

ment must have revenue through the Customs, let us pay direct to the Customs instead of having middlemen's profits added to the Customs dues. If we were to work as one man, probably we should get our disabilities removed. Western Australia is good enough to develop, and will pay for its developing. Unfortunately the man who does the greatest amount of developing work, he who is nearest to Nature, does not get anything like his proper percentage of value produced. The first man to reap the benefit of the capital coming out from England will be the commercial man. Everything that the settlers require in the shape of tools, clothing, etc., will represent to the commercial man an immediate advantage. We on the land have to grow our products and wait until we market them before we get any cash return. We have been asked to explain the drift to the cities. The answer is simple. There is no incentive for young people to remain in country districts. Consequently they migrate to the better conditions in the city. Once let the people in country districts realise that it is more profitable and healthy for them to remain in the country, and they will no longer desire to come to the city. When you give them comforts and decent home life, families reared in the country will remain there. A little ridicule has been directed at the 2½ acre crop of cotton. I would not care if it were only 1½ acres. I suggested two years ago that cotton seed, linseed, and tobacco seed should be distributed to the country schools for cultivation in small experimental plots. We should then find out which centre is most suitable for the production of each of those commodities. Tobacco was grown at York some time ago, but it was not successful, because of insects boring the leaf. However, if we were to make these small experimental tests at country schools, it would be very interesting for the children and would cost nothing. During the last two or three years it has been proved that the carrying capacity of the South-West areas has been very much increased by subterranean clover. In the Great Southern a similar result has been achieved by the cultivation of Sudan grass. At Geraldton recently I was informed that the fattening qualities of blue lupine were simply astounding.

Mr. Latham: It is very good on light land.

Mr. HARRISON: Well, we have plenty of light land in most districts. If we could get in the eastern districts anything which would give us a similar advantage, it would revolutionise the stock-carrying capacity of our land. I congratulate the Premier on having secured so large a sum of money. If judiciously used it should serve to create a turning point in the history of the State. I am very pleased indeed that a move has been made in this direction, and I am convinced that if the officers of the various departments will work together most excellent results will be obtained.

On motion by Mr. Underwood, debate adjourned.

*House adjourned at 8.57 p.m.*

## Legislative Assembly,

*Tuesday, 8th August, 1922.*

	PAGE
Questions: Dumping of Eastern goods ... ..	119
State Sawmills ... ..	119
Railways—1, Carnarvon-Killis project; 2, Re-laying, Perth-Bellevue; 3, Freight to Albany ... ..	120
Leave of absence ... ..	120
Address-in-reply, Fourth day ... ..	120

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

### QUESTION—DUMPING OF EASTERN GOODS.

Mr. CARTER asked the Premier: 1, Is he aware of the fact that dumping of Eastern States' goods is occurring on a large scale in Western Australia, that such tactics on the part of Eastern commercial houses is designed, and is successfully operating, against the local industries already established and the establishment of further secondary industries in our State? 2, If so, has any action been taken to prevent these attacks upon our growth? 3, Will he cause the attention of the Commonwealth Government to be drawn to the matter and demand that the terms of the Federal Constitution be applied to prevent continuance of the evil?

The PREMIER replied: 1, The W.A. Chamber of Manufactures has recently written to the Minister for Industries stating such to be the case. 2, The matter is receiving attention. 3, If it can be shown that dumping is occurring, and the Federal Constitution can be applied by way of remedy, suitable representations will be made.

### QUESTION—STATE SAW MILLS.

Mr. WILLCOCK (for Mr. Wilson) asked the Minister for Works: 1, What was the output of timber from the State Saw Mills Department for the year ended 30th June, 1922? 2, The average number of men employed by this department during the year ended 30th June, 1922? 3, What were the profits made by the department during the year ended 30th June, 1922?

The MINISTER FOR WORKS replied: 1, 50,480 loads of sawn timber. 2, 890 men in

saw mills. 3, Stock-sheets and accounts are not yet completed, so that a definite sum cannot yet be stated. It is not clear whether the hon. member wants anything but sawn timber. If he does, he can ask a further question.

### QUESTIONS (3)—RAILWAYS.

#### *Carnarvon-Killili Project.*

Mr. ANGELO asked the Premier: 1, What is the present cost of 45lb. rails? 2, What is the present cost of sleepers for 3ft. 6in. railway? 3, At what rates did Mr. Tindale frame his report on the proposed Carnarvon-Killili railway? 4, Will he supply the House with a detailed statement of Mr. Tindale's estimates showing how the cost of the proposed railway reached £4,000 per mile? 5, What induced Mr. Tindale to frame his estimates of freight earnings at 6d. per ton per mile, whilst the original proposal was 1s. per ton per mile, a rate to which no objection has been taken by the people of the district?

The PREMIER replied: 1, £1,020 per mile in store, North Fremantle. 2, Three shillings and seven pence per sleeper at mill. 3, At above rates. 4, In absence of survey, details are not possible. The estimate is framed on experience of cost of other lines reviewed by knowledge of Carnarvon conditions. 5, Mr. Tindale framed alternative estimates at 6d. and 1s. respectively per ton per mile.

#### *Relaying, Perth-Bellevue.*

Mr. WILLCOCK asked the Minister for Railways: 1, How many men were employed on the relaying job between Perth and Bellevue on Tuesday, 1st August, 1922. 2, Wednesday, 2nd August, 1922?

The MINISTER FOR RAILWAYS replied: 1, 194. 2, 137. The reduction in the number of men on the 2nd instant, compared with the preceding day, is due to the completion of the relaying as far as Bellevue, and the necessity for reconditioning the plant. When this has been done, relaying will be started between Chidlow and Lion Mill, which will enable additional men again being employed.

#### *Freight to Albany.*

Mr. CARTER asked the Minister for Railways: 1, In view of the withdrawal of s.s. "Eucla" for nine months for the purpose of cheap transport of rails to Esperance, is it the Government's intention to assist manufacturers who have to rely on this cheap means of transport to meet Eastern States' competition by granting a cheaper rate of freight to Albany? 2, Are the Government aware that it is now cheaper to send goods to Esperance and ship them back again to Albany than to rail them to Albany as their destination? 3, How do the Government justify their action in granting this cheap rate for shipment to ports south-east of Albany and excluding goods for Albany? 4, Has

this been done at the request of the wholesale traders in Albany who are distributing agents for Eastern houses, with the idea of excluding W.A. manufacturers' competition?

The MINISTER FOR RAILWAYS replied: 1, 2, and 3, I am advised that at least two of the interstate steamship companies are arranging to lift cargo from Fremantle to Albany by sea at approximately the same rates of freight as were in operation on the s.s. "Eucla" for that run. If this is correct, the Albany merchants will be in precisely the same position, having the same facilities at approximately the same rates of freight as when the s.s. "Eucla" was running, and the special rail freight, therefore, would only apply to cargo sent to ports east of Albany in cases of emergency, the rail freight plus sea freight per "Eucla" being much higher than the sea freight to Albany plus freight per "Eucla" to ports east of Albany. 4, No. The State Shipping Service and railway officers conferred regarding this matter, their object being to enable the settlers on the South-East coast to obtain goods at approaching previous rates pending the return of the s.s. "Eucla" to the run through to Fremantle.

### LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

On motion by Mr. Pickering, leave of absence for four weeks granted to Mr. A. Thomson (Katanning) on the ground of urgent private business.

### ADDRESS-IN-REPLY.

#### *Fourth Day.*

Debate resumed from the 3rd August.

Mr. UNDERWOOD (Pilbara) [4.45]: I have listened with some interest to the various speakers on the Address-in-reply. I know it has been stated that the leaders have all spoken and that now the smaller fry might have a chance. The speeches have been interesting in a degree, but I do not know that all has been said that can be said. I listened with considerable interest to the Leader of the Opposition, who gave a very helpful criticism, and the Premier, to an extent, enlightened the House. The Leader of the Country Party reminded me of a jockey who was doing his preliminary before he got the owner's instructions; that is to say, he did not know whether he was having a fly or whether he was in the bag. Many things have been said to which I can only refer again and possibly endeavour to say them in other words. The Leader of the Opposition referred to Royal Commissions. I think he spoke somewhat contemptuously of them. We might classify Royal Commissions under three headings. There is the useful commission, such as the inquiry into the Railways, or the inquiry into the Kendenup accounts, or others on which Parliamentarians have sat with experts such as that on lunacy and the

management of our hospitals. Then again we have what might be termed the whitewashing commission, such as the Education Commission of last year. We had a similar whitewashing commission this year on the Lake Clifton railway job.

Hon. P. Collier: Hear, hear!

Mr. UNDERWOOD: Then, with all due respect, I must refer to what might be termed the foolish commissions, and one needs to be courageous to do it, for almost every member of this House is a Royal Commissioner. To demonstrate what I mean by foolish commissions, let me refer to the Licensing Commission. The commission travelled, east, north and south, and took evidence in various parts of the country on questions which have been debated for 50 years, and on which public opinion is as diverse as the weather. The commission went to the Boulder, and took evidence from a miner who stated that, after coming off shift at 11 o'clock or midnight, he had a couple of pots and found they did him good. Then the commission went to Geraldton and examined a Rechabite or a vegetarian, or something like that, and he told them that all alcoholic drinks were bad. It is not necessary to travel around the country with all the paraphernalia of a Royal Commission to get evidence of that description. The member for Kanowna (Hon. T. Walker) can tell us that all alcoholic drinks are bad, and I can tell members that a pot or two does one good.

The Minister for Works: It does me good, anyhow.

Hon. T. Walker: You would be better without it.

Mr. Richardson: It depends on one's temperament.

Mr. UNDERWOOD: Yes, and one's ability to absorb the drink. Coming to more serious matters, the question of immigration overshadows all other questions which are to be debated. It seems to me that one is required to make a declaration of faith for daring to speak on this question; that is to say, he has to declare, "I am in favour of immigration; I do believe that this country must have more people; I am convinced that, if we are going to keep a white Australia, we must have more white people here." The Leader of the Opposition put it very fairly when he stated that every sane man, inside or outside of Parliament, agrees that we want more people in this country. But we have to think how we are going to handle those people and what we are going to do with them when we get them here. There is always a danger in bringing immigrants into a country when unemployment prevails. Immigration and unemployment will not run in double harness, and without doubt there has been considerable unemployment in Western Australia for the last year or more. In introducing immigrants into this country, we have to be careful that we do not drive out the best citizens we can possibly have, namely the young groopers. Any policy of immigration that will force the young West Australian born out of this country is one that we do not

want and, until we can absorb the whole of them, we must be very careful about bringing other people in. We have heard a good deal regarding immigration. We have heard something about the employment to which they are to be put. We are told that all these immigrants must go into the country and, in the first place, clear land and then become farmers. I do not care whether you get people from Great Britain, from other parts of Europe, or from many parts of Australia, I maintain that there is a considerable percentage of men who will never be successful as land clearers. I have known men who could not earn salt for their porridge at land clearing, and they have included European and Australian born. If this is all we can offer immigrants, we can be absolutely sure that we are going to have quite a large number of failures who will either have to drift into the cities or leave Australia.

Hon. P. Collier: That stands to reason. Take any 6,000 Australians and a percentage will fail at clearing work.

Mr. UNDERWOOD: I included Australians. There is a question which is still agitating the minds of some people, namely, what wages should be paid to the farm assistant and the clearer. My experience is that there are quite a large number of men who, during the first few months on clearing or in any other position to which they have not been brought up, are not worth anything. As regards clearing, those men who own or are trying to own the land and win through on the land cannot afford to pay fixed wages to clearers or farm hands who do not know their work. It is impossible to lay down any fixed wages to be paid to land clearers or farm hands.

Mr. Willcock: There ought to be some standard.

Mr. UNDERWOOD: If a standard is fixed, there are thousands of these men who will never be able to make a start. Quite a number of men would be utterly or practically useless for a few months, but would gradually pick up and learn the business and become good men; but to begin with, it is impossible to fix a wage for them. If we are depending on private employers—and most of the private employers in the agricultural industry in this State are themselves working very hard in trying to win through—they cannot afford to keep a man who cannot do his work. There are some men who will never learn to be farmers and who will never learn to be bushmen, and this remark does not apply to immigrants alone. There are hundreds of thousands of Australian born men who would never be successful as farmers. We have heard a good deal about the drift to the city. One is apt to gather the impression—

Hon. W. C. Angwin: That it has just taken place.

Mr. UNDERWOOD: Yes, and that Australia is the only place in the world where it has taken place. Of course the drift to the cities

is an evil as old as the world itself; at least it goes back as far as reliable history extends. There has always been a tendency for people to drift into the cities. Some people say, "Make the country attractive." This involves a question possibly of temperament, possibly of early environment. To me, the country is and always has been attractive, and to thousands of other men it is attractive. To tens of thousands of others it offers no attractions whatever. No matter what we may put there, they will come where the crowds are. I say with all due respect to the member for West Perth (Mrs. Cowan) women have a greater tendency to come to the cities than men.

Mrs. Cowan: Because you give them no conveniences in their homes on the land.

Hon. P. Collier: They follow the men anywhere, to the city or the country.

Mr. UNDERWOOD: The Leader of the Opposition is wrong. There are hundreds and thousands of men in the cities of Australia who would prefer to go into the country, but they follow the women. Human beings like a crowd. To make the country attractive we must put a crowd there, but in Australia that is utterly impossible. I am sure, however, there are sufficient people in Australia, and sufficient who will come to Australia, who will be attracted by what is called the loneliness and the isolation of the country, and the other difficulties connected with it, who would much prefer the fine healthy life, both moral and physical, afforded by the country. When the Premier went on his great tour, he cabled from London asking for the help of the Leader of the Opposition. In this House the Premier has a majority of almost two to one. When he sent that cable he was certainly not paying any great compliment to his supporters. I have never agreed with the policy of spoils to the victors; at the same time, it has always appealed to me that one should never pass over a friend to placate a foe, because one would most likely lose a good friend. Why, the Premier, with his substantial majority, should cable for the Leader of the Opposition passes my understanding. In declining to go the Leader of the Opposition did exactly what I would have done. If I had been the Leader of the Opposition, and possessed the requisite flow of language, I know what I should have told the Premier. Ministers have done one or two things in opposition to the express will of this House. Last session a no-confidence motion was moved in regard to the Lake Clifton railway. I may be reminded that I voted against that motion. Possibly Ministers were under the impression that any member who would stand the Lake Clifton job would stand anything that followed the same track. The Como tramways have, up to date, been nicely smoothed over. Three distinct views may be taken regarding that matter. The first is, whether under our present financial condition, we should spend any money except upon works that will tend to increase production; the second is, should a Minister

go behind the distinct instructions of Parliament; and the third is, whether the proposition is any good? From every point of view the undertaking is wrong. We should spend all the money we can get at present upon increasing production. We should at all times respect the decisions of Parliament. Again, when a public work is being carried out, it should be carried out on the best possible lines. Members will agree with me that there is no tramway proposition in the metropolitan area that is not better than the Como trams. The Minister for Railways has told the public that this only involved a paltry £40,000. Like the baby, it is only a little one.

Mr. Richardson: It will grow, though.

Mr. UNDERWOOD: Everything is comparative. When we recollect the Minister's huge loss of £300,000 in connection with the motor ship "Kangaroo," £40,000 is only a small loss.

The Minister for Mines: Who said I lost £300,000 on the "Kangaroo"?

Mr. UNDERWOOD: I say so. The Government had a firm offer of £240,000 for that ship.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: £280,000.

Mr. UNDERWOOD: The £240,000 will satisfy me. They expended £190,000 on altering and spoiling the ship. That makes £430,000, or £470,000, whichever way one may look at it. The ship to-day is worth about £100,000 or £130,000. There is no doubt whatever the Minister lost to the State £300,000 over that ship.

The Minister for Mines: Only in your own opinion.

Mr. UNDERWOOD: Of course it is. The Minister will express his opinion later on.

Hon. P. Collier: You are going pretty well along the line of facts.

Mr. UNDERWOOD: I always endeavour to do so. The Leader of the Opposition, when speaking the other night, only referred to what a fine proposition it was to buy that ship, but everything we made out of her has been lost again. The good bargain we made has been lost by the action of a Minister who says, in regard to the Como trams, "It is only a paltry £40,000." The Premier said the Acting Premier did not know that he (the Premier) had made a promise not to build the trams. I am sorry the Premier made that statement. With Mark Twain, I believe one should speak the truth where the truth will be good, but should never tell an untruth that no one will believe. Nobody believes the statement that the Acting Premier did not know a promise had been given.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: He said it himself.

