

most emphatic protest. We have the largest auriferous area in Australia, and the greatest possibilities, and we produce most of the gold that is won in Australia. If the Government, because of the temporary depression in the mining industry, decide to place the School of Mines under the Director of Education, thus materially altering its status, they will be showing the white feather in regard to gold mining. If the status of the school is to be maintained, whoever may be in charge of it should be directly responsible for the Mines Department, as has been the case hitherto. Adelaide once had what was admitted to be a good school of mines, but the institution developed into a technical school; and the status of anything of that kind is negligible. Ballarat and Kalgoorlie are the chief schools, and Kalgoorlie offers special opportunities for the gaining of practical experience both at the school and at the mines. We should make every effort to attain and maintain the highest standard there, as we have done hitherto.

Hon. J. Cornell: Not an ounce of gold has been got at Ballarat during the last five years.

Hon. E. H. HARRIS: That does not matter from this particular aspect. It is a question of the status of the school. I know a former Kalgoorlie mine manager, now resident in England, who has sent his two sons to study at the Kalgoorlie School of Mines. They are a credit to the school and to Western Australia. I do hope that the paragraph which I have read and the interpretation which I have placed upon it will both prove to be incorrect, and that the Government will allow things to remain as they are. I support the motion for the adoption of the Address-in-reply.

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

House adjourned at 8.42 p.m.

Legislative Assembly,

Tuesday, 14th August, 1928.

	PAGE
Questions: Main Roads Board supervisors ...	182
State Hotels, tariff ...	182
State Saw Mills, dismissals ...	183
Railways—1, Midland and departmental trucks ; 2, Kellerberrin station lighting; 3, Kellerberrin overhead bridge; 4, Cunderdin station lighting ...	183
High School, Merredin's claim ...	183
Committees for the Session ...	188
Address-in-Reply, fifth day ...	184

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

QUESTION—MAIN ROADS BOARD SUPERVISORS.

Mr. BROWN asked the Premier: 1, Is he aware that applications were called for supervisors for Main Roads Board by advertisement in the "Sydney Morning Herald" of 20th June, 1928? 2, Was the opportunity given to men in Western Australia to apply? 3, Has any appointment been made in response to such advertisement?

The PREMIER replied: 1, Yes. This is a matter for the discretion of the Main Roads Board. 2, Yes. The Main Roads Board has made it generally known locally that there are vacancies for good men. 3, No.

QUESTION—STATE HOTELS, TARIFF.

Mr. THOMSON (for Mr. C. P. Wausbrough) asked the Minister for Agriculture: 1, Is it a fact that the tariff at State hotels has been increased by 20 per cent. since the 30th June? 2, What circumstances have arisen in connection with this branch of State enterprise that warrants this action? 3, Is he aware that privately owned hotels have not increased their tariff and that the department's action has added an unjust impost upon citizens and travelling public alike? 4, Will he inquire into the matter with a view to reverting to the original charges?

The MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE replied: 1, Yes. 2, The tariff of 10s. per day previously charged was not commensurate with the services rendered. 3, No; many of the better class country hotels have long since raised their tariffs. 4, There is no necessity for further inquiry.

QUESTION—STATE SAW MILLS, DISMISSAL.

Miss HOLMAN asked the Minister for Agriculture: 1, Have any workers been dismissed from the State Saw Mills as a result of the depression in the timber trade in this State? 2, What action is he taking to ensure a continuity of employment for the men now employed at the State Saw Mills?

The MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE replied: 1, No. 2, The outlook as regards future business is such that it is not anticipated that any of the State mills will be closed.

QUESTIONS (4)—RAILWAYS.

Midland and Departmental trucks.

Mr. A. WANSBROUGH asked the Minister for Railways: 1, What was the number of departmental trucks hired, or in use by the Midland Railway Company, during the years 1926-27, 1927-28? 2, What was the number of Midland Railway Company's trucks hired, or in use by the department, for the same period? 3, Were detention charges raised; if so, what were the amounts? 4, If detention charges are not raised, what are the conditions operating?

The MINISTER FOR RAILWAYS replied: 1, Including the empty trucks returned from the Northern district—(a) 1926-27, 16,292 trucks; (b) 1927-28, 16,958 trucks. 2, (a) 1926-27, 7,652 trucks; (b) 1927-28, 7,953 trucks. 3, Demurrage paid by the company—(a) 1926-27, £7,811; (b) 1927-28, £16,913. Demurrage paid by the Government—(a) 1926-27, £9,464. (b) 1927-28, £18,141. 4, Answered by No. 3. The extra payments by the Government railways per truck is caused through the company's trucks being used on Government lines for longer periods than the Government's trucks are used on the company's line.

Kellerberrin Station Lighting.

Mr. BROWN (for Mr. Griffiths) asked the Minister for Railways: 1, When is the lighting system at the Kellerberrin railway station to be altered? 2, Is he aware that already three serious accidents have occurred at night through passengers stepping into the engine pit through the absence of lights?

The MINISTER FOR RAILWAYS replied: 1, When the town supply can guarantee an all-night service. 2, No.

Kellerberrin Overhead Bridge.

Mr. BROWN (for Mr. Griffiths) asked the Minister for Railways: Has he given any further consideration to the urgent need for an overhead railway bridge at the Kellerberrin railway station?

The MINISTER FOR RAILWAYS replied: The hon. member has already been informed that there are more urgent works than the erection of an overhead bridge at Kellerberrin railway station.

Cunderdin Station Lighting.

Mr. BROWN (for Mr. Griffiths) asked the Minister for Railways: Before the Estimates are presented will he see whether a small sum can be put aside to provide something better in the way of lighting at the Cunderdin railway station?

The MINISTER FOR RAILWAYS replied: Sufficient data is not available to reply to this question, nor does its relative importance demand immediate attention. The decision will be given to the hon. member when it is available.

QUESTION—HIGH SCHOOL, MERREDIN'S CLAIM.

Mr. BROWN (for Mr. Griffiths) asked the Minister for Agriculture: Before any decision is made regarding the allocation of money for the building of any new High School, will he go into the matter of Merredin's claim for priority?

The MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE replied: The claims of all centres will receive full consideration before the building of a new High School is authorised.

COMMITTEES FOR THE SESSION.

On motion by the Premier Sessional Committees were appointed as follows:—

Library Committee—Mr. Speaker, Mr. Angelo, and Mr. Corboy.

Standing Orders Committee—Mr. Speaker, the Chairman of Committees, Hon. W. J. George, Mr. E. B. Johnston, and Mr. Marshall.

House Committee—Mr. Speaker, Mr. Chesson, Mr. Lambert, Mr. Teesdale, and Mr. Thomson.

Printing Committee—Mr. Speaker, Mr. J. MacCallum Smith, and Mr. Pantoun.

ADDRESS-IN-REPLY.

Fifth Day.

Debate resumed from the 9th August.

MR. DAVY (West Perth) [4.40]: As usual, I have no roads and bridges matters to bring before the House, but I should like to make a few remarks, not so much on the Governor's Speech as on subjects that might reasonably be said to arise out of it, and on general matters of interest, at all events for the moment. I do not share some of the complaints levelled against the Governor's Speech. The chief complaint, probably, is that it is rather misleading. The very modest programme of legislation set forth at the end of the Speech is no more modest than similar programmes in preceding Governor's Speeches since I have been in the House. I have always found in the past that the modesty has been very promptly abandoned when the House really took the bit between its teeth and started in on the work of the session. I have taken the trouble to make a count of the measures that have passed through Parliament in each of the four sessions during which I have enjoyed the privilege of sitting in this House. I find that in 1924 we passed 40 Acts, in 1925 we passed 54, and in 1926 we passed 63. Then, instead of coming back after the new elections full of legislative vigour, we visibly slipped and put through only 34 Acts. Of that mass of measures, quite a number are necessary and merely formal. But during the past four years we have certainly put through an enormous volume of legislation. If I felt sure that the forecast contained in the Governor's Speech, namely, that we were going to deal with only seven matters this session, if I could feel that that was to be accomplished I, for the first time since being here, would feel inclined to offer the Government my hearty congratulations. I submit, and I think the Premier and many other members will agree that if we did confine ourselves to legislation dealing only with those seven matters, and the other necessary legislation that has to be passed every session, I believe we would produce seven very good measures indeed—

assuming that they dealt with subjects that ought to be legislated upon, and that the principle in each measure made for the benefit of the community as a whole. At any rate, we would give mature and thorough consideration to the principles of the Bills considered, and would be able to thrash out the details very comprehensively in Committee. I believe that if session by session we confined ourselves to a small number of Bills and dealt with them thoroughly and exhaustively, the result would be to the benefit of the people of Western Australia and of the State in general. We have far too many laws. Every person is supposed to know the law. The plea of ignorance of the law is not accepted in a court of law.

Hon. W. J. George: How many Acts of Parliament have we now?

MR. DAVY: I do not know, but I should say about 75 per cent. too many. If I may be pardoned for being personal to myself, I may say I had an illuminating experience a little while ago, when engaged in a case in court. The Act upon which the case was brought was an ancient statute of William and Mary, dealing with the rights of a landlord to claim treble the amount of damages where a pound breach had been committed. In the course of the argument in the court I had to admit that, on my contention of the proper construction of that statute, it was a very harsh statute, and might work harshly in a certain set of circumstances. I said I thought that Parliament, if it were fully apprised of the fact that the Act was in existence, would probably very quickly amend it. Very justly a well-known journal made a comment about me, saying "Here is Davy, who talks like this. He is a lawyer and has also been in Parliament for four years, but he has made no attempt to alter this harsh law." The answer is, and I confess it without shame, that I had not the foggiest notion that this piece of legislation was in existence until I happened to undertake this particular action on behalf of a client. If a man who has devoted a certain amount of time to the study of the law, and endeavours to specialise in it, does not know the Acts in existence, or their sections, without looking them up or having them looked up for him in each case, what chance has the ordinary citizen of knowing them? We do not draw the line at that. In addition to a mass of statutes that we put upon the books every year, we are pouring out regulations week by week and month by month.

I have protested ever since I have been in the House that we are not doing our duty in this Parliament when we permit important matters to be dealt with by regulation that ought to be the function of this House. Some members on the opposite side of the House have agreed with this view. The Minister for Works has expressed his entire agreement with that viewpoint, and yet the thing goes on. We had a special session recently to deal with one agreement. The most drastic clauses I have ever seen enabling regulations to be made were included in that Bill. I believe those clauses to be almost unprecedented. So it goes on! The measures that are brought down are really only skeletons, the flesh and blood being added by departmental officers by way of regulations. I say now, as I did before, that it is wrong, and leads to an extension of the powers which Parliament has given to the executive, and makes the task of the ordinary citizen increasingly hard, when he is endeavouring to fulfil his duties as a citizen, to know the law and obey it. I wish to make one or two remarks on the question of State finances. I do not pretend to be anything like an expert in that matter. I do not know who is an expert in State finances. The more I see of them, the more convinced I am that they are constructed and presented in a manner quite unlike that which any business man uses in handling his business affairs. The Premier has this year presented a statement to the public in which he shows that he has sustained a deficit of £26,466. and this, he has told us, he regards, in all the circumstances, as a very satisfactory result. It may be satisfactory to him, but if so it must be that different methods have been adopted in achieving the result from those adopted in securing the small surplus of the previous year. I submitted last year that the small surplus of £28,000 was obtained by certain entries in the statement of receipts and expenditure which ought not to have appeared in those two columns. I referred in particular, and my honourable leader also did, to two particularly large sums. The first was the failure to pay interest and sinking fund which amounted to £154,000—I think at the time the matter was debated it was called in round figures £150,000—and there was also the fact that the revenue had benefited by charging to the cheap money the loan at the full rate per cent., and paying out only the cheap rate of 1 per cent., resulting in a benefit to revenue

of £103,000. When these two figures were placed before the Premier a year ago he answered the claim that the interest and sinking fund had not been paid, amounting to £150,000, by saying that although it had been credited to revenue, it had nevertheless gone out on the other side, being debited to a suspense fund to meet losses on group settlement. If that were so, no great exception could be taken to the procedure. The money would still be available in case the Financial Agreement did not become law, and in the end the interest and sinking fund for that year had to be paid. We find from the Auditor-General's report that this was not done, that the setting aside of the £150,000 was not as against interest and sinking fund, but as against the £103,000 which was the benefit derived by the process of charging to loan 5 or 6 per cent., and debiting revenue only with the 1 per cent. on the cheap money. I do not know that it matters very much, but the fact of the matter is that on the receipt side last year the revenue did benefit by £154,000, and by £103,000, making a total of £257,000. In this matter I am ignoring all other sums. As against that, there was a sum put into suspense to meet losses on group settlement. I submitted a year ago, and I submit again, that as far as the Premier's statement of revenue and expenditure was a means of enlightening the public, and enabling them to dissect the figures, it did not show whether our finances were really improving or not, and the statement was therefore of no value whatever from that point of view. I am not in the position at the moment to say that similar things were done in this year's account, but if they have been done I say that this statement of revenue and expenditure is of no value whatever as a means of enlightening the general public as to our true financial position. The Premier the other night described the Auditor-General's report as being, after all, "the mere pointing out of technicalities." If the Auditor-General's functions are merely to point out technicalities, I suggest he is not performing his duty. He is paid, I think, a salary of over £1,000 a year, and has a fairly large staff. He is appointed under a special Act of Parliament by Parliament to represent Parliament and the people in checking the expenditure of money by the Government. He is not a Government servant. He is there as the watchdog of the public on behalf of the public to check the expenditure from the

public purse by the Government. If his annual report is to be brushed aside as "a mere pointing out of technicalities," the sooner we get rid of him the better.

The Premier: It would interest the hon. member to look back through Auditor-General's reports over the last 20 years or so. He would find a continual repetition of the same things. It has been so ever since I have seen such reports.

Hon. G. Taylor: But not such glaring cases.

Mr. DAVY: No doubt in many cases the Auditor-General will point out what is a purely technical breach of the law, but his duty is to point out something more than that. I see in the report he has presented to us for the year ended 30th June, 1927, that he has pointed out things that are not mere technical breaches of the law. No one who looks at page 6 of the report, and really thinks what it means, can possibly say that he is merely pointing out a technical defect when he is dealing with migration money at 1 per cent. He indicates that we are getting millions of money and spending it, and that we are putting this into what I think the member for Menzies described as a jam tin. Out of that jam tin we are taking 5 or 6 per cent., depending on the rate which varies from $4\frac{3}{4}$ per cent. to $6\frac{1}{2}$ per cent., and putting it into revenue, and swelling revenue by it. On the other side we are taking out of revenue 1 per cent. only. The Auditor-General says there is no authority for such a thing. He is a very polite man. I submit that the mere pointing out of that shows sufficiently that he is not dealing with a mere technicality. It may not be his function to condemn the practice, because he never condemns anything. He merely brings these things under our notice. I suggest that if the Auditor-General had been the auditor of a public company and had set forth these facts of criticism, he would have given, as auditors of public companies do, a pretty fair rap over the knuckles to the directors of the company for doing these things. He points out that by this process of charging to loan the full rate of interest and debiting the revenue merely by 1 per cent., the estimated gain—it is impossible to get very near it—during 1923-24, the first year of office of the Premier, was £19,000, the next year it went up to £29,000, the following year to nearly £60,000, and last year it was £103,405. It is impossible to find out what has been done

this year. If the increase has gone up proportionately, I venture to say that for the year ended 30th June, 1928, the gain to revenue from this process has probably been nearly £150,000. I do not know, but I suggest this is probably so. I can hardly think the Premier himself will say now that the increase of revenue by this process allows one to judge fairly as to what our revenue is by comparison with previous years. I do not believe he will say now that it helps to enable the public to know exactly what the position is. My submission is that if this year's revenue has benefited by this process to the extent of £150,000, our statement of revenue and expenditure ought to have set out not that we have a deficit of £26,000, but that we have a true deficit of that amount plus £150,000. Surely the people of Western Australia ought to know the position so that they can face it. I do not propose to resuscitate the argument that we have been having with the Premier over this one-third reduction of taxation, and what it has been worth to him. He says he has lost on the transaction. The Premier was pleased to describe himself and his colleagues the other night as plain blunt men. I am not going to agree for one minute that the Premier is a plain man. I do not think he is at all plain. Further, I will not agree that he is a blunt man, if by "blunt" the hon. gentleman meant the opposite to acute. But if the Premier really believes that in giving away a third of something it is difficult to estimate what one has lost, then I agree that the Premier can, if necessary, at least simulate bluntness in that sense of the word. There can be no question about the thing. The Premier has said that income tax collections totalled £323,000, and that that amount of £323,000 is what he got through reducing income tax by one-third. Let us pause there for a minute. "One-third" does not mean one-third of the rate, because those of us who are fortunate enough to have to pay income tax know exactly how the assessment comes. It sets forth the assessed income, and then sets forth the tax, and finally says, "less one-third of the tax." Repeating that process in every assessment made in Western Australia means that the Premier gets exactly two-thirds of whatever he would have got if the one-third had not been knocked off. This year, he says, he got £323,000. That sum is exactly one-third less than he would have

got if he had not given away the other third, in which case I make the amount he would have received £484,000. That is to say, by giving away a third the Premier lost the sum of £161,000. Subtracting that amount from £200,000, one gets, near enough, £38,000 that he has made on the transaction.

