

for Lands, had a lot of clearing done in anticipation of the subsequent sale of the land.

Mr. Lindsay: That was not too successful.

Mr. ANGELO: That may be so, because the work was done by day labour. I am not suggesting day labour in this case.

Mr. Lindsay: That was for ringbarking and scrubbing. The timber grew up again before the settlers could make use of the land. The work was badly done.

Mr. ANGELO: Hundreds of men are ready to purchase blocks as soon as the clearing has been effected. I would ask the Government to give these suggestions some thought. If it relieved the situation and assisted 90 per cent. of the unemployed it might be followed up later by further clearing along the same lines. I have an idea the Government do not like contract work, but in times of stress we have to take exceptional measures to overcome difficulties. I hope the Government will see if the suggestion put forward by the "Daily News" cannot be gone into and perhaps given effect to, thereby not only relieving those who are unemployed, but speeding up production generally.

The Premier: You do not know what has been happening. You must have been out of the State for a few weeks.

Mr. ANGELO: If the Premier can tell me that something has already been done in this direction, I shall be only too glad to hear it.

The Premier: All that was done weeks ago. How long have you been away?

Mr. ANGELO: I am delighted to hear it. I have read numbers of speeches as well as the papers, but I have heard of no action being taken in this direction. I have heard that land has been cleared out from Southern Cross for roads only, but I understand the actual work of clearing lots has not yet been started.

The Premier: You have not been long enough back to make yourself acquainted with all the facts.

Mr. ANGELO: I am glad to hear that something in this direction is being done. It is the right way to set about such work. If, therefore, what I have been talking about cannot be taken as a suggestion, I am only too pleased to compliment the Government upon having already started this scheme.

On motion by Mr. Rowe, debate adjourned.

*House adjourned at 9.22 p.m.*

## Legislative Assembly.

*Thursday, 23rd August, 1928.*

	Page
Questions: Police Benefit Fund ...	419
Police Superannuation scheme ...	419
Railways and Vacuum Oil Co. ...	420
Address-in-Keyip, tenth day, conclusion ...	420
Bills: Abattoirs Act Amendment, 1R. ...	457
Fertilisers, 1R. ...	457
Dried Fruits Act Amendment, 1R. ...	457
Feeding Stuffs, 1R. ...	457
Police Offences (Drugs), 1R. ...	457
Workers' Homes Act Amendment, 1R. ...	457
Electric Light and Power Agreement Amendment, 1R. ...	457
Electoral Act Amendment, 1R. ...	457
Traffic Act Amendment, 1R. ...	457
City of Perth Superannuation Fund, 1R. ...	457
Dog Act Amendment, 1R. ...	457

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

### QUESTIONS (2)—POLICE BENEFIT FUND.

#### *Scale of Benefits.*

Mr. E. B. JOHNSTON asked the Minister for Police: 1, Have the Government given effect to the recommendation of the select committee of the Legislative Assembly appointed to inquire into the Police Benefit Fund, namely that the scale of benefits for officers who have joined the Police Force since 1917 be increased to the rate applicable to officers who joined prior to that date? 2, If not, why not?

The MINISTER FOR POLICE replied: 1, No. 2, It is not at present considered that the financial position of the fund is sufficiently strong to allow of the extension of benefits as mentioned in (1).

#### *Superannuation Scheme.*

Mr. E. B. JOHNSTON asked the Minister for Police: What action has been taken by the Government in regard to the recommendation of the select committee of the Legislative Assembly appointed to inquire into the practicability of converting the Police Benefit Fund into a superannuation scheme:—"That the Police Benefit Fund be converted into a pension scheme similar in respect to pensions, gratuities, and allowances to that covering the Victorian police force"?

The MINISTER FOR POLICE replied: Similar requests have also been received

from officers of the Public Service, teachers' union, various railway unions, and other Government employees. As it is desired that any action taken should be on a uniform basis, the whole matter will be considered as it affects all Government employees.

### QUESTION—RAILWAYS AND VACUUM OIL CO.

Mr. C. P. WANSBROUGH asked the Minister for Railways: 1, Is it a fact that a lease has been granted to the Vacuum Oil Company for the purpose of establishing a depot in the Quairading railway yard practically in the centre of the town? 2, If so, is he aware that a site was available on the outskirts of the town adjoining the Shell Company's depot? 3, Is it a fact that the local authorities strongly protested against the site being leased, and will he have further inquiries made with the view of meeting the local authorities' desires in the matter?

The MINISTER FOR RAILWAYS replied: 1, Yes. 2, No. 3, The objection of the road board was considered before the agreement with the Vacuum Oil Company was finalised.

### ADDRESS-IN-REPLY.

#### *Tenth Day—Conclusion.*

Debate resumed from the previous day.

MR. ROWE (North-East Fremantle) [4.37]: Having some questions of more or less importance to deal with, I am glad of the opportunity to say a few words on the Governor's Speech. The most outstanding question in the eyes of the general public is the extension of the Fremantle Harbour. It has been suggested that the harbour should be extended outward. At the outset, let me express my absolute opposition to that idea. Being thoroughly conversant with conditions prevailing in the outer harbour before the inner harbour was constructed, I could relate some exciting incidents which happened during that period. Twenty-five or 30 years ago there was no such place as the inner harbour, all work being performed in the outer harbour. I have frequently worked on ships in the outer harbour when a gale

from the North-West was blowing. On such occasions I have seen springs attached to the pier carried away. Springs as thick as a man's thigh snapped like a bundle of thread. On the other hand, if the springs were too powerful, the bollards would be torn away from the jetty and the ship would drift towards Robb's jetty. As a consequence, much time would be lost while the ship was being moored at a fresh berth. The seas then broke across the North Mole and the south jetty just as they are doing to-day, and similar seas will break across the harbour or the breakwater for all time to come. We are given to understand that an outside harbour will be quite satisfactory and will answer all purposes. This is on the supposition that sufficient accommodation will not be provided in the inner harbour to accommodate the ships that will be visiting Fremantle in the near future. Comparing the ships of to-day with those that came here 20 years ago, one recognises that there is no comparison between them in point of tonnage. My memory goes back to the time when the "Buninyong," the "Gabo," and the "Coolgardie," were moored to the jetty. Compare with such vessels the steamers of to-day, with all their top hamper; and consider what a terrible force of wind they would catch! To moor these ships of to-day in the outer harbour is almost a matter of impossibility, to say nothing of the enormous expense attaching to the proposal. My own view is that we have not much occasion to worry about this aspect of the matter, because the enormously increasing production of wheat in Western Australia will inevitably entail a system of bulk handling.

Hon. W. J. George: We shall not be able to handle the wheat without.

Mr. ROWE: That being so, I fail to see the need for entertaining the idea of an outer harbour scheme. Whether on the north side of the Mole or on its south side the same terrific weather will be experienced in future as is being experienced to-day. Therefore I voice my objection to the idea that the outer harbour will be able to accommodate the ships that will come here in future. Another matter which I think calls for attention is that of making provision for the financing of hospitals and charitable institutions. Many years' experience as a member of the Fremantle Hospital Board has convinced me that action

in that respect is overdue. Frequently the hospital board have been at their wits' ends to know how to meet the liabilities of the institution. Accounts have often been passed for payment at such time as funds were available. That is a state of affairs which should not exist in a country like Western Australia. I have taken my stand in the public street with a collection box and asked people to give something towards the upkeep of the hospital. It is not fitting that in a State like Western Australia any resident should have to do a thing of that kind. Therefore I shall support any measure which may be brought forward to overcome the trouble. Thanks to the generosity of the people of Fremantle, who organised a carnival in aid of the Fremantle Hospital, the position of the board has been somewhat easier of late; but that expedient cannot be relied upon for all time, because the people eventually tire of such affairs.

Mr. Mann: It is the same people that give every time.

Mr. ROWE: Undoubtedly; and that is why I shall support a measure under which everyone would have to give—rich and poor alike; and the richer a man is, the more he should give. We are led to expect a wonderful harvest this year, and we realise that such a prospect looms in the distance. Consequently there is likely to be a shortage of rolling stock to cope with the wheat. I suggest to the Minister for Railways that when rolling stock is being constructed, consideration should be given to the claims of the State Implement Works at North Fremantle, which have ample accommodation and plenty of artisans, in addition to railway communication right on the premises. The works, in fact, are possessed of everything needful for the construction of the rolling stock which the Railway Department require. I hope the Minister will bear in mind the value of the distribution of that work in this State. At present things are not too good at the implement works. Orders for rolling stock will render the position there much more satisfactory. Now I have a few words to say about the much-abused Canning-road. I have watched the work on that road closely and I want hon. members to bring to their minds now what is commonly known as Kelly's Lake. It is a particularly low place at the bottom of the Canning-road on the way from Perth. An immense volume of water runs down the road in both directions during the winter months, and up to the present there has

been no proper outlet for that water. Prior to the Main Roads Board taking control, that area was under the jurisdiction of the Melville Road Board, who constructed a large sump or well into which the water was drained, and from which it ultimately disappeared. Subsequent to the Main Roads Board taking control that sump has not been used, with the result that the water has accumulated and on various occasions six or eight inches of water have submerged the road. The rush of the water has swept away the ballasting under the tramline with the result that the trams have not been able to run, causing consequent inconvenience to passengers. To overcome the difficulty it was suggested that the Main Roads Board should drain the flood waters on to a vacant piece of land on the right-hand side of the road. I have been to the spot on various occasions with officials and it appeared to me that they were nonplussed by the problems involved. They did not appear to know how to get over the difficulty. It was suggested that they should resume a block of land and construct a fair-sized dam into which the flood water could be drained. Up to the present nothing has been done along those lines, and to-day a man who lives in a house on one side of the road is periodically marooned by the flood waters. It is impossible to get out of his house without wading through the flood. The same position exists to-day as three months ago. I hope the attention of the Main Roads Board will be directed to the importance of this matter so that steps may be taken to overcome the difficulty. I desire to deal briefly with one other subject of importance to my constituency. At one time one of the most popular resorts along the river was Point Walter. For some unaccountable reason, that beautiful spot has fallen into disrepute or, at least, into disfavour. In consequence, the grounds have become neglected and are at present in a most unsatisfactory condition. One explanation that has been given is that in these days many people own motor cars and prefer to go inland for their holidays. It will readily be agreed that there are still many people who cannot afford a motor car. Those people would like to spend their holidays at a riverside resort such as Point Walter. I hope the Government will see their way clear to preserve that pleasure ground in a proper condition for the people before it becomes, more or less, a commonage for the depasturing of horses and

cows. A large amount of money has been spent on the grounds in the past, and if the matter is taken in hand at once, it will probably mean saving a greater expenditure in the future. I will not deal with the unemployment problem. I have had my share of trouble on that account, but I will leave the member for Fremantle (Mr. Sleeman) to discuss that phase. I hope my few remarks will bear fruit in one direction or another.

