests of the people already within the State. That is why I oppose the immigration question. The question of finances I would leave to the leader of the House; but I would like to touch upon one little remark made by the Mr. Colebatch. When he added up the sum last night, or suggested that the Ministry had added up the sum and cribbed the answer, I interjected "There is such a thing as copying, and probably they are only copying from their predecessors." And, judging by the debates in another place, if this indictment be correct, they are only doing what somebody else does. Personally, I do not admit it. In regard to State steamers, it has been said that they have been a gigantic loss and are likely to continue to be so. I do not know whether they have been a loss. I hope that in due course there will be laid on the Table of the House a balance-sheet dealing with the State steamers. Even if they are a loss to the State, is there anything to get ex-

cited about? How many private trading concerns have languished for years before reaching success, while others have gone ahead and paid dividends from the start? I venture to say if there has been a loss on the steamship service it will right itself in the very near future and, despite obsolete ships, and abuse aimed at the Government for having entered into this enterprise, I can assure hon. members that they may disabuse their minds of the belief that the service is to go. State enterprise is here to stay and, indeed, is going to be extended, not only in regard to State steamers, but in many other directions, for the people have awakened to the fact that they can do much for their own benefit collectively. As to the Government meat shops, I think the remarks made by the Premier in another place go to show that they have already netted a profit of £800. There is only one fault to find with the Government meat shops, and that is that there are not enough of them. I only wish there was one at Midland Junction, in order that I might patronise it. Rather than the Government decreasing the number of the shops, I hope to see them extend the system. It is generally recognised—although I am not a business man, and do not care about having much to do with business men, because they invariably get the best of one—still I know that the bigger the business the more likelihood is there of its being a financial success, and I claim when the Government have extended their butchers' shops right through the length and breadth of the metropolitan area the profits will increase tenfold. There is the disability that one has to go to the Government shops to obtain the required meat. However, that is one's own funeral, and if one does not want Government meat one need not go there. I cannot get the Government meat, because there is no Government shop in Midland Junction. Mr. Cullen, in dealing with Government enterprises should have broadened out for once in his life. I had occasion last session to take the hon. member to task in regard to a resolution he moved in this House. In my opinion he then went one better than the stinking fish party. Now we find that in dealing

with these State enterprises he went to extremes when he said that the Government would be better employed dealing with bigger concerns of trade and commerce than in the two-penny-ha'penny selling of tripe and sausages. I think we can debate a question such as this without going to extremes and getting down to the last thing in meat.

Hon. C. Sommers: Sausages!

Hon. J. CORNELL: Yes, sausages. It must be taken into consideration that Mr. Cullen could have summed the situation up if he so desired, in sausages. He could have left out tripe, because, after all, the sausage is surrounded by tripe. I wish the hon. member was here, for I desire to suggest that when he next addresses the House he will address it in broader language, and take a broader view dealing with broader issues.

Hon. W. Kingsmill: And that he will not speak in conundrums—sausages.

Hon. J. CORNELL: Exactly. We have all heard of the mystery of life. Professor Haeckel tried to solve it, but I have yet to find a man who has solved the conundrum of the sausage, which Mr. Kingsmill refers to. I would like to touch on the Civil Service Appeal Board and the Arbitration Court. I regret that the impasse created by the civil service appeals, but hon. members must take the blame. Hon. members passed an Act of Parliament making the president of the Arbitration Court chairman also of the Civil Service Appeal Board. If any member had paused for a few moments he must have seen that that dual system is hardly capable of being given effect to. I think the long hearings of the civil service cases have conclusively proved that the president of the Arbitration Court cannot attend to civil service appeals and to the Arbitration Court also. There is enough work in the Arbitration Court to keep the president occupied until after Christmas, and I hope the Government will insist upon the president of the Arbitration Court remaining in the Arbitration Court. This impasse opens up another question: The civil servants will have to wait either until such time as the