The Premier: Does not significance attach to the fact that I got considerably less from income tax than I got in past years?

Mr. DAVY: It is a distressing fact, because I myself have heard the Treasurer say that the amount of income tax collected is, other things being equal, a pretty fair index of the prosperity of the country. I agree that the Premier, other things being equal, is receiving a great deal less from income tax than he received in the past. During the preceding year, at the same rate of tax with one-third off, he received £345,000 from income tax. Last year he got only £323,000, showing the reduction of £22,000.

The Premier: I do not think the hon. member really believes that taxpayers are getting fewer or that the amount of taxation is getting less.

Mr. DAVY: I do not know what to believe, but the fact remains that during the last three years income tax collections have been going down. Unless there is some other factor to explain the decrease, a factor I do not know anything about, it might be due, as the Premier suggested recently, to more businesses being formed into companies. That factor, however, would not be sufficient to explain the decrease.

The Premier: That process has been going on for many years.

Mr. DAVY: I do not want to be dogmatic about this, although I feel inclined to dogmatise, but it is clear to me, and I think to anybody who cares to look at the figures, that the Premier has gained by the sacrifice of one-third of the income tax for £200,000, and that last year his gain amounted to £38,000 odd. I suggest the trouble is that income tax collections have been dropping, dropping seriously, during the last three or four years.

The Premier: Why should that have been so during four years of increasing harvests and therefore of increasing incomes to the farmers?

Mr. DAVY: I do not know, but it is so. Without any deduction of the one-third at all to cloud the issue, returns from income tax have dropped £22,000 between the pre-

ceding year and the year which has just closed. That is not denied; one cannot get away from it. Until four or five years ago income tax collections were increasing steadily every year. There can be no complication about the reduction of one-third during that period.

The Premier: It is worth remembering that in some years the arrears brought in are much heavier than in other years.

Mr. DAVY: That may be, but the other day the Premier tried to explain how it was that he did not seem to get on as well as he might have, and the explanation was that there ought to have been an increase in income tax collections and that there always had been an increase previously.

The Premier: That is so.

Mr. DAVY: Suddenly, three years ago, instead of an increase we had a decrease, and that decrease has gone on year by year. I am not saying for a moment that there may not be an explanation of it. Because of this I do not wish to suggest that our present prosperity, in which we all believe, does not exist; but I do say that the decrease is an alarming feature which wants some thought and investigation. It is alarming that the upward trend of income tax collections has been turned into a downward trend.

The Minister for Lands: That is due to people forming themselves into companies and so escaping income tax.

Mr. DAVY: Possibly that is the position, but that process has been going on year in, year out.

The Minister for Lands: It is increasing.

Mr. DAVY: If it can be shown that during the last three or four years there has been an enormous increase in dividend duty as opposed to income tax, that might be the explanation; but I do not think there has been any marked increase in the tendency to turn private shows into companies. It has gone on steadily for the last 20 years, perhaps slowly increasing. At any rate, I would be interested to hear what is the true explanation, if there is any. Now I wish to make one or two remarks upon the Main Roads Board, in particular connection with the Canning-road. I believe the Premier himself recently admitted that the whole business in connection with the making of that road discloses something almost catastrophic. The length of road—I am not sure whether it is eight miles or ten miles—

The Premier: Something between eight and nine miles.

Mr. DAVY: Let us put the length at nine miles. We do not know exactly how much has been spent, but the total is about £133,000. On last year's Loan Estimates we were asked to vote a sum of £133,000 to meet the expenditure on this road. Whether all that amount has been spent or not I do not know, but it is admitted by the Government, and in fact by everybody, that the road has cost a scandalously large amount of money, utterly unwarranted and exhibiting some highly serious lack of management or incompetence on somebody's part. We know that the road is not yet finished, and that it is not a road of remarkable construction. It looked very nice before the winter came and the motor cars started to splash into the bushes, but at the same time it is not a road of concrete foundations or of a wood-block surface. It is an ordinary stone-formation road of not very remarkable quality. I do not know for what length, but I do know that for an appreciable extent—I will not say more than that—the foundations of that road are limestone.

Mr. Sleeman: I think your information is bad.

Mr. DAVY: I will guarantee it, though I did not see the limestone put in. It came under my notice professionally that that was the position, because I acted for a man who had a contract for the supply of limestone. As a matter of fact, it was for "capstone as per sample." The sample was not capstone as represented, but limestone; and limestone was what the man delivered, and limestone was put into the foundations. For what length I cannot say, but I can guarantee that the man delivered limestone there and that it was put into the foundations of that road.

The Premier: For a short distance at the Fremantle end, I believe.

Mr. Sleeman: For a few feet, more likely.

Mr. DAVY: I think it will be found to be a great deal more than a few feet. Section 4 of the Main Roads Act passed by this Parliament provides that the board shall consist of three members, who shall be from time to time appointed by the Governor, and that two members of the board shall be engineers qualified by training and experience in modern road-making. The third is to be a skilled administrator. Section 12 provides that every assistant engineer, inspector, and other officer shall exercise and discharge all his respective powers and duties under this Act and in all things be subject to the direction and control of the board. We

are told that justice has been done or vengeance satisfied for this appalling catastrophe because one subordinate engineer has ceased to be in the service, which of course is the euphemistic way of saying that he has got the sack.

The Premier: He was a pretty highly placed man.

Mr. DAVY: He was one of the persons with regard to whom it is provided by the Act that in the exercise and discharge of his powers and duties he shall in all things be subject to the direction and control of the board.

Hon. W. J. George: If this man made a muddle, what were the board doing?

Mr. DAVY: I am just trying to make that point. I am not howling for the members of the Main Roads Board to be hung from lamp posts; but, at the same time, when two skilled engineers and one highly skilled administrator are appointed to the board, one might expect them, on the first big job they have, to make some sort of attempt to stand up to their responsibilities, and to be brave enough to accept the blame and not have it put on one of their subordinate officials, who was under their control and direction.

The Premier: Even Homer nodded sometimes.

Mr. DAVY: Of course; but Homer, so far as I am aware, was not paid a large salary to refrain from nodding. Neither was he ever described as highly skilled until he had proved himself, and that was hundreds of years later.

The Premier: Seven cities claimed to be his birthplace. I am afraid no city will claim to be the birthplace of the board.

Mr. DAVY: I am afraid not. My point is that the whole object of this scheme was to give the public confidence that the large sums of money to be spent would be spent under careful supervision, and not be wasted. I suggest to the Premier that this House is entitled to a great deal more information than merely the fact that retribution for this ghastly failure has been achieved through one subordinate official having now left the service.

Hon. G. Taylor: Always there is someone who has to be the scapegoat!

Mr. DAVY: I suggest that the request by the Road Board Conference, which sat the other day, for a Royal Commission to inquire into some of the activities of the board, was not quite as silly as the Premier suggested.

The Minister for Mines: Conference cancelled that decision the next day!

Mr. DAVY: I suggest that the request was not so silly in view of the fact that one subordinate officer only has ceased to be employed in the Public Service. It would be advisable for inquiries to be made as to why this particular piece of road has cost such a fabulous sum of money. I desire to refer particularly to one other subject before I conclude my remarks. It was touched upon by the Leader of the Country Party, and I wish to refer to another phase of the same problem. The Leader of the Country Party dealt with some force, I think, with the results that are achieved by the restriction of the number of apprentices in Western Australia. He pointed out that the opportunity for boys joining professions or callings other than unskilled occupations, was being seriously restricted by the limitation of apprentices to the number of journeymen in trades or callings. Of course, we can understand why journeymen do not desire a large number of apprentices in their particular trades. The more apprentices admitted, the greater will be the competition to be encountered in the future. If it is desired to keep a tight corporation—

Mr. Kenneally: Like the lawyers have.

Mr. DAVY: I thought the hon. member would say that! But he may not know that the lawyers are generous enough to pay out of their own pockets a sum of £500 a year towards the education of people who cannot afford to get their legal training in any other way. The member for East Perth (Mr. Kenneally) has not kept himself au fait with those developments.

Mr. Kenneally: Where do the lawyers pay that?

Mr. DAVY: The hon. member has not been marching with the times. That amount is paid here to the University of Western Australia under an Act of Parliament. The lawyers voluntarily undertook to tax themselves in order to provide that money. Gibes such as that the hon. member made against lawyers should be left alone, for, as in this instance, they signally fail.

Mr. Kenneally: The lawyers have one of the strongest unions in the Commonwealth.

Mr. DAVY: That gibe has come from the cross benches ever since I have been in this House. I say again emphatically that there is nothing even slightly resembling a union about the lawyers. The suggestion of keeping up fees or not agreeing to work for less than a certain amount,

is not true. Unlike any other section of the community, the lawyers have their fees fixed by law, which says that they shall not charge more than a certain amount.

The Minister for Lands: The law is generous to lawyers.

Mr. Kenneally: The law sets out the maximum a worker can get.

Mr. DAVY: The law does not say anything of the kind. The law prescribes the minimum that can be paid to a worker. I admit that the minimum certainly has a tendency to become the maximum, but it cannot be suggested that there are not many workers in Western Australia who are getting more than the minimum prescribed wage. I am prepared to produce a great number of names of men who are paid more than the prescribed minimum, and I can produce them at short notice.

Mr. Kenneally: Can the hon. member deny that charges as between solicitor and client have to be paid, though they are in excess of what should ordinarily be charged?

Mr. DAVY: I wish the hon. member would get his information where it will be accurate. Should the hon. member have the misfortune to require the services of a lawyer, and be dissatisfied with the bill of costs that lawyer may present to him, the hon. member can go to the Supreme Court and have the Bill taxed by an official of that court.

Mr. Kenneally: But he will have to pay what the lawyer charges just the same.

Mr. DAVY: The hon. member is getting deeper and deeper into the mire! He will not have to pay what the lawyer says; all he will have to pay will be the amount that the Master of the Supreme Court says that he shall pay, in accordance with the law.

Mr. Kenneally: Exactly!

Mr. DAVY: If the amount fixed by the Master is less than that shown in the bill he receives from the lawyer, the member for East Perth will have to pay only the amount fixed by the Master. I thought that was common knowledge.

Hon. G. Taylor: After all, this is merely another instance of the difference between East and West!

Mr. DAVY: I wish to make one other point before concluding my remarks. I am not dealing with the question of apprentices; I want to carry the argument further than that. In speaking along these lines, I am not doing so by way of criticism; it has nothing to do with the Government. I want hon. members to help me in thinking just where

we are getting to. Two or three years ago we passed the Arbitration Act Amendment Act. Under the provisions of that amending legislation, we included a proposal that I believe was unanimously favoured by this House. The object of that provision was to secure the declaration of the basic wage each year. In the circumstances, that seemed a sensible course to adopt. After some discussion, we agreed to that provision without any opposition in this House, and I do not think any serious objection was taken to it in the Legislative Council. Since then the amended Act has been in operation. When the community as a whole has become completely industrialised, when every type of employee is embraced in a union, and when every employee is covered by an award or an agreement, then we will arrive at a peculiar situation. When that time comes, a man, should he reach the age of 21 years, and still be unskilled, will die unskilled. That is what faces this community. If you will pardon me, Mr. Speaker, for taking you as an example, I would point out that if you had been a bit younger in the present days, you could never have become a lawyer, because obviously a man who enters a lawyer's office or any skilled trade at the age of 21 years, cannot expect to be paid £4 5s. a week. Without reflecting upon you, Sir, I do not think that even you would suggest you were of much use in the office of the practitioners to whom you were articled during the first year or two. Certainly you could not have been worth to them £4 5s. a week, if you were worth anything. With the result that we see from this system, it is apparent that if we do not agree to some alteration of the law to meet the objections that can be raised it will simply mean that if a man reaches the age of 21 years and is still unskilled, he will have to end his days as a failure or be an entirely unskilled worker.

The Minister for Lands: That is largely the position now.

Mr. DAVY: Yes.

The Minister for Lands: And it has always been so.

Hon. G. Taylor: Not quite so, but it will be.

Mr. DAVY: Of course it has not been so, and was not so until the arbitration system was built up under which we fixed the wages that people should receive according to their ages.

The Minister for Lands: That is not my experience.

Mr. DAVY: Probably economic pressure may make it difficult for a man to enter a trade after he reaches a certain age. Perhaps he may get married and have the battle of life before him. If this tendency is carried to its logical conclusion, we must look forward to any boy who reaches the age of 21 years, being absolutely settled for entering any skilled trade or profession. My view has always been that the best ideals of democracy were to provide every person with an opportunity to take that position in the social and economic life of the community to which his ability and character fitted him. That is the whole trend of democracy. My point is that this artificial ruling that men shall be paid a certain wage on reaching the age of 21 years is really one that hampers the march of progress. We should be very careful regarding the tendency in that direction.

MR. BROWN (Pingelly) [5.25]: It is not my intention to delay the House at any great length. I am afraid my speech will be merely a repetition of my previous Address-in-reply speeches during the past few years. On those occasions I expressed the desire that certain works should be undertaken in my electorate and I am sorry to admit that even now those works have not been attended to.

The Premier: I see they are going to bring a deputation down.

Mr. BROWN: Yes, I will see the Premier about that in due course. Regarding the financial position, I listened with pleasure to the Premier deliver his Budget speech last year when he predicted a surplus of £14,000. Unfortunately that did not materialise and on the contrary, we had a deficit of £26,000.

Mr. Teesdale: But now we have found oil!

Mr. BROWN: It is not much use harping on the deficit of £26,000, which, after all, is not very much; but in view of the prosperity enjoyed by the State, we naturally assumed that the Premier's estimate would be realised. I thought at the time, and I am still of the opinion, that when the Premier decided to reduce the income tax by 33½ per cent., it was an astonishing thing for a Labour Government to reduce taxation of that description. It simply meant playing into the hands of the larger firms. I know that to-day very few farmers are paying income tax.

The Minister for Railways: Have a look at the returns!

Mr. BROWN: By reducing the income tax by 33½ per cent., not many farmers benefited because not many pay income tax at all.

The Premier: Perhaps that is the reason why.

Mr. BROWN: The relief given by the Government meant assistance to those in receipt of big dividends and to shareholders who do not live in Western Australia at all. However, it is pleasing to know that the deficit was as small as £26,000. The prospects for the coming year are very good, and I hope that we shall have a surplus next year. If that is so, I trust the Premier will be able to give some recognition to the requests that country members have to make to him.

Mr. Teesdale: Give them a few railways.

Mr. BROWN: We talk about our great resources, but the greatest of them all is to be found in the agricultural industry. I have no definite figures, but I am sure that the value in money of the exportable goods produced by the agricultural industry reaches very high figures. For instance, the exportable value of the wheat we produce is about £7,000,000, whereas that of wool is £4,000,000.

Mr. Teesdale: And now we will have oil.

Mr. BROWN: Prices have been good and they are likely to continue, which will mean that the demand for our wool will be greater still during the next two or three years. The population of the world is increasing and therefore the demand for wool for clothing will be increased. In Western Australia the position is favourable, and the Premier dealt with that phase when he referred to the rapid increase in our production of wheat and sheep. If the 3,500 farms materialise, as I have no doubt they will, because the land is there, the production of wheat in Western Australia will be greatly increased. In fact it is predicted that in the near future Western Australia will be producing between 50 and 60 million bushels of wheat.

Member: More.

Mr. BROWN: That is quite likely. When the 3,500 new farms are in full working order, they should produce an immense quantity. The settlers on those blocks will have to depend entirely on wheat. It will be a considerable time before they will be able to fence their holdings and provide water in order to run sheep. Consequently, their work will result in great quantities of

wheat being available for export and the revenue of the State will benefit as well.

Hon. G. Taylor: There will be some road board conferences then.

Mr. BROWN: Let me refer to the cost of producing wheat. The question has occasioned a good deal of controversy recently. Articles have appeared in the newspapers to the effect that wheat is actually being produced at a loss. I do not think that is so, but I am convinced that there is not a great deal of profit in wheat growing. The price of wheat is falling. At the sidings it is only about 4s. a bushel, and taking into consideration that the State average is only about 11 bushels, the average return is only 44s. per acre. I question whether there is much profit in wheat growing at that price. Nevertheless necessity compels men to make a living at something, and those accustomed to farming pursuits will naturally produce as much as they can.