**MR. SLEEMAN** (Fremantle) [4.50]: In addressing a few remarks to the House, I had better deal with the most urgent and important matter at the outset, particularly as the member for North-East Fremantle (Mr. Rowe) has left it for me to discuss. I shall start with the subject of unemployment. The trouble in that regard has been aente for some considerable time. Several causes may be advanced in explanation of the unemployment problem in this State. One is the migration of Southern Europeans; another is the migration from Great Britain; and the third, the transfer of population from the Eastern States to Western Australia.

**Hon. Sir James Mitchell**: That is rather a sweeping statement.

**Mr. SLEEMAN**: We should tackle the problem, and see whether we cannot prevent people coming here unless there is a prospect of their securing work. Moreover we should see that the people who are brought here secure work at the ruling rates of wages, so that they will maintain our Australian standards. We should thrust upon the Prime Minister of Australia the problem regarding Southern Europeans and insist upon his accepting the responsibility. I believe that if we were to notify him that if he does not take steps to prevent the importation of Southern Europeans, we shall suspend our migration policy until such time as he does, something might be accomplished.

**Hon. Sir James Mitchell**: The Southern Europeans are not imported; they come here.

**Mr. SLEEMAN**: They are brought here! Let hon. members investigate the position for themselves. They will find that a lot of the Southern Europeans are brought out here in batches. They are taken straight from the boat and given railway tickets. They are then met at the railway station and taken away to jobs in the country. Very

few of those Southern Europeans are out of work a few days after their arrival here.

**Mr. Lindsay**: Some of them are out of employment now.

**Mr. SLEEMAN**: They are met here and taken straight to jobs. The same thing happened, perhaps not to so great an extent during the boom days on the goldfields. The Southern Europeans are brought out by relatives or by agents in this country, who are exploiting them for all they are worth. The Federal Government are responsible for foreign migration, and we should put it to them that we shall suspend our migration scheme until the Prime Minister comes to his senses and is a little British for once in his life time. While Mr. Bruce allows hundreds of these Southern Europeans to come here, it is impossible for British migrants to secure jobs. We have a duty to the British migrants. We take them from their Homeland and entice them here with pictures of our prosperity and the possibilities that can be availed of by them. Many of them leave good positions in Great Britain and sell their homes in order to migrate to Western Australia. When they come here, they find themselves without any prospect of securing work. I am continually meeting men who have sold good homes in the Old Country, having been encouraged to do so by the pictures that have been painted of the conditions obtaining here. Frequently they secure jobs at the outset that last for six weeks or a month, and then they find that they are out of work. They are forced to return to the city to swell the ranks of our unemployed. If the migration of Southern Europeans were prohibited there would be some chance of the British migrants securing the work that is available. I was surprised last night to find that there are members of this House who say they would prefer Southern Europeans or foreigners of any description, to their own kith and kin.

**Hon. Sir James Mitchell**: Everyone would prefer to have Britishers.

**Mr. Heron**: One member who spoke last night does not prefer them.

**Mr. SLEEMAN**: That is so. That hon. member said that rather than employ a Britisher, he would prefer to pay 2s. or 3s. extra in order to secure Italians or foreigners to do his work. A man who would say that is a traitor to his country! Fancy saying that he would prefer a foreigner to a Britisher!

Mr. Teesdale: You might go on to say in what part of the House that hon. member sat.

Mr. SLEEMAN: He sits on the other side of the House, not on the Government side.

Mr. Teesdale: That is all you care about.

Mr. SLEEMAN: No member on the Government side of the House would express such a sentiment.

Hon. G. Taylor: But he gave reasons for it.

Mr. SLEEMAN: He did not. The only thing he said was that the foreigners were better men and could do the work better than any Australian or British migrant. He said that the Australians and the Britishers would not, and could not, do the work. A man who can say that does not know what he is talking about. I say emphatically that an Australian will hold his place against any comer in any part of the world.

Mr. Teesdale: Hear, hear!

Mr. SLEEMAN: Our first duty is to the Australian born; after that, our duty is to the British migrant. We owe that preference to them. We have all sprung from the same British stock and charity should begin at home. We should first see to it that our own Australians secure any work that is available and then we should provide for the Britishers.

Mr. Teesdale: Two hear, hears!

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: We will all agree with that sentiment.

Mr. SLEEMAN: No, you do not.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. SLEEMAN: The hon. member I refer to was supported by others in his remarks.

Mr. Lindsay: Not by me.

Mr. SLEEMAN: We find that these foreigners are being exploited in the country areas, and only recently when I was in the country I saw business people carting them round the district. I met one grocer who had three Italians going on his rounds with him. When his cart drew up at a farm, the grocer asked the farmer if he had any work. He said, "If you have any work, I would like you to give it to these men. They are good workers." I came across a glaring instance when I visited one town. Ten or twelve Britishers were walking from farm to farm asking whether there was any work for them. I came across Britishers in the district who were willing to take any work that was going; yet I found a number of foreigners engaged on road work for the Ballidu-

Wongan Hills Road Board, who preferred to have Italians on the job.

Mr. Teesdale: Was Main Roads Board money used for that purpose?

Mr. Lindsay: No.

Mr. SLEEMAN: The money of the road board was being spent on the work, not Government money at all. I spoke to an official of the road board about it and he said that a notice had been posted outside the road board office for some time, but there were no applicants for the work.

Mr. Lindsay: Not an official, the chairman of the board.

Mr. SLEEMAN: That is so; I stand corrected. He said that the secretary was out some distance and came across the band of Italians, and asked them if they would like to take on the job. They agreed to do so, and were put on. I say that sort of thing is wrong. When I was in that district I had occasion to speak to another person about another job, and he told me that the work had been advertised for six weeks, but men could not be found to do the work. I had not left that centre very long before I met Britishers who were looking for work. I told them about the road work that was available, and they at once proceeded to see about it. When they spoke to the secretary of the road board, he told them that the work had been withdrawn and that the road construction was not to be gone on with. When the Britishers applied for the work, they were told the board were not proceeding with it; when the foreigners came along, they were at once put on a job. That sort of thing is absolutely wrong. At the same time, we have a couple of members of this House, who are travelling round the world, telling the Maltese that they should come to this country, where there is ample work and no unemployment. They told the Maltese that they should come out with their families and the bigger the families, the better it would be.

The Premier: Who said that?

Mr. Withers: The member for Swan (Mr. Sampson).

Mr. SLEEMAN: Recently the member for York (Mr. Latham) and the member for Swan gave an interview to a newspaper in Malta. I have the cutting here and this is what Mr. Sampson said—

In Western Australia especially, large families, such as I hear you have here, would be very welcome. The old idea of making money and coming back to Malta is no good for settlers who want to achieve something big. Let Maltese go out in great numbers and settle

permanently in Australia. They will be eminently welcome, as they are eminently the right type of settler.

Later on he said—

I should like to bring Australian farmers, who own farms of a thousand acres or more to Malta, where men gather a living from little cabbage plots of farms which, if many times as large, would be lost in one of their fields; the Maltese farmer who can wrest a living from so little should surely be able to do great things with a settlement of, say, a thousand acres in Australia. And the Government, by loans from the Agricultural Bank, is, under certain conditions, ready to loan funds to settlers. Australian conditions admit of no permanent unemployment except for the unemployable who will not work or those who do not go about matters in the right way. Western Australia alone is capable of absorbing the entire population of Malta.

Fancy members of this Parliament saying that there is no unemployment in Western Australia!

The Premier: Who said that?

Mr. SLEEMAN: The member for Swan (Mr. Sampson). He said there was no unemployment in Western Australia, and advised the Maltese to come out here in their thousands.

Hon. G. Taylor: You must remember that a former Governor of this State is now Prime Minister of Malta.

Mr. SLEEMAN: And I suppose he is a very good man, too. I am not saying anything against the Maltese who may be good people, too.

Hon. G. Taylor: I think the member for Swan must have been in a joking mood that day. You should not take any notice of what he said.

Mr. SLEEMAN: These members of Parliament are public men, and yet they could urge the Maltese to come out here with their big families. What would they come to? They would merely come from employment to unemployment.

Mr. Withers: The joke would then be on the Maltese.

Mr. SLEEMAN: The only thing I hope is that some of these Maltese with large families do come to Western Australia, and that when they do so, they wait on the doorstep of Mr. Sampson and make him keep them while they are here. That is what that hon. member deserves in view of his effort to induce the Maltese to come here to secure employment, although those people may be doing well in their own country at present. He says in the interview I have

referred to that the Maltese do well on a few acres of land. He ought to take some of our Western Australian farmers to Malta, to see how the Maltese earn a living in their own country. But Mr. Sampson and Mr. Latham knew that when they left here there was any amount of unemployment, notwithstanding which they exhorted those Maltese to come to Australia.

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: There is plenty of unemployment here to-day.

Mr. SLEEMAN: Then we had Mr. McCallum in England talking of bringing out a lot of miners. There are a few miners down on the Esplanade now who would like to tell Mr. McCallum their opinion of inducing miners to come here. I don't know why members of this House should be trotting about the world urging other people to come here.

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: A good many of you came here from elsewhere and seem to be pretty well satisfied with the place.

Mr. SLEEMAN: And we have done a lot of good for your country. We made the country when we came here, and I was very sorry last night to hear a Western Australian born make the statements that he did. I say definitely that the migration policy of this State should be suspended until Mr. Bruce comes to his senses and does something to prevent the Southern Europeans from arriving here until such time as there is plenty of work for them to do. Personally I have nothing against the Italians, provided there is work for them, but I do object to their coming here to be exploited to the detriment of our own people.

Mr. Lindsay: Large numbers of Italians are wise enough to refuse to be exploited in any way.

Mr. SLEEMAN: I have not met many of them amongst the new arrivals. The people who advocate the bringing in of foreigners are the very people who point the finger at members on this side of the House. They are the people who some time ago declared that we were pro-German, carrying on the fight with German gold. Yet they now advocate the bringing in of Italians to this State. At other times they have declared that we were Sinn Feiners and communists.

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: Whereas you are only socialists.

Mr. SLEEMAN: Whatever I may be, I want to do all I can for the bottom dog. I hope something will occur to bring Mr.

Bruce to his senses. Otherwise we must stop these Southern Europeans from coming here. As for the Eastern States people who are coming over, more publicity should be given to show that it is useless for them to arrive in Western Australia only to be thrown on to the unemployed market. People in the Eastern States have suffered from bad seasons and, hearing that Western Australia is booming, they are ready to rush over here with a view to securing better conditions. If the true state of affairs were published they would realise that in coming here they are coming to a place where unemployment is just as acute as it is in the States where they have their homes.

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: We cannot stop people of the Eastern States from coming here.

