

States. I think the Government would be well advised to risk the expenditure of some money in opening up and developing the possibilities for tourist attractions in this State. I will support the motion.

On motion by Hon. W. J. Mann, debate adjourned.

House adjourned at 8.55 p.m.

Legislative Assembly,

Wednesday, 7th August, 1929.

				PAGE
Questions: Ravensthorpe Smelter case	179
Sandalwood regrowth	179
Address-in-reply, sixth day	179

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

QUESTION—RAVENSTHORPE SMELTER CASE.

Mr. STUBBS asked the Minister for Justice: What is the total cost to the State to date for legal expenses in connection with the Ravensthorpe smelter case?

The MINISTER FOR JUSTICE replied: £5,921 3s. 3d.

QUESTION—SANDALWOOD REGROWTH.

Mr. LATHAM asked the Premier: 1, What was the amount credited to the special account of the Treasury for the regrowth of sandalwood for the year ended the 30th June, 1929? 2, What amount was expended from this account?

The PREMIER replied: 1, £5,000. 2, £2,826.

ADDRESS-IN-REPLY.

Sixth Day.

Debate resumed from the previous day.

MR. RICHARDSON (Subiaco) [4.36]: I have listened very attentively to the speeches delivered by several members during the debate on the Address-in-reply, and while listening to them I had to admit to myself that it was somewhat difficult to maintain a really steady attitude so that one might dissect what was right from what was wrong. We were told on the one hand that everything in the garden was lovely, and we discovered from the Governor's Speech that the finances of the State were in a very satisfactory condition. We know that the last financial year ended with a deficit of £275,000, and to the ordinary layman that does not appear to be satisfactory at all. If, for instance, any large unexpected expenditure had occurred during the financial year probably the deficit could have been easily explained. If, on the other hand, the revenue had fallen off to a considerable extent under any particular heading, we would naturally be able to conclude that that had been responsible for the deficit. One reason given by the Premier for ending the year £275,000 to the bad was that the water front disturbance had caused a loss of £100,000 or thereabouts to the finances, but almost in the same breath he told us that during the year there had been no industrial trouble of moment to the State. I do not know how the Premier can reconcile those two statements, but they were made by him and we have to consider which is correct.

Mr. Sampson: He does not intend to try.

Mr. RICHARDSON: If the State made a loss of £100,000, it is only reasonable to suppose that companies and men of capital running businesses would naturally lose to a much greater extent than the Government. Therefore in that respect we must conclude that the finances of the State are not satisfactory. We know well that the railways showed a very heavy deficit for the financial year. The reason given by the Premier for the loss was a shortage in the wheat yield, but the Minister for Railways stated by way of interjection when the member for Toodyay (Mr. Lindsay) was speaking the other night that on every bag of wheat carried over the Western Australian rail-

ways the Government incurred a loss. If that is so, the loss on the railways cannot be attributed to the fact that there was a shortage in the wheat yield.

The Minister for Railways: Yes, it can be attributed to the general depression.

Mr. RICHARDSON: The Minister told us that the railways incurred a loss on every bag of wheat carried. If the Minister's statement is correct—and we in this House surely want correct statements—then by reason of last year's wheat yield having fallen short of expectations, the railways should have saved a considerable amount of money.

The Minister for Railways: No, there was no money in the country because of the decreased wheat yield.

Mr. RICHARDSON: I do not know whether the Premier or the Minister for Railways is correct, or whether both of them are wrong. I am not going to try to decide who is correct. That is not my duty. I wish to direct the attention of members to a statement of the comparative results of railway working during the last five years. This has been issued over the signature of the Commissioner of Railways, Mr. Evans, and I assume it is absolutely correct. If members cast their minds back to 1921, when the present Leader of the Opposition was in charge of affairs, they will recollect that the railways showed a loss of up to half a million pounds. Including interest, I think the amount was somewhat over half a million. It was just about that period when the Premier of the day extended the conditions of the Agricultural Bank to permit of further advances to agriculturists up to 100 per cent. of the work done, in order to clear and improve their properties. The results did not appear instantaneously, and the railways recorded deficits for some years, but in 1924, the last year of the Mitchell Government, the railways showed a surplus of £140,000. That was the year in which the present Government took office.

The Minister for Railways: Have not we been extending the railways to new areas since then?

Mr. RICHARDSON: I am not complaining of that, but I have something definite to show regarding the working of the railways. We freely admit that the present Government have continued the policy of encouraging agriculturists to clear and cul-

tivate bigger areas of land, though to lesser extent than did the Mitchell Government. I have pointed out that in 1924, after four years of administration by the Mitchell Government, the position of the railways was improved from a deficit of half a million to a profit of £140,000, and that improvement was principally due to the fact that—

The Minister for Railways: They increased railway rates as soon as wages went up.

Mr. RICHARDSON: I shall have something to say about the wages presently.

The Minister for Railways: I am telling you that first of all.

Mr. RICHARDSON: The improvement in the financial position of the railways was principally due to the fact that so much work had been going on in the country, with the natural result that bigger yields were obtained and bigger quantities of wheat were available for haulage to the seaports. The railway system reaped the benefit of the increased development in the country, notwithstanding the Minister's statement that every bag of wheat is carried at a loss.

The Minister for Railways: Look at the return and see what you make of it.

Mr. RICHARDSON: I intend to deal with the return. In 1925 the earnings of the railways amounted to £3,359,501, while the working expenses totalled £2,355,087, showing a surplus of earnings over working expenses of £1,004,414. In the following year—

The Minister for Railways: Look at the interest bill.

Mr. RICHARDSON: I shall give some figures for the benefit of hon. members. That was in the first year.

The Minister for Railways: There is a difference of a million in your figures. You do not quote interest.

Mr. RICHARDSON: Here is the position. I shall give all the figures, showing exactly how things were done. The balance after payment of working expenses and interest was £190,565 in 1925. The surplus had been increased from about £140,000 to about £190,000. The percentage of working expenses to earnings was 70.1 in 1925. Perhaps that will satisfy the Minister. I have all the figures here, and I do not want to keep any of them back. In 1926 the earnings were £2,337,292, the working expenses £2,509,049, and the surplus of earnings over working expenses had decreased

to £828,243. In the next year the balance after paying working expenses and interest was represented by a deficit of £31,982. It would be hard to account for that difference if the other figures were not quoted. The percentage of working expenses to earnings in 1926 went up from 70.10 to 75.18.

The Minister for Railways: That was the year in which we reduced railway freight by about £50,000.

Mr. RICHARDSON: But the Government got increased taxation in return.

The Premier: That does not show in the railway accounts, though.

Mr. RICHARDSON: Let us carry on.

Mr. Panton: No. Stop and think about that.

Mr. RICHARDSON: It makes very little difference. By the way, I think the Minister for Railways is wrong in saying that was the year in which railway freight were reduced. I think the year was 1928.

The Minister for Railways: No fear!

Mr. RICHARDSON: However, we will let that pass.

The Minister for Railways: You are wrong again.

Mr. RICHARDSON: In 1927 the earnings increased to £3,607,989, and the working expenses were £2,685,693. The surplus of earnings over working expenses had risen to £922,296. In that year the surplus after payment of working expenses and interest was £34,556. The percentage of working expenses to earnings was 74.44, showing a reduction of .74. That, of course, brought about the surplus. In 1928 the earnings were £3,858,051, the working expenses £2,910,811, and the surplus of earnings over working expenses £947,240, showing a net surplus of £26,671, or a reduction of about £8,000 as compared with the previous year. The percentage of working expenses to earnings was 75.45. There had been an increase of 1.11 per cent. in the working expenses. Now I come to last year. In 1929 the earnings were £3,799,764, a decrease of £98,287 as compared with the previous year. The working expenses, however, had risen to £3,055,446, a margin of £144,635. The surplus of earnings over working expenses was reduced by about £200,000 leaving £744,318. The deficit for last year was £178,699. The percentage of working expenses to earnings had risen from 75.45 to 80.41—a considerable increase I think every hon. member will agree, an increase of 5 per cent. less .04 per cent. in

one year. In my mind there is no doubt that the working expenses had a great deal to do with the deficit shown by the Railway Department last year. I do not consider that the deficit is due, as hon. members opposite would have us believe, to deficiency in freights due to the shortage in the yield of wheat.

The Minister for Railways: Do not you believe in long service leave?

Mr. RICHARDSON: I do. I supported the Minister whole-heartedly on that matter when he brought it before the House. But long service leave will not account for last year's large increase of 5 per cent. in working expenses. I can readily understand that with annual increases in wages the percentage of working expenses to earnings must go up. I fail to see, however, how that factor can account for 5 per cent. in one year.

Mr. Lindsay: We have had the 44-hour week since then.

The Minister for Railways: Do not you believe in the 44-hour week?

Mr. RICHARDSON: I do, but I have never mentioned the 44-hour week, and I am not responsible for the interjections of the member for Toodyay (Mr. Lindsay). Under practically the same Commissioner, but probably under a different manager, there are the tramway figures for purposes of comparison. I shall not weary the House by quoting all the figures for five years, but will restrict myself to a comparison between 1925 and last year. For 1925 the earnings of the tramways were £281,612, the working expenses £233,608, and the surplus of earnings over working expenses £45,604. In that year the surplus after payment of working expenses and interest was £769. The percentage of working expenses to earnings was 83.81. In 1929 the earnings went up to £342,788, and the working expenses showed at £281,257. The surplus of earnings over working expenses was £61,531. The surplus after payment of working expenses and interest was £11,376. Working expenses for 1929 represented 82.05 per cent., showing a reduction of .76 per cent. during the five years. There is a close comparison, because long service leave applies in the tramways as it does in the railways. Where is the difference in the working? There must be some difference, and I hope the Minister will be able to explain it. However, there is the comparison. The two undertakings are worked on similar lines. One is able to reduce

working expenses by almost 1 per cent. during the five years, whereas the percentage of the other, the Railway Department, has risen from 70.10 to 80.41, an increase of 10.31 per cent., practically 10 $\frac{1}{3}$ per cent. It may be contended that our railways are overmanned. I am not in a position to say whether they are or not. If they are overmanned, if due inquiry should show this to be the case, it will be impossible, in my opinion, for the Government in the circumstances prevailing to-day in regard to unemployment, to turn the surplus men adrift. But I do ask the Government seriously to consider whether if the railways are in fact overmanned, those surplus men could not be transferred to some other Government service which would become reproductive in a year or two, and which would return something of benefit to the State and to the electors. I say again that I hope no sucking will take place even if the railways are found to be overmanned. The unemployment question is growing larger every year. Still, there are certain works which the Government may put in hand, and by which it would be possible, instead of allowing any Government service to be economically overmanned, to transfer the surplus employees to something of a reproductive nature. I have brought these figures forward because I really fail to see where the advances have come in. It may be possible to explain them; but so far as I can see, after careful study, there is no explanation.

The Minister for Railways: Did you study the next page?

Mr. RICHARDSON: I did. As a matter of fact there is nothing at all in the statement which would make one believe that everything had gone along well in the Railway Department. In all probability losses may be made.

The Minister for Railways: On the next page you will find it stated that, on our ton-mile statistics, compared with the previous year, we carried 9,000,000 more tons for £9,000 less freight.

Mr. RICHARDSON: Statements of that sort reflect upon the Administration. The Government are not entitled to carry stuff over the railways at a loss unless there is some special reason for it, as in connection with the carriage of super. Super. is carried at a very low rate for the simple reason that otherwise the trucks would be running empty.

Mr. Lindsay: Super. was being carried in 1925.

Mr. RICHARDSON: Of course.

The Minister for Railways: In the cheap time for super. we carried about 30 or 40 per cent. more.

Mr. Lindsay: Because you were carrying 30 per cent. or 40 per cent. more traffic.

Mr. RICHARDSON: The unemployment question is, in my opinion, one of the most difficult confronting the Government to-day. Up to the present the Government have not given us any idea of the means by which they propose to overcome that difficulty. I would remind hon. members that about 1922 or 1923 there were a considerable number of unemployed in the metropolitan area, and that a great fuss was made then. Deputations were sent to Parliament House to wait on the then Premier, the present Leader of the Opposition. In the course of five or six weeks the then Premier was able to have practically every one of the unemployed at work. To-day the unemployed problem is much bigger than it was at that time, and of course it will take more effort to get rid of; but I fail to see why the Government should blame private employers. A good many excuses have been made, a good many reasons have been given for the existence of the unemployed problem. The old talk is no longer trotted out that unemployment is the Federal Government's affair. That has died a natural death. I have not heard it for the last few years. Then the explanation of an influx of Southern Europeans was offered.

Miss Holman: That is a Federal Government matter.

Mr. RICHARDSON: That explanation was put forward, but we do not hear quite so much about it to-day. From a recent remark of the Premier I gather that private employers are a great deal to blame. My experience of the private employer is that if he has work to do he will very soon get a man to do it, but that if he has not any work to do he is not prepared to engage labour, save in exceptional circumstances. Only yesterday I interviewed the manager of one of the large metropolitan firms, and he was good enough to place two men who had been out of employment for about six months.

The Premier: Have you been about the State much, and noticed what the employers in the country districts have been doing?

Mr. RICHARDSON: I am afraid I do not avail myself of my free pass over the railways very much.

The Premier: You do not know what attitude they have been adopting? It is all right in Subiaco.

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: I have been out in the country districts.

The Premier: And you know jolly well that foreigners are employed in the country districts.

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: No, I do not.

The Premier: Of course you do.

Mr. RICHARDSON: The Government have no right to ask private employers to engage more men than they can adequately pay for. The electors have the right to ask the Government what they intend to do regarding the unemployed. That question has not been answered yet. Nothing has been said or done that would lead us to believe that the Government are taking the unemployed difficulty seriously.

The Premier: What was your remedy for unemployment when you were a member of the Labour Party?

Mr. RICHARDSON: Work.

The Premier: Can you distinguish between the policy of the Labour Party then and the present-day policy?

Mr. RICHARDSON: Yes, I can.

The Premier: Of course, you would say that!

Mr. RICHARDSON: I do not want to enter upon an argument with the Premier on that question at this stage. If he wants to discuss that phase, I shall be quite prepared to do so outside the Chamber. The Government have a tremendous amount of work that they could start, and they have £500,000 in hand for work on main roads.

Hon. G. Taylor: They have £800,000 odd, including the State's contributions.

Mr. RICHARDSON: Perhaps therein is the difficulty; the State Government have not been able to find the money representing their quota. If that is the position, I regard it as a scandalous thing that the Government have not made that money available. The Federal Government have been good enough to make that money available to the State, and certainly the State Government should make some effort to raise their contribution in order to get on with the work. There is any amount of reproductive work to be done in Western Australia. In my electorate of Subiaco

there is important drainage work that has been held up for five years. That is work of a reproductive nature. The people have complained about the work being held up, but the Government continue to do nothing, and the unemployed difficulty remains. Many reasons have been advanced in explanation of the unemployment difficulty. One is that there are too many people living on the primary producers, a phase with which I dealt during my speech last year. The logical solution to that difficulty would seem to be the establishment of secondary industries, but we know that that idea has long since been exploded. Owing to circumstances over which we have no control, we have been forced to an acknowledgment of the fact that we cannot get our secondary industries established here in competition with those elsewhere. Then again we send too much money out of the State.

