

Legislative Council,*Wednesday, 10th August, 1927.*

	PAGE
Questions: Metropolitan market	187
Land Settlement, Lake King	187
Papers: Railway project, Great Southern-Esperance ...	187
Motion: Traffic Act, to disallow regulations ...	188
Address-in-reply, sixth day	189

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

QUESTION—METROPOLITAN MARKETS.

Hon. J. M. MACFARLANE asked the Chief Secretary: 1, Is he aware that the delay in appointing the—(a) central marketing board is seriously inconveniencing many business people; (b) that one of the present marketing areas has changed ownership and the tenants will be compelled to find other premises? 2, Will he make an early announcement to permit these tenants and others involved to—(a) make suitable temporary arrangements pending the establishment of the markets, or (b) permanent arrangements in the event of its not being intended to proceed with the work?

The CHIEF SECRETARY replied: The personnel is now being arranged and an announcement will be made at an early date.

QUESTION—LAND SETTLEMENT, LAKE KING.

Hon. J. CORNELL asked the Chief Secretary: 1, Is any data available showing the approximate area available for settlement in the Lake King district? 2, If so, what is the extent of the area? 3, When will this land be available for selection? 4, Has any maximum price per acre been fixed? 5, If so, how much per acre? 6, Is it intended to give preference of selection in this area to migrants or group settlers proposed to be removed from their present locations? 7, If not, will preference of selection be given to discharged soldiers holding qualification certificate on a 50 per cent. reduction in price basis?

The CHIEF SECRETARY replied: 1, Yes. 2, 650,000 acres. 3, Detailed classification by surveyors is proceeding. This will be followed by subdivision, and making the

land available for selection—but several months must elapse. 4, No. 5, Answered by No. 4. 6 and 7, The question has not yet been considered.

PAPERS—RAILWAY PROJECT, GREAT SOUTHERN-ESPERANCE DISTRICTS

Hon. H. STEWART: I have on the Notice Paper the following motion—

That all papers relating to the Engineer-in-Chief's proposals for the provision of railway facilities in the country lying between the Great Southern spur lines and the Norseman-Esperance railway, in P.W.D. file 1863/23 be laid on the Table of the House.

I desire to modify that motion in a way that will be acceptable to the Government, so that no objection will be raised. I move—

That the report of the Engineer-in-Chief recommending a main trunk railway line from Fremantle to Esperance, in P.W.D. file 1863/23 be laid on the Table of the House.

The PRESIDENT: Does the Minister oppose leave being given to amend the motion?

The Chief Secretary: No.

The PRESIDENT: Then leave is granted.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: I have received from the Acting Minister for Works this afternoon an intimation that the file is required by the committee working upon it. I submitted that intimation to the hon. member, and subsequently he informed me that he had interviewed the Acting Minister for Works who, while offering objection to the whole of the file being placed on the Table—on the ground that the committee is about to prepare reports upon the projected railway—had no objection to the tabling of the Engineer-in-Chief's report. I understand that Mr. Stewart now wants only that report. I have not had time to see the Acting Minister for Works, but of course I accept the assurance of the hon. member.

Hon. J. CORNELL: I do not desire to oppose the motion, but I wish to stress another phase of the laying of this report on the Table of the House. There is another party concerned in this proposed report—

The PRESIDENT: I must point out that if this motion is of a controversial nature it cannot be proceeded with until after the Address-in-reply has been dealt with.

Hon. H. STEWART: By way of a personal explanation: Perhaps it would be better if I were to move that my notice of motion be taken to-morrow instead of to-day. That would ratify the whole position.

For to-morrow, I think, the motion will not be controversial.

Hon. J. J. HOLMES: Unless we are going to finish the Address-in-reply debate to-day, what the hon. member proposes will not ratify the position. If his motion is postponed until after the Address-in-reply debate is concluded it will be in order.

Hon. H. STEWART: Perhaps I may be permitted to wipe out what has been done, withdraw my motion and move in lieu of it that the motion of which I gave notice be postponed until the next sitting of the House.

Leave granted accordingly.

MOTION—TRAFFIC ACT.

To disallow Regulations.

Debate resumed from the previous day on the following motion by Hon. G. Potter:—

That the regulations prescribing omnibus routes Nos. 7, 16, 20, 42, 48, 54 and 55, under "The Traffic Act, 1919-1926," published in the "Government Gazette" on the 22nd July, 1927, and laid upon the Table on the 2nd August, 1927, be and are hereby disallowed.

HON. SIR WILLIAM LATHLAIN (Metropolitan-Suburban) [4.43]: The Chief Secretary said yesterday that there was a conflict of opinions generally in regard to the routes. We can quite see that is so. It appears to me there is no unanimity among the authorities themselves about the control of these vehicles. I have here a copy of the "Government Gazette," dated the 22nd July, containing regulation No. 55 prescribing that the taxi cars for Cottesloe shall start from Bazaar-terrace. Then, in the issue of the 29th July there is a notification of a stand on the south side of St. George's-terrace for three cars, provided that the stand shall be used only for cars running on the North Cottesloe service. And this later notification is covered in a letter from the Town Clerk of Perth to the Mayor of Cottesloe. Clearly the Government published a statement on the 22nd July as to where the taxis should stand, and on the 29th July we have, also in the "Government Gazette," a different starting point for taxis. I have visited the proposed starting place. Whilst I do not consider it a desirable spot to start from, that difficulty might be overcome by the installation of a number of lights, and a clearing up of the footpaths in

