

Legislative Assembly,

Tuesday, 24th November, 1925.

| | PAGE |
|--|------|
| Personal Explanations | 2136 |
| Question : State Sawmills | 2136 |
| Annual Estimates, Report | 2136 |
| Bill : Brookton Recreation Reserve, 2R., Com. Report | 2137 |
| Auditor General's Report | 2141 |
| Annual Estimates, State Trading Concerns | 2141 |

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

PERSONAL EXPLANATIONS.

Mr. North and Randall's Contract.

MR. NORTH (Claremont) [4.35]: I wish to make a personal explanation. Last week I made a reference to what is known as Randall's contract. I was informed that Mr. Best had handed the contract to Mr. Randall. That information was incorrect; I should have said the contract had been offered by Mr. Best to Mr. Randall, but was not accepted.

Minister for Lands and Leader of the Opposition.

THE MINISTER FOR LANDS (Hon. W. C. Angwin—North-East Fremantle) [4.36]: I desire to make a personal explanation. On Friday morning when the debate was rather heated I made a statement concerning the Leader of the Opposition.

Mr. George: You should have been in bed then.

The MINISTER FOR LANDS: I stated that he had wasted a lot of money in certain directions. This remark was taken up in a manner in which I did not intend it should be regarded, namely, as something derogatory to the Leader of the Opposition in his administration of the department concerned. I regret having made the statement, and apologise to the Leader of the Opposition. There are moments when during a late sitting we are apt to get a little heated in our remarks, and it was in those circumstances that I made the interjection which was taken in a wrong way, and in a way in which I did not intend it to be taken.

Members: Hear, hear!

QUESTION—STATE SAWMILLS.

Retired Officers, No. 1 Mill.

Mr. SLEEMAN (for Miss Holman) asked the Minister for Works: 1, Is it a fact that Messrs. Kennedy and Vennell, two of the officers recently retired as a result of the findings of the Royal Commission on State Sawmills, are still employed at No. 1 mill, Manjimup? 2, On what grounds have they been reinstated? 3, Are there no experienced men in the State who could do the work that is being done by these two men? 4, Why did the management not have the bush surrounding No. 1 mill classified earlier than the date of the fire which destroyed the mill? 5, Why were these two men (previously managing officers) selected to do this work? 6, What progress is being made with the rebuilding of the mill?

The MINISTER FOR WORKS replied: 1, Messrs. Kennedy and Vennell are temporarily employed to assist the new manager of No. 1 Mill, at his request, in classifying the bush and locating the best routes for log lines. 2, They have not been reinstated. 3, There are no two men in the State who know so much about this particular bush as the two men referred to. 4, The bush surrounding No. 1 mill was classified, and the report then received indicated that it would give the mill 14 years' cutting. The fire has rendered it necessary to expedite the classification of the remainder of the bush contained within this permit. 5, Because of their knowledge of this bush and country, and at the request of the new manager. 6, A site for the new mill cannot be determined until the report regarding bush, etc., is received and considered.

ANNUAL ESTIMATES, 1925-26.

Report of Committee of Supply adopted.

In Committee of Ways and Means.

The House having resolved into a Committee of Ways and Means, Mr. Lutey in the Chair,

THE PREMIER (Hon. P. Collier—Boulder): I move—

That towards making good the supply granted to His Majesty, a sum not exceeding £5,328,112 be granted from the Consolidated Revenue Fund of Western Australia, and a

sum not exceeding £112,868 from the Sale of Government Property Trust Account.

Question put and passed.

Resolution reported.

BILL—BROOKTON RECREATION RESERVE.

Second Reading.

THE MINISTER FOR LANDS (Hon. W. C. Angwin—North-East Fremantle) [4.43] in moving the second reading said: This is one of the Bills that generally come up annually. It appears that the Brookton road board possesses an area of land granted by the State for the purpose of a racecourse, and that it is situated some distance from Brookton. Within the Brookton area there is a recreation ground. It is thought advisable that the racecourse and the recreation ground should be amalgamated. The Bill provides that the road board shall have power to sell the ground that is situated some distance from the township, and expend the money on improving the recreation ground, adding some land to it, and making it suitable both for a racecourse and a recreation ground. The area will be vested in the Brookton Road Board, and it is proposed that a certain portion of the township that is owned by private persons—I do not know whether there are any negotiations going on for the purchase of it—should form part of the new recreation ground, and that the streets that divide the land should be closed so that the area should be all in one. This has the unanimous support of the people of the district and of the road board. The whole area put together would comprise 65 acres. This arrangement is to be made on condition that, as is done in other cases, the money that is obtained for the land that is situated some distance from the township shall be used for the purpose of improving the recreation ground and the racecourse in one.

Hon. G. Taylor: What is it required to sell?

THE MINISTER FOR LANDS: The area is 124 acres, 1 rood, 21 perches.

Hon. G. Taylor: It is not so valuable as the other block.

THE MINISTER FOR LANDS: The ground nearest to the town is the more valuable. The road board has been anxious to amalgamate the whole of the reserves so as to

have one ground for shows, recreation purposes, and so on.

Hon. G. Taylor: How far will the ground be from the township?

THE MINISTER FOR LANDS: The area is almost within the township. At present there are 14 acres in one reserve, three acres in another, and it is intended to purchase the balance necessary to make up the 65 acres. One or two streets will have to be closed for the purpose of making the area free from subdivision. I do not see any objection to granting the request of the people as it applies to one locality, and the move will be of benefit to the people of the district generally. I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

MR. BROWN (Pingelly) [4.46]: I support the Bill. Brookton is within my electorate. The ground was made available many years ago for racecourse purposes and is situated about a mile and a half from the town. A river runs through it, and the land is swampy, making it altogether unsuitable for such purposes. The people have had to utilise a private paddock for their race meetings. At present there is a football ground, a cricket ground and so on, and the local people consider it would be much better if one ground were made to serve for all various sports, agricultural shows, and so on. The land lies to the westward of Brookton and that which they desire to acquire, to be added to the area already held, extends to a dead-end adjoining a farm. With that area acquired, the reserve will comprise between 60 and 70 acres. The area that is to be so comprises 237 acres, that portion vested in the racecourse comprising 120 acres. I do not know whether the Government intend that the whole area shall be disposed of, to the racecourse people to have the proceeds for improvements to the new grounds. Part of the area I refer to is good grazing country and part good agricultural land. The estimated upset price of the land to be sold will be about £1 15s per acre, whereas the land that the people desire to acquire represents suburban blocks which, it is anticipated, will cost about £300 to purchase. The proceeds from the sale of the racecourse, together with subscriptions received from the people, will, it is considered, be sufficient to provide a recreation ground embracing upwards of 70 acres. Brookton itself will not be interfered with because the township comprises :

area extensive enough to meet all requirements for many years to come. By concentrating everything on one reserve, the local people will undertake a big problem. I do not know how the people view one clause in the Bill. I refer to that which sets out that those concerned cannot grant any lease extending beyond a period of three years.

The Minister for Lands: The period may be longer than that, with the approval of the Governor-in-Council.

Mr. BROWN: In view of the Minister's interjection, I presume it will be all right. The people in the Great Southern districts realise that it is convenient for the public if all the recreation grounds are concentrated in one part. I trust the House will agree to the Bill. The object of the Brookton people can be attained without interfering with the interests of the township, although one or two roads will have to be closed.

HON. G. TAYLOR (Mt. Margaret) [4.51]: Having listened to the remarks of the Minister for Lands and the member for Pingelly (Mr. Brown), I believe the proposition to have one recreation ground as close to the township as possible, is wise. That will prove a great convenience and a benefit to the district and to the people. I have no objection to the Bill.

THE MINISTER FOR LANDS (Hon. V. C. Angwin—North-East Fremantle—in reply) [4.52]: It is true that Clause 4 sets out that the board may lease portions of the reserve, provided that no such lease shall be granted for a term exceeding three years. The proviso, however, contains the following words: "without the consent in writing of the Governor." I raised this question myself, because I realised that public bodies could not lease land for a period of three years only. It was thought advisable that the Crown should have some say regarding leases, and any extension of time that is necessary can be obtained by way of application for consideration by the Governor. The clause does not limit the provision to a period of three years. It can be extended with the consent of the Government.

Question—put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Mr. Lutey in the Chair, Minister for Lands in charge of the Bill.

Clauses 1 to 3—agreed to.

Clause 4—Powers of Board:

Mr. LATHAM: Power is given to the board to carry out certain works. Is it intended that the work shall be done out of the ordinary revenue of the board, or is there provision for money to be raised for such special purposes?

The Minister for Lands: That is a matter for the board to determine in its own discretion.

Mr. LATHAM: Power is provided already in the Road Districts Act. Is it intended that the clause shall override the provisions of the Road Districts Act?

The MINISTER FOR LANDS: The intention is that the board shall be able to lease some of the land to various clubs, and that those clubs shall be able to carry out their own improvements. The board is given power to do work that may be deemed necessary, but it cannot spend money without the consent of the people.

Mr. Latham: They may do it out of their own revenue?

The MINISTER FOR LANDS: That is a matter for themselves.

Mr. Latham: The Road Districts Act sets out how boards can spend money.

The MINISTER FOR LANDS: The idea is not for the board to do the work, but for the various sporting bodies to do it.

Mr. LINDSAY: I have been associated with road board work for a long time, and I know that we have spent road board funds on making recreation grounds. We charge 10 per cent. on gate receipts, and that provides interest on the money involved.

Clause put and passed.

Clause 5—Power to expend revenue and loan moneys for purposes of this Act:

Hon. W. D. JOHNSON: We should have some explanation regarding the clause. It sets out that "the ordinary revenue of the board and such moneys as the board may borrow (which, under and subject to Part VII. of the Road Districts Act, 1919, the board is hereby authorised to do)," shall be available for the payment of expenses incurred by the board under the Bill. What is the meaning of the words in parentheses, particularly the last few, "the board is hereby authorised to do"? If it is necessary to get the permission of the ratepayers first, I do not see the necessity for the additional

provision. I cannot quite understand the meaning of the clause.

THE MINISTER FOR LANDS: I think the road board has power now to spend ordinary revenue on recreation grounds, but cannot spend any loan funds unless the ratepayers agree. The words referred to mean that the board is authorised to carry out those works subject to the Road Districts Act.

Hon. W. D. Johnson: If they have the power under the Road Districts Act, why give them further authority?

THE MINISTER FOR LANDS: Because the board may desire to do that which they cannot do under the Road Districts Act. For instance, they cannot put up a refreshment room. The clause will give them power to do these things. The intention generally is to try to get the various local clubs to improve the grounds. The board is anxious to have these powers, which I think municipalities now enjoy. Road boards have power to improve recreation grounds, but not to erect buildings thereon.

MR. DAVY: What shall be done with the revenue of a road board is laid down in Section 210 of the Road Districts Act. Now it is proposed to give them certain additional powers in respect of revenue. Part VII. of the Act provides for the expenditure of borrowed money, and in Section 277 we find a definition of works and undertakings, on which such money shall be spent. They are confined to road making, construction of bridges, culverts, wharves and jetties, sewers and drains, purchase of lands and materials and, finally, any other works approved of by the Governor. Under the clause it is proposed to give them a free hand, subject to the power of veto in the ratepayers, to borrow money and spend it on these things without the consent of the Governor. Whereas in the past it has been provided that they cannot borrow money for purposes other than the elementary work of a road board, it is now proposed to give them power, without the approval of the Governor, to raise moneys for other purposes. We ought to be sure where this will lead us before giving them that power without additional control.

THE MINISTER FOR LANDS: As I see it, the ratepayers are the controlling body. If the ratepayers are satisfied that the road board can and ought to carry out such works, it does not concern anybody else. It is entirely for the ratepayers of the district. The board asks for power to improve their re-

creation grounds if necessary. Already they have power to spend ordinary revenue in that way. If they want to borrow money for any of these works, they can get the consent of the ratepayers.

MR. DAVY: No, but the ratepayers do stop them.

THE MINISTER FOR LANDS: Well, they must get the consent of the ratepayers to borrow the money. So far no objection has been raised where these powers have been given.

MR. LATHAM: But where have such extensive powers been given?

THE MINISTER FOR LANDS: At Narrogin.

MR. LATHAM: That is a municipality.

THE MINISTER FOR LANDS: It makes no difference. It was done under special Act similar to the Bill. Surely we can trust the road boards.

MR. LATHAM: They have very nice grounds at Narrogin.

THE MINISTER FOR LANDS: Yes, the Act enabled all local bodies to unite for the improvement of the grounds. Brookton has seen the advantage of it, and is anxious to do the same.