The Minister for Railways: There were 1,000 persons employed in secondary industries last year.

Mr. RICHARDSON: That was not enough.

The Minister for Railways: It was a fairly large number.

The Premier: How many do you think should be employed?

Mr. RICHARDSON: A much greater number than that.

The Minister for Railways: Is not the employment of over 1,000 men in one year a sign of pretty good progress?

Mr. RICHARDSON: As I pointed out formerly, we are sending too much money out of the State, but how it is to be stopped constitutes a difficult problem. I suggest that the Government should lead the way by sending as little money as possible out of the country, when they are fulfilling their own requirements. Recently tenders were let and overseas manufacturers secured the work. We know that steel plates have been brought all the way from England to Western Australia. At present a contract has been let to manufacturers in Victoria on behalf of the Government. I would remind hon. members that in my electorate we already have a steel pipe manufacturing industry established, likewise a plant for turning out cast iron pipes. I am aware that it is the policy of the Government not to use cast iron where it is possible to use steel. Sure-

ly some negotiations could have been set on foot by which a reduction in the local tender price could have been made, and thus saved the contract from going to the Victorian manufacturers.

The Premier: Do not you know the Government have gone out of their way to give contracts to the local people you refer to?

Mr. RICHARDSON: I do not.

The Premier: Be fair now; you do know!

Mr. RICHARDSON: I am always fair, and I endeavour to be accurate.

The Premier: We went out of our way to give the contract to that firm.

Mr. RICHARDSON: I am perfectly well aware of that fact, and I mentioned that negotiations might have resulted in a reduction of the price put in by the Hume Pipe people.

The Premier: We have given contracts to those people even against the financial aspect of the question. You should be fair!

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: You always give 10 per cent. preference to local people.

The Premier: And we have given more than that.

Mr. RICHARDSON: I accept the premier's assurance.

The Premier: We lost money by it.

Mr. RICHARDSON: Then that lends point to my argument that our industries cannot compete with those established outside our borders.

The Minister for Lands: We have been giving tenders for 2,000 miles of wire netting to local firms for years past.

Mr. RICHARDSON: However, this represents one of our difficulties regarding unemployment. The only way of overcoming the problem is by providing work. It is a big task, but the Government must face the job. I think it was the Leader of the Opposition who said that work begets work. So it does. While the Government will not do anything I fail to see why private employers can be blamed in any way.

The Premier: Do you say that the Government have not done anything?

Mr. RICHARDSON: The Government should start operations as early as possible, and employ the men who cannot find work now.

The Premier: In what direction?

Mr. RICHARDSON: I have already pointed out some directions in which work can be supplied.

The Premier: Get away from the general to the particular.

Mr. RICHARDSON: I have already pointed out that it is over five years since authority was given for the drainage of Shenton Park lake in Subiaco.

The Premier: That is just a small work!

Mr. RICHARDSON: The previous Government intended to carry out the work straight away.

The Premier: What a national work!

Mr. RICHARDSON: It forms part of a big national scheme.

The Premier: There are hundreds of lakes that could be drained.

Mr. RICHARDSON: It is no good the Premier being sarcastic with me; I will not take any notice of it!

The Premier: Truly a national work!

Mr. RICHARDSON: Of course, it is a national work.

The Premier: A small lake in Subiaco!

Mr. RICHARDSON: It is work that the Government only can undertake.

The Premier: Will that work bring in any increased revenue?

Mr. RICHARDSON: No other body can undertake the work but the Government.

The Premier: Will it bring any increased wealth to the country?

Mr. RICHARDSON: It would bring relief to residents in that part of the metropolitan area, and they are quite as worthy of consideration as are the people of Boulder.

The Premier: I have not mentioned Boulder; I keep my constituency out of it when I am taking.

Mr. RICHARDSON: Doubtless the Premier has no occasion to mention his constituency in Parliament, for presumably his electors get everything they want. We private members have to state our case in Parliament or at deputations in order to seek relief, and whether or not the Premier neglects his district, I am not prepared to neglect mine. I hope that in the near future something will be done so that we will obviate the recurrence of the unemployed difficulty. The present is the first time in the history of Western Australia when men have been forced to go from house to house collecting money, food and clothing. It is the first time that we have had men appearing at football matches, at the races and about the city streets with their collection boxes, begging for money.

The Premier: Have you read what that Englishman said in this morning's paper about migrants?

Mr. RICHARDSON: That man was here for ten minutes, and, of course, he knows all about it!

The Minister for Railways: He came out on the boat with a batch of migrants.

Mr. Griffiths: And his remarks do not reflect credit on the people at Home who sent them out.

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: He knew nothing about the people here.

The Premier: But he knows something about the people on the boat.

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: Perhaps so, but he may not even know them.

The Premier: He was for a month with them on the boat.

Mr. RICHARDSON: I would like to touch upon another local matter. Recently a tramline running along the Perth-Fremantle-road to Claremont, was opened up. That has been a great comfort to the people in that district, but it has rather hampered people at the other end of Claremont because there is no connecting link between Nedlands and Subiaco. People may desire to come from Claremont and would like a connecting point at Broadway and the Perth-Fremantle-road. It often happens that a tram from Nedlands arrives at the intersection just before a tram has got there from Claremont. There is often a wait of 25 to 30 minutes before the next tram arrives. That difficulty should easily be overcome by the provision of a connecting point that would meet the convenience of the public. If that were done it would beneficially affect the tramway receipts, because, as it is, people are more likely to take a taxi and run right in to Subiaco. I hope these matters will receive some attention.

MR. COWAN (Leonora) [5.12]: I appreciate the opportunity to say a few words in support of the motion for the adoption of the Address-in-reply. I regret I was not present to hear the Governor's Speech read, or to hear the speech by the Leader of the Opposition. After listening to the remarks of the Leader of the Country Party, I confess I was left with an impression that the Speech must have been a very depressing production.

Mr. Sampson: It was very uninspiring.

Mr. COWAN: Having heard the Premier in reply, however, my depression was entirely dispelled. I have just returned from my electorate, and I am pleased to announce that there is a much more optimistic feeling there than has been evidenced for years past. That applies to both the mining and the pastoral industries. I have heard the present Government discussed, and their actions criticised. I am pleased to admit, however, that the administrative ability they have shown has not been classified as within the category of those who benefit from "Dame Fortune's fickle wheel." Their work has been appreciated, and the ability displayed has been regarded as otherwise than attributable to that which was suggested by one hon. member who referred to "Lucky Collier." I am also pleased to know, from the remarks of the member for Kataanning (Mr. Thomson) that there is a certain unity of interest between the views of his party and members sitting behind the Government. We are told that the Government have put into force many things that the Country Party would have carried out had they been given time. It is very reassuring to have that from the cross-benches, for it means that we are not to expect any serious opposition from that quarter. But quite in contradiction to the remarks of his leader, were the views of the member for Toodyay, who attacked several of our policy planks, including that of the 44-hour week. Having worked in and around the gold-mining districts of Western Australia for a number of years, I hope we shall never see the reintroduction of the 48-hour week in the gold-mining industry. I am quite sure there are very few members of the House who would be prepared to work in a level anything from 1,000 feet to 4,000 feet underground a four-hour week, much less than a 44-hour week. I have no hesitation in saying that for two members, one the member for Toodyay, and the other myself, and I can assure you, Sir, that while I am a member of this House I will never advocate nor support conditions for others that I would not be prepared to accept for myself. Although I have been in the House but a little time, I regret to find we have a number of members who seem either to have forgotten or wish to forget that there still exists in the State the industry that was responsible for placing Western Australia on the industrial map, namely, the gold-mining industry. We have

here a number of members much more interested in red rust than in gold dust. I am going to try to show some comparisons which are unfair between the conditions of the man on the land and those of the man who is doing his best to develop the gold-mining industry. In and around the district I have the honour to represent we had some few years ago quite a number of prospectors working and mining their own shows with considerable success. At that time our State battery was kept working almost continuously, with the result that in my district alone there were treated 56,000 tons of ore for a return of over 62,000 ounces of gold. That was a very gratifying result, and it meant considerable prosperity not only in the immediate district, but in the State as a whole. Yet we find that during the time of war and for a few years after, owing to little or no stone being made available for crushing at State batteries, there was a general depression in prospecting activity. However, within the last year or two, when prospectors again showed themselves prepared to give the mines in the district a further trial—since justified by results—we were faced with the position that the only crushing facilities available to those men were at the Coolgardie State battery, some 200 miles distant. This state of affairs was not brought about by the present administration of the Mines Department.

Hon. G. Taylor: But it was brought about by the present Government.

The Minister for Railways: There are certain compensating advantages.

Mr. COWAN: I will deal with those advantages. The only one I know of is a subsidy granted for the cartage of ore from a mine situated anywhere outside a five-mile radius of the nearest railway siding. But take the position of the man whose show is situated within that radius and whose ore is worth only 10 or 12 dwts. If there were a battery in operation in the district, that man would handle his ore only once, namely, from the mine into the battery bin. But under existing conditions he has to cart the ore to the siding, dump it down, have it carried to Coolgardie, where it goes through the same process again. The time lost and the increased expenditure in handling means more than the difference between profit and loss. In these circumstances we are only encouraging the men to pick the eyes out of

the mine; that is to say, to take out the rich ore and leave behind the ore that if properly handled, would be payable. It was methods such as these, followed in the earliest days of the industry, that have left us with millions of tons of ore that cannot now be handled until some cheaper form of treatment is devised. Indeed, our existing conditions relating to prospecting are just as bad as, if not worse, than they were 25 years ago.

Mr. Lindsay: You are not blaming this side of the House for that!

Mr. COWAN: No, I am sorry I cannot do that. I claim that we have in my district the only mine at present employing a large number of men between Kalgoorlie and Wiluna. I am prepared to admit that this mine is working under considerable State assistance. As member for the district, it is my duty both to the district and to the State to mention this matter in the House. The residents of that district, more particularly the workers who have built their homes and reared their families there, are very keenly appreciative of the present Government's action in granting that assistance. But apart from the justification, I am pleased to say the mine is equipped with the most modern and up-to-date plant and is very economically managed. If any members are sufficiently interested to compare the costs of that mine with those of other mines in Western Australia, they will find that those costs speak volumes for the capabilities of the management. I am also pleased to say that I hope within the near future that developments on that mine will prove that every penny of that loan money has been fully justified. It would have been nothing short of a calamity had that mine been allowed to close down and throw out of employment a large number of men—particularly when we remember how much unemployment there is in the State. But I want to point to some rather unfair conditions in the treatment of the gold mining industry as compared with that of agriculture. A steel hauling rope used for the purpose of hauling ore from underground to the surface on the Sons of Gwalia weighs about 12 tons, and the railway freight on that rope from Fremantle to Gwalia is no less than £75. That is a very big sum.

Hon. G. Taylor: What is the cost of the rope?

Mr. COWAN: I cannot say.

The Minister for Railways: We have reduced railway freights on mining requisites by $12\frac{1}{2}$ per cent.

Mr. COWAN: And still the freight on such a rope from Fremantle to Gwalia is £75. Yet the Railway Department is prepared to carry the same tonnage over the same rail-age in agricultural areas—I refer to fencing wire, wire netting or superphosphate—for a very much lower rate than it is prepared to carry anything for the mining industry. It is very poor encouragement for those prepared to endeavour to carry on in the industry to which, as I have already said, quite a number of our other industries owe their very existence.

Mr. Thomson: You have our sympathy. We have always supported any encouragement for the gold mining industry.

Mr. COWAN: I am glad to hear it. It supports my contention that, after all, there is very little difference between our policy and that of the Country Party. There is another matter related to mining, and in this I am quite sure I will have the sympathy of all members of the Assembly. I have already referred to the bad conditions that prevailed in the earlier days of gold mining in Western Australia. We now find a great number of the men who worked in the industry in its infancy, inmates of the Wooroloo Sanatorium. This is a deplorable reflection. A number of those men are personal acquaintances of mine, and I say it is the duty of all members to see that our future conditions are such that those prepared to work in the industry will have an assurance that they will be able to live out their declining years under happier conditions. Whereas at one time we had to rely exclusively on the gold-mining industry for our existence, we now have an industry of more recent growth in this State and which is certainly prosperous. I refer to the sheep and cattle raising industry. A number of our early pioneers took up considerable tracts of country in my district and proved that that country would carry stock. But those men were not in a position to develop it. Nevertheless they were the means of bringing in interested pastoralists from the Eastern States who have since invested tens of thousands of pounds in the development of millions of acres of country which we in our early-day ignorance considered worthless. Those men have developed their places very systematically. They seem to be quite satisfied with the laws

of the land, and they have spent many thousands of pounds on fencing, sinking wells, erecting windmills, and stocking up with the very best class of stock. I am pleased to say they have not asked the Government for very much. However, there is one thing they do ask for, indeed have been asking for since a time before I took my seat in this House. The member for Pingelly last evening thanked the Government for having provided suitable trucking facilities in a portion of his electorate. I claim that in point of trucking stock Leonora is one of the most important places in Western Australia at the present time. The stations up there are stocked with both sheep and cattle. Some members may think we are fortunate in having one set of trucking yards. But there is a disadvantage in that. We have at present yards suitable only for the trucking of cattle. In all probability in the near future we shall have 400 or 500 head of fat cattle periodically coming down to the market. The owners will have to charter a special train for the removal of those cattle. That train probably will come along about 3 o'clock in the afternoon, which means that the cattle will be yarded at sundown that evening. At about 8 o'clock that same evening our 5-mile-an-hour speed-hog of an express will put in its appearance and pass very close to the trucking yards, filled with 400 or 500 fat cattle. On that incoming train there will be probably two trucks of stud sheep from South Australia. Those sheep will have to be unloaded that night in the same yard as the 400 or 500 head of cattle. Those cattle have not seen many white men, and certainly they have not been hand-fed and stall-tended. It is only a matter of time before those cattle will rush that yard. Then there will be considerable loss of valuable stock, and indeed it will be fortunate if there is not also loss of human life. A request was made for the erection of a yard for the handling of sheep. The district contains hundreds of thousands of sheep, and markets many tons of wool. It will thus be realised that this request is only fair. When four or five hundred cattle take it into their heads to make a rush in the yard, nothing will stop them, and many of them will be injured. The remainder will go into the bush, and months will elapse before they are mustered, and before they can be sent in to be trucked again. Who will be responsible for the payment for the special

train that may have to wait to load the missing cattle? No doubt the man who ordered the train will be regarded as responsible. When this sort of thing happens it will be necessary to build two yards, a cattle yard and a sheep yard. Why wait until it does happen? Why not give the people the yard they have asked for, so that the sheep may be properly handled? I am a little Scotch. I think it is better to build one yard now than to go to the expense later on of building two yards. Pastoralists have turned this portion of the back country to profitable account. Some of us were misguided enough to look upon that part of the State as useless, but these men have turned it to account and are surely worthy of a little consideration.

The Minister for Railways: They will get it, too.

Mr. COWAN: I am sorry my remarks are directed so much at the Minister for Railways.

The Minister for Railways: You have never mentioned this before.

Mr. Latham: We are enjoying it.