Mr. SLEEMAN: No, but we should let them know the true state of affairs. When they do come here we have a duty to them. It is the duty of the Government to attempt to provide employment for them. However, it is not possible for the Government to find employment for all. Since that is so, it is the duty of the Government to see that nobody starves.

Mr. Lindsay: Let us have a change of Government.

Mr. SLEEMAN: That would only be jumping out of the frying pan into the fire. We do not want that.

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: The last time you succeeded in changing the Government you threw many people out of work.

Mr. Angelo: The last change of Government in South Australia worked an improvement.

Mr. SLEEMAN: It did not. Things there were pretty bad when the Labour Government of South Australia left office, but the conditions are very much worse now. The hon. member told us last night of the thousands he saw marching up the streets of Adelaide in a protest against unemployment.

Mr. Angelo: They require a lot of cleaning up over there.

Mr. SLEEMAN: A change of Government here would not bring any solution of the problem.

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: Yes, it would. There will be plenty of work as soon as there is a change of Government.

Mr. SLEEMAN: There will be no change of Government for a long time yet. I do

hope the Government will do something for the people that are starving in our midst.

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: Why not read what Mr. McCallum said about the miners in England?

Mr. SLEEMAN: I am not above reading it. If Mr. McCallum is doing what I think is not right, I am just as ready to tell him so as I am to tell Sir James Mitchell or Mr. Sampson or Mr. Latham when I think they are doing wrong. I hold no particular brief for Mr. McCallum. He is reported in the newspapers as having talked about migration. If he has been trying to get people to come out here in great numbers, with things here the way they are, he has done something not quite right.

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: You read what Mr. Sampson said; read now what Mr. McCallum said.

Mr. SLEEMAN: Very well. This is from a newspaper interview with Mr. McCallum in Auckland—

Mr. McCallum said he was confident that the Western Australian immigration scheme, which involved substantial financial support, would be accepted by Britain. He favoured unemployed miners as immigrants, considering that they would easily adapt themselves to the new conditions.

And here is a Press cable message from London:—

Members of the House of Commons representing the distressed mining constituencies today had a conference with Mr. A. McCallum (Western Australian Minister for Works) and discussed the possibility of Australia absorbing a percentage of the unemployed and their families.

No decision was arrived at.

The Premier: What he was saying was that if we are to have migrants, he favoured the miner.

Mr. SLEEMAN: If that is what he meant, I agree with him. Let us have the British miners, and if more migrants are required let us have other Britishers. Only after they have been exhausted should we try to bring in foreigners. I know the class of men miners are, and I can say they are as fine a class as can be secured anywhere.

Mr. Lindsay: Then Mr. Sampson is not the only member of this Parliament who said something he ought not to have said.

Mr. SLEEMAN: Whatever Mr. McCallum may have said, Mr. Sampson and Mr. Latham said something a thousand times worse.

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: You think so because they belong to a different political party.

Mr. SLEEMAN: Nobody can say that I am a great stickler for party, outside of party platforms. In our party, outside the platform, we are free to do what we like.

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: What is the value to the State of your party's platform?

Mr. SLEEMAN: But for the platform of our party, the working man would be in a very bad way to-day. It is the policy of this side that has raised the standard of living in Australia, and I hope it will be still further raised.

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: Not by your people.

Mr. SLEEMAN: It will be by those on this side, not by those opposite, for they do not trouble much about those who have to work.

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: We trouble much more than you do. We do not insist upon a man buying a job before he can work.

Mr. SLEEMAN: The hon. member has harped on the necessity for a union ticket and having to buy a newspaper. But that particular union to which he is always alluding charges an annual fee, and supplies its members with a newspaper. Whether or not they take the newspaper, they have the same fee to pay. The fee charged by that union, 25s., is not an exorbitant one, yet in addition to other services and privileges the members are supplied with a good newspaper. The Leader of the Opposition always insists that they are compelled to contribute to that newspaper and to political funds. I say they are not contributing very much. I hope that when an election, or any industrial trouble comes along, they will be in a position to contribute more than they have had to do in the past.

Mr. Lindsay: They do have to buy a newspaper before they can get a job. No wonder we have preference to unionists.

Mr. SLEEMAN: It is not very long since, at the request of members opposite, we put through a Bill giving preference to unionists. That was a Bill having to do with the Royal Show. Under it, if the people of Wyalkatchem wanted a Royal show, they had to affiliate with the Royal Agricultural Society. We also know that at the Primary Producers' Conference a few

days ago the hon. member's friends did not want the foreigner to compete with them.

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: It is a scandal to make a man take out a union ticket before he can get a job.

Mr. SLEEMAN: These things have come to stay and are going to stay. Preference to unionists is only a fair policy.

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: Thank God it is not the policy of this country.

Mr. SLEEMAN: It is the policy of the present Government, and the Leader of the Opposition will have to put up with it for the time being.

Mr. Lindsay: A man cannot get a job under the Government unless he has a union ticket. Is not that compulsory unionism?

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: Yes, it is.

Mr. SLEEMAN: Well, what about it. No sporting body can run a race meeting in the country, or do anything else of the sort, unless it is affiliated with the central association. Where is the difference?

Mr. Lindsay: I have recollections of a Bill that the hon. member introduced into this House.

Mr. SLEEMAN: Yes, a Bill to get a fair deal for the town to which I belong. It was necessary before we could have a few horses trotting around a track, because the law of the land really meant one law for Wyalkatchem and another for Fremantle. Yet the hon. member talks of preference to unionists. I hope the Government will see to it that nobody in this country is allowed to go under. At the present time there are men starving in this State. The Government should rise to the occasion and see to it that no man is allowed to starve. A few days ago I met eight men from Southern Cross. They were not men hanging around the town waiting for somebody to come along and give them a feed. They had carried their swags to Southern Cross, where some public works were in progress, but on getting there they were told by those in authority that they would have to be picked up in Perth. So they carried their swags back to Perth. But they have not been picked up yet, and they can only get a feed by the kindness of the people of Fremantle. That should not be. Those men should be given something to keep body and soul together until they are picked up. I understand that in Perth there is a fund to assist single men from Government departments, and that in Fremantle they have another fund.



Mr. Lindsay: Why should men have to come to Perth to get a job at Southern Cross?

Mr. SLEEMAN: I am not supporting that. I am only stating what I believe to be true. Those men are there, and they should not be allowed to starve.

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: We used to hear a lot of the right to work.

Mr. SLEEMAN: Yes. I believe in that.

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: We never hear of that now.

Mr. SLEEMAN: There is one way in which some money can be saved if the country is so hard up that it cannot afford to give a few starving men a feed. But first let me say that the unemployed demonstration in Perth was not handled as it should have been. Whenever anything is done by any Government department or any Governmental head, according to some people every member of Parliament has to take his share of the blame. I have come in for a fair amount of criticism over the action of the police during the unemployed demonstrations in Perth. I am told that we are all members of the Government. Quite a lot of people think that every member who supports the Government is actually a member of the Government. Consequently, not only the Government, but every Labour member has come in for a certain amount of criticism over the action of the police. I wish to dissociate myself from the action of the police on that occasion. I say that the Commissioner of Police exceeded his duty. In my opinion, the function of the police is to maintain law and order, and not to cause disorder. On the Tuesday when the demonstration was held I happened to be at the corner of the street as the police came along, and I venture to say that if the same thing had happened in many parts of the country, there would have been a riot. When the police came up, they, without justification, started to push the men over. That is not the work of the police.

The Premier: That is not true. I was looking on and saw what happened.

Mr. SLEEMAN: Then the Premier could not have seen what I saw.

The Premier: I did.

Mr. SLEEMAN: The police came around the corner and, when the procession of 40 or 50 police filed out of the Treasury building, without any more ado whatever the police dragged the banner out of one man's hands and a couple of the police started to push the men over.

The Premier: That is not a true representation of what happened.

Mr. SLEEMAN: It is a true representation of what I saw.

The Premier: It is not; I saw what happened.

Mr. SLEEMAN: I repeat that it is a true representation of what I saw. If the Premier saw something different, he is entitled to have his way. I am speaking of what I saw.

Mr. Angelo: The newspapers said that the Premier was looking out of the window.

Mr. SLEEMAN: I do not care what the newspapers said; I know what I saw.

Hon. G. Taylor: The Premier might have had a better view from the window.

Mr. SLEEMAN: I saw the police push those men. When a man is breaking the law, I admit it is the duty of the police to arrest him. If the man does not make any show of resistance, he should be arrested without the use of force. Of course, if he offers any resistance, the police are entitled to use force. I repeat that if what the police did that day had been done in many parts of the country, it would have led to a riot.

The Premier: Nonsense! Rubbish!

Mr. SLEEMAN: I maintain that the Commissioner of Police was the guilty person because he was personally in charge of the operations.

The Premier: Not at all.

Mr. SLEEMAN: I have seen inspectors of police handle far more difficult situations than that without resorting to the use of anything like the force used that morning. By the exercise of a little tact, four or five policemen could have handled that crowd comfortably.

The Premier: Nonsense!

Mr. SLEEMAN: I am dissociating myself from the action of the police on that occasion—

The Premier: I am glad you are, too.

Mr. SLEEMAN: And I hope that I shall never witness anything of the kind again in this State.

The Premier: I take the responsibility for it.

Mr. SLEEMAN: I have accurately described what happened that day.

The Premier: I know what happened.

Mr. J. H. Smith: Every man should have the right to walk the streets.

The Minister for Justice: Have not you been moved on by the police when you have been blocking the footpath?

Mr. J. H. Smith: Yes.

Mr. SLEEMAN: But a man should not be pushed over for that. If a man is committing a breach of the law, he should be arrested and put inside.

The Minister for Justice: But if a man persists in blocking the footpath, he is liable to be pushed over.

Mr. SLEEMAN: This is not the first occasion on which the Commissioner of Police, in my opinion, has exceeded his duty.

The Premier: If ever similar circumstances arise, the same thing will happen again. There is no mistake about that.

Mr. J. H. Smith: The real cause of the trouble was the destruction of property, was it not?

Mr. Stubbs: It is necessary that the police should maintain law and order.

Mr. SLEEMAN: The police should maintain law and order, but they should not create disorder. It is the function of the police to keep order.

Mr. Lindsay: There was an instance a while ago of private citizens being unable to get demonstrators away from their premises, and the police did not interfere too much on that occasion.

Mr. SLEEMAN: And I can remember an occasion when preparations to meet a demonstration were carried to the extent of providing machine guns, barbed wire entanglements, mounted police with rifles and field ambulances. Would the hon. member say it was right to do that?

Hon. G. Taylor: I think somebody got the wind up on that occasion.

Mr. SLEEMAN: It is stupid to employ force on occasions of that kind.

The Premier: The stupid force was on the other side.

