

pared to give consideration to the matters that will then come before us and, if necessary, sit well into the evening in order to get through the work that will be before us. Consequently I move—

That the House at its rising adjourn until Tuesday, 27th October.

Question put and passed.

House adjourned at 5.9 p.m.

Legislative Assembly,

Wednesday, 14th October, 1931.

	PAGE
Questions: Rabbit-proof fences	4630
Street betting, fines	4630
Hospitals, finance	4630
Bills: Land Tax and Income Tax (No. 2), 1R. ...	4630
Vermis Act Amendment (No. 2), 1R. ...	4630
Dividend Duties Act Amendment, 1R. ...	4630
Stamp Act Amendment (No. 4), 1R. ...	4630
State Savings Bank Transfer, Council's amendment	4630
Poor Persons Legal Assistance Act Amendment, 3R.	4632
Reserves (No. 2), 2R.	4632
Roads Closure (No. 2), 2R., Com. report ...	4632
Licensing Act Amendment (No. 4), 2R. ...	4660
Annual Estimates: Votes and Items discussed ...	4632
Premier's Department	4633
Governor's Establishment	4634
Tourist Bureau	4639
Literary and Scientific Grants	4639
Treasury	4639
Audit	4640
State Savings Bank	4640
Taxation	4641
Workers' Homes' Board	4641
Miscellaneous Services	4641
State Accident Insurance Office	4644
Agricultural Bank, Industries Assistance Board, and Soldiers' Land Settlement	4645

The SPEAKER took the Chair at 1.30 p.m., and read prayers.

QUESTION—RABBIT-PROOF FENCES.

Mr. GRIFFITHS asked the Minister for Agriculture: 1, What amount of money has been expended on the construction of the rabbit-proof fences and their upkeep to the 30th September? 2, What purpose are the fences now serving? 3, Do the Government intend to continue the present expenditure on the fences? 4, Have the Government considered the advisability of distributing the fences gratuitously among the farmers and pastoralists adjacent to them? 5, Seeing that there are more rabbits between No. 1 and No. 2 fences than are outside of them,

will the Government consider the advisability of cutting out the maintenance of No. 1 fence?

The MINISTER FOR LANDS (for the Minister for Agriculture) replied: 1, The original cost, £352,000; annual maintenance, 1905-30, £12,000 per annum; maintenance for 1930-31, £8,000; maintenance up to 30th September, £1,600. 2, Preventing the movement of rabbits and other vermin, such as emus, and to a lesser extent dogs, from one area to the other. 3, Yes. 4, No. 5, The Government are unaware that there are more rabbits between the No. 1 and No. 2 fences than outside of them.

QUESTION—STREET BETTING, FINES.

Mr. MARSHALL (for Hon. W. D. Johnson) asked the Premier: 1, What is the total of fines imposed for street betting during the 15 months ended 30th September? 2, What amount has been paid into general revenue as a result of those prosecutions?

The PREMIER replied: 1, £7,434 15s. 2, £7,405 5s.

QUESTION—HOSPITALS, FINANCE.

Hon. S. W. MUNSIE asked the Minister for Health: 1, How much money was collected under the Hospital Fund Act from 1st January, 1931, to 30th June, 1931? 2, What amount was paid from Consolidated Revenue towards the upkeep and maintenance of hospitals during the financial year ended 30th June, 1931?

The MINISTER FOR HEALTH replied: 1, £64,834. 2, £47,860.

BILLS (4)—FIRST READING.

- 1, Land Tax and Income Tax (No. 2).
- 2, Vermis Act Amendment (No. 2).
- 3, Dividend Duties Act Amendment.
- 4, Stamp Act Amendment (No. 4).

Introduced by the Premier.

BILL—STATE SAVINGS BANK TRANSFER.

Council's Amendment.

Returned from the Council with an amendment.

Standing Orders Suspension.

On motion by the Premier, Standing Orders suspended to enable the Council's amendment to be taken into consideration at this sitting.

In Committee.

Mr. Richardson in the Chair; the Premier in charge of the Bill.

Clause 3. Delete all the words after "agreement" in line 21 to the end of the clause.

The PREMIER: The amendment proposes to delete the words added in this Chamber, reading, "and subject to the bank undertaking to have all printing and all stationery requirements for the Western Australian business executed in Western Australia." Since the amendment was made, I have received a letter from the bank as follows:—

Perth, 10th October, 1931.—With reference to the request by the bank that the amendment to the Savings Bank Bill regarding printing and stationery be expunged or suitably altered, the bank undertakes, in the event of the clause being expunged, to have printing and stationery requirements for all Western Australian branches executed, as far as may be practicable, in Western Australia.—R. A. Love, Manager.

Some printing is special work done on special bank paper and under special supervision. One can understand that that is so in connection with all banks. As far as the printing can be done here, the bank will have it done for all its branches in Western Australia. I hope members will be satisfied to accept the letter as an undertaking by the bank to do all it can to keep the printing in Western Australia.

Mr. Marshall: That will be none at all.

The PREMIER: It would be the greater part of the printing.

Mr. Marshall: It is all done in Western Australia at present.

The PREMIER: Not by the Commonwealth Bank.

Mr. Sleeman: What sort of printing is not done here?

The PREMIER: Everything that can be done is done here. I think the letter is perfectly satisfactory. Of course it would be very difficult to enforce the provision.

Hon. P. Collier: Does the letter indicate that all the printing possible will be done here?

The PREMIER: Yes.

Hon. P. Collier: Apart from such printing as is done under special conditions?

The PREMIER: Yes.

Hon. P. Collier: Does the letter say that?

The PREMIER: It undertakes definitely that that shall be done.

Hon. J. C. Willcock: It says, "As far as practicable."

The PREMIER: It says that all the printing that can be done here will be done here. The letter is signed by the manager of the Commonwealth Bank in Perth, and I regard the assurance as satisfactory. I move—

That the amendment be agreed to.

Mr. MARSHALL: I do not like the amendment at all. The whole of the printing work required by the State Savings Bank was done in Western Australia. The Commonwealth Bank now desire to make some reservation in that respect. Under the amendment this State might retain a little of the printing work for a brief period, but ultimately the whole of it would be whittled away from us and done in the Eastern States.

The Premier: That is not right.

Mr. MARSHALL: Naturally that will happen. The work desired to be taken away is the standard class of printing, which will eventually be all the work needing to be done. I have not the Premier's confidence in the Federal Government's attitude. There are enough unemployed in Western Australia already. The amendment affords us no security whatever. Some of the work is to be taken over to the East immediately, and ultimately the rest will follow.

Mr. SLEEMAN: I hope some other wording will be adopted. Owing to the insertion of the words "as far as practicable," we are now where we stood originally. The argument will be that it is not practicable to do the printing for the bank in this State. All the work hitherto done here for the institution should be compulsorily retained.

Mr. J. H. SMITH: I agree with the member for Murehison. If we accept the Council's amendment, the printing work will be lost. It should be saved to our own printers.

Question put and passed; the Council's amendment agreed to.

Resolution reported, the report adopted, and a message accordingly returned to the Council.

BILL—POOR PERSONS LEGAL ASSISTANCE ACT AMENDMENT.

Read a third time, and transmitted to the Council.

BILL—RESERVES (No. 2).

Second Reading.

Debated resumed from the previous day.

HON. M. F. TROY (Mt. Magnet) [4.55]: I have no objection to the Bill. The arrangement proposed appears to be desirable; and I understand that the member for Guildford-Midland (Hon. W. D. Johnson), who has been consulted, approves of the measure. The only possible objection could be to the fact of the road board securing a gain of 10 acres out of the transaction. The area given to the board in exchange is 10 acres greater than that taken from the board. Looking at the map, I am disposed to think that the giving of the proposed area to the board will destroy the remainder for cutting-up, and make it an ugly shape. In my opinion, the former arrangement was more satisfactory. Certainly the exchange will create difficulties as to the settlement of the other area. I suppose, however, that the Minister for Lands has given the fullest consideration to the matter, and so I see no serious reason to object to the Bill. While supporting the second reading, I draw attention to the fact that the exchange will make the cutting-up and settlement of the other portion of the reserve difficult.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Mr. Richardson in the Chair; the Minister for Lands in charge of the Bill.

Clauses 1, 2—agreed to.

Clause 3—Reserve A 18325:

The MINISTER FOR LANDS: I have no doubt that the whole of this land will be set aside for park and recreation purposes. There is always great need to obtain open spaces. People are reluctant to hand over areas for the benefit of the public generally.

On the west side of the reserve there is some high land, and the Town Planning Commissioner is inquiring as to the suitability of the site for a hospital. Provided the position is not subject to the noises usually associated with a sports ground, it may be set aside for that purpose. The department do not at present anticipate the disposal of the land for residential purposes, as it is rather low-lying. Consideration has been given to the peculiar shape of the land; but that area will be leased to the golf club, and the remaining portion will be available for recreation purposes.

HON. M. F. TROY: The subdivision of the area will be spoiled, and the shape will be very peculiar. If it were squared off, it would not affect the subdivision so much.

The Minister for Railways: The proposal is in accordance with the Town Planning Commissioner's lay-out of the roads.

The Minister for Lands: The position is due to the levels.

Clause put and passed.

Clause 4, Title—agreed to.

Bill reported without amendment, and the report adopted.

BILL—ROADS CLOSURE (No. 2).

Second Reading.

Debate resumed from the previous day.

MR. SLEEMAN (Fremantle) [5.5]: The member for South Fremantle (Hon. A. McCallum) is interested in the Bill and he assures me that it is all right. There is no objection to the Bill being agreed to.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee, etc.

Bill passed through Committee without debate, reported without amendment and the report adopted.

ANNUAL ESTIMATES, 1931-32.

In Committee of Supply.

Resumed from the previous day; Mr. Richardson in the Chair.

Department of the Premier (Hon. Sir James Mitchell, Minister):

Vote—Premier's Department, £83,039:

Item, Royal and other Commissions of Inquiry, £200:

Mr. J. I. MANN: A Royal Commission was appointed some time ago to investigate the disabilities of farmers throughout the State. Much evidence was taken and many recommendations were submitted to the Government in the Commission's report. Naturally, the farming community have been looking forward to the Government taking action in order to save the industry. Up to the present, the Royal Commission appears to have resulted as most other such inquiries; the report has been more or less pigeon-holed, and no action has been taken following upon the recommendations made. I earnestly request the Government to take the matter into consideration and they might provide an opportunity for a thorough discussion of the report of the Royal Commission, with a view to attempting to solve the problems confronting the farmers to-day.

Hon. W. D. JOHNSON: I support the remarks of the member for Beverley. It had been my intention to speak at some length on the general discussion, but circumstances prevented me. I can do so just as well on the item. I would not like to support the hon. member to the extent of requesting that the Royal Commission's report be placed before the House for discussion. There is nothing of value in that report, and we did not secure any assistance from the inquiry. I would not accept any of the recommendations made with the exception of the proposal to establish one handling agency to deal with the wheat, and thus do away with the multiplicity of handling agents that we have to-day. That recommendation of the Royal Commission would make for economy, which would be a saving to the farmer. Apart from that, I do not know of any suggestion made by the Royal Commission that will tend to relieve the distressful condition of the farming industry to-day. Something must be done. We cannot allow the industry to continue in the way in which it is struggling to-day. We must realise that although crops have been put in and will be harvested, unless there is some alteration, there will be little, if any, cropping undertaken next year. Credits have been strained in order to carry on this year, but there will be no further credits for next season. The position is alarming.

It is useless attempting to disguise the fact that the industry is in a frightful condition. The position is so bad that we cannot allow it to remain as it is at present. The Government attempted to get some idea of what ought to be done by means of the Royal Commission, but that inquiry has not assisted us at all. If the Royal Commission could not do it, and the Government cannot do it, then Parliament must undertake the task. We hear about National Governments being formed in these days, but I am opposed to such bodies being established.

The CHAIRMAN: I would point out to the hon. member that we are discussing the item dealing with Royal Commissions, not National Governments.

Hon. W. D. JOHNSON: I realise that fact. Where a Royal Commission has failed in a matter such as that I have referred to, then it is worthy of consideration as to whether a committee of Parliament could not do what the Commission failed to achieve. Unless the Government take the matter into consideration seriously and do something immediately, chaos will reign.

The PREMIER: I do not agree with all that the member for Guildford-Midland has said regarding the report of the Royal Commission, to which he referred. The report submitted was long and elaborate and has received earnest consideration. The truth is that money is required, and it is not available. The farmers require some assistance from the outside creditors. So far as I can see, the only step that would help the farmers to-day would be for the outside creditors to take surplus proceeds, as they did in 1915. I do not think that the farmers can get through by any other method. To aid them as we did in the past is impossible these days because we have not the necessary funds with which to help them. If the farmers were allowed to proceed with cropping, then the creditors, as in the past, would receive the proceeds of the harvest over the cost of production. No report of a Royal Commission will save the industry. The only thing that can do that will be consideration extended to the farmers by those to whom money is owed. There have been suggestions for writing down indebtedness but that indebtedness is not with the Government except in respect of Agricultural Bank advances and outstanding taxes, land rents and so

on. To a large extent the farmers' debts are to outside people. To-day creditors should realise that, with the price of wheat at its present figure, there can be little return to be secured from the farmers. If they do not choose to carry on operations, then the creditors cannot expect to get any money from them. We are going into the whole question and are giving it earnest consideration. There are innumerable difficulties, and we are without funds. The claims of outside creditors amount to an enormous figure. I can assure hon. members that the Government have every desire to help the industry, but we have not the opportunity to do so.