MR. GEORGE: Under the Road Districts Act the road boards are empowered to improve the reserves vested in them or placed under their control. When it comes to giving them such wide powers as is proposed in the Bill we should pause and consider especially when we know the condition of the roads in all parts of the State. Remembering that it is difficult to get road boards to raise sufficient revenue to attend to the roads, we might well hesitate before giving them power to enter into ambitious schemes for the improvement of recreation grounds. Section 94 of the Act shows that in the framing of the Act there was a desire to indicate to the boards the avenues through which they might do practical work. Clause 5 of the Bill is going further than is warranted. The primary object of a road board is to maintain roads, and certainly the ratepayers should have some say in any expenditure on recreation grounds. I have had experience of certain road boards, and that experience prompts me to hesitate before granting the proposed additional powers.

MR. LINDSAY: I fail to see any objection whatever to the clause. I have had something to do with the formation of recreation grounds in country districts, and I say that

are necessary in the interests of all the residents. It is only right that the road board should have the proposed power. No road board would do these things unless a demand for them arose amongst the ratepayers. I will support the clause.

Hon. W. D. JOHNSON: I am not opposed to the proposal to amalgamate under the local authority all the recreation activities in any given district. One of the wisest administrative acts on the part of a local authority was that at Narrogin, when they got the whole of their sporting bodies to concentrate on one ground. That was a well-established municipality, and provision was made by special Act. Is it wise in a Bill of this description to extend the powers and functions of local governing bodies? Surely it would be better to provide for borrowing under the Road Districts Act Amendment Bill, which the Minister for Works has in hand. We have a department specially charged with the responsibility of saying to what extent local governing bodies shall be permitted to raise money, and for what purposes the money shall be applied.

Mr. Davy: Under the existing Act they have power to borrow with the consent of the Governor.

Hon. W. D. JOHNSON: For certain things.

Mr. Davy: For this purpose.

Hon. W. D. JOHNSON: The raising of revenue for refreshment booths and recreation grounds, I think, would be beyond the power of a local authority as provided in the Road Districts Act. If we are going to grant extended powers the provision should be made in the Road Districts Act and not in some other measure.

Mr. North: And it should not be applied to only one road board.

Hon. W. D. JOHNSON: That is so. I do not oppose the Bill, but we should consider whether it is wise to give a board under this measure power to borrow that is denied under the Road Districts Act. If it is desirable to do this sort of thing at Brookton, we should make the provision general and give all road boards an equal opportunity to develop their recreation grounds without requiring each one to approach Parliament for a special Act.

Mr. BROWN: If we do not agree to this clause, we shall spoil the Bill. In Pingelly the Agricultural Society, race, tennis, football and cricket clubs are concentrated on the one

recreation ground. The land was vested in three trustees of the agricultural society, and I am one of them. We approached the bank for an overdraft to enable us to carry out improvements, but were refused. We, however, were offered a grant for which we were generally and severally liable. The road board is the proper body in which to vest a recreation ground, because it has a continuity of existence, whereas trustees might die. The question of borrowing is one for the ratepayers to decide. The members of the road board represent the people, and we can rest assured that no harm will be done.

The MINISTER FOR LANDS: I do not think it makes any difference. The member for Perth interjected that I was opposed to the Cottesloe municipality having similar power. Cottesloe has the power to-day.

Mr. North: All that is wrong is that the people will not support the council in the raising of a loan.

The MINISTER FOR LANDS: Still they have the power. Any proposal to borrow must be advertised and ratepayers have an opportunity to object. The power rests entirely with the ratepayers. Road boards, however, have not the power. When grounds are used for various purposes, it is necessary to carry out improvements. The idea is that areas should be granted to tennis, bowling, football and cricket clubs, each of which will improve its own portion, but it may be necessary to erect a pavilion or grandstand, which the clubs could not finance. I know of an instance in which a club is going to pay 10 per cent. on the cost of improvements, and that will mean a good revenue for the local authority. Unless the clause is retained the road board will have no power, because only a very small proportion of a road board's revenue could be used for a recreation ground.

Mr. LATHAM: I do not oppose the Bill. Possibly it is quite right to encourage these people to have their recreation reserves under the control of the road board to concentrate their sports on the one ground. Section 160, Subsection 13, of the Road Districts Act empowers a board to improve its reserves out of revenue.

The Minister for Lands: But how much could a board spend out of revenue?

Mr. LATHAM: As much as it liked, so long as it was available in the ward. There is also power under Section 277 to borrow

money if the Governor gives his consent in writing.

The Minister for Lands: Only for certain purposes.

Mr. LATHAM: The section says "for any other works whatsoever approved by the Governor." Thus power is already provided, and it is not necessary to repeat it here. It is dangerous to grant powers under a separate Bill when the machinery already exists in the principal Act.

Mr. BROWN: Only 14 acres is devoted to a recreation ground and it is held under three trustees. Will there be dual control?

The Minister for Lands: That has already been dealt with in Clause 2.

Clause put and passed.

Clauses 6 and 7, Schedule, Title—agreed to.

Bill reported without amendment and the report adopted.

AUDITOR GENERAL'S REPORT.

Mr. SPEAKER: I have received from the Auditor General, in pursuance of Section 53 of the Audit Act of 1904, the 35th report for the financial year ended the 30th June, 1925, which I now lay on the Table of the House.

ANNUAL ESTIMATES—STATE TRADING CONCERNS.

In Committee.

Mr. Lutey in the Chair.

Division—State Brickworks, £27,469:

Hon. J. CUNNINGHAM (Honorary Minister): During the 12 months ended on the 30th June last the State Brickworks produced 7,754,000 bricks, and made total sales of £23,823. After allowing or providing for interest and depreciation, and also a reserve of £800 for repairing and re-conditioning the No. 1 kiln, there remains a profit of £2,281. During the year the No. 2 kiln was completed. It was then found necessary to put the No. 1 kiln temporarily out of commission for the purpose of re-conditioning and repairs. That work is now being completed, and within the next two weeks we should have the first batch out of the old kiln. During the last few months there has been a greater demand for bricks than previously. Although, owing to the re-conditioning of the old kiln, we have not

been in a position to meet quite a number of orders offered to us, I am hopeful that after the first week of December the State Brickworks will be able to supply all orders received. Undoubtedly during the last few months there has been great activity in the building trade, and as a result greater demands have been made upon the State Brickworks. I think it will be agreed by all members that it was a good move on the part of the Government to provide an additional kiln. We shall now be able to utilise the whole of the plant, which has not been the case for about 13 years. Thus a valuable asset to the State will now be used to its fullest capacity. I shall be prepared to answer any questions relative to the operation of the State Brickworks.

Mr. LATHAM: It appears that the State Brickworks have a monopoly and are unable to supply the bricks required. Buildings are hung up throughout the State for want of bricks, due entirely to the Government monopoly.

The Premier: Where have the Government a monopoly?

Mr. LATHAM: Practically a monopoly.

The Premier: No.

Mr. LATHAM: I travel about the State a good deal, and people inform me that their buildings are hung up because of orders for bricks given to the State Brickworks which have not been supplied. It is a short-sighted policy on the part of the Government not to anticipate future requirements.

The Premier: The Government you supported are responsible.

Mr. LATHAM: I would instantly close down the works if I had control.

Hon. S. W. Munsie: Then builders would not be able to get bricks at all.

Mr. LATHAM: There never was any trouble in getting bricks before the State Brickworks started. People are not going to embark on an industry in which the Government would compete with them. I do hope the Government, if they are going to maintain their monopoly, will meet the demand for bricks. I do not think two kilns will suffice to meet the demand. In Merredin, for instance, bricklayers have been dismissed for want of bricks. When their services are wanted again, there will be difficulty in obtaining them.

The Minister for Works: What is private enterprise for?

Mr. LATHAM: The trouble is that the Government have a monopoly.

The Minister for Works: Oh!

Mr. LATHAM: How is the private individual going to make any profit if he has to pay income tax and—

The Minister for Works: That simply proves that under private enterprise people would have to pay more for bricks.

Hon. S. W. Munsie: If it were not for the State Brickworks, the price of bricks would be higher now.

Mr. LATHAM: The argument that one can get anything cheaper by having it manufactured by the Government has collapsed long ago.

Hon. S. W. Munsie: It is your mind that has collapsed.

Mr. LATHAM: Since the State Implementation Works came into existence, the cost of farming implements has not been reduced one whit.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The hon. member will keep to bricks.

Mr. LATHAM: People are shy of engaging in an industry where they know the Government will compete against them. The Government are not subject to income tax and local rates, as private individuals are.

The Premier: Why did not the Government which you supported sell the State Brickworks?

Mr. LATHAM: The Premier knows why. On two occasions the late Government tried to get the necessary Bill through this House, but were unsuccessful. The Premier knows very well that he cannot sell these works without an Act of Parliament. He would first have to amend the State Trading Concerns Act.

The Premier: If I desired to sell the State enterprises as you profess to desire, I would ask Parliament to consent to their sale. You had a majority.

Mr. LATHAM: But all members on our side did not think alike. I am speaking only for myself. If the Government monopoly is to be maintained, I do hope the Treasurer will make the necessary advances, so that an adequate supply may be forthcoming.

The Premier: Why does not private enterprise step in and make bricks?

Mr. LATHAM: The Premier would not like to put any of his money into brickworks, seeing that the Government are engaged in the industry. In my opinion it is not a function of government to engage in this kind of thing, and the sooner the State

trading concerns are discontinued, the better it will be for the country.

The Minister for Mines: This is the first time you have admitted that private enterprise cannot supply the needs of the people.

Mr. LATHAM: I say private individuals are shy of engaging in an industry in which the Government have embarked. I never heard any great noise about the price of bricks.

The Premier: That was when you were out in the country districts.

Mr. LATHAM: I know bricks are more than twice as dear now as they used to be.

Hon. W. D. Johnson: Everything else is dearer.

Mr. LATHAM: It is useless to ask for a reduction of the vote, because we shall not get it. I do hope, however, that the Government, having a monopoly, will supply the demand.

Mr. DAVY: I do not know whether this is the proper time to make speeches about the advisableness of continuing State Brickworks or not. We on this side of the Chamber have, I think, made our attitude clear. We think that State enterprise in such things as brickworks is not in the best interests of the community as a whole. Hon. members opposite think otherwise, presumably.

The Premier: The State enterprises were enlarged slightly during the time your party were over here.

Mr. DAVY: Speaking personally, I protested against the previous Government not having done away with them. I am now in the fortunate position of not having to answer for their sins. Perhaps I may have some sins to answer for in the next Parliament.

Hon. S. W. Munsie: You are a bit optimistic.

Mr. DAVY: I was putting the matter very moderately; I said "perhaps." Even the Honorary Minister, I suppose, admits the possibility. I would like the Government to tell us one or two things which are not immediately apparent on the surface of these Estimates. How much capital is invested in the State Brickworks, and what interest is shown on the enterprise after taking into account the amount of working capital and the estimated contribution to Consolidated Revenue? Are the bricks sold at a cheaper rate than that charged by private enterprise? If not, how is the price of the bricks arrived at? It is a very nice thing to have cheap bricks, and we are as-

sured that if it were not for the State Brickworks, bricks would be dearer than they are.

Hon. S. W. Munsie: Private brickworks approached the management of the State Brickworks with a view to getting them to agree to increase the price. That is pretty good proof that were it not for the State Brickworks the price would have increased.

Mr. DAVY: There is nothing in the world to stop the State enterprise from selling its products at any price it likes, provided it can pass on the loss. But is it a good thing to sell bricks cheap and charge the loss against some other members of the community, or against the community as a whole? What interest was shown on the total capital invested in the concern, and how much less interest would be shown if this concern paid income tax or dividend duty and local rates like the ordinary private enterprise firm has to do? After all, that ought to be taken into consideration in estimating whether the community is running the enterprise at a loss.

The Premier: The footnote to the division covers interest and sinking fund, as well as other charges, and then shows a profit.

Mr. DAVY: I assume that if we added the £1,575 representing interest on fixed and working capital to the £2,281 representing estimated contribution to Consolidated Revenue for the year, we would get what is expected to be available for distribution at the end of the current financial year. What does that represent in interest on the capital invested?

Mr. NORTH: If the State concerns as a whole absorb more employees than do private firms, then they are not efficient. If they absorb less than private firms, then they are of no benefit to the labour market.