Mr. Teesdale: You have forgotten to include the mustard gas!

Mr. SLEEMAN: There is another matter on which I should like to have a word to say, because I think I can indicate a direction in which some money could be saved to the State. A little while ago orders were issued throughout the Government service that Government motor cars must carry special identification plates bearing "W.A. Govt." in addition to the numbers. Recently I asked a series of questions in this House regarding the motor service, and was told in reply that I had better move for a return. I hold that we stand for equality, and I am of opinion that the person in charge of the Government motor garage is something like the Commissioner of Police, in that he has

exceeded his duty. We find that when the special identification plates were placed on all the Government cars, some of the departmental heads took direct action. Had that been done by some of the workers, they would have been told to get off the job or would have been put inside for breaking the law. The heads of departments, however, took direct action. One in particular had a few cars purchased for him and a private number is carried on that car. There are a number of departmental heads using private numbers while motoring around the city.

Mr. J. H. Smith: And using Government cars?

Mr. SLEEMAN: Yes; Government cars with private numbers. I am referring to some of the departmental heads. The result is that when a car is required for use by a Minister on official business, there is often none available for him, and it is necessary to ring up a motor garage and hire a car. That state of affairs should not be allowed to continue. We stand for equality for all. If the understrapper who has to travel in the hush is compelled to carry a special plate inscribed "W.A. Govt." then the heads of departments such as the Engineer-in-Chief, the Chairman of the Main Roads Board, and the manager of the Tramways and Electricity Department should be required to abide by the same rule.

Hon. G. Taylor: Most of the cars used by the Main Roads Board have the words "Main Roads Board" printed on them.

Mr. SLEEMAN: But the big fellow himself has not "W.A. Govt." on the number plate of the car he uses. The Chairman of the Main Roads Board has a car bearing a private number.

Hon. G. Taylor: It might be his own car.

Mr. SLEEMAN: And there are one or two of these cars that can be seen halted outside city clubs, while the gentlemen in question are inside. Joy riding in Government cars has been barred to men in lower grades of the service, but not to the heads.

Hon. G. Taylor: But the heads may be using their own cars.

Mr. SLEEMAN: And they may not be. The cars they are using may be Government cars.

Hon. G. Taylor: You should be sure of that before you mention it.

Mr. SLEEMAN: I would not make such a statement unless I was pretty sure of my ground.

Mr. Angelo: It should be worth while your giving an amendment to the Address-in-reply.

Mr. SLEEMAN: The hon. member can move that.

The Premier: It is too late for him; he has already spoken.

Mr. SLEEMAN: During the last couple of sessions we have had quite a lot of discussion on traffic regulations. It is time something was done. Goodness knows we have been talking long enough!

The Acting Minister for Works: Everyone is now satisfied.

Mr. SLEEMAN: Everyone is not now satisfied, and the Minister ought to know it.

The Acting Minister for Works: Why, I attended a conference representative of the road boards less than two weeks ago and everyone was satisfied with the regulations.

Mr. SLEEMAN: But what about the owners of taxi cars? I say there are too many taxis on the Perth Fremantle route and the number should be limited. Under existing conditions, taxi owners have to work from 12 to 16 hours a day in order to make a crust. If the number of taxis on that route were limited, the men would be able to earn a living without having to work unduly long hours and without having to employ drivers under sweating conditions. There are some owners of taxis who hop on to the run only at the peak periods. Though they are licensed as taxi owners, they also work at other occupations during the slack portion of the day, but during the peak periods they compete for the traffic.

The Acting Minister for Works: We have not been able to prove that, although we have made searching inquiries.

Mr. SLEEMAN: I can tell the Minister the names of a couple of them.

The Acting Minister for Works: Give me the names of those who are doing it!

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: If they have licenses, I should think they could do as they liked.

The Minister for Justice: No, if people are licensed to run a public utility, they cannot come on and go off the running just when they like.

The Acting Minister for Works: The matter has been investigated and the statement is not correct.

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: Surely a man is entitled to get a license for his car!

Mr. SLEEMAN: The statement I have made is correct. People are running taxis on the road for only a portion of the time, and there are owners employing drivers at less than the union rate of wages. The union finds it impossible to get home on such men because they are registered as part proprietors of the cars. All sorts of devious means have been employed to enable such cars to be kept on the route. It is time that regulations were introduced to impose a reasonable limit on the number of taxis running on that route.

The Acting Minister for Works: Traffic regulations cannot be made for the purpose of regulating wages and conditions.

Mr. SLEEMAN: But traffic regulations can be made to compel compliance with proper condition on the road. I know that traffic regulations cannot be made to govern wages, but the present unfair competition could be eliminated. If the taxis were regulated so that they would compete on even terms, better conditions would be introduced for the drivers on the Perth-Fremantle run. The Leader of the Country Party the other evening, complained of the lumpers who, he said, were asking for 7s. per hour for handling wheat. Half a truth, in my opinion, is worse than a lie. The hon. member did not explain the reason why the men were asking for 7s. an hour. Some little time ago a large quantity of wheat was loaded into a boat at Fremantle. When about 3,000 bags had been put aboard, the captain of the vessel discovered that the wheat was badly infected with weevil. In fact, it was practically alive with weevil. The captain thereupon ordered the wheat to be discharged from the boat and disinfected, and the boat sprayed. The wheat was taken out of the boat and sprayed with cyanogas, and the Fremantle lumpers asked for 7s. an hour for working that cargo.

Hon. G. Taylor: What was it sprayed with?

Mr. SLEEMAN: Cyanogas, which is a deadly poison. The lumpers had to reload the wheat and some of the poison was still adhering to the bags. When the men took the matter to the reference board, the Waterside Workers' Union got two analyses made, one by Mr. R. F. Parry, an analyst of Perth, and the other by the

(Government Analyst, Dr. Simpson. Let me quote from the reports. Mr. Parry said—

It is doubtful whether the material as received by me would be dangerous. It might cause a certain amount of discomfort as the process mentioned above goes on, but the danger would really exist just after the fresh material had been distributed, and would gradually grow less as time went on until the strength of the material had been reduced to very low limits.

The men were called upon to re-load the wheat just after the fresh material had been distributed, and they had to work amongst it in the ship's hold.

Mr. Lindsay: Was not the wheat sprayed while it was in the ship's hold?

Mr. SLEEMAN: No; it was discharged from the ship and sprayed on the wharf. After the captain was satisfied that the weevil had been exterminated, the wheat was put back into the ship. Mr. Parry added—

There would always be the possibilities of pockets of the cyanogas collecting in un-ventilated corners, and here, I think, lies the greatest possibility of danger. Externally the material should have little effect as it is less alkaline than dry slaked lime. As a dust, of course, it would cause a certain amount of discomfort like any other dust.

Here is an extract from Dr. Simpson's report—

Cyanogas is a very impure cyanide of lime which is used as a vermin destructor because, on exposure to air, it gives off the poisonous gas commonly known as prussic acid. If this gas be inhaled by human beings, it results in temporary sickness or even death, unless in an extremely diluted state. . . . Apart from the cyanide the powder consisted of calcium carbonate and dust. Its alkalinity is too small to have any deleterious effect upon men handling it. If, however, they were to handle bags coated with fresh cyanogas, they would undoubtedly run the risk of skin affections from the prussic acid compounds.

Yet the Leader of the Country Party stood up in this House the other night and endeavoured to point the finger of scorn at the lumpers for having asked 7s. an hour for handling cargo that had been treated in that way.

Mr. Lindsay: Does it make the job any more healthy because they get 7s. an hour for it?

Mr. SLEEMAN: No, but the extra payment helps to compensate men for the risk they run. Personally I would not handle such cargo for 14s. an hour.

Mr. Lindsay: Did any one of them suffer ill-health in consequence.

Mr. SLEEMAN: Yes. I believe some of the men were sick. The result was that the union passed a resolution as follows—

That we enter a strong protest against the use of cyanogas for fumigating foodstuffs. We also protest against its use where men have to work, believing that such a practice is dangerous to human life.

Then there was an addendum requesting me to bring the matter under the notice of the authorities. Those are the facts underlying the request of the Fremantle lumpers for 7s. an hour for loading wheat. We did not hear the Leader of the Country Party complaining about the 6s. an hour that the lumpers got on Sunday when they handled damaged wheat. The owners of that wheat were only too anxious to get it away. They rushed the work through on Saturday afternoon, Saturday night, and on Sunday in order to get the wheat out of the way so that the people should not know the condition it was in. No questions were asked about that work. The owners were willing to pay as much as the men were entitled to in order to get the wheat out of the way. Something like 30,000 bags were shifted from the wharves to the re-conditioning sheds, and this was going on while the people in the country were starving.

Lon. Sir James Mitchell: If you quote from those papers, they must be laid on the Table of the House.

Mr. SLEEMAN: I know. Something must be done to ensure that the wheat that is exported is pure, wholesome and good. The Leader of the Country Party last session asked by way of a question whether the statements I made were not likely to have a bad effect upon Western Australia's wheat trade. The questions I asked were not likely to have nearly as bad an effect as the sending of affected wheat out of the country. Something should be done either by the State or the Federal Governments to ensure that only good and wholesome wheat is exported. All wheat should be subject to Government certificate. I believe it is not possible to compel people to take out such a certificate on their cargoes but they should be compelled to do so in order to safeguard the interests of the country. We saw in the paper the other evening that the wheat market of the world is in a precarious condition. Unless we can protect our wheat from unscrupulous sellers who may send it overseas, the reputation of

Western Australia will be seriously damaged. I hope something will be done to prevent damaged wheat from going overseas, or any wheat at all unless it is up to the f.a.q. standard and carries a proper Government certificate.

The Minister for Water Supply: You will have to approach the Federal Government for that purpose.

Mr. SLEEMAN: That should be done. We should not allow the reputation of the country to be damaged in this way. It is likely to be damaged still further if people send away wheat in any condition they like. If a man is selling bad meat, or any other food that is unfit for human consumption, the law deals with him at once. If a buyer is sending anything out of the country that is liable to damage its reputation, then he too should be dealt with. I have asked questions about damaged wheat in Fremantle over the last two years, but I hope it will no longer be necessary for me to do so.

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: I suppose there was not much of it.

Mr. SLEEMAN: Altogether 30,000 bags were taken from the North Wharf to the sheds to be reconditioned. The hon. member can imagine the state the bags were in, and can judge for himself the condition of the wheat.

Hon. G. Taylor: It is a good job it did not belong all to one man.

Mr. SLEEMAN: Our arbitration system is not all that it should be. Unless the court has some means of arbitrating to prevent the price of commodities soaring, it is not successfully fulfilling its function.

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: Do you mean farming machinery?

Mr. SLEEMAN: The court can regulate the amount of wages that are paid, but immediately an award is given, the cost of living goes up.