president of the Arbitration Court can again take their cases or until the Act is amended; because as it is now the president of the Arbitration Court must be the chairman of the appeal board, and if the Bill is amended we will find that one section of the civil service has been dealt with by a board constituted one way while another section will have to be dealt with a board constituted on entirely different lines, and that the findings of these two different boards will not always agree. That is a very regrettable feature, but it is an aspect of the question which might well have been taken into consideration by hon. members when dealing with the Bill. I join with Mr. Colebatch in his remarks concerning secondary education. I hope to see it extended, not only throughout the agricultural areas, but throughout the goldfields and, indeed, throughout the length and breadth of the State generally. I claim that the educated youth and men and women of the country are of greater assistance to the State than the men who hold all the broad acres; because, after all, the progress of any community is dependent on the intelligence of the units composing the community. The Government, I know, feel sympathy with this movement for secondary education; but it is all a question of finance, and I say that those who live in wealth and affluence, should not object to being taxed in the interests of the education of the people generally. We have here established a University, which I believe is free. However, all classes of the people cannot attend the University and I hold that a system of secondary education could be brought into operation throughout the State. Personally if the question of education is dealt with I hope to see it modelled on the lines of the system in Germany—where it is compulsory for every child up to the age of 14 to attend a primary school, after which it is compulsory, until the age of 17, for the student to attend secondary and technical schools and learn a trade—all for a fee, so the Commonwealth Statistician informed me in Melbourne, of 30s. per

annum. And if the parents of a child are too poor to pay 30s. they are heard before a board sitting in camera, when if it is proved to the satisfaction of the board that the 30s. is too great a strain on the parent, the State provides for the education of the child. Education has done much for Germany and is making Germany the foremost nation in trade and commerce to-day. Side by side with education the German authorities are improving the physique of the people. To-day they are the only nation in the world improving physique. If the British people do not wake up to this great question they will find they are behind another European nation. In conclusion, I ask hon. members, when an old familiar friend comes before the Chamber, to extend to it a hand as to a brother. I refer to Mr. Kirwan's foster son, the Esperance railway. I hope that when the Bill comes before the House hon. members will agree to it. I have voted in this House for Bills to authorise the construction of certain railways without having personal knowledge that those railways were needed or that the country justified such railways. I claim that as a member of this Chamber I cannot have a knowledge of the whole of the requirements of the people and of this State, and for that reason I was prepared to take the word of the Government, who were put into office by the people, that these railways were needed, and were badly needed. If ever a railway was needed more badly or if ever a railway was more advocated than the Esperance Railway, I would like hon. members to name it. I venture to say that if hon. members would put themselves in my position a good deal of prejudice would disappear from their minds, and the Esperance Railway would become an accomplished fact. I invite contradiction when I state that there are members in this House who are no more qualified to give a vote as to whether the Esperance railway is justified than I was to vote on the railways which were discussed in the House last session. I ask hon. members to remove themselves from

parochialism. Do not take the word of the man in the street. There are some members of this Chamber who have so consistently and so long opposed the Esperance Railway that it has become part of their religion, and I believe some of them will vote against it until the day they die. But there are some members who have not these strong convictions. I believe the convictions of some hon. members carry weight with other hon. members, but I ask the latter when the Esperance Railway Bill comes on for consideration to extend the same tolerance to hon. members who represent and know the district and its requirements as these members have extended to them when dealing with railway proposals affecting their constituencies.

Hon. E. McLARTY (South-West): I desire to make a few remarks on the Address-in-reply. Some of the speakers who have preceded me have taken to task the leader of the House for not having replied to certain criticism levelled against the Government by the Hon. Mr. Moss. I do not know whether it is usual for the Minister to reply to the first speaker after the moving and seconding of the Address-in-reply, but at all events I do not think it is the best course to adopt. I think the Minister is acting wisely in hearing all the criticisms of other members, and then replying in one general speech. The conditions in this House are very different from those which prevail in another place, where there are a number of Ministers and each has an opportunity of replying to the criticism levelled at the particular department over which he presides. I may say at once that I am not in accord with the policy of the Government or with their administration. My remarks are directed, not against Ministers individually, as I entertain the greatest respect for them, but against their socialistic undertakings with which I certainly do not agree. We find that the Government at the present time are working at least a couple of saw-mills in the karri country, which must be costing the country a tremendous amount of money, and no doubt is adding to the very large deficit which had accumulated at the end of the financial year, and I am