the vicinity. I am anxious to do everything possible for those in authority. I had a long experience as Mayor of the city, and know something of the difficulties with which the authorities are faced. I have always endeavoured to fall in with their wishes. I do not offer any direct opposition to the corner of Bazaar-terrace and William-street as a starting place and a terminus for the Fremantle taxis, but I feel that a great deal will have to be done to light the vicinity better and make it more attractive. In that respect I am prepared to waive any objection I may have. I have interviewed Inspector Hunter and realise some of the difficulties he has to contend with. It is unfortunate that we are compelled to accept or reject all these regulations that have been laid on the Table. In the circumstances, having regard to the outcry from Cottesloe, I am prepared to vote in favour of the motion. The outcry at Cottesloe has not arisen from the taxi drivers or the motor bus people. It is a genuine complaint from the residents of this popular locality.

Hon. G. Potter: The same thing applies to Fremantle.

Hon. Sir WILLIAM LATHLAIN: The Fremantle case is in the hands of better exponents, and I will leave it to them to deal with. I wish particularly to stress the difficulties at Cottesloe. This happens to be part of the great dominion I represent. In analysing the complaint as to the proposed deviation, one can hardly realise what the Advisory Board had in mind when it inaugurated the new system. If it is conceded that the railways are to be the secondary consideration and that the convenience of the people is to be studied first, the authorities are not going the right way about achieving this object. The new route which it is desired to bring into operation for the Cottesloe taxis will disconnect a great number of people from the use of those cars. It is a duty cast upon all citizens to-day to help the Government both in regard to tramways and railways. Motor transport has, however, come to stay. We are not able on the railways to cater for all the people. Motor cars now run every few minutes, whereas the trains do not run as conveniently. A big meeting was recently held at Cottesloe, and so big was it that the conveners had to engage a larger hall. The meeting was composed of residents of the locality, not of taxi or motor bus owners, but of the people directly affected. They

are very strong in their opposition to the proposed route. While I would be prepared to accept many of the regulations, we are faced with the position either of accepting the whole or none, and in the circumstances I am compelled to vote for their disallowance. A great deal has been published in the Press with regard to the outcry from Cottesloe. I believe it to be perfectly genuine. A great number of people will be cut off entirely from the conveniences that are now provided. There has been no demand from the people concerned for any variation in the present route. I hope wise counsels will prevail, and that some method will be arrived at by which those interested will be consulted, and a solution of the difficulty, that will be in the best interests of all concerned, will be brought about. The "Government Gazette" that I read shows clearly that there is no consensus of opinion on the part of the authorities. A regulation was published on 22nd July and another set was published on the 29th July. If one is to supersede the other the Cottesloe taxis will have the right to start from St. George's-terrace, and this right will be denied to the others. On account of the manner in which it is proposed to alter the Cottesloe route, and because we must take the regulations as a whole, I must vote for the motion.

On motion by Hon. J. M. Macfarlane, debate adjourned.

ADDRESS-IN-REPLY.

Sixth Day.

Debate resumed from the previous day.

HON W. T. GLASHEEN (South-East) [4.52]: It was not my intention to speak this afternoon. I was, however, informed that Mr. Burvill was not prepared to proceed, and, in deference to the wishes of the Leader of the House that we should get on with the debate as speedily as possible, I consented to play my part this afternoon. I have not prepared any notes, and as a consequence if my remarks are somewhat disconnected I hope members will bear with me. Perhaps at no time in the history of the State have we had such splendid indications of a bumper harvest all over the State. Not only in regard to wheat are these indications apparent, but they are also apparent in the case of the wool yield. So far as my

knowledge goes this is the first time in our history when the general climatic conditions have been favourable from one end of the State to the other. Whether in the furthest north or down south things could not look better. We may not realise our anticipations, because the season is yet young. Anything may happen between now and harvest time, but seeing that we have had no excessive rains this winter and that there is every prospect of getting sufficient rains for the remainder of the winter, there is every reason to believe that our anticipations will be realised. I listened with great attention yesterday afternoon to one of the best speeches I have ever heard Mr. Cornell deliver on the mining question. He dealt with it in a wonderfully logical manner, but spoilt an otherwise excellent speech by one statement he made towards its conclusion. I think he made the remark without knowing what he meant, and without perhaps giving much thought to what he said. I was surprised to hear him remark that as far as he was able to gather the great body of citizens of this State did not care a tuppenny stamp whether we had a deficit or a surplus.

Hon. J. R. Brown: Quite right, too.

Hon. W. T. GLASHEEN: I am sorry to hear some people agree with the hon. member.

Hon. J. Cornell: What I intended to say was that only five per cent of them cared.

Hon. J. J. Holmes: They will know all about it presently.

Hon. W. T. GLASHEEN: I was under the impression that we came to this House to assist in bringing about prosperous conditions, and that the greatest indication of prosperity was the Parliamentary Budget. If we had a surplus it was an indication of prosperity, and if we had a deficit it was an indication that things were not as we desired them to be. As a taxpayer I have always felt that if there was a surplus there was a possibility of having taxation reduced, and that if there was a deficit there was a strong possibility of its being increased. Seeing that that is the sequence of a surplus or a deficit, and that every man objects to a deficit, I can only say that, if the great majority of our citizens do not care a tuppenny stamp whether there is a deficit or surplus, we must in a great measure be wasting our time by coming to the House. I hope Mr. Cornell was wrong in his statement, and I certainly think he is. I think

the great body of our people are taking things more seriously than was indicated by Mr. Cornell's remarks.