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: Of course it does.

Mr. SLEEMAN: A week or two after a new award is issued, the workers find themselves worse off than they were before.

Mr. Lindsay: What can you expect?

Mr. SLEEMAN: Power should be given to some tribunal to prevent the price of commodities going up beyond a reasonable figure.

Mr. Lindsay: When you raise wages, you must expect the cost of living to go up.

Mr. SLEEMAN: The price of bread and meat and almost everything has gone up,

and the worker finds that he is worse off than before he got his award.

Mr. Brown: Do you know that Australian wheat is already above the London parity?

Mr. SLEEMAN: Last month the Government Statistician (Mr. Bennett) published figures showing that the price of meat had decreased for that month. I do not know how he arrived at those results. I know the price of meat I bought last month was higher than it had been. It certainly has not gone down in price.

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: It must have gone down.

Mr. SLEEMAN: In my opinion, the price is still going up. Something should be done to prevent house rents from going up. Members opposite always maintain that the workers should go to the Arbitration Court, but if we venture to talk about arbitration for the landlord, that is a horse of a different colour.

Mr. Lindsay: The cost of house building is going up all the time.

Mr. SLEEMAN: Of course it would not do to interfere with the landlord. Members opposite would like everyone but the worker to be exempt from the laws of arbitration.

Mr. Lindsay: You will raise wages, and increase the cost of house construction.

Mr. SLEEMAN: It is very necessary that wages should be raised. I do not know how people on the basic wage are able to live under present conditions. Members opposite say, "You must not touch house rents, or the butcher or the baker." We should do something to counter the present price of meat and bread. If there is no other way out of the difficulty, we should start butchers' shops and bakers' shops.

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: The Government did that once before, and also established fish shops.

Mr. SLEEMAN: I do not know why we should not have State fish shops to-day.

Mr. Angelo: They gave the fish away for nothing.

Mr. SLEEMAN: Our people are not getting their necessary commodities as cheaply as they should, if they are to live in reasonable comfort. If those who are in trade will not agree to some price fixing, and the party opposite will not agree to arbitration for the landlord, the butcher, and the baker, we should make some other arrangement to meet the situation. Frozen meat could be brought down from the North and

sold cheaply, and the position in that trade would then be relieved.

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: Queensland tried it, but not successfully.

Mr. SLEEMAN: I do not know that a State flour mill would do much harm.

Mr. Lindsay: This House appointed a Royal Commission to inquire into the price of commodities. What happened to their report?

Mr. SLEEMAN: I do not care about that. I want to know what is going to be done for the future.

Mr. Lindsay: You ought to know what that report contains. It has been available to you.

Mr. SLEEMAN: The time has arrived when something in this direction should be done.

Mr. Lindsay: The Commission were unable to do anything.

Mr. SLEEMAN: When wheat advanced a few pence a bushel a few weeks ago, the price of bread soared again. The reason given for that was that the price of flour went up. If there is anything in that argument, the price of bread should have been 6d. when wheat was dear, but it should have come down to 5d. when the price of wheat dropped.

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: I think it will come down.

Mr. SLEEMAN: I now wish to refer to State industries. The member for Pingelly and others sitting opposite attempted to throw water on State industries. One member said we must have secondary industries if the State is to advance, but another maintained that there should be no such thing as a State industry. But for the cold water that has been thrown on the State Implement Works, that concern would have been in a thriving condition to-day and paying well and it would have been employing upwards of 700 men.

Hon. G. Taylor: What reason does the hon. member advance for its not doing so?

Mr. SLEEMAN: It is largely due to the number of public men who have thrown cold water upon it, and endeavoured to show that the implements are no good. They have urged the public not to patronise the works. That has had a lot to do with the position in which they are to-day.

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: That is nonsense.

Mr. Lindsay: I do not believe that was ever said. Good lines will always sell themselves.

Mr. SLEEMAN: It has been said in this House, and this session, too.

Mr. Lindsay: The truth was told in that instance.

Mr. SLEEMAN: It has not been told.

Hon. G. Taylor: It very seldom is told here.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. SLEEMAN: The truth was not told when it was said that the implements made at the State works were not up to the quality of other implements.

Mr. Lindsay: Some are not.

Mr. SLEEMAN: If it will please the member for Toodyay, I will say that the harvester may not be up to his expectations. If, however, we take the plough, the drill, or the combine, we will find that every un-biassed farmer will say that those implements are second to none in the world.

Hon. G. Taylor: No one has attempted to decry the quality of the plough.

Mr. SLEEMAN: Then how is it the State Implement Works are not selling more ploughs? If all the farmers in the State were to patronise the State ploughs, more than twice as many employees would be at work there, and the institution would be a success. As it is, very few ploughs are being sold on account of the local prejudice against them. Cold water is always being thrown upon local industries. If anyone dared to start a jam factory it would be said at once that we cannot make jam here. The same thing was said of the implement works. It is a wonder the member for Bunbury has not been told that clothes pegs cannot be made in his constituency.

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: Why did the unions prevent the Sunshine Harvester people from starting a factory here?

Mr. SLEEMAN: They did not prevent it. Mr. McKay insisted upon certain conditions, to which the unions would not agree. The factory could have been started in fair competition with the State Implement Works if there had been any desire in that direction. The fact of the matter is that Mr. McKay did not want to come to Western Australia. He wanted to see if he could close down the State Implement Works. It would not have paid Mr. McKay to manufacture implements here against competition. It pays him much better to turn them out in large quantities in Melbourne.

Mr. Lindsay: He could have supplied a great proportion of the local market with machinery.

Mr. SLEEMAN: It would pay him better to manufacture them in Melbourne, and distribute them from that centre throughout Australia. He could start to-morrow on the same basis as the State Implement Works, but he can do better by remaining in Melbourne. He would not treat his employees in the way that the State works treat theirs. He would not pay long service leave to them if he opened a factory here, and would not have to give the holidays for which the State Implement Works pay.

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: What you want is to have the State Implement Works and no other here, is that it?

Mr. SLEEMAN: We would welcome any other works here, but the Sunshine Harvester people will not come here.

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: They cannot get here.

Mr. SLEEMAN: Members opposite would rather patronise the imported article, just as they would rather patronise foreigners than Britishers and Australians.

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: Some of us have done as much for the Britisher as you have.

Mr. SLEEMAN: I am glad the hon. member said "some of us." Some have done more for the foreigners than I have.

Hon. G. Taylor: You know that Australian products are not appreciated by Australians.

Mr. SLEEMAN: No man is a prophet in his own country. That principle acts very nicely with our local goods. When we have an industry, whether it be privately owned or State owned, we ought to do what we can for it, and endeavour to remove some of the prejudice that appears to surround any local industry. The general idea is that nothing is any good that is made in the country.

Mr. Lindsay: When Mr. McKay wanted to start implement works here, your organised unions prevented him.

Mr. SLEEMAN: He did not make a serious effort in that direction. He asked a few questions about local conditions, and then returned to his own State and announced that he would have opened a factory here but for the attitude adopted by the unions. The member for Toodyay knows that as well as I do.

Mr. Lindsay: I know more than you do about the whole business.

Mr. SLEEMAN: Mr. McKay had no serious intention of embarking upon the manufacture of farming implements here.

All would like to get the State Implement Works closed down. The way some members in this House are acting towards the implement works will be bound to have that effect; certainly if they could get their way some members would close down those works to-morrow. Next I would like to refer to hospital finance. The time has arrived to take steps to place the hospitals on a proper footing, and I am pleased to know that legislation is to be introduced this session for the purpose of financing the hospitals of the State. At the present time we are going cap in hand in every direction trying to scrape up a few shillings here and a few shillings there for the purpose of keeping the hospitals going. I hope that the Bill to be introduced will provide that every member of the community shall subscribe towards the upkeep of these institutions. There should be enough raised by means of the proposed legislation to meet the urgent needs of the hospitals, but on top of that I should like to see the Minister for Health introduce a Bill to provide for a State lottery, the profits from which should be devoted towards swelling the amount raised by means of the suggested tax. While on the subject of health administration I should like to mention that the Minister in charge of that department is, in my opinion, the most capable the State has ever had there. He is responsible for the construction of more hospitals throughout the country than any other Minister who preceded him, and he has placed the department on a sound footing. I should like to see a State Lottery Bill introduced so that we might catch all that money that at the present time is being sent to Tattersalls in Tasmania and to the Golden Casket in Queensland. The profits from the latter are devoted to the Queensland hospitals, and those institutions benefit to a considerable extent. Why could we not do the same here?

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: We should do away with White City where so much gambling goes on.

Mr. SLEEMAN: I am talking about a State lottery, and I hope the Leader of the Opposition will support the Minister for Health if such a measure is introduced.

Hon. G. Taylor: What about the hospital tax?

Mr. SLEEMAN: I am supporting the proposal to impose a hospital tax, but in addition to that I am urging that we should have a State lottery on the lines of the lottery conducted in Queensland, in order to stop the

drift of the thousands of pounds going out of the State annually. The next subject I wish to deal with is the proposal to redistribute the seats. I am pleased to know that a measure for this purpose will be brought down. The time has long since gone for the introduction of such a Bill. The existing distribution is anything but equitable. Here, too, is another opportunity whereby we may effect some economy. Personally I consider that we could do with half our present number of members, and the business of the country could be carried on just as well, if not better, than is being done now. Firstly I would abolish the Legislative Council. Thus we should save the salaries of 30 members and the expenditure associated with that branch of the Legislature. Next I would cut down the number of the members of the Assembly from 50 to 40, and the distribution should then be on a population basis. This, in my opinion, would be the most equitable and fairest method to adopt. We talk about one man one vote, and one vote one value. At the present time where is there one vote one value? We find in one electorate no fewer than 15,000 electors while in another, that represented by the member for Mt. Margaret (Hon. G. Taylor) for instance, there are about 400. Anomalies of that kind would be avoided were the distribution made on a population basis.

Hon. G. Taylor: You could not possibly have it on such a basis in sparsely populated places such as we have in Western Australia.

Mr. SLEEMAN: At any rate we could try. Another subject that should receive the attention of the Government is the question of increasing jurymen's fees. This is a matter that is long overdue for consideration. A few sessions ago an amending Jury Bill was introduced, but unfortunately it did not go through.

The Minister for Justice: Two attempts were made to put it through.

Mr. SLEEMAN: Another attempt ought to be made to amend the Jury Act or perhaps the Minister might consider the advisableness of submitting a short Bill to deal merely with the fees paid to jurymen. I understand that the fees cannot be increased by administrative act and that it is necessary to submit legislation. There is no doubt about it that the jurymen who serve in our courts are badly treated by being paid the miserable pittance of 10s. a day. They are taken away from their

employment or their businesses, and in many instances they are subjected to considerable inconvenience. We should certainly see to it that they receive payment commensurate with the services they render to the State. No man in the community should be made to suffer by being compelled to perform a public duty. The next subject I wish to touch upon relates to the State Shipping Service. The other night the Leader of the Country Party (Mr. Thomson) advocated the lifting of the Navigation Act, I suppose for the purpose of again giving preference to foreigners. One member of the Country Party advocates preference to Southern Europeans in connection with agricultural operations and the leader of the party now asks us to support him in the direction of giving preference to the blackfellow.