doubtful whether these sawmills will in any way help to reduce the deficit. I have expressed the opinion over and over again that a huge mistake will be made by using karri sleepers on the Trans-Australian Railway. I have no faith in this powellising business, and I regret that the Government have seen fit to go to so much expense for the purpose of erecting mills to provide the necessary sleepers. If karri is to be used, the cutting might be done by private enterprise. I have no fault to find with the Government for erecting a mill in a jarrah forest in order to supply their own requirements. Perhaps it is a wise step to take to reserve a good large extent of our fine jarrah country and to have the necessary provision for supplying their own requirements. This the Government have done, and I have no fault to find with them for so doing, but there are many other enterprises which are very questionable indeed, and to some of them I will refer a little later on. I notice that money is being spent very lavishly in many directions, and I feel that people on the land are being taxed to such an extent that it is becoming very difficult to carry on improvements and develop their properties. In the Governor's Speech reference is made to an amending Land and Income Tax Bill. I do not know what form the amending Bill is to take, but I presume that it is not to reduce the taxation, and I would like to know how many more times the Government are coming to this House for approval of a measure to increase the taxation of the people, or rather on only a small section of the people. I think the taxation should be general, and that every man should contribute something towards the government of the State, but here we find one everlasting desire to put the taxes on the people—

Hon. F. Davis: Who are able to bear them.

Hon. E. McLARTY: On the people engaged upon the land. The Hon. Mr. Cornell has told us that he does not hold any land; therefore he will advocate a land tax with all his might and will say "There is nothing like a land tax." I want to know what the hon. gentleman or any in the same position as himself contributes

to the taxes of the country. Evidently if he has no land—

Hon. J. Cornell: I am a good smoker and a good drinker, and so I pay a lot.

Hon. E. McLARTY: The hon. member is not an employer of labour, and is not improving the State by his enterprise and capital—

Hon. J. Cornell: I have one child.

Hon. E. McLARTY: He sits down quietly—

Hon. W. Kingsmill: The trouble is he does not sit down quietly.

Hon. E. McLARTY: And enjoys his income.

Hon. J. E. Dodd (Honorary Minister): He has to pay somewhere.

Hon. E. McLARTY: Those who are engaged on the land are doing a very great deal for the benefit of the State in addition to the direct taxation under which they labour, and it is time we looked for some other source of revenue instead of continually increasing the taxation on the few people.

Hon. F. Davis: What other source do you suggest?

Hon. E. McLARTY: I noticed a short time ago that a deputation of ladies waited upon one of the Ministers—the Attorney General, I think—and one of them suggested that a benevolent fund should be established. This lady contended that it should not be necessary to ask people to contribute for charitable purposes, but there should be a benevolent fund. The Minister naturally asked how it should be provided, and one of the ladies at once replied, "Oh, by an additional tax upon the land." Some people seem to think that if a person owns some land, it will bear any amount of taxation, but those who have had experience know that there is a limit to the taxation which the land can bear. When the proposed Bill comes before this House, if the object is to increase taxation, as I believe it is, the House should carefully consider before assent is given to any further burden being placed upon the rural industries. I am not going to follow the remarks of some hon. gentlemen who preceded me and deal with the financial and other questions in-

cluding the matter of the powellising agreement. If that agreement is what it is represented to be, I can hardly understand any sane man entering into such a contract, and I can only believe and expect that when the time comes the Minister who is responsible for it will have some explanation to make, which will place an altogether different construction upon the reports which are now in circulation. I naturally feel a little interested in this great question of State steamships and State retail butchering. So far as the State steamship enterprise goes, I am not prepared to say that a little competition in the northern trade is not required. I can say from my own experience that I have paid very dearly, and have been put to hundreds of pounds expense for excessive freights for which by right I ought not to have been charged, and for that reason I am a little sympathetic with the steamship business, although I am certainly opposed to it being a Government matter. We are told that at the present time the steamships show a loss of £30,000 on their working, and I fail to see how the Government can make them pay in the North-West trade. In another couple of months the chief source of revenue, namely the carrying of the stock, will be at an end. The Government have had very little to do in that direction, and I do not know how they will get freight to keep these vessels employed during the off-season. With regard to the butchering business, I read in the *West Australian* this morning that the Premier had stated yesterday evening that a profit of £800 had been made on the retail business of this one butcher's shop in Perth. I am not going to infer that the Premier has made a mis-statement, or that he is trying to mislead the country, but I have grave doubts if a proper audit was made whether that statement would be verified. It is easy to say that there has been a profit of so many hundreds of pounds on one portion of the business, but I would like to see a proper audit made. The Government have a station in the North, and are bringing bullocks down here for slaughtering. I would like to know what part is debited to the station, and what

part is debited to the butchering, and what part is debited to the steamship earnings. I take it that the Government to deal with the matter in a business-like way will allow so much per head for the cattle delivered on the boat, and then the cost of bringing them to Fremantle and feeding them at Fremantle, which is a considerable item and the cost of slaughtering should be debited.