Hon. J. Cornell: I do not think members could quote any item in the monthly statements which would tend very much to interest the public in general.

Hon. W. T. GLASHEEN: I should be sorry to think that the hon. member's statement was correct, and that a surplus was used only at election time in order to pull the wool over the people's eyes. I have not been present at all the sittings of the session and I have not very much knowledge as to the lines upon which the debate has proceeded. A brief run through "Hansard," however, shows me that up to the present not a word has been said about the big noise that was made over roll stuffing at election time.

Hon. E. H. Gray: That was an election-eering dodge.

Hon. E. H. Harris: There have been only half a dozen speeches.

Hon. W. T. GLASHEEN: The interjection suggests that the matter will yet be dealt with. I have never yet and never will accense any Ministry or any individual in such Ministry of corruption unless I am certain of the facts beforehand. Before people make such accusations they should be certain of the truth of their statements. Members of this Chamber, through the Press and on the platform, acclaimed to the public that corruption was about, and that the rolls had been stuffed, and I candidly say I am not inclined to believe that there was very much in the statements.

Hon. E. H. Gray: Hear, hear!

Hon. W. T. GLASHEEN: But this is the point I am leading up to. When the Main Roads Board was appointed the desire was expressed that that body should be free from political control as far as possible, and we went to no end of pains, remembering the immense amount of money the board would have at its disposal to spend, to see that our desire was carried out. If the statements that have been made concerning the manner in which the board carried on their operations during election time, are not true, and if the board, as well as the Government, are innocent of the accusations that have been made against them, the board should be the very first to take action in the direction of having an in-

vestigation made. So far nothing has been said about an inquiry, but I hope and trust that some form of inquiry will be instituted to find out whether there was anything in the statements made. I contend that if a commission, or whatever form the inquiry might take, were appointed, and it was found that there was substance in what was said, the Government would have to be censured. I do not think it will be possible to get at the facts unless there is a commission of inquiry. Were I a member of the board, and were I innocent of the charges made in connection with the election, I would be a most enthusiastic advocate for an investigation.

Hon. E. H. Harris: To what board are you referring?

Hon. W. T. GLASHEEN: The Main Roads Board. I had the privilege of speaking on many platforms during the election campaign, but I always went this far and no further: I said it was a great pity that the nomadic voter, who had no interest in any particular electorate, should come along and be allowed to declare who should represent the electorate for the ensuing three years, and then leave the district.

Hon. E. H. Gray: Would you disfranchise them altogether? They had their postal vote franchise.

Hon. W. T. GLASHEEN: I just said it was a pity that this kind of thing should be allowed; I never went further than that on the public platform. We come now to the Vermin Act. I do not know of any legislation that has been more rebelled against than this. The total revenue to be raised by taxation under that Act will be approximately £40,000. We objected to the quota carried by the agricultural industry as compared with that carried by the pastoral industry. Speaking from memory, the ratio was £28,000 in the agricultural areas and £10,000 in the pastoral areas.

Hon. H. Stewart: It is a shame.

Hon. W. T. GLASHEEN: A summary of the position is this: we are approximately fifty-fifty in regard to sheep. That is to say, there are as many sheep in the pastoral as in the agricultural areas, and therefore the allocation of the amount that should be borne by the two industries should also be fifty-fifty. Speaking as a farmer and sheep owner, I have no objection to the dingo tax: I welcome it, pro-

vided, of course, the tax will result in destroying the pest. I think it is an excellent insurance, irrespective of the ratio, if it rids the country of dingoes. But I say, so far as the £2 bonus for dingo scalps is concerned, whilst it might be effective in the North-West, where the dingoes are thick, in the agricultural areas, where there may be only an occasional dog, it does not act as a remedy, for the simple reason that there are no expert trappers. The catching of dingoes is one of the most expert jobs known.

Hon. C. F. Baxter: Mr. Burges, representing the pastoralists, says that you can poison any dingo.

Hon. W. T. GLASHEEN: As he is an expert, I believe him.

Hon. C. F. Baxter: I do not think he is an expert.

Hon. W. T. GLASHEEN: I consider that the most effective way of dealing with the pest is to secure the services of a number of the most expert dog trappers to be found—and a great number of them can be found in the State. These men should be employed by the central authority, and when an isolated dog comes into a locality it should be possible to go to the central authority and ask for the services of the expert. Years ago I had a dog in my flock. He worried the sheep for over three years, and in that period got nearly 200 of them. I tried to catch the dog and my neighbours also tried to catch it. Eventually we did catch it by a ruse, and we found that it was not a dingo at all but that it was a dog belonging to my next door neighbour. If we had had an expert from Perth in that particular case, I am sure that in a day or two the dog would have been captured. Previous to that time, another neighbour, who was an expert in catching dingoes, got every dingo that came into the district. I desire particularly to impress this upon the House, that he made application to the authorities to be employed at £600 a year, and in return for that sum he guaranteed that any man, given the secret that he possessed, would be able to rid the country of the pest. I believe his was a simple secret and he was prepared to sell it for £600. He said he would travel all over the State, meet the various local bodies, and tell them how to catch the dogs, and he added that afterwards all would be able to catch the pest as easily as he had done.