Hon. J. CUNNINGHAM: We are getting accustomed to hearing such remarks as those uttered by the member for York. The State has no monopoly of brick production. We have only recently completed a second kiln, and it was owing to the great demand for the bricks turned out at the State works, that that second kiln was constructed. Recently the orders have been so big that there has been great difficulty in coping with the demand. The No. 1 kiln has been in commission continuously for 13 years except for a period of 18 months during the war. It will be realised by those who have a knowledge of the subject that deterioration takes

place in a kiln which is not continuously employed. The opportunity had to be seized to recondition the kiln and on that account we did not have the production of bricks that we anticipated we would get during the first half of the present financial year. As each chamber of the kiln was reconditioned it was filled with green bricks until at the present time the kiln holds 200,000 green bricks which should be on the market in eight or ten days' time. If private enterprise is desirous of entering on the pressed brick trade—the State is producing only pressed bricks—there is nothing to prevent them from doing so. Large orders are coming in for pressed bricks, and those orders are from people who are desirous of erecting good buildings. With reference to the point raised by the member for West Perth, he has had an opportunity to peruse the balance sheet which was laid on the Table of the House about three months ago. No doubt he will be satisfied with the position after having perused that balance sheet.

Mr. Davy: I was asking for information; you do not mind telling me.

Hon. J. CUNNINGHAM: I am putting the hon. member on the track.

Mr. Davy: Apparently you do not know it yourself.

Hon. J. CUNNINGHAM: The real essential is to supply those people who are in need of a first-class brick. That is the sole desire of the Government. In the past there was great difficulty in securing what was really a first-class article, and now it is generally admitted that the bricks produced by the State are superior to any turned out at other brick works.

Hon. W. D. JOHNSON: It is gratifying to hear from the Opposition that the State brickworks are fulfilling the function for which they were established. They were established to control the quality and price of bricks. At that time there was a brick-makers' association in the metropolitan area and that association had control of all bricks, and they were able to fix the price and regulate delivery as they thought fit. The Government were erecting the Hospital for the Insane at Claremont and consequently required an enormous number of bricks. The Government not only had to pay the demands made by the association, but the public also were compelled to pay an increased price because of the scarcity caused by the Government requirements. Workers' homes were also erected a little later on, and again the

general consumer was penalised. The State Brickworks were established to prevent that kind of thing. The association of brick-makers was a close corporation, and those connected with it used it to the maximum extent. The State works imposed a healthy restraint on the combination, and it is pleasing to hear that they caused the private brickmakers to realise that they could not go on doing what they had set themselves out to do. The Government at the present time are not preventing a private man from extending his operations. The Armadale works have been extended as well as those at Bellevue. These extensions have been carried out since the State Brickworks have come into existence.

Mr. Latham: A lot of them at Bellevue have been closed down.

Hon. W. D. JOHNSON: Only those that had a limited clay supply closed down. The works controlled by Mr. R. O. Law at Bellevue are producing more bricks at the present time than they ever did before, but they are a different article from those turned out at Byford. They are wire-cut bricks. If the works at Bellevue have suffered in any way, they have not suffered by reason of the extension of the State works. Mr. Law has also installed better equipment at his Bellevue works. What the member for York should have said on the subject of bricks was that those who had been making huge profits from the public were now not able to do so by reason of the State competition.

Mr. Latham: You tell that story very well.

Hon. W. D. JOHNSON: What we want is more policing of industries by the State. I am pleased that the Government have equipped the State works so as to maintain a maximum output that will cope with the demand. The machinery that was originally installed was capable of turning out only a limited number of bricks. The previous Government hampered operations at the works mainly, of course, in the interests of their policy which was to encourage and foster private enterprise. But they had to recognise that whilst they were carrying out a policy that was suitable and profitable to private enterprise, they were doing an injury to the State to the extent that they were turning out only a limited number of bricks as compared with the capacity of the plant. The present Government have put that right, and we now have the brickworks on a basis that will make them more profitable and more

useful. I have no doubt the member for York would add, more dangerous.

Mr. Latham: The supply is less than is required to-day.

Hon. W. D. JOHNSON: With the introduction of the second kiln it will be possible to produce bricks cheaper than was formerly the case. If the machinery can be made to produce more, the price of the product will be reduced accordingly. The brickworks reflect credit upon the Government. These works will now perform a valued function in regulating the price of bricks that are so necessary in the metropolitan area. I hope the lead given by the State will be followed by private yards. The latter must recognise that their combinations will be restricted and controlled by the policing of this State trading concern, which was badly needed at the time of its establishment and has fulfilled a valued function ever since.

Mr. DAVY: How is the price of bricks regulated?

Hon. J. CUNNINGHAM: The works must provide sinking fund, interest and depreciation charges, working expenses and managerial charges. The price of bricks is fixed so that these charges may be met. On that basis we have shown a surplus of £2,900 on the year's operations. The capital cost of the two kilns and machinery is £37,741.

Division put and passed.

Division—State Ferries, £8,290:

Mr. DAVY: Early in the session the Premier made some remarks about the State ferries which seemed to hold out some hope for the future. He said it was not the function of Government to run this concern, and that he would be willing to listen to any reasonable offer that might be made for it. Is the Premier opposed to any steps being taken to sell this trading concern, or does he intend to do nothing further?

The PREMIER: I have received a communication from a person acting on behalf of the South Perth Road Board. At present I think the local authority would not have power to operate such a concern, but under the Bill before the House power is given to road boards to handle such undertakings. I am prepared to listen to the South Perth Road Board, and, if a satisfactory offer be made, seriously to consider the question of disposing of the service.

Mr. Davy: Would you consider a tender from a private company?

The PREMIER: I would consider any tender that might come along.

Hon. W. D. JOHNSON: I trust no hasty decision will be arrived at on this matter. The Government entered on this business after consulting the local governing bodies, and the service was taken over at their request. They appealed to the Government to protect them from private enterprise that was operating to their detriment. A certain firm had the right to run a ferry service from Barrack-street to South Perth. While there was opposition a good service was maintained, but just before Christmas in one year the larger company absorbed the smaller, and the service began to fall away. The Government realised that the service was being run to the detriment of the travelling public, and, with the endorsement of the local governing bodies, took it over. One of the curses of Sydney is the great control that private enterprise has over the ferry service.

Mr. Latham: It is a very cheap and efficient service.

Hon. W. D. JOHNSON: It is neither cheap nor efficient. The Parliament of New South Wales has often protested against the existing condition of affairs.

Mr. Latham: But it has done nothing.

Hon. W. D. JOHNSON: A great deal of capital would now be required before the Government there could do anything. It would not be wise to give away the control of the river transport. No one local authority could run it all, and it would not be a good thing to have it in the hands of several local authorities. Possibly, if we sold one of the State trading concerns, it might appease the Opposition for the time being, but instead of attempting to quieten the Opposition by this means we should extend our State enterprises in those cases where private concerns are operating in proved detriment to the public. In the case under review the ferries were being operated to the detriment of South Perth.

Hon. G. Taylor: Has the change had the desired effect?

Hon. W. D. JOHNSON: Yes. The ferries have been run at a limited amount of profit, which is as it should be. As South Perth extends, more boats will be required, and I hope the Government will supply them. The State alone can control the river traffic in the way that it should be controlled.

Mr. GRIFFITHS: From what I know of the ferry service in Sydney, I would say it

is ridiculous to suggest that it is in the hands of private companies who are acting like octopi. Passengers may travel 70 miles there for 2s. 6d., and can go three or four times as far as from Barrack-street to South Perth for 3d. If travelling by water could be made cheaper on the river, it might tend to open up Applecross and Attadale, and other places that are at present dormant.

M.R. ANGELO: State ferries and State steamers are not trading concerns, but public utilities, and should be treated in the same way as railways and tramways. The South Perth ferry is really a bridge joining two ends of the tramway lines. I should be sorry to see it placed under private control. I hope the Premier will be able to take the State ferries and State steamers out of the trading concerns Estimates.

Division put and passed.

Sitting suspended from 6.15 to 7.30 p.m.

Division—State Hotels, £64,331:

Mr. LATHAM: Will the Minister state the Government's intentions regarding the necessary additions to the Corrigin State hotel? It is often impossible to get accommodation there, even though the double bedrooms have been dispensed with and extra beds provided.

The Premier: That should be no great grievance.

Mr. LATHAM: But one cannot get accommodation for one's wife! As the men occupy all the accommodation, a woman cannot get a room. The State hotels are earning good revenue, and the Government should do what every other hotelkeeper is required to do. Increased accommodation should also be provided at the Caves house.

Hon. S. W. Munsie: The Estimates for the Cave House have already been dealt with.

Mr. LATHAM: But the State Hotels Department has to provide the necessary accommodation.

Hon. S. W. MUNSIE: The department realise that the accommodation at the Corrigin hotel is not adequate, and several proposals have been advanced for overcoming the difficulty. It is all a matter of money.

Mr. Latham: But the State hotels are earning good profits.

Hon. S. W. MUNSIE: It is the one trading concern to which hon. members cannot take exception on that score.

Mr. Latham: The estimated contribution to Consolidated Revenue is £8,800.

Hon. S. W. MUNSIE: That is so, but the last estimate I saw for the extra accommodation represented an outlay of £9,000. There is another estimate running into £12,000. It is all a question as to whether or not the money can be found.

Mr. Latham: Well, sell the hotel!

Hon. S. W. MUNSIE: The department realise the position, and if money can be made available the extra accommodation will be provided. Here is an opportunity for private enterprise to supply the extra accommodation required. The Government have not a monopoly under the existing Licensing Act as they had under the old Act.

Mr. Latham: I hope the Licensing Board will refuse to renew your license.

Hon. S. W. MUNSIE: They are as likely to do that as not. They treat the State hotels just the same as hotels privately owned.

Hon. W. D. JOHNSON: I hope a special effort will be made to provide the necessary accommodation where required.

Mr. Latham: No special effort is required. The actual contribution to Consolidated Revenue for 1924-25 was £7,771.

Hon. W. D. JOHNSON: I hope that accommodation will be provided, not only at Corrigin but wherever there are State hotels. I do not like the utterance of the Minister and protest against private enterprise being invited to supply the accommodation required. The State has a hotel at Corrigin which has contributed considerably to Consolidated Revenue.

Hon. S. W. Munsie: Not too much.

Hon. W. D. JOHNSON: It is unsound and not financially right that the Treasury should take all the results of the State hotels and yet refuse to provide necessary accommodation for the public. The State hotels pay handsome interest on the capital expenditure involved and while money is spent in many other directions, where it is questionable whether a good return will follow, something more should be done in connection with a proposition from which revenue is assured. The Government have indicated that they will cater for the requirements of the residents and the travelling public and I trust they will treat this matter a little more seriously than has been done in the past. I for one do not support the Honorary Minister's invitation to private enterprise to

fulfil an obligation that the Government should undertake. It is the Government's job and they should get on with it.

Mr. ANGELO: The member for Guildford put forward a good case for the retention of the State Brickworks because they kept the price of bricks down. The same argument, however, cannot apply to State hotels. We have a good Licensing Act and a fine board to look after the interests of hotels and the public. I do not know why the Government retain this particular trading concern. It is a degrading trade; we cannot get away from that fact. We have had debates on the adulteration of liquor, the inadequacy of accommodation, the high prices charged for drinks and other degrading matters. The public are not now benefiting from the State hotels as when those hotels were first established. There may have been a good reason for their establishment at the outset; there is none now. Private enterprise is willing to supply first class hotels and there is no comparison between the State and private hostleries. If any member travels through the Midland country he can secure excellent accommodation at private hotels. The refreshments are kept beautifully cool and it is a joy to partake of them after a long and dusty journey. At the State hotel at Wongan Hills, however, a party with whom I was travelling, were offered refreshments that had been half boiled. I went behind the bar and asked if it were not possible to have drinks that were cooler. I was told that there was no ice and that the liquor could not be kept cool. No attempt was made even with wet bags to keep it cool. The liquor was stacked in a room and the sun beat down on the iron roof above. No attempt was made there to cater for the public's requirements. I understand that if one arrives there a minute after the dinner hour, it is impossible to get a meal. As a contrast to that, when we arrived at the Dalwallinu Hotel we experienced every comfort, although we arrived late. If it is argued that we cannot afford to lose the profit, surely we could lease the State hotels at rentals that would represent as much as the profits reaped now.

Mr. North: Without the burden we have to carry.

Mr. ANGELO: That is so.

Hon. S. W. Munsie: Would anyone have built a hotel at Corrigin when the Government did so?

Mr. ANGELO: That is a different question.

Hon. S. W. Munsie: Of course it is.

Mr. J. H. Smith: They would have jumped at the chance.

Mr. ANGELO: People are only too anxious to rush in with capital for the provision of first class hotels. Under the old conditions when a State hotel was built, no one else could secure that privilege, but under the new Licensing Act the licensing board see that only necessary hotels are licensed, and they are jealous in assuring that proper accommodation sufficient for all requirements is provided. I visited the Corrigin hotel with three friends and I know that the hotel is very well run. The fact remains, however, that we could not get a room there and had to sleep on the verandah.

Mr. Latham: A woman cannot get a bed there at all.