Mr. COWAN: Shortly after taking my seat in the House, I asked some questions with regard to one through train a week to Leonora. We are only 500 miles from Perth, and yet, in order to reach Leonora on Friday night, we have to leave Perth at 5 o'clock on Wednesday evening. We have two trains a week. One leaves Kalgoorlie on Monday morning and returns on Tuesday, and the other leaves on Friday and returns on Saturday. There is no connecting train between Perth and Leonora. Is it any wonder that those who can afford to do so avail themselves, when possible, of motor transport? I am not so much concerned about those who use motors as I am about the business people and the residents, who have to rely upon the railway service for their supplies, and those who are obliged to make use of the railway passenger service. Let me instance a woman with a young family. She leaves Perth on Wednesday and reaches Kalgoorlie on Thursday. She then has to leave the train and seek accommodation in the town for herself and her children. Fortunately for her she receives greater consideration from hotelkeepers and boardinghouse proprietors than she would if placed in similar circumstances in Perth. If a woman with three or four young Australians sought accommodation in Perth, she would walk the

streets from morning till night before finding any. I have had personal experience of that sort of thing.

Hon. G. Taylor: That is peculiar to all the cities in Australia.

Mr. COWAN: Our young Australians are not thought as much of when their mothers are looking for accommodation as they were in 1914, when they were in great demand. To-day a young Australian is not wanted by those who manage hotels and lodging houses. Apart from the inconvenience caused to the woman, she has to catch a train on Friday morning and does not reach Leonora until 8 o'clock at night. Probably she has to leave by motor car at daylight next morning and travel between 50 and 150 miles. That is a big journey for a woman with a young family to undertake. Many of these women are the wives of men who are working outback. I have had experience of these places. Men do not get such high rates of pay that their wives can afford to throw away money in unnecessary expenditure. Apparently, we can offer wonderful conveniences to travellers who are going out of the State. There are no vexatious delays for people who go by the Great Western Railway. If we can make these arrangements for people who are leaving the State, surely we should be prepared to do likewise for those travelling within it, developing it, and opening up the industries in the back country. These people are entitled to consideration. I trust the Minister for Railways will see that we get a through service to Leonora. A particular measure was dealt with last session. Its importance will bear political fruit in the near future. I sincerely hope that whatever alteration is brought about in the personnel of the House, through the passing of that Bill, it will be for the benefit of the State as a whole, and not for any one section of the community. As a newcomer in this Chamber, I wish to thank members for extending to me so uninterrupted a hearing.

MR. GRIFFITHS (Avon) [5.37]: On the Address-in-reply members are allowed to ramble over the fields of thought.

The Premier: I hope not too many.

Mr. GRIFFITHS: The Premier's sigh makes one assume that he wants the debate to conclude.

The Premier: I hope you will not go too far afield.

Mr. GRIFFITHS: The member for Leonora has spoken of the unfortunate men who are taken to Wooroloo because of the ill-effects upon their health brought about by their occupation. I should like to explain certain statements I have made in this House upon tuberculosis. I have asked several questions in the Chamber.

The Premier: Goodness knows, you have!

Mr. GRIFFITHS: I do not know whether the Premier is posing as the funny man of the House.

The Premier: I agreed that you had asked questions all right.

Mr. GRIFFITHS: And these questions were to the point. I have been told that I write a lot of letters. I certainly answer letters that are sent to me, which is a rule all members do not observe. I always agree with any sympathetic references goldfields members may make to those unfortunate men who have to seek an asylum at the Wooroloo Sanatorium. I said I had asked questions about which the Premier was so funny. These referred to bovine tuberculosis. There has been a campaign in Great Britain and Australia in regard to the great white plague, as it is termed, tuberculosis. That campaign has taken definite shape in certain action in Great Britain and recently in New South Wales with regard to bringing into effect the tuberculin tests of cattle. I did not intend to-night to say anything on this question but was going to leave that until we reached the Estimates. The few notes I have, however, will be illuminating to the House, and will explain to the Minister for Agriculture why I referred to these questions before. The other night I asked some questions in regard to the embargo that has been placed upon our cattle by the Dutch East Indian authorities. Again the Premier has a chance to be funny.

The Minister for Railways: Some of your questions are funny.

Hon. G. Taylor: And the answers are worse.

The Minister for Railways: The questions deserve the answers.

Mr. GRIFFITHS: I was told that steps were being taken to prove that the statement that our certificates were untrustworthy was incorrect. Last session information was given to me from Canberra concerning the Wyndham Meat Works, and the inspection of cattle slaughtered there

for export during the period 1921 to 1928 inclusive. I find that in 1927, 549 cattle suffering from tuberculosis were destroyed at the Wyndham Meat Works. In 1928 the increase was more than double, as many as 1,161 being destroyed. In the case of forequarters, in 1927 eleven were destroyed, and in 1928, 24 had to be destroyed. In the case of hindquarters the figures were four and twenty respectively. When I asked the questions last session the Minister for Agriculture was a little concerned as to my reason for doing so. My reason was this: if it is true, as stated, that tuberculosis prevails to that extent amongst the cattle in the North-West, one wonders what the position is with the dairy cattle in the South-West.

Hon. G. Taylor: There is more inspection in the South-West.

Mr. GRIFFITHS: Dairy cattle are more liable to tuberculosis than are cattle that are kept for slaughter. I believe that in Perth the milk supply is very much improved compared with what it used to be. There is a closer inspection of dairy herds, and the chance of children being affected by bovine tuberculosis through drinking milk has to a large extent been minimised in the metropolis.

Mr. Sampson: Pascomi has done a lot.

Mr. GRIFFITHS: In the back country an ex-member of the House impressed me very much by showing me certain cattle that had to be destroyed after inspection. What I saw impressed me with the fact that there was more tuberculosis amongst our cattle than the authorities were prepared to admit. Just recently a series of articles have appeared in the country Press setting out the danger of infectious diseases and particularly stressing the menace of the tubercle bacillus infection from the use of milk. At a conference recently held in New South Wales the Berrima branch of the Country Women's Association carried a resolution dealing with this subject. Let me first explain that the association in question is a non-sectarian and non-political body and its membership is some 9,000. The resolution read—

That the Berrima district branch desire to draw attention to the necessity for further action of testing against tuberculosis in cattle, from both the economic and health standpoints, and recommends that all private owners of cows who are using milk for their own families, have the cattle tested, and that all schools and

institutions using milk take the necessary steps to assure that their milk supply comes from tubercle-free herds. The association desires to offer every encouragement in pushing forward the scheme of voluntarily accredited tubercle-free herds.

At that conference the delegates received a special message from Sir Neville Howse, Federal Minister for Health. I am referring to this matter to-night because I feel that our Minister for Health (Mr. Munzie) should endeavour to follow in the steps of the authorities in New South Wales who have by their labours established tubercle-free herds. That is the position also in the Federal capital territory. The message of the Federal Minister for Health is as follows:—

The elimination of bovine tuberculosis in Australia would add considerably to the wealth of our cattle industry, but would also have an effect upon the health of the community to which no monetary value can be given. It is a recognised fact that a considerable amount of tuberculosis in children, especially that form which is manifested by enlarged glands and bone lesions, is due to infection by tubercle bacilli of bovine origin. The usual channel of infection is through the milk supply, and one method of eliminating it is by testing all cows supplying milk for human consumption, with tuberculin. Great strides have been made in United States of America in the elimination of bovine tuberculosis. During the year ended 30th June, 1928, 10,826,280 cattle were tested, while a total of 21,418,977 are under State and Federal supervision for the eradication of the disease. In Australia the system of testing all dairy herds has been adopted in the Federal capital territory, whilst the system of providing for accredited tubercle-free herds has been adopted in New South Wales, and the movement is slowly extending. Because of the large areas devoted to cattle raising in Australia, the testing of all cattle is not within the bounds of practicability at present, but the establishment of tubercle-free areas for all dairy cattle is a much to be desired aim, especially in respect of country towns where a system of efficient pasteurisation of milk is not practicable.

The list I saw published recently in the Government "Agricultural Gazette" of New South Wales gives something in the neighbourhood of 50 herds which have been declared tubercle-free. All this may appear to be wearisome to hon. members, but the subject is of extreme importance. The member for Leonora (Mr. Cowan) dealt with the dire effects of a somewhat similar disease in human beings, and personally I have lost many old friends and goldfields acquaintances through the same trouble. This prompts me to lay emphasis on the import-

ance of giving the subject attention, and I am bringing it forward in the hope of inducing Ministers to realise that everything possible should be done to ensure a pure milk supply. I know I shall be told that already a great deal has been done in the metropolitan area, and I admit that the milk supply in and around the city is more wholesome than it was some time ago. But we must not lose sight of the fact that some system of pasteurisation is necessary for country towns. With this I will close the subject. Recently I asked some questions with regard to hire purchase machinery agreements. I think it was in 1919 that I had brought under my notice the case of a man who had bought a harvester and after using it for a couple of seasons had it taken from him. It is because of cases such as that, I feel I am justified in asking the Government to bring forward an amendment to the hire purchase legislation. In the case I have just mentioned the man bought a harvester and his crop was a partial failure. He was only able to pay half the first promissory note. In the next year, 1914, his crop was a total failure, and the man was unable to pay the promissory note that fell due. In the next year he had a fair crop, and in the subsequent year he paid off the second promissory note. In 1918 he paid off the third promissory note, leaving half of a previous promissory note unpaid, together with the sum of £30 accrued interest, bringing up the total to £52. Just as he was starting to harvest, the machinery people stepped in and took charge of the harvester, despite the fact that the man had up to then paid £91 of the total of £118 10s. The farmer had used that harvester on practically two crops only, and at the end a demand was made for £52. Whether the machinery people ultimately collected that amount or not I do not know. The fact remains that they received nearly two-thirds of the cost of the machine, and then took it away from the farmer. Repeatedly have I asked in this House certain questions on the subject of hire purchase agreements, and this is the third or fourth time that I have referred to this particular incident. Some time back I placed in the hands of the late Mr R. T. Robinson when he was Attorney General, or perhaps it was Mr. Draper, who also filled that portfolio, a copy of the Canadian statute dealing with hire purchase agreements. That copy must still be in the

department somewhere, and as far as I can remember it provides that in the event of seizure of an implement, three people shall value the machine, one of them to represent the buyer, another the seller, and the third to be independent of the parties, the duty of each being to put the price on the machine in its existing condition, the amount having been paid to be deducted from the total cost, and should there be a balance either way the matter then to be referred to either party. I have had a good deal to do of late with the manager of the Agricultural Bank and the Industries Assistance Board, and I have learnt of many people purchasing motor cars instead of using that money in paying interest or rents. What I should like to see in regard to the machinery business is that the hire purchase should be an ordinary purchase, and that a bill of sale should be given over the article. Then at least 14 days' notice should be given to those people who know well that the farmer could not afford to buy an expensive car, and so enable them to protect the man as well as themselves against making a foolish purchase. That would be welcomed by the manager of the Agricultural Bank and by the Industries Assistance Board.

The Minister for Railways: We could not control such a thing.

Mr. GRIFFITHS: It should be possible to control such foolish actions, and if there were a bill of sale, what might prove a foolish purchase could be stopped. A bill of sale is a protection for the trader. Whether such a course could be followed I am not prepared to argue, but I do contend that it should not be possible for such a case as I have instanced to be recorded—the removal of a machine, and giving the farmer who had paid two-thirds of the cost, no credit whatever for that payment. It seems extraordinary that it should be possible for a man to pay so much off a harvester and then, after using it for barely two seasons, to lose it altogether. So far as I know, the machine was undamaged and had been well cared for. I suppose I shall have to keep harping on the subject, and some day perhaps steps will be taken in the direction I am advocating. In any case I have made it clear that a gross injustice was perpetrated in the case I have referred to. Recently I paid a visit to the South-West in company with the Minister for Education. In the past I have had very little to say

about the South-West, but as a Country Party member I should now like to give a few of my impressions. Back in 1900 I was in the Leeuwin country and I saw what was being done in a small way without any elaborate preparation. Even then I had a vague impression that the South-West was capable of great things. I should like to bear testimony to the public spirit displayed by the mill workers, settlers and townspeople of Pemberton and Manjinaup. In Pemberton there was a branch of that very fine organisation, the Parents' and Citizens' Association, headed by the capable schoolmaster, Mr. Glew, who is a past master in organising. He has manifested great enthusiasm in the district and it has been nobly responded to by the people generally. At Pemberton the people have provided for the town—not for the school alone—a swimming pool 110 yards long by 45 yards wide, with a maximum depth of 11 feet, giving a water space of over an acre. The cost of labour was not recorded because it was mostly volunteer labour, but the cash cost to the people was £150. At the school there is a nursery, and a pine plantation has been started. I had the curiosity to look through the minute book to ascertain what amount of money those people had collected and I found that since 1925 the cash collected had amounted to £1,109. Volunteer work to the value of £377 was also done, making a total of £1,486 to improve the school grounds, provide a tennis court for the girls, a cricket pitch, pine plantation, swimming pool, and school equipment in the shape of pictures and sports material. Money has also been made available to give the children a holiday at Bunbury during the summer. A community who work for the common welfare in such an enthusiastic manner is deserving of our highest commendation. The money was raised partly by donations, but mainly by weekly or fortnightly collections among the people. I had the pleasure of visiting, in company with the Minister and the member for Nelson, a number of the settlers, and after inspecting various holdings I came to the conclusion that the settlers were men who could not go wrong. The following will illustrate the type of settler we met: the man was from the north of Ireland, a born wit who, when we congratulated him on his nice orchard and fine crop of potatoes—the potatoes were a side line that he expected would bring him in £400 to £500—told us

that he was now on the place for the third time. He would go on to the block, work it for a year or two and then go away and resume sleeper cutting or timber falling. Then he would return to his block and do some more work. In that way he had gradually made a nice holding of it and his orchard was just coming into bearing.

Mr. J. H. Smith: He was not a group settler.

Mr. GRIFFITHS: No. That reminds me that we saw a group settler of whom the Minister asked why he did not get more cows. He had done very good work on his block, and his reply was, "I am not going to get more cows until my pastures are ready for them, and then I want to get them with my own money instead of borrowing money from the bank." There are many settlers of that description. I was greatly impressed with the fertility of the country, which cannot be questioned. I understand that we were not shown the worst holdings, but to the north-west and west of Pemberton I understand there are many thousands of acres of equally good land, extending, indeed, as far as Nannup. I realised that the ultimate success of the right type of settler is beyond all doubt, in so far as dairying and intensive culture are concerned. During the visit I heard certain complaints regarding the Forests Department. I was given to understand that the department are taking the 2,000,000 acres reservation in a face, including all the fertile gullies. That is not right. I also learned that the department are leasing some of those gullies. If the department are doing that, it appears to me they are building up another Lands Department. The people consider it is not in the best interests of the South-West that the country should be taken in a face with all the fertile gullies included. The gullies should be exempt from forestry operations. After my visit I am satisfied that with the right type of settler, there is a great future before that part of the State. On various occasions the member for Nelson and I have had little exchanges across the floor of the House regarding the South-West, but these have not been due to any condemnation by me of the South-West. The hon. member has misunderstood some of the things I said. I have always been sympathetic towards his advocacy of closer settlement, and am not exclusively a wheat-belt man. I endeavour to take as broad a view as possible of the whole

State and its requirements. There is one serious aspect of South-West settlement with which I am sure the Minister for Agriculture will agree. It is part of Labour's agricultural policy to encourage research work to cope with stock and plant diseases. Therefore the Minister should seriously consider what I am about to say regarding the South-West and its pests. I do not wish to usurp the prerogative of the member for Nelson, but this matter was brought before my notice by one of the settlers and I feel sure the hon. member will not take umbrage at my mentioning it.