The reply that this man got was that there was no provision on the Estimates for any such expenditure, and his offer was turned down. I contend that if the services of such a man were secured at the present time great benefit would accrue from his employment. I desire to say something about our railways. On the Table of the House we have a sketch of a comprehensive scheme for which, during the past several years, we have been agitating and in fact dreaming about. I congratulate those responsible for the sketch, and on at last having set out a scheme in concrete form. To my way of thinking, any person perusing it will say, that if it is carried into effect, it will open up one of the most thinly populated parts of the State. It is almost a young continent in itself, capable of supporting thousands of people, and I hope and trust that the time will not be long before we will have the steel rails traversing the route indicated. But I am not at all optimistic because of the fact that there is a distinct tendency towards pessimism arising out of the dilly-dallying in connection with the railway policy that requires to be carried out in this great State of ours. I think the total mileage of the comprehensive scheme which consists of a line from Southern Cross to Albany, linking up all those unsatisfactory dead-ends and giving practically the whole of that vast country access to its natural port with the exception of the suggested Brookton-Armadale and Corrigin to Kalbarin lines, will be approximately 500 or perhaps 550 miles. I am in keeping with Mr. Stileman's recommendation as far as Kalbarin is concerned, but at the present time, with our want of knowledge of the country beyond that point, I consider it is as far as it should go. If we are to wait for the 550 miles to be constructed and wait also for the 600 miles, the construction of which, I believe, has been authorised, we shall all be well and truly dead. Our children also will be dead before the project comes to fruition. Seeing that we have 40 or 50 people ready to apply for every block of land that is thrown open, and seeing that thousands of blocks will be made available, given railway facilities, in that vast province, I should like to say, as I have said before, that I hope the Government will become a little more courageous in the raising of money for railway construction. If we go

into figures, it will be found that at the present cost of railway construction the linking up right through by the Stileman scheme from Brookton to Armadale and on to Kalgarin, the construction of the north-south line from Southern Cross to Albany and the linking of Ravensthorpe with Pingrup would entail an outlay of a mere two millions of money, and the interest charge per annum on that sum per head of population would amount to the price of attending one picture show, namely 5s. Seeing that the interest on that expenditure would be only 5s. per head per annum and that the railway would enable hundreds and perhaps thousands of people to be settled, I maintain that if we have the faith we profess in this great country, it should not be foolish to borrow the two millions of money for the work. During the regime of the previous Government, they constructed a total of 150 miles of railway in three years, which was 50 miles a year. At that rate of progress it will take us 12 years to construct the railways at present authorised. The land along the routes of the authorised lines is well and truly settled. The people have gone there in anticipation of the railways being built. There is hardly a block of land to be obtained anywhere along those routes. Most of the people applying for land are migrants and, if all the blocks adjacent to authorised railways are occupied, where are we going to put the migrants? The group settlement scheme has been discontinued for the moment; no more migrants can be absorbed there. The English people who are being brought here and cannot obtain land will be absolutely and positively the worst advertisement for the State in the Old Land, because they individually write to their friends and tell them that though they were informed they could get land in Western Australia, application after application has proved unsuccessful. So I stress the fact that everything this great stretch of country promises, provided railway facilities are given, indicates that we should go on with the proposal, borrow an extra couple of millions of money and allow the cheap migration money now available to be utilised to vertake the arrears of railway construction by the building of the authorised lines. There has been a great agitation, in fact I might describe it as a battle of the routes. The Kalgarin people are fighting tooth and nail to get the Stileman scheme, which will connect Kalgarin with Kondinin, whereas

the Lake Grace people want the railway to go from there and connect with Kalgarin. There is a prevailing opinion that the construction of the one line would to some extent disqualify the construction of the other. I know that country, and I say without hesitation that the construction of the line from Lake Grace to Kalgarin would not nullify the claims for the construction of the line from Kalgarin to Kondinin, or vice versa. I hope we shall push on with a comprehensive scheme of railway construction, particularly if we link up the Brookton-Armadale section. It will provide a means of revenue production from wheat and wool that we are all so desirous of obtaining. The question of the groups is one of the biggest public questions claiming the attention of the country. At present much division of opinion exists regarding the group settlements. I hope that those people who hold the view that group settlement is a white elephant will not express it, seeing what group settlement means to this State. I trust they will be loyal enough to the State and to all that the group system stands for fervently to pray that their opinions will be falsified rather than to be able to say, "I told you so." No system of migration has been so widely advertised as has group settlement. The British Delegation who visited Western Australia were shown our groups particularly and eulogised them all over the world. Group settlement has been the guiding star of other migration proposals and if, after all that wide publicity, the group system fails, it will strike the greatest blow at the credit of the State that has ever been known in its history. At the same time let me sound this note of pessimism. One cannot help thinking we need to be very careful indeed. The Federal Minister for Markets in the person of Mr. Paterson told us yesterday something of the Paterson scheme. Under that scheme the people of Australia have given producers 3d. per lb. extra to enable them to make a living. That has set me thinking. If the people in the Eastern States who have been bred to the industry, know it from A to Z, have been engaged in it for generations, have most fertile land, all developed years ago when costs were low and now highly fertilised and as prolific as possible, much of it under irrigation; if those people, I repeat, are unable to make a living without the help of 3d. per lb. per medium of the Paterson scheme, we at least have ground to fear for the suc-

cess of group settlement in this State. I hope that all members of Parliament and all people in the community will apply their united wisdom to make our groups successful. Statements have been made about the high costs of group settlement. I am not surprised at the cost; what does surprise me is that the costs are not higher. In spite of the accusations made from time to time about the administration, the overseers and in fact everybody connected with the scheme, I contend that, considering the raw material with which the departmental officials had to work, they have done as well as could be expected. We have brought here from London people who previously had never had an axe in their hands and had never used a pick.