The Colonial Secretary: That is exactly what is done.

Hon. E. McLARTY: If the Government have allowed for that and have made a profit of £800 on that little insignificant bit of a shop which they are running in Perth, then I confess I am astounded. I would be prepared to give something to know how it is done, and I would be almost prepared to swear to secrecy if I could get the information. I am engaged in this business under better conditions than the Government are, and I have had my eyes opened pretty widely lately, and have been obliged to put myself in the hands of competent auditors. I fear that when the audit is completed there will be no £800 to my credit; on the other hand, I fear there will be a large amount on the debit side of the ledger. From my experience in the butchering business, which is a very long one, I can count on fewer than the fingers of one hand all the people I have known who have made money in the retail butchering business. I cannot understand the system that this business is run on. When the Government entered into this retail business the market was very low for stock. Cattle were selling at a very low price and the Government got out a schedule of prices. Cattle at that time were fetching £7 or £8 a head. Since then they have absolutely doubled in price and on special occasions for extra good cattle the price has gone up to £20 a head. Yet the Government have never altered their schedule of prices. They sell at the same price when they are buying at £13 or £14 a head as when they were buying cattle at £7 a head. If the schedule was based on a proper system in the first instance then the Government must be losing money when they are buying cattle at a higher rate. Only yesterday I was at a

sale where cattle went up to over £16 a head; the average price, I estimate, would be about £13 or £14 for over 100 head of cattle sold. I am told that some of the cattle were knocked down to the Government at £12 17s. 6d. per head. I want to know how the Government, with all their expenses, can carry on the business; how they can buy cattle at £12 17s. 6d. a head and sell them at the retail prices they are doing and show a profit on the business. I am very doubtful indeed whether a great many of the items in connection with the business were taken into consideration when the statement was made by the Premier that there was a profit of £800. The Government, apparently, judging from the last speaker's remarks, are going to persevere in this fad: I am sorry to call it by that name. Personally it does not affect me as a producer. If the Government are buying and killing cattle it does not matter to me; it does not matter whether the Government are doing it or somebody else; the same number of cattle go into consumption, therefore I am not speaking from a personal point of view; but at the present time the Government have, so I am told, 1,200 head of store cattle purchased for further requirements and they are grazing them on the well-known Yandanooka property. I am anxious to know what the result of this venture on the part of the Government will be. After years of experience of buying and selling cattle, I fail to see how the Government are going to come out without a loss in this direction. They purchased this property some months ago and the interest on it, I think I am correct in saying, is over £15 a day on the purchase, besides the expenses of looking after the stock. The country is certainly some of the best we have, but as soon as the summer months set in the Government will find that the cattle will go down in condition as fast as they have gone up in the good time. I do not think they will be able to run the number of stock on Yandanooka that they are running to-day. I expressed the opinion last year, and I am still satisfied that it is a huge mistake, and that it is not in keeping with what I consider the Government ought to do. If you go into the

market in Perth what do you see? There is a butcher's shop on the right hand side and another butcher's shop on the left hand side, and in front of you there is the little bit of a Government butcher's shop, and you always see very inferior meat in the Government butcher's shop compared with what you see in the other shops. I walked through the market yesterday, as I frequently do, and I had a look round and really the quality of the beef in the Government shop is a disgrace to put on the market. I thought one might call it the blue beef shop, the meat was as blue as the sky. If the Government have the credit of selling meat at a cheaper price than anybody else, they are certainly selling poorer meat. Not only on one occasion have I noticed this but ever since the Government have started, and the reason is not very far to seek. They bring down a shipment of cattle to Fremantle, the cattle are put in the yards, given hay, of course sufficient to keep them alive, but the cattle will not eat sufficient to keep them in good condition. They are there for weeks perishing away and when they are killed the beef is not fit for consumption. I, with Mr. Cullen, sincerely wish the Government would give up this fad. I think it is unjust and a crying shame that the Government should start these shops in opposition to poor men. There are two shops which are kept by men who are supposed to be supporters of the Labour party. The Government have started in opposition to these two men, who have been in business for a long time, and I believe they are no better off than when they started. The same thing has happened in Fremantle. I know one butcher, I have known him since he started, I knew him as a boy and he grew up with a business, yet the Government started in opposition to this poor man. I know him, I will not mention his name, but I know that after years and years of hard work from four or five o'clock in the morning until dark at night, seven days a week, I would not like to have his banking account to-day. Such men as this have the Government competition against them. There is no business in this State, or any other, that is so cut to pieces as the butchering business. Wherever there is a