Mr. UNDERWOOD: Who did?

Hon. W. C. Angwin: The Acting Premier. It was published in the Press.

Mr. UNDERWOOD: Is that the first thing he said? There is not a member in the House who will believe that the Acting Premier did not know of the Premier's promise.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: The Premier had to take his word for it.

Mr. UNDERWOOD: I will tell the House later on what I will take his word for.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. UNDERWOOD: Apart from the Premier's promise, which I do not consider much—

Mr. Carter: Be fair.

Mr. UNDERWOOD: I am fair. I know that promises are made and circumstances alter, and a promise, if not broken, is at least not fulfilled. There is more than the Premier's promise in this matter. There is the fact that this House appointed a select committee to inquire into the question of the construction of these trams. Until that select committee, or Royal Commission as it afterwards was, had reported, Ministers were bound by the decision of this House. I find from reference to the division that the motion to appoint the select committee was carried by 28 votes to 9, and of the nine who opposed it five were Ministers. If the Acting Premier did not know of the promise given by the Premier, he must have known of the appointment by this House of the select committee, which committee afterwards became a Royal Commission. There is no excuse for him. We remember the Lake Clifton incident and all the circumstances attendant thereto. A good tradesman, a great criminal, or a speaker, has certain characteristics by which he is known. His work too is known. Here we have over again all the characteristics of the Lake Clifton matter. The Premier was away and the same man was Acting Premier. A Bill is passed by Parliament but it is ignored. The Acting Premier then tells us that owing to pressure of business he did not read a certain minute and did not know it was opposed to the will of Parliament. In respect to the Como trams we have practically the same position. The Acting Premier says he did not know of the promise. The circumstances seem to me to be on all fours with those connected with the Lake Clifton affair. On both occasions the Premier, who was away, and who was absolutely opposed to the undertaking, comes back and screens his Ministers. The evidence given by Sir Henry Lefroy before the Lake Clifton Royal Commission was merely a screening of Ministers, seeing that the proposition was not agreed to by Cabinet. There are other points connected with the Como trams that I do not care to discuss now, particularly with regard to the cost of land—the statements concerning which are entirely false—and as to the trams themselves. I now come to the question of the draining of Herdsman's Lake. In reply to a question the other day the Minister informed me that the draining of the lake would cost £72,000. That work was authorised by Act of Parliament. When the Bill was before the House, I supported it, and I concluded my speech by saying—

I hope the Minister will make certain, before he allows his officers to go on with this work, what the cost of the drainage will be. I have before this known officers

of the Public Works Department to underestimate cost. I will not say there is not some little gully passing through the sandstone range, but unless there is such a gully, I undertake to say we shall not be able to get through that range along the lime kiln for £25,000—and that is irrespective of the rest of the drain. The proposition requires very careful consideration from the aspect of cost before one embarks on it. The Minister said the cost would be £25,000.

The Minister for Works: Is not there £15,000 for lining as well?

Mr. UNDERWOOD: Lining is not referred to. Replying on the second reading debate, the Minister said the cost would be between £25,000 and £27,000. The position, as I put it, is this: either there was unpardonable negligence and incompetence of officers, or Parliament was being misled. I undertake to say that had an estimated cost of £75,000 been put up for that drain, this House would never have passed the Bill.

Hon. P. Collier: It all has to be unloaded on to the price of the land.

Mr. UNDERWOOD: It will be unloaded on to the deficit. The Premier has said that he is short of £100,000 of taxation with respect to liquor license fees. Here is £50,000 not put in at all, £50,000 gone.

Hon. P. Collier: Posterity will pay it.

Mr. UNDERWOOD: We have heard about the Minister for Works as a practical man, a man who knows his job.

Hon. P. Collier: An all-round man.

Mr. UNDERWOOD: No, not all round, but practical on navying work, and particularly in tunnelling and engineering.

Hon. P. Collier: All round, but special in that.

Mr. UNDERWOOD: Here is a job right under that Minister's eye, right before him. He puts up to the House £25,000 as the cost. Now he tells us the cost is to be £72,000. And there is £30,000 more yet to be spent. The total cost of the job will be about £100,000. Yet the Minister tells us that he is the man who knows his job.

The Minister for Works: You know he does.

Mr. UNDERWOOD: If I, a layman, casually walking over the country, could tell this House that it would cost more than estimated to get through that range, then what sort of men have we in the Public Works Department? If the Minister has been misled, why does he not sack one of the men, or all of the men, connected with the business? Nobody has been dismissed. Everything is going on just as swimmingly and smoothly as ever.

The Minister for Works: That is all you know about it.

Mr. UNDERWOOD: There is another matter in which the intention of Parliament has been grossly violated, and that is as regards oil prospecting concessions. When we passed the measure dealing with that subject we gave the Minister full discretion, as we presumed he had some discretion. But those licenses to prospect for oil have all the ap-

pearance of a conspiracy. The first thing we knew was that every inch of Western Australia was taken up as oil prospecting areas.

Hon. P. Collier: By 36 individuals or companies.

Mr. UNDERWOOD: Yes, and at £5 a "nob." Men who are acquainted with mining legislation and with prospecting areas never in their wildest dreams thought that a prospecting area could be sub-let. Therefore we did not provide against the sub-letting of prospecting areas. Now, the prayer book says that you cannot marry certain people, but it does not say that a man shall not marry his grandmother, simply because no one expects he will want to marry his grandmother. Similarly, it was never expected by members of this House that a Minister would allow a prospecting area to be sub-let.

Hon. P. Collier: The original holders of those areas are asking large sums of money for what they took up at £5 a year.

Mr. UNDERWOOD: Yes, and they are getting scores of thousands of pounds by farming out the right to prospect. The Minister agrees to and approves of this farming out of oil areas, and even goes further, and grants the people who are farming out an extra five years to go on farming. I do not desire to speak at length on this oil prospecting business just now. I intend to ask hon. members to carry a motion directing the Government to forfeit all those oil areas which are not efficiently worked.

Hon. P. Collier: Hear, hear!

[The Deputy Speaker took the Chair.]

Mr. UNDERWOOD: I shall not discuss the matter in detail, but in dealing with those things which have been done by the Government against the decisions of Parliament, or in some cases without the authority of Parliament, I must mention the alleged prospecting areas for oil. Now I turn to what is, I suppose, really the only question we have before us—the great immigration scheme. Let me say again that in speaking on this scheme I do so only to point out some of the difficulties. I wish to prove to the House, if I can, that we must have better administration and considerable reduction of costs, or we shall go headlong into bankruptcy. What does the scheme propose? So far as I can learn, the Premier has secured the right to borrow £6,000,000. The Federal Government and the British Government will each pay one-third of the interest on that money for five years, after which the loan becomes ours. I sympathised with the Leader of the Opposition when he was trying to get at the facts of the matter. The Premier makes one statement; the Minister for the North-West and Education and waste, makes another statement; the "West Australian" publishes its figures; the "Sunday Times" comes along and points out what a foolish paper the "West Australian" is; and Mr. Lovekin of the "Daily News" has

also given his figures. Then the Premier tells us that every one of them is wrong. However, there are some things which the Premier has not told us. He says we shall get a loan of £6,000,000, and that for the loan we have to introduce 75,000 immigrants and place 6,000 of them in the South-West. As regards the Wheat Belt he tells us that things will go on as usual; that is, those who want our wheat lands will get through the Agricultural Bank as hitherto. Now let us take the proposition of introducing 75,000 immigrants in three years and the placing of 6,000 of them on farms. One can make fully improved farms in the South-West for £1,000 if that money is carefully expended. But in starting group settlements one has to deal with men and women who have never been used to Australian life, and more particularly are not used to clearing Australian land, who possibly have never used an axe in their lives. They are the people who are going to clear South-West land. With such labour the clearing will cost at least 10 per cent. more than with trained labour, with trained Australian axemen. Under the conditions proposed it will take at least £1,000 to make a farm. Six thousand farms, therefore would cost £6,000,000. The Premier tried to show us that we need not worry about the deficit, that these people who are coming here will pay our debts and get out of the £750,000 annual deficit. The revenue we shall get from these people, the Premier says, will clear off everything. Now wish to point out some of the difficulties. We are borrowing six millions, and the Premier said that those who borrowed the money would pay it back. I asked him, "What about the failures?" The Premier again replied, "Those who borrow the money will pay it back." I have had experience, and so have other members of this Chamber, to show that it is not always the person who borrows the money that pays it back. Sometimes the paying is done by the man who backed the bill. So far as this immigration scheme is concerned, we are backing the bill. I referred just now to the failures. In order to place 6,000 successful farmers one requires to handle at least 9,000, because a third of them at least will fail—I care not where they are drawn from. If we draw them from Australian farmers' sons, they would not all prove successes.

Mr. Lambert: Even if they had good seasons.

Mr. UNDERWOOD: That is so. We must allow for having to put 9,000 men on South-Western farms, thus providing for 3,000 failures. Again, there is the question of the payment of fares. The immigrant who is sent to this country gets a free passage. The British Government have passed an Act to enable them to spend up to 1½ millions a year, and three millions annually for the next 14 years, to assist in sending British immigrants to other parts of the British Empire. Are the other parts of the British Empire likely to want immigrants?

As I understand the Bill which passed through the House of Commons, that money may be expended on sending out immigrants.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: That is the position. The estimate was that it would cost about £8 a head.

Mr. UNDERWOOD: We have six States in Australia and with New Zealand, seven States. There are eight States in Canada, making the total up to 15. With the five Provinces in South Africa, the aggregate number of States reaches 20. Is Western Australia to get the whole of the money available, or only her share of one-twentieth of £3,000,000? On that basis, will it pay the State to bring in 25,000 immigrants? On that basis, we will find ourselves £300,000 or £400,000 down in bringing the immigrants to Western Australia! It is as well to look at this phase because it cuts out all the rest of the explanation about the immigrants paying off our deficit. As a matter of fact, if the scheme succeeds and we get all the Premier so optimistically expects of it, we cannot expect the immigrants to pay their way for the next ten years, much less to do anything in the direction of wiping off the deficit.

Mr. Davies: Is it not the responsibility of the Commonwealth to bring the immigrants to Australia?

Mr. UNDERWOOD: It may be the responsibility of the Commonwealth, but Western Australia is undertaking this responsibility. When we undertake such a responsibility, we should see where it is leading us. At the very least, we should take stock of the liabilities we are assuming.

Mr. Davies: So far as the passages are concerned?

Mr. UNDERWOOD: I now come to a question that every member of this House should consider. I refer to the deficit. For last year we had a deficit of some £700,000 odd. We have started off the first month of the present financial year with a bigger deficit than has been recorded in past years. Not only did we spend more in July last than in the previous July, but we collected less. Judging by that, our deficit will be greater, instead of less, at the end of the present financial year. The Governor's Speech and the speech delivered by the Premier hold out no possible hope of any attempt being made to reduce the deficit. All the Premier can say is that he will get if possible, more taxation. We heard a great deal from the Premier regarding the sinking fund, and there is no doubt that the provision made by previous administrations in Western Australia could have been very beneficial to this State had we kept our finances level. The position regarding the sinking fund is that we have repurchased about £5,000,000 or £6,000,000 worth of our stock. With regard to the interest, we have been fortunate in getting in face value our stocks to the extent of £1,000,000 less than was actually paid for it. That in itself is very fortunate for us, but while doing that, we have

been buying back stock, carrying 3½ per cent. interest, by borrowing to pay the deficit to the extent of nearly the same amount, at interest ranging from 5½ to 6 per cent. In the circumstances, our sinking fund is not helping us at all. On the contrary, we are getting further into the mire every day we live. One may ask, having made such a statement, what is the remedy? The first thing to be done towards balancing the ledger is to achieve economy in our administration, the elimination of absolute waste and the improvement of efficiency. We can take department after department, and we find there is a continual increase in the expenditure and in the number of civil servants employed. A sentence used by Mr. Stead, the Royal Commissioner who investigated the administration of the Railway Department, regarding the traffic branch, to the effect that the number of officers employed in this branch at the head office was altogether out of proportion to the work done, could be applied, I believe, to every Government department in Western Australia. Take the Education Department for example. In 1911—I go back to that year because that is the beginning of the drift—we expended £205,000; last year we expended £560,000. From 1911 to 1921, the statistics show that our population increased from 305,000 to 335,000. Thus we increased our population during a period of 10 years by 10 per cent.; we increased our expenditure on education by 170 per cent. or more. I ask hon. members: Are they sure there is no waste in that department?

Hon. P. Collier: A Royal Commission said, "No."

Mr. UNDERWOOD: I have expressed my opinion regarding that Royal Commission once or twice. In view of the circumstances at the present time, would it not be a fair thing if we went back to conditions obtaining in 1911? Were the conditions in 1911 so very bad? Can any hon. member notice any improvement for the expenditure of this enormous amount of money?

Mr. Mann: What was the increase for salaries?

Mr. UNDERWOOD: About 20 per cent.; the total increase was 170 per cent.

Hon. T. Walker: The question is: What was the increase in the number of children attending the schools?

Mr. UNDERWOOD: Then we have the Premier's Department, with only a paltry expenditure at the outset. In 1907 the expenditure was some £700. In 1911 it had increased to £800, leaving out the odd amounts. In 1922 the expenditure was £2,200.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: No. It was £119,000.

Mr. UNDERWOOD: Have we got any advantage for that expenditure? I admit we have got a man who can lay back and say, "Yes, we will see about this." Then we have the Public Works Department. For the last six years we have not carried out any public work of first class importance.

The only one costing much money was the Wyndham Meat Works. Although that was the only work of any importance carried out by the Public Works Department during the past six years, do we see any decrease in connection with that department? Are not officers of that department running up and down the stairs, thick as flies, just as they did when they were spending a few millions? All the department has done comprises a few renovations. The other day I saw four men levelling off a bit of ground to make a garden at the back of that ramshackle Barracks where the Public Works Department is housed. It took four men to do it! That is where our money is going. The Minister for Works who "knows his job" and is "a practical man," is in charge of the department. As Professor Murdoch says, "When you get a practical man, you are all right." So far as I know, giving cheek to the Mayor of Perth and being impudent to the Town Clerk comprise the Minister's long suit. Apart from that, I do not know there is much for which we can commend him.

Mr. Simons: Are those his virtues?

Mr. Lutey: He is the busy bee of the Cabinet.

Mr. UNDERWOOD: We have three rabbit-proof fences, including the outer fence, which we keep in repair. There are no rabbits east of the outer fence; there are any number of rabbits west of it and between the other two fences.

Mr. Chesson: That is quite true.

[The Speaker resumed the Chair.]

Mr. UNDERWOOD: The other day at Geraldia, I saw a rabbit shot inside the third fence, which was built by the Gascoyne Vermin Board. That rabbit was shot 350 miles inside the outer fence. We go to considerable expense in maintaining that outer fence and keep men riding up and down it. To my own knowledge, rabbits are 350 miles inside that fence, yet we talk of the extravagance of the Federal Government! We must have economy in our own Government departments before we can possibly start talking of the extravagance of the Federal Government. The only thing we can do, both as regards the State Government and the Federal Government, is to cut out this useless waste and inefficiency in our Government departments. Now I come to a department the operations of which I am able to check, because I know what they are doing. I refer to the Department for the North-West. The Minister for the North-West took a tour through the North-West—Kimberley districts, and he liked the country. He liked it so much that he hooked himself on to us as Minister.

The Minister for Works: You wanted him, didn't you?

Mr. UNDERWOOD: Who? I?

The Minister for Works: Yes, you.

Mr. UNDERWOOD: There are a lot of other places to which the Minister can hook himself, and if he would only hook himself to one of those other places, I can assure

the House that the people of Pilbara would appreciate it.

The Minister for Works: I understood that you wanted a North-West Department.

Hon. P. Collier: That does not say they wanted this particular Minister.

Mr. Troy: They wanted a local Minister.

Mr. UNDERWOOD: If hon. members peruse the Governor's Speech, they will find a good deal there about the North-West Department. They will find that 2½ acres of cotton are now coming into bearing at Violet Valley in the East Kimberleys.

Hon. P. Collier: They have built a shed on a jetty.