Mr. ANGELO: We were told that that sort of thing was usual. Now we hear the Minister say that the Government have not got the money necessary to provide more accommodation.

Hon. S. W. Munsie: I did not say that.

Mr. ANGELO: If a licensee told the Licensing Board that he had not the money necessary to provide extra accommodation, the board would make him hand over the license to someone else.

Hon. S. W. Munsie: Nothing of the kind.

Mr. ANGELO: It was done the other day. At Wyalcatchem the Licensing Board ordered more accommodation to be provided immediately because it was found that the accommodation available was not adequate. No such excuse is accepted as that money is not available. Why carry on hotelkeeping? I hope the Government will admit that the time when such State activities were necessary is now past, and will leave the business to private enterprise.

Mr. J. H. SMITH: State hotels have a monopoly of the most promising centres in Western Australia. The member for Gascoyne (Mr. Angelo) has just told us that more accommodation is required at certain State hotels. I should like an assurance from the Minister that, where necessary, competition by private hotels will be allowed.

Hon. S. W. Munsie: I cannot give that assurance. It is for the licensing bench to say.

Mr. J. H. SMITH: I want to know the Government's policy in respect of the con-

tinuation of State hotels. Do the Government intend to continue them?

The Minister for Works: What about Pemberton?

Hon. J. H. SMITH: It is an open secret that there is a possibility of a State hotel being built at Pemberton. The Treasurer will derive a great deal of revenue from the recent sale of town blocks there. Applications will shortly be made for a hotel site in that town, but it is rumoured that the Government intend to build a State hotel down there. On the whole, the State hotels are very well run, but where there is no competition one cannot expect the same service as obtains where there are several hotels in one locality. I want the Minister to see to it that the travelling public receive the same attention in State hotels as is available in private hotels.

Hon. S. W. Munsie: My experience is that the public receive better attention in State hotels.

Mr. J. H. SMITH: We have had the evidence of the member for Gascoyne, and also of the member for York.

Hon. S. W. Munsie: But the complaint was of insufficiency of accommodation, the place being too small.

The Minister for Works: That exists in the City of Perth.

Mr. J. H. SMITH: Yes, but in many instances it occurs only at certain periods of the year; if the accommodation were to be increased, rooms would be lying idle for the greater part of the year. I do want the Minister to tell us whether the Government intend to establish a State hotel at Pemberton.

Mr. LINDSAY: The Minister said there had been nothing to prevent anybody from building a hotel at Corrigin prior to the erection of the State hotel. In my district, which is a similar one, the whole of the town blocks were sold with a provision that no hotel license would be granted. In all the towns on the wheat belt two blocks were reserved for a State hotel. That restriction existed for many years.

Hon. S. W. Munsie: It existed until the amendment of the Licensing Act wiped it out.

Mr. LINDSAY: I had trouble about a hotel in my own town. As chairman of the road board, for 18 months I tried to induce the Government to remove the restriction so that we might get a hotel built. Eventually the road board induced the Government to

put the State hotel site up for sale. It brought £1,470, and a private hotel was built on it. I say it was not possible for a hotel to be built at Corrigin until the Government built it, which they did.

Mr. DAVY: I was surprised to hear from the Minister that the chief justification for State hotels was that the Government built a hotel where no one else would build it.

Hon. S. W. Munsie: That has happened in two places.

Mr. DAVY: From time to time I have been engaged in making applications for hotel licenses in places where no licenses existed, and the whole of the argument has been as to whether or not the requirements of the district justified a license. Private enterprise has sought to build hotels in places where there was a population of two men and a donkey, and in every instance the application has been opposed, not only by those opposed to the sale of alcohol in any form anywhere, but also by the police officially. Sometimes the application has been granted in the teeth of the keenest possible opposition, the opposition being on the grounds that the requirements of the district did not justify a license.

Hon. S. W. Munsie: For many years there was the 15 mile radius provision.

Mr. DAVY: But that made no difference in respect of an application for a license beyond that radius. Now, of course, one can get a license irrespective of the distance from the next hotel. Private enterprise has been prepared to build hotels in any place for which a license could be secured. So I find it difficult to believe that the State has built hotels where private enterprise refused to do so. The member for Guildford (Hon. W. D. Johnson) 18 months ago laid down the principle that it is not the function of the Government to do for the people what they can do for themselves. Yet to-night he is upholding the principle of State hotels. That being so, he should find some other general principle on which to base rules for the conduct of the Government. Certainly his rule that the Government should do for the people only what the people cannot do for themselves does not justify the running of State hotels. On the other hand the Premier regards the running of State ferries as no part of the functions of a Government.

The Premier: The whole principle of State trading is a little out of order on this vote.

Mr. DAVY: I do not propose to press the thing any further, but I think members on the Government side must find it difficult logically to justify the retention of this item on the Estimates. It seems to me that State hotels ought to go. The Minister in charge of the Vote welcomes the incursion into the field at present monopolised by State hotels.

Hon. S. W. Munsie: There is no field monopolised by State hotels to-day.

Mr. DAVY: But there is. Wherever a State hotel exists it has at the moment a monopoly. Of course it is open for a private person, provided he can get the necessary petition, to apply to the licensing court for a new license in opposition to an existing State hotel. I do not suggest that one would have any more difficulty in getting a license in opposition to a State hotel than in getting one in opposition to a private hotel. In fact perhaps there would be slightly less difficulty in getting a license in opposition to a State hotel, for if a petition comes along for a license for a new hotel in opposition to an existing private hotel—

Mr. Marshall: The existing licensee will refuse to serve the petitioners.

Mr. DAVY: The licensee of the private hotel will use his best endeavours to defeat the application, whereas the manager of a State hotel has no particular interest in doing anything of the sort. So, I say, it may be easier to get a license in opposition to a State hotel than in opposition to a private hotel. The Minister says he is quite willing to see opposition from private individuals, whereas the hon. member for Guildford strongly objects to it. I hope the Government will see fit to wipe out this particular trading concern. It must be a terrible burden for a Minister to have to control such a variety of State enterprises. The ordinary old fashioned job of Minister was quite enough to require full attention and a great deal of ability to carry out properly. At the present time the Minister, instead of having the old fashioned limits to his job, has to extend his attention to State hotels and to a hundred and one other matters which should never be required of him.

Mr. BROWN: Some time ago when passing through Corrigin some of the principal residents asked me to impress upon the Minister the need for making additions to the State hotel there, as the present accommodation is inadequate. I stayed there a few

weeks ago and the manager told me he had not a room of any sort to offer me, but that he would provide a shake-down on the balcony. I was made comfortable, but it showed there is not sufficient accommodation at the hotel. Corrigin is growing rapidly, and the people would be justified in asking for another hotel, but I do not think they want that. As the Government have a monopoly at Corrigin, they should provide more accommodation. If a license could be obtained, I believe private enterprise would apply for one immediately. I have watched the conduct of that hotel and have seen a mob of men waiting for the hotel to open at 9 a.m. The manager refused to supply drink to anyone before that hour. That is as it should be. In the evening I have been turned out of the bar at 9 o'clock. Unfortunately, that is not always done in private hotels.

Mr. J. H. Smith: Yes, it is.

Mr. BROWN: I could take the hon. member to hotels where he could get drinks up till midnight.

Mr. Latham: Where are they?

Mr. J. H. Smith: You ought to say where they are.

Mr. BROWN: Where the Government have a monopoly, they should provide sufficient accommodation. I understand the Corrigin hotel is a good paying proposition. I have heard the Minister say that the extra accommodation required would cost £9,000. That expenditure would be warranted.

Mr. Panton: Then they would have to serve drinks after 9 p.m. in order to get it back.

Mr. BROWN: There is no occasion for that at Corrigin. I had no fault whatever to find with the food supplied at the hotel. Although I left before breakfast time, I was supplied with tea and toast without charge.

Hon. S. W. Munsie: That is more than you would get from private enterprise.

Mr. BROWN: The same thing occurred at Bruce Rock.

Mr. Latham: There they charge 9d. for it.

Mr. BROWN: I was not charged anything.

Mr. Davy: I do not see why you should get it for nothing.

Mr. Panton: I suppose you showed your gold pass.

Mr. BROWN: If a State hotel is properly conducted, it is probably instrumental in preventing a good deal of drinking after hours.

Hon. S. W. Munsie: Where is there a State hotel that is not properly conducted?

Mr. BROWN: I have been in only two apart from the Cave House, and there I could not get a drink after 9 p.m., although I did not look for one, but I have not been in a privately-owned hotel where I could not get a drink at any hour of the night I liked. No doubt that is due to the keenness of competition through there being several hotels in one town. I have seen hotels serving drink at 6 a.m. on Sunday, but I venture to say that would not occur at a State hotel. At the same time I hold no brief for State hotels.

Mr. MARSHALL: I endorse the policy that the State should take control of the liquor traffic as far as possible. I do not suppose we can find an industry where strict control and supervision are more essential for the welfare of the community than in the liquor trade.

Mr. Davy: I did not say the State should not exercise supervision.

Mr. MARSHALL: The hon. member said it would be difficult for supporters of the Government to endorse the action of the Government in retaining State hotels.

Mr. Davy: That is a totally different thing from supervision.

Mr. MARSHALL: I can recollect the problem of the liquor traffic ever since I was a youth. It has been a problem in all countries how to supervise the liquor traffic properly and strictly. Wherever private enterprise has been wholly and solely responsible for hotel keeping, difficulty has been experienced and expense has been incurred to enforce the licensing laws.

Mr. Davy: But you do not suggest that the running of a State hotel at Corrigin affects the supervision of hotels in Perth.

Mr. MARSHALL: If the hon. member had travelled the State as I have done and had seen the unseemly—I cannot find word strong enough—manner in which private hotels were conducted in the early days, he would not have made use of the utterances he employed this evening. I do not wish to refer to the iniquitous control of the liquor traffic. Since the advent of State hotels, there has been a marked improvement in supervision and control.

Mr. Davy: You do not seriously suggest that the establishment of a State hotel at Corrigin improves the supervision in Perth.

Mr. MARSHALL: Private enterprise, seeing how strictly the Government control the traffic, has been guided by their actions lest the Government step in and establish a greater number of State hotels. The State hotels have operated as policemen.

Mr. J. H. Smith: They had no supervision until a year or two ago.

Mr. MARSHALL: The liquor traffic has never been without supervision.

Mr. J. H. Smith: The State hotels had none.

Mr. Davy: You mean that the Palace Hotel in Perth is run properly for fear the State might start an hotel on the opposite side of the street?

The CHAIRMAN: I cannot permit a general discussion of the liquor traffic. The hon. member must confine his remarks to State hotels.

Mr. MARSHALL: I do not profess to be familiar with the internal workings of State hotels. I have heard scores of reports about the control of the State hotel at Bruce Rock. To-night we have been told of the need for increased accommodation at the Corrigin State Hotel. We should have State hotels wherever necessary to ensure the proper control of the liquor traffic. If the State is going to undertake this business, it should be done thoroughly. The least we can expect is that State hotels will comply with the laws of the land. Under the latest amendment of the Licensing Act it is laid down above all things that food and accommodation shall be provided in abundance at all hotels, and the State should set a lead by fully supplying the demands of the community wherever a State hotel has been established. We should not enter the business in a half-hearted manner.

Mr. Mann: You think they should be under the same control as privately-owned hotels?

Mr. MARSHALL: So they are.

Mr. Mann: They are not.

Mr. MARSHALL: The same laws govern the lot.

Mr. J. H. Smith: They do now; they did not at one time.

Mr. MARSHALL: Reference has been made to the State having a monopoly, but private enterprise has had a monopoly also.

Mr. Davy: That is quite right.

Mr. MARSHALL: In a place where there is a State hotel, a traveller receives treatment no worse than in a town where there is only one hotel conducted by private enterprise. I know of one centre where an appli-

cation was made for a second license and was refused. Yet no more vile treatment is offered to a community anywhere, and the Licensing Board would not grant a second license, thus giving a monopoly to the holder of the existing license. If we are going to continue State hotels, as I say we should do, they should be sufficiently well appointed to meet the requirements of the community in the way of good food and high grade liquor, and there should be efficient control and supervision.

Mr. J. H. SMITH: Without accepting the challenge of the member for Pingelly (Mr. Brown), I must say his statements amount to a gross libel on men whose characters have been scrutinised most closely. Indeed, the hon. member has been talking through his neck. I ask him now to quote some of the dozens of places where liquor was sold at 6 a.m. and after 12 midnight.

Mr. MANN: If the Government intend to continue the running of State hotels—

Hon. S. W. Munsie: Rest assured of that.

Mr. MANN:—and if, as the Honorary Minister says, they are under the same control as privately owned hotels, then the Licensing Board should have power to require the Government to provide additional accommodation where necessary.