Mr. DONEY: Arising out of the report of the Royal Commission, I ask the Premier to indicate whether the Government have come to any decision regarding the introduction of legislation to prevent the after-harvest scramble for crop proceeds that formed such a pronounced and regrettable feature of last year's operations.

Mr. J. I. MANN: While I agree with much that the Premier has said, and realise it is not possible for the Government to find the whole of the money, would it not be advisable to convene a conference representative of the agricultural industry, with a view to arriving at some scheme to meet present-day difficulties? Take the position of the private creditors. Apparently the farmer is at their mercy, and after the harvest I believe there will be an unholy scramble.

Hon. P. Collier: That has nothing to do with the item under discussion.

Mr. J. I. MANN: It relates to Royal Commission matters.

Hon. W. D. Johnson: It is not out of order.

Hon. P. Collier: Of course it is.

Hon. W. D. Johnson: It is not.

Hon. P. Collier: Well, I say it is.

Hon. W. D. Johnson: Then there is a difference of opinion.

Mr. J. I. MANN: Unless something is done before the harvest is garnered, I am afraid there will be added difficulties in the future.

Hon. P. Collier: You can talk about that on the Estimates for the Agricultural Department, or the Lands Estimates, but not on this item; it is absolutely out of order.

Mr. J. I. MANN: Would it not be possible to bring about some improvement? I mean, so far as next year's crop is con-

cerned? I hope the Committee will try to take some steps that will result in bringing about a conference of all concerned. Failing this, there can be no doubt we are going to have ruination of the industry before very long.

Mr. PIESSE: I am sorry the Premier was not able to make a more definite announcement as to the intention of the Government regarding the Commission's recommendations. It was understood there was hope of some immediate relief being afforded, or some better arrangement being arrived at, as between the farmers and those who have been assisting them to put in their crops during the past year. The recommendations made by the Commission are very important, and for a considerable time the primary producers have been hoping that some announcement would be made by the Government as to those recommendations. It has been suggested that there should be a scheme for the assistance of some 2,000 necessitous farmers. We know it would be very difficult to put into operation at present any scheme involving a large expenditure of public funds, but I think the Government should assure the House and the farmers that they are seriously considering the Commission's report, and that some steps will be taken to put the recommendations into effect. In some districts already the farmers have stated that they will hold up their crops pending a decision by the Government on various points of importance to the industry. Only the other day, in my own electorate a resolution was carried by the Wheatgrowers' Union demanding some concession by the Government in regard to the security of tenure before delivery would be made of the coming harvest. I hope the farmers will not be driven into that position, and I feel sure it could be averted if the Government would seriously take into consideration the recommendation made by the Commission.

The Premier: Serious consideration of the position is now being given by the General Manager of the Agricultural Bank.

Vote put and passed.

Note—Governor's Establishment, £1,896:

Mr. SLEEMAN: A few weeks ago the Premier told us that when the Estimates were under consideration we should have opportunity for a full discussion of the ques-

tion of appointing another Governor. Provision for the Governor himself is under a special Act, but members were assured there would be in the Estimates a line on which we could discuss the question of whether or not another Governor should be appointed. I should like to know from the Premier whether it is intended to appoint another Governor, or whether we are to have merely an Administrator, as at present.

The PREMIER: I do not know whether we are likely to ask for the appointment of another Governor in the immediate future. Of course, it is not provided for here, and this is not the place for such a discussion. All I am asked is whether it is the intention of the Government to request the appointment of another Governor. I think another Governor ought to be appointed some day, for we are a sovereign State, and we have just as much need for a representative of His Majesty as have the Federal Government. However, at present it is not intended to ask that any further appointment be made.

Mr. SLEEMAN: In view of the Premier's answer, it is up to the Committee to see that some action is taken to prevent the bringing out of another Governor. The Chief Justice of the State is at present Administrator, and can quite efficiently carry out the official duties of the Governor. As for the social duties of the position, we can well do without them. The other day we had with us Sir Isaac Isaacs, previously Chief Justice of the Commonwealth, who has since been appointed Governor-General. Our present Chief Justice can quite well carry out the duties of Governor of this State. The Premier says this is not the place in which to raise this question, but when we were discussing it on a previous occasion he definitely promised that there would be on the Estimates a line that would afford us opportunity to debate the whole subject. We should now take definite action so as to preclude the possibility of the Government reconsidering the appointment of a Governor; there should be a definite instruction from this Committee that no further Governor shall be brought here.

The CHAIRMAN: That would require a separate motion.

Mr. SLEEMAN: If I were to move that the whole of this Vote be struck out, and if the motion were carried, would that have the desired effect? Of course, if we were to do

that, we would be putting a difficulty in the way of the Lieutenant-Governor carrying on.

Hon. J. C. Willecock: As a protest, move to reduce by £1 the item providing for the orderly.

The CHAIRMAN: Even if the Committee agreed to cut out the whole of this Vote, it would not prevent the Government from asking for the appointment of another Governor; it would merely take away the provision made in this Vote.

Mr. SLEEMAN: Well, I will move to delete the item making provision for cleaning during the Governor's absence. If we are not going to have another Governor, the place will not require to be cleaned for him.

The Minister for Railways: Surely you do not wish to sack a cleaner!

Mr. SLEEMAN: I do not wish to sack anybody at all, but the Governor. But I do wish to test the feeling of the Committee in regard to the appointment of another Governor. I do not wish to injure anyone, but I say the cleaner required for the Governor's residence could well be employed in some other department. I am only afraid the Government will see fit to ask for the appointment of another Governor after Parliament goes into recess. As a protest against the appointment of another Governor, I will move to reduce the total vote by £1.

Hon. J. C. Willecock: As an indication that the Committee does not desire the appointment of a further Governor.

The CHAIRMAN: When moving to reduce the Estimates, the hon. member must move for a reduction by some substantial amount.

Mr. SLEEMAN: Well, I am moving to reduce the Vote by £1.

The Minister for Railways: Which is a substantial amount these days.

The CHAIRMAN: The hon. member might move to reduce it by £10.

Mr. SLEEMAN: Very well, I will go one better. I move an amendment—

That the Vote be reduced by £20.

The time is long past when it was necessary to bring out from England a gentleman of military career to be Governor of the State, for there are already within the State gentleman who are very well able to do the work.

Hon. W. D. JOHNSON: I support the hon. member in his effort to get some declaration that the very substantial economy which has been effected as the result of utilising the Chief Justice as Administrator shall be for long maintained. The hon. member tried to raise this issue on a previous occasion, but was authoritatively advised to wait until the Estimates were reached. We now have the Estimates, but it still seems difficult to get a definite assurance. I am anxious that Parliament should be given an opportunity to voice its opinion before another Governor is appointed. The Government should not consider the appointment of a further Governor until Parliament is consulted. Under these Estimates, it is quite possible for the Government at any time to open up negotiations at Home for the purpose of having another State Governor appointed. The Premier should give the Committee an assurance that nothing will be done towards the appointment of a further Governor until Parliament has been consulted.

The PREMIER: There are two opinions on this subject; the hon. member who has just sat down represents one view, while I represent another. We are an autonomous State, and as such have always had a representative of His Majesty here. I think we should maintain the rights we possess. There are some very wrong ideas regarding the usefulness of the King's representative here. The King rules not only over Britain but over the Empire, and he must have a representative wherever there is a government such as ours.

Hon. P. Collier: Has not he a representative in the Governor-General?

The PREMIER: Not to quite the same extent. I do not think we should weaken our rights, particularly at this time. The member for Murchison wants to know what the Governor does.

Mr. Marshall: Even the Royal Show went on this year without him.

The PREMIER: And it will go on for years without the hon. member. As a sovereign State we ought to have a representative of the King here, and we should maintain the State as a sovereign State. We should not weaken any of our rights to govern the country. The original idea of Federation was very different from the realisation. We thought that all we had been in the habit of doing, outside of a few

things to be transferred to the Commonwealth, would still remain, but that has not been the experience. We still own the lands of the State, as we always did, but that is about all. As to altering the form of Government at this stage, I have no intention of agreeing to such a proposal.

Hon. W. D. Johnson: Will you agree to consult Parliament before you recommend an appointment?

The PREMIER: We are expressing our views on the question now. It has meant a good deal to this State to have a Governor from the Old Land as representative of the King. He has helped our credit and helped the work we have to do very considerably.

Hon. P. Collier: Would not a local appointee represent the King just as well? To say that a man born in Australia would not represent the King in the same way as a man born in the Old Country is absurd.

The PREMIER: I was referring to the other advantages arising from the appointment of a man from the Old Land.

Hon. P. Collier: Why do people say there is not an Australian fit to be Governor of the State?

The PREMIER: Who says that? Any Britisher may be appointed Governor of the State.

Hon. P. Collier: We know it is not so.

The PREMIER: I am speaking of the advantage that accrues to the State from having a Governor from the Old Land.

Hon. P. Collier: There is no advantage about it.

The PREMIER: The Leader of the Opposition must realise that there is some advantage.

Hon. P. Collier: I know, from my own personal knowledge, that the King was not aware who was Governor of the country. He asked me who was the Governor.

The PREMIER: That may be so.

The Minister for Railways: You should have said, "I am."

Hon. P. Collier: As a matter of fact he thought the Governor was Tom Bridges, who was Governor of South Australia.

The PREMIER: Then he was not far out. I have heard the hon. member speak of the good that a Governor could do.

Hon. P. Collier: Why oppose the appointment of an Australian?

The PREMIER: I am not opposing the appointment of an Australian. We have just had the pleasure of entertaining the

Governor-General, who is an Australian. That is not the question. Whenever a Governor is appointed, we have an opportunity to approve the appointment, and Governors generally have been satisfactory. The question is, are we to have a Governor some day or not?

Hon. P. Collier: Yes, and let him be an Australian.

The PREMIER: That is another question.

Hon. W. D. Johnson: We want to avoid the expense.

Mr. Hegney: We cannot afford it.

Hon. J. C. WILLCOCK: If the people of the State could be consulted about the appointment of a Governor, there would be an overwhelming majority at the present time against it.

The Premier: We do not propose to make an appointment now.

Hon. J. C. WILLCOCK: What does "now" imply, to-day, to-morrow, next week, during the financial year, or during the term of office of the present Government? If the Premier would say that his Government would not recommend any appointment during the present financial year—

Hon. P. Collier: He has given no assurance.

Hon. J. C. WILLCOCK: That is so. If Parliament closes in seven or eight weeks' time, is it intended in the following week to recommend the appointment of a Governor? Goodness knows the financial position is grave enough, and there is no necessity for the appointment of a Governor during the present financial year at any rate.

Hon. P. Collier: Of course there is not.

Hon. J. C. WILLCOCK: If the Premier says there is no necessity to appoint a Governor, and does not want to waste public funds on such an appointment, that will probably satisfy members as regards the passing of the Estimates. Whether members who feel strongly on the matter would then table a motion to secure an expression of opinion would be for them to determine. We would be satisfied if the Premier gave an assurance that during the present financial year the Government would not recommend an appointment. The Premier spoke of the advantage to the credit of the State by having a Governor from the Old Country.

Hon. P. Collier: That is all balderdash.

Hon. J. C. WILLCOCK: The credit of the State is determined by hard-headed business men on the financial position. Whether we had as Governor the Prince of Wales or the Chief Justice would not make a penny of difference to the amount of money that London financiers would be prepared to advance us.

Hon. P. Collier: Very few people know who is the Governor.

Hon. J. C. WILLCOCK: Previous to Federation the people of Australia thought one of the first steps to be taken would be the abolition of the office of State Governor.

Mr. Panton: We were told it would be so.

Hon. J. C. WILLCOCK: The people have never been given an opportunity to express an opinion on the question. In prosperous times no one bothered much about the comparatively small expenditure on a Governor, but in these times every penny of expenditure counts.

Hon. P. Collier: I was in England when the ex-Governor General was appointed, and everyone was surprised that a mere party political hack should be appointed. No one knew him or anything about him.

Hon. J. C. WILLCOCK: It would be much better to discuss the principle rather than individuals.

Hon. P. Collier: They are party hacks, generally. That is a fact.

Hon. J. C. WILLCOCK: The people of Western Australia do not desire that a Governor should be appointed. According to the Press the Statute of Westminster is to be one of the first measures submitted to the Imperial Parliament by the new Government, and I think the sovereign rights we have, in accordance with which the King maintains direct communication with the States, will be done away with, and there will be no necessity to have a Governor to provide a direct link with the King. Communication can be conducted through the Governor General.