Mr. UNDERWOOD: No, they did not build one; a shed was extended. There is some thing about this business at Violet Valley that is not known by hon. members regarding cotton-growing and that is that it is utterly impossible. It is over 100 miles from the nearest port, which is Wyndham, over one of the worst roads in Western Australia. And this is where they have 2½ acres of cotton which will be in full bearing next year. Before the Minister went north, we had a good engineer who had with him an assistant, and both did practically all the work that was required from this end. Now we have a Commissioner for the North-West a secretary to the Department of the North-West, a technical assistant, a private secretary to the Commissioner, and an officer in charge. There are two or three rooms which are full of officers of the North-West Department, and in fact the officers are more numerous than the mosquitoes at East Perth.

Mr. Simons: Impossible.

Mr. UNDERWOOD: We find in the Governor's Speech that the Department completed 50 undertakings, including the building of jetties, goods sheds, hospitals, schools and stock route wells. As a matter of fact all that has been done is the ordinary amount of renovation, while so far as the wells are concerned, they replaced a bucket which had fallen down one of those wells.

Hon. P. Collier: All important enough to include in the Governor's Speech.

Mr. UNDERWOOD: Exactly. I went to the office of this Department the other day. I knew the Commissioner was away, and I knew also that the secretary was away. I asked for the officer in charge and a clerk came out. I said, "Are you in charge?" and his reply was that he was not, but that "so-and-so was in charge." "That is the man I want to see," I said, and the reply I got was, "I will ask whether he will see you." Then the clerk apologised to me and said, "You asked for the clerk in charge; I did not think you wanted the boss." We find that Meekatharra is included in the North-West Department.

Mr. Marshall: We have been adopted as well as you.

Mr. UNDERWOOD: When the Meekatharra Road Board require to communicate with the Government on any question they have to write to the Commissioner at Broome. Of



course the Commissioner may be there, but it is highly probable that he will not be there. The Governor's Speech sets out that the Commissioner has established his office at Broome, and it is a fact that the Government have purchased a residence there for him. I will undertake to say, however, that all the time the Commissioner has spent there has been not more than 14 days.

Mr. Teesdale: It is to his credit that his wife has been there.

Mr. UNDERWOOD: The people of Nullagine desired cheap excursions on the Meekatharra to Perth railway in the summer time—cheaper return fares when they wanted to visit the coast. Previously they would write either to the Minister for Railways or to the Commissioner for Railways. Now the letter is passed on to the Commissioner for the North-West, and the secretary for the North-West writes to the Railway Department, the secretary of the Railway Department writes back to the secretary of the North-West Department, and the secretary of the North-West Department passes the letter on to the road board at Nullagine. I may say that the Commissioner for the North-West made a grand tour the other day. He went to Wyndham by boat and there got a motor car to go through from Wyndham to Derby and possibly on to Broome. He took with him the secretary for the North-West Department, the technical assistant and, I think, his private secretary, and his wife. They had two motor cars and traveled *de luxe* through country where there is practically no work to be done. A postal inspector was travelling through the same country at the same time, and he was using mostly a horse and sulky, and at times the vehicular mail, not the motor mail. This officer travelled over the same country as the staff of the North-West Department. He went to Turkey Creek, Hall's Creek, Fitzroy Crossing, Derby, and then came down to Broome, Port Hedland, Marble Bar, Whim Creek, Roebourne and Carnarvon, and was in Fremantle before the Commissioner and his suite had got past Derby. That is what the Minister for the North-West, that extraordinary man of waste and inefficiency, is responsible for. Now we are asked to go further. We are told that an expert on tropical agriculture must be added to the staff of the North-West Department—there are not enough there yet.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: They must have one now that they have 2½ acres of cotton put in.

Mr. UNDERWOOD: If it is desired to examine that country, and if a definite proposition is put forward, one to which a man can go to carry on experiments, then an expert can do good work, but if he is to merely travel through the country and then come back here and report—

Hon. W. C. Angwin: And then go back again.

Mr. UNDERWOOD: All I can say is that we have quite enough reports already. We have

Mr. Despiessis' report, and the North-West Department, who are also looking after the publicity campaign, as they call it, have had that report reprinted. And then they re-hashed it, and added to it a slab supplied by the Minister. The next thing we shall have will be Despiessis rissoles. They say we want an expert on tropical agriculture. We already have quite a number of experts in the Agricultural Department. We have an expert on irrigation, and I think that there are fully two or three acres under irrigation. We have an assistant to the expert on irrigation.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: He is at Carnarvon looking for water in the river and cannot find it.

Mr. UNDERWOOD: He is not. He is in Perth now. If advice is wanted there are men in the service who can give it. But no, that will not do for the North-West Department; it would lower the status of that Department. What they want is a big man, one on whom they can spend £1,200 or £1,500 a year. There should be no shortage of agricultural experts. We have had a Chair of Agriculture at the University for the last ten years, and Professor Murdoch tells us that all we have to do is to get the University in good order to turn out experts.

Hon. P. Collier: To clean up kerosene tins.

[Mr. Munsie took the Chair.]

Mr. UNDERWOOD: To clean up the Legislative Council, to clean up this House, and to clean up everything which requires the services of experts. What has become of all the young fellows who were turned out from the University? Are they not available now? It would not add to the dignity of the North-West Department to have one of these; they must have one from outside. On the subject of irrigation, the Governor's Speech mentions that 70 blocks have been sold at Carnarvon, and that more are required. I do not care to condemn any place, but with regard to Carnarvon I wish to say that the proposition taken in hand is a very doubtful one. In this House I have listened to various hon. members, who have represented that district, talk about the growth of peanuts and bananas there, but when it comes to the real proposition I can assure the House that the water at Carnarvon, both in regard to supply and quality, is very doubtful. There are a few settlers there at the present time, and I advise the Government to give them every possible assistance to see whether it is possible for them to win through. But until they have proved successful not another sixpence should be spent on irrigation at Carnarvon. I have always held that the Government should not spend money without first getting advice, but when I read what Mr. Neville had to say, that there was any quantity of water in the river at Carnarvon for irrigation purposes, I can only reply that, while Mr. Neville is a very good officer, and is able to deal with those things

he knows something about, what he knows about water supply can be summed up in the one word "nothing." When I see that 70 blocks have been sold and that it is proposed to send returned soldiers there at a cost of £625 per man, I regard it as my duty to warn the House and Ministers. There are other departments I am not so well able to criticise. I know that there are confusion and overlapping in regard to group settlement and settlement on the land generally, work which is controlled by five or six departments, each of which is interfering with the other. The member for Collie (Mr. Wilson) will probably deal with that question or some phase of it, on the motion of which he has given notice. He is asking for the appointment of a Royal Commission and I am prepared to say that he will not put up a case for a Royal Commission; what he will do will be to condemn the Administration. We are becoming quite used to this multiplicity of departments and we are accepting it as something that is quite right. For instance, I notice that the member for Gascoyne (Mr. Angelo) recently wrote to the "Sunday Times" and seriously suggested that the North-West Department, acting in conjunction with the Tourist Department, should confer with the State Shipping Department with a view to inaugurating cheap excursion fares to enable amateur fishermen to go to Carnarvon.

Mr. Angelo: All good for trade.

Hon. P. Collier: It is not good for the State. Some attention might be given to that Tourist Department.

Mr. UNDERWOOD: The hon. member is quite right in that. Is it not work that should be done in the Railway Department?

Hon. P. Collier: They are making a hash of what they already have to do. Have you seen the advertisement in the dining car?

Mr. UNDERWOOD: Yes. If one were looking for curios he ought to go and have a look at those. In regard to the overlapping of departments, the "Sunday Times" says—

It is generally admitted that the departmental expenditure has been cut down to the irreducible minimum, unless wholesale retrenchment is to be introduced. This, however, should be avoided if possible, owing to the effect it would have on the commercial world, and that there will be no ability to absorb the retrenched men, who would go to swell the unemployed.

Are we to keep men there because, if retrenched, they would swell the unemployed, or should we not put them out on group settlements? It is not only the money we are needlessly paying, but it is that, with a multiplicity of officers, the work is not so well done. The axiom, "Too many cooks spoil the broth," is not quite so applicable to anything else in life as it is to a public service. We are not only wasting money, but we are giving bad service. Yet the "Sunday Times" says it would affect the commercial world, and that we would have

no ability to absorb them. So much for the expenditure side. How do the Government propose to make it up? By taxation. The Federal Government do the same. All the waste and inefficiency has to be paid for by taxation, not only direct taxation but taxation by railway freights, harbour dues and other imposts. This taxation is materially retarding the development of the State, and is a big factor in maintaining the high cost of commodities. The Government have not introduced any Bill which is not a taxation measure, an agency for collecting taxation. Take the Licensing Bill. Its failure to pass the House actually upset the Premier's estimates of revenue and expenditure. Then there is the Machinery Inspection Act, purely a taxing measure.

Hon. P. Collier: It is payment for services.

Mr. UNDERWOOD: It is certainly a vexatious Act. The number of accidents that have occurred in machinery are not a small percentage of those which result from carelessness in getting in the way of motor-cars and other vehicles, or from driving horses, or from falling down. Yet we must have a tax-gathering Bill to apply to machinery. Practically the whole of that tax will be expended on a battalion of inspectors. This is suggested by the very regulations framed for the examination of those inspectors. All those non-producers will be well paid for looking after the poor unfortunate producer who is using a 2-horse power oil engine. It is our duty, not only to balance the ledger but, if we are to render the State prosperous, also to reduce our taxation and our cost of government. Sir Henry Barwell, of South Australia, and others, have been declaring that wages must come down. I am prepared to say that wages will not come down until the cost of commodities comes down. While the Government are imposing vexatious taxation and keeping a horde of unnecessary and useless public servants, those costs cannot come down. It is absurd for Barwell to talk about wages coming down. The wages men are not going to carry the whole of the burden; others will have to do their bit. Excessive costs of commodities have closed down our metal mines, with the result that we are losing revenue on the railways and other services. The only means of getting those mines working again is to reduce our costs, and we cannot do that while we have Ministers wasting money and collecting taxation, direct and indirect. We must have economy in administration. We must have Ministers prepared to face the proposition for reducing, and even cutting out, useless expenditure. The whole of our debts have to be paid by the primary producers, including miners, woolgrowers, meat growers, shearers, gardeners, and others. Those debts must be paid by exportation, and the struggling primary producers must be relieved of those excessive costs. They can only be relieved by the Government cutting down expenditure, cutting down taxa-

tion, and thereby giving a start to the reduction of the prices of general commodities.

[The Speaker resumed the Chair.]

Mr. ANGELO (Gascoyne) [6.10]: I desire to welcome our Premier home again and to thank him for the good work he accomplished in England, and for his able representation of this State in the Motherland. He must have made a good impression at Home. His outstanding honesty and optimism must have had a very good effect, especially among the financiers, to whom we have to look for the development of this huge State. The chief business of this session, and indeed for the next five years, will be the carrying out of the immigration scheme made possible by the Premier's visit to the Old Land. The success of that scheme will depend almost wholly on its administration here in Western Australia. If the scheme is not well administered it will be a very serious thing for the State. The scheme will mean one of two things: either by its successful administration we shall be able to get out of our financial difficulties, and in a few years square the ledger, or, if the scheme be not well administered, we shall get into so deplorable a condition that the State will have to acknowledge that it is bankrupt, and be taken over by the Federal Government. Two years ago the North-West members approached the Government and pointed to the necessity for populating the North, showing what a menace the empty North was to the Empire, and urging the Government to draw the attention of the Imperial Government to the position, with a view to obtaining without interest a large sum of money for the development of the North. We now find that that policy has been adopted; but, instead of any of the money being spent in the North-West, it is all to be spent in the South-West.

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

Mr. ANGELO: Before tea I was directing attention to the fact that nearly two years ago the North-West members advocated the borrowing of money for the development of the North. We pointed out how important it was from a defence point of view to have this part of the State, situated so close to teeming millions of foreigners, properly developed and peopled in order that it might no longer be one of the most vulnerable parts of the British Empire. The policy was adopted by the Government. They secured no less a sum than £6,000,000, but we now find that the whole of this money is to be spent in the South-West. The Government might well have divided it on a 33 per cent. basis, two millions to be spent in the South-West, two millions on the wheat areas, and at least two millions in the North. The Speech deals rather briefly with this matter. It states—

My advisers have long felt that not only the material prosperity of Western Australia, but its safety as a white State in the Imperial Commonwealth of Nations,

depend upon a rapid increase of population and production.

Which is the more necessary—to populate the South-West situated something like 3,000 miles further away from the great menace that exists in the North, or populate and develop the North, which is only about 2½ days' sail from these teeming millions of foreigners? At from 2½ to seven days' sail of the North-West there are nearly a thousand millions of people, increasing at a rate per annum greater than the population of the whole of Australia. If the Government intend to give due consideration to this problem, and populate this State as a measure of safety, the North-West should certainly receive a share, if not the greater share, of their attention. We are all very pleased that the Premier succeeded in reaching an agreement with the Imperial and the Commonwealth Governments, but I hope that the Premier and members of this House will not lose sight of the fact that neither the Imperial Government nor the Commonwealth Government is giving very much away. I am perfectly satisfied that Mr. Hughes, before agreeing to anything in the nature of a concession, took jolly good care to ensure that he would get a quid pro quo. I think he realises that under this agreement the Federal Government are going to score very materially, if not during the five years in which the agreement will operate, then immediately afterwards. The Federal Government have agreed to pay one-third of the interest during the five years which, according to my calculation, works out at £480,000. The per capita grant of 25s. will add another £281,000, making a total of £761,000. But the Federal Government collect from every man, woman and child throughout the whole of Australia a sum of £5 17s. per head for Customs duties alone, not taking into consideration any direct taxation whatsoever. Western Australia, being a consuming State, is considered to pay at least 10s. to 15s. extra but, for the sake of easy calculation, I have estimated that the Commonwealth will collect £6 per head from the new settlers. During the five years' currency of the agreement, this will represent £1,800,000 as against the £761,000 which the Commonwealth Government will give to the State in the way of interest and per capita grant. We are told that the Commonwealth Government are going to pay the fares of the people who are coming out to this State, amounting to about £1,200,000. During the five years' currency of the agreement, therefore, the Federal Government will obtain from these new people alone a sum equivalent to the whole of their expenditure by way of interest, the per capita grant and boat fares. And after that, what will happen? The liability of the Commonwealth will cease and Western Australia must carry the baby. From that time on, the Federal Government will get £450,000, if not more, every year by way of Customs taxation alone from these people. We know that it will not be necessary to largely increase the Customs staff in order to collect this extra revenue, so that if there—

is no profit to the Federal Government for the first five years, there will thereafter be a profit of something like half a million a year going into the coffers of the Federal Government from the very people they have assisted us to secure. Therefore, we have not very much to thank the Federal Government for in helping us to get these immigrants. The British Government, on the other hand, have to pay enormous sums of money every year to cope with their unemployed difficulty.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: You must remember that these people contribute towards it.

Mr. ANGELO: Quite so, but it is good business for the Imperial Government and for the people of Britain to send emigrants to dominions under their own flag and thus relieve themselves of this huge responsibility. The Premier said that the 75,000 immigrants contemplated would be only a small instalment, and that he hoped to see many more instalments of 75,000 coming to Western Australia. I trust that when future arrangements are made, the advantages thus accruing to the Imperial Government and to the Commonwealth Government will not be overlooked. I hope to see more than 75,000 people coming out to settle in this State. We have five years in which to settle 6,000 people on farms, and the Premier has told us he intends to expend about three millions of money on them and about three millions on the Wheat Belt. If this money is spent on the Wheat Belt, some of it should be coming back to the Treasury before the whole of the 6,000 farms have been settled, so, this appears to be rather good business. If we can develop the Wheat Belt almost immediately, then by the time the last of the batch of settlers arrives here, some of the money advanced should be flowing back to the Treasury. From the experience of recent years, it does not take long for a farmer to get a handsome return. Let us hope that these conditions will continue. I am not one who imagines that six millions of money will be sufficient. Up to the present we have been borrowing money at the rate of two millions a year, and I think it will be necessary to continue to borrow at this rate. We cannot stop development in other directions while we spend the six millions of money. I feel certain that much greater expenditure will be involved and that we shall have to look forward to increasing our indebtedness by something like 15 or 16 millions before the five years have expired. Regarding the inspection of emigrants, I noticed in the "British Medical Journal" a complaint that the doctors are allowed only 4s. a head for examining these people, and it states that a demand of 10s. 6d. per head will be made for this work. We cannot expect very much from a doctor in the way of a certificate of health or physical fitness for 4s.

Mr. Clydesdale: He has only to interview them, not examine them.