chance found, some small man will start a butcher's shop; it will last for a few months and then the man goes bankrupt and the shop is shut up. For years in this place, as soon as the cattle come down in large numbers in the season you will find these small shops opening in all directions and the price of meat is cut down as low as possible. You find the cutting carts running about selling meat, yet the Government come to the rescue and say that meat is so dear that it is necessary to open shops. I have recently visited the Eastern States and I took notice, naturally, of what I was interested in. I attended the stock sales in Sydney and Melbourne and saw how the cattle were selling there and inquired the retail prices, and I contend the conditions here compared with the Eastern States are better, and that this is the cheapest place in Australia for meat. I go about very much in Perth and Fremantle and I see in most of the shops that sirloin beef is marked 6d. a pound and I do not think I saw anything lower than 7d. a pound in the Eastern States. Mutton is cheaper, but beef is quite as low here, in many instances lower, than it is in the Eastern States. The difference there is that people put their cattle on the rail, in some cases they have to rail them a long distance, and they can carry them right to the market; here we are producing our cattle 1,500 miles and 2,000 miles from the consumer. They have to travel all this distance to the markets and it costs for droving them to the port 15s. per head, at least that is what I am paying, and to drive them to the ports, to Derby and Wyndham, is a very considerable distance, and there is considerable risk in bringing them to the market. I am paying £4 1s. 7d. per head to land cattle at Robb's Jetty.

The Colonial Secretary: How much of that is freight?

Hon. E. McLARTY: It amounts to £3 12s. 6d.

The Colonial Secretary: For freight alone?

Hon. E. McLARTY: Freight, fodder, and attendance. How can you expect to have meat cheaper than it is being sold when these conditions prevail and when

you are producing your meat 2,000 miles away? I think it is wonderful that we can put meat on the market as we are doing here and sell it at the price at which it is being sold. There is no reason at all for this fad of butchers' shops. I think, with Mr. Cullen, the Government would be far better employed; and I honestly believe, if it was not for the power behind the throne, the Government would close the shops to-morrow morning and give the whole thing up. But we know the power working behind, the cry for cheap meat, and I have heard it said that the Government have brought down the price of meat as much as 3d. and 4d. in the pound. I contend that the Government have not brought down the price of meat one fraction. You could buy meat just as cheaply before the Government opened the retail shops as you can to-day, and you can go into many of the shops and buy meat as cheaply to-day as at the Government retail shops. I noticed yesterday the price of mutton in the Government shop, it was marked on a board, and the price is quite as high as it is anywhere else. Apart from the price, I do wish the Government could see the folly of carrying on this business, and give the people who have been in the trade for years a chance to make an honest living. With reference to the Speech, there is not very much that is new in it, or to comment upon. The only railway we are asked to consider is the Esperance line. I understood there was a promise from the Government, in fact it was so, that a railway from Busselton to the Margaret district was to be one of the next constructed. I commend the Government for purchasing the line from Margaret to Hamelin and it must be apparent that when that connection is made it should be made from Busselton to Margaret, and as early as possible. I am aware that the financial condition of the State would make it difficult almost to go on with railway construction at all. I often wonder what is going to happen if the Government are not successful in floating another loan at an early date. The Premier went to London and he may have had some influence there. I have a little doubt myself if he had any in-