The Premier: We have protested successfully so far against the passing of the Statute of Westminster.

Hon. J. C. WILLCOCK: I do not think any notice has been taken of the protest.

The Premier: Oh yes, it has.

Hon. J. C. WILLCOCK: The Press informs us that the Imperial Government desire to introduce the Statute of Westminster as one of their first legislative acts. Evidently the protest has not been regarded seriously.

The Premier: The Statute of Westminster has not been passed so far.

Hon. J. C. WILLCOCK: From the point of view of the British people, there are more important questions to be considered than the Statute of Westminster. So far as I can gauge public opinion in this State, it is almost unanimously opposed to the appointment of a Governor at the present time. That being so, it is the duty of the Government to give effect to the wishes of the people. In the correspondence that has passed between the Imperial Government and State Governments, it has been said that if the States expressed a unanimous wish against the appointment of Governors from the Old Country, the British Government would have no hesitation in acceding to the wish, but while there was a divergence of opinion, no alteration would be made to the existing system. We do not want any divergence of opinion. We think there is no necessity for such ornamental appointments in these times, and the Government should make a pronouncement to that effect. If the Premier announced that during the present financial year the Government had no intention of recommending an appointment, it would have the endorsement of 90 per cent. of the people. I know the duties the Governor has to perform, and feel that the present occupant of the position can very well carry them out, except those appertaining to the social side of the position.

The Premier: Purely for financial reasons, we are not going to make an appointment now.

Hon. J. C. WILLCOCK: I do not think the Premier expects the position to improve during the period covered by these Estimates.

Mr. WELLS: I do not wish to discuss the merits or demerits of the appointment of a State Governor, but I think the Premier would be giving nothing away if he made a statement on the subject that is now being debated. People would be relieved if they knew it was not intended to make an appointment during the present financial year. We are all doing our utmost to help the unemployed, and I think it would be a wise thing to save the money involved in this post.

Mr. SLEEMAN: I am prepared to withdraw the amendment if the Premier will give an assurance that no appointment will

be made until Parliament meets again. The Premier casts a reflection upon the manhood of Australia when he contends that His Majesty cannot be represented by other than an overseas Governor.

The Premier: I did not say that.

Mr. SLEEMAN: He said His Majesty must be represented by someone brought in from overseas. He also said that one Governor was not enough for Australia. He has just given away our only State Savings Bank, and thus relies upon the one Commonwealth Savings Bank. If one bank is enough, one Governor is enough.

Hon. P. Collier: The Governor is appointed by the political party in power for the time being in England.

Mr. SLEEMAN: The salary attached to the position would be better spent in providing for necessitous cases that arise in the State. I hope the Premier will give an assurance that nothing will be done before next session.

The PREMIER: I have already said that, for financial reasons, the Government have no intention of approving of a new appointment just now. I wish to make it clear that I think we ought to have a Governor of the State.

Hon. J. C. Willcock: Make it definite that there will be no appointment made this financial year. If you give a definite promise like that, we will accept it.

The PREMIER: For financial reasons there is no intention to appoint another State Governor now.

Hon. J. C. Willcock: During this financial year?

The PREMIER: I should be glad if I thought we could get out of our financial position by the end of the current period. So long as the depression lasts, I do not think we should appoint another State Governor. There is no intention to appoint one during this financial year, because I am quite certain existing circumstances will not permit us to do so.

Mr. MARSHALL: The Premier's statement is contrary to his Estimates. These show an estimated expenditure of £1,600 for the Governor's salary and £282 for the Governor's secretary.

The Premier: We cannot have a Governor's establishment without some cost. This is the amount to which the cost has been reduced. It does not cover any particular term of the year.

Mr. SLEEMAN: In view of the statement of the Premier, I will withdraw my amendment.

Amendment by leave withdrawn.

Vote put and passed.

Votes—Executive Council, £5; London Agency, £8,804; Public Service Commissioner, £1,842; Government motor car service, £771; Printing, £48,741—agreed to.

Vote—Tourist Bureau, £1,644:

Mr. SAMPSON: The State does not take full advantage of the opportunities it possesses to attract visitors.

Hon. P. Collier: It does not advertise.

Mr. SAMPSON: There should be greater publicity overseas concerning the many points of interest in this State. I was very much impressed by the work that is being done by Canada in this direction.

The Minister for Railways: But Canada is a Dominion.

Mr. SAMPSON: The provinces of Canada also advertise oversea.

The Minister for Railways: That has no effect. Only the Dominion advertising is really valuable.

Mr. SAMPSON: British Columbia advertises in England. Western Australia should make known abroad its forest country, its gold-bearing country, its North-West, and other features of interest. Advertising to attract tourists is not anything in the nature of a State trading concern. The Government would be doing a valuable work if they laid out money in making the State known.

The Minister for Railways: A lot of money will certainly go out of the State.

Mr. SAMPSON: Tens of millions of dollars go into Canada each year as a result of the tourist traffic.

The Minister for Railways: And two million pounds a year comes to Australia from tourists.

Mr. SAMPSON: Western Australia does not receive its share of that. It would pay us to treat this as a business proposition. We are losing revenue by allowing the special opportunities we can offer people to enjoy themselves here to go by default. We should make our country better known and attract to it visitors with money to spend. The United States citizen is a great trav-

eller. He goes to Canada and other parts of the world, because he is attracted to them by what he reads concerning them, and he can also be attracted to this country.

Mr. Panton: The tourist traffic is quite an industry in New Zealand.

Mr. SAMPSON: New Zealand does make itself known.

The Minister for Railways: And so does Australia.

Mr. SAMPSON: I hope that greater attention will be given to this matter.

Vote put and passed.

Vote—Literary and Scientific Grants, etc., £8,765:

Mr. SLEEMAN: There is an item here, £80, for the Royal Society. For what purpose is this money mainly used?

The PREMIER: It is a grant, reduced from £100. It is made to the Royal Society, and represents the cost of producing its journal. The money is paid to the Government Printer.

Hon. P. Collier: The society is made up of the scientific people of the country.

The PREMIER: Yes. A subsidy of this nature is given in all the States to the Royal Societies.

Hon. P. Collier: The society here is a body of scientists.

Item—Chair of Anthropology, Sydney University, £75:

Mr. DONEY: What benefit accrues to the State from this expenditure of £75?

The PREMIER: The amount is contingent upon an arrangement for the time being.

Vote put and passed.

Vote—Centenary Celebrations, £303—agreed to.

Vote—Treasury, £10,385:

Mr. SLEEMAN: Where do pensions for civil servants appear?

The Attorney General: Under retiring allowances.

Mr. SLEEMAN: I am referring to civil servants retired on pensions.

The PREMIER: Such cases would be under special Acts. The rights are statutory.

Vote put and passed.

Vote—Audit, £11,365:

Mr. COVERLEY: This vote shows a recoup for services performed for the Public Works Department and the Wyndham Meat Works. Why is there a recoup as regards the meat works? The practice used to be to send a Government auditor to Wyndham; but this season there has been only an internal audit, the internal auditor being subordinate to the general manager of the works.

The PREMIER: Services are rendered by the Audit Branch to various departments, and at the end of the year the cost is debited to each department concerned. This year the amount of the recoup is £160, for some small services rendered.

Mr. CORBOY: In this vote an item of £293 appears in the wrong column, being a decrease and not an increase. The figures are wrong.

The Premier: Yes, the amount does appear in the wrong column.

Mr. CORBOY: The total decrease should be some £3,000 instead of £2,977.

Vote put and passed.

*Vote—Compassionate allowances, etc., £780—agreed to.**Vote—State Savings Bank, £28,206:*

Hon. J. C. WILLCOCK: The report of the State Savings Bank shows an estimated profit of some £16,000. I do not know that the Treasurer is entitled to take into Consolidated Revenue money from the State Savings Bank.

The Premier: Your Government did.

Hon. J. C. WILLCOCK: I know that, but the position is entirely different now. During the past two years the investments of the State Savings Bank, particularly those in Government bonds, have depreciated to the extent of 16 per cent. even in the case of the highest-priced securities. If the bank had to realise on the market at the present juncture some of its securities in order to make repayments to depositors, it would be a huge amount short. When a bank's securities have depreciated by one million pounds, no Government should say that the institution had made a profit of £16,000. Any profit made should remain in the institution at least until the value of the securities compared with what it was when the money was invested. If the money

of the depositors had been invested in securities which had appreciated in value, the bank would be quite justified in realising on them and treating the difference as cash. At present the State Savings Bank has neither cash nor security.

The Minister for Railways: The bonds will still be worth the £100 when they mature.

Hon. J. C. WILLCOCK: To the bank and the depositors they are not worth nearly the amount shown on the balance sheet.

The Attorney General: Supposing you are absolutely right, when should an alteration in the system have been made?

Hon. J. C. WILLCOCK: There is no supposition about my being right; I am absolutely right. Two years ago the price of the stock was pretty well par.

The Attorney General: No. It varied from day to day.

Hon. J. C. WILLCOCK: Some of the stock has been quoted at a premium during the past two or three years. Unfortunately, however, the value of the securities has depreciated. In the circumstances, is it right to say that the institution has made a profit?

The Attorney General: What was done last year has been done in previous years.

Hon. J. C. WILLCOCK: But the position now is entirely different. It should not have been done last year, and certainly it should not be done this year. In a few days the Treasurer will finally close the accounts of the State Savings Bank and hand them over to the Commonwealth under the Bill which was finalised this afternoon. Before doing that, if there has been a paper profit of £3,000 or £4,000 made during the past two or three months, he will take the amount into Consolidated Revenue notwithstanding that the money of the depositors is invested in securities which have depreciated by more than one million pounds.

The Minister for Railways: They are our own securities.

Hon. J. C. WILLCOCK: If the depositors want their money back to-morrow and the bank tries to realise the securities, the amount available will be a million short.

The Attorney General: You cannot suggest that in making up the profit and loss account for any particular year, you must ascertain the market value of your securities?

Hon. J. C. WILLCOCK: No. The difference might be a very small amount.

The Attorney General: Where do you draw the line?

Hon. J. C. WILLCOCK: For the moment I draw it at one million pounds. The Premier is not justified in drawing money out of the State Savings Bank, calling it a profit, and putting it into Consolidated Revenue while the value of the money put in by the depositors has been reduced so greatly.

Sitting suspended from 6.15 to 7.30 p.m.

Hon. J. C. WILLCOCK: I should like the Premier to inform the Committee whether he intends to take the profits into Consolidated Revenue before he hands over the bank to the Commonwealth. If he does, I do not think it is quite right in the interests of the depositors.

The PREMIER: What the hon. member is referring to has been the practice ever since the bank was established. I cannot hand over the profits to the Commonwealth.

Hon. J. C. Willcock: You can hand over the assets.

The PREMIER: Yes, but I do not know about the profits. I do not see that I should hand over the small amount of profit that will be made during the few months of the present financial year.

Vote put and passed.

Vote—Government Stores, £11,045—agreed to.

Vote—Taxation, £30,000:

Item, Amount payable to Commonwealth Government for collection of taxes, £28,461:

Hon. W. D. JOHNSON: I notice that in regard to the amount payable to the Commonwealth Government for the collection of taxes, provision is made in the Estimates for an increased vote to the extent of £141. Do we not secure a reduction as the result of the Premiers' Plan? Payments for all other services have been reduced, and I cannot understand why this item should show an increase instead of a reduction.

The PREMIER: The matter has been gone into and it cuts both ways. It is possible that the advantage would not be with us if the reduction were made.

Hon. P. Collier: And we have to pay for extra officers for extra services, and that is not included in the other amount.

The PREMIER: That is so. I doubt if we would secure any advantage if the item were decreased.

Mr. PIESSE: The Premier's reply does not seem to be quite clear. It is expected that there will be a reduction in taxation received to the extent of about £150,000. The item does not show a proportionate reduction.

Vote put and passed.

Vote—Workers' Homes Board, £10,699:

Item, Senior Accounts Clerk, £318:

Hon. W. D. JOHNSON: The item seems to deal with a new appointment. The board's operations have declined, so why the necessity for the additional officer?

The PREMIER: The secretarial duties have been amalgamated with those of the accountant.

The Minister for Lands: We have done away with one office.

Vote put and passed.

Vote—Miscellaneous Services, £679,213:

Item, Deaf and Dumb Institution, £400:

Mr. COVERLEY: The vote has been decreased by £100. I know the reason for that, but I urge the Premier to reconsider the position. He has appealed to the various departments to reduce their estimates, and, of course, subsidies have to be dealt with in the same way. I appeal to the Premier to reinstate the £100 and make the subsidy for the Deaf and Dumb Institution the usual amount, £500. Exceptionally good work is carried out by the institution, which is controlled on a voluntary basis, the parents of the children paying small amounts where possible. Although conducted on the most economical lines possible, it is necessary to provide £2,000 to run the institution. The committee have been faced with a serious decline in revenue during the financial depression, and seeing that the expenditure has been reduced considerably, the decreased subsidy will make it impossible for necessary work to be carried out. Doubtless the Premier is as sympathetically inclined towards the unfortunate boys and girls at the institution as anyone else, and I appeal to him to reconsider the position.