Mr. J. H. Smith: I am very pleased to receive some support.

Mr. GRIFFITHS: The pest I have in mind is the lucerne flea. Members who know little of the subject may think it a matter of no importance, but I assure the House that it is a serious menace to the lucerne and clover crops. Certain action has been taken in South Australia, where tremendous damage has been done by the pest, but investigation there has proved that only on agricultural land of the higher class can the chemical remedy be applied to combat this fearful pest. Mr. Holdaway, one of the Federal Government's research students, has given the matter considerable attention. A recent Press cutting stated—

The Council for Scientific and Industrial Research have received a report from Mr. G. F. Hill, who had recently visited South Australia to carry out preliminary investigations on the lucerne flea pest, which was becoming a serious menace to the successful growth of lucerne, cereals, clovers, and other pasture plants in the State. The report indicated that the insect had become too widely distributed to be successfully controlled by artificial means, and that the only satisfactory solution of the problem appeared to be the discovery and introduction from abroad of effective natural enemies. . . . Mr. Holdaway, who is now in the United States, but who carried out investigations on the lucerne flea before he left South Australia, indicates that in lands of higher agricultural value a partial solution of the problem might be found by chemical treatment of the soil.

Members representing South-West constituencies will probably have something more to say about this menace. The Federal Government are doing something and I trust that when the vote for our entomological staff is under consideration there will be no stinting of money for the carrying on of their investigations. Mr. Newman is doing very useful work and should receive every encouragement. The circular he sent out re-

cently has been most helpful. There are other pests such as the red earth mite, which I have seen in places like Tammin, where the whole of the vegetation was swept away as by a blight in the course of a couple of nights. The scientific staff of the Department of Agriculture—the bug hunters as they are sometimes facetiously called—should be assisted to the utmost, and I hope we shall not be niggardly when their votes come before us for consideration.

Sitting suspended from 6.15 to 7.30 p.m.

Mr. GRIFFITHS: I desire to express my appreciation of what was done by the Lands Department in regard to fixing up the transfer of certain blocks for the East-West Airways, so that they could have the beacon erected in time for the initiation of their service. From the Minister and the Under Secretary downwards, I was afforded every opportunity to allow this transfer to be effected rapidly, so that electric light might be installed and other necessary work performed in time. There is a vexed topic which has occupied the attention of almost every member of the Chamber and upon which I desire to express my views. I refer to unemployment. Reading the remarks of the Leader of the Opposition it seems to me that though the Premier has found his position a fairly hard one, yet he has had many props supporting him in his manipulation of the State's affairs. When certain props have been removed, I do not know how we will get on; I fear we shall have increasing deficits. The first thing that strikes me in this connection is that between 1913 and 1927 the taxation of production has increased from 10.4 per cent to 19.6 per cent.; that is to say, it has practically doubled itself. There has been a good deal of talk about reduction of taxation, but it is no use addressing that talk to the man in the country who has to pay the cheque. His cheque books tell him, and I will tell all those who investigate them, that in many cases there has been something more than a doubling of taxation. The Premier to-night interjected that the Government could not help the increases in land value. As regards the farmers, however, we of this party have pointed out over and over again that they are now charged two taxes, both land and income tax, instead of only the greater one of the two. There is also the removal of the £250 exemption. Again and again have we argued in this

House in favour of investigation to see whether something cannot be done to reduce the burden on the primary producer. Taxation on production, I repeat, between 1913 and 1927 has increased from 10.4 per cent. to 19.6 per cent. Federal grants to assist revenue show that there has been an increase of £226,000 in this item and of £197,000 in taxation, making a gross increase of £423,000. These are some of the props to which I have referred.

Hon. G. Taylor: You are speaking of the last financial year?

Mr. GRIFFITHS: Yes. The Federal Government's aid to our finances include the special grant of £300,000, increased interest on transferred properties £22,000, payment of part of our sinking fund £91,607, road grant, if we care to use it, £384,000, making a total of £797,500 odd. In addition to all this, local authorities have during the five years increased their borrowings by £1,048,000. The State Savings Bank deposits have increased by £2,000,000, and ordinary bank advances by £5,430,000. All this is in favour of the State. These things are props which should help the financial position, and in spite of them we have unemployment. I have heard a good deal about Southern Europeans, for whom I hold no brief. I was at the Mundaring Weir a few days ago, and I spoke to two of these men. They had been travelling around the country for more than three months looking for work. They said that they could not get any work on the wheat belt, that the farmers had no work for them. It has been stated here to-night emphatically by the Premier that the farmers are employing Southern Europeans, and that the Leader of the Opposition knows they are doing so. I declare that it is not so. There are cases in which clearing has been done with Southern European labour by independent farmers in a position to employ them. They employ the Southern Europeans—I regret to have to say this—because our own people will not do the work, because our own people very often start a job and leave it unfinished, with a store bill exceeding the value of the work they have done. That has occurred repeatedly in and around Westonia. I will give particulars of the case of a man who was granted permission to employ Southern Europeans. I did not know whether this man was a constituent of mine or of Mr. Corboy, so I took him to Mr. Corboy in the first instance. The man had had some Southern Europeans

—Dahnatians or Albanians—employed on clearing, but the edict went forth that these men were not to be employed. Accordingly they were put off. A request was made to have them reinstated, but it was refused. Three men were then sent to this farmer by the secretary of the Timber Workers' Union, men supposed to come from the South-West. Two of them stayed a week, and one stayed a fortnight. They left saying they could not make tucker at the job. They left behind them a store bill exceeding the value of the work they had done. The farmer thereupon wired to the secretary of the union, who sent three more men. The farmer happened to be an old comrade of the union secretary. This lot of three men stayed about the same length of time, and cleared out leaving a store bill in their turn. Finally the farmer came to Perth and made an appeal to the Minister, saying it was absolutely impossible for him to carry on in this way. He pointed out that he could not get local men to do the work, and that it meant either that he was going to make some money out of the coming harvest by getting this work done, or that he would lose the lot. He was most anxious to get a certain area of land cleared in time. An arrangement was made to allow him to employ certain men to help him out of his difficulty. That was against the order which had been issued; but the Minister in this instance, having regard to the farmer's position, waived the condition so as to allow him to get his clearing done. I hear the member for Fremantle (Mr. Sleeman) and other hon. members talk about farmers being unpatriotic in the matter of employment. Let me take the case of the Minister for Works. He has a farm, and I believe he has had a dam sunk there, and I presume he did not put men on day labour to do dam sinking. I believe he would get it done by contract. If he did it by day labour, he is a bigger fool than I take him to be.

Ministerial Member: He paid more than any other farmer in the district.

Mr. Lindsay: That remains to be proved.

Mr. GRIFFITHS: If the Minister for Works did not have his dam sunk by contract, I will say he was a fool not to have gone about the thing in the usual business way. Similarly, I do not think for a moment that the Minister for Works would be a strong advocate of the 44-hour week on his farm, nor would the Premier, during harvest

time, when a storm might come along and wipe out the result of the year's work. That is my reply to the accusation that the farmers are unpatriotic in employing these men. Generally speaking, very few Southern Europeans are employed by farmers. A son of mine is going on a block in a fortnight's time, and has to get his clearing done; and I am expecting trouble for him before he gets his bit of land cleared. I have had my fling as regards hire-purchase of machinery, and also with reference to the spread of tuberculosis through the milk supply. As to the latter point, I hope it will appear that Western Australia is in a better position than is sometimes stated to be the case. To-day I have given notice of certain questions I desire to ask the Minister for Agricultural Water Supplies concerning an extension of the Belka water scheme, as follows:—

What year will the Belka water scheme extension be completely paid for by the settlers? Does a reduction then become operative?

I have also given notice of the following question to the same Minister:—

Will he inquire into the charge of 6s. 8d. per thousand gallons for excess water charged on the Belka extension of the goldfields water scheme as compared with the 2s. 6d. per thousand gallons charged on the South Mine's Hill extension, and make a reduction to the Belka scheme?

The Minister for Agricultural Water Supplies: You should have raised that question when your Government made the price 6s. 8d. per thousand gallons.

Mr. GRIFFITHS: We are told that the Goldfields Water Scheme is to-day practically the property of the people of Western Australia. I do not know whether it is out of place for me to venture such an opinion, but it appears to me, at any rate, that having purchased the scheme and got it into our own hands, and having now only to maintain it and keep it in good order, we might very well reconsider the whole system of pricing the water throughout the wheat belt. This so-called Goldfields Water Supply Scheme is really a wheat belt-goldfields scheme.

Mr. Lindsay: The goldfields water supply was paid for by the whole of the people of this State, not by the goldfields people alone.

Mr. GRIFFITHS: Upwards of 50 per cent. of the water used from the scheme at present is used throughout the wheat belt, and the Government should consider the re-

lationship between the agricultural industry and the water supply scheme.

The Minister for Agricultural Water Supplies: Are you advocating an increase of the lower rates, or a reduction of the higher rates?

Mr. GRIFFITHS: I would suggest a flat rate if possible. As it is, it seems that the more enterprising men who go outback are penalised accordingly. The rate of 10d. and 1s. is not too bad if a man is making a success of his property, for he can really make it profitable because of his stock.

The Minister for Agricultural Water Supplies: No farmer is rated at 1s.; the highest rate is 10d.

Mr. GRIFFITHS: One extension—that to Belka—was rated at 1s., but it was reduced to 10d.

The Minister for Agricultural Water Supplies: Your Government fixed the rate at 1s. and it was reduced to 10d. by the present Government.

Mr. GRIFFITHS: That is so. I do not think a rate of 10d., particularly in the early stages of a man's development of his holding, is a good proposition. I know that these people will sign anything to get a water supply, hoping that, should the venture not prove profitable to them, they will be able to get a reduction. Many of these people have been charged this rate even though they were not able to use the water. I hope the Minister will look into these matters and see whether some more reasonable provision than a charge of 6s. 8d. per 1,000 gallons for excess water can be made.

MR. KENNEALLY (East Perth) [7.47]: I trust you will permit me, Mr. Speaker, to express my personal regret that so far during the session, it has not been possible for our warrior friend, the member for Murray-Wellington (Hon. W. J. George), to attend to his parliamentary duties. We may differ in politics, but I know I am expressing the wish of every hon. member when I say that we would like to see him in his seat before the session ends. In the Governor's Speech we find that the position of prime importance is given to the question of railway construction. In view of that fact, it is reasonable to give a few moment's thought to the construction of our railways as it is proceeding at present. To-day that construction includes three railways, the greatest number of such works in hand at one time since responsible government was inaugurated.

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: What, three railways! There were as many under construction when we left office.

Mr. KENNEALLY: The Leader of the Opposition does not deny my statement that the railways now in hand represent the greatest number under construction by the Public Works Department since we have enjoyed responsible government. The reason he has not denied my statement is that he knows if he were to do so, his denial would be untrue.

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: How many are under construction?

Mr. KENNEALLY: Three at one time.

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: Why, we opened five in one year!

Mr. KENNEALLY: The Government have maintained that rate of railway construction during practically the whole time they have been in office. The policy of the Government is such as to open up the country in a manner that has not been possible under any previous Administration. I can easily understand the interjection by the Leader of the Opposition.

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: Wonderful! We know all about this, because we have had returns.

Mr. KENNEALLY: Then the hurt will be not less to the hon. member's dignity!

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: You have a lot of unemployment now.

Mr. KENNEALLY: The Government have a system whereby the farmers are assisted in respect of agricultural supplies. I am awaiting to hear the Leader of the Opposition say that that system, too, was in operation during his period of administration.

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: Of course it was.

Mr. KENNEALLY: The hon. member evades my point, which was that the system of agricultural water supplies at present operating throughout the country was inaugurated by the present Government.

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: Wonderful! The only thing the Government have done in five years, and then they used one per cent. money and charged the farmers eight per cent.

Mr. KENNEALLY: We will analyse that statement a little later, and possibly the Leader of the Opposition will agree that there are one or two other things that the

Government have done during the past five years.

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: Yes, they are responsible for the unemployed.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. KENNEALLY: At present we have in operation in this State health laws such as never before were promulgated since responsible government. Perhaps the Leader of the Opposition will say that that is one of the things that the present Government have not done.

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: Certainly they have not; they have just gone on with their job.

Mr. KENNEALLY: The Minister for Health has inaugurated legislation dealing with the health of the people that places Western Australia in the forefront of the other States. That may be a matter to cause facetiousness on the part of the Leader of the Opposition, but I would point out to him that the Labour Party, in its health policy, places women and children in the forefront. If the Leader of the Opposition can make that a subject for jocularity, the members of the Labour Party cannot afford to do so. The health of the women and children stands pre-eminent among the reforms that are being tackled at the present time.

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: It is merely your claims that amuse me.

Mr. KENNEALLY: It ill-becomes the Leader of the Opposition to make light of the reforms brought about by the Government with regard to such matters, for the health of the women and children is of the highest moment in the eyes of the Government of the day. We could wish that the Leader of the Opposition, when he had charge of the Treasury bench, had displayed the vision, through his then Minister for Health, that has characterised the work of the present Administration.

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: Wonderful! You have had £4,000,000 more to spend.

Mr. KENNEALLY: And we had four millions less deficit than you had.

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: We followed your rotten deficit.

Mr. KENNEALLY: Having been able to avoid that £4,000,000 deficit that the hon. member was associated with, it stands to the credit of the present Government that they have been able to do something in the direction of social reform.

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: You had £4 000,000 more than I had, and I had to wipe out your deficit.

Mr. KENNEALLY: When the Leader of the Opposition starts to talk about rotten administration, it shows that my remarks are going home! This being our Centenary year, it opens up a new phase of the State's development. I hope that the celebration of the State's hundredth birthday will be on such a scale that it will leave on the memories of the young people of to-day an impression that will never be eradicated. I am particularly anxious that at least a number of the proposed celebrations shall be successful. There is being arranged to-day an aerial flight from Sydney to Perth, the like of which has never been attempted before in the Commonwealth. I am hopeful that the success of that attempt will not only draw attention to the Centenary of the State, but to the possibility of aerial developments that must be of direct interest to this State. It has been noted in the Governor's Speech that there was a good wheat harvest last year, and another good harvest is promised by the season that has developed so far. I could wish that it would be possible for the policy of the present Government to be so shaped that the producers of that wheat would be placed in the position of receiving the benefit of the full price secured for their product. A few weeks back we were told that it was expected that Russia would come into the wheat market as a big producer. At the same time we were told of the enormous harvests that would be reaped in the Argentine, in the United States of America, and in Canada. Then it was pointed out in the Press that there was an enormous carry-over from the previous harvest. The direct result of that propaganda was that the price of wheat was quoted at a very low figure. Subsequently we found that instead of Russia coming into the market as a big wheat producer, the announcement was made that she was purchasing enormous quantities of wheat in order to feed her starving millions. In the course of a few days there appeared different reports regarding the crops in Canada, America and elsewhere. The result of that market juggling done by the middlemen was that the price of wheat went up with a bump.