Hon. S. W. Munsie: Yes.

Mr. MANN: At Doodlakine the Licensing Board instructed the publican that unless he practically rebuilt his hotel, he would not get a renewal of his license. Now, there is not sufficient accommodation at any of the State hotels except those at Gwalia and Kwollyin. If the Caves House were double the size it is, it would still be full during the season.

The CHAIRMAN: The Caves House has already been dealt with.

Mr. MANN: The State hotel at Bruce Rock has not adequate accommodation, by a dozen or a score of rooms. Because it is a State hotel, the additional accommodation is not demanded. At Dalwallinu and Kununoppin there are great opportunities for State hotels. The man who got the private license recently at Dalwallinu received a gift of probably £8,000 or £10,000, and the same thing will occur at Kununoppin. If the Government established more State hotels, they could reduce the overhead charges, as the general manager could control additional hotels. However, I am satisfied that the Government do not like being in the hotel business, and would like to get out of it.

notwithstanding the protests of the Honorary Minister.

Hon. S. W. Munsie: For what reason?

Mr. MANN: Because the Government are merely carrying on the business in a half-hearted way. They are not really catering for the public.

Hon. S. W. Munsie: Is private enterprise doing that everywhere?

Mr. Latham: Yes. It is compelled to do so by the Licensing Board.

Hon. S. W. Munsie: So are the Government.

Mr. MANN: Wherever necessary, the Licensing Board, in travelling about the country, order additional accommodation to be provided.

Hon. S. W. Munsie: There are places where the board could do it with advantage to the public.

Mr. MANN: At Merredin they ordered 17 rooms to be added, and at Wyalcatchem 20. If the Government do not intend to carry on the hotel business as it ought to be carried on, let them lease the State hotels under strict supervision.

The Premier: Get us a decent offer.

Mr. MANN: That interjection convinces me of the correctness of my view that the Government would like to get out of the business. From a pecuniary point of view, they would make more than they are making to-day, the hotels would be just as efficiently run, and the necessary additions would be made.

Mr. Brown: I am not going to take up the challenge of the member for Nelson, but I will not retract one word of what I said.

The CHAIRMAN: That has nothing to do with the vote.

Mr. LAMBERT: I do not think my opinions on this subject have altered in any way since last I spoke. The Government should either get into the hotel business or get out of it, and not carry it on in a half-hearted way. If private people conducting hotels are compelled to provide accommodation for the public, the Government should likewise be called upon to do so where they are operating. I do not know that any useful purpose has been served by the establishment of our State hotels. There are some very good privately-controlled hotels here.

Mr. Mann: They would hold their own with any hotel in Australia.

Mr. LAMBERT: The liquor trade is now on a satisfactory basis, thanks to Parliament

having recognised its responsibility by amending the licensing law. Great hardships occasionally result from the existence of State hotels. At Bruce Rock the people undoubtedly have just cause for complaint on the score of lack of accommodation. If the Government are not prepared to provide additional accommodation there, or an additional hotel, they should let someone else do it.

Hon. S. W. Munsie: We cannot stop anyone else from doing it.

Mr. LAMBERT: The principle of State hotels probably is good. If it is, the Government should continue to build hotels where they are needed, and private enterprise should not come in at all. If the idea of State hotels is wrong, the Government should get out of them and so protect the public funds. However, there is the legitimate complaint that the State prevents the provision of adequate accommodation in growing centres. As I said three or four years ago, I hope the control of State hotels generally will be reviewed. I do not think we are getting within 50 per cent. of the revenue that we should from the capital invested in them.

Mr. Latham: The State hotels are nearly all over-staffed.

Mr. LAMBERT: That may be merely a superficial view of the hon. member. In State hotels there is not that elastic control which obtains in private enterprise.

Mr. Lindsay: You do not agree with State liquor control?

Mr. LAMBERT: I do not know that the establishment of State hotels here has served any useful purpose.

Mr. Panton: Has any hotel served a useful purpose?

Mr. LAMBERT: I am not prepared to admit even that.

Mr. Panton: I am with you there.

Mr. LAMBERT: I do not wish to be sidetracked, however, on that issue by my prohibitionist friend. The idea of State hotels was a fine one theoretically. Indeed, theoretically it would be a fine thing to buy out all the private hotels lock, stock and barrel. As we have not built a State hotel for some years, it cannot be said that we are getting control of the liquor trade by means of hotels. I feel that perhaps by the retention of the freehold of the State hotels, we could arrive at our object. In that way the State would retain the unearned increment, even if the hotels themselves were

leased under highly reasonable conditions. The present position is not satisfactory.

Division put and passed.

Division—State Implement Works, £170,356:

Mr. LATHAM: Will the Minister give the Committee an idea whether we are likely to make any profit out of this trading concern?

Mr. Sleeman: Yes, when the farmers patronise it.

Mr. LATHAM: If the hon. member is answering for the Minister it is time we closed down the works. I notice that there is a deficit forecasted for this year. It is about time we took stock of the concern.

Mr. LINDSAY: I fail to understand some of the figures that appear on the Estimates. The estimate of expenditure for 1925-26 is £170,356. Then below, the estimated receipts are set out at £180,000. We are also told that the actual contribution to Consolidated Revenue for 1924-25 was nil. I would like to know how all these figures are arrived at. We are told that the interest on fixed and working capital for the current year is to be £11,500, whilst for 1924-25 it was £12,802. Has the capital cost of the works been reduced? Regarding the implements that are made and the support given the institution by the farmers, I know that if the machines turned out are suitable, farmers will buy them. I happen to have two of the ploughs, and I find them suitable for a certain class of work. If the farmers do not buy State-made machinery it is because they want something better. Farmers require the best possible machines to be got at the price. The ploughs made at the Implement Works are no cheaper than those made outside; in fact in some cases they are dearer.

Mr. Sleeman: I would make every man assisted by the State buy machinery from the Implement Works.

Mr. LINDSAY: I am not prejudiced against State implements; I have bought some State-made machinery but only because it suited me to do so. That is the only principle on which a man can run a business. I would like the Minister to tell me whether any capital has been written off the concern, and if so, how much.

Mr. NORTH: The staff at the Implement Works are operating a plant that is obsolete, and a big sum of money is required

to put it in order. Has the Minister any figures to show what would be the cost of equipping the works with a modern plant, so that the employees could give to the country a service that they would like? It is possible to say this and yet be opposed to State enterprises. It is a pity that the Implement Works should be between two fires; they are not to be closed down and they are not to be made efficient.

Mr. ANGELO: I am not supporting this vote because it is a State enterprise, but if we are to have it we should make the best use of it for the benefit of the State. I make this suggestion: First we are told that the farmers are not buying the implements because they are not as good as others, and next the member for Claremont tells us that the plant is obsolete. There is one commodity that the State will require to the extent of tens of thousands of pounds worth, a commodity that is absolutely necessary for the protection of the farming community—I refer to wire netting for keeping out dogs and rabbits. Could not the works be well employed on the manufacture of this netting? If we did that we would not be affecting anybody.

Mr. BROWN: I spoke strongly on this matter last year and I mentioned that certain implements turned out at the State Works were not up to the standard of those we were receiving from the Eastern States. This institution really ought to be a benefit to the farmers of Western Australia, if properly conducted. I live in hopes that it will be so. All that is wrong is the patents, and as time goes on the machines that are being turned out should improve.

Mr. Sleeman: You admit the works are of benefit to the farmer?

Mr. BROWN: They should be of benefit to the farmer, and if the works turned out implements of the same standard as those made in the Eastern States every one in Western Australia would patronise them. As Mr. Lindsay pointed out, a farmer knows exactly what he requires, and he purchases that and nothing else. So long as we have a heavy tariff we must keep the works going. If the works were to be closed down what would be the result? We would be sending our money away to the Eastern States. The works should be equipped with modern machinery, and if the manager made a demand for certain plant, it should be secured for him. Nothing should be put in the way of preventing the turning out of an article

equivalent to that which is produced in the Eastern States. I believe the harvesters are very good, and we know that the ploughs are being improved. It is surprising to see the number of implements that are imported from the other States and from Canada and America. As the number of our farmers increases more machinery will be required. The Government will then have to bring the State Implement Works up to date, and it will be our duty to see that they are a success.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: I am surprised to hear the member for Gascoyne advocating that these works should manufacture wire netting. Notwithstanding the high protective duty on machinery they are losing money. I know we have to compete with the older established works where mass production is going on. I am glad to hear that the machinery at the works has improved. We are asking the works to do too much, to turn out half a dozen kinds of machinery in the doing of which no factory in Australia has been successful. They also have to compete with the factories of the world. If the works can hold their own in price and quality they will have a good sale for their output. We have heard no complaints concerning them of recent date. I do not want to see any more State enterprises established. If we had private implement works here of the magnitude of the large concerns in the Eastern States, we should have more employment than is afforded by our own works, where the output is limited. A good deal of the work done there is done for the Government.

Mr. Sleeman: If we had not the State works, more money would be going to the East.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: Yes, if we had no other factories. It has to be proved that we should not have other works. We are importing ten times as much agricultural machinery as we are manufacturing. There is, therefore, plenty of room for expansion in the business. Ours is hardly a factory; it is only a small affair.

Mr. Lambert: The previous Government lent the farmers money, and allowed them to buy Eastern States implements.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: The farmers should not be compelled to buy in any particular market, merely because money has been advanced to them.

Mr. Lambert: They should be compelled to do so, all things being equal.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: There appears to be an increase in the turnover at the implement works. We do not, however, get anything cheaper under State trading than we do in other ways, and I doubt if anyone is getting more wages because of State trading.

Mr. LAMBERT: One would imagine there was a mystery about the genius displayed in the construction of an ordinary agricultural implement.

Mr. Lindsay: It looks like it in practice.

Mr. Latham: There is a mystery in the making of the castings.

Mr. LAMBERT: The real intricacies of castings have not yet been touched in Australia. If we had an expert in agricultural machinery, and the necessary equipment at the State Implement Works, our requirements should be constructed there as cheaply as anywhere else. There are eight or ten distributing and importing firms in this State. Each of these is an agent for most of the things required by the people. They import from England, America, Germany or anywhere, and will not buy anything that is manufactured in Western Australia. It pays them better to import. If a person sets out to manufacture anything in Western Australia he is boycotted.

Mr. Latham: The Implement Works are already in touch with the farmers.

Mr. LAMBERT: Various kinds of commissions are given to induce agents to sell their wares. What chance would the State Implement Works have of competing with a representative of the Sunshine harvesters?

Mr. Lindsay: Why can they not compete?

Mr. LAMBERT: There are many reasons.

Mr. Latham: Give us one.

Mr. LAMBERT: It is not for me to parade them. The hon. member, who has a knowledge of the time-payment system connected with the purchase of agricultural implements, must know to what I refer.

Mr. Latham: I know some of the advantages they have.

Mr. LAMBERT: If it is necessary to spend a sum of money on making the State Implement Works thoroughly efficient, that money should be spent upon them. It is the efficiency of the plant that enables the works to turn out good machinery.

Mr. North: The obsolete plant is not fair to the men.

Mr. LAMBERT: And more unfair to the State and the people who have to pay for the whole thing. If the works are to keep abreast of the activities of private enterprise, it is necessary to have more means of production. In order to get the best results the State Implement Works should be brought up to date and the world curried-combed for the best men to turn out machines equal to McKay's, and if possible to excel them. I believe that in an ordinary harvest probably not less than £250,000 is lost through ineffective garnering.

Mr. Lindsay: Quite right.

Mr. LAMBERT: It may run even to as much as £500,000. Surely it is an essential function of a Government to see that machinery is made available that will enable the individual producer to carry out his duties in the best possible way. If we had an improved plant at the Implement Works capable of turning out machines equal to those produced in the Eastern States, we should have a research department making investigations to ascertain where improvements could be effected. That may be a dream on my part and may be theoretical, but I think it is more essential than running an observatory, that peepshow on the hill.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The hon. member must keep to the Vote.

Mr. LAMBERT: Helping people to carry on an essential and useful service to the State is of more consequence than that peepshow on the hill. I hope the farmers' representatives will realise, now that the works are established, that we must improve our output in every way. We apparently are to be overburdened with the super protection advocated by the Federal Government. The people in the Eastern States have operated to the disadvantage of Western Australia and have not extended consideration to us in the disadvantages from which we suffer. I express the pious hope that no one associated with Governments here will take the paltry bribes from the Eastern States manufacturers who have their tentacles out in the high protection policy, for those in the Eastern States have shown little interest in or sympathy for Western Australia. It would be a good thing if we could bring the plant at the State Implement Works up to date as soon as money becomes available. The works should be put on a sound basis and thus test out the question as to whether

they are useful or not. Bearing in mind the great part agriculture plays in the development and stability of Western Australia, a quarter of a million or even half a million of money spent in bringing the works up to date will prove of advantage to the State.