The PREMIER: The subsidy to the Deaf and Dumb Institution has been reduced, in

common with others paid to similar organisations. There is provision for special consideration in view of special circumstances. I do not know exactly what the financial position of the institution is, but I shall give the matter all possible consideration should the necessity arise.

Item, Victoria Institute and Industrial School for the Blind and Braille Society, £ for £, £2,240:

Mr. GRIFFITHS: The subsidy to the institution has been reduced by £560. I know full well the difficulty confronting the Premier, but I hope that some further consideration can be extended to the Institute for the Blind. Excellent work is being carried out there, and the authorities endeavour to make it self-supporting. Can anything better be done for the institution?

Mr. SLEEMAN: I regard it as false economy to deprive the Institute for the Blind of its full annual subsidy. If any State contribution should be kept intact, it is that paid to this institution. Last night the member for Leederville made an appeal on behalf of the blind, and it would be a kindly action if the Premier resolved to maintain the full subsidy. There are many other directions in which reductions could be made before cutting down the subsidy to the institution. Looking through the Estimates I notice that one or two people in high positions have not had their salaries reduced, yet the blind are to have their vote reduced. I would like the Premier to indicate his views before any move is made to test the feeling of the Committee.

Hon. W. D. JOHNSON: I want to support the appeal for further consideration of this item. The member for Leederville (Mr. Panton) last night urged the Treasurer to reconsider it, and stressed the difficulty the committee are experiencing in keeping going. We all know that public subscriptions to these charitable institutions cannot be maintained. It must be very discouraging to the committee, with a reduced income from private subscriptions, and carrying increased burdens, to see that the Government have found it necessary to reduce the annual grant. I agree with the member for Kimberley (Mr. Coverley) that the Deaf and Dumb Institution deserves further consideration, and I hope the Premier will agree to associate this institution with the other, and see if something cannot be done

to reinstate the grants that have been made in the past. I think members generally would endorse the attitude of the Premier if he were to decide that the original amount of this item should be reinstated.

The PREMIER: The grant to the Victoria Institute for the Blind is a subsidy on a pound for pound basis on the money collected by the institute. Last year we paid them £2,800, and although this year we have been compelled to reduce it in conformity with the Plan agreed upon, I am hopeful that the institute is not so unfortunately placed as the hon. member has said.

Hon. W. D. JOHNSON: But their burdens are greater than before.

The PREMIER: Yes, probably they are. I shall be very pleased to give them all the consideration I possibly can.

Mr. CORBOY: I suggest that the Premier might increase the maximum amount he is prepared to grant on a pound for pound basis to this institution.

The PREMIER: This institute is rather better treated than are similar institutions in the Eastern States.

Mr. CORBOY: In the Eastern States, as the Premier must have seen for himself, blind people have to go begging in the streets. That position has never arisen here, simply because of the work this institution and the Braille Society are doing. We have never had blind persons begging in our streets, but if we reduce the amount available to this institution it is probable we shall be faced with that awful spectacle. I am sure the Committee will readily agree to allow this subsidy to remain as it was previously, and so keep the unfortunate blind usefully employed. If we include in the calculation the dependants of the blind, it will be found that the State subsidy of last year amounted to only about 5s. per week. Surely we can afford that much for those people. Nobody would object if the Premier allowed the grant to the Victoria Institute for the Blind and the Braille Society to continue at £2,800 a year on the pound for pound basis.

The PREMIER: I will see that they get all the consideration possible.

Mr. H. W. MANN: All these organisations are in much the same position during this period of depression as they were during the war, when so many appeals were being made for various war funds. The result was that institutions like the Victoria Institute for the Blind and the various hos-

pitals depending on public subscriptions had to close portion of their buildings. It is to-day more difficult for the collectors for those various organisations to collect from private citizens, who have not the same means as they had previously. Consequently it is very much harder to finance those institutions. Recently the Victoria Institute participated in a sweep and secured a handsome return. But even with the £2,000 they got from that sweep, I feel certain their total returns this year will not be equal to what they were a couple of years ago. The Government are much like those organisations, in that they find it difficult to collect their taxes. If the Premier can see his way clear to help those institutions, I am sure he will do so.

Mr. ANGELO: If the Premier, finding that these institutions are getting into further difficulties, decides to excess this Vote, he can be assured of sympathetic treatment from this Committee next year. Personally I should like to see the item remain as it is, if only as an indication to the citizens that we are trying to keep to the Premiers' Plan.

Item—Departmental advertising (except Railways and State Steamship Service), £800:

Mr. COVERLEY: I should like some information about this item. Am I to understand that the advertising for the State steamers and the Railways is paid from the departmental revenue of those two concerns?

The PREMIER: Yes, in both instances they pay for their own advertising.

Item—Workers' Compensation Act Fund, £4,000:

Hon. S. W. MUNSIE: Last year £4,000 was provided and the expenditure amounted to £4,232. The estimate this year is £4,000. I take it this is an estimate of what the Government will have to pay in compensation for Government employees that are insured under the departmental fund.

The Premier: Yes.

Hon. S. W. MUNSIE: I remember when the fund was established, and I know that year after year the credit balance rose, until it reached £50,000. It has never shifted since. Each year there has been a certain amount paid into Consolidated Revenue as profit from that fund. Can the Premier tell me what amount has been paid into Con-

solidated Revenue from that departmental insurance scheme?

The Premier: I have not the figures with me, but I will get them for you.

Item—Expenses of Repatriation of Sundry Persons, £300:

Mr. SLEEMAN: In view of last year's expenditure, I should like to have seen a larger sum on the Estimates for this item. Lately I have been pestered by persons certified by doctors as being totally unfit for further work. The Premier would have been studying economy had he placed a larger sum on the Estimates and repatriated a larger number of these persons, who alternatively will have to be maintained at the expense of the State. Only last Wednesday two migrants came up to the House to see whether there was any chance of their being sent back to England. Both had been certified to be suffering from an incurable disease. One of them, who had been in this State only 18 months, admitted that he was suffering from the disease before he came here. He said a repatriation doctor in London had told him the Australian climate would do him good. Instead of that, his condition has become worse, and he is now certified as being unable to do any work. It would be real economy if the Government were to send those people, and many others like them, back to England. Only a little while ago Mr. J. H. Thomas, Dominion Secretary in the British Cabinet, pointed out that any dominion Government had power to repatriate any migrants that were found to be unsuitable. Quite a lot of the migrants were induced to come out here under false pretences published in English newspapers. Here is a Press picture of the Golden Eagle nugget. The English paper that published that picture declared that the nugget was picked up by a youth in a street of an Australian town.

Mr. H. W. Mann: You do not suggest that that was inserted to induce people to come here. It was just a news item.

Mr. SLEEMAN: It was inserted to tell people something that was not true. The publishers of the paper knew it was not true; they knew the nugget was not found in a street. Many migrants were led to believe that once they set foot in Australia, they could get a gold mine or a farm, and any amount of work. In contrast to our treatment of migrants, let me quote a state-

ment from an address by His Excellency Sir Cecil Clementi, Governor of Malaya, in an address to the committee of the Empire Parliamentary Association—

As regard the Indian labourers, the Tamils, we have been obliged to repatriate them. More than 12,000 had been repatriated before I came away, and I daresay the number is higher to-day. We wished to reduce their wages. That was the first suggestion that was made, and it came very largely from the Indians themselves. They would have preferred to have had their wages reduced rather than to be repatriated to India, where it was not at all certain they would get any employment. But the Indian Government said that, the basic wage having been fixed, they preferred these men should be repatriated rather than that their wages should be reduced.

The British Government should follow that example. The wages of migrants have certainly been reduced, and I do not know to what level they will fall by the time the present Government have finished with them. The British Government should say, "If you are not prepared to keep those people in reasonable comfort, you should repatriate them." People are calling on me every day in the week presenting doctors' certificates showing that they are unable to do any work. They will be a permanent charge on the community so long as they remain here, and their children will probably also become a charge on the community. The repatriation of Chinese is being undertaken by the Government of Malaya. Surely we, too, should undertake the repatriation of migrants who are in distress and who wish to return to the Homeland. Had the Premier provided a sum considerably in excess of that provided last year, he would have been practising economy and treating the migrants fairly. I hope the Premier will see the error of his ways and endeavour to repatriate those migrants. There are all sorts of rumours current that the British Government are antagonistic to us, but I have quoted the words of Mr. Thomas, who said that the Dominion Governments had power to deport any settlers who were surplus to requirements. If pressure were brought to bear upon the Commonwealth Government, I see no reason why they should not grant passports to migrants. The only thing that could make the Commonwealth Government hesitate would be the few paltry pounds owed by the migrants for their fares to Australia. The Commonwealth should not stand in the way of those people for the sake of a few paltry pounds.

Those people have no chance of getting a return fare, and the proper attitude for the Commonwealth to adopt is to say to the State Government, "If you are prepared to send them Home, we will raise no objection to the granting of passports." I do not intend to relax my efforts to get those people sent Home, and I hope the authorities will recognise that if they are not prepared to do anything for those people, it is only fair to send them back.

Vote put and passed.

[Mr. Angelo took the Chair.]

Vote—Group Settlement, £48—agreed to.

Vote—State Accident Insurance Office, £3,175:

Item, Temporary Clerical and other assistance, etc., £835:

Hon. W. D. JOHNSON: This item shows an increase of £327. Can the Premier explain why the increase is necessary?

The PREMIER: The increase is necessary to meet the needs of the department.

Hon. P. Collier: In other words, the business of the department is increasing.

The PREMIER: Yes, and it is necessary to have assistance.

Hon. W. D. JOHNSON: It is satisfactory to know that the department is increasing in popularity, and that the work is increasing. I am of opinion that it would be economical from the point of view of the State to extend the operations. The Minister for Works has placed on record in "Hansard" very strong reasons why the scope of the department should be extended. The premiums charged by the private insurance companies are out of all proportion to what is reasonable and fair, and the only way we can protect the people from exploitation is to use the State organisation. That the business has increased under the present Government is demonstrated by the figures. Let us hope that the desires of the Minister for Works in regard to other branches of insurance will be seriously considered, so that the people may be relieved from the enormous and unreasonable charges imposed by the private insurance monopoly.

Hon. P. Collier: I think he should try again.

Mr. SAMPSON: In view of the increase referred to, and the painful thoughts thereby engendered, it would be gratifying to many members to learn that the Government intended to do what has so often been advocated, namely, abolish this form of State trading. The member for Guildford-Midland referred to the increase of business as if it were some godly act, instead of something to which a majority of members are definitely opposed.

Vote put and passed.

Vote—Agricultural Bank, Industries Assistance Board, Soldiers' Land Settlement, £5:

Mr. DONEY: I wish to speak generally on this vote.

The CHAIRMAN: The hon. member may ask questions to elicit information from the Premier:

Mr. DONEY: My remarks will be in the nature of queries. I wish to inquire from the Premier whether Cabinet has reached any decision with regard to a reduction of the capital value of farms under the Agricultural Bank and the Soldier Settlement Scheme. I realise that this is a particularly difficult question, but it is one that cannot be side-stepped. Not that I think the Government wish to side-step it; I believe they are prepared to meet it when it arises. I am of opinion that a material reduction is absolutely inevitable. I cannot see that the matter can be side-stepped at all. As we are all aware, values have fallen, and they seem to show no sign of returning, at any rate for some years, to the level that excused the existing high capitalisation. As the level has fallen, it is but right and imperative that the capitalisation shall fall also, that is, if the industry is to survive in anything like its present form. Whether mortgagees are prepared or not to write down their advances, the fact is plain that values have decreased substantially, and ledger recognition may just as well be given to the new values. I do not say that the accounts should be written down to the actual productivity values of to-day. That would not be fair, and I admit too, that it is going to be difficult to determine exactly the basis upon which holdings should be revalued. Upon this question soldier settlers have recently acted concertedly, and the matter has lately been referred to me on quite a few

occasions. Whilst agreeing always that reductions must inevitably be made, I have pointed out that precisely the same arguments that show a reduction to be necessary in the case of soldier settlers apply with equal force to the farms that are mortgaged to the Agricultural Bank and to the Associated Banks. I should be glad if the Premier would give some indication of the Government's intentions in this regard. Let me also refer to the question of penal interest. I know that the Premier does not regard it as penal interest. The term, however, does not matter. Penal interest is nothing less than compound interest, and the Government have, I readily admit, every legal and commercial right to impose the charge. The term, I believe, was given to this particular impost by the Agricultural Bank itself. I hope the penalties will be very sparingly imposed, and that they will be imposed, only in the case of those settlers who cannot pay, as distinct from those who will pay. I agree that these penalties do serve a useful purpose in that they speed up the payments. I agree that they are all right in normal times, but in times like these they become merely an irritant. Is it not a very simple matter to discriminate between those who will not pay and those who cannot pay; but even though the problem may be a difficult one, it should be attended to and attended to quickly.