Hon. G. Taylor: Mixed farming at that.

Mr. BROWN: It is impossible to carry on other than mixed farming, though I realise that a new settler cannot carry sheep until he has provided water and fencing.

The Premier: I am getting a bit concerned about this.

Mr. BROWN: The tariff is a bugbear to the farmers, but being a Federal matter it has nothing to do with this Parliament. The farmer's tools of trade, the implements he requires in order to produce the wheat, are altogether too dear. Some member may feel inclined to retort that the farmer of to-day is operating under conditions entirely different from those that prevailed in the industry 25 or 30 years ago. I admit that. On the modern farm we find big machinery doing the work. There may be seen one man working a tractor and another working a drill. I know of two men who this season have put 1,000 acres under crop. Such a feat was impossible 25 years ago when the work of cropping had to be done with a small team. Owing to the high cost of implements, bags, labour and freight an average of 11 bushels per acre leaves little for the farmer himself. For that reason not too many farmers are paying income tax. A heavy duty is imposed on harvesting machinery in order to encourage its manufacture in Australia. Apart from the State Implement Works, we have no implement factories in this State. The other night I learnt that, whereas some little time ago the State Implement Works employed 600 men, only half that number are employed to-day.

Hon. G. Taylor: And they are turning out more work now than when they had the 600 men.

Hon. W. J. George: The manager, Mr. Shaw, says that by putting the works in proper order, he got more work with fewer men.

Mr. BROWN: If that is a fair sample of our Government concerns, I am afraid some investigation of them is necessary.

Hon. W. J. George: That was 12 years ago, when I became Minister.

Mr. BROWN: There is something radically wrong with the implements turned out by the State works.

Mr. Sleeman: What is wrong?

Mr. BROWN: The farmers have not taken kindly to the State implements.

Mr. Sleeman: And they do not want to.

Mr. BROWN: There must be something wrong with them; otherwise how could H. V. McKay manufacture a machine in Victoria, pay the freight on it to Western Australia, and almost undersell the locally made machine?

Mr. Sleeman: The same thing was done with jam.

Mr. BROWN: But farming machines are not being sold for a mere song. Jones, the jam maker was able to send his jam here and undersell the local manufacturers, but that does not apply to farming machinery.

Mr. Sleeman: What is wrong with the State machinery?

Mr. BROWN: It is not popular with the farmers.

Mr. Clydesdale: But why?

Mr. BROWN: The machine is not doing its work.

Mr. Withers: The principal reason is that it is a local article.

Mr. Lindsay: It is not satisfactory.

Mr. BROWN: There must be something wrong, or farmers would not pay the higher price, plus the freight, for a machine from the Eastern States.

Mr. Clydesdale: As a farmer's representative, you should know what is wrong.

Mr. BROWN: I have told the hon. member what is wrong; the machine will not do satisfactory work. I believe that ploughs, harrows, rollers, etc., turned out by the State Implement Works are giving satisfaction, but not the harvesting machinery. I do not wish to decry the management of the works, but perhaps the staff

has been cut down to such an extent that suggestions are not being obtained from the farmers. When McKays or Bagshaws supply a machine, a representative of the agents follows it to the farm soon afterwards and is open to receive any suggestion that the farmer has to make. That is not done by the State Implement Works. If a man buys a State machine and it does not give satisfaction, he throws it out and that is the end of it, and the management of the works knows nothing about it. If a manufacturer has a machine to put on the market, he must follow it into the field and be ready to listen to suggestions from users of the machine.

Mr. Lindsay: That is the whole point.

Mr. BROWN: I regret that the implement works are not turning out machines as they should be doing.

Mr. Sleeman: You are not looking very sorry about it.

Mr. BROWN: I would rather buy a machine of local manufacture than send my money to the Eastern States. The other day I asked a lecturer on behalf of H. V. McKay why we should be sending so much money to the Sunshine people for machinery instead of their erecting the necessary works locally. The answer was that the labour conditions in Western Australia made it impossible to build the machines here.

Hon. G. Taylor: That's the stuff to give them!

Mr. Clydesdale: Is that the reason why the farmers buy them?

Mr. BROWN: He added that there was a spirit of co-operation amongst the employees in the Sunshine factory and that every man was contented. By co-operation I take it he meant that a bonus was paid to every employee.

Hon. W. J. George: Employees should be honest in their work without being specially paid for honesty.

Mr. BROWN: And he said the labour conditions in Western Australia would not allow them to adopt that system here.

Mr. Sleeman: Is that right?

Mr. BROWN: I should like to see a spirit of co-operation introduced here. We are told that no trouble exists between employers and unions in the United States. Every man there works under a system of co-operation and benefits as a result.

Mr. Sleeman: Do you believe the conditions are at fault?

Mr. BROWN: We are told that the wages ruling in American factories are higher than those paid in Australia. That being so, there must be something radically wrong if American manufacturers can pay excessive freights and heavy duties and under-sell Australian-made machines.

Mr. Sleeman: You would not like the Pingelly people to send to Perth for their blacksmithing.

Mr. BROWN: If the local blacksmith endeavoured to charge twice as much as the job was worth, people naturally would send their work elsewhere. The Country Party believe in a revenue tariff, but I consider that the payment of a bounty would be more equitable. If a bounty were offered for the manufacture of certain articles, the whole of the people would assist to pay it, because it would be in the interests of the State to establish a flourishing industry. By imposing a heavy duty on machinery, only one class of the community is penalised, namely, the class that uses it.

Mr. Mann: There is no duty on McKay's machinery.

Mr. BROWN: No.

Mr. Mann: Then what are you complaining about?

Mr. BROWN: My complaint is that when the tariff was increased, McKay's put up their prices accordingly.

Hon. G. Taylor: You should save that speech until the Federal Treasurer arrives here.

Mr. BROWN: Years ago, when McKays were first granted assistance to make machinery, it was stipulated that after the works became established the prices must be reduced. For a year or two that condition was observed. I bought a 6ft. harvester for £89. Let members consider that in comparison with the price to-day. Immediately a heavy tariff was imposed, in order to encourage the manufacture of machines in Australia, up went McKay's price proportionately to the landed cost of the imported machinery. I am dubious about the utility of much of the machinery that comes from overseas, more particularly the tractors. I wonder if anyone can tell me how much profit is attached to the selling of a £500 tractor. It would astonish members to know how much the agents are making by way of selling commission.

Hon. G. Taylor: You can ascertain by taking the price of cars in America and the price here.

Mr. BROWN: We were told that, owing to heavy duty on cars, the price had to be increased. I am glad that the British car is coming into its own.

Hon. W. J. George: How much duty would there be on a Buick car sold at £500?

Mr. BROWN: I have not the slightest idea.

Hon. W. J. George: Over £150.

Mr. BROWN: And it is quite possible that, on top of the customs duty, the agent receives £150 selling commission.

Hon. W. J. George: I do not think he does.

Mr. BROWN: I am inclined to think that the profits now made on cars are not so high as they were previously owing to the keen competition between British and American manufacturers.

Hon. G. Taylor: When Ford cars cost £70 in America, the price here was £180.

Mr. BROWN: Ford is the only man who can turn out cars at that price and he is able to do it because he has his own forest and ironworks. Mass production is the rule in his factories and the men work under the co-operative system. It is really a system of piece work under which they are able to produce cars cheaply.

Hon. G. Taylor: That does not alter the fact that a Ford car is double the price here.

Mr. BROWN: The price is fixed generally, according to the duty. There is not much hope of the duty being taken off.

The Minister for Lands: What about a deputation to Earle Page?

Mr. BROWN: I will leave that to Mr. Johnston. It is deplorable to think that the labour conditions in Western Australia are responsible for the absence of McKay's Implementation Works here. It would have been a wonderful thing for the State if we could have had in our midst a branch of the Sunshine factory. It would have been of greater advantage to the State to have been able to retain the £150,000 or £200,000 that now goes out of Western Australia for agricultural implements. That amount of money could have been distributed amongst our own workmen within the State. Now it all goes to Victoria. So far as the raw material is concerned, there is very little of it to be got in Australia; it must all be imported.

In that respect therefore the conditions would have been similar in Western Australia to those of Victoria, and the machines could have been built here just as cheaply as they are built in Victoria. All the States are alike in respect of the freights that have to be paid. The Navigation Act is responsible for those high charges. Take for example the "Jervis Bay" and the other Bay steamers. The crews of those vessels would not work under English conditions, and had to be repatriated to Australia. The difference in the wages, I believe, is £8 a month as against £16 paid under Australian conditions. These high wages were responsible for excessive freights and fares which benefited nobody.

Mr. Sleeman: The Country Party were responsible for the selling of the steamers.

Mr. BROWN: I wish to congratulate the Minister for Railways on the administration of the Railway Department and on the fact that freights and fares that are levied from the people are as low as those in any other part of Australia. We have more miles of railway per head of population than has any other State of the Commonwealth, and the fact that our railways have been successful financially proves that there is a rich and fertile country behind them.

Mr. Sleeman: And if you patronised the implement works, they too would pay as well as the railways.

Mr. BROWN: With regard to the Lands Department, I consider it to be the most important of all. One has only to go to the Lands office to see a large number of people congregated there all eagerly seeking for land. Our reputation in the Eastern States is very good and the result is that men with limited capital are flocking here to take up areas. With the 3,500 farms proposal, unfortunately, if we require cheap money we must take a certain number of migrants to settle on those blocks.

Hon. G. Taylor: We certainly will not get any cheap money if we do not.

Mr. BROWN: My belief is that we could settle our lands without the aid of that cheap money. I am satisfied that we could put our own people on those blocks. I am an Australian and I believe in Australia for the Australians. Here in Western Australia there are numbers of men who would be willing to take up some of those farms. I was pleased to hear the Premier say the other evening that a majority of the blocks are to be given to Australians. I would like

to know how many are likely to be settled on those proposed new farms. I reckon that at least 60 per cent. will go to British migrants.

The Minister for Lands: You are wrong.

Mr. BROWN: I am pleased to know that I am wrong in that respect. The migrants that have come here have been penniless and have had to be spoon fed. It seems to me that they must get assistance from the moment they land. Then they are without practical experience and it is only natural to expect that there will be from 30 to 40 per cent. of failures. I have no reason to doubt the ability of the British race. Our forefathers came here and pioneered Australia, and surely there should be nothing wrong with the migrants who are coming. All have sprung from the same stock, and if they have the same grit and determination as our forefathers, they must make good. What I would like to know is whether the migrants are being selected from the rural districts of England. Most of those who have come out here have had little practical experience of farming. Men have been taken from factories in the towns and brought out here. Is it any wonder, therefore, that they do not adapt themselves to the rough bush life? Then when they find their funds running low, they drift back to the city. I wish to say a few words on the subject of light lands, and in respect of which the Minister for Lands has had a lot of trouble. Most of the people who have taken up areas of light country have had a big struggle, because they have not been able to get assistance from the Agricultural Bank. The bank will not advance any money unless on the block of light country there is a fair amount of better-class land. I am convinced that with the proper methods of farming the light lands will produce payable crops, and the bank should certainly advance money to the extent of 40 or 50 per cent. of the improvements carried out. What is the position to-day? The men who have gone out on this class of country and who have been struggling for years, find it impossible to go on any further. There is nothing for them to do but to get out. Then the big man living near by gets the block at his own price. That kind of thing is not desirable. I speak as a practical man and I say that I have seen areas that could be made a profitable proposition. I could take the Minister for Lands to hundreds of such farms that are paying at the present

time, and yet under the classification it would be said that they did not include one acre of good land.

The Minister for Lands: The bank is advancing fifty-fifty on most of the light lands.

Mr. BROWN: I do not think that is so. I have had occasion to make several requests to the bank for assistance, and I have been told that the bank did not advance money because the blocks in question contained no proportion of good land. I do not know whether or not they are taking the holders of the areas into consideration, but certainly they are not giving the individuals a show of any kind. These men work under difficulties from the very start whereas, with a little help from the Agricultural Bank, it would mean the difference between success and failure. The Minister would not be running any risk if he altered the Act to provide that assistance in the direction I have outlined should be given, of course under reasonable conditions. I wish now to say a few words about the Public Works Department. I have no complaints to make though I was surprised to hear the Premier say that it would not be advisable to spend too much money on bridges and perhaps on roads, but that it would be preferable to spend it in the development of agricultural areas. The Premier must know that access must be given to areas that are opened for selection and that in many instances it is important that bridges be built. I congratulate the Government on their activity with regard to country water supplies. The rock catchments, without doubt are giving great satisfaction.

Hon. W. J. George: They were investigated in my time, but we did not have the money.

Mr. BROWN: The present Government have the money and they are making good use of the rock catchments. At one time the settlers thought that the provision of these water supplies would be a costly matter for them, but some of them are rated as low as 4½d. per acre. That is very reasonable for a supply of good water, and I do not know that any farmer would growl at having to pay that amount. Very often, however, the settler is not in the position to pay even so low a rate by reason of the fact that he has not made provision for this expenditure.

Hon. W. J. George: It is a just debt.

Mr. BROWN: In such cases the Government could well permit the farmers to have extended terms. A great deal has been said

about the administration of the Main Roads Board, and the mistakes that have been made by that body. We must not forget, however, that the mistakes were made in the initial stages of the board's operations. The board were working with the wrong class of machinery, and under great difficulties, and it was no wonder, therefore, that the cost of road construction was great. The board should be permitted to remain to carry on its work, but at the same time they should not limit the operations of the local road boards. Speaking of the Pingelly Road Board, with which I am familiar, that body has an adequate plant consisting of graders, scarifiers, etc., and the men who operate the plant are doing splendid work. Instead of the Main Roads Board insisting on doing all the work within road board areas, a board with a plant such as that I have described should be allowed to carry on work in its own district. I am sure that better work would be done and the cost would not be as great as if it were done by the Main Roads Board. The Main Roads Board should confine its work to arterial roads and main roads, work beyond the scope of the local authorities. There is plenty of work for the Main Roads Board to do and the work of that board should be confined to the more important undertakings. In that way satisfaction would be given to everyone. The Minister for Agriculture also has an important department to control. I am glad to know that our present Minister is a great enthusiast. He has been a farmer himself, and perhaps is one even now. So he knows the difficulties with which we have to contend. I am certain we shall always get the greatest sympathy from the present Minister for Agriculture. But there are still a lot of difficulties in the department for him to try to solve. Turning to the dairying industry, it is astonishing to find that Western Australia last year imported £194,000 worth of hams and bacon, and about half a million pounds worth of butter and cheese. Therefore it stands to reason there must be a lack of encouragement in the agricultural industry.

Hon. G. Taylor: We have a trade at our own doors there.

Mr. BROWN: Yes. What is wrong with the industry? I have heard dozens of men say, "Do you think I am going to let my wife and daughters enter upon the life of drudgery represented by dairying?" In the

early days of Victoria, that view was not taken. There dairying was used as a side line, and before the creameries came into existence butter was sold in the Melbourne markets at 8d. per lb. Nevertheless the dairy farmers continued. Of course it will be said that 8d. in those days was worth about 2s. to-day. I do not think that is so. However, the fact that we have to import three-quarters of a million pounds worth of dairy produce shows that there is room for great expansion in our local industry. After all, the best butter is made by the local farmer. Under the Patterson scheme a little encouragement has been given by the Commonwealth Government in the form of a bounty of 3d. per lb. on butter. In view of this I take it that butter is actually being sold in Australia at a price not much below that at which it is sold in England.

Mr. Panton: It is dearer in Australia than in England.

Mr. BROWN: Yet we find the industry does not pay! Surely there is something particularly wrong. I do not know why we can afford to send our dairy products out of Australia and sell them in England at a cheaper price than is demanded for them in the Commonwealth. I suppose it is that the supply has never equalled the demand. Our merchants, I understand, send the surplus overseas, leaving only just sufficient in Australia. So it is that the supply hardly comes up to the demand. I wish to say a word about railways. Here I hope I shall not be in the same plight as the member for Avon (Mr. Griffiths), who said the Premier had declared that every time he spoke about the Yarramony railway he set it back twelve months. I would rather not speak about any railway projects if it means putting them back twelve months.

Mr. Teesdale: You will put them back a couple of years.

Mr. BROWN: We have the migration scheme, but the details have never been published, and so we do not know in which direction the proposed railways are going to run. In certain outlying districts people are trying to farm without the assistance of a railway. Recently the Minister for Lands made a journey east of Kondinin for 50 miles, and along the whole of the way he saw field after field under cultivation. I ask, can a man profitably farm an area 50 miles distant from a railway? I know one man whose farm is 40 miles from Kondinin. He had a

splendid crop last year, but by the time he paid cartage, there was no profit at all left for him. I do hope the Kalgarin people will have a railway very shortly. I do not know what direction it is going to take. I am one of those who hold there should be a direct line from Fremantle to Esperance, and another line from Southern Cross running south. But I do hope the Government will give those poor unfortunate settlers in the Kalgarin district a railway just as soon as ever they can. No finer settlers can be found than those at Kalgarin. For years now they have been working under the worst conditions, living like blackfellows, continually hoping for a railway. Yet from what one can gather, that railway appears to be as far off as ever.