fluence at all. I think the Agent General was quite competent to look after the state of affairs in London and to obtain money for this State, but the amount which the Premier obtained is not going far, and when it is expended, what will happen to the country? Why, we are living on loan money. We have thousands of people employed on public works, far too many on the day labour system, a system I have always raised my voice against, and when I heard the Premier make a statement last session that the Government had 3,000 wages men employed a shudder went through me. I know plenty of good men working for the Government, but there is a good number of men who get on with the Government that the contractors would never have, and there are plenty of men working for the Government who would never work for contractors. Therefore, I feel quite satisfied that we are not getting the best value for our money in that respect, but unless we get this next loan the works will have to stop, and I wonder then what will become of the people. At the present time there is a good deal of talk about the unemployed, and there is no doubt that there are a good many people out of work. I do not think the case is nearly as serious as it is often represented to be, but unless we have money to keep the public works going I am quite satisfied the position will assume a serious aspect. Therefore, I fail to see how many more railways can be undertaken for some time to come. Hon. members are aware of the discovery of lime deposits which has been made at Lake Clifton. These are of very good quality, and agricultural experts are urging upon the people the necessity for using lime upon land in the back country. I quite believe that that is sound advice. It would be a great advantage if lime could be obtained at a reasonable cost for the use of the settlers on the clay lands, and I hope some action will be taken at an early date to utilise the enormous quantity of lime which has been found in that lake. There must be hundreds of thousands of tons of it. This lake is 14 or 15 miles in length, and over a portion of it the deposits have been found to a considerable depth, I forget

exactly how many feet. Railways to enable the settlers to make use of that lime, and also to give the Government access to the poor country referred to by Mr. Clarke, I think would be of general benefit. Exactly in what direction the railway should be built is, of course, a matter for consideration. We have seen samples of what is being produced along the coast in the way of potatoes, and I think they would be hard to beat in any part of the world. If railways could be constructed to give the people who are growing these fine products facilities to get to market, the Government would be carrying out a very necessary work indeed. I give the Government the credit that is due to them, and I think they are honest in their intentions but I am not altogether in accord with their methods. I think many of the socialistic enterprises they have entered into should have been left to private individuals. If we are going to stifle industry, and the Government are going to take up the question of producing and all these other things, it is better that they should go the whole hog. If it is necessary to have butchers' shops, it is necessary to have bakers' shops, and the Government may as well start grocers' shops. Why confine their operations to one industry? I would like to say a word or two with regard to the small squatters in the north. It was said that when the Government purchased steamers they were going to the rescue of the small squatters who had been boycotted by the bigger men of the north. I know very little about East Kimberley, but I know a good deal about West Kimberley in which I am interested, and I made a statement last year that there was not a man in West Kimberley who could produce 20 bullocks or even 10 bullocks who would not find men tumbling over each other to buy the stock. There is no boycotting, but the result of this steamship business has been—I do not know whether the Government have been responsible for it, but to some extent they have been—that they have compelled these men to force their cattle upon the market. There was an instance only the other day to which I might refer, and it was rather a pathetic case. A man who had lived in the



back blocks at East Kimberley for 20 years with his wife, and who had reared a family of children who had never had a day's schooling until this year—this man got together 200 head of marketable cattle from his low herd. He was offered £4 a head for the cattle at Wyndham for shipment to Manila, but he declined the offer and said he would market them himself because cattle were bringing high prices down this way. He travelled to Fremantle with the stock and when he got there he found that cattle were almost being given away, that there was no demand, and that there was twice the number of cattle required, and there he was, at Robb's Jetty having to buy hay to feed them. After days of worry and anxiety he sold the balance of 80 at an absurdly low price. He got £3 15s. a head, and they were good conditioned cattle too. I know that, because the man who purchased them told me so, and these were the cattle for which he was offered £4 a head at Wyndham. That man, after paying the expenses of bringing them to this market, realised 17s. a head on them, over and above his expenses, which would not include his expenses here and his fare back to Wyndham. Other small squatters who have availed themselves of the Government boats cannot sell at all. There are no buyers, and I understand that a number were recently railed to Mingenew, where an effort was made to sell them, and the general opinion when they were sold was that the breeders would have to put their hands in their pockets to make up the deficiency. This enterprise on the part of the Government, therefore, has not been such a great blessing to the small squatter. This market can absorb 600 bullocks a week, but lately there have been, I think, from 1,000 to 1,300 head of cattle available. The result has been a heavy loss to all the breeders, while I am not prepared to say that it has resulted in much benefit to anyone else. This has altogether upset the trade. I am not advocating that this trade should be monopolised by a few people, and that there should be short supplies, but with a market which is only able to absorb 600 bullocks it is useless bringing in 1,300. In the course of a few days we shall have