Mr. ANGELO: Quite so, but I think it would be good business for the Government

to send Home a doctor to undertake this work. A doctor with a knowledge of the conditions and climate of Western Australia would be in a far better position to judge of the class of people we require than would a doctor at Home.

Mr. Davies: Australian doctors are examining them now.

Mr. ANGELO: If the Government sent Home a doctor at a salary of about £1,500 a year and he examined 25,000 emigrants, even at 2s. 6d. a head the cost would be £3,250.

Mr. J. H. Smith: Nationalise the profession.

Mr. ANGELO: It is not a matter of nationalising the profession. It is merely a matter of having our own medical man attached to the Agent General's staff in order to save a big sum of money. Allowing 4s. per head for the examination of 25,000 people, the cost would be £5,000. We ought to be able to get a good man for £1,500 a year and under this system, apart from the saving, we would be assured of a proper selection of suitable people. There is one matter connected with the administration of the scheme we must take into serious consideration. When a business is started with a capital of half a million it is usual to appoint an efficient manager to look after it, and that manager is usually paid an excellent salary. We have before us a scheme involving the expenditure of six millions. The wise administration and proper carrying out of that scheme must greatly affect the position of the State from a financial point of view. We may lose our sovereign rights and be absorbed by the Federal Government unless this State, and the scheme especially, are administered in a proper manner. This House should take into consideration the advisability of providing our Ministers with more assistance. Queensland, New South Wales, and Victoria represent the eastern third of Australia and Western Australia represents the western third. The facilities for travel in those three States are better than they are here, and yet Queensland has nine Ministers, New South Wales 12, and Victoria also 9. There are thus 30 State Ministers found to be necessary in those States to govern the eastern third of the Commonwealth, whereas in Western Australia we only have six. In addition there are 12 Federal Ministers who spend nearly all their time in the more populous States. Ministers are expected to attend numerous ceremonial functions such as the opening of halls and the like, and all that work is thrown upon our six Ministers.

Mr. Simons: Why not a Minister for functions and junketing?

Mr. Lufey: Why not a travelling Minister?

Mr. ANGELO: Our Ministers are twitted in the Press with doing too much travelling about the State, but on the other hand, they are constantly receiving complaints from local authorities and others in different parts

of the State that they are not doing their work because they never visit those parts.

Mr. Lutey: Why not appoint a travelling Minister?

Mr. ANGELO: Not at all. The work should be divided so that Ministers can get about the State and so understand the conditions that exist there. Another place has had to go into recess because the Leader of that House has been obliged to visit the Eastern States. The Minister for Education not only has to lead the Legislative Council, but has to make himself conversant with every Bill submitted to that Chamber. He must know a great deal about the finances of the State to answer questions on that subject, and in addition is called upon to administer three of the most important spending departments of State, namely, Justice, Education, and the North-West. Even if it cost a little more it would be of advantage to the State to give Mr. Colebatch another Minister in that House. The adjournments that would be saved in the Legislative Council would soon more than account for the salary of an extra Minister.

[Mr. Piesse took the Chair.]

Hon. W. C. Angwin: A year's adjournment there would not make much difference.

Mr. ANGELO: If the extra Minister took over the Departments of Education and Justice, and left to Mr. Colebatch the control of the North-West, we should get much better results. In this House we find the Colonial Secretary has been ordered a rest of some weeks.

Hon. P. Collier: That is because you people have worried him so.

Mr. Simons: It is the conference.

Mr. ANGELO: Ministers have their noses so constantly on the grindstone, both in their offices and in Parliament, that their health sometimes suffers.

Mr. Simons: It is because they have been squeezed by the outside juntas.

Mr. ANGELO: The juntas have not started to put on any pressure yet. It is necessary to have another Minister in this House. One man is required to control the immigration scheme alone. We are going to spend six million pounds in developing the State, and it is intended to add this duty to the present duties of one Minister. We have no Minister representing the metropolitan area, and, if an additional Minister is appointed, I should like to see a metropolitan member placed in the position. The future of the State is in the balance. If possible I should like to see party politics set aside. I should also like to see one of the members of the Opposition assisting the Government. During the war it would have been a jolly good thing for the State if the Leader of the Opposition and another member of his team could have been induced to assist the Government.

Mr. Corboy: The Leader of the Opposition may have to keep the Government in office after next week.

Mr. ANGELO: The invitation was extended to them but not accepted. Failing that I should like to see national labour representatives in Cabinet, that is, another Minister in the Upper House and one in this Chamber. It is necessary that we should have two additional Ministers. No doubt the extra expense will be objected to. What does an extra £2,000 a year mean against what we are likely to lose if the immigration scheme is not properly administered and every little detail scrutinised? The work cannot be efficiently done by a team of six men. The Government have to administer and develop not only the whole of the South-West of this State but the vast territory of the North-West as well. I hope the idea will appeal to members and that we shall hear their views upon it. I have been surprised during the last few days to learn from one or two ex-Imperial soldiers that they have been refused assistance by the Government, not only through the soldier settlement scheme, but that they have been told that they cannot participate in any scheme in connection with the settlement of soldiers on the land. I hope that is not so.

Mr. Mann: Why were they refused?

Mr. ANGELO: They told me they were informed that the scheme was not for them. The soldier settlement scheme authorities endorsed that statement and said it was only for Australian soldiers. This is a question that should be gone into. If we are to use Imperial money we must not turn down Imperial soldiers, provided everything else is in their favour. I do not want to see men, who are not fitted, settled on farms in this way, but everything else being in order they should have extended to them the same facilities and assistance that have been meted out to our own people. The member for Pilbara (Mr. Underwood) rather made fun of the invitation that was extended by the Premier to the Leader of the Opposition to visit England. I cannot endorse his attitude, and am of opinion that the Premier did quite right. Last session the Leader of the Opposition and many of his followers here promised to help the Premier to place the State in a better financial position and assist him in developing it. What else could the Premier be expected to do than answer such an invitation by inviting the Leader of the Opposition to proceed to England to assist him in his great scheme.

Mr. Corboy: Not to proceed with him, but to follow after him, and commit himself to what the Premier had done.

Mr. ANGELO: I am sure that did not enter into the mind of the Premier. What he wanted to do was to impress the people there with the fact that he had the Opposition in this Parliament with him, and that all parties and sections of the State agreed it was necessary to develop this State and people it with a white race. I am glad to see in the Speech this year that we have a longer reference to the North-West. Four years ago it was mentioned in four lines, in

the following year in five lines, and last year in seven lines, and now there are four paragraphs devoted to it.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: That cost £15,000.

Mr. ANGELO: The printing?

Hon. W. C. Angwin: No, the report.

Mr. ANGELO: The member for Pilbara somewhat belittled the North-West Department. This was formed above five years ago, and the hon. member was its first Minister. He then had an opportunity of doing a great deal more than he did. During the last 18 months, whilst the department has been in the hands of Mr. Colebatch, the North-West has been brought into greater prominence not only here, but before the outside world. I agree with the member for Pilbara that the Department is trying to take over functions which it was never intended it should take over. We understood the department was created with the object of ascertaining how development should take place, and generally supervising the activities of the various other Government departments operating in the North-West. I regret to find it is now absorbing the functions of these other departments, which is not good government. Public Works officials who were engaged in the North-West have been transferred from that department to the North-West department. I am sure none of the members representing the North-West contemplated such a departure. Even road boards have been taken from the control of the Minister for Works and put under the control of this new department.

The Minister for Works: Could you have two authorities in the same place?

Mr. ANGELO: I thought it was intended that the department should make full inquiries as to whether a certain job was required and satisfy the Government that it was necessary, the job then being handed over to the department concerned to carry out. If, for instance, a new school was required the department would ascertain the facts of the position, and if recommended the Public Works Department would erect the building and the Education Department provide the teacher. But I am afraid that with those two authorities, as suggested by the Minister for Works, there is a great deal of overlapping. In the matter of selection of land, applicants who write to the North-West Department find that they are deprived of land because they have not written to the Lands Department, and those who write to the Lands Department find that the matter has been dealt with by the North-West Department. However, the position can be rectified. Members representing the North-West should be called to a conference with the Minister on the subject. The member for Pilbara (Mr. Underwood) referred to closer settlement on the Gascoyne, saying that it is doubtful whether there is sufficient water and doubtful whether the quality of the water is what it should be. Some years ago Mr. Despeissis was sent by the Government to report on the advisableness of closer set-

tlement in the North-West, and with regard to water supplies he said—

During my trip I collected a number of samples of well water for analysis, in order to ascertain their value for irrigation or watering purposes. Whereas stock, and particularly sheep, can drink water fairly heavily charged with salt, viz., 300 grains per gallon, plants require fresher water; and it would be unsafe to use continuously and extensively for purposes of irrigation water containing more than 70 grains of salt to the gallon.

[The Deputy Speaker took the Chair.]

He took away about 100 samples of water and had them analysed. At the very place where settlement is now taking place there were then several wells. Four of them are situated on the eastern, northern, and southern boundaries of the settlement. Analysis shows that the town supply contains only 13.39 grains of salt to the gallon. The well on the north of the settlement is shown to contain only 8.66 grains to the gallon. The well on the western boundary contains 12.36. At Brickhouse Station the well is shown by analysis to contain only 24.09 grains of salt to the gallon. So that all these sources of supply are well within the limit Mr. Despeissis suggests as water fit for irrigation. The member for Pilbara says that there have been about 70 blocks sold. That is not quite right, because some dozen or 20 of these blocks are away from the river frontage and at my suggestion the Lands Department have kept them back from sale. I am firmly of opinion that any water drawn for irrigation purposes should be drawn from the river itself, which we know contains fresh water fit for irrigation. Only 55 blocks have actually been sold, and as a man and his wife are allowed to take two blocks between them, it means that we have about 30 settlers on the estate at the present time. A few additional blocks have lately been cut up, but these are required for a syndicate of banana growers, who are coming from Queensland. They have taken up this land and will start banana growing on it. They have visited the locality, and selected these blocks. Having made full inquiries as to the conditions, they think, and rightly so, that the conditions are thoroughly good and suitable for the purposes to which the land is to be applied. These growers are selling out at Cairns, owing to the high freight on bananas from Cairns to Sydney. They have been starved out of their market by the banana growers around Brisbane, from which city the freight to Sydney is much cheaper. Further, I would like to say that the Government are assisting only three of these settlers, three returned soldiers. Government assistance is not to be extended any further. These three settlers are to do the experimental work. All the other settlers are finding their own capital to carry on their operations. Out of the three returned soldiers two are men who were

born up there and know the conditions and have decided to make the Gascoyne their future home. On the question of water, I am with the member for Pilbara (Mr. Underwood) and the member for North-East Fremantle (Hon. W. C. Angwin) in the opinion that it is necessary to exercise caution. I consider that there is abundance of water on the spot to irrigate a large number of blocks. The river is about three-quarters of a mile wide, and has a 60ft. depth of sand, proving that there is a subterranean flow of water, a flow which is never exhausted. At one period the river did not run for five years, and still the water fell only 18 inches. I have mentioned these various matters only by way of reply to the member for Pilbara. At my suggestion, which was approved by the Colonial Secretary, who was on the trip, no further settlers are to be placed in that locality until it has been proved that those who are now there have made good, and that there is abundance of water for them and for additional settlers. The member for Pilbara seems to belittle the idea of getting a tropical expert for the North-West. For my part I would rather see a tropical expert there than a Minister, or a Commissioner, and all the other officers. Without the assistance of tropical experts—we ought to have several—it will not be possible to do much good up there in the way of land settlement. I know of instances in which large amounts of money have been spent on settlement in the North-West, and in some cases lost because the people concerned did not know what to grow or how to grow it. It is up to the Government to see that assistance is granted in the shape of advice from men who know what should be grown and how to grow it. Just look at the number of experts we have in the South. As the member for Pilbara pointed out, we have two irrigation experts down here; and how many acres of irrigation are there in the South-West? For the North-West, where there are possibilities of large development as regards irrigation, we have suggested the appointment of a tropical expert without result for the last four years. I repeat, it is necessary that not one but several tropical experts should be appointed. I desire to compliment the member for Roebourne (Mr. Teesdale) on the steps he has taken to secure a man with a knowledge of tropical agriculture to come here and see for himself what can be done. There is another matter which I have suggested in this House several times, and wish to suggest again. It has frequently been pointed out in the Press by people who have visited the North that up there avenues of development exist in the way of closer settlement. But we have not in this State an engineer who knows anything about the conserving of water in dry rivers. Now, in India of late years, tens of millions of acres of what was originally desert have been converted into verdant provinces simply by the knowledge and experience of engineers who have been engaged in this kind of work for a considerable time. I again urge our Government to communicate

with the Indian authorities and request the loan of one of these engineers for six or twelve months.

Mr. Davies: What does the Commissioner for the North-West say about it?

Mr. ANGELO: The matter has been put to him time after time, but so far nothing has resulted from our suggestions. The Government say, "Look at the expense." But I feel sure that the expense would be very little indeed. For my part I feel perfectly sure that if a request of this kind were made by the Western Australian Government to the Indian authorities they would send the engineer along and charge nothing. Even if we had to pay the engineer's fare, what would it mean? We have all heard of this marvellous Millstream. An engineer who understood his work might be able to turn that district into a great province. And there is not only the Gascoyne, but also the Ashburton, the Fitzroy, the De Grey and many other rivers further north. All those districts are waiting development by somebody who knows the job. But I am afraid that we have not at the present time in Western Australia a man to tell us how those places should be developed. I am glad to learn from the Governor's Speech that a jetty is about to be constructed at Beadon Point. The Onslow district has been sadly neglected in the past, and one of the first works which ought to be carried out is certainly the construction of that jetty. Here I wish again to suggest that careful investigation be made as to how the jetty should be built. The jetty at Carnarvon, where the teredo is not so bad as it is further north, is a constant source of expense to the State. It is necessary to replace piles in it at nearly all times of the year. Almost as soon as the engineers get from one end of the jetty to the other, they have to go back and start over again.

The Minister for Works: A considerable portion of the Beadon jetty is concrete, and the other piles will be sheathed with concrete.

Mr. ANGELO: I am glad to hear it. I suppose the initial expense will be very much greater, but there will not be the constantly recurring expense to keep the structure up. Now I come to a matter of vital importance to my district, and that is the construction of the Carnarvon-Killili railway. As appears from the Press, this project has been turned down by Mr. Tindale as not a payable concern. The following is the extent of the report of the Engineer-in-Chief, Mr. Thompson, on the same subject:—

Mr. Tindale's report hereunder is submitted for the information of the Minister.

I am of opinion that financially the proposition is not justified.

Some three years ago, at the desire of the pastoralists of the Gascoyne, I approached the Government with a request that Mr. Tindale should be sent to Carnarvon to inspect the probable site of the meat works, and also to frame an estimate of the cost of a works capable of dealing with 150,000 sheep per

annum, the estimate being required for submission to a number of graziers with a view to the flotation of a company. Mr. Tindale and Mr. Dalton both went, and the result of the visit was that they submitted a report, estimating the cost of the works to be between £70,000 and £130,000—only a margin of 90 per cent. for safety. Not being satisfied with that, we obtained the opinion of an expert freezing engineer.

Mr. Underwood: Not Dunkerley?

Mr. ANGELO: No. I am afraid the member for Pilbara (Mr. Underwood) is not conversant with the facts. Instead of asking for an estimate for works with a capacity of 150,000 head, we asked for an estimate for double the capacity. That is to say, we asked for an estimate for double the size of the works, estimates for which had been given by Mr. Tindale. That gentleman gave us a quotation of £55,000 for the job. Unfortunately, we have had to increase the works since then and they have cost £90,000. That, however, is for three times the capacity of the works, the estimate for which Mr. Tindale gave as between £70,000 and £130,000.

The Minister for Works: What are you trying to prove?

Mr. ANGELO: I am trying to prove that Mr. Tindale's estimates are unduly inflated, and I can prove that from his report.

Mr. Underwood: You cannot prove it.

Mr. ANGELO: Mr. Tindale says that this line will cost £420,000 to build. Within the last few days I have interviewed two or three firms of contractors who have carried out railway works, and they guaranteed that, if the construction of the line were put up for tender, they would submit a tender of under £300,000. One firm are prepared to put up £7,000 required for the survey, provided they are allowed to tender.

The Minister for Works: Does that include—

Mr. ANGELO: It includes everything.

The Minister for Works: All right; you should take it.

Mr. ANGELO: It does not include rolling stock.