Mr. Teesdale: They will get it after death.

Mr. BROWN: It would be well if the Minister for Railways or the Minister for Lands, I am not sure in whose province it comes, were to put a dump somewhere in the Kalgarin area. If the Minister were to do that and make a charge on the dump, the railway could be built quickly and it would be a thoroughly good policy. The local people are hoping to see such a dump. Now I wish to refer to the Brookton-Dale railway, the Bill for which was passed some time ago. For 20 years past the Dale residents have been agitating for a railway. They have succeeded in getting a Bill passed, authorising the construction of a line 26½ miles in length, but since then other events have cropped up, making it feasible that the line should go right through to Armadale.

Hon. G. Tayler: What distance is that?

Mr. BROWN: From Brookton to Armadale is between 60 and 70 miles, whereas from Brookton round the existing railway to Perth is 118 miles. It is not so much the Brookton people, as those living beyond Brookton, that will reap the benefit of the proposed railway. Moreover that railway will reduce the congestion at Spencer's Brook and at the bottle-neck in Perth. Like the proposed railway bridge at Fremantle, it is all part of the Stileman scheme. The residents of the Dale are beginning to realise that they asked for the railway in the wrong place. They ought to have had it 30 miles from Armadale. It would bring them within 60 miles of a port, whereas at present they have to send their produce 16½ miles to

Brookton, and then all round the 118 miles to Perth. It is essential that the Brookton-Dale railway should be built as soon as possible. It is, not a local, but a national matter. We have brought various requests before the Minister for Railways, requests for trucking yards and other facilities. They cannot be built all at once, but I do hope the trucking yards for which I have been asking for so long will be built as soon as possible. Perhaps they are already built. The Minister told me they were seventh on the list. That was some time ago, so possibly the yards are built already.

Mr. Teesdale: Built in the night.

Mr. BROWN: Then there is the matter of the Pingelly railway station, which is in exactly the same condition as it was 40 years ago. Every Minister and member of Parliament who has visited Pingelly agrees that the station is a standing disgrace to a flourishing district. It is scandalous that the residents should have to put up with so paltry a structure. Only this morning, at half past four I was seated on that station, virtually in the open, with a bitterly cold wind blowing on me.

Member: Why did you not go to the pub?

Mr. BROWN: There are no pubs open at that hour. The Minister for Railways will agree with me that I am not asking for too much when I urge him to erect at Pingelly a structure that will be a credit to the railways and to the district, which is a most deserving one. I wish to say a word or two about the Health Department, which of late has grown to considerable dimensions. Government hospitals and committee hospitals alike are increasing by leaps and bounds. That is under the policy of the present Minister for Health. I am not complaining of that. It is splendid to know that we have hospitals for the sick and needy, the people not in a position to pay for medical attendance. But in the near future something will have to be done to finance all those hospitals. It is stated in the Governor's Speech that the Government intend to bring down a Hospitals Bill. What the nature of that Bill will be, I do not know. When, a couple of sessions ago, the Minister introduced his lottery Bill for the maintenance of hospitals, there was considerable opposition from every church in the State. Of course we, as God-fearing politicians, ought to have taken notice of it. However, we did not take that into

consideration. But the other House did, and so the Bill was thrown out. Since then I have heard men connected with one or another of our churches declare that, after all, it was a mistake, that the lottery Bill should have been allowed to pass. They said they would rather have a lottery Bill go through than walk down the streets of the city and see men and women selling sweep tickets all day long. No sooner is one sweep drawn than another is promoted. Dozens of men in Perth are making their living selling sweep tickets. It seems to be the policy of the Minister for Health to give every person who applies for it permission to run a lottery.

The Minister for Health: I have nothing to do with that.

Mr. BROWN: Then perhaps it is the police who give the permission; but probably the police take their instructions from the Minister. All over the country we are getting dental and other clinics, which is a splendid thing for the health of the community, and more particularly the children's health. The Minister is to be commended for that.

Sitting suspended from 6.15 to 7.30 p.m.

Mr. BROWN: Before tea I was speaking about the various medical clinics that the Government have established, and dealing more particularly with the examination of children. The Government are to be commended for what they have done in this direction. Why should we not have adults examined? In the case of diseases in animals the Government are spending a considerable sum of money in utilising the services of scientists to investigate these diseases. The economic loss as a result of these diseases is considerable. What are the Government doing with regard to the examination of human beings? Cancer is increasing. I have been told by a medical friend that in Western Australia, in proportion to its population, there are more cancer cases than in any other part of Australia. If that is so, it would be a good idea if the Government made it compulsory for every adult to be medically examined once a year. In nine cases out of ten when a patient consults a doctor he is told that he should have done so before. A man may have been living in the country, and always enjoyed good health until the time comes when he feels unwell. He will then go to a doctor and

may be told that he is suffering from some malignant growth, and that, if he had sought medical attention before, by means of an operation his life might have been prolonged. It would not be a great expense to provide for the compulsory examination of adults. Doctors are to be found in every little centre in the State. If a man made a practice of being medically examined once a year, it would be to his advantage, and probably save him a great deal of suffering. If a Bill is introduced to provide for hospital finance, the opportunity might be taken to provide for these annual examinations. A doctor could examine patients at small expense, and this might be the means of saving valuable lives. I wish now to refer to the most important question at present before Australia, namely unemployment. This crops up very often. There may be a cycle of years when everything is prosperous and there are very few unemployed, and this may be followed by a cycle when employment is scarce. I remember before the goldfields were discovered that men in New South Wales and Victoria had been walking about for 12 or 18 months without getting a job of any sort throughout that time. When the goldfields were discovered, all the able-bodied men left the other States to come here. In those days men were working on farms for about 12s. 6d. a week, but wages have now gone up to the extent of £2 or £2 10s. a week and keep. We have gone through another cycle of years. Is the present position caused by the influx of people to our shores for whom there is no actual employment? I hardly think that can be so. There must be some other reason for the situation. I am going to make a bold statement. I maintain that the reason why we have so much unemployment is the basic wage. Members opposite may laugh, but I honestly believe that the basic wage is too high in times of depression for employers to utilise the labour that is offering. Some 30 years ago, when there was a depression on the goldfields, men had to go into the country districts. There were not many farmers about then. I remember splendid looking men coming to me and asking for work. I said I had no work for them and could not afford to put them on, and that I must do the work myself. They told me they had been walking about till the soles were worn off their boots, that they badly needed work, and were quite prepared to take it on for £1 a week. These men were willing to work for that sum, and

although I did not need them, I gave them work at that wage. They said it was better for them to take the £1 a week than to walk around the country and starve. I therefore employed them, and when they had earned sufficient money they returned to the goldfields and I did not see them again. If a farmer wishes to employ anybody to-day, he knows he must pay the basic wage.

Mr. Chesson: What about the Italians?

Mr. BROWN: The farmer is not in the position to pay that wage, and he therefore says that he has no work to give.

Mr. Panton: What is the basic wage for a farm hand?

Mr. BROWN: A good man is worth 50s. a week.

Mr. Panton: What is the basic wage?

Mr. BROWN: I do not know that there is one. The wages paid to farm hands are such that any able-bodied and practical man can get his 40s. or 50s. a week.

Mr. Clydesdale: How much has he left on Saturday night?

Mr. Davy: A jolly sight more than the man who is working in the town.

Mr. BROWN: The man who is living in the country has no expense. His food is found for him and he has a place in which to sleep. The £2 or £2 10s. a week that he receives is clear money.

Mr. Clydesdale: What would the married man do on that?

Mr. BROWN: My sympathies are with the married man.

Mr. Panton: Some of them have six children to keep.

Mr. BROWN: If an industry will not permit of high wages being paid, what is the best thing to do? If I were starving in the country I would not beg for food, but I would work for what I could get. Is it not better that I should take £1 a week temporarily than starve? Is it not more honourable for me to take that wage than to come to Perth, where I would only swell the number of unemployed, and exist on two sixpenny feeds a day?

Mr. Clydesdale: Why do you not draw £1 a week from your Parliamentary salary and give it to the unemployed, if you are sincere?

Mr. BROWN: If we were passing through times of depression, I would be prepared to give up £1 a week from my Parliamentary salary for the unemployed; but I would have more spirit than to come to Perth and live on two sixpenny feeds a day. We are all up against it. The farmer

is not in the position to pay high wages, but he is prepared to give temporary relief. A strong unionist would say, "My union will not allow me to accept that small wage," with the result that he would not get any work.

Mr. Panton: The basic wage does not affect the farm labourer.

Mr. BROWN: That is the position today.

Mr. Panton: It is not the position.

Mr. BROWN: The unions are really the cause of a good deal of the trouble. The principle of holding up wages may be all right from the point of view of the unions. When men are up against it in the country, and there is work for them to do if they will take it, they have to come to Perth and register as unionists, and then are sent back from Perth to any of the jobs that may be available. That is not right. Men who have had the spirit to keep away from the town, and do a little work in the country, should have some consideration extended to them. They are not being considered when they have first to be registered in Perth. A good deal has been said about Italians. I have no time for them. I honestly believe, however, that a great deal of the prosperity the State is enjoying to-day is due to the fact that these Italians will go out into the bush and work there, and in that way increase the acreage under crop. By means of Italians, farmers have been able to get their areas under crop far more expeditiously than was often the case before. Other people who have tackled the same class of work have not properly understood the business. I do not uphold the employment of Italians. When these men have been put on to do the work, however, they have given no trouble. They have been able to do the work so well that instead of the farmer getting in only 100 acres of crop, he has been able to get in 200 acres. To that extent, therefore, these foreigners have been a good asset to the State. I feel sure it is the policy of the Commonwealth Government that the migration of Italians should be restricted. It has now been arranged that something like 3,000 only of these foreigners shall land in Australia in any year. The restrictions, however, do not declare in what proportions each of the States shall receive the foreigners. Unfortunately they have been flocking in larger numbers to Western Australia than to the other States. In most cases the Italians have given no trouble either to the Government or to the police. They have

done no cudging, and evidently they know how to develop the country. We should not be too hard on them, although my sympathies every time are with the Britisher. Amongst those of British extraction we have as good men to do our clearing as we have amongst the foreigners. I know that in the early days when the miner or timber worker came down we could not get better men for farm work. But those men had been used to high wages and to receiving the basic rate. They said they would not work for farmers at below those rates. There is the trouble. When these people do not get work they drift into the city. Many members have been in the country. Some of them may have visited small country towns, and have watched the little children going to school. Take a school of perhaps 100 scholars. Every year a percentage of the boys and girls leave that school. It may be only a small town, containing four or five shops. These shops are employing all the labour they want, and there is no more local labour required. What will happen to those eight or ten children who leave school every year? They have to fight their battles in the world, and how are they going to do it? They cannot all go in for farming, and gradually, I regret to say, they drift into the city. There may be secondary industries in the city, but they are only small ones. As it is impossible to absorb the children in the country, they are absorbed into other avenues in the town. I regret very much the dearth of domestic servants. We give our children as good an education as we can. A girl goes to school, and, being fairly clever, she profits by the education she receives. She gets the idea that domestic work is beneath her. She does not want to be called a "slavey," and she goes into an office or factory, preferring to follow those occupations. The result is that the British immigrant girls are being absorbed into domestic service.

Hon. W. J. George: What are you going to do with our own girls?

Mr. BROWN: We have given them such a good education that they look upon domestic service as beneath them. They drift into the cities, get into offices, dressmaking establishments and so on, and now we have people crying out because they cannot obtain domestic servants. To a certain extent education is doing it. I admit, however, that we must give our children the best education we possibly can. At the same time, there is being instilled into our girls the idea that domestic work is beneath

them, and so they drift into the city offices. In any provincial town a percentage of the children leaving school have to go out into the world and look for employment.

Hon. W. J. George: We all had to do that.

Mr. BROWN: Yes.

Hon. W. J. George: And are not the boys of to-day as good as ever the boys of your time and mine?

Mr. BROWN: Certainly; but there is a good deal of difference between the boys of to-day and the boys of olden time. Formerly boys did not look for amusements and pleasures as the boys of to-day do. One of the first aspirations of the modern boy is to possess a motor byke.

The Premier: Yes. Moreover there were no endurance dancers in our days.

Mr. BROWN: No.

The Premier: We had to cut chaff before breakfast.

Mr. BROWN: Yes, and after dinner.

The Premier: That had compensations, because the girls used to help us cut the chaff.

Mr. BROWN: The Premier was luckier than I have been. The rising generation are looking for a different class of work, higher wages, and more amusements.

Hon. W. J. George: If you come down to bedrock, boys and girls are all the better for their education.

Mr. BROWN: I make no complaint as to the education. But we are instilling into them principles different from those we held in our youth. In conclusion let me express my pleasure at the fact that Western Australia is still prosperous. The season is promising. For the past five or six years we have had good seasons. Western Australia's rainfall is assured, and I believe that in the near future this will be the greatest wheat-producing State of Australia.

HON. W. J. GEORGE (Murray-Wellington) [7.50]: Speeches already delivered have dealt with many points of the Governor's Speech, but possibly there are some points upon which I may offer a few words without traversing ground already covered. I am pleased that the Government declare their intention to bring in one measure in particular which, to my mind, must prove for the good of the State—namely, the Bill to establish a Rural Bank branch of the

State Savings Bank. I shall await that measure with great interest. Although I firmly believe that the establishment of some financial facilities in addition to those already existing in the State will be beneficial, one has to bear in mind that attempts of this kind made by some other countries have not always led to the prosperity anticipated. I take it that the Government, when bringing forward the measure, will lay before the House their full proposals and be prepared to receive from all members such ideas as are intended to assist in carrying out a highly important work. The question of redistribution of seats may cause perturbation among some members, since it goes almost without saying that a number of the present electorates are absolutely unqualified, by reason of shrinkage of their population and of their importance. I do not quite know, and we shall not know until the Bill for prevention of profiteering is before the House, what exactly is meant by that phrase. So far as I can judge, some members of the Government are prepared to go from A to Z in a matter of this sort. They have before them a piece of work that will probably take some months for full discussion, not with the idea of burking the proposal if good points are shown, but because to deal with the intricacies of various trading concerns is a matter calling for all the experience various members of the House may have, and also for such advice and assistance as can be given outside. The last speaker referred to the difference in cost of implements in the United States and their sale prices here. I interjected at the time—I do not think the hon. member quite comprehended my remark—that a rough-and-ready practical way of getting at the American sale price of an American article brought here was to halve the Australian sale price, the difference being accounted for by the heavy duties placed upon the statute-book by the Federal Parliament. Of course there are also the various men through whose hands the imported article passes, and each of whom requires some remuneration for work done. I know of one article sold in America for about £300, while here the sale price is £600. I do not believe the distributor of motor cars in Western Australia gets more than 7½ per cent. clear for his work. Certainly he gets nothing like the amount the last speaker would have us understand. I mention this matter to show that in the proposed Bill for prevention of profiteering due regard must be had for the ramifi-

cations of trade, which are extremely various, wide, and far-reaching. Therefore the measure in question will require the closest attention. Registration of land agents, another matter mentioned in the Speech, is something that might have been brought about long ago. In connection with the purchase and resale of large blocks of land near cities, it would be well if the land agents of this State had been brought under some sort of control.

Mr. Davy: They are now.

Hon. W. J. GEORGE: But not to the extent they should be. It must be some 25 years since this question came up in the old House. The measure then proposed did not go so far as one would like. But I remember at the time pointing out the effects of the Victorian land boom and giving an instance of something that had occurred within my own experience to show how people might easily be misled. The practice is for some sharp people to get hold of a large block of ground near the city, pay a deposit on it, and then start to cut it up. Thereupon they fix prices and sell, but it is extremely difficult for them to give a title even to a purchaser for cash. The reason is that the original owner sticks to the land till he has got all his money. He will not allow patches to be picked out here and there. In Victoria there were many cases in which it was proved that persons had paid the full purchase price but had never received titles, the reason being that the land agents who purchased from the original owners were unable to complete the purchases, and thus the original owners retained the land. In a place called Northcote, where there were large brickworks, I had purchased some land and insisted upon my title. I was offered a big sum by the sellers to let them nullify the transaction, so that they would not have to complete the purchase from the original owner. Registration of land agents would not be a costly matter to the agents themselves, and would be some sort of guarantee to purchasers of land as to the solidarity of the agents and their reliability for giving a square deal. I do not wish it to be understood that I think there have been many cases of bad treatment in land dealing in Western Australia. I know of only one or two such cases. The land agents we have are good men, and I am sure they would not object to the proposed legislation.