Hon. Sir William Lathlain: Neither had our fathers.

Hon. W. T. GLASHEEN: And we send them into the bush in the South-West. Any person with the bush instinct, looking at the gigantic trees and considering their thickness and profusion, cannot expect a man from London, unused to anything but driving a quill, to supply the labour to produce results. If anyone contends otherwise he does not understand the job. I have seen a man, skilled in the use of the axe and of fire for clearing, go into the bush side by side with a man knowing nothing of the job—a “pommy” from London—just the kind of labour employed in developing the groups, and the man of experience has cleared 20 acres while the other has not cleared half an acre. That sort of thing can be seen in any part of the State, and it goes to show the crudeness of the labour with which the department are endeavouring to do the job.

Hon. J. Ewing: How long would it take them to learn the job?

Hon. W. T. GLASHEEN: Some men will never learn. If it is late in life when they take it on, they will never learn. Many people think it requires nothing but stupidity to use an axe or a pick, but it requires training just as does anything else.

Hon. G. Potter: Adaptability also counts.

Hon. W. T. GLASHEEN: Quite so.

Hon. G. Potter: The most successful settler on the Peel Estate is an ex-London bus driver.

Hon. W. J. Mann: Some of the settlers have been using a pick all their lives.

Hon. W. T. GLASHEEN: This brings me to the question of inefficient labour. The whole tendency of the world has been in the direction of harnessing capital with great inventions and the great results of scientific research, and to that we owe our high standard of living. I make this statement, and I am not aware that it has been made before, that while we have made wonderful strides in massed production, forced upon us it is true by economic circumstances, we are to a great extent producing butter and endeavouring to develop the groups by the same old-time methods that were adopted 40 or 50 years ago with the exception, perhaps, that to-day up-to-date milking machines are used. In the manufacture of motor cars, boots, and everything else necessity has compelled individual effort to give way to massed production, and yet we are endeavouring to carry on dairying by time-worn methods. I have no hesitation in asserting that if the men on the groups were allowed to earn the basic wage and demanded a five instead of a seven-day week, the holidays that other sections of the community enjoy and the pleasures of picture shows, racecourses, etc., it would be impossible to get butter in this State at 4s. a lb. It is just because men and women are wearing out their lives in slavery that we have cheap butter to-day. I know nothing about timber, but I was told certain things at Denmark, and I may add that the person who told me did not know to whom he was talking. He said to me, “Do you know that on some of the groups the settlers were told that as soon as they occupied their blocks they must start to ring the timber, to kill it? In two or three years’ time it is commercially dead and useless, and on hundred of acres of these blocks there was karri and jarrah of a value of £400 or £500 per acre.” Does it not seem that in this there is a great waste?

Hon. J. Nicholson: Did the overseers tell the settlers to ring the timber?

Hon. W. T. GLASHEEN: I do not know. I can only bear out what I was told by saying that with my own eyes I saw hundred and hundreds of acres ringbarked. Somebody must have ordered the job to be done.

Hon. W. J. Mann: What kind of timber?

Hon. W. T. GLASHEEN: Karri and jarrah. It has occurred to me that if we are to give these people the current standard of living and all that is meant by democracy

we shall have to put a stop to individual effort in the butter industry. As surely as night follows day, if the butter industry is to be a sound, desirable industry, we must introduce mass production into it. May I visualise the proposition in this way? Take, for instance, a 20,000-acre patch in the South-West. I presume there is such a patch in the South-West. If we are to get the proposition up to a point of efficiency that has been found absolutely necessary in the economic scheme of things, we take hold of that 20,000-acre patch by harnessing it just as industry has been harnessed with capital and scientific invention and scientific research. The individual would be merged in that great body of efficiency. I cannot for the life of me see why great capital should be concentrated only on transitory things that are here to-day and gone to-morrow—motor cars or women's silk stockings. Big combines of capital and scientific invention and specialism should also be applied to such matters as the butter industry. They are now applied to such transient things as I have mentioned, and evidently there is sufficient faith in returns for such businesses to continue. As long as there has been human life, probably, the product of the cow has been used. People have always eaten butter, and presumably they always will do so. Butter is a world's commodity that will never suffer from changes of fashion, but will always be necessary. I cannot but think that if assistance and encouragement were given to capital in Western Australia, there could be mass production of butter in the South-West. A company might be floated to work a 20,000-acre block such as I have suggested. The first thing the company would do would not be to put people from London on that block to clear gigantic trees. For a start the company would construct a light line into the block, a line such as Mr. Hedges built at Kurrawang, and such as the timber interests in the South-West construct. The company would run a line into the middle of the group, and then would supply the best machinery and the best efficiency possible to the conversion of the commercial timber on the block. I understand that the capital resulting from the sale of that timber, about £400 or £500 per acre, would practically clear the holding. In the groups there is division of effort. We see the bedraggled man who owns a few cows, and the childrer who are as bedraggled as he is; and possi-