The Minister for Mines: It is down 2s. a quarter according to to-night's paper.

Mr. KENNEALLY: It went down by 2s. a bushel at an earlier stage. When sufficient time had been allowed to enable the agents to get control of the wheat at the lower figure there was a sudden rise in prices. Unfortunately in very many cases those who produce the wheat will not get the benefit of that rise. In some places where the pool may be able to protect them to an extent they will be not as badly off as those in other places where the pool does not extend; but the fact remains that those who produced the wheat will not get the full benefit of what they have produced. After all, that is the Labour complaint. We say the labourer is entitled to the result of his labour, and that whether that labourer happens to be a farmer or an artisan, the same policy shall apply. But on account of the anti-Labour policy in operation elsewhere, we find the producer does not get the benefit, but the middleman gets the benefit while the producer is defrauded.

Mr. Lindsay: It must be remembered that there was practically no wheat for sale two months ago.

Mr. KENNEALLY: No such thing.

Mr. Lindsay: I think I know a little more about wheat than you do.

Mr. KENNEALLY: It is very little you know if you do not know more than I do. I do not profess to know much about wheat, but I do profess to know sufficient to be able to say that when the hon. member declares there was no wheat for sale two months ago he ignores the fact that there was supposed to be 150,000,000 bushels of a carry-over for sale.

Mr. Lindsay: Yes that is so.

Mr. KENNEALLY: Therefore when the hon. member says there was no wheat for sale two months ago, he has to qualify that remark. So while I do not profess to know much about it, I do know that the carry-over was there, and that even at the present time the carry-over is playing an important part in the rigging of the market.

Mr. Lindsay: No one can control wheat to-day; there is too much of it in the world.

Mr. KENNEALLY: I will deal later with that statement that there is too much wheat in the world to be controlled.

Mr. Mann: Where do you suggest it is controlled?

Mr. KENNEALLY: We have the fact established, which I do not think even the member for Toodyay will deny, that under that system the producer of the wheat is not getting the full result of his labour. It is those people who are engaged in rigging the market who are getting a big slice out of what should be the full result of the farmer's labour. I am asked how I would deal with it. I would deal with it through the policy of the Labour Party, which makes provision for dealing with such questions.

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: You would not have a monopoly of the wheat.

Mr. KENNEALLY: No, I would not have a monopoly, which the member for Toodyay the other evening seemed to favour when he said that one farmer was buying out another and therefore getting larger holdings to the detriment of those previously on the land. I deprecate that state of things. But last session—and I hope the Government will do so again—we did make an effort to try to control similar positions in this State by the introduction of anti-profiteering legislation, which the hon. member assisted to throw out.

Mr. Lindsay: How would that affect the accumulation of land by certain men?

Mr. KENNEALLY: Anti-profiteering legislation if properly applied will deal, not only with the land, but with wheat also. Therefore if the hon. member repeats his question and asks how we are going to deal with it, if we could be assured that there would be a Labour Government in the country where these questions have to be dealt with as they have to be in this country, we could deal with them by introducing anti-profiteering legislation by which the situation could be controlled.

Mr. Latham: You mean a Labour Government in America?

Mr. KENNEALLY: I should like to see a Labour Government there too. Labour throughout the world adopts the policy of trying to return to the producer the full result of what he produces.

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: Get out! You grumble about the price of bread all the time.

Mr. KENNEALLY: I hope the Government will bring down anti-profiteering legislation again this session and that they will make a special effort also to deal with pro-

fitteering in house rents. We have a system by which the cost of living is computed in this country. Under that system house rents play a fairly important part in the method of computation. The Government, and indeed the community generally, should take up this question of profiteering in house rents. Some people will say the high cost of labour greatly increases the cost of building and therefore results in high rents. But that does not account for those houses that were built a quarter of a century ago, houses the rent for which, nevertheless, in some instances has been trebled. The argument that it is the cost of labour that puts up the rental of those houses falls to the ground when it can be shown that none of the labour for the building of those houses was paid at anything like the present rates.

Mr. Mann: What about the land tax? Does not that affect the rents?

Mr. KENNEALLY: Yes; land tax at $\frac{1}{2}$ d. in the pound would affect rents, perhaps.

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: It is the fault of the present Government.

Mr. Lindsay: I did not know that the land tax was only $\frac{1}{2}$ d. in the pound.

The Premier: It is only a fraction. I myself have to pay 15s. more in land tax than I did previously.

Mr. KENNEALLY: A question needing the attention of the House, one that has been dealt with by some members, is unemployment. I had occasion recently to deal with this outside the House, and I want to repeat here what I said then, namely, that this question should be dealt with, not on party lines, but as a question requiring the best that is in every party to solve it. It will not be solved unless all parties do put their minds to it in order to solve it in a manner satisfactory to the community. Unemployment is known not only in this country or even in Australia. Every civilised nation of the earth—with the possible exception of France, which to a large extent has been engaged on post-war reconstruction—at present is confronted with the problem of unemployment.

Mr. Sampson: But is unemployment justified here?

Mr. KENNEALLY: Unemployment exists in practically every known country. I am asked is unemployment justified here. I think that when I have finished my remarks, if the member for Swan still wants informa-

tion he can repeat the question; if he does not repeat it, we may take it that his question has been answered. Recently I spoke at a meeting in the Town Hall. In the course of the debate here two or three members have made reference to that speech. Three of them, the Leader of the Opposition, the Leader of the Country Party and the member for Toodyay, took their information from the same source, the newspaper, and each decided to put a different construction on what the paper contained. The Leader of the Opposition said I had advocated reduced production.

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: No.

Mr. KENNEALLY: Perhaps I am ascribing to the hon. member what the Leader of the Country Party said. What the Leader of the Opposition said was that on the argument; I had advanced at that meeting I would regard an increased production of close on £9,000,000 as being of no advantage to the country. I do not hear any denials of that. The Leader of the Country Party said I had advocated reduced production. The member for Toodyay, after making mention of portion of what the newspaper contained, went on to try to prove that the statements made by me meant that I believed in decreased production.

Mr. Lindsay: Well what did you say?

Mr. KENNEALLY: I propose to repeat what I said. I said then as I say now that the cry, "Produce, produce, produce" is not going to solve the unemployment problem.

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: Not the cry, but production itself will.

Mr. KENNEALLY: That is what I said and what I repeat here. I said there that effective modern, labour-saving machinery means a reduced number of employees necessary in order to operate that machinery, and that if a reduced number of employees is required in order to operate that machinery, and if that labour-saving machinery—which sometimes means a tremendous saving in labour—is to be extended, there is one method by which we have to deal with the question of unemployment, and that is to give some benefit to the worker in the form of fewer hours in consequence of the labour-saving machinery.

Mr. Lindsay: We had unemployment before there was any machinery in the world. Your story has been told and re-told for many years past.

Mr. KENNEALLY: And the hon. member's story was told when our predecessors advocated a lesser number of hours to be worked in the mines in England. When it was advocated that child labour should be abolished from the mines of England we were told that if it was not possible to utilise the combined services of a man, his wife and his children for production, the State would go bankrupt. We have been told that right through history. Any attempt at reform in the matter of hours or working conditions has been met by the statement that it will ruin industry. That characterised the agitation from the 60-hour week, for the 54-hour week, and the 48-hour week, and no doubt when the time comes for modern machinery to make it possible to work weekly hours below 44, we shall also be told that industry will be ruined. An invention is useless to society unless it leads to cheaper production, and goods can be produced at a lower price than was the case before. If that be so, are we, as a people, to be placed in the position of advocating fewer inventions? Is it not more logical to say we welcome them, and anything that will reduce the amount of labour required to produce a certain result?

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: The point is to increase the standard of living.

Mr. KENNEALLY: Are we to subscribe to the idea that a little more food and a few more clothes are the utmost the worker can get out of the inventive genius of man?

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: And books and comforts, etc.

Mr. KENNEALLY: Then let the Leader of the Opposition support our policy of a 44-hour week, and join us over here.

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: All the rest would be starving if I went there.

Mr. KENNEALLY: He should join with us if he thinks books and other comforts should be provided for the worker. Let him support us in our efforts on behalf of the working man to give him greater hours of leisure to enjoy the books and comforts.

Hon. G. Taylor: Too many men are spending long hours each day looking for work.

Mr. KENNEALLY: That is due to the fact that we in Australia have been unable correctly to tackle our industrial problems. To do this we must give attention to the question of inventions and the effects of

new machinery. We cannot give attention to the question of hours unless we also consider those other things. We should not subscribe to the idea that the utmost the working man can expect out of inventions is a few extra clothes and food, as the Leader of the Opposition suggests.

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: I suggested nothing of the kind.

Mr. KENNEALLY: I think he added books.

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: I said comforts, and increasing the standard of living.

Mr. KENNEALLY: If so, let him subscribe to the principle of giving the worker more opportunity to enjoy those things than he has at present.

Mr. Sampson: Did you, in the Town Hall, say that fewer hours meant greater prosperity?

Mr. KENNEALLY: I did not take leave of my senses there.

Mr. Sampson: We have been given to understand you said so.

Mr. KENNEALLY: I can give the hon. member the facts and the figures, but I cannot endow him with the required intelligence to enable him to understand them.

Mr. Sampson: If you make a hard try, you might be able to put them more clearly.

Mr. KENNEALLY: I shall have to leave them at that in the hope that, like the Scotchman, the hon. member may see the point later on.

Mr. Lindsay: I have not seen the point yet.

Mr. Marshall: You are too mean to look at it.

Mr. KENNEALLY: So much for the statement of the Leader of the Country Party that I advocated reduced production. I believe that with the inventions that have been made in machinery we can have increased production with a lesser number of men. The member for Toodyay will endorse that.

Mr. Lindsay: The men go into other occupations. If we grow more wheat, more men are required to handle it.

Mr. KENNEALLY: I am coming to that later. Unemployment must be dealt with as a non-party question by all sections, if any relief is to be given to those communities where this evil is rife. Last year when we had unemployment a committee was formed consisting of representatives of employers and employees, and presided over by the Acting Minister for Works. This

committee gave attention to the question of obviating the big call for work at the period when the harvest was being garnered. We endeavoured to see that provision was made whereby works that could conveniently be postponed until the harvest had been garnered were so postponed, so that persons needing employment might go straight from the harvest to those seasonal occupations. The local governing bodies attempted to put that into effect, and we received support from them. As it was, however, we had to wait upon the Government and the local governing bodies earlier in the season to ask them to put into operation as many works as possible to absorb the unemployed that were then available.

Mr. Lindsay: During the winter months?

Mr. KENNEALLY: Not far from them. We found that with the number of people coming to the country it was necessary to have these works started earlier than previous indications seemed to warrant. Owing to the many men out of work and to our desire to secure employment for them, we combined to get as many works as possible started on their behalf. This committee has the right to claim the support of all members to see that unemployment is reduced to the fullest possible extent. We are giving attention to the question with a view to solving the problem. In South Australia a committee was appointed to devise means whereby the difficulty could be overcome, and the same thing has been done in New South Wales and Victoria. England has only just received the blessing of a Labour Government, but there, too, committees are seeking to solve the unemployment problem. The question is one about which all parties should unite, employers and employees, in an endeavour to bring about a solution. Just as people outside Parliament are doing this, so should members here combine with the same object in view, to minimise the number of men who fail to get work. The member for Swan has asked whether the amount of unemployment we have in this State is justified. We know how well the State has been managed during the last five or six years.

Mr. Lindsay: That is the reason for the unemployment.

Mr. KENNEALLY: We know that proportionately with the other States, Western Australia can absorb more people than any of the others.

Mr. Sampson: There was no unemployment when the previous Government went out.

The Premier: Oh, no!

Mr. KENNEALLY: I should like to present the hon. member with a very powerful microscope to enable him to see the facts.

Mr. Sampson: There was no unemployment then.

The Minister for Mines: You believe that is true because you have said it so often.

Mr. KENNEALLY: The hon. member has so frequently made the statement that he believes himself when he utters it.

Mr. Sampson: The records will show it.

Mr. KENNEALLY: If other people do not subscribe to that statement he cannot blame them, especially when unavailing efforts were made to get employment from the ex-Premier for the thousands who were out of work.

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: You never once came to me when I could not absorb them.

The Premier: Wonderful.

Mr. Lindsay: Have you taken deputations to the present Premier?

Mr. KENNEALLY: Yes. I would take deputations to any Premier if I thought I could get employment for only half a dozen men. Instead of criticising, members opposite should assist in finding a solution for this very grave problem, that some of us are doing our best to solve. Others have not tried so hard to do so.

Mr. Sampson: That is not true.

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: He is trying to solve the problem by abusing other people.

Mr. KENNEALLY: I have been associated with the problem in the time of the present Government and in the time of the previous one.

Mr. Sampson: Your job is a sinecure.

Mr. KENNEALLY: One of the prime reasons for the present position is the influx of Southern Europeans. The figures are remarkable. Western Australia has no control over these people. It has some control over migration from Great Britain, but all Southern Europeans are under the control of the Federal Government.

Mr. Latham: The Government have no control over free passages from the Old Country.

Mr. KENNEALLY: We realise the difficulties created by the influx of Southern Europeans.

Mr. Sampson: The figures show that more are going out than are coming in.

Mr. KENNEALLY: That is another of the tarradiddles the hon. member likes to put before the House. I shall be able to show that he is wrong.

Mr. Sampson: It is a tarradiddle that appears in Knibb's Commonwealth figures.

Mr. KENNEALLY: The State has no control over these foreigners. Realising this we have been trying to lessen the difficulties caused through that influx; we have been in touch with the Prime Minister to induce him to give attention to the question of the influx of Southern Europeans. When we could not get him to stop it, we asked what was the reason. He mentioned in his correspondence that it was a reflection upon the British worker to say that the Southern European was displacing the British worker in employment. We replied that it was not a reflection on the British worker, because we were able to show that the foreigners were being employed at a rate at which the British worker could not accept employment and keep a family.

Hon. G. Taylor: That statement is not borne out by general opinion.

Mr. KENNEALLY: I thought possibly some interjection like that would be made, particularly by the hon. member. We can rely on him for that class of interjection. The Prime Minister took the same objection and the complaint was supported by affidavit. The Prime Minister requested that a member of the C.I.D. should be made available to verify the statement. That was done by the Premier of this State. The services of the C.I.D. representatives were made available and the affidavit was shown to be correct. Then the Prime Minister adopted an oyster-like silence when asked what he proposed to do, what steps he proposed to take to prevent the influx of Southern Europeans, and would he take steps to put into operation the quota system that the American Nation had in operation against us. The Prime Minister's reply was that to attempt to put into operation the quota system against Southern Europeans might give rise to international complications. If we are so degraded as a nation that we can permit other nations to put into operation the quota system against us, and in addition reduce it from time to time as America has reduced it lately, then the sooner we go out of business as a Nation, the better. We have not yet become such a degraded entity as to allow others to put a

quota into operation against us, and not put it up against other nations the people of which we do not wish to come to our country in too great a number. Members will have observed that whilst up to recently it was possible for 131 Australian citizens to take up citizenship in America, each year, that figure has now been reduced to 100. That is to say, no more than 100 citizens of the Commonwealth can take up residence in America in any one year, and in addition, for the next five years, the list of Australian citizens who may desire to take up residence in America is closed.