Mr. Mann: They were asking for it.

Hon. W. J. GEORGE: The Minister for Health deserves the admiration of the House for his sincerity. I may refer particularly to the step which the hon. member has taken in regard to dental matters. His action has been good, wise, and thoughtful; and I hope to see it pushed even further than it has gone. I trust, also, that the author of that may be regarded not only now but in years to come as one who studied the health of the children, recognising them to be the basis and strength of our race. Legislation with regard to workers' homes and local government matters we shall be prepared to discuss when it comes along. Now I wish to say a few words regarding the metropolitan water supply. I notice that the Speech says—

Despite the heavy increase in the consumption of water in the metropolitan area during the long summer, the water supply proved adequate to meet all requirements.

I would advise the Minister to be very careful regarding the consumption of water that is going on in Perth to-day. But few water consumers of Perth—unless they possess a meter, and meters cannot be supplied to all of them—have any idea how much water they are using, or as I would say, abusing. When the original Perth waterworks were put into operation, there was in Roe-street a pressure of 80 odd pounds to the square inch, and 400 gallons could be delivered in 12 minutes from a $\frac{3}{4}$ -inch tap. Residents on the hills here were very pleased to have gardens—which everyone must admit are an admirable feature—but they turned the water on the soil of those gardens until they had bleached out all the humus. The increase in water consumption during last summer was unprecedented, and was more than the scheme can be allowed to carry. I submit that the Government and their officers must exercise all the reasonable restrictive powers they can, or else they will find that the water scheme, although calculated to last Perth for a number of years, cannot be relied upon to do that. Another matter I wish to refer to is the Fremantle harbour and its extension. How far the Government have committed themselves in regard to any scheme it is, perhaps, for them to tell us later; but I do not think they would commit themselves to any scheme until the matter had been considered even more fully than is the case up to the present. I do not wish to get the idea that I

am offering hostility to the scheme put up by Mr. Stileman. I recollect, however, the controversy which took place when Mr. C. Y. O'Connor brought forward the scheme which has done such good work for Fremantle. I am not in any way desirous of extending the controversy initiated by Sir George Buchanan, but I do suggest that further inquiry—not delaying inquiry, but inquiry searching for information—might well be set on foot by the Government, so that we may know exactly where we are in this vitally important matter. The suggestion that we shall go into the open roadstead for harbour extensions does not appeal to those of us who have been years in the State, have seen the storms that have raged and the wrecks that occurred in days gone by. The use of open roadsteads does not commend itself to shipping men in any part of the world, unless it is impossible to get a sheltered or partially sheltered port. I am satisfied that Mr. Stileman has given much consideration to the proposition to the best of his ability and skill, but those who have made a life-long study of local conditions and are trained and practical men, have their doubts about the scheme and we should do what we can to take into consideration their views as well.

The Premier: C. Y. O'Connor did not favour an up-river scheme.

Hon. W. J. GEORGE: I have never favoured the idea of bringing shipping to Perth.

Mr. Davy: The evidence of what C. Y. O'Connor really favoured is rather groggy.

Hon. W. J. GEORGE: I believe that for a good few years to come, we can get all the accommodation necessary for vessels coming up-river as far as Rocky Bay. I believe we should take the opportunity of getting further opinion on the subject, and that might go far towards dispelling opinions formerly held. During the course of his remarks, the member for Pingelly (Mr. Brown) went out of his line a bit.

The Premier: Very much so.

Hon. W. J. GEORGE: Certainly he did so referring to one of the industries of this State. It ought to be well-known by now that I do not favour the State Implement Works, the State Sawmills and other State undertakings. Those concerns could have been better left for control by private enterprise. That would be pre-

ferable to the State controlling them and the people being taxed, in a way, to maintain their existence. When I was Minister of the Crown in charge of State enterprises, my task was an individual one.

The Premier: You stuck to them well.

Hon. W. J. GEORGE: I was placed in charge of them; I could not ruin them, and, in the circumstances, I could do only what an honest man would do, and tried to make them successful. When I heard the member for Pingelly talk about the State Implement Works, I thought it was a pity that he, with his finished eloquence and the excellent diction that is peculiar to him, had not been more assiduously industrious in making inquiries as to the facts, before he proceeded to commit himself to statements such as he made to the House. The manager of the State Implements Works, Mr. Frank Shaw, is a Western Australian-trained engineer. He is a man fitted by his education and native ability to go into any of the workshops of the world and claim for himself the respect of men who are giants in the engineering profession. On no occasion did Mr. Shaw claim to be able to accomplish prodigies with the concern. Is the hon. member for Pingelly aware how the State Implement Works were started?

Mr. Brown: What were they started for?

Hon. W. J. GEORGE: I do not know what they were started for, any more than I know why the hon. member was born! The State Implement Works were garrotted at their berth. Worn-out, discarded machinery from engineering works in the Eastern States found in the representatives of the then Western Australian Government, eager purchasers, and machinery that was obsolete when I was a boy 60 years ago serving my apprenticeship, are to be found in the State Implement Works to-day. With that type of machinery, efforts are being made to turn out modern plant.

The Premier: I thought you scrapped most of the out-of-date stuff.

Hon. W. J. GEORGE: I scrapped some of it. It is only since the present Government have been in power that machinery in which an engineer could feel some pride, has been placed in the works, and a chance given to the skilled men we have there—

Mr. Teesdale: I think you are slipping! Get over the other side!

Mr. Thomson: The hon. member is reflecting upon his own administration!

Hon. W. J. GEORGE: The hon. member pointed to the fact that 600 men had been employed in the workshops in the past, and now the number had dwindled down to 200.

Mr. Brown: No, to 300.

Hon. W. J. GEORGE: If the member for Pingelly had applied his natural talent, to which I have already referred, to making inquiries, he would have ascertained the conditions that operated in the works when the 600 men were employed. I would not allow anyone to say that in those days 600 men were sponging on the State, but I say that the management in charge before Mr. Shaw took over the control, was not capable of keeping the men going so that a return was being brought back to the State on account of their services. Mr. Shaw, by the installation of modern methods, brought down to the present total, the number of men that were necessary. When I consider the hon. member's criticism, he must realise that I speak with the greatest charity and consideration for him!

Mr. Thomson: He is very appreciative!

Hon. W. J. GEORGE: I am trying to teach him a few things about the State Implement Works. In order to make wheels for cultivators and other implements, spokes had to be made. In the early days it was an hour's work to turn out 14 spokes.

Mr. Teesdale: Piecework or daywork?

Hon. W. J. GEORGE: Day work. Mr. Shaw went to the Eastern States and saw the methods in vogue there. He came back and the result was that we converted an old machine at the workshops, and soon we were turning out 130 spokes per hour, instead of 14. That furnishes an explanation of why the same number of men are not required at the Implement Works now as in former days. I can give the hon. member another instance. I would advise him to go down to the works and interview Mr. Shaw, who is a very polite man.

Mr. Davy: He is a jolly good chap—

Hon. W. J. GEORGE: Yes.

Mr. Davy: In the wrong place, working for the wrong boss!

Hon. W. J. GEORGE: He is doing his work well, and I do not know any man who could do it better. Another instance was in connection with certain attachments required for screw elevators. In the old days they were turned out with the aid of snips. We took steps that enabled us to turn them

out at the rate of from 800 to 1,000 per hour. That was done with the aid of an old punching machine. Now Mr. Shaw has applied the electric welding process to many items, and thus is turning out work more expeditiously and better. That again resulted in fewer men being required for that work. We hoped that the harvesters made by the State Implement Works would prove all right, but unfortunately they did not. We knew it, and stopped making the harvesters. The ploughs made by the State Implement Works were regarded by the great bulk of our customers as the best they could get. We had, as head plough-maker, a man who had a reputation throughout Australia. To make out that all the implements turned out by the State Implement Works were rubbish, is ridiculous, and I hope the hon. member regrets having made that statement.

Mr. Thomson: He did not say that.

Hon. W. J. GEORGE: There is another thing I would say to the hon. member. Surely if Western Australia has suffered him to grow prosperous and helped him to get ahead, perhaps by refraining from immature criticism, he can help Western Australia to get on?

Mr. Davy: You are not supporting the State Implement Works, are you?

Hon. W. J. GEORGE: I do not care if I am.

Mr. Thomson: I think you had better go over to the other side.

Hon. W. J. GEORGE: I was at Narrogin the other day, and the speeches made at the public gathering I attended had one key dominant throughout. It was, "Let us be proud of our own town and trade as far as we can within our own town because, when we help ourselves we also help someone else here to make good." Cannot we all be proud of Western Australia? I am, although I was not born here. Cannot we trade in Western Australia, even if that trading costs us a little more money than we would have to pay if we bought elsewhere?

Mr. Lindsay: I thought you were with us.

Hon. W. J. GEORGE: I have no time for people who live in the State and make their living here, but cannot boost the country that enables them to exist.

Mr. Teesdale: There is a new party; don't you forget it

Hon. W. J. GEORGE: I am pleased indeed to note from the Governor's Speech that water supplies in the agricultural districts are to be provided, and that money has been furnished to enable the rock catchments to be dealt with. For many years the Engineer for Country Water Supplies, Mr. P. V. O'Brien, has urged upon Ministers the setting aside of comparatively small sums of money to make the necessary provisions for water supplies in the country.

Mr. Corboy: And at last he got a Treasurer who made the money available.

Hon. W. J. GEORGE: These matters were brought before successive Ministers and urged strongly by Mr. O'Brien. I am particularly pleased to know that now the money has been made available, although I was not able to get the work done in my time. Fortunately the present Minister has been able to get the necessary funds from the Treasurer and I rejoice that that has been possible. It does not matter whether it be a Labour, Nationalist, or Country party Government in power, if the Administration in office for the time being can do anything to help the people in the country to earn a living and make a competence for themselves, they should receive support. The unemployed difficulty has been emphasised by members during the last few weeks. I do not intend to go into the cause of the trouble, but I can support those who have asserted that there are many farmers who are anxious to have work done but have had to let the work go until they can save up the necessary funds to pay the rates of wage required under present conditions. But amongst all the people of Western Australia there would be very little unemployment if they would go out and search for work as we had to do in the early days. Regarding the migrants coming here—this is perhaps more a Federal than a State matter—I think that if we adopted the regulations of the United States and Canada which apply before migrants are permitted to enter those countries, it would be a good thing for Australia. It is not fair that we should practically ask people without a bean in their pockets to come here and go on the land and undertake work of which they have had no previous experience, with the result that in many cases the funds of the State have to be applied for their sustenance and to keep them going. No one should be ad-

mitted into Australia unless he possesses a fair amount of cash, as migrants must do before they can enter United States or Canada.

Mr. Teesdale: How would that have applied to you when you came here?

Hon. W. J. GEORGE: I would not like to explain the state of my finances when I came here, because it might shock the hon. member. Although I was a competent engineer, when I could not get in Melbourne the work that suited me, I offered to go as a packer at 18s. a week. No work that is honest degrades a man, and no matter where a man starts in Australia, whether at the bottom grade or not, if he succeeds in rising, his earlier efforts should not be counted against him.

Mr. Teesdale: Then do not harney because a migrant has not a few quid when he comes here.

Hon. W. J. GEORGE: No, the question I raised was that of bringing into the State a whole lot of people with no means to support them and unsuited for the work, people who ultimately have to be supported out of the taxes of the country.

Mr. Teesdale: No man is brought here without the Premier's sanction.

Hon. W. J. GEORGE: But the Premier might consider whether in some cases his sanction should be given.

Mr. Teesdale: He is a pretty good judge.

The Minister for Lands: That is not correct.

Mr. Teesdale: The requisitions have to come from the States.

The Minister for Lands: That is for nominated migrants.

Mr. Teesdale: They do not involve any cost to the State.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order!

Hon. W. J. GEORGE: I was about to move that the debate be adjourned until the interjections had ceased. I want to see more population in Western Australia and British population, too, but I do not want to see transferred to this State Britishers who have probably been existing on the dole of the British Government, and who, when they come here, expect to collect it still, at the expense of the people who pay the taxes.

Mr. Thomson: You are opposed to immigration, then?

Hon. W. J. GEORGE: A few words have been said regarding the Main Roads Board. The recent conference on road board matters, I think, raised a great many ques-

tions that will have to receive the consideration of the Government. Of one thing I am satisfied, namely, that it is useless to expect that the ordinary road boards in this State can afford to make contributions towards the construction of roads in which the Federal and State Governments are partners and in which the road boards have been brought into a sort of semi-partnership. The very work of constructing roads causes the Main Roads Board to use the side roads in the various districts. Take Murray-Wellington and the Bunbury-road, in many places the vehicles have to travel perhaps six, eight, ten, or twelve miles to the foot-hills to get the gravel and stone. Aeroplanes cannot be used, so the carters have to use the roads which have been made by the road boards. The traffic of the lorries, under the heavy loads they carry, cuts the roads to pieces. Who repairs the roads? On whom does the burden fall? On the ordinary road board. The road boards have not the means to carry out the work.

Mr. North: The roads have been left in ruin.

Hon. W. J. GEORGE: In many instances the roads have been left in ruin. The rates levied by the average road board are not very high. That is a good thing, because if they were high they would not be paid. The miles of roads for which a board is responsible mop up the funds very quickly indeed. Years ago the old Murray Road Board had about 270 miles of roads to attend to. We created two new road boards, Serpentine and Waroona, and even so the Murray Road Board now has 600 or 700 miles of roads to attend to. The funds obtainable, unless the boards are going to ruin the settlers on the land by their rates, are inadequate to keep the roads in repair, and if in addition to their troubles with the side roads they have to pay a contribution to the Main Roads Board, it is asking them to do the impossible.

The Premier: The hon. member knows that is one of the provisions of the Act.

Hon. W. J. GEORGE: No doubt the Act has a lot of things in it, but as we put those provisions into operation experience should show whether they are weighing too heavily on the people and are proving a burden beyond their capacity to bear. Perhaps our methods are wrong. Surely the experience gained should be applied to amending the Act. Let us provide for what the people can reasonably be expected to bear.

The Premier: I agree with that.

Hon. W. J. GEORGE: I am rather annoyed regarding the Canning-Fremantle road, because we have not got information to enable us to form anything like a proper judgment. We have to remember that concerned in that work are the Main Roads Board, the various supervisors, engineers and others, and we cannot condemn them right and left. It would be unfair to do so unless we first considered the full facts. But I must say that for a sum of £130,000 to be spent on making eight or nine miles of road—and it is not finished yet—is something that must cause the Government very grave worry and require of them very grave consideration. Thirteen or fourteen thousand pounds a mile for making a road! What would it cost to construct a railway along there, finding rails and all the rest of the material? Scarcely more than half of that amount. What can there be in the road to cost £13,000 or £14,000 a mile? We are not asking for anybody's blood; we are not asking that there should be wholesale sackings, but what we have a right to ask and what the country has a right to ask is that there should be given, with nothing but absolute candour, a statement of the whole of the expenditure. To tell us that one engineer has been discharged over it does not cure the situation. That does not rectify anything. I make bold to say, without bringing any accusation but trying to be quite fair to the members of the Main Roads Board, that whoever was responsible for the expenditure, when he got the fortnightly returns showing the progress of the work, ought to have seen at once that there was something very wrong in the state of Denmark. Thirteen or fourteen thousand pounds a mile for a road! The Premier said that an officer had been discharged.

Mr. Davy: They ought to be able to pave it with gold for that.

The Premier: And kerb the sides with diamonds.

The Minister for Mines: There is a sovereign under every stone.

Hon. W. J. GEORGE: I do not intend to speak further on the question until I get full information, but I do say we have a right to expect the responsible Minister to lay a statement on the Table of the House that will enable us to judge whether the man responsible was a born fool or a lunatic, or whether he should be shot.

The Premier: You can have the whole information.

Hon. W. J. GEORGE: Without unfairly criticising members of the Main Roads Board, we have a right to say to whoever was charged with the duty of watching the expenditure, "Why didn't you call a halt before this had gone so far?" What was there in the way of difficulties to occasion such excessive cost? There are no difficulties to an engineer if you provide him with the money to do the work, but there were no difficulties at all in constructing that road.

Mr. Davy: What was the highly skilled administrator doing all the time?