bly there are a couple of starved-looking dogs. They march out into the bush every morning—individuality is everywhere—and bring in the cows and milk them in the crudest manner possible, by a process that is far from hygienic, milk them in filth which becomes mixed with the milk sometimes. With that great inefficiency arising from our having little patches of cream all over the place that reach the factory only occasionally, we expect the production of prime butter. Let us assume that capital is provided to deal with the job of working a 20,000-acre proposition. The breeding of cattle is a highly specialised process, and the best expert obtainable in that line would be on the block. The growth of pastures is another highly specialised job, and the best specialist available would be there on the spot. We have heard from Mr. Mann and Mr. Burvill that one of the chief disabilities of the South-West is that one cannot get continuity there as regards fodder. Those hon. members said the solution of the difficulty was the establishment of silos, by which fodder could be bottled up when it was plentiful to be used when it was scarce. Little silos everywhere would not be needed. With systematised mass production which has been found essential in practically every other industry, one gets specialisation. Sensible people would co-operate with their labourers and give them a share in the returns. I contend that if butter is to be produced at a cost within the means of the people generally, while at the same time those engaged in the butter trade are to be maintained at that standard of living of which we are all so proud, the only course is to deal with butter production as we have dealt with the production of other commodities that we need. What would it cost to-day to have a motor car manufactured by the village blacksmith? Assume that the village blacksmith insists on the high standard of living that has evolved, on the tenancy of a £1,000 house, on good clothes, good education, good food, good beer and all the rest of it. Such a village blacksmith could not produce a motor car for the public under £3,000 or £4,000. The same things are behind the production of butter as are behind the production of women's silk stockings. With the exception of minor applications of what we call up-to-date methods, the butter producers are expected to supply by entirely antiquated processes prime butter at a cost within the financial capacity

of the general public. I voice these few sentiments. The people who produce butter, just like the people who produce shoes or any other article, are entitled to a high standard of living. To-day we are getting cheap butter because in the economic scheme of things butter is being produced under conditions approximating slavery.

Hon. J. Ewing: What would become of the small holder producing butter? Would he become a servant then? Your idea is Utopian.

Hon. W. T. GLASHEEN: When British capital built the first railway in China, the Chinese said, "It is no good to us," and they smashed it to pieces. In England the same thing occurred. The people said, "This railway is a curse; it will out our horses and our carts." The people who built carts expressed themselves to the same effect. All the interests, by every means in their power, rebelled against the railways. And the great mass of workers have always said the same thing upon the introduction of machinery or labour-saving devices. When the factory system evolved, they rebelled and broke the machinery. But in the great scheme of things, greater efficiency produces greater wealth for everybody, and more work.

Hon. C. F. Baxter: Australia will not gain much from motor cars, tractors and so forth, seeing that all the money for their purchase goes to America.

Hon. W. T. GLASHEEN: That interjection rather surprises me. I am not aware that anyone in this country buys a tractor or a motor car for fun. When I bought one I bought it because it was a business proposition.

Hon. C. F. Baxter: But was it a business proposition for the Commonwealth?

Hon. W. T. GLASHEEN: Absolutely, in order to gain individual efficiency. I contend that the motor car, even though produced in America, is one of the greatest civilising factors Australia has known. It has brought the isolated outback people together, and added to the efficiency of our people as a whole. With the aid of an American tractor a farmer can now put in 1,000 acres of crop alone. If Australia thinks she is getting nothing out of tractors and motor cars, she is entirely mistaken. By reason of the added wealth produced here, we get a great deal out of tractors and motor cars. The subject of fruit I will let alone. Doubtless Mr. Mann will blow it to ribbons when

he gets up. Now I come to the great industrial question. There are people about—I believe there are some in this Chamber—who persistently declare that they cannot support the basic wage. All I can say is that I wish any person holding that view, if he is in comfortable circumstances, might be less comfortable for a while, at all events to the extent of having to try what living on the basic wage means, having regard to the high standard of living and the high cost of everything. Personally I would rather be inclined to say that the basic wage is not sufficient, providing that people work.

Hon. J. M. Macfarlane: Does that apply to rural workers?

Hon. W. T. GLASHEEN: To anyone, if his industry can stand it. When it comes to a question of efficiency, hon. members can go to some of the farms in the wheat belt where the farmers are struggling along in their individual ways. They have not gone in for efficient production. On many wheat farms are to be found men who, while they will rebel with all the venom and language they can command, against the payment of £2 in connection with the vermin tax, are content to leave, possibly, £2,000 worth of expensive machinery lying about their property uncovered and being destroyed by the weather. That is usually the type of man that lodges such complaints. To a certain degree we cannot blame anyone for this position. The fact remains, however, that inefficiency, to a great extent, prevents agriculturists from paying high wages and shouldering all the disabilities that they have to suffer because of the tariff and the high cost of living, expenses that they cannot pass on.

Hon. G. Potter: Do you say that the farming community can do that and still sell their commodities in the world's markets?