Mr. SLEEMAN: I was pleased to hear the remarks of the member for Gascoyne (Mr. Angelo) regarding the necessity for the manufacture of wire netting. It is astonishing that the Eastern manufacturers have been sending supplies to Western Australia at a greater charge than that imposed on New Zealand buyers. The trouble with the people here is that we are not loyal to ourselves. It is regrettable to hear hon. members tell us that the implements manufactured at North Fremantle are inferior to imported articles.

The Minister for Agriculture: Who said that?

Mr. SLEEMAN: I have heard members say on many occasions that the quality does not compare with that of the imported machines. The same thing applies to our jams. The people want nothing but Eastern States jams.

Mr. Lambert: The importing firms always tell you that.

Mr. SLEEMAN: The people will not take anything but English chocolates.

Mr. Latham: Your views are extreme now.

Mr. SLEEMAN: There are also people who will say that we cannot turn out lining and plaster boards, but the fact remains that we are turning them out at Fremantle and that they are as good as those manufactured in any part of the world. Because these lines are manufactured in the State the prejudice against the local article results in their being regarded as no good. One would have thought that machines from the State Implement Works would have been used on the group settlements. Now that the present Government are in charge, I hope more of them will be seen in those parts.

Mr. Latham: Some of them are scrapped there now.

Mr. SLEEMAN: If the farmers will not patronise the State Implement Works, it is a bad look-out for them. People should be encouraged to use the locally manufactured article. If there had not been any State Implement Works the whole of the money would have gone out of the State. We talk

about assisting primary producers and we talk about our secondary industries. Primary producers should be the first to assist our secondary industries.

Mr. LINDSAY: I was surprised to hear the member for Coolgardie's reference to the sales of State implements. I am afraid he is not conversant with the subject. The State Implement Works have travellers in the country endeavouring to sell State implements, and also have agents appointed throughout the country. At the present time in every small country town we find three or four agents representing different types of machines, all endeavouring to place their particular machines. The State Implement Works have not been placed at a disadvantage in that respect, because the clients of the Industries Assistance Board were practically compelled to use the State Implement Works machines. In these circumstances the machines were there to prove their worth or otherwise.

The Minister for Lands: When was that?

Mr. LINDSAY: Some years ago, during the early days of the Industries Board.

Mr. Sleeman: We were told that they could not get State wagons.

Mr. LINDSAY: At the time I refer to, the works were not turning out wagons. Some farmers use the State-made machines, while others prefer the output of private enterprise. If there has not been any increase in the number of machines turned out by the State Implement Works, it means that the farmers do not regard them as suitable as those turned out by other firms. I know of no prejudice against the State machines, but I remember that during the evidence tendered to the Royal Commission we asked why State ploughs were not used, and we were told that they were not suitable.

Mr. Sleeman: Who said that?

Mr. LINDSAY: That evidence was given by group foremen. I have no prejudice whatever against the State Implement Works. I was instrumental in getting them to construct their first roadmaking machine. The road board imported a machine and Mr. Munt, Mr. Shaw and a foreman inspected a demonstration of the machine at Minnievale. They took drawings from the machine, and from those they have since constructed similar machines. The trouble about the State ploughs is that they are too heavy. The imported ploughs are lighter and fewer horses are required to operate them. The

State Implement Works have not discovered where to place the weight so as to give the greatest strength. Other machines are being continually improved. I have yet to learn that the State Implement Works have proved of any benefit to the State, seeing that they continue to make losses. If those works are to be effective they should be brought up to date with the best type of plant. There is no difficulty regarding the men.

Mr. Lambert: Without the works you would have to pay more for your machinery.

Mr. LINDSAY: No, there is no monopoly.

Mr. Marshall: Do you know anything about a mutual understanding?

Mr. LINDSAY: There is none in connection with farm implements, because of the various prices. We have imported machines from Canada, and thus there is competition all round. I do not think the State Implement Works make the slightest difference from that standpoint. In fact, some of their machines are dearer than many that we import.

The Minister for Agriculture: They are not dearer.

Mr. LINDSAY: Yes, they are. The plough is dearer.

The Minister for Agriculture: That is not so.

Mr. LINDSAY: It is a little dearer. It costs £110 for a 10-disc plough, and we can buy a 14-disc Sundercut plough for £76.

The Minister for Agriculture: They are different machines.

Mr. LINDSAY: I always go for efficiency, and that is what concerns me. I suggest that the reason why the State Implement Works cannot turn out as good machines as some of the others is that the plant is inefficient. Mr. Shaw is a fine man, and if it were at all possible he would turn out a better class machine. The plant, however, is practically the same as when it was brought from South Australia. Until such time as we modernise the plant it is useless to expect the farmers to buy State machines.

The MINISTER FOR LANDS: The hon. member said that some of the group settlement foremen had told him the State ploughs were no good. That is merely a matter of opinion on the part of the foremen. Officers of the department some time ago got a report from all the group settlement foremen and, while many said the State ploughs could not be excelled, others said they were useless. No great ability is required for the

making of agricultural machinery. For instance, the first 12 months I spent in Australia I spent in the making of winnowers. However, I am convinced that the best ploughs made in Western Australia to-day are those made at the State Implement Works. For the group settlement supplies we called for tenders, and the State Implement Works are now making the ploughs for the groups cheaper than we could import them, and the ploughs are giving general satisfaction. Where they did not give satisfaction the manager of the works went down to discover the reason. However, he found that one settler wanted one thing while another wanted another thing, and so it was very difficult. Still, to-day every satisfaction is being given by these ploughs. It is true that some of the ploughs used on the groups are not made by the State Implement Works. We have special ploughs for bottlebrush country, and certain country on the Peel estate calls for a plough made in Canada, nothing like it being made in Australia. Those ploughs have reduced the cost of the work from £9 to £3 per acre. So, not all the machinery required can be secured from the State Implement Works, but certainly so much of it as has been supplied for the group settlements has been perfectly satisfactory.

Mr. MARSHALL: One point raised by the member for Toodyay (Mr. Lindsay) struck me as remarkable in view of the declarations made by the ex-Minister for Works in this Chamber and, further, in view of the attitude of members of the Opposition who fought an election six years ago. Give a dog a bad name and it will stick to him! Prejudice the public mind, as is often done during elections, and though it be only against State implements, yet you are doing grievous injury to the sale of those implements. For years past the public Press of the State has devoted columns to the condemnation of the State Implement Works and all other State trading concerns, irrespective of whether or not the condemnation was based upon truth.

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: Nonsense!

Mr. MARSHALL: At one election the Leader of the Opposition and his supporters pledged themselves to selling the State Implement Works if they were returned to power. However, they did not sell anything of the sort.

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: You had better be careful of what you are saying.

Mr. MARSHALL: I can produce the files proving the truth of this.

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: Well, produce them.

Mr. MARSHALL: The Leader of the Opposition and his supporters pledged themselves to the sale of the State trading concerns.

Mr. Sleeman: It is as well they did not get back.

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: But they did get back.

Mr. MARSHALL: We are often told that as citizens of the State we should be patriotic and make some little sacrifice in order to keep the home markets.

Mr. Davy: What has the manufacture of ploughs by the State to do with patriotism?

Mr. MARSHALL: This much, that instead of condemning them and trying to bribe the manager of the State Implement Works—the hon. member need not frown.

Mr. Davy: I am not frowning; I am laughing at the nonsense of it.

Mr. MARSHALL: The ex-Minister for Works held up the money and the letter accompanying it. A certain individual wrote to the manager of the State Implement Works enclosing money and asking him to furnish all details that would condemn the State Implement Works.

Mr. Mann: Was it a lot of money?

Mr. MARSHALL: No, but the statement in the letter was conclusive that it was merely to cover immediate expenses and that the balance was waiting in the bank.

Mr. Davy: What did you do about it; have you prosecuted the writer of the letter?

Mr. MARSHALL: No, unfortunately the letter was not signed.

Hon. W. D. Johnson: And we are not sure yet whether the Deportation Act is constitutional.

Mr. MARSHALL: If members would be sufficiently loyal to give the State Implement Works fair and reasonable treatment, and sufficiently patriotic to advise users of agricultural implements to try those manufactured at the State Implement Works, instead of condemning them, we might prevail upon the Government to extend those works.

Mr. Davy: But we do not want to see them extended.

Mr. MARSHALL: No, we would sooner send our money to the Eastern States! That

is the extent of our patriotism! We would sooner see black labour instead of White Australians on the boats.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The hon. member must address himself to the Vote.

Mr. MARSHALL: I will be on it presently.

The CHAIRMAN: The hon. member will get on it at once!

Mr. MARSHALL: The minds of the public have been poisoned against the State Implement Works by public men and the Press of the State.

Mr. Sleeman: And that is not the only industry either.

Mr. MARSHALL: It would be better if people were a little patriotic and gave a fair deal to local production.

The MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE: The member for Toodyay (Mr. Lindsay) said the State Implement Works were of no value to the country. I say they are of great value to Western Australia because they are employed in other undertakings in addition to making agricultural machinery and they give employment to large numbers of specialised mechanics. I have been to the manager on many occasions and he has shown me work done for the Fremantle Harbour Trust and for private concerns. By these means he employs a large number of valuable mechanics.

Mr. Mann: If they were not there some other firm would be employing them.

The MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE: The value of the Works lies in their finding employment for men who will be in the service of the State when the State requires them. But for the State Implement Works, they would not be in the service of the State. The important thing is that we are able to give employment to that class of men. As for the agricultural implements, buyers are largely guided by their impressions.

[Mr Angelo took the Chair.]

Mr. Mann: No, they are guided by practical experience.

The MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE: Since 1915 I have used State harvesters exclusively. I have taken off a considerable quantity of wheat with those machines. They are still in use and will be for a number of years to come. My machines have outlasted two Sunshine machines belonging to my neighbour, partly because he does not

care for his machines as he should. The State harvester is a really good machine. In the early days a large number were issued to the I.A.B. settlers, who at the time had no knowledge of either the use or the care of agricultural machines. So, of course, they did not get very good results from the State machines. They were new at the game, and they took the impression that the machines were no good. Consequently, many of them secured Sunshine machines and, having by that time gained a little experience at the cost of the State machine, they were able to do better with the imported article. The selection of a plough is largely a matter of taste. I know people who swear by the State plough, and others who swear by the Shearer plough, the Robinson plough, or the Smith plough. The average man, because he uses a certain plough and as the result of a good season gets a good harvest, is prepared to swear by the plough he used. I have heard the State disc ploughs spoken of highly. Some farmers require a heavier disc plough to deal with stiffer country. I have used the same cultivator plough for 10 years and have had wonderful yields. There is no reason why I should change that for any other because I have had results. I had an American drill. A man who was working with me share farming said the American drill was the best. A neighbour purchased a State drill and that is still working, while my American drill was scrapped years ago. I am satisfied that if the State machinery is given a chance all round it is as good as any other. I do not say that I always use it. I would use what suited me.

Mr. Davy: Then patriotism does not enter into it.

The MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE: Eighty per cent. of my machinery is State-made machinery, but I am not bound to it all the same.

Mr. Davy: No. You buy what suits you best.

The MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE: It is all a question of taste and prejudice. No doubt Sunshine machinery has a reputation. When we first started farming the Massey Harris binder was regarded as the best. Now many people will not have it. I mention that, not to the detriment of the Massey Harris people, but merely to show that at times people have a liking for some machinery and a prejudice against other

machinery. At one time Massey Harris machinery was used almost universally; now Sunshine implements have come into vogue. There are Government departments that contend that State machinery cannot be used; they want something else. I say it can be used and used successfully, too. The State Implement Works experimented for the old settlers to the loss of the department.

Mr. Lindsay: That is quite correct.

The MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE: The settlers treated the State machinery badly and thus it got a bad name.