Hon. W. J. GEORGE: The road was already formed, some parts of it made, some parts of it dirt, and it was only a matter of constructing it; quite an ordinary job. Whether it is fitted like a mosaic or not, we cannot tell until we get the file. I should like to say a few words about group settlement. Let me express my appreciation of the sincerity and zeal with which the Minister for Lands has set to work to deal with a very difficult question. Let me thank him also for the courtesy he has always shown me by affording such information as I have requested. I think he acted wisely in constituting the Group Settlement Board. They have a job which is a giant's job, because, as the group settlement scheme has been developed, there have grown up so many tangles that it is difficult to tell just how things stand. Having gone that far, I do not wish to say more. I regret that my chief did not have the opportunity to continue the work of group settlement. If he had done so I think many of the tangles into which it has drifted would not have occurred. In saying that, I am not reflecting on the Government; I consider that the present Minister has tackled the difficulty strongly, and I hope he will be able to straighten it out. It is an awful job. A lot of the poor, unfortunate settlers are in a bad way, but the Minister has assured me that his instructions are to extend to them all the sympathy he can. One thing will have to be done—and we may as well face it; it is idle to try to stick our heads into a bag—and that is the cost to be charged to the settlers who remain on the groups must be reduced from the cost standing in the books of the State.

Mr. Thomson: Hear, hear! I wish you had said that before.

Hon. W. J. GEORGE: I have said it. To charge settlers the full cost standing in the books of the State would be to impose upon them a crushing burden. To-day I received a letter from a man—one I know

very well—who has spent quite a lot of money of his own on a soldier settlement. The same principle applies to the group settlers.

The Minister for Lands: Where is he?

Hon. W. J. GEORGE: At Richardson's swamp. He said the charge against him in the department was £1,300. "With the work I have put into the block," he added, "I think I can make a success of it in time. I shall do so unless I am swamped. I have put a lot of my own money into it. I do not think I could get £500 for the place to-day, but I will stick to it as long as I can." I think the £1,300 charge against the place should be reduced, and I believe the Minister, when I put the facts before him, will be of the same opinion. It is no use trying to get someone to bear the burden of the mistakes made. The way in which I look at it is that we have to face the position as we find it. If a holding is valued in the departmental books at £3,000, because that money appears to have been spent on the property, we know that capitalised to that extent it is impossible for an individual to earn a living on it and therefore it must be revalued and brought down considerably. We know of course that many settlers never will succeed. In Western Australia we have as many fine men as ever God Almighty allowed to come here, and they are doers. Those are the men we ought to help, and I want the Government to take thoroughly into consideration the need there is for bringing down the values of some of the properties on which it can reasonably be expected a man can make a living. If that is done, it will go a long way towards remedying many of the ills that exist. The member for West Perth had something to say about taxation. I should like to ask members what they think of the position in this State. We are a sort of Siamese twins. None of us ever dreamt that we would be in such a state of Siamese twinship as that in which we find ourselves by reason of the Federal and State taxation. We have a State income tax and a Federal income tax; we have a State land tax and a Federal land tax. We have a State vermin tax and though we have not a Federal vermin tax, there is yet another such tax imposed by road boards.

Hon. G. Taylor: They are for different purposes.

Hon. W. J. GEORGE: Exactly, but when a man's pocket is pretty weak, it does not improve it if money is pulled out of it. The methods of preparing the Federal and State returns differ very materially. In one case, an individual is allowed to deduct necessary expenses such as those incurred in carrying on his business, and in another case he must not do that, but he may deduct something else. If it is not desired to drive the bulk of the people of Western Australia to Kar-rakatta, which is getting overcrowded, or to the Claremont Lunatic Asylum which has been overcrowded for a long time, let us get one of the good men from the Treasury to join Mr. Black, the Commissioner of Taxation, in an endeavour to prepare a decent form which a man can fill in without too much worry.

The Premier: The Commissioner of Taxation has to conform to the Act.

Hon. W. J. GEORGE: Then let us alter the Act. When the taxation measure comes before the House, I will supply the Premier with a few instances of what I consider to be ridiculous matters. I say, hang the Act and let us put it right. There is another matter on which I wish to say a few words and that is with regard to the money collected in the police courts from erring motorists. I do not know how many thousands a year the penalties that are imposed amount to.

The Premier: Not half as much as they ought to be.

Hon. W. J. GEORGE: Perhaps not. I am not grumbling at the amount of the fines; I am not grumbling at the administration of the court. I hold that people must be made to understand that if they take into their hands a powerful machine like a motor car, they must guide it to the safety of the public or pay for it. The fines, however, should not go into Consolidated Revenue. I know that the answer will be that under a special Act of Parliament it is provided that all fines shall go into Consolidated Revenue. I would like to see all fines paid by motorists and money raised by way of licensing fees for motor cars devoted to their proper use, namely, the making of good roads. The motorists of this State pay very high fees for their motor cars and all the revenue raised through the use or misuse of motor vehicles should be devoted towards making our roads good.

The Minister for Railways: Who is going to pay for regulating the traffic?

Hon. W. J. GEORGE: The police get at least 10 per cent. of the fees in the metropolitan district; the taxpayer also pays for the police force and the work they do. The conduct of the traffic is part of the duty of the police.

The Minister for Railways: A fourth of the police in the metropolitan area are engaged in controlling the traffic.

Hon. W. J. GEORGE: It is idle to argue that the fines should go towards the expenses of the police force. There are days on which we find as much as £50 or £60 collected by way of penalties and the sum in the course of a year, must be considerable. At any rate, those are my views. I expect that you, Mr. Speaker, as well as myself and others who are getting pretty well on in years, cannot have all our own way. I should be satisfied, however, if I could have my way in some things, but I realise that other people also have their rights and that therefore I must at times give way. I have said all I wish to say. If I have criticised some of the measures of the Government, I hope that criticism will be regarded by them as having been made, not for the glorification of the individual, but with the earnest desire of this side of the House to do the best we can for the country in which we live. We have here a territory of which we should be very proud and no exception can be taken if we do boost it up. I like the man who speaks well of the bridge that carries him over the stream. I have been here for 40 years, the country has given me health and happiness and I am glad to say also that I have had some prosperity. With all these things, if I did not think well of the country I ought to be shot.

MR. LINDSAY (Toodyay [8.40]: After listening to the speech of the hon. member who has just resumed his seat and to the eloquent way in which he condemned the policy of the party of which he was a member for many years, as well as agreeing with the policy of the Government, I am beginning to wonder what the Opposition has been elected for.

Mr. Teesdale: Do not say the Opposition; say some of them.

Mr. LINDSAY: The member for Murray-Wellington referred to the question of

agricultural water supplies. That is one matter on which I can congratulate the Government. The Minister for Agricultural Water Supplies has done very good work in this country and he has carried out undertakings that the Government of which the previous Speaker was a member should have done many years ago. When I heard the hon. member speaking, there came to my mind memories of many deputations of which I was a member, deputations that urged him time and again to do what the present Government have done. Having said this, I am afraid that I will be responsible for the only discord that has so far occurred on the Address-in-Reply. There has been a lot said about the Main Roads Board and there was also a lot of talk at the conference held last week about the administration by that Board. I listened with a great deal of interest to the Premier's reply to certain criticisms. He dealt first with the conference which he described as wild and woolly, and then told us that he had no fault to find with the Main Roads Board. In fact, the Premier gave the Main Roads Board such a reference that if he only put it in writing I am inclined to think that it would get the members of the Board a job anywhere. The Premier said that he had never known before of any department with such a large and responsible work that had been run more smoothly and efficiently.

The Premier: Is the hon. member quoting from "Hansard"?

Mr. LINDSAY: No, I am quoting from a Press report.

The Premier: The Press report was not correct. You had better read "Hansard."

Mr. LINDSAY: I have had no time to peruse "Hansard"; it was issued only today.

The Premier: Anyhow, what you quoted was not what I said.

Mr. LINDSAY: The Premier should have taken the opportunity to correct it in the Press on the following day. As he did not do so, I assumed that the report was correct.

The Premier: I did not say what was attributed to me.

Mr. LINDSAY: The Premier said that much of the feeling against the Main Roads Board was entirely unfair, and 75 per cent. of the criticism was unjustified.

The Premier: Hear, hear; that is giving you 25 per cent.

Mr. LINDSAY: He then went on to reply to an interjection made by the member for West Perth. In his speech the Premier went further and said that the trouble was caused by the Federal Government. The Federal Government dictated how the money was to be spent and that therefore the Main Roads Board were not responsible for it. When, however, it came to the Canning road, the Premier agreed with us that there had been great mistakes made and that the engineer who was responsible for them had been dismissed. We have a Main Roads Board and they are responsible for the employment of engineers. The Canning road, which cost £140,000, is not in the North-West; it is within a stone's throw of the Main Roads Board office, and the members of the Board at any time, and on any day of the week, could have had a look at the road to see what was being done. I contend that they are fully responsible and the responsibility should not be shelved by the sacking of one of the engineers.

Mr. Davy: The Act makes them responsible.

The Premier: I do not say they had no responsibility.

Mr. LINDSAY: There were two conferences held last week, one of which criticised the Main Roads Board. I attended the second one, not as a blow-in, but by invitation. When main roads questions were being dealt with, I listened with great interest and I heard most astounding statements made by the Chairman of the Main Roads Board, Mr. Tindale. I will give him this credit, that he had the conference eating out of his hand when he had finished talking. He was invited by the chairman of the conference to address the conference, and by the way, there were no fewer than 42 motions on the agenda paper dealing with main roads and the Act. The Chairman is a very tactful gentleman and after he had invited Mr. Tindale to address the conference, Mr. Tindale told the members there that he did not intend to make a speech, that he was only merely going to talk to the delegates. He proceeded to tell the delegates that he wanted the co-operation of the road boards. Then he went on to tell them of his 12 months tour round the world and

described his trip to England and said he found there that he had nothing to learn. He went on to America and he saw many roads too good for our conditions, but he did see roads constructed in a way that might be followed here. He said he had seen some fine machinery and had ordered some of it. Then he said that recently he had gone to visit the Merredin Road Board, and had stayed there for two days. He left the conference under the impression that he learned more in those two days than in the whole of his twelve months trip round the world. Why? The various road boards had been protesting against the methods of the Main Roads Board, particularly on developmental roads, protesting against the wasteful expenditure of public money. Mr. Tindale said that on the Sunday morning, Mr. Hunter, the Chairman of the Merredin Road Board, took him over a beautiful road, not a Commonwealth road, not a State road, but a Merredin Road Board road, one of the most beautiful roads he had seen for the conditions of the wheat belt. He said the policy of the board in future would be to send up an engineer to a road board district, meet the local engineer or supervisor, and go over the road with him. There would be no surveys made, as in the past. It would be decided on the spot what class of material was to be used, and, wherever possible, the material would be the local material that the road board had been using for so many years past. Then Mr. Tindale said that instead of spending all the available money on one patch of road, as in the past, the policy would be to spend the money on the worst patches with a view to making the road passable throughout. He was talking about developmental roads. He went on to talk about main roads, and he took the Perth-Albany road as an illustration. What our roads wanted mostly, he said, was drainage, and he intended to drain the water off them and leave the natural surface. He proposed, he said, to go over the whole of the Perth-Albany road and make that road passable to traffic. He did not say one word about Commonwealth money or Commonwealth specifications. I want the House to understand that what the road boards have been working for during the last three years is just what Mr. Tindale promised. As a consequence the conference accepted him and withdrew 40 motions from the agenda paper.

Mr. Panton: He must be some orator.

Mr. LINDSAY: It was a remarkable statement that he made, and if he can live up to it, everything in the road board arena will be well. He said that instead of having 90 per cent. of failures, as in the past, we would be having 90 per cent. of successes. But up here in the evening the Premier said that the Commonwealth Government were interfering and putting up specifications, and that in consequence we could not do anything. The following day was Friday, and the conference was still sitting. Actually it was dealing with only three or four motions, but it took nearly the whole of the day to get rid of them, because, after reading the Premier's speech in Friday morning's paper, the conference was beginning to think that things were not too good. I have met a number of the conference delegates since then, and they are thinking very seriously. Unless Mr. Tindale starts to carry out that policy there will be another road board conference in Perth within the next few months. Now I intend to say what the conference meant to say.

Mr. Kenneally: Or what you think they meant to say.

Mr. LINDSAY: What I know they meant to say. I have attended every road board conference in Western Australia and have been a member of a road board for 16 years. so I know what the conference meant. The conference did not criticise the Main Roads Board, although it had very good reason to do so. But before I come to that, let me remark that the Premier went a little further and said that the trouble at the conference was over the allocations of money that the road boards were asked to pay. The road boards have received certain allocations, and according to information given here in answer to a question by the member for Avon (Mr. Griffiths), the amount the road boards have been asked to pay up to the present is less than £5,000. It is not a very large amount, but I know that is not what the road board conference intended to kick up a noise about. It was because the boards were not getting value for that £5,000. The Premier also said these allocations were inserted in the Bill by a select committee of another place. He fined that committee down to one man, Mr. Stewart.

The Premier: The chairman of that committee.

Mr. LINDSAY: He described the chairman of that committee as being responsible for the allocations.

The Premier: Mainly.

Mr. LINDSAY: I agree that he was. But if Mr. Stewart was responsible for what is wrong, he was responsible also for what is right. Mr. Stewart's action saved the road boards considerably more than they have been asked to pay. This select committee was appointed by another place to deal with the Bill that had been passed by this House. One of the recommendations made by the committee reads as follows:—

Your committee consider that traffic fees should not be taken from country road boards, because it would seriously reduce their revenue and unduly hamper the very valuable work being done by these local authorities.

Why did the committee recommend that? Because the Bill took away the whole of the traffic fees from the local authorities. Now, how much would those traffic fees aggregate? I stood here and fought that Bill. The Minister said he was going to get £75,000 from the traffic fees. I told the House he was more likely to get £175,000 from the fees, and I believe to-day the fees would reach that amount if the whole of the metropolitan area were included. That is what this Bill proposed to do before the select committee of seven members decided that it was not just to take away that money, because the road boards required it for the making of developmental roads. The committee had to put up some alternative, and they put up the following:—

Provision to be made in the Bill authorising the Main Roads Board to allocate contributions to be borne by local authorities benefited for (a) permanent works and maintenance expenditure on main roads; (b) the cost of maintenance of main developmental roads.

That was what they recommended in place of the traffic fees. Now this is what the Main Roads Board was to get—

Your committee consider that the proposed funds available to the Main Roads Trust Account would be £265,000 plus (a) any petrol tax that may be imposed; (b) revenue accruing from assessments of local authorities made by the Main Roads Board; (c) moneys appropriated by the State Parliament for the purposes of this Act. The figure above-mentioned being made up as follows—£96,000—Federal grant for developmental main roads.

I forgot to mention that when that Bill was being dealt with we had no Main Roads Act, but we had a Developmental Roads Act, and instead of the £384,000 we

were getting £96,000, a very different proposition. If the select committee had known that we were getting £384,000, no doubt they would have altered their recommendation. However, their report continues—

£96,000—State contribution on the pound for pound basis. £48,000—Federal grant for main roads not conditional on a State contribution. £25,000—in lieu of subsidies to road boards. Total—£265,000.

I do not think there can be any doubt about it, because we have the evidence of the Under Secretary for Works, Mr. Munt, who stated that the Minister for Works had appointed a board, consisting of Mr. Munt, Mr. Black and Mr. Simpson, to advise the Minister. And Mr. Munt in his evidence touched upon the amount collected from traffic fees, stating that it was £75,000. So it was the intention of the Bill to take those traffic fees from the local authorities. Then Mr. Munt mentioned that there was proposed a land tax to bring in £60,000 per annum. At the last road board conference a resolution was carried to the effect that the license fees should be an alienable source of road board revenue. I hope they always will be, for they represent at least 40 per cent. of the revenue of the local authorities in the wheat belt and about 10 or 20 times as much as the local authorities are likely to be charged under this section within the next 10 or 20 years. I am quite prepared to give Mr. Stewart all the blame for what he has done in connection with that matter. The Premier and even the Press have given it to him already. Unfortunately he could not defend himself at the road board conference, and at present he is in Melbourne. But, on the other hand, I say that Mr. Stewart should also receive the blessings of the road boards for having saved to them the traffic fees. I mentioned that I intended to deal with the work done under the Main Roads Board, and what is actually being done to-day. The Roads Development Act came into operation five years ago. Then the Government provided plans and specifications and conditions that were most unsuitable for the local authorities, who found it impossible to tender under those conditions. After much agitation and a visit by a Federal Minister, the Government provided specifications suitable for road board work. But two years ago there was a sudden lull in the operations. It is quite two years since any money has been spent on developmental roads in my district. Nevertheless engineers have been sent round

every little road, taking levels and putting it all on blue prints, while building up huge specifications that would take a week to read. Last October I saw Mr. Anketell about those specifications, and showed them to him, I asked him if it were meant that we should work under them. But he told me, as Mr. Tindale told the conference the other day, "No, you have to carry on as you have carried on in the past under the developmental roads grant." That was all we wanted, for the roads were made well under that scheme. I went back to my district and was talking to the chairman of the road board. I told him what had been said to me, and he replied, "But the Main Roads Board officer is here doing that now." I said, "Well, you can tell him to go back again." About three months ago the result of all this work of engineers and draftsmen was embodied in a letter sent to the various road boards. I saw a copy of the circular at the Dowerin Road Board office and I saw the plans and specifications. It would require an engineer to understand them. It was upon them that the board was asked to tender. They submitted a price at £18 a chain and they were satisfied that they would lose money under the contract. They informed the Main Roads Board of their opinion and intimated that they did not want the job. All that work cost a lot of money. A month after that, new specifications and plans were sent and fresh tenders were called. The Dowerin Road Board submitted a tender at £655, or £11 12s. a chain. We have been told repeatedly that these specifications submitted by the Main Roads Board must stand and yet, after 12 months of work by the engineers and draftsmen, after long delays in the operation of the Act and after the road boards have not received the money they were promised, a new set of plans was sent out.