Mr. Underwood: It works out at about £3,000 a mile.

Mr. ANGELO: That is so. One of the firms is prepared to put up the deposit to provide for the survey, on condition that the Government will carry on the work.

The Minister for Works: You know what rails will cost?

Mr. ANGELO: I have said what the firm is prepared to do.

Mr. Davies: Would the line be of a standard similar to the Government railways?

Mr. ANGELO: Yes, like the Wongan Hills-Mullewa railway.

The Minister for Agriculture: That is, provided the Government will carry the baby.

Mr. ANGELO: I will refer to that aspect later on. Mr. Tindale says in his report—

The warranty for the railway is bound up in whether the line will pay interest on

capital expended, or, should it drop short in its ability to do this, whether the prospects of successful settlement and expansion are such as in the interests of the developmental policy espoused by the Government would justify expenditure entailed in construction. The country which this proposed railway would traverse does not present any great engineering difficulties from a construction point of view; the route would be as approximately delineated by red line on litho. attached; the distance from Carnarvon to the proposed terminus at Killili townsite via the proposed route is approximately 105 miles. The country is sparsely timbered, and for the most part pastoral at present, although much of it offers considerable promise of ultimately being used for other production; evidence of its fertility is given in the amount of cultivation—although limited at present—that has been undertaken in the vicinity of Carnarvon and at other points along the river—

Now I come to a part to which I particularly desire to draw attention—

I append a statement showing probable traffic and revenue. The figures in that statement are based on freight at 1s. per ton per mile, as suggested by Mr. E. H. Angelo, M.L.A.; in view, however, of the position that the rates of the Railway Department over the Port Hedland-Marble Bar railway are fixed at 6d. per ton per mile, I cannot see how that department, under whose control the new railway would be operated, could sustain the rate of 1s. per ton per mile, or one any higher than that which obtains on the Port Hedland line.

Mr. Underwood: Not more. I do not think so, either.

Mr. ANGELO: I would ask the member for Pilbara why Mr. Stead, who is acting as a Royal Commissioner to report upon the railways, has gone to Marble Bar?

Mr. Underwood: Why has he gone?

Mr. ANGELO: I think I can tell the hon. member; he will report on the advisability of taking up the railway there because it does not pay.

The Minister for Works: That was advised long ago.

Mr. ANGELO: Then we will find that the people there will be willing to offer 1s. per ton per mile rather than have the line torn up.

Mr. Underwood: They will not offer that.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. ANGELO: The people in my electorate are perhaps more unfortunate, for they do not have good roads, and they have to pay from 1s. 6d. to 1s. 9d. per ton to have their goods taken to the port and out to their stations.

Mr. Underwood interjected.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! I must ask the member for Pilbara to keep order.

Mr. ANGELO: In discussing this matter with the people at Carnarvon, I told them



that they would have to be prepared to pay 1s. per ton per mile until such time as the earnings of the railway warranted a reduction in the rates. I told them that they could not look for any relief until the freight earnings were sufficient to cover interest, sinking fund and working expenses. Mr. Tindale has worked out the prospective earnings on the basis of 6d., and also on the basis of 1s. He has made a mistake, for, instead of basing his figures on my estimate of 14,000 bales of wool, he has quoted 12,000 bales, on which basis he has put down the freight to be carried as 1,800 tons. Our bales are considerably heavier than that; I suppose it is because the wool is a little more earthy.

Mr. Underwood: It is more sandy.

Mr. ANGELO: Our bales average five to the ton and we should have 2,400 tons to be conveyed over the railway, instead of the 1,800 tons on which Mr. Tindale bases his estimate. This is probably due to a clerical error.

Mr. Mann: That would provide only six train loads!

Mr. ANGELO: There are other items. On a basis of 2,400 tons of wool at 1s. per ton per mile, under Mr. Tindale's estimate, it would give £12,600. For skins and hides the earnings would be £500—I am quoting Mr. Tindale's estimate at 1s. per ton per mile—station stores, of which 1,000 tons would probably be carried, £5,250; 200,000 sheep at 1s. 6d., £15,000. In that connection, it is interesting to note that 2s. is paid on the Port Hedland-Marble Bar railway over the same distance.

Mr. Underwood: Is that right?

Mr. ANGELO: Yes. Other items include: mails, £150; passengers, £1,500; sandalwood, £1,575; firewood, £300; and miscellaneous consignments, £500. These give a total estimated earning, according to Mr. Tindale's figures, of £37,375. On the other side of the ledger, basing the cost of the railway on £300,000, at which figure I am perfectly certain we can get the line constructed, the annual expenditure for interest on that capital, and on £22,000 for the survey and rolling stock, would be £17,710. The working expenses would be £12,000, according to Mr. Tindale's estimate, including provision for interest, depreciation and so on, making a total of £29,710. As against that, the earnings, according to Mr. Tindale, would be £37,375.

The Minister for Works: You could not operate for less.

Mr. ANGELO: I am quoting Mr. Tindale's figures. He gives the working expenses as £12,000, on the capital cost of £300,000; the cost of survey £7,000; and the cost of rolling stock £15,000. Interest on £322,000 at  $5\frac{1}{2}$  per cent. would total £17,710. On these figures, a profit is shown of £7,665 for the first year the line is operated. Yet Mr. Tindale regards the proposition as financially unsound! The seven points I tried to make when I advocated the

construction of this line two years ago were as follows:—

1, It will give improved facilities for the carriage of mails and passengers, not only to the North-West but to the districts adjacent thereto.

2, It will benefit stock owners in the North-West, and what benefits stock owners benefits the whole State.

3, It will reduce the cost of conveying meat to the metropolitan market.

4, It would mean more wool, meat, skins, tallow, and other products for export and for local consumption, thus again benefiting the State.

5, It will mean insurance against loss of stock depasturing, not only in the Gascoyne district, but in other districts as well.

6, The building of the railway will mean a large increase to the State revenue in land rents, and in land and income tax and other taxes, in the shape of payments made by those directly benefited.

7, The railway will assist the development of the mining industry.

The construction of this line would open up about six million acres, comprising country which is at present carrying only a few head of cattle. It is impossible to carry sheep from such a distance to the port, but if the line were constructed, that country would carry sheep at the rate of about one to every 15 acres. I need not say any more regarding the advantage of the line from the standpoint of mining development, but I ask the Government to give this matter serious consideration. If we want to develop the North-West, the only way by which this can be achieved is by the construction of spur lines from the coast to the hinterland. Such a policy would open up vast areas of country now unused. We must give facilities for the railing of stock and products to the port. I think I can prove that this line will be payable from the very inception.

Mr. Lambert: At 1s. per ton per mile?

Mr. ANGELO: Yes, we are paying up to 1s. 9d. now.

Mr. Lambert: What are you paying now all through?

Mr. ANGELO: Had the hon. member been here, he would have heard the figures I read.

Mr. Lambert: I would probably have been asleep by now.

Mr. ANGELO: I was glad to note that the Minister for the North-West said that he was in favour of building workers' homes, not only in the South-West but in the North-West.

Mr. Teesdale: He will not give us some school forms worth about a "tenner," although we have been trying to get them for months past.

Mr. ANGELO: A long time ago I brought down applications for 22 workers' homes at Carnarvon, but we have not got one yet. I hope that what we are promised in that direction by the Minister will speedily come to pass. Regarding the development of

the State, I compliment the Minister for Agriculture on his administration, because there is no doubt that he has been doing a great deal of good work since he has been in office—

Mr. Lambert: Now, what are you going to ask for?

Mr. ANGELO: I am afraid that the Minister's viewpoint seems to be more in the direction of wheat and the products of the South-West than elsewhere. I think we should endeavour to increase our cattle and sheep in the North-West. Recently we had a report from Mr. Easton, a surveyor, who verified what has already been stated in this Chamber, that there are tens of millions of acres of well watered and well grassed country between Wyndham and Derby, which await development. We will never get people to go there unless we can give them a jumping off point. The Government should consider the advisability of opening up a port between Wyndham and Derby. The late Lord Forrest sent an expedition to Wyndham and established head-quarters there; and so that vast, wealthy province was developed. The Government ought to send up an expedition consisting of 100 or 200 men ready to embark on the cattle-raising industry. A new port would be opened from which they could work out, at first in groups, until the danger from natives was overcome. The State ought to be able to carry four times the number of sheep it is carrying to-day, namely, about seven millions. The question of reducing the area of stations has often been discussed. I do not believe in repudiation. No Government should deprive a man of his rights under his lease. But I would be prepared to support an amendment of the Land Act by the insertion of a provision that any person with a station to sell should first of all give the Government an option of purchase. The Government could have the property surveyed and subdivided into four or even six stations. The Premier has urged that our acreage under fruit and vines should be vastly increased. Before we can do that, it is necessary to see that the English consumers are supplied with better quality fruit than is being sent to them at present. Here is a letter received last week from a firm of brokers at Home—

We are sorry to say the market is quite sick, which has been mainly brought about by the poor condition of the fruit recently arrived. It is up to your Agricultural Department to endeavour to ascertain the cause of the fruit turning out in such poor condition this season, a condition which has never been experienced in previous seasons. We cannot understand it. To all outward appearance the fruit is sound, but on being cut open the interior is found to be brown, and in some cases absolutely rotten round the core. We fear very much that this season is going to finish up very badly. Here is a letter from another English firm of fruit brokers—

We must say that, taking the season as a whole, the fruit from Western Australia has not been landed in good condition. Some

of the earlier boats were in fair condition, but the later boats were not in good condition, Jonathans being particularly bad. In addition to this, bitter pit has been very prevalent throughout the season and this, of course, has operated against high prices.

Some of the returns from earlier shipments reached 19s., 20s., and 21s. per case, but those from the last shipment have been only about 11s. If we are going to increase our fruit area, it will be necessary to see that the people at Home are not supplied with fruit in such bad condition.

Mr. Lambert: It is on account of the refrigeration.

Mr. ANGELO: The bitter pit is not due to refrigeration, nor is the brown rotten centre. The Government ought to seriously consider the erection of cool storage at Bunbury and Fremantle as part and parcel of the harbour facilities.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: Only to-day your boss advised you against State trading concerns.

Mr. ANGELO: This is not a State trading concern. Surely the hon. member does not consider that the wharf sheds and electric cranes on the Fremantle pier are trading concerns! They are Government utilities, harbour facilities.

Mr. Lambert: Are they run by private enterprise?

Mr. ANGELO: We must have them there, and so too we ought to have cool storage facilities, right on the harbour. It is of no use having the Fremantle meat works without having cool storage facilities on the wharf. If we had such facilities, when a ship or train came in, the fruit could be taken right into the cool chamber and from there passed into the ship's hold. Without such facilities we cannot compete with other countries. I am sorry I cannot suggest any very drastic alteration in the State's finances. The Leader of the Opposition pointed out that the Country Party in the Federal Parliament had succeeded in saving about two million pounds last year. But they have something to work upon, whereas we have nothing. What chance have we of making these big savings? Possibly some hon. members are not aware of the small amount of taxation this State receives in comparison with what is received by the Federal Government. Every man, woman and child in Western Australia pays an average of £12 18s. 11d. per head in taxation. Of this amount the State receives £3 6s. 1d., whereas the Commonwealth receives, in direct taxation £3 15s. 10d., and in indirect taxation £5 17s., making a total of £9 12s. 10d.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: But we get also £1 5s. of the balance.

Mr. ANGELO: That is so. Still we get nothing in comparison with what the Federal authorities get, notwithstanding which we are expected to carry great spending departments, such as those of Education and of Charities.

Mr. Lutey: We have to pay our share of Federal war expenditure.

Mr. ANGELO: But this has been going on since long before the war. Moreover, the contributions from Federal revenue towards the war are not very great as yet; it has all been done out of loan. Frequently complaints are heard that we are heavily taxed. But against the £12 18s. 11d. per head in this State, in New Zealand it is £18 12s. 1d., and in the United Kingdom £24 2s. 6d. As showing what we have to suffer in the collection of taxes, I might state that for the 18 years ended June, 1919, the Commonwealth collected per head of population, in New South Wales, £54 7s. 11d.; in Victoria, 51 3s. 10d.; in Queensland, £50 1s.; in South Australia, £51 19s. 7d.; in Tasmania, £42 12s. 9d.; and in Western Australia, £75 15s. 8d. People do not realise what we have suffered through the collection of Commonwealth taxation. We have had to go slow with State taxation, because of the enormous taxation imposed on us by the Commonwealth Government. Yet if we were to refrain from imposing on our own people any particular taxation, the Federal Government would at once jump in and take it for themselves.

Mr. Mann: What is the Federal Convention select committee doing about it?

Mr. ANGELO: That committee was appointed to prepare a case for the promised convention, but immediately the Federal Government heard that we and South Australia and Tasmania were preparing our cases, some excuse was made, and the convention floated into thin air. However, we have been preparing a case, with the assistance of Mr. Owen as financial adviser. His report will shortly be printed, and I feel sure the House will consider that the appointment of the Commission and the granting of the services of Mr. Owen as financial adviser were well worth while. The report will be useful on account of the approaching Federal elections. In the coming election campaign, the whole of the people of the State should do their utmost to return men out for Western Australia and for Western Australia only. I would like to see a Nationalist, a Country Party man, and a Labour man selected for the Senate. Let us all work together to secure the return of three such men. The Senate is not a party House. It is the House of the States and the House in which Western Australia should be represented.

Mr. Mann: Will you ask your party to move in that direction?

Mr. ANGELO: I think they would do so if the suggestion were made.

Mr. Mann: Will you make the suggestion?

Mr. ANGELO: Willingly. Only in the Senate have we any hope of getting the State represented or of getting any measures passed to give Western Australia a fair deal in the Federation. In the House of Representatives, we have only five members out of a total of 75.

The Minister for Works: They can do a lot.

Mr. ANGELO: True, but not so much as the Senate.

The Minister for Works: You and I will go.

Mr. ANGELO: But we could not spare the Minister for Works. What would our debates be without his contributions? Where would the country drift without him? If we could get returned to the Senate six men out for the good of Western Australia, six men out for the good of Tasmania, and six men out for the good of South Australia, and for no other reason than to see that we were properly represented and treated, the smaller States could control the Senate and block measures adverse to the interests of those States. This is why I think it necessary to select three men to represent in the Senate Western Australia first and foremost. We have heard a good deal from the Leader of the Opposition about the finances. He said the Government had given their usual explanation. Until we receive better treatment from the Federal authorities and a bigger cut of the taxation, I do not think we can hope to do much better with our finances.

Hon. M. F. Troy: The Federal Government! The Federal Government all the time!

Mr. ANGELO: The Leader of the Opposition thinks we should cut down our expenditure. Will he assist to cut down the Education vote, the Charities vote, or the Medical vote? No; because his side of the House is strongly in favour of these departments being continued as at present. I am with him in that opinion. We cannot afford to cut down the education or the medical or charities services to any great extent. It is interesting to look over the figures of the last decade. The Labour Party came into power in 1911 and in 1916 the Wilson Government took charge of the administration. During the five years of Labour administration, the population of the State increased by only 12,708, whereas during the five years of Liberal Government it increased by 28,582.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: Do not forget the number who went away.

Mr. ANGELO: I was expecting an interjection of that kind. An analysis of the figures shows that between August, 1914, and June, 1916, and from June, 1916, till the end of the war, the numbers who left the State were just about equal. There is not a difference of 100.

Mr. Johnston: What about the numbers who came back?

The Minister for Mines: There were none coming back till 1916.

Mr. ANGELO: Now take the public debt. During the five years of Labour administration, the public debt increased by £15,435,723.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: No, by £13,000,000. We left a million for the present Government to spend.

Mr. ANGELO: The member for North-East Fremantle is referring to the sinking fund.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: No, I am not.

The Minister for Mines: You are speaking of the amount raised, not expended.

Mr. ANGELO: The amount expended was £15,435,723 as against £9,899,991 in the following five years.

Mr. Johnston: What about the asset?

Mr. ANGELO: The ass sits there. The sinking fund during the five years of Labour administration increased by only £1,983,620 while, during the subsequent five years, it increased by £3,113,132.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: You are wrong there also.

Mr. ANGELO: I obtained the figures from the Under Treasurer.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: Then you got them wrongly.

Mr. ANGELO: Deducting the sinking fund, during the five years ended 1916 the public debt showed an increase of £13,452,103, as against an increase of only £6,736,859 during the Liberal regime. However, there is one item of expenditure which should be noted. During the first period of five years, the expenditure on railways and tramways increased by £360,737, whereas during the subsequent period, the increase was £1,028,484, which I presume was due to the higher wages paid to employees.