Mr. MANN: The Minister for Agriculture said that settlers had done considerable damage to State implements. I consider that the State implements did considerable damage to the settlers. The implements turned out now are much superior to those manufactured by the works eight or ten years ago. I have a State drill and a Union drill. The State drill is one of the old type and it frequently breaks down in the weak parts. The works officials admit that the machines built at that time have weaknesses. The drill they are turning out to-day is much better. The fault does not altogether lie with the inexperienced farmers; a good deal of the fault lies with the inexperienced mechanics or those in charge of the works eight or ten years ago. By experience they have been able to build improved machinery. My State drill has cost me much more for spare parts and repairs than has the Union drill. The implement works, however, have improved their machines at the expense of the farmer.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: The State Implement Works have completed the most successful year they have had for many years. Their financial position was the best for a considerable time, and although on the face of things there is a loss of £652, all charges have been met. It is argued that the work should not be carried on unless there is a profit. Although the loss last year was £652, no less than £80,000 was paid out in wages. It is idle to contend that if the State works were closed down, that amount of wages would still be paid locally. There are hundreds of thousands of pounds worth of agricultural implements still being imported into the State, and if private enterprise desired a field, there is an unlimited field in which to operate to overcome the present enormous importations. The engineering department showed an increase from £73,765 in 1923-24 to £80,946 last year, and

the implements increased from £73,477 to £91,321 last year. Those increases are substantial. The discrepancy in the figures pointed out by the member for Toodyay (Mr. Lindsay) is accounted for by the fact that there are back interest payments that were not met before, and have had to be met this year. I am not able to give the amount written off plant account, but nothing has been written off since the present Government took charge. Whatever was written off was done prior to our taking office.

The Minister for Lands: It was only put into a suspense account.

The MINISTERS FOR WORKS: Since Mr. Shaw took charge of the works he has not been provided with money to bring the plant up to date. The previous Government were opposed to State enterprises, and they allowed the works to slide for eight years, and so they were handicapped through having to operate with obsolete plant. It was unfair to the management and the men to expect them to compete with machines turned out by up-to-date plant. I am unable to say what amount will be required to bring the plant up to date, but as a start we are going to provide £10,000 this year.

Mr. Davy: That will not go far, will it?

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: No, but it represents a start. A number of the machines have been reconditioned and brought up to date. The £10,000 will equip one or two departments, and next year we hope to do better.

Mr. Mann: Which department is most obsolete—the turning department?

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: I do not wish to enter into details, but the obsolete plant affects the manufacture of implements as apart from the engineering side of the works. The works appear to have been allowed to drift from the idea in mind when they were established originally. The outputs of the engineering department and of the implement department were roughly fifty-fifty, but last year the manufacture of implements leapt ahead, because we have tried to get back to the original idea of assisting the man on the land. Shortly after taking charge I decided to obtain an expert in the manufacture of agricultural implements, and place him under Mr. Shaw. There is altogether too much work for one man to do, and I desired that Mr. Shaw should have time to go into the country, meet the farmers, discuss any defects in the machines,

and organise his selling department better than it has been in the past. I have obtained a man named Mr. Mellor, who was in charge of Shearer's Agricultural Implement Works in South Australia. Mr. Mellor comes from the family of Mellor Brothers of Mannum, South Australia. He is a younger son, and was chosen by the Government to tour America and England to report on agriculture. He was selected by the Imperial Government to organise the biggest aeroplane works in Great Britain during the war, although he had never seen an aeroplane made. He has testimonials from the Imperial authorities showing that the output of his factory compared more than favourably with that of any other works in Great Britain. A man who can organise works of that description, who comes from a family that has been engaged in the manufacture of agricultural implements ever since his birth, and who has been in charge of Shearer's works should be the right man for us, and he should be able to make big improvements in that section of our works. The day I visited Mannum and selected Mr. Mellor, they were laying down 200 harvesters for Western Australia. Those machines had to be shipped down the river to Murray Bridge, railed to Port Adelaide, and then shipped to Western Australia before the manufacturers were on a level with us. There is something radically wrong if they can compete against us in face of all those disadvantages. The main trouble has been that the plant at Fremantle is obsolete. To an extent we are handicapped, because the works in the East can organise for massed production, whereas we have not so large an output. Anyone who has walked around Fremantle during the last month or so must have been impressed with the enormous quantity of imported machinery. There is hardly a vacant allotment handy to the wharf that is not crowded with agricultural implements. All this machinery is purchased mainly with money found by the people of this State.

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: No fear!

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: Money that the people of this State have to guarantee.

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: Not so.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: Decidedly so. But for the Government assistance, these machines could never have been purchased.

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: That is quite wrong.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: Only by State funds could these machines have been purchased.

Mr. Lindsay: There are not so many I.A.B. clients.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: These machines have been purchased out of money advanced by the Agricultural Bank. It is only the backing given by Government institutions that has enabled farmers to import these machines. Otherwise they could not have been imported because the security was not available. It is only by the backing of public funds that these machines have been purchased. Everybody realises that. It is a boast of this State that Western Australia is the only country in the world that does it.

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: Why does the State back the men?

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: I shall not return to that. The works are there, and they are a considerable asset to the State. Over £80,000 was spent in wages and over 300 workmen were employed there last year. Our youths have opportunities of learning trades there.

Mr. Davy: Why not start a clothing factory?

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: That has frequently been considered. We are not ruling that out at all. It is quite possible that there will be a State clothing factory started. The hon. member should not get down-hearted because we have not started one in our first year of office. The manufacture of wire netting was suggested by you, Mr. Angelo; and I hope to make a very interesting announcement in that connection shortly. Is not the State benefited to the extent of the £650 apparent loss? With the new factory superintendent, Mr. Shaw will be enabled to get around among the farmers and organise his selling branches more effectively. In very few places have we an exclusive agent, and special inducements are offered to push the wares of our competitors. As regards the selling branch, we propose to establish an agency in each zone, and the agent will be equipped with a motor car and will be expected to visit each farmer in the zone by way of a vigorous campaign of pushing the products of the State Implement Works.

Mr. Lindsay: That has been done in my district for 12 months.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: Yes, and good work has been done there. Next year we hope to put on the market a new harvester, the invention of the men in charge at the works. As regards ploughs and shares, I think we shall within the next few months stop all that huge importation now obtaining. I hope the men in charge will direct their attention more to the agricultural implement side. At the same time I do not wish the engineering side to be neglected, because it offers a considerable field for our mechanics and the training of our youths. A very creditable piece of work has been turned out during the year in the lifting crane for the Fremantle Harbour Trust. Originally it was recommended that one of the cranes should be made in England and brought out here, where Mr. Shaw could look at it and decide whether he could make it, in which case three more were to be made here. I put up the proposition to Mr. Shaw, who said there was no doubt the work could be done here. Further, he said he would do it at the price of the London quotation with the added duty and freight. Before that crane was finished, those in charge were so satisfied that the job would be all right as to urge me to give Mr. Shaw the order for the other three. There is nothing approaching that crane in Australia. Sir George Buchanan, when here, said it was a really first-class piece of work. During the last few weeks I have had a proposition put up to me by the Fremantle Harbour Trust for the installation of a 20-ton crane. The western end of the wharf has been strengthened for the purpose. The proposition originally was to have the crane made by the patentee in London at his own figure, but I am pleased to say that we have been able to arrange with the patentee on payment of royalty to furnish plans of the crane, which is to be made by the State Implement Works. When the harbour is fitted with these cranes it will be the best appointed harbour in Australia, and a fine advertisement for our engineering. We have also built a boat for one of the dredges, and a small launch for the Harbour Trust. Further, we are making log-haulers for the State Sawmills. Up to now we were told that the log-haulers could not possibly be made in Australia. They have hitherto been imported from America. However, the State Implement Works are now making four. I hope that during the next year we shall be able to show a profit. Last

year's results are the closest we have been to a profit for a long time.

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: You ought to keep separately the work done for the Government.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: But in all work done for the Government the State Implement Works have to compete with outsiders.

Mr. Davy: Not in everything.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: Yes.

Mr. Davy: I do not understand how they compete, as they have not to show a profit.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: I hear all this talk about bad management and waste of money in State enterprises, about too many men being employed, about Government stroke and going slow. If those things are true, how is it outside firms cannot compete with the State Implement Works?

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: Who made those statements?

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: They have frequently been made by hon. members opposite in the way of electioneering, out on the platform. Members do not make those statements here, where they would have to face a reply.

Mr. Mann: But you do not have to pay interest and income tax.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: What sense would there be in asking one Government department to pay money to another Government department?

Mr. Mann: That is your advantage.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: It is no advantage at all. If the balance sheet had been made up in the same way as a private balance sheet, last year would have shown a big profit. I hope that with the assistance of Mr. Mellor as superintendent, and Mr. Shaw being able to get about more, and with some additional up-to-date machinery, as well as a better organisation of sales in the country, the State Implement Works this year will show better results than those of last year.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: The Minister has said that money was lent to the farmers for the purchase of machinery and that the farmers in turn should have taken State implements whether they wanted them or not. Farmers should be allowed to buy machinery wherever they like. The State would have mighty little money but for the farmers. The Minister talks about

the money advanced by the Agricultural Bank for the purpose of buying machinery. Out of £365,000 advanced by the bank to the farmers, only £11,600 was authorised for the purchase of machinery. Why should people be fooled by statements such as that made by the Minister?

The Minister for Works: They would never have been there but for the money advanced by the State.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: Does not the Minister know that £197,000 worth of machinery was imported in the last three months, and that for the whole of the 12 months the bank advanced £11,600 for machinery?

The Minister for Works: You are dodging the point.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: I am not; I am answering the reckless and unfair statement made by the Minister.

The Minister for Works: On a point of order, the Leader of the Opposition is entirely misrepresenting what I said.

Hon. G. Taylor: That is not a point of order.

The Minister for Works: I never made the statement attributed to me by the Leader of the Opposition. He is misrepresenting what I said.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: I should be ready to apologise and withdraw if I thought that I had misrepresented the Minister. I merely repeated what I thought he said. If he did not mean what he said, I am very glad.

The Minister for Works: I deny having used the words you attribute to me.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: I am glad to hear it. We have said to the people, "If you go on the land we will back you and see you through." As a result of that policy we have wealth pouring in now. I would like to see every machine used by the farmers made in Western Australia, but not by the Government.

Mr. Sleeman: Who would make the machines?

Mr. Latham: Who bakes bread—private enterprise.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: The farmer is like the Minister; he wants a machine that he knows and understands and likes. The Minister himself said that when work was required for the Fremantle harbour, prices were invited. Then he expects the farmer to do other than that. I have not heard members defame the quality of

the machinery turned out at the State Implement Works. If they knew it to be bad it would be their duty to tell the Minister. There is no desire to have the farmer landed with unsuitable machinery.

Mr. Sleeman: I want them to use the best; that is why they should use State-made machinery.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: It is not to be expected that the works at Fremantle can turn out every class of machine and make it a first-class article in a few years. That has never been done by any firm in Australia. There are not three plough makers in Australia that can turn out a first-class plough to-day.

Mr. MANN: In most instances, country agents take on consignments of a large number of spare parts. They get 10 per cent. from the Government for selling, and in many cases they add another 10 or 15 and sometimes 20 per cent. to the price of those spare parts. I can show the Minister certain documents that will prove that. I hope the Minister will bear that in mind when he is reorganising his sales department. If he does, the sales will increase.

Division put and passed.

[Mr. Panton took the Chair.]

Division—State Quarries, £22,777—agreed to.

Division — State Shipping Service, £211,800:

Mr. SLEEMAN: I congratulate the Government on having given an order for the construction of two new vessels. I am disappointed that something has not been done in connection with the wiping off the coast of the black crews. It is not fair that our boats should have to compete against vessels with black crews. We know that some of those crews were permitted to remain on the coast only on the recommendation of the previous Government. It is up to the present Government, therefore, to do something to wipe them out.

The Minister for Lands: The Government have nothing to do with it.

Mr. Lindsay: What harm are they doing, anyhow?

Mr. SLEEMAN: The "Bambra" pays £100,000 annually for coal and stores, while the other vessels spend practically nothing in the State. An attempt should certainly be made to do away with this unfair compe-

tion. I hope that trouble, similar to that which occurred on the "Bambra" recently, will not again take place. I think it was a departmental blunder that was responsible for holding up the ship for a few hours.

Hon. G. Taylor: What was the trouble?

Mr. SLEEMAN: Stewards were not paid back time to which they were entitled.

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: And do you think they should hold up a steamer whenever they like?

Mr. SLEEMAN: In this case they were entitled to what they claimed, and it was through a blunder that the payment was not made. Some inquiry should be made so that the incident will not be repeated.

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: There was no need for them to hold up the boat in order to get their money.

Mr. SLEEMAN: The workers have no right to do anything, but the employers can do as they like.

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: The Government would have paid them if it had been their due. They were badly advised.

Mr. SLEEMAN: The smaller growers in the North and the butchers are not getting the chance of shipping their stock to the metropolitan area as freely as is desirable. Unless they book space six or eight months ahead, they cannot do business.

Mr. Mann: On the offchance of their being able to take it up.

Mr. SLEEMAN: The big growers can always fill the space. These people should be given a chance to supply cheaper meat to the metropolitan area.