Mr. Lindsay: All the members of the Country Party are agreeable to the suspension of the Act.

Mr. SLEEMAN: Yes, and we know that the Country Party agreed to the sale of the Commonwealth steamers.

Mr. Lindsay: Quite right.

Mr. SLEEMAN: The Country Party will live to regret that they agreed to the sale of the Commonwealth steamers. I hope that in the near future we shall see another vessel purchased by the State for coastal service, a vessel that will employ white men. The purchase of another ship will to some extent absorb some of our unemployed, and it will also be the means of circulating some money within the State. Some of the boats that move up and down our coast are of no value at all to the towns along that coast with which they trade. Their coloured crews spend nothing in the State, whilst the vessels themselves provision elsewhere.

Mr. Angelo: The officers spend money here, and the vessels get nearly all their provisions here.

Mr. SLEEMAN: I am prepared to admit that the officers spend a little here, but they are only a small percentage of the crew. The hon. member will admit that the crews of the State steamers are responsible for the distribution of a good deal more money in Western Australia than are the crews of the other vessels. I do not think the hon. member would object to the addition of another ship to the fleet of the State, because I understand he



looks upon the State ships as a public utility. It is remarkable that one member, whose constituency derives some benefit from what he is pleased to call a public utility, is quite willing to support it as such, while other members urge that the Government should sell this public utility. We have also heard it said by some members that the Government are interfering with private enterprise, and in the next breath those members are trying to induce the Government to acquire the Midland Railway which they also declare to be a public utility. The time has certainly arrived for the purchase of another State vessel for our coast, a vessel like the "Koolinda." The "Koolinda" is recognised as a very good boat, and the "Kangaroo," though not in the same class, has done good work. With another vessel trading on the coast the State would have an excellent fleet and the community generally would benefit. I wish to say a few words about the western portion of my electorate—Rottnest Island. I am sorry that something has not been done for the long-suffering few who live there. For some years now the construction of a new jetty has been promised, but the old and tottering jetty still remains.

Hon. G. Taylor: Has not that jetty yet been started?

Mr. SLEEMAN: No. If the Americans possessed an island like Rottnest they would exploit it to the fullest extent, and provide so many attractions there as to induce the public to visit it all the year round. One of the troubles in connection with that island is the irregularity of the boat service. A steamer runs to the island during the summer months, but for the remainder of the year the island is practically cut off from communication with the mainland. With a better service the island would come into its own. I am convinced that if a steamer were purchased by the board controlling the island, and a regular service instituted, Rottnest as a pleasure resort would be availed of for the greater part of the year. The island is beautiful in every respect and its attractions are not made the most of. A good deal could be done to induce people to pay more frequent visits to the island and fewer visits to the Eastern States. To begin with a jetty must be built, for in rough weather not boat can hope to get alongside. Some four or five years ago, about £10,000

was spent in dredging and surveying and it was said then that nothing could be done until such time as it was determined whether silting up would take place. I understand that there has been no silting, and still the island is without adequate jetty accommodation. If a jetty is constructed and a steamer bought for the island trade, I am certain that neither will be a losing proposition. Next we come to the oft-discussed Fremantle bridge and harbour works. A lot of people are concerned about this question and I am glad to know that it is not being regarded as a Fremantle matter, but a State matter. The scheme submitted by Mr. Stileman I do not consider would be satisfactory. I am not making this statement as my own opinion, but when schemes of this sort are submitted for consideration, it is not only the engineer who knows what is wanted, but the nautical men who use the harbour and the authorities who administer it. In this case the Fremantle Harbour Trust know what they want, and the navigators who use the port also know what is required in any scheme of improvement. If a man wants a design carried out, he consults an architect, but he tells the architect the nature of the work he requires done and asks whether it can be carried out.

Hon. G. Taylor: And he can do nothing for you unless you give him enough money.

Mr. SLEEMAN: The port authorities know what is required and they tell the engineer what, in their opinion, should be done for the safe handling of vessels. In the scheme that has been submitted, we find that the harbour extension is to be narrowed down to 800 feet. That narrowing down is opposed by every known authority. The Harbour Trust Commissioners, the pilots and others are all agreed on that point. We find that away back in the early days the late C. Y. O'Connor proposed that the harbour should be not less than 800 feet wide. Then he said, "I am not a nautical man; I am an engineer"; and he called in a nautical man to confer, with the result that the conviction was borne in upon him that to build for large ships would be useless except with a width of not less than 1,000 feet. Mr. O'Connor fell in with the views of the nautical man, and it was agreed that the width should be 1,000 feet. Then someone

else came upon the scene. The P. & O. Company sent out an engineer to inquire into the situation at Fremantle. That engineer said that unless the harbour was built to a width of 1,400 feet he could not recommend that the P. & O. boats should call there. As a result Fremantle harbour was built 1,400 feet wide. It is unnecessary to go beyond the local men to learn what width the harbour should be. The Fremantle Harbour Trust Commissioners have put up a report on Mr. Stileman's scheme, and the Fremantle pilots have done likewise, and Mr. Stileman has replied, and, lastly, the pilots have made further comments. I hope that before a final decision is made, these latest reports, with Mr. Stileman's remarks on them, will be made available. The secretary to the Fremantle Harbour Trust writes—

The Commissioners hold without any equivocation whatever that the 1,400-foot clear width between quays now existing at Fremantle shall be continued, and they must warn the Government that if they embark in a work which gradually lessens this width to the 800-foot now recommended, and a decrease in depth from the 36-feet now provided in the existing harbour to the recommended 32-feet, the day will arrive when this will prove inefficient, and it will then be obtainable only at a much greater cost than if provided originally. The Commissioners do not make this statement idly. The width and depth is what they have always held to be necessary, and their experience of handling modern ships teaches them, without any question, that these two most essential features must be provided if the country is to be protected from spending heavily in the near future in rectifying what they consider would be a blunder and the spoiling of what is otherwise a splendid working harbour. What the Commissioners strongly recommended is that the enlargement should be taken in hand without delay, and that the 1,400-foot clear width be provided. As regards the depth of water, let the piles of all the wharf structure be driven sufficiently deeply to permit of a depth of 40-feet (as is done at present) being obtained if required in future, but that the dredging work be finished at the outset to a depth of 36-feet.

That extract shows that the Commissioners take a long view and are not likely to agree to anything that will prove disastrous to the country. The Fremantle pilots also come into the picture. They say—

In order to get our unanimous opinions on to paper we have held a meeting amongst ourselves, and beg to report as under . . . . . Taking Mr. Stileman's recommendation for extending the present harbour in an up-river direction first, while we are thankful at the prospect of getting an extension we unani-

mously beg to strongly advise that it be not carried out as designed. We entirely disagree with the proposal to lessen the width of water area quay to quay from what exists in the present harbour, and we take the liberty of warning the Commissioners that should this width of harbour be reduced, grave risks will be involved in handling shipping in it, which will mean at the very least considerable delays to shipping, but also, especially in heavy weather, of accident and damage both to ships and quay structures. In our opinion Mr. Stileman's recommendation to narrow the width down to 800 feet is entirely out of the question, and will not bear any criticism from nautical men. We consider that undoubtedly the 1,400 feet now existing should be continued.

Later the pilots say—

As regards the proposed outer harbour to be built along the North Beach to the north of the North Mole, this we unhesitatingly condemn from an aspect of a nautical man, and we say without any fear of contradiction that there must arise many times when ships cannot enter or leave it, and at all times even with a vast amount of dredging work to be done, not shown on Mr. Stileman's sketch plan, it will always be a most difficult and dangerous harbour. The term "haven" does not, in our opinion, apply to it at all. We therefore wish, with the greatest possible respect, to unanimously warn the Commissioners that if such a harbour is built, the Trust and the Government must be prepared for great delays and the constant menace of grave danger to valuable ships. In fact, we doubt whether, especially in heavy weather, ship owners or ship masters would allow an attempt to be made to get their ships into or out of it. We realise from the sketch plan attached to the Engineer-in-Chief's report that with the outer harbour proposal the full exposure of weather is to be retained, with disastrous results on a highly built-up ship, whereas we have been all along looking forward to the day when these larger types of vessels can be taken up into stiller conditions. As we have reported on several occasions, there is a marked tendency for ships to sheer badly to windward when taking the entrance channel, and we greatly fear an attempt to get them into the recommended outer harbour, with the further difficulty of knowing what to do with them if we were successful in getting them in without incurring great danger of damage.

Right through the piece nautical men, pilots and Harbour Trust Commissioners, warn the Government that if they go on with the 800-foot width, they will live to rue the day. Mr. Stileman, in commenting upon those criticisms, writes—

The harbour master states that a reduction in width means grave risks and considerable delays to shipping. Not unnaturally neither he nor the pilots are concerned with the economics of the question.

Mr. Stileman, it would appear, puts up his report as a matter of economy; but

we cannot afford to spoil a ship for a pennyworth of tar. If we are to ignore the pilots and the harbour master, who are entitled to have an opinion on the subject, and if we are to accept the views of an engineer who knows nothing of harbour work, being an engineer purely and simply, then we shall be responsible to the country for the failure of the job. Following this criticism of Mr. Stileman, I understand, there is a further report from the Harbour Trust Commissioners and the pilots on Mr. Stileman's reply. If we obtained that further report, we should have more light on the subject. In conversation the pilots have told me that the channel is no criterion, that they come out at a fairly good speed where there is no occasion to manoeuvre or swing the vessel, but that once they get inside the harbour and start to manoeuvre, the ship is a dead ship, as it were, at the mercy of the wind, and they must have further room. Moreover, they say that if the harbour is built on the width of 800 feet, there will be huge expenditure for tugs to handle the ships. They state that in bad weather, with such a narrow harbour as proposed, it would sometimes be necessary to have three tugs on a vessel. As regards the outer harbour scheme, they say it would be impracticable to enter it at all during certain weathers.

Mr. Withers: Perhaps the harbour had better be closed up.

Mr. SLEEMAN: No. The port is highly necessary. It is likewise highly necessary that the work should be pushed on quickly. In fact, we should get going on it immediately.

Mr. Angelo: Better move for a select committee.