Mr. Mann: What is the population of America?

Mr. KENNEALLY: I am not here as an encyclopaedia to answer the hon. member's interjections.

Mr. Mann: It would complete your arguments if you could give us those figures.

Mr. KENNEALLY: The question of population does not affect the point I am making. What I wish to emphasise is that we are expected to take the stream that was flowing to America, now that America, by her quota law, is preventing the influx into that country of people from Southern Europe. The outcome is that Southern Europeans who previously migrated to America have been turning their attention to Australia.

Mr. Sampson: There are more leaving Australia than are coming in.

The Minister for Mines: Nonsense!

Mr. KENNEALLY: The member for Swan asked me if I could justify unemployment in this State, and I am pointing out to him that it has been caused through the influx of Southern Europeans. Then he said there were more Southern Europeans leaving the State than were coming into it and when I tried to nail him down to that statement he said he was applying it to Australia. I propose to continue to deal with the State to which we belong and I wish to point out that during the four years 1925 to 1929 the population of Western Australia increased by some 43,000 people, and that the number of Southern European males who came into this country increased by 7,700. So that in a population increase spread over four years, of 43,000, in male foreigners alone we got no less than 7,700. We have been told by the Prime Minister that he is going to do everything necessary to protect the position of the Commonwealth, to make it 98 per cent. British, and I want to say to the House that

when we have figures for Western Australia alone, showing that we had an increase of 7,700 foreigners in four years out of a total of 43,000, it needs no arithmetician to prove that the 98 per cent. British proposition has gone by the board, at any rate as far as Western Australia is concerned. I am told by the member for Swan that after all, the spread of Southern Europeans throughout Australia does not apply to such a great extent. If in any one State of the Commonwealth there is anything like a foreign invasion it is the duty of that State to try to protect the position from the Australian point of view. There is another aspect of the Southern European question that demands the attention of members of this House. It will be agreed that the mentality of the Southern European, and particularly the type of Southern European we are getting in this country, is not equal to that of the Australian. When we have the big numbers I have mentioned coming into our State over a period of four years, and such a large proportion of males, we know full well that ultimately they will intermingle and marry with our own people. We need only refer to history to realise that where there is a union of people the tendency is for the lower mentality to prevail. That being so, it is important that we should give attention to the question of the influx of Southern Europeans even from that point of view, as well as from the point of view of unemployment. In any case we must give attention to the matter when we find Southern Europeans coming to the State in numbers greater than the State can conveniently absorb.

Mr. Latham: Do you think the Commonwealth can stop them coming here from the Eastern States?

Mr. KENNEALLY: The large numbers arriving here are not coming from the Eastern States.

Mr. Latham: Then where are they coming from?

Mr. KENNEALLY: From overseas.

Mr. Latham: Then the statistical returns must be wrong.

Mr. KENNEALLY: The hon. member's method of dealing with statistical returns is convenient to suit his own purpose. From the point of view either of unemployment or our national welfare we have necessarily to give attention to this question, and I am one of those who will not hesitate to give

it attention from a non-party point of view. At the same time, many party questions crop up, and it is difficult to obviate retreating to them at times. I intend to make a special plea to members and ask them to give attention to this matter. I point out, in addition, that the fact that the State has control of British migration and that the Commonwealth has control of foreign migration, is going to tell in an additional manner against the migration of Britishers to this country. We have a big unemployment difficulty here, and we contend that to a large extent it is caused by the influx of Southern Europeans, and we realise that until the position is improved, every possible method should be adopted to prevent foreigners coming to the country to look for work that is not here. The Federal Government to whom we have appealed, will not move in the direction of preventing the influx.

Mr. Lindsay: They have moved to limit the number.

Mr. KENNEALLY: My friend is very optimistic in that regard, more optimistic than I am.

Mr. Mann: The foreigners require to have a certain amount of money.

Mr. KENNEALLY: We have been told that they must have a certain amount of money, that each man must have £40.

The Premier: It would do a thousand times.

Mr. KENNEALLY: Like the oyster working in the oyster saloon on its own, there is no doubt that the £40 does duty over and over again for different people coming into the Commonwealth. Men who have come into the country supposed to have been possessed of £40 have been looking for relief two days after their arrival. With £40 in their possession on their arrival, they have been unable to keep themselves for two days. When investigation was made as to what had become of the £40, we found that it had disappeared in smoke. We know what has taken place.

Hon. G. Taylor: So long as it did not disappear in beer, it would be all right.

Mr. KENNEALLY: I would not fear its getting into the possession of the hon. member. While the Federal Government will not prevent Southern Europeans from coming here the State Government realising the large number of people out of work have naturally to take every possible step to prevent people from coming here in search of work that

does not exist. Therefore the only action the State Government can take is to limit the immigration of Britishers.

Mr. Mann: Are you speaking for the Premier and the Government of the country?

Mr. KENNEALLY: I am endeavouring to speak as the representative of East Perth, and I hope that those who will have an opportunity to speak later will exercise their right, and remain quiet while I am speaking. If the State Government take the only course open to them to prevent additional unemployment, the result will be that a premium will be placed on the introduction of foreigners, and Britishers will be prevented from coming here. Therefore, from a third point of view, I say it is necessary for this House to give attention to the question of limiting in some way or other the influx of Southern Europeans, if for no other reason than that the Britisher should have the opportunity to take any work offering. It is interesting to glance at the records showing the amount of money sent from this country to Italy each year in order to provide Italy with a local market that should be available for our people. The Southern Europeans who come to this country invariably leave their womenfolk at home, and the sole interest of the men in this country is often to make sufficient money to be able to keep their womenfolk in their own country and later to be able to return home themselves and make room for some other Southern European to come here. The result is that money that should be spent here in a local market and to produce work for our people goes out to provide work and markets elsewhere. When I am asked for contributing factors to unemployment, I say not the least among the many contributing factors is that the money earned by Southern Europeans is not spent here, but is transmitted to the country of their origin to keep their dependants. We have a statement from a member of the Country Party that he gives preference to foreigners, and it appears from the attitude of some other members of the Country Party that they support the utterance of their fellow member.

Mr. Sleeman: I think they are pretty united on that.

Mr. KENNEALLY: It is time they were united on something.

Mr. Lindsay: I do not think anyone has spoken about Southern Europeans this session.

Mr. KENNEALLY: I am not referring to this session. Although the hon. member would prefer to have a short memory and forget what was said in a previous session, I am entitled to use the utterance of a country member, repeated after his attention had been directed to it.

Mr. Lindsay: Why pick me? I did not say it.

Mr. KENNEALLY: No; I shall come to what the hon. member said in a moment. If legislators are going to proclaim, as a member of the Country Party has definitely done, that they would give preference to foreigners, it is very difficult to ask them to join in any movement having for its object the prevention of an influx of Southern Europeans.

Mr. Latham: That member was going to give the Southern European a certain class of work.

Mr. KENNEALLY: The hon. member's apologist has spoken. Can I take it that that represents the opinion of the Country Party, that preference to foreigners should be given for certain classes of work?

Mr. Lindsay: No.

Mr. KENNEALLY: Then the Country Party are not united yet. Possibly we can let it go until they have given the matter consideration.

Mr. Lindsay: Even the Labour Party do not speak with one voice.

Mr. KENNEALLY: I think they all speak with one voice on the question of the influx of foreigners. They have shown their loyalty to their country because they believe in giving preference to Australians and, if there is then any work left, it should be given to Britishers. I think the Labour Party have made that quite clear.

Mr. Lindsay: Why is it that so many white gum sleepers are chopped by Southern Europeans in the Toodyay and Northam districts for the Railway Department?

Miss Holman: Not in the last two years.

Mr. KENNEALLY: I am glad the hon. member has raised the question of hewing in the timber industry. I was through the timber country of the South-West a few years ago and, with the exception of some Italians who had been in this country for a long time and in some instances had been

naturalised, numbering not more than 25 or 30, there were no foreigners in the timber industry. Of the 3,500 men employed in the timber industry to-day, one in three of the workers is a Southern European.

Miss Holman: That does not take in private property, either.

Mr. KENNEALLY: I am excluding private property. The more we analyse the problem of the influx of Southern Europeans, the more important does it appear that attention should be given to it. Every man who has the interests of the State at heart must necessarily give attention to the question with a view to ensuring that our own people shall be given an opportunity to work out their destiny. I do not wish to be misunderstood. I have said, and I repeat, that the Southern European who has been admitted to this country has to live. I am not opposed to the Southern European who has already landed here. The system is wrong. If we had had circulated amongst us a dodger such as was circulated in his country, showing men shovelling sovereigns into a bag, and with great faith went to his country to earn a living, and when we got there found no work offering except at 10s. or 20s. a week, the tendency would be for us to take the job rather than starve. It is not with the man who has come to this country and who has found that the illusion under which he was brought here is false that we wish to deal. We object to the system that permits of other people coming here when there is no work for them to perform.

Mr. Latham: I do not know of any instance where they have worked for less than Australians or Britishers.

Mr. KENNEALLY: Then the hon. member has not given much attention to it.

Mr. Latham: I have given a lot of attention to it, especially since the question was previously raised in this House.

Mr. KENNEALLY: Then the hon. member has not eyesight sufficiently keen to see the elastic attached to some portion of the wages that the foreigner was supposed to receive. We have been able to prove that employers—

Mr. Latham: Odd ones.

Mr. KENNEALLY: I will give that in, but men in responsible positions, both in the farming and industrial spheres, have got their employees to sign for certain wages—

Mr. Latham: And not only foreigners.

Mr. KENNEALLY: And when the minimum wage was £5 9s., they have paid £5 9s. according to the book signed, but in some cases up to £2 10s. has had a string on it and has gone back to the employer's pocket.

Mr. Lindsay: The farmer does not pay £5 9s. a week.

Mr. KENNEALLY: But we were able to prove the same thing against the farmer in proportion to what he paid.

Mr. Lindsay: I suppose it is the exception to the rule. It is not the general rule.

Mr. Latham: Nearly all the foreigners are unionists.

Mr. KENNEALLY: We hope to get them into the unions.

Mr. Latham: Nearly all of them are in.

Mr. KENNEALLY: We do not want them to be exploited in this country, particularly by the farmers. The other evening the member for Toodyay (Mr. Lindsay) mentioned the 44-hour week and went on to say that it was one of the things that was ruining this country. I do not know whether he has only recently awakened to the fact, or whether he has had information in his possession for some time and has kept it to himself, but I understand his chief complaint was against any attempt to introduce the 44-hour week into the farming industry.

Mr. Lindsay: My views were expressed in this House when the Bill was before us prior to your coming here. I did not keep my views to myself but expressed them when the opportunity arose.

Mr. KENNEALLY: The hon. member proceeded to quote the rates of wages paid in Toronto as compared with Melbourne, and I think quite unintentionally he gave figures that were absolutely false.

Mr. Lindsay: I ask for a withdrawal of that statement. The member for East Perth says I gave figures to the House that were absolutely false.

Mr. KENNEALLY: I mentioned that I thought the hon. member had done it quite unintentionally.

Mr. SPEAKER: I heard what the hon. member said. He said that the member for Toodyay gave figures to the House, perhaps unintentionally, that were absolutely false.

Mr. Mann: He qualified it.

Mr. SPEAKER: Yes. Does the member for Toodyay object to that statement?

Mr. Lindsay: Certainly I do. The hon. member has made a statement that will be reported. Even if he said I did it unintentionally.

tionally, the very fact that he said I gave absolutely false figures is a reflection on me and I object to the statement.

Mr. KENNEALLY: I withdraw the statement.

Hon. G. Taylor: That is the easiest way out.

The Premier: The figures were incorrect.

Mr. Lindsay: My figures were sworn evidence before the Tariff Board and were not incorrect.

The Premier: They were incorrect.

Mr. Lindsay: They were not.

Mr. KENNEALLY: When the hon. member was speaking he gave figures which were very far from being correct.

The Premier: They were incorrect.

Mr. Lindsay: They were not incorrect.

The Premier: They were.

Mr. Lindsay: They were not.

Hon. G. Taylor: Who will have the last word?

Mr. KENNEALLY: He stated that the blacksmith in Toronto was in receipt of £6 3s. 3d. a week, and the Melbourne blacksmith in receipt of £4 17s. The blacksmith in Melbourne is not in receipt of £4 17s., and not for years has he received that sum.

Mr. Lindsay: He did receive that sum in the year I was quoting from.

Mr. KENNEALLY: If the hon. member went back to pre-war years he may be somewhere near the mark.

Mr. Lindsay: I went back to 1923.

Mr. KENNEALLY: Even in that year the blacksmith in Melbourne was not in receipt of £4 17s. The Federal awards dealing with blacksmiths' wages are available to us all. We find that the blacksmith in Melbourne has not been in receipt of less than 24s. above the basic wage, and the basic wage in Melbourne from 1923 onwards has not been £4 17s. less 24s. Seeing that the award of the courts is available for perusal, it is no use the hon. member telling us the wages are £4 17s. against £6 3s. 3d in Toronto.

Mr. Lindsay: The figures are comparable for the year I gave you.

Mr. KENNEALLY: There is not even a get-out for the hon. member, by his possibly having referred to implement smiths. He was dealing at the time with Mackay's factory. Even the implement smith is in receipt of 18s. per week above the basic wage. His wage in Victoria is in the vicinity of £5 7s. a week. The hon. member

would have us believe that the blacksmith who receives 6s. above the basic wage more than the implement smith is in receipt of only £4 17s. Having ascertained from the incorrect information supplied by the hon. member that the basis of his figures has been disturbed, there is not much reason to deal with the superstructure he erected upon them.

Mr. Lindsay: That is only your side of the question. I shall have an opportunity to reply later.

Mr. KENNEALLY: If we go outside the strictly legal instrument and refer to agreements covering blacksmiths in Melbourne, we find that the wage in some cases is as high as £6 4s. a week. I wish now to refer to remarks made by the hon. member on Professor Perkins' report on the development of agriculture in South Australia. He stated that the professor mentioned that production had been doubled in South Australia.

Mr. Lindsay: Nearly doubled. I said it had increased by 87 per cent.

Mr. KENNEALLY: The hon. member did not go into percentages. He said that production had been nearly doubled, and that 3,000 fewer farmers were employed.

Mr. Lindsay: Farm hands.

Mr. KENNEALLY: We have that definite statement from the hon. member. He went on to say that in South Australia the good farmers were buying out the bad ones, and increasing their holdings in that way. Is the Country Party behind the idea of one farmer buying out another and thus increasing his holdings? If so, we shall gradually reach the position when we shall have to spend more money in closer settlement.

Mr. Lindsay: There is an Act on the statute-book now which has never been enforced.

Mr. KENNEALLY: This seems to introduce a vicious circle. We have first of all the large areas, which are purchased in order that settlers may be placed upon them. People are settled on the land and then the buying out process begins. In time the holdings become large enough for the owners to sell them back to the Government at an increased profit, so that the Government may cut them up again for the purpose of closer settlement.