Mr. STUBBS: I see by this morning's paper that the farmers at Ravensthorpe cannot get their machinery down for the harvest as the "Eucla" will not carry it. They also say that the transport of their grain from Ravensthorpe costs so much that at the end of the year they are on the wrong side of the ledger. Perhaps the Minister will inquire into the matter.

The Minister for Lands: She can only carry one harvester at a time.

Mr. LAMOND: I am glad the Government have arranged for the construction of an up-to-date motor ship for the North-West trade. I understand she will be ready about November next year. The "Bambra" has done wonderful service on the North-West coast. During the war freight rates were increased, but owing to the State Shipping Service we were able to maintain pre-war rates. We owe a debt of grati-

tude to the Labour Government, who inaugurated the service. The big growers were able to hold up all the space, but since the advent of that service, things have been different. I should like to see the White Australia policy put into effect along our coast. In times of trouble black crews are very unreliable. It has frequently been necessary to stand over them with firearms in cases of trouble, in order to keep them at their work. This happened in the case of the old "Sultan," and four years ago it was reported that the coolies in the stokehold of another ship had to be kept at work with loaded firearms. It would be a good thing if all our ships were manned by white crews.

Mr. ANGELO: This division should be placed under the heading of a public utility, and I hope the Premier will amend the State Trading Concerns Act so as to make that possible. We in the North owe a debt of gratitude to the Singapore boats. But for them the North would not have been developed as much as it has been, and we should not have been able to get our produce and stock away. No doubt ultimately the Singapore boats will have to be manned with white crews, and costs will go up. I am glad the Government have ordered another State boat. I wish they had ordered two while they were about it. It has not been possible for the State service to do as well with the antiquated boats they have. The private companies had boats specially built for the exacting conditions along our coast. The Government are now getting a boat built for the trade, and will be able to compete with any other type of service. We could not wish for better captains than we have had on the State boats, or more obliging crews or capable seamen. The staff on the vessels always desire to make the journey enjoyable for the passengers. State boats have been asked to do things that other boats have not been asked to do. They have had to go into shallow water and call at small ports, such as Ballaballa and other places of the kind. We should have a fortnightly service. The other boats will not interchange tickets with the State boats, which makes it awkward for passengers. If we had a fortnightly service there would be more passengers and a larger proportion of cargo trade. With only one regular boat consignees are chary about giving her the cargo. If we had a fortnightly service with two boats we would

get four times the patronage that we have to-day. The consignees would be able to rely upon a regular service. As to the "Kangaroo," I admit she is doing good work, and earning good freights, but she is not carrying on a regular trade with the North-West, which is left almost entirely to the "Bambra." It is said that the State Shipping Service represents a big loss to the State; that loss is made by the "Bambra" because she is most unsuitable for the trade. She has to carry such a big quantity of coal that she cannot possibly take cargoes that will enable her running to be profitable.

The Premier: The new boat will be run at about one-third the cost.

Mr. ANGELO: I am certain that when we get the new boat on the coast there will be a different tale to tell at the end of the first financial year after she has commenced running. Again, the loss on the "Kangaroo" is caused by her huge capitalisation, but if the £200,000 profit she made had not been taken into Consolidated Revenue but had been set off against her capital cost, the position would have been much better.

The Minister for Lands: The loss would have disappeared.

Mr. ANGELO: About £170,000 had to be spent on the vessel when she returned so as to fit her up to carry stock. That £170,000 was added to the capital cost of the boat. On behalf of the people of the North-West I thank the Government for having ordered the new boat for the North-West coast, although I am sorry that they did not go a little further and order two.

Hon. G. TAYLOR: I draw the Minister's attention to the provisioning of the State steamers. The same method is not adopted in regard to the State ships as is adopted for other Government institutions. Tenders are not called for the supplies. I understand that the work is done by telephone; and that is not satisfactory. It would be worth the Minister's while to go into this question for I presume it has not come under his notice. If he took action, it would stop a lot of grumbling that is going on regarding the present system of provisioning the State boats.

Mr. COVERLEY: In common with the member for Gascoyne (Mr. Angelo) and the member for Pilbara (Mr. Lamond), I desire to express appreciation and to congratulate the Government on endeavouring to do something for the people of

the Kimberley districts, and of the North-West by providing an up-to-date boat for the coastal run. I am sorry that they did not order two boats while they were about it. We desire a fortnightly service on the coast which would be a great advantage. I also wish to pay a tribute to the officers and crew of the "Bambra" and "Kangaroo." The boats compare more than favourably with those manned by coloured crews. The "Bambra" is a first class boat for passengers and cargo, while the "Kangaroo" holds the reputation of being the best cattle boat on the coast. That is probably due to the care and attention given to the stock by the crew. I do not think the State boats get a fair deal from some of the agents, who also hold the agencies for the coloured-crew boats trading on the coast. Full credit is not given to the State boats for what they have accomplished. They have done a lot towards the development of the North-West and have kept people there who otherwise would have had to leave that part of the State. During the war period when freight soared so high, it would have been impossible for the people to have remained there had the State boats not given so much help in developing the coastal trade. The State boats have provided extra concessions for women and children, as well as concessions on motor cars taken up with the owners for the purpose of developing the pastoral holdings, discounts have also been allowed on wool sent south to scouring works. The agency at Wyndham is held by the Wyndham Meat Works. The whole of the cargo is dumped on what is known as the ramp at the meat works. It is held there for anything from five to seven days before the people can get their supplies. That could be obviated by the general manager of the meat works or the manager of the State Shipping Service.

Hon. G. Taylor: Cannot they get delivered as soon as the goods are landed on the ramp?

Mr. COVERLEY: No. The difficulty could be overcome if numbers were used, one number for the meat works cargo and another number for the town cargo. In that means the cargoes for the works and the town people respectively could be kept separate. Often perishable goods such as potatoes and so on are kept for seven days before the townspeople can get their co-

signments. The member for Fremantle (Mr. Sleeman) suggested that the Government should use their influence to have the ships on the North-West coast manned by white crews only, and advocated a protest against any extension of the right to have the coloured crews on ships trading on the North-West coast. I think that is a proper course to pursue.

Mr. A. WANSBROUGH: Like the members representing the North-West I desire to express my appreciation of the action of the Government in purchasing a boat to replace the s.s. "Eucla" on the South-East coast. When may we expect to see her in Australian waters?

The Premier: About April or May next.

Mr. A. WANSBROUGH: I am glad to hear that. I wish to raise a protest against the high freights charged for goods transported by the "Eucla." For conveying wheat from Ravensthorpe to Albany the freight is 18s. although the freight right round to Fremantle is only 20s. There is something wrong when the wheat can be carried so much further for 2s. extra. Rumours are afloat regarding the home port of the new vessel. It is said that it will be at Fremantle. I hope the Minister will give me an assurance that that is not so, but that it will be Albany. I notice the Minister has had great trouble in naming this vessel and that the name originally selected, "Wal-laby," could not be adopted because that name had already been registered. I suggest adopting "Tamma," which are very plentiful on the South-East coast.

Mr. MARSHALL: In the early days of the history of the State Shipping Service the figures supplied by the department were used to condemn State enterprise. I do not wish to dwell upon that aspect at length, but prefer to congratulate the Government upon their decision to replace the "Bambra." I did one trip aboard that vessel, and have come into contact with a good number of people who have done business with her. She is most unsuitable for that particular trade. She was not built for work in a tropical country, and I understand she is more suitable for the North Russian trade for which, I was told, she was built. Regarding State trading, we have heard much about the competition with private enterprise. Every time the opportunity is open to the Press and those opposed to State steamers, use is made of the "Bambra's" cost and figures to condemn the whole of the State trading con-

cerns. Yet during the war, when freights were soaring and when Inchaup and his satellites were rushing about to get the bulk of the more profitable trade, the companies operating on the North-West coast removed their two boats, leaving the State to fill the omission with State ships, although those ships might have earned greater profits elsewhere. These things were never mentioned by those opposed to State trading. Another thing about the "Bambra" is that she employs a white crew, whose wives and families reside in the State. The contrast between travelling on the State ship and on the privately owned ship is very marked. It is a pleasure to travel on the State ship, whereas on the privately owned ship the odours are intolerable. Still, the patriotism of some people drives them to travelling on the privately owned ship, despite the odours.

Hon. G. Taylor: Do you really believe that it is due to patriotism?

Mr. MARSHALL: Well no. Yet plenty go out of their way to miss the "Bambra" and get the other boat. Another thing in favour of the State steamers is that undoubtedly they have served to remove the complaint previously lodged by small growers in the North-West that while the private boats were running the cattle the whole of their stock space was chartered by the big growers, even though they did not use it all, in order to maintain the metropolitan markets for themselves by barring out the small growers. It was a very great hardship on the small growers, who then had to send their stock overland.

Hon. S. W. MUNSIE: The member for Wagin (Mr. Stubbs) complained that the State steamer "Eucla" had refused to carry State implements. I do not know the conditions prevailing, but I will certainly make inquiries and convey the result to the hon. member. The member for Pilbara (Mr. Lamond) asked for the dates when the new boats would arrive. The Premier has already answered him. The boat for the North-West is due to arrive here next November, while the boat for the South coast, it is expected, will be in commission in April next. The member for Mt. Margaret (Hon. G. Taylor) raised the point of the provisioning of the State boats. I do not know what induces the State Shipping Service to provision the boats in the way that is now done, except that the system is more satisfactory to the service than the alternative

method of calling tenders through the Tender Board; more satisfactory because the service can insist upon as much as possible of locally grown stuff being provided, whereas through the Tender Board they had not that control. The member for Kimberley (Mr. Coverley) spoke of delays in the delivery of cargo at Wyndham. Most certainly I will have inquiries made into that complaint. As to the member for Albany (Mr. A. Wansbrough) and the home port of the new boat for the south coast, I cannot answer him. Albany is the home port of the "Eucla," but I cannot say which will be the home port of the new boat. All I can say is that it will give the best possible service to the ports on the south coast. There has been at times a good deal of criticism of the "Kangaroo." During the past 18 months or two years that vessel has been maintaining a service that no private company running a steamer in Australia would ever have taken on. We could never have got any private steamship service to work up a trade between Western Australia and the East for the benefit of the producers of Western Australia, as the "Kangaroo" has done. It is as well that hon. members should know the result. The running for this trade was first established in 1921. From that date till the present the actual value of fruit exported has been £128,701, while the actual trade worked up and the value of the flour exported to the same countries has been £813,478. The State Shipping Service should certainly be given credit for that trade, which would not have been secured for Western Australia but for the State ships.

Mr. Angelo: Southerners do not realise that.

Hon. S. W. MUNSIE: I believe that with the continuance of that ship's running to the islands, we are likely to more than double those figures within the next few years. I really think the Government should be commended for the attitude they have adopted towards that proposition. Even though it is being run at a loss on the balance sheet, it must pay the State eventually.

Vote put and passed.

Votes, State Sawmills, £808,013; Wyndham Freezing, Canning and Meat Export Works, £253—agreed to.

Resolutions reported and the report adopted.

House adjourned at 10.57 p.m.

Legislative Council,

Wednesday, 25th November, 1925.

| | Page |
|---|------|
| Address: Death of Queen Alexandra ... | 2165 |
| Select Committee, Main Roads Bill, report presented ... | 2166 |
| Motion: Police Force, pension allowances ... | 2166 |
| Bills: Marketing of dried fruits, 1a. ... | 2166 |
| Brookton Recreation Reserve, 1a. ... | 2167 |
| Primary Products Marketing, 2a., defeated ... | 2167 |
| Day Baking, Com., Recom. ... | 2189 |
| Divorce Amendment, 2a., Com. Report ... | 2189 |

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

ADDRESS—DEATH OF QUEEN ALEXANDRA.

THE CHIEF SECRETARY (Hon. J. M. Drew): The Committee appointed to prepare the address of condolence to His Majesty the King in connection with his recent bereavement have prepared the draft, which is as follows:—

May it please Your Majesty—

We, Your Majesty's loyal and dutiful servants, members of the Legislative Council in Parliament assembled, humbly approach Your Majesty with feelings of deepest devotion to Throne and person. We desire to assure you of our great sympathy and sorrow for Your Majesty and the other members of the Royal Family in the sad affliction and bereavement that has befallen Your Majesty and your family by the lamented death of your mother, the Dowager Queen Alexandra, who, during a period of over sixty-two years, had endeared herself to the hearts of all your subjects, for her kind and charitable actions.

We pray that the blessing of the Almighty may rest upon Your Majesty, Her Majesty the Queen and the other members of the Royal Family and that Your Majesty may be thereby sustained in your heavy affliction.

I move—

That the Address be agreed to.

Hon. J. W. KIRWAN: I second the motion.

Question put and passed.

On motion by Chief Secretary ordered: That the address be transmitted by Message to the Assembly desiring its concurrence therein.