Mr. J. I. MANN: I should like to know what attitude the Premier intends to take up with regard to Agricultural Bank clients, and the heavy load of debt they are carrying to-day. I should also like to hear from him with regard to the rates of interest which have to be paid. I do not see how these settlers can meet their obligations. Of all the clients of the bank, fully 80 per cent. are hopelessly involved financially. There is an enormous portion of their indebtedness which they will never be able to repay. In order to satisfy the man on the land as to the intentions of the Government, I should like to hear from the Premier what he is going to do. With regard to soldier settlement, at the last Returned Soldiers' Conference the matter of the claim of £790,000 from the Commonwealth for losses in connection with that, was discussed. A deputation waited on the Minister for Lands from that conference, and the subject matter of that deputation was passed on to the Premier. I hope the Premier will make a definite

announcement with regard to soldier settlement generally. Of the 5,300 original soldier settlers, there are to-day only about 2,500, representing practically one-tenth of our wheat farmers. They are in a condition similar to that in which the ordinary settler finds himself. I hope some announcement will be made by the Premier this evening.

Mr. GRIFFITHS: I wish to speak particularly about the farming industry. I understand there is owing to the Agricultural Bank £14,000,000.

The CHAIRMAN: Will the hon. member's remarks be confined to soldier settlement and the Industries Assistance Board? Anything he may have to say in regard to agriculture can be dealt with when we come to that vote.

Mr. GRIFFITHS: I wish to deal with the Agricultural Bank.

The CHAIRMAN: The hon. member will be in order if he confines his remarks to the activities of the Agricultural Bank and the I.A.B.

Mr. GRIFFITHS: I believe the total indebtedness of the farmers to the State is £34,000,000, an immense sum. In view of the position of the man on the land one wonders how the Agricultural Bank is ever going to get its money back. I was recently on a farm, the owner of which told me his exact position. He dealt with his indebtedness, and his prospects of repaying not only ordinary creditors, but the amounts due to the Government by way of various rates, Agricultural Bank interest, etc. He told me he would realise from his crop this year 1,600 bags of wheat, less 100 bags for seed. At 1s. 8d. a bushel this would bring him in £375. Before he could talk about paying Agricultural Bank interest or meeting calls by the Government he had to find £152 out of this £375, leaving him £224. This small sum would have to pay interest to the Government, rates, land rents, wheel tax, wire netting instalments, vermin tax and so forth. There would be a call on the £224 of a total of £303. Considering that the money he would realise would be quite insufficient to enable him to carry on his farming operations, I cannot see why there should be such a scramble to get the proceeds from the sale of his wheat, for he will have practically no proceeds to divide. I wish to impress upon members how important the agricultural industry is to Western Australia. If the

Agricultural Bank is to be paid off, and the demands by the Government and local authorities have to be met, some radical change in the position will have to be effected. The price of wheat is so low that it costs about twice as much as people can get for it to-day to produce it. The prospects for the coming year are that there will be a tremendous falling off in the area under crop. If we are ultimately to get out of our difficulties it is vitally important that our farmers should be carried on. The State generally does not realise how important the industry really is, and how necessary it is to see that the farmers are placed in a position to pay their debts.

Mr. J. H. SMITH: I desire to say a few words on the question of soldier settlement and the Agricultural Bank. Under present conditions it is impossible for the settlers concerned to meet their liabilities. A few weeks ago the settlers had a meeting in Perth, and many days of their conference were taken up with land settlement and soldier settlement. People were placed on the land in the South-West and in other parts of the State, and estates were bought for them at a price. The man who has been continuously on his holding is not in such a bad position as he who has been moved from place to place. Unfortunately numbers of men have had to leave their holdings, because they were unable to pay either the interest or the accrued interest. Other men taking over the forfeited holdings have been loaded up with all accrued interest and in many cases dead or sold stock and useless machinery. The original capitalisation of the property has been doubled. The original cost of the land has been built up to twice what it was 10 years ago, and as the bottom has fallen out of the market for practically every article of primary production, settlers are not now able to meet their interest payments. Many of them have been threatened with eviction notices, and they are becoming very uneasy. The Government declare that the Agricultural Bank interest must be paid if that institution is to be carried on. These settlers are up against a stone wall. They are unable to pay the present rate of interest, and will remain unable to pay it until the price of primary products reaches somewhere near normal.

Mr. J. I. Mann: Even then they will be unable to pay the back interest.

Mr. J. H. SMITH: No, because of the high capitalisation of their properties. A great deal of money has been sunk in soldier settlement. In the case of some settlers rebates have been made. The board which controls that settlement have given rebates of interest and of accrued interest, and sums of £200 or £300 have been wiped off, and in some cases larger amounts. Money has also been written off the capital accounts. To-day we are in a quandary as to how to deal with land valuations. The capitalisation is altogether too high and there is a very big problem confronting the Government. I should like to know what the Premier is going to do about it.

The PREMIER: The Government have spent on soldier settlement in principal alone an enormous sum of money, on which interest has to be paid. There is not a penny of outstanding interest but is for money which has had to be borrowed for this object. We have heard something about the penalty rate. I would point out that this is merely interest outstanding on capital advanced. This capital is money which has been borrowed by the Government. I am sure members realise how considerate the Agricultural Bank has been to soldier settlers. Last year the Agricultural Bank collected for interest an amount of £153,585, and the interest collected for the year on the bank's other transactions amounted to £156,589. On account of the Industries Assistance Board there was at the end of the last financial year a sum outstanding of £1,199,467. It would be wrong to write down the value of wheat farms to the price that they are worth on the market to-day. We cannot very well write off the indebtedness against the farmers and leave that as a debt against the State. It cannot be argued that the value of land to-day is its proper value.

Mr. Patrick: You are writing down the value of land every day.

The PREMIER: We may have to do that in certain circumstances. I do not think the farmers should expect the Government to write down their debts to an amount that would represent a fair amount based on present values.

Mr. Doney: That would be unfair.

The PREMIER: Yes. The Federal Government have reduced the interest on soldier settlement to 4 per cent. for all moneys supplied by them, and the soldier settler in his turn will pay 4½ per cent. on the money

he has received. It is not right that we should have to consider the writing down of the security itself.

Mr. Patrick: When you call for tenders for the re-possession of a farm you write down the capital considerably.

The PREMIER: That is probably necessary. The hon. member would surely not argue that all farming properties should be written down on the same basis. The money has been handled by the farmers. I know they are not in a position just now to pay interest at the rate that was imposed last year. I would point out that not alone to the Agricultural Bank do the farmers owe money, for they owe it to many other people as well. It would not be right for the Government to write down securities just now to their present value. In the case of soldier settlement, there has been a writing down of debts from time to time. The settlers have been relieved in the matter of the rate of interest charged, as from the early part of this financial year. That will be a considerable relief to those who are paying, though not to those who are not paying. I know that the prices of wheat and wool have been so dreadfully low that it has been extremely difficult for men on the land to carry on and meet their obligations.

[Mr. Richardson took the Chair.]

Hon. W. D. JOHNSON: We have got beyond the stage where we can be satisfied with expressions of sympathy for those associated with the agricultural industry, and especially clients of the Agricultural Bank. I trust this Chamber will not pro-rogue until the Government have made a definite pronouncement of what they are prepared to do for the industry. So far as the Agricultural Bank is concerned, 14 millions sterling are involved. Unless serious thought is given to the matter, there is great danger of very heavy losses as the result of farmers ceasing to operate. Although possibly some farmers may remain on their farms, they will not work them to the extent rendering it possible to maintain them or make a return to the State. All that the farmer can do, has been done this year. I speak feelingly on the matter, because I know that all the neighbouring farmers in my district have explored every avenue for the purpose of getting sufficient funds to carry on up to

the present stage. I want an assurance from the Premier regarding the supply of bags. Farmers in the Bruce Rock district, which is regarded as a flourishing district, have exhausted all their credit for the purpose of getting the present crop in. Many will find great difficulty in taking the crop off. I know that last year we spoke in somewhat the same strain regarding the industry, and got through notwithstanding; but we got through by exhausting all possible chance of further continuation. All the farmers are now getting on to compound interest. Their debts have increased so enormously that the interest on them cannot be met, and thus compound interest is being imposed. Therefore the position is becoming hopeless; the farmers cannot carry the burden. As to helping the wheat farmer by a bonus, we are told that the country cannot bear the expense. The amount which the whole of the people could not carry last year the wheat-grower has been forced to carry. I do not say that while doing so he has paid his way, but he has exhausted his credit. The Royal Commission failed to furnish a policy. They were appointed to deal with an acute situation, but the report has been of no practical value. And up to date the Government have not taken the matter seriously. If the Government cannot do it, we as members of Parliament must accept the responsibility, for we cannot allow the agricultural industry to go out of existence. Parliament must adopt a policy which will save the situation. An investigation is needed into the liabilities of agriculturists to ascertain whether something cannot be done to reduce those liabilities in some way though not to write them off. They should be funded for a term of years so as to avoid compound interest and allow the farmers time to re-establish themselves. Under existing conditions the farmers cannot live.

Mr. J. I. Mann: No, they cannot.

Hon. W. D. JOHNSON: Surely we should have more from the Premier than just an expression of sympathy and an outline of the situation regarding commodity prices. If the producers cease production, it will mean disaster to the State. When we reach the Department of Agriculture, I hope the Government will be able to outline some scheme for saving the wheat industry. If the Premier will not do that,

we must try to get a committee of the House representative of all parties, to do for the people of this State, and particularly the agriculturists, what the Royal Commission failed to do. If the Royal Commission have failed, it is not for us as members to say that nothing can be done. It is necessary to encourage the agriculturists by letting them realise that Parliament is taking the matter up seriously. The agriculturists are already organised. Unless we recognise their situation, a chaotic condition will result from their ceasing operations at the most critical period. There is already the difficulty regarding bags, the price of which is soaring every day.

The Premier: There is a co-operative company dealing with bags.

Hon. W. D. JOHNSON: The co-operative company has been carrying the obligation as to bags out of all proportion to its strength, and that cannot go on indefinitely. Especially the company should not be called upon to meet the claims of clients of the Agricultural Bank. The whole question is too serious to be passed over in general terms such as we have had up to date. We should encourage the trustees of the Agricultural Bank and their assistants. To-day they are not getting encouragement, because the Royal Commission have proved of no assistance. The result of the Commission has been to disorganise the minds of the farmers and of officers of the Agricultural Bank. Everybody is getting mixed as to what should be done to overcome the difficulties which are increasing day by day. Personally I am prepared to play my part in seeing that before the session closes, there shall be some definite policy for the re-establishment of the agricultural industry.

Mr. DONEY: I do not like the suggestion of the previous speaker that the Premier is merely expressing sympathy, without doing anything. I listened to the Premier closely, and I did not hear him express sympathy either by actual words or by implication. I did, however, hear him refer to a particular benefit, as to which I should like a little more information. The hon. gentleman said that interest on Federal money lent to clients here had been reduced from 6½ per cent. to 4½ per cent. What proportion of the money lent to soldier settlers bears that rate of interest? If explanation on that point is

not forthcoming the statement will be interpreted as meaning that the reduction from $6\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. to $4\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. applies only to the £625, being that portion of soldiers' settlement loans, for which the Federal Government are responsible.

Hon. M. F. TROY: Before dealing with Agricultural Bank activities, I wish to make a reference to the late Mr. Frank Cooke. I desire to express my great regret at the passing of Mr. Cooke. I admired him very much as a trustee of the Agricultural Bank, and the State owes a great deal to him because of his sound judgment and fine character.

Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. M. F. TROY: I hope we shall succeed in getting another trustee of equal qualifications.

Mr. Corboy: It will be difficult.

Hon. M. F. TROY: I came into contact with Mr. Cooke when I was Minister for Lands, and I always felt the greatest admiration for his fair outlook and fine judgment, as well as for his wonderful patience in dealing with the bank's clients. He was also a man of great generosity of heart and mind. The present are difficult times on the land, and everyone is looking to the Government. An idea is abroad that the Government can solve all difficulties, that really the difficulties under which the people are labouring are due to the fatuousness of the Government in not being able to see those difficulties. I have risen to criticise the Government, and I shall criticise them in regard to their administration. This is a time when we should look the situation in the face. It is no use upbraiding the Government because they cannot relieve all the wants of the farmers. The Government have their own difficulties. The money which comes to finance the country is not plucked from trees, but has to be produced from the land; and if wealth is not produced by the country the Government have not the money to spend. That is the position to-day. The only money the Government can spend in keeping the farmer on the land is money that comes from goods produced in the country, or else money that the Government can borrow. Within those limitations, the Government can act. I admit that the farmers are confronted with difficulties, and that was recognised by the Government who appointed a Royal Commission to report on how best to meet the situation. I also admit that

there is not much to be said for the Commission's report. The Commission did not point the way out of the farmers' difficulties. I would have been surprised had the Commission been able to find a way out. It would have been extraordinary had they been able to do so. As a matter of fact, the Royal Commission found themselves faced with the facts as we have to face them, and, in my opinion, they reported to the best of their judgment and ability. It was a Royal Commission appointed not by Parliament, but by the Government. I think more experienced men could have been chosen, but the Commission applied themselves earnestly to their task and did not shirk their responsibilities. What is it that some hon. members want the Government to do? They want the Government to help the farmers by providing all their requirements. They want the Government to provide sacks and super, help them to put in their wheat and to take it off, to pay all their costs and then give them something to go on with next year. On top of all that, they want the Government to provide the farmers with security of tenure. The other night a well-known gentleman in Western Australia, a man who has had considerable experience in connection with wheat growers' agitations, said that 10,000 settlers were prepared to leave the land to-morrow. I do not believe it. I am convinced that if he did his utmost, he could not get 500 settlers to leave the land, because, bad as the position of the farmer is to-day, it is no worse than that of thousands of people in other parts of the State.