The Minister for Mines: I do not know where you got your figures, but there was more railway construction during the first five years.

Mr. ANGELO: The Leader of the Opposition has suggested cutting down the Government departments. He knows very well the difficulty confronting the Government in that respect. If men are retrenched, many of them have to be paid pensions.

Hon. P. Collier: Who said that?

Mr. ANGELO: The hon. member.

Hon. P. Collier: No, I said nothing about retrenchment. That is what you are talking about.

Mr. ANGELO: The hon. member mentioned economy. How is it to be brought about?

Hon. P. Collier: There are other ways of economising than retrenchment.

The Minister for Mines: There could not be much reduction of expenditure by way of wages and salaries.

Mr. ANGELO: I do not think we could reduce the Civil Service. We are arranging to bring in an additional 75,000 people and we shall be expending £6,000,000 during the next few years, so that all our civil servants will be required. Of course we should see that none of them are loafing on their jobs and that all are fully employed. I for one cannot see where any retrenchment is possible at the present time.

Hon. P. Collier: You are not in a position to say. Only those with an intimate acquaintance and experience of the departments can say.

Mr. ANGELO: Full inquiry should be made into the various departments. To this extent I agree with the Leader of the Opposition. I hope that, during the next few

years when the future of the State is in the balance, we shall do our utmost to sink party feeling—

Hon. P. Collier: You will drown it if you sink it much further.

Mr. ANGELO: And that we shall work together to make the immigration policy the success we all hope it will be.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN (North-East Fremantle) [8.55]: I was rather amused at the concluding remarks of the member for Gascoyne. I do not know where he obtained the figures he quoted, but I am quite confident he did not get them from the official returns. Regarding loan expenditure—

Mr. ANGELO: I only took to the end of last year.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: The hon. member evidently took one period of six years of Government and contrasted it with another period of five years.

Mr. Angelo: No, I took five years in each case.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: Anyhow a million or so is neither here nor there when one feels inclined to drop it. I was greatly struck with one paragraph in the Speech. Some members have been excusing the Government for their inactivity with regard to public affairs, and I never expected that the Government would have included in the Speech such words as these:—

Believing that the time had arrived when a vigorous attempt should be made to repair the period of comparative inactivity resulting from the war, etc.

In that the Government have confessed that the period they have been in office has been one of inactivity. Of course, we see evidence of that throughout the State. No matter where one goes, one cannot find any monuments to show that the Government have been in any way active. Their activity has been such that no one can find any trace of it. It is little wonder that the party who desire to control Parliament out of Parliament are getting a little dissatisfied, more especially when the Government themselves admit that they have been inactive during the last few years.

Hon. P. Collier: They have been a long-suffering party.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: However, there is one thing which has not been inactive and that is the deficit.

The Minister for Mines: We would not have known that if you had not drawn our attention to it.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: The deficit has been continually on the move.

Hon. P. Collier: Working overtime.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: We are often reminded that the wool and the wheat grow while the farmer sleeps; the same applies to the deficit during the inactivity of the Government. If something is not done to stop the growth of the deficit, the State will soon be suffering from the consequences.

The Minister for Mines: There is only one way to do it when in opposition, and that is to put the Government out.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: I am very pleased to hear that interjection, and I hope that members supporting the Government will digest the advice. The Minister has informed members that there is only one way of stopping the deficit growing—

The Minister for Mines: I said when in opposition.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: And that is by putting the Government out. The Minister, therefore, has admitted that with a change of Government, there would be a possibility of the deficit being reduced or at least kept stationary. I would not promise a reduction of the deficit in such circumstances, but it might be possible to keep it stationary. If we could do no more than that for a time, it would be a great improvement on the experience of the last few years, when we have been going to the bad to the extent of £600,000 or £700,000 a year. Members should sleep on the Minister's advice to-night and be prepared to-morrow to act upon it.

The Minister for Mines: You would not like your salary to depend upon it.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: Since the Labour Party left office the deficit has grown by £4,132,099. The Labour Government were referred to as extravagant. First of all it was said they could not raise money, and later on it was said they had been raising too much. Members of the Opposition said that their regime was one of extravagance and debauchery, in fact, a "big drunk," as was stated in another place, and that these things had continued throughout the time they had control of the State. Whilst in office that Government expended approximately £13,000,000 of money.

Hon. P. Collier: And spent it well.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: A large proportion of the difference between £13,000,000 and £15,000,000 was left in the Treasury when the Labour Government went out of office so that the other people could spend it. A few weeks before he gave up the reins, the present Minister for Mines, as Treasurer, arranged to borrow £1,600,000 from the Commonwealth.

The Minister for Mines: That was only some of our own money coming back again.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: And we had to pay dearly for it,  $4\frac{1}{2}$  per cent. The Labour Government were told that they were borrowing money to such an extent that the country could not stand it, that it meant bankruptcy in the future, and that borrowing must cease. It was claimed that what was wanted was business acumen and ability, and that until a change was made there would be no improvement in the finances. Since the Government left office borrowing has ceased, and the indebtedness of the State has increased by about  $12\frac{1}{2}$  millions. Where the Governments that have since followed obtained the money I do not know—it was against their policy to borrow.

Hon. P. Collier: And what are they doing with the money?

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: Since 1916 they have increased the indebtedness of the State by approximately that amount. I was not surprised at the remarks of the Leader of the Country Party when he spoke on Thursday night. When he came to consider the large amount the Government obtained in revenue, about two millions more than the Labour Government obtained, and the large increase in the indebtedness by means of loans, it rendered him speechless. He could not refer to the all absorbing topic of finance except to say he was pleased that the Premier had arranged to borrow another £6,000,000. His motto for carrying out improvements in the State was not the motto of his party, "Produce, produce, produce," but "Borrow, borrow, borrow." As long as he could see the money coming in he did not care whether the finances of the State were ever in a position to pay it back. The other night the Premier dealt with the question. He said it was true we had a deficit, but that our sinking fund had increased by £800,000. When the Labour Government left office in July, 1916, it was announced by a flourish of trumpets, by telegraph and no doubt by wireless, that we had ruined this country and left a deficit of £1,361,000. What would have been said by the Press if the Treasurer of the day had denied this, and stated that the Labour Party had left not a deficit but a surplus, and that they had a sinking fund which had increased approximately by £700,000 above the deficit, so that instead of there being a deficit of £1,361,000, there was a surplus of £700,000? Would the Press have remained silent if the Treasurer had taken that line of argument?

Mr. Lutey: That is business acumen.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: Would they not have circulated it broadcast that the Labour Party had told the people on the one hand that there was a deficit, and later announced that there was a surplus of £700,000. They would have said it was trying to delude the people and lead them astray, and that the State was not in the position in which it was endeavouring to show it to be. They would certainly have said the sinking fund should not be taken into account, that it was a fund brought into existence by wise rulers who had made that arrangement in order to meet the obligations of the State in the future. Those on the Opposition benches would have scorned the suggestion to take into account in this way the sinking fund. Since then, various Governments have not found themselves in such a position that they could even show a surplus, because of the increase of the sinking fund. The deficit has been increased by £4,132,099.

The Premier: There is a mistake in your last figure.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: The total amount paid by Governments since 1916, to the sinking fund was £1,906,166, which left them a

deficit of £2,225,933 after taking into account the amount paid into sinking fund.

The Premier: All interest on money you borrowed when you were in office, but which earned nothing.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: If it had not been for that money the country would have been bankrupt. It was only by keen judgment, and the exercise of caution by the Labour Government in watching departments that the country is not in a worse position than it is in to-day.

The Premier: How much did you spend?

Hon. P. Collier: The proof that you believed in our policy lies in the fact that you took our Treasurer.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: I believe the Premier has entirely bluffed the people in regard to the sinking fund. The majority of the people think that the large increase to the sinking fund made during the past six years is entirely due to the efforts of the Government.

The Premier: So it is.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: It is entirely due to the unfortunate position the world has been placed in through the war, and it is because of the high rates of interest prevailing that the Government, since 1916, have been able to contribute to the sinking fund £1,906,166. This has enabled them to build up the sinking fund to £8,000,000. The Government, however, had nothing whatever to do with that.

The Premier: You are mixing up your figures.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: I am taking the Premier's figures as they appeared in the "Daily News." The Premier proposes in the first place to alter the conditions under which the loans to the State were raised.

The Premier: No, I do not. I think you ought not to say that. I said nothing of the sort.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: He proposes instead to pay a sinking fund on the loans which have been raised in accordance with the prospectus which was issued at the time the money was borrowed, and not to pay the full amount in the future. He also proposes not to pay interest on the full amount in the future.

The Premier: Not where the amount required is already provided.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: Not where the stock has been purchased.

The Premier: You tried to wipe out the sinking fund.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: Yes, and I think that was justified at the time. The war was on and every nation was trying to wipe out its sinking fund. Special Bills were passed in almost every State in Australia.

The Premier: Were you in favour of it then?

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: Yes, as a temporary expedient.

The Premier: But the world is at war still.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: The Premier is endeavouring to show that he can rectify

his finances by breaking faith with the people in the old world who helped to develop this country, and who advanced money for the establishment of our railways, harbours, and land development generally. He is taking a high handed action, which may affect our future loans.

The Premier: You are quite wrong.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: If my words do not carry any weight perhaps the Premier's words will.

The Premier: I only discussed your proposal to wipe out the whole of the sinking fund.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: The Minister for Works had something to say about the sinking fund.

Hon. P. Collier: He was very angry about it, too, that night.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: He said—

I have endeavoured to show to the House that in the issues of these loans a sinking fund is provided, and that is held out as one of the inducements to investors, giving them as it were, an additional security that the money they have loaned will be redeemed probably before the expiration of the period for which the money is loaned.

The Minister for Works: That is business.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: He goes on to say—

Whatever may be the view of the Treasurer as to future loans that may be brought before the House and probably adopted, any interference with what has gone before and which bears the signed manual of the State is undesirable.

The Minister for Works: Exactly. At that time you were not in the position we are in to-day.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: We were in a better position.

The Minister for Works: Oh, dear, no.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: We did not build up a deficit of £5,000,000 or £6,000,000. The Minister for Works went on—

I may state I believe that the hon. member for Irwin will agree with me—

He knew that Mr. Gardiner was the financial member of the House and he wanted his sympathy in the matter, knowing he would not care to endorse any action that was likely to be detrimental to the finances of the State—

—that it is a very unsafe thing indeed to attempt in the slightest degree to depreciate the security which has been given to anyone from whom we have borrowed money. If a man is dealing with a bank he must be open and frank, and if it comes to the ears of the manager of the bank that the client is not acting up to his agreements, then difficulties arise. If our securities are depreciated and there is any alteration in the statements which are placed before the investing public, naturally reaction will take place. With the bond holders the only reaction which can take place is that they may take fright.

The Minister for Works: Not in this case, when there is more money than is necessary to pay them.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: No, because there is a different Government in this case. Tinkering with the funds does not matter in itself; it is the people who do it. Then he says—

“Here is a Government proposing to alter the conditions on which we have lent our money. We do not know how far they intend to go.” The bond holders may take fright in regard to the matter, and then, even if they do not throw their bonds on the market, one thing is very certain, that when the next loan is placed on the market any proposal from the Government of Western Australia will be viewed with very very grave concern not only by the clients themselves, but by those who do the investing for them.

The Premier: Do you agree with that?

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: The speech further says—

It is well known that these bonds are taken up by underwriters, and they have for years looked upon the Western Australian securities and the sinking funds attached as something like gilt-edged securities. I feel very jealous that any attempt should be even hinted at to interfere with arrangements which have been made.

The Minister for Works: That is right.

The Premier: Did you agree with that at the time?

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: At that time our conditions were entirely different from our conditions of to-day. At that time the British Empire and Europe as a whole were at war. At that time funds were required not only for development purposes but also for war purposes. To-day things are more normal. What was wrong in times of extreme tension is right to-day, under more normal conditions.

The Minister for Works: Because we have now more money saved that would pay our debts.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: There was more money saved then than would pay the debts at that time.

The Minister for Works: There was not; that is the difference.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: There was not as large an amount, simply because the sinking fund at that time had not become such a benefit, owing to the European war. I will refer to the Premier's statement made when he was in Opposition.

The Premier: Can you say yes or no to my question?

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: The speech continues—

When we go to raise money in London, we issue a prospectus which sets out the conditions under which we raise the loan. In 1913 we paid less interest than any other State of the Commonwealth; that is, we got our money more cheaply, which was due, I believe, to the fact that we had

a sinking fund. We must respect our obligations under this sinking fund.

The Minister for Works: We are respecting them to-day.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: The Premier continued—

It would be unwise in the interests of the people of the State to disregard our obligations. As a matter of fact, it would go to reduce the deficit.

The Premier: Did you agree with me then?

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: The hon. gentleman said—

As a matter of fact, it would go to reduce the deficit. It would not provide any more work, and any action in this direction would make it more difficult for us to borrow in the future.

At that time the Premier refused to agree to any interference with the sinking fund, or with any agreement entered into by the State with the bondholders, because, he said, the money would be used to reduce the deficit.

Hon. P. Collier: The deficit was a serious matter in those days.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: Of course it was. At that time it was a deficit of less than a million; to-day the deficit is nearly six millions. On that account the Minister for Works claims that the financial position is better to-day than it was six years ago. Then the Premier went on to say—

I notice the member for Irwin (Mr. James Gardiner) made a suggestion as follows—

I admit that the Premier did not agree with that suggestion, which was in the following words:—

In times of great financial stress, when the heavy demands of our sinking funds have a crippling effect on our finances, whilst there would be no justification for suspending the interest stocks and the sinking fund on the balance held by investors, such a suspension might be deemed advisable on the stock which the State itself held.

Is that what the Premier is proposing to do to-day? He proposes not to pay the full amount of sinking fund as stated in the prospectus issued when the loans were raised, to enable the sinking fund to meet the loan on maturity—a great change from the position taken up when the Labour Government were in office. Nothing would please him then at all. No action that was proposed by the Government of that day to assist in a position of financial difficulty received any consideration whatever from the hon. gentleman. The attitude of the Premier was then that he had to pay the whole amount. But to-day the position is that the Government find themselves in such difficulties that they look in every hole and corner for the purpose of discovering something that they can escape paying.

The Premier: The difference is that you wanted to get out of the lot.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: But you would not agree to Mr. Gardiner's suggestion.

The Premier: I do not agree with it to-day. I only wanted to save over-payments.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: We have to-day a floating debt of 14 millions, in respect of which not one penny of sinking fund has been provided. That is a matter for consideration by the State. We are paying sinking fund on only a portion of our debt. The greater proportion of the floating debt has come into existence since the present Government came into office.

The Premier: No. Every loan for the last 30 years has a sinking fund.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: The Premier knows, without my reminding him, that a large number of loans issued through the Federal Government were taken up in bonds. No sinking fund was provided in those cases. Several of those loans are due at early dates. In fact, one of them fell due recently, and the States were unable to meet it, whereupon the Federal Government agreed to put the amount on the market as a conversion loan. The action now proposed by the Premier in regard to the sinking fund will, no doubt, tend to benefit the finances of the State at the present time, but it will have the effect of throwing doubt on any prospectus which the Western Australian Government submit to the market in future.

The Premier: Nothing of the sort.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: As the Minister for Works said, investors would get frightened, and would want to know whether they could rely on the prospectuses issued.

The Premier: I am not doing anything without consulting the trustees for the bondholders. They agree.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: It is true that we can do nothing without the consent of the sinking fund trustees. But we know that the late Treasurer, Mr. Gardiner, tried to do the same thing, and failed. This is not a new proposal. The difference is that Mr. Gardiner was not in London at the time, to put pressure on the trustees. He was not in London to point out to them the condition of the finances here. The Premier had to go to London to find out that we had bought a million pounds worth more bonds than was necessary.

The Premier: No.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: The Premier had to go to London to find that out.

The Premier: Nothing of the sort.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: The hon. gentleman could have found it out here. However, he did find out in London that the amount of stock purchased by the State for sinking fund amounted to a million pounds more than was necessary.

The Premier: Nothing of the kind; and you never discovered that we need not pay interest on the amount.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: I have not looked for that discovery. I never look for a thing that gets me out of an obligation into which I have entered. While there are many of us who take that for our motto, yet times come when we may find ourselves compelled to try

to avoid such an obligation. That is the position of the Premier to-day.