Mr. Davy: That is No. 4 set.

Mr. LINDSAY: Yes. Owing to the modification of the plans, the road board was enabled to reduce the price. That was not the position at the outset. It was a most ridiculous proposal to put up to any local governing body. The Main Roads Board's specifications set out that in graveling a road we had to take out a length of 3 chains and we had to put in 6in. x 1in. jarrah boards; we had to put the gravel down on steel sheets and we had to roll with a 3-ton roller with a horse team, after spreading 3 inches of gravel. After doing

that we could put on another 3 inches. The whole thing was ridiculous. Then Mr. Tindale told us that in the future he was going to follow certain lines. Despite that, we find in last Sunday's paper that the Main Roads Board called for tenders on the same old conditions.

Hon. G. Taylor: On the same conditions as you have been referring to?

Mr. LINDSAY: Yes.

The Minister for Mines: And you will not collect a shilling of the Commonwealth money if you do not stick to those specifications.

Mr. LINDSAY: Then how was it Mr. Tindale could tell the Road Board Conference that these modifications had been made and what course he proposed to adopt in future. He agreed to do practically all that the road boards wanted him to do. They wanted Commonwealth money spent on the roads.

The Minister for Mines: I am not responsible for what Mr. Tindale may say.

Mr. LINDSAY: Two years ago, when the previous road board conference was held, two members of a road board in my electorate came to me and said that they had been informed that if they went to the Main Roads Board office they could get matters fixed up. Prior to that tenders had been called and the board put one in at £7 per chain. They were told that they could not get the contract. Later these two road board members, so they informed me, were told that if they went to the Main Roads Board office and agreed to do the work under day labour conditions, they would get the contract. I advised the road board members not to do anything of the sort, and told them that the time would come when they would get £1,000 and get value for the expenditure of that money. I told them that if they agreed to the suggestion that had been made to them, they would get £500 worth of work, and they would never get anything in return for the other £500. Soon after that the Main Roads Board sent up a gang to do the work and it ran out at £13 17s. 6d. by day labour. When the Christmas holidays came, 19 chains of the road had not been completed. It was rather late in the year and the wheat carts cut up the road. The Main Roads Board offered the local board 25s. per chain to recondition the road. It cost all that to do work for which the local board had submitted a tender at £7 per chain. There is no satisfaction in this sort of thing for those who have

been working under the road development grant for two years. When the road board were asked to tender for the 19 chains that were not finished, they again submitted a tender at £7 per chain. In reply the Main Roads Board said that the local board could have the work for £6 10s. per chain, and they did it. What I said proved true. If £1,000 is allocated for a road, and the work is done by the local authorities, they will get full value for the £1,000, whereas if the work is given to the Government, the district will get £500 worth of work and nothing more.

Mr. Davy: That is exactly what you can expect.

Mr. LINDSAY: Of course, it is. On the other hand, when the Premier gets up in this House and gives a good reference to the Main Roads Board, we are inclined to become a bit more critical.

The Premier: I did not give the Main Roads Board the reference that you read out.

Hon. G. Taylor: Very nearly so.

The Premier: Not at all.

Mr. LINDSAY: That is what appeared in the "West Australian."

The Premier: Be fair! You cannot get away from what appears in "Hansard."

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: We should have a Royal Commission.

The Minister for Mines: But the road board conference turned down that proposal.

Mr. Davy: Why worry about the road board conference, if we think there should be a Royal Commission?

Mr. LINDSAY: On the occasion of the meeting of the road board conference, there was also a vermin conference to deal with the Vermin Act Amendment Act of 1925. The motions tabled concerning the Vermin Act numbered 28, or nearly as many as had been sent along in connection with the Main Roads Board. I attended the conference as a member of the advisory board under the Vermin Act. On the Opposition side of the House we have been twitted with a desire to repeal the Act. I have always said that I would sooner have the Act that is in existence than no Act at all. I know my views do not coincide with the wishes of 90 per cent. of the people I represent. On the other hand, I believe we must view this question from the standpoint of the State as a whole, not from the point of view of our own little villages. For that reason I did not attend the conference from a political standpoint. It would have been easy for me to make po-

litical capital out of it, but I went there as a member of the Vermin Board, to fight for the retention of that body and to secure some control over the funds we have been trying to administer. When the Minister for Lands introduced the amending legislation, we tried to make him listen to reason. Even if the Government can blame a select committee for the Main Roads Act, they cannot blame anyone but themselves for the provisions of the Vermin Act Amendment Act.

The Minister for Railways: Who asked for the amending Act?

Mr. Thomson: We did not ask for the Act as you gave it to us.

Mr. LINDSAY: I was one who asked for amending legislation. When I read from the same file that the Minister had read from—it referred to the conference at which I had moved the resolutions—some hon. member on the Government side of the House said that I was calling the Minister for Lands a liar. I admit that we did ask for amending legislation, but we did not ask for what we got. The road board conference asked for a tax of a farthing in the pound and for the Government to subsidise the administration of the Act out of general revenue. The Government did not agree to do that.

The Minister for Mines: Good old general revenue!

The Premier: Of course, out of general revenue!

Mr. LINDSAY: The Government were concerned only with the saving of the general revenue under the amending Act they passed.

The Minister for Mines: What about wiping it out?

Mr. LINDSAY: The Government can do so if they like. After the last conference, I am satisfied to let it go if the Government wish to adopt that course. If I were thinking merely of the interests of the agricultural districts, I would advise the Government to wipe it out. But I regard the matter from the standpoint of the State, as a whole, and not as one affecting the agricultural community alone. For that reason I believe legislation of this description should remain on the statute-book, but not the Act in its present form. I have had a great deal of experience of this subject, and I have always regarded it, as far as possible, from the standpoint of protecting the wealth of the State. It is only by the extermination

of the dingoes that the outer country areas can be settled. It is only by securing that end that the country can produce more stock and contribute to the general prosperity of the State. When the Government, however, forced through a measure that amounted to nothing but class legislation, to make the agriculturalists pay nearly all the money available in the vermin fund for the destruction of dingoes thousands of miles away, it was not right. The agriculturist should be asked to pay only his fair proportion. The Government should have levied a tax upon the unimproved value of land, because the people in the metropolitan area stand to gain just as much as the people in the agricultural areas. Earlier in my remarks I referred to certain figures and I wish to give them to the House. The members of the Vermin Board endeavoured to get from the Deputy Commissioner of Taxation information to show the amount collected from the agricultural and pastoral areas respectively. We have not altogether succeeded, but I have a letter from the Commissioner in which he has given some information and has furnished us with particulars of the assessed values for the year ended the 30th June, 1927. It must be remembered that the valuation of pastoral land has been fixed for some years ahead, and the value of the agricultural land has been re-assessed and has increased in value practically each year at an average of about £2,000,000. According to the Deputy Commissioner of Taxation, the rate assessment on agricultural lands represented £24,851 and the rate assessable on pastoral lands, £9,052. It will be seen that the rate assessable on the agricultural lands is nearly two and a half times as much as on the pastoral lands. When it comes to a question of expenditure, the figures are indeed interesting. The number of dogs destroyed and paid for at the rate of £2 per head during the last financial year totalled 15,450. The number of foxes destroyed and paid for totalled 1,403, and the eagles 3,406. Dividing those totals into the separate pastoral and farming districts, we find that of the dingoes, 4,125 were killed in the farming areas and 11,325 in the pastoral areas; 1,235 foxes were killed in the farming areas and 168 in the pastoral areas; 775 eagles were captured in the farming areas and 2,631 in the pastoral areas. These figures represent a total payment for the vermin in

the farming districts of £10,914 and a payment in the pastoral areas totalling £23,644.

Mr. Griffiths: Just the reverse of the taxation collection!

Mr. LINDSAY: That is so. If there is any justice in an Act that allows that sort of thing to be done, I cannot appreciate it. A little while ago the Minister for Mines interjected "Good old general revenue"; the Premier also interjected "Of course, out of general revenue." We have been paying for dog scalps for years without any special taxation. In the financial year 1924-25 we paid for 8,910 dog scalps; for the financial year 1925-26 the total dog scalps paid for was 6,036; for the financial year 1926-27, the total was 7,286. That meant on an average a payment of £3,500 out of general revenue. On the other hand, the Vermin Act Amendment Act was on a different basis and the Government have not paid a penny. In other words, the general revenue of the State has benefited to that extent, with the result that the Premier can show a corresponding benefit in the financial statement. For that reason I think the Government should meet us in some way regarding the subsidy. The advisory board—it is only an advisory board and has no administrative powers—carried certain resolutions, all of which have not been agreed to. At the conference to which I have referred, there were several motions to the effect that the road boards or vermin boards should be allowed to destroy scalps. I am prepared to say that 95 per cent. of the boards desired that permission. It is quite easy to agree to such a proposal, and I got on at the conference nearly as well as Mr. Tindale did when I opposed that proposal. There is no legislation to give the boards permission to destroy the scalps, and I pointed out that in future the whole of the scalps must be destroyed at head office, and the Minister would be called upon to withdraw the permission given to certain boards. The Act states that the scalps must be destroyed in the presence of the chief inspector. Yet the Minister, although not in accordance with the wishes of the vermin board, has given permission to 14 different centres to destroy scalps. We say that is likely to result in our having to pay for more scalps than is necessary.

The Minister for Agriculture: You do not know that; you are only guessing.

Mr. LINDSAY: I am not guessing about the instance I shall quote. If the Minister can tell me why he gave Northampton permission to destroy dog scalps, I should like to know it.

The Minister for Agriculture: Because of exceptional circumstances.

Mr. LINDSAY: Because he was asked to do so.

The Minister for Agriculture: No.

Mr. LINDSAY: What is the difference between Northampton and Mullewa? Why give Northampton permission and not Mullewa? If the Minister starts by giving permission to a place like Northampton, which is on the railway line, where is he going to stop? That is the point. The Mullewa delegate stood up at the conference and called me everything he could think of. He knew that Northampton had permission and he said not only that the vermin board was hampering operations, but that his district could not get any payment at all from the board. When I told him we had paid Mullewa for 60 dog scalps, as against 18 at Northampton, and for 101 fox scalps, that stopped his tirade. We had very good reasons for adopting that attitude.

The Minister for Agriculture: Permission is granted only in exceptional circumstances.

Mr. LINDSAY: There are no exceptional circumstances to justify permission being granted to the Northampton board. Almost every road board in the State wanted permission and we say that permission should not be granted. The conference agreed that permission should not be granted. All that we did was done to protect the farmers. I am on the board to protect the people and the funds. Dog scalps are worth £2 each; they are equivalent to bank notes, and I do not think we should put our trust in people quite as much as that.

The Minister for Agriculture: Independently of the advice of one of your board, I refused.

Mr. LINDSAY: That was Mr. Paterson, who agrees with me now. The reason we opposed the granting of permission to the road boards was that we had information of what was occurring in the other States. We are paying out of the fund £2 for each scalp, which is the highest amount paid out of any Government fund in Australia. Yet South Australia paid for 32,000 dog scalps in the year before last, while last year we paid for

15,000. When members consider the area of South Australia as compared with that of Western Australia, they will realise that ours is four times as large, and pastoralists from South Australia have told us there are more wild dogs here than in South Australia. Yet that State is paying for more than twice the number of dogs. The Minister knows that when the South Australian Minister for Agriculture visited Perth recently, he was considerably worried over the discrepancy in the figures. He knew that every Tom, Dick and Harry could draw from the fund if the destruction of the scalps were permitted.

The Minister for Agriculture: Do you say that in this State every Tom, Dick and Harry can destroy them?

Mr. LINDSAY: No.

The Minister for Agriculture: Do you know that any road board or vermin board cannot destroy them?

Mr. LINDSAY: Yes.

The Minister for Agriculture: They can be destroyed only by a resident magistrate or other person appointed.

Mr. LINDSAY: There is one centre where they may be destroyed, namely, Hall's Creek, and there we paid for 1,741 scalps, a matter of over £3,500.

The Minister for Agriculture: Where the advisory board could not supervise the destruction of the scalps.

Mr. LINDSAY: I admit it would be difficult to do so in a place like Hall's Creek, but at Northampton it is not difficult. If the Minister is going to give permission to Northampton, then let him give it to every road board in the State. I told the Road Board Conference plainly that if it approved of every board having permission to destroy scalps, I would resign from the vermin board, thereupon the motion was withdrawn, and it was decided to request the Government that all the scalps be destroyed in Perth. Another remarkable fact is that Queensland paid for over 40,000 dogs and yet the adjoining State of New South Wales paid for only 4,500. In New South Wales the Pastoralists' Protection Board finds the money and sees the scalps destroyed. Queensland has an entirely different system. I hope the Minister will stand fast by the Act which provides that the scalps must be destroyed in the presence of the Chief Inspector. I do not think the Minister has power to give boards permission. If he de-

sires to give boards permission, he should have the Act amended.

The Minister for Agriculture: You are quoting a regulation, not the Act.

Mr. LINDSAY: No, I am not; the Act says that the scalp must be destroyed in the presence of the Chief Inspector.

The Minister for Agriculture: Or someone appointed by him.

Mr. LINDSAY: Yes, he could appoint the Minister.

The Minister for Agriculture: That is no good.

Mr. LINDSAY: The road boards agreed to a resolution suggesting what I believe is the only fair way of dealing with vermin and that is by the imposition of a tax on the unimproved land values of the State. I have been told that such a tax is not possible. Yet it seems to be quite possible in other States of Australia. I have a copy of the Victorian "Hansard" of 1923. In that year the Government introduced a Bill to deal with vermin and noxious weeds. Later on, in the tax Bill, provision was made for a tax on unimproved land values to provide funds for the purpose. In the Victorian Assembly, there was only one speaker, and that was the Minister. Mr. Prendergast asked whether the Bill was the same as that which had been introduced in the previous session and, on being told that it was, the measure was passed. The speech occupied only half a column of "Hansard." The Bill was then considered by the property owners in the Upper House, and if there was any injustice about it, one would assume that opposition would be raised to it there. Certainly a few members spoke on it, but their remarks occupied not more than four pages of "Hansard." Only one member showed any semblance of opposition and he was a member of the Labour Party. He suggested that the exemption should be increased to £500, but he did not move an amendment to that effect and the Bill was passed by the Upper House. I am prepared to say there is considerably greater value in the metropolitan area of Melbourne than in the metropolitan area of Perth. Yet every man who represented a metropolitan constituency in the Victorian Parliament considered the Bill from a State point of view. Members generally realised that the measure was in the interests of the metropolitan area as well as of the country and they

supported it. I maintain that we should adopt a similar course. If a tax to control dogs is necessary, and I believe it is very necessary, it should be a tax on the unimproved land values of the State. I have one other matter to speak about and that concerns the Minister for Railways. Our production is rapidly increasing and the quantity of goods carried by the railways is expanding in much greater ratio than the supply of trucks. In 1925 the Minister for Railways, speaking in this House, said it had been usual in the past to shift the whole of the wheat harvest in three months of the year, but that was not economical and in future it was intended to spread the period to the month of July. I agreed with him, but stated by way of interjection that I hoped he would not spread it too far. Last season we had wheat on the wharf at Fremantle when the new season's grain was coming in, and I believe the same thing will happen this year.

The Minister for Railways: We could have shifted the whole of it long ago, but those responsible did not want it shifted.

Mr. LINDSAY: According to a Press report, the Chamber of Commerce pointed out that there was a great shortage of railway trucks.

The Minister for Railways: Does not common sense tell you that if we could shift 350,000 bags a week in January, we could do more than 150,000 bags in June? They will not shift it; they do not want to shift it.

Mr. LINDSAY: If it is so easy to shift large quantities of wheat to-day with the small increase in the number of trucks, the railways must have been greatly overloaded in the matter of trucks in years gone by. Since 1923-24 the increase in the number of trucks has been 656. I understand they are about 14-ton trucks.