Mr. H. W. Mann: The farmer is in a better position than others.

Hon. M. F. TROY: It has to be said for the farmer that he has a roof over his head, wood and water, something growing for him on the farm, and no rent to pay. Probably he is better off than 90 per cent. of the rest of the people in Western Australia to-day. Compare the position of the farmers with that of thousands of the people who have lost their homes absolutely! If they bear that in mind, the farmers will not regard their position to-day as being so bad. I know many people who have invested hundreds of pounds in their homes, and yet to-day do not possess those homes. If security of tenure is fair for one section of the community, that principle must apply all round. If the Government can give security of tenure to some of the people,

they must go further and provide security for all the people. The artisan in the city the labourer on the land and the miner are equally entitled to it. We are not entitled to give consideration to individuals as against their fellow men. If we grant security to one section, we must provide it for all. It must be borne in mind that all are citizens of the State. If we are going to the help of people in need in one direction, we must grant assistance to others who require it. Last year I emphasised that in Western Australia we must face the facts. It is more necessary than ever to do so to-day. So far as I can judge the possibilities of the future, I do not think we shall have good times on the land for some years to come. I do not look upon the present situation as a passing phase. I regard it as a phase that will take some considerable time in passing. I cannot conceive that in a year or two we shall have high prices ruling again. I believe that prices will firm, and it will certainly be far better if they firm slowly and permanently than if they fluctuate so that we are in doubt as to where we stand from time to time. That in itself represents an improvement, if people will only recognise the fact. The difficulty of the wheatgrower is that he has received such a small return for his product, and that is because the world has produced too much wheat. There can be no doubt on that point. Although in prosperous times people said that they could not grow wheat at under 5s. a bushel, and that they could not and would not do it for less, I always realised that the day would come when the producers would be glad to grow it for 3s. a bushel. The files of the Agricultural Department contain a minute in which I expressed that opinion five years ago. To-day if we were offered 3s. a bushel for our wheat, we would rejoice exceedingly. If that were to happen, a changed attitude of mind would be apparent throughout the community, and we would feel that we were entering upon good times again. What is happening to-day? We are producing too much wheat, but we are receding from that position. All over the world the wheatgrower is reducing his acreage. It is the only attitude to adopt. If the Federal Farm Board in America had not been created by the United States Government, who equipped that body with millions of dollars with the object of, as they said, stabilising prices and encour-

aging farmers to go on producing wheat, the position to-day would have been rectified. The American Farm Board has been responsible for the American producers growing so much wheat. But the position did not improve as the result of the creation of that body. Now the board has arrived at the definite conclusion that its operations were of no value at all. To-day the board is refusing to buy wheat and has become in-operative. That is a good thing for the wheat producers throughout the world. Stocks, happily, are being sold. The Americans are sending their wheat to China or to any other country that will agree to take it. The result of that has been an immediate improvement of the wheat industry throughout the world and all wheat-growing operations have reached the receding stage. We are getting down to the simple, but efficient form of farming. Instead of cropping thousands of acres, the farmer to-day is putting in his 300 or 400 acres, and is doing most of the work himself. He is living more simply and frugally. It is not hard to live frugally and carefully, and he is satisfied with one's lot. It will produce good results. It will mean that the farmer will attend to his property, go in for mixed farming and, generally speaking, become a better farmer than he has been in the past. Our present-day experience will do no harm at all. Recently I had the pleasure of travelling from Kalgoorlie with a South Australian who has had long experience in agriculture. He said, "How is it that your people are squealing here? You have had one bad season, and your farmers are squealing! We have had five years of non-success in South Australia, and are not squealing." The explanation, as I told him, was that the South Australian farming industry had been developed along different lines. The farmer in that State received little assistance from the Government. He had no Agricultural Bank to buttress his efforts, and no I.A.B. to help him along. He had to depend largely upon his own resources. The result was that in South Australia, as well as in New South Wales and Victoria, there developed a hard-working industrious, frugal farming population.

Mr. J. I. Mann: Are there no hard workers in this State?

Hon. P. Colleir: Yes, but are they frugal and careful?

Mr. J. I. Mann: Of course they are.

Hon. M. F. TROY: I do not propose to allow the member for Beverley to misrepresent me. I do not say that there are no hard-working men in this State; I am pointing out how the industry developed. I know the facts as they apply here and in the other States. I grew up under the conditions that I speak of. I grew up on a farm, and know from my own experience that my people lived frugally and simply in order that they might save and pay off the mortgage. I am in a position to speak, because I know from past experience. Despite all that has been said about the Agricultural Bank in this State, it has been a benefactor to thousands of people. In fact, the bank has been too generous. The trustees have given way too often. I speak as a client who has had dealings with the bank. As long as I am a member of this Chamber, I shall not cease to say that the Agricultural Bank extended to me fair and generous treatment, and I reciprocated. I know some people who will not give the Agricultural Bank a fair deal. They want to live up to all their advances, and beyond them, and then they want the bank to stick to them when they get into difficulties. I know the conditions that obtain. No man knows better than I do how difficult it is to carry on to-day. All the same we need not deride the institution that was the stand-by for so many farmers in the early struggling days. I fully appreciate the difficulties of the present conditions in this State, but we must realise the facts. There is no royal road of progress to success, such as we fancied in the early history of farming here. It is realised now that farming does not mean simply going on the land, borrowing £2,000 or more from the Government, and getting someone else to do the work, as has so often been done. Too many refrained from bothering about their liabilities, but expected the Government to carry them through their difficulties. I remember one experience I had. When Minister for Lands I used to talk to men who were about to go on the land. I asked them to come into my office and I said to them, "Take my advice. Do the work yourselves. Do not be in a hurry. Look ten years ahead. Work towards your goal and in ten years' time, if you do the work yourself, live frugally and act carefully, you will have your farm and will have paid your debts." In reply to that one man said, "You have no vision. Why

not give me £5,000 so that I can make a home immediately?" Unfortunately that is the attitude of a lot of men who have gone on the land in this State. When I was Minister for Lands the Government was most generous in assisting the men on the land, and hundreds of thousands of pounds were provided through the Agricultural Bank to assist farmers in their operations. It was not intended that the money should be spent by having the work done by Southern Europeans. I know of one instance in which a man went on to his selection and bought a car and truck in the first week. He had no warrant for doing that at all; he could not afford it. If you talk to men of that type about their responsibilities, they reply, "But we live in different times now." I spoke to one group settler who had bought a motor car. I said to him, "You cannot keep yourself, so why buy a car? The old settlers were not able to buy cars." He replied, "We are educated now." That education has been utterly wrong and stupid. So I say again, we must get down to facts. In any walk of life the individual must learn to crawl before he attempts to walk. That means again that there is no royal road to success. Much as I sympathise with the settlers in their difficulties to-day, I realise that they must reduce their acreages. It is necessary for farmers to do most of their work themselves, and that in itself will tend towards reduced wheat acreages. Then we must go in for mixed farming and, an important feature, we must go in for farm economy. In earlier days farmers were to a large extent independent from an economic standpoint. They saw to it that the farm produced most of their requirements, including mutton, beef, butter, milk, eggs and bacon.

Hon. P. Collier: And they had their vegetable gardens.

Hon. M. F. TROY: Yes. The housewife made necessary side lines for the home, and vegetables were grown in sufficient quantities to supply half the district. In other words, the farmers of those days practised farm economy. That is a phase that is sadly neglected to-day throughout the farming areas and on the group settlements as well. It made me heart-sick when I went through the group areas and saw no vegetables grown anywhere. That is not farming; that sort of thing will get us nowhere. The State is not entitled to stand by people who will not

make an effort on their own behalf. The State is entitled to look after the man on the land and every other citizen wherever he may be, because no one citizen has a right to expect more than is due to another. The Government can be expected to look after the people, but the settlers themselves must shoulder the duty that devolves upon them to reciprocate. They must help themselves as far as they possibly can. I might easily blame the Government from this standpoint or that standpoint, and thus make myself agreeable to the farmers. I do not propose to do so; it is not worth while. Irrespective of whether I may be misrepresented, I intend to speak the truth. I am showing myself to be a better friend of the farmers by speaking the truth, than by misleading them or by playing up to them to win their favour. To do the latter, would not be in their interests, nor in the interests of the State. I am not downhearted about the present position. If we can scratch through and pay our debts, and keep things going, we are very lucky. And it is so much the better if the Government can help us scratch through, ease our difficulties and reduce taxation. The local authorities also should reduce taxation, for at times we pay them taxation, without getting much service for it. I am optimistic that, with the reduction of wheat production in the world, in a year or two we shall find a market at reasonable prices. I hope the great majority of our farmers will be kept on the land and will improve the position, and that after this experience we shall be wiser and sounder farmers than before. Now let me say a word or two about the abandonment of areas in the Lake King and Lake Carmody districts. I could quite understand those areas being abandoned on the advice of a scientific man, if that advice were confirmed by the practical operations. But so far as I can learn from the men themselves, the land which has been condemned by Dr. Teakle is growing splendid crops of wheat, up to eight bags to the acre last year, and is carrying good crops this year.

Mr. H. W. Mann: Would not the same apply to your 3,500 farm scheme?

Hon. M. F. TROY: Yes, I am coming to that.

Hon. P. Collier: These abandoned farms are all part of that scheme.

Hon. M. F. TROY: In view of the practical experience of the settlers, and seeing

what has been accomplished, I am surprised that the Agricultural Bank should abandon the proposition, and that the Minister should support it. I take it the Minister does support it, because we know how far the bank can go without his support. The trustees are not warranted in abandoning large areas of land on which hundreds of thousands of pounds have been expended, merely because some young man, fresh from the University, condemns the land as being no good. If the Premier now stands behind the bank, is not that contrary to the Premier's attitude towards 3,500 farms scheme? What did he say when the Collier Government held up that scheme in order to make further investigations before a huge sum of money was expended upon it? The present Premier derided the Collier Government and condemned them for their action. We all remember the story he told to illustrate his point.

The Premier: But these men were out at Lake Carmody before that time.

Hon. M. F. TROY: Of course they were. I am commenting on the Premier's attitude towards the holding up of the 3,500 farms scheme because Dr. Teakle said the land was likely to become too salt for the growing of crops. The Premier told a story. He said that a scientist once stood talking to an American farmer, telling him all about what the country could do and what it could not do. Presently the farmer said, "Thank you, Sir. Now I will get on with my planting." It was the present Premier who told this story and attacked me and the Collier Government in the Press for not going on with the 3,500 farms scheme when Dr. Teakle advised caution. Now the Premier adopts Dr. Teakle's advice and abandons hundreds of farms that have grown wheat to the extent of eight bags to the acre and are now carrying very good crops. So I want to know from the Premier what his attitude really is. Was he merely influenced by prejudice when he attacked the Collier Government for not going on with the 3,500 farms scheme because of Dr. Teakle's advice, or will he take the same attitude now and deride Dr. Teakle for stating that the land at Lake King and Lake Carmody will not grow wheat? If that land were not actually growing good crops, I would have nothing to say in opposition to the new attitude; I would say, "The land looks good, but apparently there is in it a con-

dition we did not know of, and so we shall have to abandon it." But that land is growing good wheat, notwithstanding which the Agricultural Bank says to the settlers, "You will all have to leave the land, for we refuse to advance anything more on it." The Collier Government were not influenced by Dr. Teakle, or only to this extent, that we felt that, having had the soil conditions investigated by an officer of Dr. Teakle's qualifications, we should have further investigation made before we expended millions of money on that scheme. I do not believe for a moment that all the country from Southern Cross right across to Salmon Gums is hopeless, merely because Dr. Teakle says so. Dr. Teakle may be a very eminent young man, but still there may be many things he has yet to learn. And, again, soil analysis in a laboratory may be very different from soil conditions when you are tilling the soil in order to grow crops. I am astounded that the Premier should stand behind the Agricultural Bank trustees in removing those settlers who are actually growing crops. In my opinion it is not Dr. Teakle's report that has influenced the trustees. The trustees may be afraid of alkaline conditions developing in certain districts, but even so, not the whole of a farm would be affected; perhaps it would be only 10 or 20 acres. Yet here is a young man who has condemned all the agricultural land right across to Salmon Gums. It is an extraordinary position. We are entitled to give due weight to his observations and make the strictest inquiry, but we are not entitled to remove people from land that is growing fine crops of wheat.