Mr. Lindsay: I said this made possible the use of bigger machinery, and that was why the farmer was able to do more work.

Mr. KENNEALLY: The hon. member did say that. This is what enabled the farmers to get rid of 3,000 workers.

Mr. Lindsay: That is right. It is a matter of efficiency.

Mr. KENNEALLY: I asked the hon. member to enlighten us as to what would become of the 3,000 workers, and where they would get employment. He replied that the reduced cost of production would enable us to sell our products somewhere outside Australia. He said that in America it had cost 18s. an acre to cut the crops with binder and thresher, whereas with the continued work of improved machinery it would now cost only 6s. per acre. That is a considerable reduction.

Mr. Latham: It must reduce the cost of the article to the consumer and make for cheaper living.

Mr. KENNEALLY: Improved machinery has enabled South Australia to double its production and dismiss 3,000 workers. When we ask what is to become of those 3,000 workers we are told that the reduced cost of production will enable us to sell our articles somewhere outside Australia.

Mr. Lindsay: Some of the workers would probably be engaged in handling the increased production on the railways and the wharves, and also in making the machinery.

Mr. KENNEALLY: The improvement in machinery noticeable in the farming industry is noticeable to a greater degree in our industrial development.

Mr. Lindsay: Why do not the industrial concerns increase their production when the farmer does so? You are now coming to the point.

Mr. KENNEALLY: Production by improved machinery has also been increased in the industrial world, despite what the hon. member says to the contrary. I am, therefore, entitled to ask what has become not only of the 3,000 rural workers, but of the industrialists who may have been displaced by the improved machinery? The hon. member tells us that we can sell our articles somewhere outside Australia. I should like to know where that somewhere is. If that improvement continues, and as a result of labour-saving devices we are constantly putting people out of employment, what is to become of them, if we do not step in and give them greater leisure which will be possible by virtue of the improvement to our machinery? That is a question which must be considered. I look

forward to the time in the development of the world when people who follow us will ask themselves why we did so much talking concerning the 44 or 40-hour week, when they themselves will be in a position to enjoy a working week of half that number of hours by virtue of the then improved machinery. It should not be thought that the greatest reform the worker can ask for in this country is a little extra food and clothing for himself and family. He should be entitled to look forward to the time when improved machinery, the result of the brains of men, will make it possible for his life to be better worth living and for him to enjoy a greater measure of leisure than he now does. I hope the time is coming when we shall not have to give much more attention to the question of hours. I should like to know from the hon. member where this mythical somewhere is. Apparently we are going to sell our commodities somewhere because of the improvements in our machinery. Apparently too, in other parts of the world, there will be other commodities available for sale for the same reason. What we want to know is where that somewhere is. I regret the absence from the Speech of any reference to superannuation for State employees. Members have referred to the ability of State employees to perform the work entrusted to them in a manner that compares more than favourably with employees in the other States. In dealing with that I put it to hon. members that the employees of this State, if they are, as hon. members opposite themselves assert, equal to the employees of other States, should receive at least the same treatment as is meted out to employees of other States. I feel inclined to point out, when Country Party members allude to the 44-hour week as having been given by the Government, and make slighting references to the long-service leave granted by the Government, that if they are not going to be false to their statement they must necessarily approve of a system whereby we shall give to employees of this State at least the same consideration as is given to employees of other States. What is the history of the long-service leave question? In point of fact, Western Australia granted it after three of the Eastern States had already conceded it.

Mr. Lindsay: That does not make it right.

Mr. KENNEALLY: And if all the Eastern States had given it, that would not make

it right either. When people wish to oppose a reform, or to oppose men getting that to which they are entitled, it is easy for them to say, "I believe in your getting it, but you did not get it in the right way." As a fact, the men in this State have got long service leave in exactly the same manner as men in the other States. I shall be told again that that does not make it right. No, it does not make it right in the opinion of some men if a reform is secured by any means whatsoever. That remark applies not only to long-service leave, but also to the 44-hour week. As regards the latter reform, this State was the third Australian State to grant it. I shall be told again that that does not make it right, that the reform should not have been effected in that way, but that some subterfuge should have been adopted.

Mr. Lindsay: You do not call the Arbitration Court a subterfuge, do you?

Mr. KENNEALLY: No.

Mr. Lindsay: What right had the Government to interfere in the matter?

Mr. KENNEALLY: I was referring to the manner in which other employees got long-service leave. Members of the Opposition, who were originally opposed to long-service leave, now say, "You got it the wrong way." Western Australia has lagged behind rather than led the way in regard to long-service leave and the 44-hour week. Western Australia is decidedly lagging behind in the matter of superannuation. Out of seven Governments, representing six State Governments and the Commonwealth Government, the majority have superannuation actually in operation. If Western Australia came into the picture to-morrow with a superannuation scheme for her employees, ours would be the fifth out of seven Governments to inaugurate the reform. Members on the Opposition and cross-benches would say, "Go in and get it, and if you get it, no matter how you get it, we will say you got it the wrong way." I hope that when the opportunity offers, Opposition and cross-bench members, if there is a specific manner in which superannuation should be obtained, will describe that manner. The adoption of that course would deprive them of the opportunity to say, after the reform has been granted, "You got it the wrong way; if you had got it some other way, we would have approved of it." I live in hopes that Western Australia will not be the last of the States to grant superannu-

ation. A community such as this, which stands for reform and improvement, a community wherein Opposition and cross-bench members vie with each other in pointing out that our State employees are equal to those of any other State, should try to give practical effect to such statements. Opposition and cross-bench members should try to make good their statements in that respect. They should say that seeing that four Governments out of seven have granted superannuation, they will not constitute themselves a stumbling-block in the way of the State employees here being treated in a similar manner. Let us get away from the cry that the Government gave the 44-hour week and the long-service leave. The Government, being an employer responsible for the peaceful working of industry, responsible for keeping a satisfied staff in reasonable conditions of labour, have recognised their responsibility, and have been prepared to say to the employees, "Whilst you are rendering good service to the State, you will get good treatment from the State." I hope that that attitude will not be departed from even at the behest of our Country Party friends, who raise so much opposition to it. Now I desire to deal briefly with a few local matters. Firstly, I wish to call the attention of the Government to the necessity for preventing the long delays that take place at the Claisebrook-road railway crossing in East Perth. We have heard a good deal about the high cost of living. If it were possible to value on paper the delays which take place at the crossing referred to, the information would be a revelation to members from that aspect of the effect on the cost of living. Melbourne-road crossing is a serious proposition also, but not nearly so serious as the other one. Take the question of building. If a builder is contracting to build a house and realises that he is going to have his material delivered at East Perth, and realises also that sometimes he is going to have inordinate delays at the East Perth crossing, he will include in his estimates an item for incidentals, and in that item he will necessarily include the cost of the estimated stoppages at that crossing, so that he will not have to pay the person waiting and himself be out of pocket as a result. I have watched the East Perth Crossing, and have seen delays there which were, to say the least of it, exasperating. It is the Government's duty to see that if the

railway continues to go through the heart of the city, reasonable facilities shall be afforded for crossing it; and if there is one locality in the metropolitan area which demands good crossing facilities, it is the Claisebrook-road crossing in East Perth. A bridge was promised by previous Governments to give communication facilities with properties resumed as the result of the decision to shift the locomotive department from West Perth to East Perth. When the people were offered the pedestrian bridge at Summers-street which at present exists, they feared that that would be the end of the vehicular bridge; but they were told that the foot bridge could go there and that the vehicular bridge, having been promised, would also be built. As a matter of fact, that is another bridge up beyond Claisebrook-road. Not only has that bridge not been provided, but facilities for crossing, either by bridge or by subway, have not been furnished at Claisebrook-road. I hope the Government will see their way shortly to make arrangements by which the Claisebrook-road crossing will receive attention. That may to some extent affect the promise made regarding a vehicular bridge across Summers-street. I desire also to draw attention to the necessity of extending the present Kensington-street tramline so as to connect with the Lord-street line at the East Perth subway. If tramway facilities were given to the people in that portion of the East Perth electorate, undoubtedly it would result in a greater amount of building activity there. Plenty of land remains in that quarter to be built upon.

Mr. Lambert: Do you think the Railway Department desire to give the people tramway facilities?

Mr. KENNEALLY: I believe that is so.

Mr. Lambert: The Railway Department?

Mr. KENNEALLY: Yes, to work in conjunction. I think that the Railway Department and the Tramway Department, working in conjunction, can make available all those facilities to the people. To a large extent the one facility becomes a feeder of the other, which is as it should be.

Mr. Lambert: For a long time the one has been simply subordinate to the other.

Mr. KENNEALLY: I have received numerous complaints, which I have laid before the Minister, concerning the nuisance created by the smoke-stack at the East Perth power house. I would like the Minister on some washing day to make a tour of the

East Perth electorate in the vicinity of the power house stack.

Hon. G. Taylor: It might not be safe for the Minister to do that.

Mr. KENNEALLY: Possibly it might be thought that I made the suggestion with malice aforethought, as likely to create a vacancy in the Ministry; so I had better not let the hon. gentleman take the risk. In all seriousness I say that the people there are entitled to some relief. I understand some new appliance has been placed on the stack, consequent upon the burning of Collie coal, so as to create a greater draught.

Mr. Latham: In other parts of the world smoke-stacks are made to consume their own smoke.

Mr. KENNEALLY: Exactly; and also in other parts of Australia. As a matter of fact, Melbourne does not permit the operation of a stack which emits smoke and cinders as the East Perth stack does.

Mr. Latham: The alteration ought to save fuel, too.

Mr. KENNEALLY: I understand that a portion of the fuel going out in cinders is certainly of such a nature as could be burnt with advantage to the department. At any rate, the people in the vicinity are entitled to such protection as is necessary to ensure that they do not have their houses and grounds covered with soot and cinders emanating from the stack. I trust that the position will be attended to by the Minister, because with the smoke-burning and cinder-arresting appliances available in the Commonwealth to-day, it should be possible to make a material alteration regarding the smoke-stack at East Perth. There is another question that requires attention in that portion of my electorate. I refer to the Claisebrook drain. I hope the Government will not allow that difficulty to continue until they are forced to pay additional compensation on account of flooding. They have had to pay compensation in the past and I think they would be well advised to take the necessary action to extend the drain beyond its present position and to give it direct access to the river which is its natural outlet. Periodically floods have taken place there because the water from the drain has flown over adjacent properties, and the department has been forced to pay compensation. It is bad policy to wait for the flooding to be repeated and more compensation to be

paid, rather than to make provision for the necessary work being carried out. Coming to another question of major importance, I trust that the Government will use their utmost endeavours to fight against the proposal of the Federal Government to repeal the Federal Arbitration Act, thus leaving the various States to compete against each other in respect of the industrial laws. There is no question of greater moment before the Australian people to-day than that of arbitration, Federal and State. In the consideration of that question, the phase of paramount importance is whether the advantages of the Federal Arbitration Court are to be restricted to a few people of Australia, and whether the Federal Government, are to be permitted to prevent the people, with the exception of one or two selected organisations, from having access to the Federal judiciary. I recollect that 12 months or more ago the present Prime Minister, Mr. Bruce, stated that the Federal Government desired certain alterations because it was not thinkable that the Australian people would permit the States to compete amongst themselves through industrial tribunals, in regard to industrial matters, and thus cause industrial disturbances. To-day the Prime Minister has altered his tune because he now says, "Let each State compete throughout the Commonwealth and let the industrial unrest occur that I prophesied a little over 12 months ago if the Federal Arbitration Court was not available for the people to approach." If the Federal Arbitration Court, apart from one or two organisations, practically goes out of existence, there will be, of necessity, competition between the various State tribunals as to the wages to be paid. Take our own local tribunal, the State Arbitration Court. If a case is taken to that court and a question submitted which involves matters affecting an industry that is also carried on in another State, one of the guiding factors in deciding the matter of wages in the minds of at least the president of the court, is the question whether if certain things claimed by the union were granted, it would amount to making a present of the industry here to a neighbouring State. I do not complain of that phase being taken into consideration, because I acknowledge that our secondary industries here are not strong enough to enable us at times to compete with those in the

other States. If, under existing conditions, the State Arbitration Court, before giving a determination on a question submitted to it, takes into consideration conditions obtaining in a neighbouring State, how much more will that be so if the Federal Arbitration Court goes out of existence and the States will be vying with each other to provide wages and conditions calculated to capture trade by an individual State. The position is very serious from the point of view of the workers. I am entitled to ask what is the cause of this change of front on the part of the Prime Minister on the arbitration question. I am entitled, I think, to give what I consider a reasonable reply to that query. When the Federal Arbitration Court was established, we know it had a chequered career at the outset. First of all, the High Court held that State instrumentalities were not entitled to go before the Federal Court to get a decision regarding their activities. While that decision was practically upset by the Privy Council, at the same time the Privy Council did not interfere with it. Later on the judges of the High Court, an alteration having taken place in the meantime, changed their previous decision and decided that State instrumentalities had the right to approach the Federal Arbitration Court. Fights have taken place throughout Australia for the right to go to the Arbitration Court. I put it to those who always preach arbitration, to the member for Moore (Mr. Ferguson) who said that the railway men had not been given their long service leave and other benefits by the Arbitration Court, as well as to others who have spoken so loudly on this subject, that the position will be complicated if we have not a court that will be able to deal with big industries throughout Australia in a uniform manner. If, as a result of the opposition of such people, the workers cannot have their case dealt with by the Federal Arbitration Court along those lines, and industrial disturbances take place, the blame must necessarily be on the shoulders of those opposed to the workers having an opportunity to go before the Federal Arbitration Court. As to the reasons behind the altered attitude of the Prime Minister, it is easy to see what they were. I have had occasion to refer to the influx of Southern Europeans to this country and to the unemployment that exists throughout the Commonwealth. While the Southern Europeans were not coming here

and there was no unemployment, the present Prime Minister and his predecessors, when considering the question of Federal Arbitration Courts, held that there could not be permitted competition between the State Arbitration Courts or there would be serious industrial disturbances. To-day the position has changed and at present, in my opinion, the point towards which the Prime Minister and his followers have been working, is now attained. There are more men in Australia than there are jobs, and therefore, in their opinion, the time has arrived when the protecting provisions regarding the standard of living in this country need not necessarily be given any further attention, because the law of supply and demand can take its place. Individual bargaining may be substituted and whatever the workers can get, that only will they be entitled to, without any protecting legislation regarding a minimum wage. The circumstances that brought such a situation about did not exist when the Prime Minister spoke on this question previously. Now the position is that there are more men than there are jobs, and at the behest of those supporting him, the Prime Minister is prepared to sacrifice legislation that it has taken a quarter of a century to build up. He is prepared to adopt that attitude in the hope that the position created by virtue of the fact that there are more men than there are jobs, will mean a reduction in production costs, of which he has been for so long an apostle. He trusts that that result will be effected because necessity will drive men to take whatever wages are offered rather than stand out for a basic wage. As a matter of fact, such an idea is not confined to Mr. Bruce. We find there are men in this Chamber who subscribe similar views. During a debate in this House last session the Deputy Leader of the Opposition stated that the basic wage in this State should be less or there should be no basic wage at all. I take it that was the idea dominant in the minds of his party.