Hon. W. T. GLASHEEN: I do not. To-day some people wax eloquent about our great prosperity, but do hon. members ever appreciate the fact that that prosperity is really based on a fluke? If hon. members throw their minds back to the period prior to the war, and have taken the trouble to study statistics, they will find that for 10 years before that period the price of wheat was 3s. a bushel and that of wool was correspondingly low. Those prices were approximately 100 per cent. below present rates. Since the war the price of wheat has risen owing to force of circumstances over

which no Parliament has had control. Without fear of contradiction, I assert that had it not been for prevailing world conditions that brought about this rise in prices for the output of primary industries, there would have been practically no such industries left here at all, because they could not have continued to exist at the old prices. The pastoral industry could not have continued had the price of wool remained at the pre-war level. The change has been brought about by the revolutionary state of Russia forcing that country out of the market. Formerly, that country always had a levelling influence on the ruling price of wheat. Then America, through her neglect of agriculture, also went off the market and at the same time China, Japan and other Eastern nations consumed an ever-increasing quantity of wheat. Because of this set of circumstance, we are now getting between 5s. and 6s. a bushel for our wheat, and that has brought about the present great prosperity in spite of all Governments and all legislation.

Hon. Sir William Lathlain: You must remember that over a million more people are born each year to eat more wheat.

Hon. W. T. GLASHEEN: I admit that. As to the industrial position, I hope with all sincerity that in future the same thought and intelligence that the industrial people brought to bear on their organising work for the purpose of fighting, will be exercised in the direction of encouraging co-operative efforts between themselves and capitalists.

Hon. E. H. Gray: But the capitalists will not co-operate! That is the trouble.

Hon. W. T. GLASHEEN: I will give the industrial movement credit for this fact. The fault is on one side no more than on the other. The blame is equally with both. I have not yet learnt of a capitalist, who was worth a tuppenny stamp, rising to a state of affluence without access to Labour, nor have I ever heard of a single labourer, worth a tuppenny stamp, who had not harnessed his labour to Capital. The greatest scientists and inventors have provided the world with wonderful means of production and they have played their part. Capital and labour have been harnessed to those great sciences and inventions, but if we are to reach a state of perfection as between the factors of Labour and Capital, it can be brought about only when the labouring classes become possessed of the belief that they must organise to co-operate with the

capitalists, and the capitalists are obsessed with the same idea. Nothing is surer, if we are to maintain our high standard of living, than that capital and labour must get together in a co-operative effort. We have a wonderful illustration of that in America, but still we had better not say too much about that country! There are some people who will be here soon who may undermine some of our illusions. On the other hand, we know of Henry Ford's work in America and his co-operation with labour. He has never had a strike in his works and he has never paid below the wages demanded by unionists. By means of co-operation, he has got the best out of his men and they are well paid for it. By this method Mr. Ford has made himself the richest man in the world and provided the people of the world with a convenience that is to be seen everywhere. In fact I believe that recently the Ford works turned out the sixty-millionth car. That is an example of what can be done by means of co-operation. Here, too, with a rising cost of living, we have an illustration of what the fight between capital and labour really means. If we are to develop this country, it can only be with capital and labour working together in harmony. The tendency to fight is reminiscent of the nigger tribes of ancient history. Those niggers believed that their very existence depended upon fighting and bashing the other fellows off the earth. Nowadays we are all human and I confess I do not know of any capitalist who is not trying to get as much as he can out of labour and to work his men as long as he can, while on the other hand I know of no worker who is not trying to get as much as he can for as few hours of work as possible. Let us not blame the worker. If circumstances arose to-morrow under which capitalists were compelled to earn their own living, they would very soon become the victims of their new environment, and it would not be long before the views of yesterday were changed to those of the immediate present and they would be fighting the fight of the labourer. They would endeavour to get as much money as they could for as little work as possible. On the other hand, if the greatest Labour agitator in the world were to suddenly become possessed of wealth, he, too, would become the victim of his environment and would develop the ideas of the capitalist. Thus we are all human, governed by nature which is the same at the top

as at the bottom. I hope industrial strife will cease and that intelligence will be applied to a co-operative effort between capital and labour. If that is done we will be able to improve our standard of living and yet the community will be able to stand up to it. I wish to deal with that hardy annual—Protection. We had a long dissertation on this question this morning at a conference in the city. Someone speaking there said what I have tried so many times to put before hon. members. In a nutshell, he said that the prevailing opinion in Australia regarding Protection was just that which had been promulgated through the Press, from public platforms, and through other avenues of communication. It was that if we protect our secondary industries, we will build up a consuming home population that will make the farming industry prosperous. The claim was that it was better to do that than to depend upon overseas parity prices.

Hon. H. Stewart: That was the great stunt in the Sydney "Bulletin."

Hon. W. T. GLASHEEN: That is the argument for Protection.

Hon. G. W. Miles: That is what Mr. Bruce calls the Australian policy.

Hon. H. Stewart: For which he disclaims any responsibility.

Hon. G. W. Miles: No, that is the Melbourne and Sydney policy.