Mr. SLEEMAN: I do not know that a Royal Commission would not be better than a select committee. I do not want to have members of Parliament going into this matter. There are men more capable of inquiring, as Royal Commissioners, into this subject. A Royal Commission could obtain the views of all the people concerned. They could take the evidence of the Harbour Trust Commissioners, the pilots, and the Engineer-in-Chief, and weigh it up. A body of Royal Commissioners appointed from among the residents of the State could act promptly. There should not be too much delay because the work needs to be expedited. If it were started immediately, five years must

elapse before a new berth would be available. The bridge will take three years to complete from the time it is started. Thereafter it will be necessary to begin on the harbour extension.

Mr. Teesdale: The Sydney bridge is being built in less time than that.

Mr. SLEEMAN: It will not be built in double the time. This work should proceed at once. The Harbour Trust Commissioners report themselves as anxious and eager to see the work begun. The project of the outer harbour will not, in my opinion, ever be carried into effect, irrespective of whether this Parliament authorises it or not. In any case the outer harbour would not be required for some three years, and by that time Parliament would recognise the necessity for repealing the Act authorising its construction—assuming that the present Parliament passed such a Bill. The bridge is being placed in about the position where it should be. I find no fault with the position, but there is certainly room for complaint as regards the line from Robb's Jetty to the bridge. That railway is to go through the thickly populated parts of East Fremantle. A good deal has been heard about level crossings latterly, but if the Robb's Jetty line is built on the route now proposed, it will have from 25 to 30 level crossings within a very short distance. A scheme has been mooted—I believe that the Harbour Trust Commissioners have gone into it—for branching the line off somewhere near Bibra Lake and connecting it with the south of the river railway which must be built sooner or later, and in that way bringing it across the river. I believe such a proposal has been submitted to the Government for consideration. I personally think that route better than Mr. Stileman's route, which would chop up a most thickly populated part of Fremantle. One might as well propose to build a railway line through the most thickly populated part of Perth. It is not absolutely necessary for the line in question to follow the route proposed. If it were started from Bibra Lake and brought along south of the river, it would avoid all the thickly populated area. No provision, I understand, has been made for shipping to get past the bridge. In my opinion the time will come when the Fremantle harbour will have to be higher up the river. Further, if the outer harbour is not constructed, it will be necessary for ships to go past the bridge. In the absence

of a suspension bridge, beneath which ships can pass, provision should be made for an opening in the bridge. The opening need not be made immediately, but provision should be made for the eventual installation of a lifting span to allow ships to come up the river. I believe the time will come when ships will go to Rocky Bay. No great expense will be involved in making the opening in the bridge then. Though I would prefer to see a suspension bridge built, yet the cost would be very great, especially as the bridge would have to be fairly strong in order to allow of ships passing under it. Mr. Stileman's scheme makes no provision for a dock. Our coast, we are told, is not suitable for a graving dock. Hon. members will recollect that disastrous Fremantle graving dock on which many thousands of pounds were wasted.

Hon. G. Taylor: About £200,000.

Mr. SLEEMAN: I understand all the experts agree that our coast line is not suitable for a graving dock, and the only alternative is a floating dock. If we are to have a floating dock, deep water must be available. My belief is that eventually Rocky Bay will be the site of wharves or quays. Once we get into Rocky Bay, we have deep water up from Blackwall to Mosman's Bay. Rocky Bay is a splendid spot, with cliffs to shelter the shipping, and with water enough to hold a dock twice the size of the Singapore floating dock. Therefore I would prefer that provision should be made for a span in the bridge, so that shipping could go through the bridge into Rocky Bay. Eventually we could have a dock further up the river, where there is ample depth of water and plenty of shelter for vessels.

*Sitting suspended from 6.15 to 7.30 p.m.*

Mr. SLEEMAN: At the tea adjournment I was dealing with the dock question and the advisability of making use of Mosman's Bay. I shall not say much more about the subject beyond making further reference to the statement issued by the pilots. In the course of that statement they said—

We should thank Mr. Stileman, perhaps, for the assumption that what is done in handling ships in old tidal docks in other parts of the world cannot be done at Fremantle; such a statement carries no weight. We can do what is done in the docked ports if the facilities are provided, but we desire to avoid these as being costly, slow, and entirely unnecessary here . . . . As to the outer harbour, we cannot think that the Engineer-in-Chief is quite

serious in this recommendation. Nothing that he has written alters our opinion one iota. As to our remarks about the entrance, we admit that the entrance is not shown on the original sketch plan accompanying Mr. Stileman's report. But we heard him say at the Town Hall meeting that it was intended to use the existing entrance channel, so assumed it would be through the North Mole. It may be anywhere else, but wherever it is, the exposed nature of the new harbour will remain. When one comes to remember that a modern mail boat is built up in the vicinity of 70 feet from the water level, without mentioning the funnels, the wind influence is so good that those ships, utterly knocked dead, are like great bladders, utterly unable to be held without four or five tugs and, if possible, shore capstans, and may do great damage.

In my opinion, the statements I have quoted from various people interested in this subject, amply demonstrate the necessity for a review of the scheme promulgated by Mr. Stileman. The whole matter should be gone into thoroughly because there is no doubt that an extension of the harbour to a width of 800 ft. only, will be totally inadequate. The pilots are people who have to do the job. When Mr. Stileman constructs the harbour, he will be finished with the whole thing; the pilots are the men who have to shoulder the responsibility of handling big steamers and safeguarding hundreds of valuable lives while they manoeuvre the ships. From some of the statements that have been made, one would imagine that these men have sailed nothing bigger than fishing boats on the Swan River! On the other hand, the pilots are men who have sailed to ports all over the world. When men of that description make statements such as I have read, their dicta carries more weight with me than the words of an engineer. The latter comes into the picture after a decision has been arrived at concerning what is to be done and where the work is to be carried out. Then the engineer takes a hand to determine whether it is practicable to carry out the work that has been entrusted to him. I hope the first portion of Mr. Stileman's scheme will be dealt with quickly. There is only the question of the width of the harbour and whether or not the bridge to be constructed shall have a moveable span installed. When those two points have been determined, it will be possible to go right ahead with that part of the scheme. I hope some finality will be reached on those points this session, and that the extension of the harbour will be carried out, thus giving effect

to the desires of the Fremantle community. There is another point regarding the working of the harbour. I refer to the watch that is kept on boats while in port. All coastal ships employ shore watchmen. The regulations do not make any provision for that being done, but the shipping companies realise the necessity for having a shore watchman employed. On the contrary, overseas ships arriving at Fremantle very often have coloured crews and, for the sake of economy, the masters do not employ shore watchmen, but put members of the crew on the gangway while the boats are in port. That is a most unsatisfactory condition of affairs. What happens is that generally a big buck nigger is stationed there and he is unable to speak in English beyond saying "What you want?" or "Want boss?" The regulations issued by the Fremantle Harbour Trust Commissioners contain the following that deals with night watchmen—

All ships above 150 tons register shall have a watchman on deck from sunset to sunrise, and all ships under 150 tons register shall have at least one man on board during the night.

That regulation should be amended, and all that is necessary is the inclusion of the word "shore," so as to make the regulation read, "All ships above 150 tons register shall have a shore watchman," etc. The present practice of overseas ships placing coloured men on the gangway to act as night watchmen does not make for safety at the port. A lot of things that happen on the wharf are put down to the foreign boats and for that reason, I am all the more convinced that provision should be made for the employment of shore watchmen. At most of the other ports that practice is adopted, and Fremantle is behind the times in not insisting upon an efficient watch, such as would be kept by a shore watchman, being maintained. During the torrent of interjections that accompanied my remarks about the State Implement Works, I omitted to mention one point. The Government should insist upon settlers who are assisted by the State in turn assisting the community by taking State manufactured machinery.

Mr. Mann: Whether suitable or not.

Mr. SLEEMAN: I did not say that.

Mr. J. H. Smith: That has been the tragedy of the group settlements.

Mr. SLEEMAN: I say the machinery is suitable, and most of the farmers are satisfied with it.

Mr. Lindsay: That was what happened at the outset with the I.A.B.

Mr. SLEEMAN: Yes.

Mr. Lindsay: Probably that was the explanation of the failures.

Mr. SLEEMAN: When mention is made of State implements, hon. members generally refer to the harvesters. When we take up the matter, most of them admit that the State ploughs are equal to any in the world.

Mr. Lindsay: You say so.

Mr. SLEEMAN: I say that hon. members sitting on the Opposition side of the House have said that.

Mr. J. H. Smith: In the South-West the depots are full of State implements, including harrows and so on.

Mr. SLEEMAN: I say the ploughs are second to none. If we are to assist men to become farmers, the least we can expect in return is that they shall patronise the State Implement Works by taking the State machinery, provided that machinery is suitable. There is no doubt about the ploughs, although, perhaps there may be a few people who will not admit it. If only the farmers would make use of the State implements that are suitable and up-to-date, the State Implement Works would be a more go-ahead concern than it is at present.

Mr. Lindsay: That is an extension of compulsory unionism.

Mr. SLEEMAN: It is not. Men come out here from the Old Country without a penny in their pockets. We put them on a block of land, and assist them with State funds. In return for that, those men should not be allowed to adopt the attitude of saying, "Although the State assisted me, I am not prepared to do anything to help the State." The least they can be expected to do is to buy State implements.

Mr. Lindsay: Many of them do.

Mr. Mann: Can you tell me why it is the State Implement Works do not keep a spare part, he has to go to North Fremantle.

Mr. SLEEMAN: I do not know about that.

Mr. Mann: You are interested in pushing the State implements. Tell me why that is so.

Mr. SLEEMAN: I was told that spare parts could not be obtained in the country and when I made inquiries I found that that was not so. I was also told that spare parts are kept for a number of individual farmers. If a man purchases a State plough, it is recognised that that plough is used in such a way as to be knocked out of shape.

Mr. Lindsay: Oh!

Mr. SLEEMAN: Sometimes the ploughs are bent into all shapes. The member for Toodyay (Mr. Lindsay) interjected, "Oh"! Let me tell him that I have seen ploughs that have been taken back and they have been bent almost at right angles. The farmer must have tried to take out a stump or something and instead of proper methods being employed, has gone right ahead, with the result that the plough has been damaged to the extent I have indicated.

Mr. Lindsay: Farmers buy ploughs that are expected to stand up to work.

Mr. SLEEMAN: But I have indicated how some of these ploughs must have been used.

Mr. Lindsay: You are condemning the State ploughs.

Mr. SLEEMAN: I am not.

Mr. Lindsay: Yes you are, when you say they have to be sent back to Perth to be repaired.

Mr. SLEEMAN: I did not say that. What I meant to indicate was that patterns of the shears were taken, particularly when bolt holes in mould boards were knocked out of shape. That was done so that the requirements of the individual farmer concerned could be supplied if spares were required. That was done in the interests of the clients of the State Implement Works.

Mr. Heron: At any rate, the management is very lax in answering correspondence.