Mr. Corboy: But wheat cannot be profitably grown 50 miles from a railway.

Hon. M. F. TROY: That is the point. That is the reason actuating the trustees. These settlers are 50 miles from a railway, and there is no possibility of their getting a railway in the immediate future, and so, while the bank is to some extent influenced by Dr. Teakle's report, it is thought cheaper to bring in the settlers than to maintain them 50 miles from a railway, and pay a bonus on the cartage of wheat. But if that be the real reason, why not state it? I regret that these men should be 50 miles away from the railway, because when we settled those areas Mr. Collier and I had assurances from Mr. Gunn and Sir Charles Nathan of

the Migration Commission that they would provide the funds for the railway.

The Minister for Lands: We cannot make them stick to that.

Hon. M. F. TROY: I remember the conversation very well, when they were anxious for this programme. There was at the time no difficulty about getting money to settle the 3,500 farms. But I was very cautious and not at all anxious to proceed rapidly. My idea was to go south from Southern Cross to Forrestania, and for the time being to stop there, developing the country from our experience. So the Government of which I was a member established experimental farms all across that country. It was a very safe policy.

Mr. Corboy: It is a pity you did not get the money to build the railway to the people you had put out there.

Hon. M. F. TROY: The fact is that people were clamouring for land at the time. There were only about 300 blocks at Lakes King and Carmody, and 400 on the Mollerin line. Mr. Gunn and Sir Charles Nathan said, "Go along with those places inside the fence, but hold up the bigger scheme. We will provide the railway and the money for settling those farmers." And they would have kept their word. But when the whole of the 3,500 farms scheme was being considered, it was dealt with as one scheme, and the railway to serve Lake Carmody and Lake King was to serve all the rest of the settlement. When the Engineer-in-Chief provided a scheme for railways it was found that to build the railway to Lake Carmody and Lake King would have been premature.

Mr. Corboy: Then it was premature to put those settlers out 50 miles from a railway.

Hon. P. Collier: We did not put them out; they went out.

Mr. Corboy: Oh, rubbish!

Hon. M. F. TROY: There will be always faint hearts who will not go away from the vicinity of a railway. But on the Wongan Hills line the settlers went out 50 miles from the railway. It is a long way, but after all many people in this country have had to go out in advance of railways. His Honour, the Speaker, knows that the settlers of Newdegate and Lake Grace went out 60 miles.

Mr. Wells: No, only 35 miles at Lake Grace.

Hon. M. F. TROY: The Speaker told me they went out 60 miles. But let me get on. The Migration Commission put it up to the Government that they should build the Kalgoorlie-Mollerin line. It was part of the whole scheme, and we were to get from the Commission money to build the railways to serve Lake Carnody, Lake King, and Forrestania. The Government did build the Mollerin railway. As soon as the 3,500 farms scheme was held up, we made application to the Migration Commission for money with which to build the railways to Lake King and Lake Carnody. I have a statement made by the member for Boulder at the time. He said—

Railway facilities for the settlers south-west of Southern Cross and the Lakes King, Cumm and Carnody areas were part of the larger scheme embraced in the 3,500 farms scheme, and with respect to these areas the Government propose to ask the Railway Advisory Board to report as soon as possible. These railway proposals will be submitted to the Commonwealth and Imperial Governments, and I anticipate being able to obtain sufficient money under the migration agreement to give the necessary services to these settlers.

Those remarks were made in the course of a general statement to the Press on the whole scheme after it was held up owing to Dr. Teakle's report. I think I have shown that we proceeded on lines with which nobody could find fault. That settlers are 50 miles from a railway is correct, but that is no new thing in this State or in other parts of Australia. Settlers will go out 50 miles from a railway in future.

Mr. Corboy: No, they will not, not after the experience of those people.

Hon. M. F. TROY: Their experience has been similar to that of thousands of other settlers in Australia. The early settlement of Australia and the settlement for 50 or 60 years afterwards was carried on without railways at all. People went hundreds of miles from a railway to develop the country.

Mr. Corboy: Do you suggest that that should continue?

Hon. M. F. TROY: These settlers in question went out 50 miles, and what did the Government do for them? They advanced £2,000 to most of those people.

Mr. Corboy: No, £1,500 was the maximum.

Hon. M. F. TROY: Well, £1,500. They received advances of £1,500 so that in a few short years they could make the neces-

sary improvements to their property. Yet we are told that theirs was a very difficult passage indeed. They got £1,500 more than thousands of other settlers got.

Mr. Corboy: That might be true, but it is not to say it is right.

Hon. M. F. TROY: In my opinion it is right: it is the only way this country can be developed. I told those settlers to do the work themselves, not to employ others to do it, but to live on the bank advance.

Mr. Wells: What killed that settlement was the reports.

Hon. M. F. TROY: I told them that in time they would get a railway, and that if they followed my advice, they would not be too heavily involved. I also told the miners on their settlement to do the work themselves. I said, "It will take you four or five years to develop your farms. Live on the bank advance, keep down your capitalisation, and do not aim at getting into production too soon. If you carry on the work yourselves for a few years you will gain experience. Do not be in a desperate hurry and do not get other men to do the work for you." Yet thousands of Southern Europeans were engaged to do the work.

Mr. Corboy: There were practically no Southern Europeans engaged in that locality.

Hon. M. F. TROY: Oh, oh!

Mr. Corboy: That is true: practically none.

The Attorney General: Every mistake made in this country has been due to a more-haste-less-speed policy.

Hon. M. F. TROY: I did not adopt that policy. I am not, by nature, built that way. I always pointed out that it was wise to make haste slowly. In my opinion that is the best form of progress.

Hon. P. Collier: It is the most solid.

Hon. M. F. TROY: On the files will be found numerous minutes urging those settlers to do the work themselves, because we found it difficult to finance them. In Southern Cross in 1929 some of the greatest agitators were men who bought trucks on the very day they were allotted land. One man came to me complaining bitterly of his conditions and stating that the Government would not help him. Imagine my surprise when he took back with him a new motor car. It is utterly impossible to help that type of man. I do not wish to infer that he was typical of the generality of men.

Mr. Corboy: Individual cases do not cover up the general faults of the administration.

Hon. M. F. TROY: I know there are chicken-hearted people in this country who want to produce crops in the first year and take a trip round the world in five years. It cannot be done.

Mr. Corboy: And the settlers who played the game, according to the department's advice, are the worst off.

Hon. M. F. TROY: They are not.

Mr. Corboy: Of course they are.

Hon. M. F. TROY: I have had as much experience as any other member of this House. I administered the Lands Department for three years and came into contact with thousands of settlers, and I am satisfied that a majority of careful, frugal men are still right. A member of this party who started farming only about six years ago has paid his way with wheat at 2s. a bushel. Last year, to my great surprise, he paid cash for his wire netting to rabbit-fence his holding. Yet members say it cannot be done. He is a careful, frugal man. He is not swanking around the country. I admire that type of man. I wish we had thousands of others like him.

Mr. Wells: How far is he from a railway?

Hon. M. F. TROY: Only a few miles.

Mr. Corboy: He is right alongside it.

Hon. M. F. TROY: He has had only five crops; yet he is able to pay his way and, as I said, he paid cash for wire netting last year to rabbit-fence his holding.

Hon. P. Collier: That is because he is not swanking around the country in a motor car. He is a worker.

Mr. Corboy: And men just as good who have paid their Agricultural Bank interest have been driven off their blocks.

Hon. M. F. TROY: While making comparisons, let me say that I know settlers who have been on the land for 30 years, who paid 5s. 6d. an acre for their land and had 21 years in which to pay it, whose farms are adjacent to a railway, and who are hopelessly involved. They are the ones who are asking the Government to grant them security of tenure. I ought not to be making a speech in support of the Government, but I appreciate the difficulties confronting them. It is of no use a member standing up in this House and fooling the people. A man who talks foolishly to the farmers is not doing them any service. My feeling towards the

farmers is one of great sympathy in their present difficulties, but it is idle for them to ask the Government to do impossible things. The miner is just as much entitled to good treatment at the hands of the Government as is the farmer. I believe the Government will be able to help every genuine man in this country, and if they do so, I will stand behind the Government. I wish to say a word about group settlement.

The CHAIRMAN: I direct the hon. member's attention to the fact that we have already passed the group settlement division.

Hon. M. F. TROY: But the Agricultural Bank now administers group settlement. I understand that the member for Sussex (Mr. Barnard) proposes to move for a Royal Commission to inquire into the group settlers' conditions. May I say I am astounded at his intention. We were told that what was wrong with group settlement, when I was Minister for Lands, was the administration. The present Premier said that the land was all right, that the settlers were all right and that the climate was all right, but that the administration was all wrong. Yet now that we have the administrator, the real man who knows all about group settlement, we find his faithful loyal supporter from Sussex moving for a Royal Commission. I shall be interested to hear what the hon. member has to say in support of his motion, and I shall not say much about group settlement until he has spoken. I cannot say what my attitude to the motion will be until I hear his reasons.

Hon. P. Collier: He will have to make out a mighty good case to get a Royal Commission.

Hon. M. F. TROY: It is ten years since group settlement was inaugurated and we have spent millions of money on the scheme, and I am astounded to learn that the settlers cannot pay their way and cannot make a living. It cannot be the administration that is at fault to-day, because the real administrator is in power, the man who knew all about the scheme, the man who said the settlers were all right, the land was all right and the climate was all right but that the administration was all wrong. It cannot be the administration that is at fault to-day. What can the member for Sussex say about it?

Mr. H. W. Mann: Do you remember telling the group settlers that their holidays would be found in their bank deposits?

Hon. M. F. TROY: I told them that frequently. I never hesitated to tell them the truth, and I do not hesitate to speak the truth here, either. When I was Minister for Lands I was not looking for votes; I was looking for results for the State. I never told the group settlers that they were the salt of the earth and that the country was dependent upon them. When necessary I pointed out their faults, corrected them and tried to put them right. When the present Premier took charge the first thing he did was to introduce new administration. It was not a new scheme at all. He went to Busselton and said to Mr. Vickery, "Put up a scheme." A scheme was put up, and it was never carried out. It could not be carried out. It was one of those schemes put up on the spur of the moment merely to impress people. Now we find that the great majority of the group settlers not only cannot pay their interest, but cannot make a living. I have asked for information of the number of group settlers who are paying their interest. I hope the Premier will supply the information.

The Premier: The officials are getting out the figures for you.

Hon. M. F. TROY: I am informed that, of the 2,000 group settlers, only about 40 are paying their interest. I may be wrong, but I understand that one of them informed the ex-Premier that he was making £15 a month by the sale of eggs alone, but there was a change of Government and now he can neither pay his interest nor make a living. I shall withhold further reference to group settlement until I hear the speech of the member for Sussex and then I hope to give my views. It is a striking fact that after 10 years of group settlement and after the expenditure of millions of pounds and the wasting of millions of pounds, those settlers cannot live and pay their way. We know that the value of their product has diminished in price, which would have some effect on their welfare, but I believe there are other reasons for it. When the Premier addresses the House I hope he will be able to give those reasons. When the present Premier was Leader of the Opposition he was never quite fair to me and to my administration of group settlement. I still have a feeling that I did a good job as Minister. It may be vanity; I may be perfectly stupid, but I think I did a good job for the group settlers.

Hon. P. Collier: My word, you did.

Hon. M. F. TROY: I hope the Premier in the course of his reply will give us the facts, as I gave them in my time. The curse of this country is that we are always playing up to the people, through the Press and through Parliament. We lead people to believe they have real grievances and yet we do not show them the way out of their difficulties. The thing is to be straightforward with people, and tell them if they are on the wrong track, and how best to get on the right one. If that practice had always been followed, it would have been so much the better for the State. The country storekeepers held a meeting the other day, and passed a motion which should have the full approval of the member for Sussex. If I were he I would substitute the motion passed by the country storekeepers for his own proposition for the appointment of a Royal Commission. The motion of the country storekeepers was, "That this conference recommends the State Government to appoint a local committee in each district to inquire into the disabilities of the group settlers; that committee to be composed of a business man, a group settler, a returned soldier, an outside farmer and bank official"; and the settlers themselves are to have charge of the committee. I suggest that the member for Sussex should adopt that as the motion he will move in the House.

The Minister for Railways: That was not the conference held on the Esplanade yesterday, was it, when they all wanted to run the show themselves?

Hon. P. Collier: I had a devil of a job defending you yesterday.

Hon. M. F. TROY: I am very much concerned about the action of the trustees of the Agricultural Bank in removing the settlers from the newly-settled portion of the State between Southern Cross and Newdegate. Of course, those settlers are a long distance from a railway, but have not the Government some means whereby they can lay down a light railway to provide those people with easy transport?

The Attorney General: Should we at the moment continue to ignore Dr. Teakle's report?

Hon. M. F. TROY: I should not advocate ignoring it if there had been no settlers on the land, but despite the report, that part of the State is already growing crops. Which is the better evidence, Dr. Teakle's

report, or the facts which speak for themselves?