The Premier: No.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: The Premier says there is a possibility of our having too much money by the time our loans mature. That may be all right to-day, but the future effect on the State may be material. I urge the Premier for goodness' sake to drop the cry that there is no deficit because we have the sinking fund.

The Premier: I have never said any such thing.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: The Premier has not said that, but the people of the State have been led to believe that that is the position, owing to the way in which the matter has been put to them. The first excuse was that the deficit was due to the Commonwealth Government. That excuse has gone entirely. Then the Minister for Education went to Melbourne, and while there discovered that we had a sinking fund. From that day onward the sinking fund has served as an excuse for the deficit. The Premier in his speech the other evening said that it was true that we had a deficit, but that the sinking fund had increased by £800,000—

The Premier: I did not say that.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: In the same speech the hon. gentleman said that the amount paid into sinking fund for that year was only about £265,000.

The Premier: And we pay interest on the six millions in the sinking fund.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: The position is that the sinking fund represents a guarantee in respect of loans which have been raised, and does not affect the position so far as the Government are concerned. I will now say the same as I said when the Labour Government were in office. Our sinking fund position is good to-day, but from my experience of the Governments during the past six years, the sinking fund would be in as bad a position as the Consolidated Revenue, if the Government had control of it. If that were so, there would be a deficit on the sinking fund.

Mr. Lambert: The Government have no right to pawn our sinking fund as they are doing.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: The position being thus, I can give no credit whatever to the Government for the large increase in the sinking fund. That increase is due to those who were here in the past, and who wisely made provision for the payment of these debts.

The Premier: You want to wipe out the sinking fund altogether.

Hon. P. Collier: No; your colleague wanted to do that.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: In reply to the Leader of the Opposition, the Premier said, dealing with the Industries Assistance Board,—

Is it not right that the commercial men of this State should have a board appointed for the express purpose of seeing how their clients, who are indebted to them,



and have been for some years, and are at the present time under the moratorium, are situated, and what the assets of these people are? Could anybody object to that? But that was not at all the question with which the Leader of the Opposition was dealing. He was dealing with the board which was proposed for the purpose of dealing with I.A.B. clients who were considered unsuitable to get any more assistance.

The Premier: I do not know anything about that.

[The Speaker resumed the Chair.]

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: I will inform the Premier. As the Leader of the Opposition stated, there was a deputation to the Minister. It was held in secret and the Press were not there. We wanted to know what was the result of the deputation.

The Premier: I have deputations every day and no one knows anything about them.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: This was an important deputation.

The Minister for Works: I have deputations and I do not have the Press there at all.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: There was a notice in the Press to the effect that certain of the Industries Assistance Board clients were to have their sustenance allowances reduced. The deputation went to the Minister to ascertain whether those allowances could not be renewed. No result of the deputation was published. Naturally, people thought it was advisable to know whether the Industries Assistance Board was to be in control or whether political influences outside were to take charge. Consequently, members watched the Press closely for some indication on the point. The Government require watching, good as they are. We have watched very carefully. The first intimation we had of any result arising from the deputation was when the Primary Producers' Association sent out a circular to their branches asking them to nominate two men to go on a board to advise the Industries Assistance Board regarding matters in their several districts. For the information of the Premier I will outline the position which was set out in a Press report as follows:—

The following tentative basis was agreed upon—subject, of course, to approval of Cabinet and the passing of amending legislation:—

1. That in the case of all assisted settlers whose position is regarded by the board as hopeless, a valuation be made of their land and other assets with a view to writing down their indebtedness to such an extent as may be deemed advisable.

2. The committee to consist of the district inspector or other departmental representative, and two qualified local farmers in each inspectorial district. The members of each committee to be nominated by the Primary Producers' Association and to be appointed by the Minister. Such members not to be assisted settlers.

3. The duties of the committee to be: (a) To make a valuation of the property and assets; (b) To advise the best method of carrying on the farm; (c) To report on the personal equation, and (d) To make such other recommendations as they may deem advisable.

Just fancy a board of experts such as the I.A.B. is supposed to be, being dealt with in that way. The Premier said that the board comprised Mr. McLarty, Mr. Cooke, and Mr. Richardson, as well as another whose name I forget. They are men who thoroughly understand their business. These men comprise the board who have to say whether the State's money should be advanced to farmers.

The Premier: And the only board who can do so.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: There is the board constituted to advise the Minister as to whether or not the State funds should be used to assist farmers, who they think are in a hopeless position. Yet another board is to be appointed, two out of the three members of which are to be nominated by the Primary Producers' Association. If the Labour Party had been in office and any such proposal had been brought forward, then there would have been such a howl from one end of the State to the other, that it would have meant the end of that Labour Government. But no Labour Government would have entertained any such proposition.

The Premier: Will you explain the proposition fully?

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: While no Labour Government would dream of entertaining such a proposal, I am surprised that the present Government should do so. I had intended referring to the North-West, but as the member for Pilbara (Mr. Underwood) and the member for Gascoyne (Mr. Angelo) have dealt with that aspect at some length, I will only add a few words. I noticed that the Department of the North-West has expended this year some £15,000, with the result that at one station comprising 70,000 acres, where there are a number of aborigines employed, 2½ acres of cotton have been planted. Whether anything else has been done, I do not know. I want to impress upon the Premier regarding Carnarvon—I have been there since the Premier saw the place—that he should be extremely cautious before settling people on the land in that district. I was surprised and disappointed when I got there. Year after year I have heard statements about the splendid soil, about the beautiful river, and about this land which was said to be flowing with milk and honey. When I went there and saw the river, I found that it had been dry for months and years at a time.

The Premier: Who said that?

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: We have heard it said here year after year. Seventy blocks have been thrown open for selection in that district, and I saw by a statement in the Press that the Agent General is advocating sending out a large number of immigrants to settle in that part of the State. The land

there might be all right if it was certain that water could be obtained. The secretary of the Department of the North-West said that settlement there was bound to be a success—he knows as much about farming as I do—but he advised the farmers to form themselves into a co-operative society and put up an efficient pump to get the water from the river. And the river has been dry for five years! They say up there that they can get water by sinking to a depth of 15 feet or so.

The Premier: In the river bed?

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: Not only there but elsewhere. There is a great divergence of opinion in Carnarvon itself as to whether the land thrown open for selection can be worked successfully.

The Minister for Works: What does the member for Carnarvon say?

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: I do not care what hon. members say, but they are always bound to exaggerate a bit. When I was at Carnarvon, I told them that, and I also said that Western Australia could not afford to gamble. I said that before any gamble took place at Carnarvon, the people should see what could be done there; they should have experimental plots so as to demonstrate if what the member for Gascoyne claims can be produced there, can actually be grown with success.

Hon. M. F. Troy: Did you see the property belonging to the member for Gascoyne?

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: He took jolly good care that we did not go there. We were driven past it and we were informed that, owing to some disease in the tomato plants, the place was in a bad state of neglect. I trust the Government will be very cautious before they proceed with any settlement scheme in that area. While I was there, I came across a family whom I know well. One of the sons, who was a soldier, took up a block. I asked the mother what the place was like and she said that she did not know but that it might be all right. I asked her for her opinion, and she said that she was not too sure of it.

The Minister for Works: She was a Scotch woman.

The Premier: You always go to the ladies for advice.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: I go to the men as well. I found that there was considerable doubt about this scheme being a success. There was no doubt expressed, however, about the success of a scheme which would cut up the big leases into areas of 50,000 acres.

Hon. M. F. Troy: If you did that, they would talk about confiscation.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: If any such action were taken, the Government could have a much bigger settlement up there. I heard one man who had been a sheep farmer in Western Australia say, "I wish I had 50,000 acres of this land. I would not desire any more. I would like to transfer it to my place in the South."

The Minister for Works: Where would he get the water from?

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: There is plenty of water for sheep, but I am doubtful about water for irrigation. The Premier made reference to the Wyndham Meat Works. I asked him what interest had been received from the Carnarvon Meat Works and also the Fremantle Meat Works. According to what we have been told he has drawn no interest from those concerns at all.

The Premier: No, it is not due.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: I hope the Premier will watch those particular works. What about the Fremantle works?

The Premier: There is nothing from them.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: Then Wyndham is wrong because of the interest charges amounting to £78,000. It must be remembered that the other State trading concerns paid in £74,000, leaving a deficit of only £4,000. The Carnarvon works had a good deal of money from the Government.

Mr. Angelo: Only on a pound for pound basis.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: They had between £50,000 and £60,000. That is not much, but no interest has been paid on that money to the Government.

The Minister for Works: They have not frozen a sheep!

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: The Fremantle works got £100,000 from the Government and not a penny of interest has been paid to the Government. They do not say anything about that aspect.

Hon. M. F. Troy: And yet Monger talks about these things not being a success.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: The Wyndham Meat Works at least have been doing something for the money expended; these others have been doing nothing. As it is, the deficit on the Wyndham Works is not so great when we take into consideration the results from the other trading concerns which have gone into Consolidated Revenue. That is the position at the present time. That being so, I trust these people who are barking so much about the State trading concerns as being detrimental to the State would just "shut up" for a while until they pay their own interest.

The Minister for Works: You should look at the speeches delivered to-day!

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: When these people pay their own interest to the Government, it is time for them to start talking about the State trading concerns. It is true, as the Minister for Works interjected, that at a meeting of the Primary Producers' Association held to-day, comments were made regarding these concerns, and the members of the Country Party were asked to take more interest in them as the works were helping to build up the deficit. The position is that during the last 12 months the State trading concerns have paid interest and re-coups to other departments amounting to £74,000, which has gone into Consolidated Revenue as profit.

The Premier: Principally by the sawmills.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: That does not matter. It was a State trading concern.

In the Wyndham Meat Works, we have the only freezing works out of three in this State, which are operating. As mentioned in the Governor's Speech those works were started for the purpose of assisting the pastoralists in that part of the State. They had experienced bad times for a considerable period and it became necessary to assist them. The Premier interjected that interest had been paid on account of those works amounting to £78,000.

The Premier: Interest and other charges.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: At any rate, the works were established for that particular purpose.

The Premier: Running them keeps the machinery in order.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: If the other State trading concerns made a profit of £74,000, then, with the Wyndham Meat Works thrown in, they have only cost the State £4,000 for the year.

The Premier: Yes, but the Wyndham works should be thrown out.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: The Wyndham Meat Works are good for that part of the State and every pastoralist wanted those works at the time they were erected.

Mr. Willcock: And they want the works now.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: The Labour Party may have made one mistake, in that we did not carry out the Premier's policy of charging so much per head for cattle there as taxation. If we had done that, those in the district would have been better satisfied; because if you give a man something for nothing he grows, whereas if you let him pay for it he is content. During the year the Government Analyst has been retired. The retirement has caused bitter feeling amongst the public service. Before this officer was retired, there was a dispute between him and the Director of Agriculture who, in a way, accused him of incompetence. From a perusal of the papers, I think that had something to do with Mr. Mann's retirement. At all events, when that officer was retired, the inquiry for which he repeatedly asked should have been held. No doubt the implied charge made by the Director of Agriculture affected Mr. Mann's application for the new position. Another point: in the case of an officer being retired before the retiring age is reached, the practice has been to add a number of years to his period of service.

The Minister for Mines: You know that we cut that out.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: I know of several who have had it. In this case it was refused. Not only did Mr. Mann go out of the service with the condemnation of another officer on him, but he was refused the conditions granted in other cases, which was distinctly unfair. I only want fair play for this officer.

The Minister for Mines: A number went out at about the same time, and all were treated in the same way.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: I wish to draw attention to the Fremantle railway bridge. I remember seeing in the newspapers some years ago that a new foundation was necessary; that the bridge had been patched until it was impossible to further repair it. There is a fear that the bridge is not safe.

The Minister for Mines: It's safe enough.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: But the fear is there, and it is better to be sure than to be sorry. A railway catastrophe there might mean great loss of life, and exceedingly heavy cost to the Government. Only the other day Mr. Stead, the Railway Commissioner, in his report pointed to the excessively heavy maintenance of the bridge. I ask the Government to consider the question as one of urgency. Also I wish to draw attention to the Fremantle water supply. It does not pay to keep quiet. For years Fremantle has been suffering from insufficiency of water. The people there have not said much, for they realise that the State is up against it financially. On two or three days in the week the water is the colour of jarrah. Yet when the North Perth people kicked up a row about the water they were getting, steps were immediately taken to remedy the position. Only the other day I drew a bottle of filthy water with the object of taking it to the Minister; but it occurred to me that perhaps it was not worth while. The question of the Fremantle water supply requires immediate attention. In Fremantle, because of the lack of water, fire insurance rates are 20 per cent. higher than in any other town in the State. I see that the Premier has made an alteration in respect of applications for land. Mr. Richardson has a new appointment. He is a very good officer, but I think his time can be better employed on group settlements. There are already in the Lands Department officers to attend to applicants for land, and I think they endeavour to give satisfaction to those applicants. But there is a want of co-operation between the Lands Department and the Agricultural Bank.

The Premier: No, no!

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: Well then I do not understand the position.

The Premier: That's quite evident.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: An applicant goes to the Lands Department and asks if any land is available. The reply is, "Yes, but it is some distance from a railway." When the applicant asks how the Agricultural Bank will treat it, the officers have to say, "We don't know." I strongly advise the Premier to bring the Lands officers and the bank officers together, and follow the practice of years ago, stating definitely on the plans how the bank will treat each block. That would greatly assist land settlement. At present it is a weak spot in the system. I hope it will be remedied. In respect of the Premier's scheme of land settlement I must admit that, after hearing the Premier the other night, I am of opinion he has not gone far enough. He should let every member know the exact position. If this scheme is going to cost ten, fifteen, or twenty millions,

let us know it. Then, when we are discussing it with outside people who desire information, we would be able to explain how they will be treated under the scheme. As it is now, we can say, "If you apply for a block in a group settlement you will get £3 weekly while clearing the land, and a house will be erected for you." But when they ask us what will happen after that, we have to confess that we do not know. That does not assist settlement. I have here the scheme which was published in January, to which the Premier referred the other night. In this scheme it was pointed out that every settler will cost between £800 and £1,000. Yet when the Leader of the Opposition made that statement the other night the Premier said, "No, we have settled so many thousand in the wheat belt at an average cost of £350." It is estimated that two years will be occupied in bringing the whole group to the productive stage, and that the total cost of each farm will be from £800 to £1,000. That is the scheme which the Premier placed before Mr. Hughes. The £1,000 basis means that the full six million loan will be required for the proposed 6,000 settlers. The Premier said there were two million acres to be cleared, that the cost of the work would be £3,000,000, which could be spread over three years, and that the rate at which it was done would depend on the number of men. Therefore it is evident that the Premier expected the clearing of two million acres would cost £3,000,000, without any provision being made for railways.

The Premier: You ought to read the lot.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: I have read the lot, and have picked out those passages bearing on the question. The Premier also said—

The State undertaking (a) to guarantee that work will be available, (b) to guarantee to settle men on the land.

Here is another paragraph, showing clearly that the Premier expected to increase the loan money beyond the six millions—

(c) It will definitely undertake to settle one immigrant for every £1,000 provided for any purpose. (d) If money is provided now for advances to present settlers to further improve their holdings, or for railways, etc., the State undertakes to provide what is necessary for farm making when required for the immigrant settler.

It shows that immediately the six millions have been expended the State undertakes to find the other money required for the purpose of settling those 6,000 persons. That is the scheme which was laid before the Prime Minister and it is a very good one too. I do not disapprove of it at all, but it would be better to know the exact cost. The Premier should get his officers to set out the position and show what money the State has to raise, how it is intended to deal with the settlers, and how it is intended to carry out the scheme. If this were done, members would be in possession of more information than they have at the present time. This scheme was placed before Mr. Hughes. We got his word that

he would assist the Government. I am not satisfied with that.

The Premier: He cannot get out of it, can he?

The Minister for Mines: He never goes back on his word.

Mr. Simons: What!

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: I am not saying anything derogatory to Mr. Hughes, but more than his word should be given in a matter of this kind. I want his undertaking in writing.

The Premier: That is the agreement before him for signature now.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: If it is in writing, the undertaking will be that of the Commonwealth Government. If it is not in writing, the Commonwealth Government will not be bound by it. No doubt that is a weak spot in the arrangement. The sooner this undertaking is put in writing, the better it will be. I know of instances where undertakings have not been carried out in the past. I wish to direct the Premier's attention to a cable which appeared in the "West Australian," dated London, 13th June, 1922:—

Colonel Amery, in speaking at an emigration meeting to-day, announced the negotiations with the Commonwealth for a joint scheme under which one-third or even two-thirds of the passage money would be advanced for emigrants. It had also been agreed that Western Australia should find land for authorised emigrants, totalling 75,000, including their families.