the Government steamer arriving with 800 bullocks, and the same difficulty will result. During the last three or four sales the price has been up to 5d. a pound. Next week there will be a glut, and the price will be down to anything the people can get. That is not a desirable state of things. Squatters are paying the Government for their land grants, and they have to take the risk of bad seasons, and losses in many ways, and they are entitled to fair value for their produce, and when the article gets below the cost of production the industry must go to the wall. So there is a good deal to consider in this enterprise of the Government steamers. I say again that I am not displaying any personal feeling in the matter, but I am confident that from the long experience I have had, as long, I think, as any man in this State, this State butchering business is going to be a failure. I said so when it was started, and I say so again, and I am confident that the people will see the absurdity of going on with this business as they will with many other industries which the Government have undertaken. I shall not detain the House much longer. I can only say that great care should be taken in trying to straighten out the finances of the country. We have a pretty heavy deficit at the present time, and if this is to be made up by another tax on the land I do not know what will become of the place. The heavy taxation has already taken the heart out of the settlers, and there is a feeling of despondency. Five weeks ago we had a notice from the Federal Taxation Department, and then comes the State land tax which has to be paid, and before we turn around there is the income tax, and now we have the ever-recurring roads board tax. I do not know how the people who are depending on the land will be able to pay these taxes. For my part I find them hard enough to bear, but I am unlike most of the people, I have other resources; I have not had all my eggs in one basket. I sympathise with the people who are engaged in the work of developing the State, and who are enterprising enough to spend money in the State. I sympathise with them for the manner in which they are taxed at the present

time. Money is very scarce in all directions. Sir Edward Wittenoom gave an explanation on this subject when speaking the other evening, which I think was reasonable, and that may account to a great extent for the scarcity, but there is no getting away from the question that that is so, and that people are hard pressed. There have been more bankruptcies during the past few months than ever before in the same period, and from what I can learn there are likely to be more. It behoves the Government to endeavour to curtail expenses, and not everlastingly look to a few people to make up the deficiency by piling on them tax upon tax.

On motion by Hon. W. Patrick debate adjourned.

*House adjourned at 6.15 p.m.*

## Legislative Assembly,

*Thursday, 31st July, 1913.*

	PAGE
Questions or Returns .. .. .	182
Questions : Fruit fly in Orchards .. .. .	182
<i>Hansard</i> Appointment .. .. .	182
Railway safeguards .. .. .	183
Workers' Homes .. .. .	183
State Meat supply and Steamship Service .. .. .	183
Powellised sleepers .. .. .	185
Brookton-Kunjin railway .. .. .	185
Land settlement .. .. .	186
Address-in-reply, fourth day .. .. .	186

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

### QUESTIONS OR RETURNS.

Mr. George having given notice of several questions,

The MINISTER FOR WORKS : On a point of order, I would like to point out that hon. members are in the habit of asking by way of questions for what are really returns. I have noticed in the

case of one or two questions submitted this session that they really should have been asking for returns.

Mr. GEORGE : All of this information for which I am asking can be given either by the Railway Department or the Works Department in less than half an hour, for they must have the accounts made up.

The Premier : You ask for returns, the same as we had to do.

Mr. SPEAKER : As to whether information may be obtained by way of a question or by way of moving for a return, if the Speaker thinks such questions should not be admitted they are not admitted, and if Ministers do not desire to reply they need not reply. Ministers may ask that a motion be submitted for a return. In respect to the questions already asked, I went through them carefully. There is one which I thought rather exceeded the limits of a question, but I gave that the benefit of the doubt. It is a question asked by Mr. Monger. However, if the Minister finds he cannot answer a question, and regards it as a return he is, of course, privileged to ask that a motion for a return be moved.

### QUESTION—FRUIT FLY IN ORCHARDS.

Mr. TURVEY asked the Minister for Agriculture : 1, Has his attention been drawn to the prevalence of the fruit fly in many of the orchards of this State. 2, Is it his intention to adopt the system of taxation of orchards as recommended at the recent Fruitgrowers' Conference in a scheme for coping with the pest ?

The MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE replied : 1, Yes. 2, A further gradation of charges on those suggested by the Fruit Conference is being considered.

### QUESTIONS (2)—"HANSARD" APPOINTMENT.

Mr. FOLEY asked the Chairman of the Printing Committee : 1, Was the vacant position on *Hansard* staff advertised