Hon. W. T. GLASHEEN: I wish to mention one of the greatest books ever written on economic subjects by a person who, until he wrote the book, was practically unknown. I refer to "The Great Illusion," by Norman Angell. He was a London banker, well up in banking circles. He was a great student of political economy, industrial legislation and so on. He wrote that book prior to the war and it had the greatest reception from Press and public alike in every part of the world, greater than was accorded any other book before or since. It was quoted in the British Parliament, in the German Reichstag, and in the Parliaments of many other countries, while every prominent newspaper eulogised the great originality of the work. Norman Angell preached of the great fallacy of war and urged that the conquering nation was the nation that lost. Every claim that he made in that book was proved as the result of the great war. Subsequently Norman Angell went to America in order to study the so-called great prosperity of that country. He applied to the problem his keen ana-

lytical mind, the qualities of which had been recognised and eulogised all over the world. As the result of what he saw, Angell predicted that in 20 years time the greatest chaos would prevail there. He prophesied that banking institutions would tumble down and that industrial chaos would rank in that country as it had ranked in no other part of the world. Whether he will be proved right or wrong in his prediction, remains to be seen, but in view of his writings in "The Great Illusion," I am inclined to think that he will be right.

Hon. G. W. Miles: What will happen in Melbourne and Sydney, then?

Hon. W. T. GLASHEEN: He said that if they left the cities of America and went into the country the contrast would be found to be so great as to be unbelievable. He said the banks were toppling over by the hundred every day, and that there was a feeling of unrest among the people, who were not getting a decent living from the soil. They were leaving their farms in thousands, and the first man to come along could pick up a farm for nothing. My point is that if there were anything in the statement of the protectionist people, that the secondary industries would build up consuming markets for the primary producers, the primary producers of America to-day should be the most prosperous in the world. However, there you have the condition of things in America. It should give us food for thought. If this mad policy of protection continues, we shall find our weak spot all right. It has struck our mining industry already, and the mining industry is dead. Had not the great burden of the protective policy been imposed on the mining industry, the mining industry to-day would be supporting thousands of people. And the next to be taken is the next weakest. We shall have to give the butter industry protection to the extent of 3d. per lb. If the mad system continues, there will come this predicted crash in America. I believe we do not require to be told it by Norman Angell; for we have studied history, and history teaches what is going to happen. So sure as night follows day, these things are going to happen in Australia. The primary industries will be attacked, and one by one they will go to the wall. When that happens we shall know whether or not it was wise to have this great policy of protec-

tion. Regrettable as it is to have to say it, we shall find out whether the thing is good or bad only by trying it; and only by failing shall we be able to find it out. No economist I have ever read but has agreed that it is a false economic principle. Yet the ignorant people—ignorant, I mean, only in this one narrow sense—have decided that it shall be the settled policy of Australia, and in consequence Governments, Ministers and members of Parliament have to carry on the policy. We have for long complimented ourselves on our high standard of living, but it cannot possibly last much longer unless we overturn that great fiscal absurdity, protection. I have pleasure in supporting the motion.

On motion by Hon. C. F. Baxter, debate adjourned.

House adjourned at 6.5 p.m.

Legislative Assembly,

Wednesday, 10th August, 1927.

	PAGE
Questions: Taxation allowance ...	198
Vermion Act—1, Bonus on wild dogs; 2, Standard fence ...	198
Butter preservatives ...	198
Railways—1, East-West extension to Fremantle; 2, Fruit for refreshment rooms ...	199
Water supply guarantees ...	199
Leave of absence ...	199
Address-in-reply, sixth day ...	199

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

QUESTION—TAXATION, ALLOWANCE.

Mr. GRIFFITHS asked the Premier: 1, Is he aware that the maintenance allowance for farm hands under the Workers' Compensation Act is 30s., but for taxation purposes only 20s.? 2, Will he instruct the Taxation Department to remedy this anomaly?

The MINISTER FOR JUSTICE (for the Premier) replied: 1, Yes. 2, No, there is no anomaly. The Taxation Department allows taxpayers (employers) the actual

cost of their employees' maintenance where proper accounts are kept, or 20s. per week for maintenance where no accounts are kept. These provisions apply to Federal and State income tax, and have never been objected to by employers or employees.

QUESTIONS (2)—VERMIN ACT.

Bonus on Wild Dogs.

Mr. LINDSAY asked the Hon. H. Millington (Honorary Minister): 1, On how many wild dogs was bonus paid? 2, How much was paid for the years 1924-25 and 1925-26?

Hon. H. MILLINGTON replied: 1, 1924-25, 8,910 wild dogs were destroyed, the bonuses for which amounted to £3,219 15s. 2, 1925-26, 6,028 wild dogs were destroyed, the bonuses for which amounted to £2,390 15s.

Standard Fence.

Mr. RICHARDSON (for Mr. Latham) asked the Hon. H. Millington (Honorary Minister): Will he give detailed specifications of a vermin fence that will satisfy the Chief Inspector and enable him to issue a certificate of exemption from vermin tax?

Hon. H. MILLINGTON: replied: The Chief Inspector will grant exemption from the payment of the vermin tax if the fence, as per details hereunder, is erected by the settler:—"A substantial fence with posts not more than 15 feet apart, hung with rabbit-proof netting 42 inches wide, mesh not greater than 1½ inches, and not less than 18 gauge wire, with not less than 6 inches of the netting perpendicular in the ground. Above the rabbit netting sheep or dog netting 3 feet wide to be hung with a final wire, making a total height of six feet. The final two feet of the fence must lean outwards at an angle of 45 degrees.

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: That is not in accordance with the Act.

Hon. H. MILLINGTON: It is.

QUESTION—BUTTER, PRESERVATIVES.

Mr. NORTH asked the Minister for Health: 1, Has he noticed that Britain has prohibited the sale of butter containing borax or other preservatives? 2, Will he obtain