The message states "and find land."

[The Deputy Speaker took the Chair.]

The Premier: That refers to the 6,000.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: No, that is the 75,000.

The Minister for Mines: That is the total number.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: This is the wording of the cable message published here. No mention is made of 6,000. Neither was there any reference to 6,000 in the speech made by Mr. Amery when introducing the legislation in the House of Commons. The only reference was to 75,000.

The Premier: I have it in writing from him.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: I hope the Premier has. If every one of the men was married and each family consisted of four, there would be 18,750 people to provide land for.

The Minister for Mines: His obligation was to assist in getting 75,000 immigrants out here.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: But this cable message does not say so.

The Premier: I am not authorised to speak for the British Government; neither are they authorised to speak for me.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: If the message is wrong, I am prepared to take the Premier's word.

The Premier: I have it in writing. I will produce it if you wish.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: I am prepared to accept the Premier's word, but I must point out that this is the position so far as it is known to us.

The Minister for Works: The people in the old country make mistakes sometimes.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: I admit that they do. The only men who make mistakes are those who try to do something. The man who does nothing makes no mistakes. Therefore the people in the old country must do something. In this, they are unlike our Ministers. In the speech which Mr. Amery made in introducing the Bill, he dealt very clearly with 75,000 people. Seeing that the British Government were going to pay one-third and the Commonwealth one-third, he was very thankful to get out of the business at £8 per head. He impressed upon members of the House of Commons that all it would cost would be £8 a head, and that as soon as the emigrants got on board ship, the British Government's liabilities would cease. In all probability this will run on for 15 years. With the member for Gascoyne (Mr. Angelo) I think it would not be out of place to get a committee of all parties interested to confer on this matter, so that each party would know its respective obligations with regard to this land settlement scheme. It is a big undertaking and great care must be exercised. I am satisfied that the Premier is as anxious as anyone else regarding the scheme. It should be a non-party question. All parties have expressed their approval of it. This was stressed by the Leader of the Labour Party in the British House of Commons.

Mr. Willcock: I do not think they all approve of the methods.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: If a committee were appointed, methods could be devised which would be suitable to all parties. There would then be fewer failures and greater prospects of success. The Leader of the Labour Party in the British House of Commons (Mr. Clynes) said—

Much of the success must depend on securing the goodwill of labour, both organised and non-organised, in the Dominions. It is therefore of the highest importance that labour in the Dominions should be consulted and its co-operation and goodwill obtained, if possible, for this scheme.

As all parties are agreed upon the necessity for increased population for Western Australia, and as all parties realise that the only means to bring this about is by settlement on the land, then all parties should get together to make a success of it. I now wish to refer to a meeting held in Perth to-day, and reported in the "Daily News." Though I am not yet very old, I must say that I have never at any time during my political career read anything which contained such damned impertinence as this speech.

The Premier: Whose speech is that?

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: Any man or body of men—I do not care who or what they are, who try to take, indirectly, the control of the

affairs of the State out of the hands of its Parliament, are a danger to the community.

The Minister for Works: Hear, hear! Who are they?

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: The speech is headed "Farmers' Parliament. The Annual Assembly. Big Gathering of Delegates. President Monger's Address. Disabilities of the Primary Producer. A Comprehensive Review."

The Minister for Works: That is his annual contribution.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: When Mr. Monger spoke at that gathering, he was speaking on behalf of the executive of that organisation. When the Premier speaks here, he speaks on behalf of his Government.

The Minister for Works: And the people.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: Of course; he is representing the people.

Mr. Munsie: A section of them.

The Premier: All of them.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: Here we have the executive of this organisation endeavouring, so far as is possible, to take control of the State affairs without the consent of the people.

The Minister for Works: Hear, hear! I agree with you.

Mr. Angelo: You are wrong.

Mr. Mann: Will the member for Gascoyne put him right?

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: I will not read the whole of the speech; it is too long.

Mr. Munsie: Was the member for Gascoyne one of those in the dock to-day?

Mr. Angelo: It was a most instructive address.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: Mr. Monger said—

Although we have identified ourselves with the movement and will do all in our power to assist the Government in its (immigration) scheme, I have to inform you that only recently we were favoured by the Government with an outline of its policy. You will therefore understand that until we are taken into the full confidence of the Government and have had an opportunity of reviewing and studying its scheme, we cannot express any definite opinion thereon.

The Minister for Works: Nobody asked them to.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: I am not sure whether it would not be advisable at the end of my speech to move an amendment to the Address-in-reply, expressing regret that the Premier visited London without asking the executive of this organisation to favour his scheme of immigration beforehand.

Hon. M. F. Troy: They approved of him going.

Mr. Angelo: Who is better qualified to assist the newcomers?

Hon. P. Collier: That is a different proposition altogether.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: I trust that the Premier, when he announces his policy regarding immigration, will announce it to

members of this House who represent the people, and not to this organisation.

Mr. Angelo: That is what Mr. Monger meant.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: Mr. Monger wants the Premier to give the organisation what should be given to this House. If Mr. Monger could find a sufficient majority to return him to this House and make him Premier, he would accept the position. I wish he would enter this House. If he were here for a little while, he would not talk in this way.

The Minister for Works: He poses as the Western Australian Kaiser.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: Referring to the financial position of the State, Mr. Monger said—

I pointed out to conference last year that so long as the present working arrangement existed, we would have to accept our share of responsibility. We cannot advance any excuse, even if the Country Party's Ministers have not had an equal voice in determining matters of policy, for the fact remains we have equal representation and are, therefore, equally responsible for Cabinet's doings, be their actions right or wrong.

How do they know? Have Country Party Ministers told them they have not had equal voice in determining matters of policy, or is the Premier, while numbering them amongst his Ministers, taking the responsibility on his own shoulders?

The Minister for Mines: We on this bench do not look too unhappy, do we?

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: Just fancy a man making a statement like that!

We cannot advance any excuse, even if the Country Party's Ministers have not had an equal voice in determining matters of policy.

The Minister for Agriculture: And they have had equal responsibility.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: Some person must have told Mr. Monger this.

The Minister for Works: It is his lively imagination.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: I have never spoken to Mr. Monger, but I do not believe, holding as he does the position of president of this important conference, he would make a statement of that description unless some information were given to him to the effect that Ministers who represented the Country Party had not been given an equal voice so far as the policy of the Government was concerned.

The Minister for Agriculture: From whom did he get the information?

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: I cannot say. Some person must have induced Mr. Monger to put in that ridiculous statement.

The Premier: Mr. Monger is responsible for it.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: I admit that.

Mr. Angelo: Call him to the bar of the House.

Hon. P. Collier: You will all be at the bar of the House to-morrow with him. Your trial is on to-morrow.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: I have always regarded Mr. Monger as a clever gentleman.

Mr. Angelo: He is a good patriot.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: Yet he admitted he has been robbing this country.

Mr. Angelo: Oh no!

Hon. P. Collier: That is serious.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: Yes. Last session the Premier introduced the Closer Settlement Bill, the result of which we all know. Mr. Monger says—

If the Government is given under the proposed new Bill powers of compulsory acquisition at a percentage advance on taxation values, then I consider every settler should be given the right to amend his assessments within a reasonable time, for many growers would prefer to pay a larger tax than be dispossessed on a taxation valuation acceptable up to the present by the Taxation Department.

Surely that is admitting that land owners who hold large areas in the State have been under-valuing their land for years.

The Premier: It does not mean that. In some cases property has a sentimental value.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: They have not been valuing their land at its full value, and now they want the Premier to give them ample time to alter their valuation before the Government acquire their land on a percentage basis.

The Minister for Mines: I may have a property which may have a definite value, but if you want to dispossess me of it I may want an entirely different value.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: We are paying on a percentage basis for that. A man may have a block of land worth £1,000, and may be putting it in at £1,000. If that were its proper value there would be no need to alter the assessment or to give him time in which to do so. If, however, he valued it at £800, he should be made to pay tax on £1,000. Mr. Monger says the settlers would be willing to pay a higher tax, because the Government would be likely to take the land at a percentage value.

The Minister for Agriculture: Is that the fault of the owner or the Taxation Department?

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: It is the fault of the taxpayer. It is known how land is valued throughout the country. It is an admission that the Taxation Department has not carried out its work in a proper manner. These people have been under-valuing their land, and now ask the Premier to give them time to increase their valuation.

The Minister for Works: Does not the department send out its own valuers?

The Premier: I wish they would all double their values.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: I was pleased to hear the Minister for Agriculture say they were consulted upon all questions. Mr. Monger has repeated the statement he made under the heading of "My most painful duty." He says—

The Country Party's association with the Government, and the holding of three

portfolios by members of our Party naturally make us in the eyes of the people responsible for the policy and actions of the Government, although it is questionable whether our Cabinet members were consulted on all matters. While nominally responsible to the people of this State by virtue of equal representation in Cabinet, I consider it my duty to say that, in my opinion, our representatives have not been consulted on all occasions, and have not had an equal voice in the determination of matters of policy.

The Minister for Works: If he had known anything about it he would never have said that.

The Minister for Agriculture: It is not true.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: Mr. Monger goes on—

Conference vested in the Country Party and the executive the responsibility of deciding whether we would join with the Nationalists in a coalition Administration, and as the joint conference unanimously decided that such was desirable in the interests of stable government, the executive realise that responsibility is resting upon them as well as the Parliamentary Party.

The Minister for Mines: That is not unusual. Your party lays it down as a definite instruction that you must not coalesce with any other party.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: Our party does not lay it down that the executive carries the responsibility.

The Minister for Mines: Who carries it?

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: I do, so far as North-East Fremantle is concerned, and no one else.

The Minister for Mines: So do we.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: It is true the Labour Party in congress lays down the platform to be submitted to the electors. Once that is done, and a member is elected, he is responsible to his electors for that platform.

The Minister for Works: Does he not get carpeted if he does not do his duty?

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: I have never been carpeted.

Mr. Wilson: Nor has any member on this side of the House.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order!

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: For the six years that I was associated with the Minister for Mines, I did not see him carpeted until the last few weeks.

The Minister for Works: Was he carpeted then?

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: The papers said so. The executive of the Labour Party has nothing to do with the political party, which becomes what is called the Labour Caucus. We are responsible only to ourselves and to the electors.

Hon. M. F. Troy: That is the position.

The Minister for Works: Have the Country Party not the same freedom?

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: No, because the executive say they carry the responsibility.

Hon. P. Collier: Mr. Monger says he is tired of carrying it.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: I advise every member to read the address as it appears in the "Daily News"; I would not part with it myself for anything.

The Minister for Works: You will get the correct report in the "West Australian."

Mr. Lambert: The revised report.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: Here is the bone of contention. I want the member for Gascoyne (Mr. Angelo) to listen to this. He advocated, in the interests of the State, and of progress and production, that party policies should be wiped out.

Mr. Angelo: That is my private opinion.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: Mr. Monger said—

I still hold it is the duty of the Country Party to join in the administration of State affairs, provided our representatives have an equal voice in determining important matters.

They have no voice at all.

Hon. P. Collier: They have been ignored, apparently, right through the peace.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: Mr. Monger continues—

Even in Parliament, our members, who were co-operating with the Nationalists against Official Labour, did not at times receive that consideration which many of us consider they were entitled to. In fact, there are several instances on record when greater consideration was shown by the Premier to the Labour Party than to the Country Party.

If that is not enough to turn the Premier out of office, I do not know what is. It is a serious indictment.

Mr. Angelo: It speaks well for your persuasive eloquence.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: The member for Gascoyne said, it would be of advantage to the Government if they had with them a member from this side of the House to assist them.

Mr. Angelo: I have said that for years.

The Minister for Agriculture: Why only one?

Hon. P. Collier: One would be equivalent to three.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: This party at present is the largest party in the House.

Mr. Lambert: And the best.

Hon. P. Collier: Modesty forbids.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: We have realised for the past six years that the Government have been hard pushed, and that owing to the financial position they have had a very hard row to hoe. That being the case, we have kept aloof from what we call strong party opposition. When we were in office at the outbreak of war, we promised we would endeavour as far as possible to keep away from anything that might lead to party strife. When my leader was on the platform in Boulder at the first election after the Nationalists took office, he told the people there it was his intention, even if he were in opposition, to render every assistance possible in the carrying on of the affairs of the State,

that until normal conditions prevailed it would be a difficult matter to carry on, and he felt it would be his duty to place the interests of the State first. From that time onward this party has endeavoured to render the Government of the day every assistance that lay in its power. There are some things of vital importance upon which we differ, but on a number of questions we have rendered the Premier every possible assistance.

The Premier: That is so.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: Because of that fact, this party has not made a number of claims upon the Government for financial assistance. Since 1916, 12 millions of money have been spent, 13 millions were spent prior to 1916 during the Labour Administration, and close on two millions were left for the Government to take after 1916. By far the greater proportion of that money was spent in the development of the country. During Labour's regime there were railways built all over the State; water supplies were provided wherever required, bores being sunk to find water where none had been found previously, and dams being constructed; farmers were assisted to remain on the land when otherwise they would have been driven off; three millions were spent in bringing the railways into a proper condition to convey the products, the rolling stock at the time being shorter than ever previously. Nearly the whole of that money was spent in land development. The twelve millions spent since have been spent entirely in land development; none whatever in the metropolitan area. If this party wanted to harass the Government, we had every opportunity to do so; but we took the stand of "Country first," and so we felt it to be our duty to assist the Premier. Our action in this respect has offended the head of the executive of the Country Party. The paragraph I have quoted is unworthy of any man who is head of an association that aspires one day to rule the State. In return for the assistance rendered to primary production and the man on the land, the Labour Party have had, not gratitude, but kicks and condemnation. That is the result of the representations made by those who bring down farmers' representatives from the country and tell them wilful lies. I say again that the paragraph I have quoted is a discredit to the man who aspires to be the head of an organisation that hopes some day—I hope the day will never come—to occupy the Treasury bench. If the views of that executive are carried into effect, Parliament is dead, wiped out altogether. Let us have anything rather than a Parliament ruled by an outside executive.

Hon. P. Collier: Country Party members have been in the dock to-day, and will be in the dock to-morrow.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: In reply to the Minister for Mines I quote this paragraph—

I think that if power were vested in the executive to collaborate with, and more fully discuss matters with, the Parliamentary party, better results would accrue. If the executive is to be held responsible in

any way for the acts and doings of our Parliamentary representatives, then they must have the right to consult them and advise them from time to time.

We know that that executive holds sway over members of the Country Party. My reason for raising the matter to-night is that the conference meets again to-morrow; otherwise I should not have referred to it. Outside rule of Parliament is dangerous, and is likely to bring us into financial difficulties, difficulties which we might be able to steer clear of were Parliament free from outside influence. We know that outside influence has already been brought to bear to such an extent as to cost the State thousands of pounds. It is time for everyone to realise that Parliament is going to control the State as long as the people elect a Parliament. I do not care if the Labour Party cast me out for it to-morrow, I will still say that I will use all the power I possess to prevent any outside executive—I care not of what political complexion—from interfering in matters of Parliamentary concern as was proposed by the President of the Primary Producers' Association at the conference to-day.

On motion by Mr. Piesse debate adjourned.

*House adjourned at 10.35 p.m.*

## Legislative Assembly,

*Wednesday, 9th August, 1923.*

	PAGE
Questions: Zoological gardens, entrance ... ..	150
Lotteries and sweeps ... ..	151
Forests Commission ... ..	151
Sewerage, West Perth ... ..	151
Tramways, destination notices ... ..	151
Amusement tax ... ..	151
Pier Street crossing ... ..	152
I.A.B. operations ... ..	152
Immigration—1, The £8,000,000 loan; 2, Accommodation for married couples; 3, Arrivals ... ..	152
Electoral Departments, amalgamation ... ..	152
Leave of absence ... ..	152
Address-in-reply, Fifth day ... ..	153

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

### QUESTION—ZOOLOGICAL GARDENS, ENTRANCE.

Mr. LATHAM (for Mr. Pickering) asked the Colonial Secretary: 1, Is it a fact that the entrance to the Zoological Gardens has been removed from a situation favourable to the South Perth ferry service to one fav-