The Attorney General: For how many years will the land continue to do that?

Hon. M. F. TROY: I am partly in accord with the Premier. I would not accept in its entirety the dictum of every scientific man. Before spending money on a proposition of this sort I would hesitate, and make further inquiries, but in the present case the money has been expended, and the settlers are growing good crops. A young man puts in a report and says that the country will not grow crops.

Hon. P. Collier: The farmer says the crop is growing there already.

Hon. M. F. TROY: Yes.

The Attorney General: The young man does not say the land will not grow crops. He says it will not go on growing crops.

Hon. M. F. TROY: What does he know about it?

The Attorney General: I do not know. You backed him up well and truly when he first put in his report.

Hon. M. F. TROY: A very eminent agricultural adviser came to my place some years ago. He was looking at a crop which was out in ear in October, and he said I should not get anything out of it. I knew he was wrong. It finally produced seven bags to the acre. I knew the country better than he did. There are local conditions about which a visitor may not know anything, but which have a very great bearing on the position.

The Attorney General: You stagger me talking like this to-night.

Hon. M. F. TROY: I hope so; I am stating facts.

The Attorney General: You took an entirely different point of view when you were Minister.

Hon. M. F. TROY: No.

Hon. P. Collier: He covered that ground before you came into the Chamber.

Hon. M. F. TROY: If before the Government had entered into the scheme a scientist had said, "Beware of this proposition," it would have been their duty to investigate it. That is what we did, and the Premier of to-day derided us for doing so. This is another proposition. The settlers are on the land and producing crops, although a young man comes along and says the country will not grow crops.

The Attorney General: He did not come along when we put the settlers on the land. |

Hon. M. F. TROY: Of course not. The Attorney General is not as intelligent as he usually is.

The Attorney General: You amaze me, the way you are talking to-night.

Hon. M. F. TROY: I am sorry the trustees of the bank are removing these settlers. I suggest their action is due largely to the fact that the Government cannot build a railway for them. Is there not any chance of the Government supplying those people with a light line and so keeping them on the land? I am sure that the country east of Koudinin and right through to Salmon Guns is fit for something, but it has all been condemned by this young man. It must come into its own some day. Before settlement we were warned by scientific men that it would be wise to make an investigation, and we made one. I know the Premier and the Agricultural Bank have a difficult programme before them. Much is expected of the bank. It is due to the people that the Government should state the facts all the time, and tell the farmers that the finances of the country are limited, and that it is impossible to find more money than is now available. My grievance against the Government is that they consider one interest more than another. They are giving sustenance to a large number of people to keep them on their holdings, but no other equally deserving people they are not giving a penny. That is my grievance against the Government. They are not acting fairly and squarely. They are giving sustenance in one case and refusing it in another. I realise the limitations of the situation, but in this House we always insist that there shall be fair treatment all round. I am optimistic enough to think that we shall get out of our difficulties, and I hope the experience we shall have will be useful to us. It should make us all more sound in our methods, more frugal in our living, and more careful. The philosophy of life is that it is one of change and of vicissitude, the bad times being mixed with the good times. Years ago I warned the settlers at Bruce Rock that the good times through which they were passing were only fleeting, and that they must use those good times to enable them to reduce their liabilities and their mortgages. If in good times our farmers had got rid of their mortgages they would be in a far better position to-day.

Mr. PIESSE: We all know the difficulties confronting soldier settlers to-day and a very large proportion of our other wheat and wool growers. Up to the time when prices collapsed the soldier settlers were more concerned about the revaluation of their properties. The Premier was good enough to receive a deputation from members of Parliament last night to deal with requests sent forward by soldier settlers. It was brought under his notice that the settlers have for the time being dropped the question of revaluation. They realised it was necessary for the Government to formulate proposals designed to carry on all the settlers during the next 12 months. The Government should be more closely concerned with giving attention to ways and means of providing sustenance for our wheat and wool growers, so that they might make the best possible use of the yields that are to come to them within the next few months. Our farmers were greatly disappointed with the results of the last harvest. It may be said that chaos reigned throughout the country, simply for the reason that it was almost impossible to get credit whereby the settlers could arrange for their next crop. Unfortunately, the prospects of a better price for the ensuing crop are hardly any better than they have been. It behoves the Government to pay close attention to the many requests which have been made to them by the primary producers, who must be assisted in every possible direction to turn to the best advantage the products of the next harvest. I, too, am somewhat disappointed. I would remind the Government that something is expected of them with regard to the findings of the Royal Commission. I give Cabinet every credit for what they have done in the past. I have been closely in touch with Ministers during the past 18 months. On every occasion they have given the fullest consideration to matters submitted to them, and have always listened patiently to the tales of difficulties which we have brought under their notice from time to time. In the circumstances Ministers have done remarkably well in the interests of the primary producer. We have a great deal to be thankful for in the legislation which has recently been passed to tide farmers over with regard to their debts and other difficulties. The Government departments responsible for the ad-

ministration of these new Acts have afforded as much relief as has been possible in the circumstances. The Royal Commission consisted of practical men. The least that can be expected is that the Government will as early as possible make some announcement with regard to giving effect to the recommendations of the Royal Commission. They may not be able to carry out every recommendation, but they should say what they are going to do. I have heard this report discussed very often and have read it most carefully. I think the findings are those of practical business men. I am sorry to hear the disparaging remarks which have fallen from the lips of some members. Some have condemned the report entirely and others have seen no good in it. It seems to me the report must contain a fund of practical information of considerable value both to the Government and to Parliament. What I ask the Government to do is to take the country into their confidence at the earliest possible opportunity, and to give some expression of opinion regarding the Royal Commission's findings. Surely, if the Government cannot identify themselves with the whole of the Commission's recommendations, they can with the greater part. Various plans have been put up, and certain recommendations would not have been made had the matter not been one of urgency. It is especially necessary to ensure that our farmers shall be protected as regards security of tenure. We know that many of our settlers, not only wheatgrowers but woolgrowers as well, are threatening to hold up their products. Surely we do not want to let them get to that stage. I am not convinced that all the blame laid on the State Government by primary producers is justified. The Government mostly to blame are the Federal Government, who have failed on every possible occasion. The Federal Government have misled the farmers.

Hon. S. W. Munsie: The Senate wilfully made the Federal Government turn the farmers down. Yet you do not say a word about the Senate. It is the Federal Government all the time.

Mr. PIESSE: I say without fear of contradiction that the Federal Government have impoverished the farmers not only of Western Australia but of Australia.

Hon. M. F. Troy: Which Federal Government?

Mr. PIESSE: Federal Governments of the past. I am not speaking from any party spirit.

Mr. Sleeman: Of course not!

Mr. PIESSE: The farming community have very little to thank Federal Governments for. I am hopeful that the Premier will shortly be able to express his agreement with, at all events, some of the requests of the deputation which he was good enough to receive. I hope also that the Government will be able to go fully into the Royal Commission's recommendations, and give the settlers assurances on two points. One is that those who find themselves in financial embarrassment will be protected at least as regards security of tenure. The second is that some scheme will be adopted for funding the accumulated debts and interest which in ordinary circumstances the farmers would have difficulty in meeting, but which, owing to the collapse of prices—it is no use hiding the fact—hundreds or even thousands of farmers are utterly unable to meet. The main thing is to assist the farmers to make a success of this year's crop. Those of us who come more closely in touch with the farmer must admit that unless as the result of the harvest he can meet this year's commitments, there will be considerably less crop next year. One thing we want to ensure is that the area of cropping shall not be lessened. I am optimistic enough to believe that prices will improve, and we should enable the farmer to put in at least as much crop next year as he has put in this year. If he does not get an equal area in, and if prices should rise, he will not have the benefit of the improved market. I join in the hope expressed by the member for Guildford-Midland (Hon. W. D. Johnson) that before the session closes the Government will deal with the questions of security of tenure and greater assistance to farmers.

The PREMIER: I should not like it to be thought that the Royal Commission's report has not received and is not receiving serious consideration at the hands of the Government, but I do want hon. members to realise that nothing much can be done without money, and that there is not any money.

Mr. Sleeman: I thought you were going to get the money from London when you were returned. You promised that.

The PREMIER: I promised nothing of the sort. The bonus of 6d. per bushel which I hope will be paid as the result of the meet-

ing in Melbourne will amount to a substantial sum, and will help the farmers considerably. The Agricultural Bank has been and is doing everything possible to assist the agriculturists. I must say again that while interest has not been paid by the farmers, it must be paid by the Government to the people who have lent the money. If nothing is paid by the farmers who have borrowed from the Government, the Government will have great difficulty in finding money at all. If anything can be done without money, let us know how it can be done. When the farmer cannot sell his produce, naturally he cannot pay his rent; but if he does sell his produce at a reasonable price, he will be able to pay a reasonable amount to the Government. In the meantime it is impossible for the Government to raise money. That fact must be borne in mind all the time. The Royal Commission consisted of a very capable body of men, and though with some of their recommendations I cannot agree, there are others which I should like to see carried out. But I do not know how men in financial difficulties are to be helped in the absence of funds. I was glad to hear the member for Mt. Magnet's references to the late Mr. Cooke. What the hon. member said was entirely justified. We shall find great difficulty in securing the services of anyone to act as trustee with the experience of Mr. Cooke, with his capacity and also with his great interest in the welfare of the State and of the farmers associated with the Agricultural Bank. For more than 20 years, I think, Mr. Cooke gave his services to the country, travelling from one end to the other of it; and he did marvellous work in connection with the development of our agriculture. A representative of the Migration Department will be here on the 16th instant, and then I hope, in company with the Minister for Lands, to have an opportunity of discussing with him the question of railways to serve country already settled, and settled only in the belief that under the migration agreement money would be found at a cheap rate to provide transport. The representative will discuss the situation with a view to cancelling the £34,000,000; but money must be found to carry out any work in progress under the agreement. The settlement of land south of Southern Cross and east of Newdegate will be discussed with the representative of the Migration Department, and we shall endeavour to relieve the State's obliga-

tions, and to secure the assistance which the previous Government expected to obtain when the scheme was undertaken. In reply to the member for Williams-Narrogin (Mr. Doney) let me say that the reduction of interest to $4\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. will cover practically all the advances to soldier settlers. I do not know that I can discuss Dr. Teakle's report. There are wonderful crops growing at Lake Camm this year, and there were last year; and I daresay patches of salt will be discovered in that country just as they have been in the wheat belt. In some cases years elapsed before the salt showed itself sufficiently to destroy the crops; for several years the crops were good, although small patches of salt were found. I do not think that Dr. Teakle's report is generally understood correctly. I do not think he made such a general condemnation of the country as is supposed in many quarters. I am afraid that if he had come here years ago, he would have probably declared the whole of our agricultural lands too salt to grow crops.

Hon. M. F. Troy: Dr. Teakle's advice is valuable.

The PREMIER: I agree. I trust hon. members will realise that so far as the Government can help the farmers, the Government will help; but I am afraid it is impossible to do much without funds.

Item—General Manager, and Managing Trustee Agricultural Bank, £1,500:

Mr. SLEEMAN: I understand that this is a most able and valuable officer, but as we hear so much about equality of sacrifice my attention is aroused by the fact that he is still on the same salary while everyone else in the department has been reduced.

The Minister for Lands: He is affected by the Financial Emergency Act. You will see that that is allowed for underneath. He has been reduced by $22\frac{1}{2}$ per cent., while others have been reduced in lesser proportions.

Mr. SLEEMAN: But he is receiving the same salary as last year.

The Premier: He will have a reduction, I assure the hon. member.

Mr. SLEEMAN: I am speaking only from the aspect of equality of sacrifice.

Item: Inspectors appointed by Trustees under Agricultural Bank Act, £40,427:

Mr. COVERLEY: Last year the Agricultural Bank had 71 inspectors. The number

has now risen to 96, an increase of 25. What is the reason for the increase?

The PREMIER: Group settlement has been passed over to the Agricultural Bank, as the hon. member knows.

Vote put and passed.

Progress reported.

BILL—LICENSING ACT AMENDMENT (No. 4).

Second Reading.

Debate resumed from the previous day.

MR. MARSHALL (Murchison) [10.1]: I secured the adjournment of the debate in order that I might scrutinise the measure. I can see nothing objectionable in it. It contains a small amendment that will concern very few and will apply to one or two clubs only. The alteration to the law will not have any general application.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee, etc.

Bill passed through Committee without debate, reported without amendment and the report adopted.

House adjourned 10.4 p.m.

Legislative Assembly,

Thursday, 15th October, 1931.

	PAGE
Question: State Gardens Board	4661
Assent to Bill	4661
House staff, designations	4661
Bills: Reserves (No. 2), 3r.	4661
Roads Closure (No. 2), 3r.	4661
Licensing Act Amendment (No. 4), 3r.	4661
Annual Estimates: Votes and Items discussed	4661
Lands and Surveys	4661
Immigration	4695
Town Planning	4699
Farmers' Debts adjustment	4699

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