Hon. G. Taylor: Every member on this side of the House is entitled to express his own views, and probably that represented that hon. member's opinion.

Mr. KENNEALLY: The hon. member will have an opportunity directly to disown his deputy leader! That was the statement that hon. member made, and whether he made the statement as a private member or as the deputy leader of his party, it would

be for him or his sponsor, the hon. member who has been interjecting, to explain. That was not the only expression of opinion regarding that question. The Leader of the Country Party gave us his opinion. You will recollect, Mr. Speaker, that he took us on a mental excursion around India and Africa. He led us through India and told us of the virtues of the coolie, how industries were carried on without trouble because there were no agitators. Then he took us through Africa and showed us how similarly good work was performed by the very docile Kaffirs. He went on to warn us that the time was coming when the Australian people would have to compete with coolie labour.

Mr. Lindsay: Some of us, particularly the wheat-growers, are doing that now.

Mr. KENNEALLY: Since some of the Opposition members have denied their Deputy Leader to-night, we may now hear the members of the Country Party deny their leader. If they are going to deny their Leader, let us first get down to a member of the rank and file of the Country Party. I refer to the member for Pingelly. During the same session that member said that in his opinion, if each man in this country were paid £1 a week there would be more work for the men generally.

Mr. Brown: What I said was that it would be better for a man to take £1 a week than to starve.

Mr. KENNEALLY: And that if each man took £1 per week, there would be more work for all.

The Premier: There would be more work still if each took 10s. per week.

Mr. KENNEALLY: To those who like the Deputy Leader of the Opposition say that there should be a lesser basic wage or no basic wage at all; or who, like the Leader of the Country Party, say that we should be prepared to compete with coolie labour or who, like the member for Pingelly, say that if each man were paid £1 a week there would be more work for all—to those I say they are simply following the lead given to them by Mr. Bruce who, realising that there are now more men in Australia than there are jobs, says he is prepared to do away with the Federal arbitration machinery which prevents the ideas of the Deputy Leader of the Opposition, the Leader of the Country Party and the member for Pingelly being given effect to. The trouble in this country, from the

Prime Minister's point of view, is that he cannot get down to give effect to his cry of increased production at lesser cost, because the Federal Arbitration Court stands in his way; and so, now that he has allowed the country to be flooded with people looking for work, he is going to take the first opportunity to do away with the law which protects the worker and his right to get a decent wage in order that he might keep his wife and family in decent conditions. It is not hard to realise why Mr. Bruce, during the last few months, has changed his views regarding the retention of the Federal Arbitration Court. I want to issue this word of warning that if, as a result of the proposed Federal action, and if as a result of the knowledge of the workers that their standard of living is being attacked by the Prime Minister in his proposed action—if, as a result of these things, those disturbances that Mr. Bruce himself 12 months ago said would take place if the States were competing in their arbitration tribunals, if the industrial unrest which he then prophesied does now take place as the result of his action, the fault will lie, not on the worker, but at the door of those people who are so altering the laws of the country as to practically make it certain on their own showing that industrial unrest must eventuate.

Mr. Lindsay: What is the good of laws if people will not obey them?

Mr. KENNEALLY: My friend should be an authority on the question of laws not being obeyed.

Mr. Brown: What is going to happen to those who cannot get work?

Mr. KENNEALLY: What is going to happen is that there is going to be a strong tendency, since there are more men than jobs, to get down to what the hon. member advocated, namely £1 per week for each man so that additional men may be employed. So the hon. member should not complain. I trust that the position in this country will be that we shall be able to protect our standard of living, in spite of the move being made to defeat it. It is all very well for Opposition and cross-bench members to say they do not believe in a reduced standard of living, but in that respect more than words is required. We require practical evidence that they are prepared to protect the standard of living. When people are engaged, as they are at present, in assailing that standard, it will be for those members who have made from the

cross-benches the utterances I have mentioned to say in this House whether they are prepared to support the policy they have enunciated, or support those on this side who are prepared to protect the standard of living to which the people of Australia have become accustomed. I hope the legislation to be introduced this session will give attention to these questions I have dealt with, and I trust that as a result of the session's achievements we shall have made one more great stride towards the goal and ideal we have had in view for so long, and to which we as a Labour Party in this country are steadily approaching.

MR. BARNARD (Sussex) [9.52]: This evening we have heard a lot about unemployment. Practically every member who has spoken this session has referred to it. Now I wish to say a word about it as it affects my district. Never before in the district of Busselton has there been so much unemployment as we have at present. A great deal of money that has been allocated for work in that district has not been spent, and the work has been delayed. I refer to road work. When the Department of Ways and Works wants men for work in that district—although men in the country are advised not to come to the city looking for work—they are sent down from the city. Recently I was told at the Labour Bureau that 20 men were required for a locality the other side of Busselton, and although there were between 40 and 50 unemployed in Busselton, 20 men were picked up in Perth. Those unemployed in Busselton were registered with the clerk of courts, the agent for the Labour Bureau. I was able to get 10 men picked up in Busselton for that job, but I noticed in the newspaper yesterday that for the same job 16 men were picked up in Fremantle and 13 in Perth. So there are 29 men from the metropolitan area and only 10 from Busselton.

The Premier: That is fair.

Mr. BARNARD: Yes, I suppose it is. Another thing was that although a man was married and held a union ticket, if through being out of employment he was unable to renew his ticket, he could not get work. Unless the men had union tickets and were financial, they had to go on the charity dole at Busselton, while men from Perth were given the jobs. I realise that every man has the right to work, and that it was pointed out

to me that some of those men from Perth had been months without work. Still, it does not seem right that men in the town where the work is going on have to live on charity, while men from the city come down and get the work. There are some timber hewers in Busselton, and they told me that although there is a certain amount of work offering in the cutting of Government sleepers, the price paid by the Government for the work does not allow them to make anything out of the work. I suppose that price is based on what the Southern European is prepared to accept. They say the Southern European is the man who cuts down the price, and that the Government take good care to avail themselves of that price when they have the work.

Miss Holman: What proof have you? You say "They say."

Mr. BARNARD: The sleeper hewers themselves told me that the price was too low for them to earn enough at it. The forestry question has been brought up by a member during the debate. The Premier, with some pride, said that when history re-recorded that his Government had dedicated 3,000,000 acres of forest, posterity would be very pleased. But there might be among posterity some who will want to know what this Government have done in the way of locking up good agricultural land that did not grow timber. There are locked up in the South-West thousands of acres of good agricultural land which never grew a stick of jarrah. I know it is as well to lock up a certain area for hardwood, but I say again there are thousands of acres of good agricultural land that should have been left open. If qualified surveyors were put on to classify the land, it could easily be shown that there are almost a million acres of agricultural land that the people ought to be allowed to take up. The Forests Department already have a lot of land which they are using for reforestation, and they are ring-barking a lot of good jarrah timber. When the timber worker applies to put men into this country for the purpose of cutting sleepers, the Forests Department claim 10s. per load from him before he can use the timber. Consequently he will not touch the timber, and so it is being ringbarked and will die. I think the Forests Department have more power than they should have, and certainly this Government are giving them more country over which to exercise their power. One

other matter I cannot allow to pass without making some reference to it and that is group settlement. I am pleased that this question has been left alone this session to a certain extent. In other sessions it has been the one question that has been thrashed out by almost every member. The Government appointed a Group Settlement Valuation Board who have investigated the position and have got out some valuations. To my mind some of the valuations are very fair, but others are still too high. Quite a lot of money has been written off the group settlement scheme, and the position disclosed by the Valuation Board is that hundreds of thousands of pounds have been wasted on the undertaking. Although the prices put on some of the blocks are still high—

The Minister for Railways: Not too high, surely!

Mr. BARNARD: I might compare them with the price of a property, the sale of which was recorded in this morning's paper. It is an old-established property well-watered and well-grassed, and it has been sold for a less sum per acre than some of the group blocks are valued at.

The Minister for Railways: What was it sold per acre?

Mr. BARNARD: About £10, whereas some of the group blocks are valued at £11 per acre.

The Premier: Oh, what a comparison!

Mr. BARNARD: It is a comparison; one property is a few years old and the other is 30, 40 or 50 years old. A thousand head of milch cows will be necessary for group settlers within the next few months and they are not to be obtained. The Government are doing now what they should have done at least 18 months ago—obtaining young cattle from the Eastern States.

The Minister for Railways: But we had to re-possess hundreds of cattle.

Mr. Sampson: What have you done with those re-possessed?

Mr. BARNARD: There are not too many now, and there will not be sufficient to meet requirements during the next few months. Some of the cattle landed on Monday last and others to be landed next week will be of no use to the group settlers for 12 months or more.

The Premier: But 18 months ago we had more cows than could be absorbed by the group settlers. Hundreds of them had to be re-possessed. What is the good of saying we should have got more?

Mr. BARNARD: The Government are going to experience a bigger loss by not having cattle for the pastures when the pastures are ready and the men are waiting for stock. Instructions have been given that every settler with 80 acres of clearing done is to get no more contract work. I have had several letters during the last week from settlers wanting to know what they are going to do when their clearing contracts are finished. In some instances they have not sufficient pastures and those who have the pastures have not got the cows. I hope something will be done for those settlers. Although the Minister has said that 18 months ago there was not sufficient feed, hundreds of acres of pasture went to waste on abandoned blocks that would have kept quite a number of cattle. There is a depot in the district where a number of cows could have been kept until they were wanted by the settlers.

Miss Holman: Why did not you think of that 18 months ago?

Mr. BARNARD: I was not the Minister in charge of group settlement. Why could not the cattle that arrived this week have been landed at Busselton instead of at Bunbury, where the Government had to lease another area of land to keep the cattle in quarantine? There are sufficient blocks in the Busselton district on which the cattle could have been kept during the period of quarantine.

Mr. Withers: They want a clean area for quarantine, you know.

Mr. BARNARD: It was said that the boat would not call at Busselton, I suppose, because the Premier had not carried out the promise he made. I should like to refer to the lack of facilities that debarked the boat from calling there. About three years ago the Premier placed on the Estimates a sum of £5,000 for improvements to the Busselton jetty.

The Premier: You will have it on this year's estimates, too.

Mr. BARNARD: With the elections approaching, I expect to see it on this year's Estimates. It was put on just before the last elections.

Hon. G. Taylor: And it will go on before the next elections.

The Premier: We will double it this time.

Mr. BARNARD: I hope the amount will be doubled. As regards the election, it will have just the same effect as it had on the last occasion, but I hope it will lead to the improvements being carried out, so that

when more cattle are imported they will be landed at Busselton and that when the timber cut in the forests dedicated by the present Government is ready for shipment, it will be loaded at Busselton instead of at Bunbury. If that is done, it will be of advantage to the unemployed, who have been waiting for work. The lumpers there get a boat about once a month.

Miss Holman: You will have to see the private companies about loading at Busselton.

Mr. BARNARD: The private companies will load at Busselton if the facilities are provided. I hope that something will be done. After the next elections, the district of the member for Bunbury will come within a few miles of the Busselton jetty, so that he will also be interested in that end of the country and will be able to give me some assistance with the next Government to secure the much needed improvements to the jetty. There are quite a number of other matters to which one could refer—matters that should have been and have not been attended to. I hope that in the near future some of the roads that are in such a shocking state will be put in order.

Mr. Lambert: What would you do to relieve the unemployed difficulty?

Mr. BARNARD: Had the Main Roads Board made preparations during the summer by getting material ready for road work, quite a number of roads could have been built at this season of the year to absorb all the unemployed in the district. One thing that would afford relief for a certain number of the unemployed in the South-West is the opening of the opossum season. If a lot of men were given an opportunity during the winter months to trap opossums—

The Premier: Yes, put it on the opossum. He has no vote.

Mr. BARNARD: Although the Premier may laugh at my suggestion, it would relieve the situation to a certain extent.

The Premier: Do you think it would make much difference? Do not they go on all the year round down there?

Mr. BARNARD: I do not think they do. The Premier seems to know exactly what the position is. His officers, however, should see that an end is put to the practice if indeed it is being observed.

The Premier: Everyone else says that this is being done.

Mr. BARNARD: Probably there is a different type of unemployed in my district from that found elsewhere. I do, however, earnestly hope that consideration will be given to the matter to which I have referred, and that the position will soon be relieved. Although every member who has spoken on the Address-in-reply has referred to unemployment the Government do not seem to be in any way forward with the problem, nor do they seem to be making available the necessary relief works for the employment of these men. I hope that when the debate on the Address-in-reply is concluded, at perhaps no distant date, an improvement will be effected to a very unpleasant state of things.

On motion by Mr. Withers, debate adjourned.

House adjourned at 10.11 p.m.

Legislative Council,

Thursday, 8th August, 1929.

	PAGE
Questions: State Insurance Office	214
State Labour Bureau	214
Railway haulage, ton-mile cost	214
White Cliffs, Perth and Goldfields	215
Loan expenditure, 1928-29	216
Leave of absence	215
Address-in-reply, seventh day	215

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

QUESTION—STATE INSURANCE OFFICE.

Hon. A. LOVEKIN asked the Chief Secretary: 1, What was the total amount of premiums received from all sources by the State Insurance Office during the year ended 30th June, 1929? 2, What was the amount of claims paid and outstanding during the same period? 3, What was the amount of premiums received in respect of workers' compensation and employers' liability? 4, What was the amount of claims paid and

outstanding in respect of same? 5, What was the cost of conducting the office, including salaries, commissions, medical expenses, and all other charges? 6, What percentage did the medical fees and charges under the Workers' Compensation Act bear to (a) the premiums received, and (b) the compensation paid or payable? 7, Are policies issued by the State office subject to stamp duty?

The CHIEF SECRETARY replied: 1, £172,721; 2, £149,619; 3, £160,861; 4, £143,676; 5, £4,395; 6, (a) 19.3 per cent., (b) 21.6 per cent.; 7, Yes.

QUESTION—STATE LABOUR BUREAU.

Hon. H. SEDDON asked the Chief Secretary: 1, What was the number of applicants for employment at the State Labour Bureau for each month during the year ended 30th June, 1929? 2, What numbers were engaged each month (a) by Government departments, (b) by municipal authorities, (c) by other employers?

The CHIEF SECRETARY replied: I produce a return giving the information desired by the hon. member.

The Chief Secretary laid the return on the Table.

QUESTION—RAILWAY HAULAGE, TON-MILE COST.

Hon. V. HAMERSLEY asked the Chief Secretary: 1, What was the cost per ton-mile on the Government railways for goods and livestock during each year from 1924 to 1929? 2, What was the cost per ton-mile for wheat traffic during each of the same years?

The CHIEF SECRETARY replied: 1, It is not practicable to take out actual cost of haulage per ton-mile, but the receipts per ton-mile for all goods traffic hauled during the years mentioned were: 1929, 1.71 pence; 1928, 1.76 pence; 1927, 1.82 pence; 1926, 1.91 pence; 1925, 1.90 pence; 1924, 1.95 pence; and as over the six years the railways just more than paid their way, it is reasonable to assume that an average of the above would approximate the actual cost per tone-mile for the haulage of all descriptions of goods. 2, Answered by No. 1. The average receipts