The Premier: Some are twice as large as those we had before.

Mr. LINDSAY: Some of the old trucks carried 20 tons, and I think the capacity of most of the new ones is 14 tons.

The Minister for Railways: No, it is 14 tons for a single truck.

Mr. LINDSAY: Anyhow, the report of the Commissioner of Railways, tabled in this House, gives the number as 656 new trucks. In that time the tonnage carried has increased from 3,023,000 to 3,697,000 tons and the quantity of wheat carried has increased from 511,000 to 950,000 tons. There is no

doubt that of the 674,000 tons increase in goods carried, wheat alone accounts for 444,000 tons. I believe the time occupied in shifting the harvest has been extended too long. When wheat is carried in winter time, a good deal of damage results. Further, if it is correct, as reported in the Press, that the Chamber of Commerce has asked for additional trucks, they have not been supplied.

The Minister for Railways: It is not correct.

Mr. LINDSAY: Let me sound a note of warning. I was through my electorate a week ago and at almost every siding stacks of wheat were being shifted. I understand from the Minister that he would have been able to supply more trucks, but he was not asked for them. On the other hand, it is not in the interests of the industry that such a large quantity of wheat should be shifted after July.

The Minister for Railways: We have supplied 3,000 tarpaulins because those responsible wanted to shift the wheat, and that is more than there were in the service previously.

Mr. LINDSAY: They were very necessary.

The Minister for Railways: But the department did not have that number previously.

Mr. LINDSAY: Does the Minister want me to understand that there are sufficient trucks and that the merchants would not use them to have the wheat carted?

The Minister for Railways: Yes.

Mr. LINDSAY: Then the statement made by the Chamber of Commerce was wrong.

The Minister for Railways: Yes.

Mr. LINDSAY: If the quantity of wheat carried has increased by 440,000 tons and the number of trucks has been increased by only 656, it represents a very small increase on the 10,000 trucks that the department had previously. I know that the efficiency of the department has been increased and that greater use is being made of the trucks.

The Minister for Railways: A lot of improvements have been made.

Mr. LINDSAY: I admit that quite a lot of improvements have been made. Still, I think that the time for shifting the wheat has been extended far too long.

The Minister for Railways: If we could carry 350,000 bags at the busiest time of the year, surely we could carry more than 150,000 later on.

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: You have carried all you have been asked to carry, have you not?

The Minister for Railways: Yes.

Mr. LINDSAY: Another subject that has already been dealt with to-night is the manufacture of agricultural machinery. I wish to refer to the State Implement Works.

Mr. Thomson: It is a pity the member for Murray-Wellington is not in his seat at present.

Mr. LINDSAY: I wish to present some information in a form different from that given by the member for Katanning the other night. It deals with the cost of agricultural machinery. This is not quite a tariff matter. I desire to show one of the disabilities under which farmers in this State suffer as compared with those in the other States. I dealt with this matter some time ago when an attempt was made to establish a branch of the McKay works in Perth. I had not the figures at the time, but am now in possession of them. A McKay stripper-harvester is sold in Melbourne for £170 cash, but the price in Perth is £181, a difference of £11 against the local farmers as compared with the Victorian price. A 20-disc drill in Melbourne costs £80, and in Perth £88 10s. A combine 16ft. x 33ft. in Melbourne costs £76 and in Perth £88 10s. It has been said that this increase is caused through the freight. I have told the House that some of it is, and some is not caused by freight. It cannot be imagined that it will cost £11 to bring a harvester over here from Melbourne. Nor can it be said that it would cost £11 10s. to freight a combine over. The McKay people have to build their machines in Melbourne in order to see that they are correctly made. They are then partially taken down, packed in crates and sent over here, where they are re-assembled. We must all realise the wonderful expansion that will take place in the wheat industry in Western Australia. I told Mr. Sam McKay in Melbourne that we shall eventually use more machinery in Western Australia than is used in all the rest of Australia put together. The new man has to buy new plant and the older settler has to replace his old plant: for that reason my statement is correct. The trade unions of Western Australia, when they refused to meet Mr. McKay here on the ground that he put forward, did an injustice not

only to themselves but to the local farmers and the people of Western Australia. I knew that the factory representative was coming here, for I was in Melbourne just before he arrived and Mr. Sam McKay told me all about it. He tried to make an agreement with the trade unions to give payment by results. No matter what agreement the men made, wages could not be reduced, they could only be increased. The Arbitration Court award stands. The men must get their weekly wage, and they could get more provided they earned it. Mr. Sam McKay wanted the unions to make an agreement to pay these men by results, and to do what he is doing in Melbourne, where he is actually paying them 15 per cent. above the Arbitration Court award. It would have been a good thing for Western Australia and a good thing for the producer, because we would not have had to pay any more than $2\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. in excess of Melbourne prices. Hon. members have said we have to pay the freight. Of course we have, but on what? Not on machinery and space, not on the building in Melbourne and the re-building here, but on iron and steel from Newcastle at £2 10s. a ton, and the timber wherever we wanted to get it, probably our own local timber. I do not believe it would have meant increasing the cost of a harvester in Western Australia by £1, but it would have meant employment in the manufacturing industry in Western Australia and the production of our machinery by Western Australians, and the saving of at least £10 on every machine to the local farmers.

Mr. Sleeman: Evidently you do not favour the development of our present industries.

Mr. LINDSAY: Yes, I do. I have several machines on my own farm. The manufacturers of agricultural machinery in Australia have done a lot for the farming industry. They have frequently improved their implements and made them more efficient, so that the farmers can get more work out of them. They have done that by following the machinery into the paddock, and by taking the practical knowledge of the men who know their job. They have not merely built machines and shoved them on the market and thereby got a bad name. They have not put out any machines without first testing them and trying them out,

and this is something the State Implement Works have not done.

Mr. Sleeman: I thought you would lead up to something like that.

Mr. LINDSAY: Some State implements are suitable, and some are not, but generally speaking they have a bad name because so many of them are unsuitable. Members talk about water supplies. Someone said to-night, "Why do you not put up the matter to Earle Page?" I am putting it up to Dr. Earle Page to-morrow, but I am giving the matter to the House first. I often ask for things in this House, but I never get them. That does not mean I do not intend to ask for them again.

The Minister for Railways: You put up a pact last time.

Mr. LINDSAY: I suppose I will have to take the responsibility of part of it. It does not matter. I get the blame for a lot of things that others do. We are about to open up a large area of agricultural land that will require water supplies. A great many pipes will have to be bought in future. Quite recently the Federal Government put a 40 per cent. duty on tubular pipes under 3 inches, although this will not take effect until next year. I have some figures to show what the cost will be, provided the Barbalin water scheme in my electorate has to pay this duty of 40 per cent. It means that every thousand acres of land served by the scheme will pay an extra £8 11s. a year as rates. That is what this duty will do to the people.

The Minister for Railways: Have you not put that to your own organisation? You control the Federal Government. Mr. Padbury boasted at Geraldton that the Country Party had half the power in the Federal Parliament.

Hon. G. Taylor: Hence the high freights.

Mr. LINDSAY: I asked the Minister for Railways some questions a little while ago dealing with implements, and the Minister gave me his answer. I asked the questions, because two of my road boards, one he knows well, gave me the information on which I was able to base them. The information was that local men who had applied for work on a railway regrading job had been told that they would have to sign up at the Perth Labour Bureau before they could get a job. I sent the replies to the local paper in my district, and they were published. I have been in the district since

then. I have met men I have known for years, who are still out of work. The organiser of the A.W.U., accompanied by an official of the Labour Bureau, went through my district after these questions had been asked. They were together. The organiser of the A.W.U. collected some subscriptions from these men, but they have not yet obtained any work. The article from which I will quote extracts shows that certain men were collected at the Labour Bureau and sent up to clear some roads north of Bencubbin. The road board secretary, the postmaster, and other people, have taken unemployed out 40 miles, and these men have camped there for a week but failed to get a job, although fresh men have come up from the Labour Bureau in Perth and got work. One night coming from Kununoppin I met the man who wrote this article, and he was with three men who came up and spoke to me. These were the men who had been looking for work on the railway re-grading and could not get it. I was told by the Minister for Railways that men could register at any local labour bureau. That may be so but registration does not mean that a man will get a job. The Minister said the policy of the Government was to pick up the men at the country bureaux, and not to bring them to Perth. There is an office at Kununoppin at the Agricultural Bank where men can be picked up. These men looked for a job there, but were told by the officials they had no power to engage them on the railway, although that line passes the door. Those four men met the A.W.U. organiser and bought union tickets from him, but they have not yet got a job. In the "West Australian" of 31st July the Premier warned people against coming into the city to look for work. The paper goes on to say that men are still coming to Perth looking for work, because they cannot get a job without a union ticket.

The Premier: Then they had better stay in Perth to look for work.

Mr. LINDSAY: Why do not the Government allow these men who have lived there for years to get a job in their own districts?

The Minister for Railways: And so they do.

Mr. LINDSAY: Only a few men are ever picked up. Gangs of men have come up from Perth and been given jobs in the country. I do know a few local men who have

been picked up on the job. I know the man who wrote the newspaper article from which I intend to quote. I know that he is speaking the truth, and will vouch for the accuracy of his statement.

Mr. Kenneally: Cannot it be taken as read?

Mr. LINDSAY: From the point of view of the hon. member, possibly it can. I am going to say something about the A.W.U. and the Government Labour Bureau. I know that the hon. member particularly—

Mr. SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. LINDSAY: I know that members opposite will not agree with me, but that does not affect my intentions. I am here to put forward my own view. I do not agree with some of the things that have been done in this connection. The article says—

At least four men, since the visit of Messrs. Tankard and Smith to Kununoppin—

These two men are joined together in this article. One happened to be an official of the Labour Bureau and the other an organiser for the A.W.U. They both travelled through my electorate together after I had asked these questions. I do not know what job the Labour Bureau man had, but I do know the job of the A.W.U. man was to sell union tickets. The article continues—

—have bought union tickets which they could ill afford, believing that Mr. Tankard's statement, that unionists would be given first preference, was fact. They have since applied for employment on the gangs and have received the stereotyped answer, "All labour must be engaged in Perth,"

The Minister for Mines: I do not believe they were told that.

Mr. LINDSAY: I say they were.

The Minister for Mines: You produce the man who told them.

Mr. Kenneally: The newspaper says it; it must be true.

Mr. LINDSAY: Am I to bring these men from Kununoppin? If the Minister will go to Kununoppin, I will take 50 men to see him.

The Minister for Mines: I am not disputing your word that these men were told that, but who is the official who would tell them that they must come to Perth in order to get a job?

Mr. LINDSAY: The officer who engages men for the lines. The Trayning Road Board requested me to ask these questions.

The Minister for Mines: If it could be proved that he is in my department, he would be out the next day.

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: No, he would not.

The Minister for Mines: He would not be kept on five minutes.

Mr. LINDSAY: These three men I am talking about bought union tickets from the organiser in Kununoppin not much more than a week ago. They told me all about this. I also met the man who wrote the article. I was with him at the time. The position is as I have stated it, and it is well known in the district.

The Minister for Agriculture: It is rather remarkable seeing that Tankard was endeavouring to get country men jobs in the country.

Mr. LINDSAY: He was trying to keep his own job by selling them union tickets.

The Minister for Railways: That is all very well.

The Minister for Agriculture: He was trying to get them work.

Mr. LINDSAY: These four men all bought union tickets, but they have not yet got a job.

The Minister for Agriculture: He was anxious to get the proper quota of country jobs for the local people.

Mr. LINDSAY: The article continues—

They are now worse off than before by the price of a union ticket each.

The Premier: Who cares what a country rag like that says?

Mr. LINDSAY: The newspaper article continues—

Members of the Timber Workers' Union at Jardee were much exercised last week because a machinery breakdown was depriving them of the right to live.

The Minister for Lands: You are one of the owners of that newspaper. You stand behind it.

Mr. LINDSAY: The Minister does find out a lot of things.

The Premier: What does anyone care about propaganda of that sort in a country newspaper?

Mr. LINDSAY: I am not responsible for the article, but I am prepared to make this statement outside the House, and prove it. The article says, too—

We are treated to the spectacle of an A.W.U. official touring the country sorting out those

of the unemployed in possession of union tickets. Are they to get the first chance?

The Minister makes the insinuation, "You are part-owner of the paper." What does he mean by that?

The Premier: The hon. member quotes that paper as if it were the Bible.

Mr. LINDSAY: If I were in Heaven I would quote the Bible. I happened to be in the place where these things happened, and so I quote this paper. Why should I quote the Geraldton newspaper or a Labour daily? My quotations are from the journal published in the district where these men live.

Mr. J. H. Smith: That sort of thing applies not only in your district, but also in the South-West.

Mr. LINDSAY: I asked certain questions. Before I asked them, this newspaper published an article, with which I did not deal. The Wyalcatchem and Trayning Road Boards wrote to me on the subject, and therefore I put certain questions. I showed the letters to the Leader of the Opposition. I sent copies of the questions to the road boards, and they published them in the Press. Since then the writer of this article has made further inquiries, of which the result is this article. There is something more behind it than getting a job in the Government. Men who have been working in that district and are now out of work find, when there happens to be a local government job going, that they have to join the union before they can obtain employment; and once they join the union, they are kept track of. What does it mean? That gradually the farm workers are becoming members of the A.W.U. The time is approaching, and even near, when the farmers of this State may expect to receive a rural workers' log. My objection is this: we are taxpayers of this State, as well as hon. members opposite; and we represent people who pay the revenue of the State, as well as hon. members opposite. The men I refer to are being forced to become unionists. Government cars are even provided for A.W.U. and Labour Bureau representatives to travel round the districts.

The Minister for Railways: Oh!

Mr. LINDSAY: The Government sent this man up to my district in a motor car.

The Minister for Railways: Who?

Mr. LINDSAY: Well, the Labour Bureau. Messrs. Tankard and Smith came there.

The Minister for Railways: That was the A.W.U. official's motor.

Mr. LINDSAY: One of these men is an A.W.U. official, and the other is a Labour Bureau official. The Labour Bureau official should not have been there.

The Premier: The object of that official was to try and establish branches of the Labour Bureau in country districts to meet the situation which has been mentioned.

The Minister for Mines: He was sent there for that very purpose.

Mr. LINDSAY: If he established a branch of the Labour Bureau at Kununoppin, the result is that not a man has been engaged there. I admit that in the district I see a great number of Southern Europeans.

The Minister for Mines: I bet you saw a few in work.

Mr. LINDSAY: It is peculiar that I saw very few in work, the reason being, I think, that the district is newly settled, and settled mostly by Agricultural Bank clients, whilst the Minister's policy is to refuse to allow Agricultural Bank money to be paid as wages to Southern Europeans. I believe the Southern Europeans are camped there in the hope of getting work in future. Eventually there may be serious difficulties to contend with as regards those Southern Europeans. If we do not like to have them in the country and will not allow them to work here, we should repatriate them to their own country.

The Premier: It is not the responsibility of this Government to look after foreigners.

Mr. LINDSAY: I have dealt with various subjects this evening, but I have not dealt with any of the customary small requests from my electorate. My hope, notwithstanding that omission, is that Ministers will in future agree, as they have always agreed in the past, to certain requests submitted by me. I expect to put up quite a number of them presently. My position is that of representative of the largest agricultural electorate in the State, in which there is more new settlement going on than in any other portion of Western Australia. In discussing the 3,500 farms scheme and new railways, members are apt to forget that there is country north of Southern Cross as well as south.

The Premier: There are some bad roads in your electorate, too.

Mr. LINDSAY: Yes. Probably more than 500 of the 3,500 farms are situated in my

electorate. Three years ago I gave the House some figures as to the production of the Toodyay electorate, showing that it produced a quarter of the wheat grown in Western Australia. The quantity then was 5,000,000 bushels. I have obtained the corresponding figures for the year just closed, and they show that Toodyay for that year produced 8,600,000 bushels of wheat, in addition to other commodities. Therefore I am compelled to throw myself on the mercy of the Government. I come to them with so many requests because I have a much greater proportion of the State to represent than have many other members. I understand it is the Government's intention to bring down a Redistribution of Seats Bill. I hope that the measure will be on just lines, and that before it is debated an attempt will be made to get people in outlying country districts on the rolls.

On motion by Mr. Chesson, debate adjourned.

House adjourned at 9.53 p.m.

Legislative Council,

Wednesday, 15th August, 1928.

	PAGE
Leave of absence	170
Bills: Navigation Act Amendment, 1R.	171
Pearling Act Amendment, 1R.	171
Whaling, 1R.	171
Address-in-Reply, sixth day	171

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

LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

On motion by Hon. G. W. Miles, leave of absence for six consecutive sittings granted to Hon. Sir Edward Wittenoom (North) on the ground of ill-health.