Mr. SLEEMAN: I do not know about that.

Mr. Mann: I fail to ascertain why spare parts are not kept in Perth.

Mr. SLEEMAN: There are not many farmers in Perth who would require them, not outside St. George's-terrace farmers.

The Minister for Water Supplies: What would be the advantage of keeping spare parts in Perth, seeing that they could be railed direct from North Fremantle to any country centre?

Mr. Mann: If course, there would be an advantage.

The Minister for Water Supplies: I fail to see it.

Mr. SLEEMAN: At any rate, if we assist these people they should in turn assist us to establish our secondary industries. Another question I wish to refer to is the recent importation of two locomotives. I understand they were imported for the Public Works Department. Why was that work not given to the Midland Junction Railway Workshops? We know that engines have been constructed there and a splendid job was made of the work. I am at a loss to understand why the Public Works Department should import those locomotives instead of causing them to be made within the State. When I was speaking about the unemployed at an earlier stage of my remarks, I omitted to mention one phase. Quite a lot has been said about the type of men who were out of work, and it was said that the Australians and the migrants were no good. Here is a report in connection with work undertaken by the East Fremantle Municipal Council—

The East Fremantle Council has given employment to approximately 40 men in connection with relief works undertaken under the Government scheme of £ for £ subsidy. Discussing the type of men who offered themselves for employment, the Town Clerk, Mr. H. H. Parker, said he was dubious at the outset over the class of men who would offer themselves for employment, as he had had a great deal of experience regarding men employed on relief works. "But I have been very agreeably surprised," said Mr. Parker. "The men we have working on our roads now are as good as any I have ever had working for me. They could be put to any similar task and would do well."

It is gratifying to know that someone will speak well of the men who have been picked up for employment from the ranks of those who have been looking for work. The last matter I wish to deal with concerns this House and the Legislative Council. When dealing with the Land Tax and Income Tax Bill, the Legislative Council insisted upon its right to amend a Money Bill. We fell down on our job at that time and allowed the Upper House to put the rule over us. It was agreed that a certain course should be pursued and a message was sent to the Council, embodying the agreement as follows:—

With reference to message No. 20 of the Legislative Council, the Legislative Assembly acquaints the Legislative Council that it accepts the suggestion to refer the matter now in dispute to the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council for decision. Meanwhile, the Legislative Assembly is prepared, *pendente lite*, to consider messages from the Legislative Council in which requests for amendments are

pressed, and assumes that the same consideration will be given to messages from the Legislative Assembly in which requests for concurrence in Bills are pressed. The Legislative Assembly therefore presses its request for the concurrence of the Legislative Council in a Bill for an Act to impose a Land Tax and an Income Tax, which is returned herewith.

We should expedite that matter and see that it is referred to the Privy Council. I can foresee that later on in the session, the Legislative Council will oppose Bills and seek to amend them, whereas in my opinion, they have not the right to do so. You, Mr. Speaker, ruled that their attempt to amend such Bills was irregular. Not only is your position to be considered, but there is the dignity of this House. We should not allow another place to put it over us. We should have this matter referred to the Privy Council and have it settled once and for all.

Mr. Davy: Will you ask a question about that?

Mr. SLEEMAN: Yes.

Mr. Davy: I suppose it has been forgotten.

The Minister for Justice: It would have to be done by means of a resolution of the House.

Mr. SLEEMAN: I do not know why the member for West Perth (Mr. Davy) wants me to raise the matter by way of question. I have raised the question and I hope something will be done about it. If the member for West Perth (Mr. Davy) will attempt to get the necessary legislation put through, or to confer with the Government, I am prepared to help him to see that the question is referred to the Privy Council. For many years now we have been saying that another place has no right to press an amendment to a money Bill. But we fell down on our job, and instead of abolishing the other House we are allowing them to run the show. I wonder whether the member for West Perth will help me to get another place abolished.

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: We will abolish you.

Mr. Davy: I do not believe in abolishing anything.

Mr. SLEEMAN: However, I trust we shall have restored to this House the power over money Bills that it has always enjoyed in the past.

**HON. G. TAYLOR** (Mount Margaret) [7.46]: Before dealing with the serious aspect of unemployment, I desire to refer to a few remarks made by various speakers

in the course of the debate. The member for Murchison (Mr. Marshall) drew the attention of the Minister for Lands to the way in which pastoral areas north of Kalgoorlie, stretching out miles beyond Wiluna, were being dummed and the stocking conditions ignored. That I can bear out, for I have had something to do for one of my constituents in respect of some pastoral country. After handling the matter for some time, I saw Mr. Angwin, the then Minister for Lands, who treated me with his characteristic courtesy. I learned that the Minister was having reports made, and that on one occasion a report had come down, a sworn affidavit, asserting that stocking conditions had been fulfilled. But there was only one watering place on the property, although the property had been held for about four years. There was no doubt whatever that had the affidavit been true, the country should not have been forfeited. But I went to some trouble to prove that the affidavit was not true. The Government sent up a special man to report, and it was learned that it was not possible to find on that country the track of a single beast. I was pleased to hear the Minister say, the other night, that he was going into the matter, although he did not feel disposed to be too harsh and make an example of someone who, after all, had only been following an old-established practice. However, the Minister went on to say that he had issued instructions that in future anybody making a false declaration about stocking should be punished. If the Minister does punish anybody for that offence, we shall have all that eastern goldfields country stocked up. For there are numbers of people anxious to put sheep on that country. They are precluded because the country is held by speculators, some of them residing in Melbourne. My friends opposite know one member of the Federal Parliament who owns a large tract of country up there. It is in his name; but I do not think he has ever seen it in reality. That gentleman should be told that if he does not fulfil the conditions he will have to get out and let somebody else do so. We cannot have our country held up when so many practical people want it.

Mr. Maley: Is it a local man who holds that country?

Hon. G. TAYLOR: He is a local man, a member of the Federal Parliament. Dealing with unemployment, the member for East Perth (Mr. Kenneally), in recounting

reasons why so many men in Perth should be out of work, said that some 400 men dismissed from the railways in South Australia had come over here. I suppose there is no reason why those men should not come over here. Probably nobody will say they can be ranged in the category of those who will not work. A lot of people say that a large number of the unemployed are unemployable. I take it the member for East Perth would not put those 400 men in that category. The hon. member should know something of the type of men employed on railways. Railway employees in this State rank amongst the best Government servants that we have.

Mr. Kenneally: I never said anything about unemployable.

Hon. G. TAYLOR: No, but others have used the term, and I want to know whether the member for East Perth considers that these 400 men are in that category.

Mr. Kenneally: You will have to give notice of the question.

Hon. G. TAYLOR: I expect those 400 railwaymen would do more than give notice of a question if they knew that any member on the Government side had placed them in the category of people who will not work. Members opposite would be very ready to recognise the power of those 400 men if an election were looming. The member for East Perth referred to the member for Pingelly (Mr. Brown), and I happened to interject that there was some force in the hon. member's argument. I am not here to defend the member for Pingelly, but I think that in fairness to him and to the House one should not misinterpret what an hon. member has said. To misinterpret a member, even unconsciously, and continue it will lead people to a wrong conclusion. The member for Pingelly, in putting up his views on unemployment, pointed out that at some time in his life he had been an employer, that then men came to him for work and he gave them work at certain wages below what is the basic wage to-day. He proceeded to say that after they had recovered themselves a little financially, they went about their business. The hon. member said that if men could be employed at a wage below the basic wage, a lot of those crying out for work to-day would be absorbed. That was what the hon. member tried to convey. Perhaps, through being interjected at, he did not state it as clearly as he might otherwise have done. His argument was that if a man could not

earn £4 10s. a week, he might well be put on to less arduous work that he could do with out undue physical fatigue, and be paid lesser rate of wage. He pointed out that certain work was not worth more than £2 10s. a week and that many men could be employed at such work. That was a fair statement for the hon. member to make. I would not support him or anybody else in trying to reduce wages, but I say that when men are hungry, and tramping the streets, and organising themselves into large bodies to demonstrate their numbers to the powers that be, it is necessary that they should be heard. The member for Pingelly is justified in asking that if there be amongst the unemployed men who are not real slap-up workmen, they ought to be allowed to go into the country and be employed on light work at less than the basic wage. If that were permissible, of course many of them would be absorbed. Having said that, I feel that the member for Pingelly will be able to say whether or not I realise what he was trying to convey to the House. The member for Subiaco (Mr. Richardson) told us the Subiaco Municipal Council were spending £2,640 to absorb the unemployed. That would provide for a considerable number of men.

Mr. Richardson: That was against the £64 spent there by the Government.

Hon. G. TAYLOR: I am only referring to this in passing. Some members opposite made some stringent remarks against members on this side, and implicated me somewhat in those statements. The member for Menzies (Mr. Pantou) raged considerably at the member for Katanning (Mr. Thomson). I am not here to defend the member for Katanning. On many occasions I have disagreed with him and I have not hesitated to put my views forward. The member for Katanning said it would be a fine thing if members travelled to other countries to see how the people there carried on their affairs, as it would widen their vision. The hon. member was unfortunate in quoting South Africa as an example. He had been on a health trip to South Africa, and naturally seized upon that as a country which could offer us an object lesson in carrying on industry. I have not been to South Africa, but from my reading I know exactly how industry is carried on there. People who went over there years ago when the gold rushes were on have spoken to me in this strain, "You talk about the gold mines in Western Australia being dangerous, not well equipped, badly la-



out at the start and faulty in ventilation, a fault that could not be cured except at great expense in order to make them healthy for human beings to work in. You ought to go to South Africa. Do you know what they do with the Kaffirs? The shift boss goes to within 50 yards of a very dangerous face, picks up a lump of stone, fires it in and tells the Kaffirs to go in there and work. It is too dangerous for him to go in, and that is how he indicates to the Kaffirs what they are to do." That sort of thing has been said time after time. We do not want to go to South Africa to learn how to conduct our industry. The member for Katanning was foolish to cite South Africa and thus give members opposite an opportunity to say he wanted to bring into this country men wearing a loin cloth to work for 1s. a day. I do not think the hon. member, if he could, would bring in men wearing a loin cloth to work for 1s. a day, but members opposite seized on that at once, particularly the member for Murchison (Mr. Marshall) who wished to make it appear that the member for Katanning desired to introduce black labour here. We ought to be able to meet each other in debate on fairer lines than that. I am not here to defend the member for Katanning; my only desire is that every member should be given a fair deal in debate. The member for Menzies and the member for Murchison were very anxious to protest strongly against anyone who would say anything about the industry or about the Arbitration Court awards or anything at all savouring of the Trades Hall. They would hardly let a member cross the Beaufort-street bridge, and if he got as far as Con. O'Brien's hotel, they would endeavour to out him, because he was getting too near to the Trades Hall. The member for Menzies quoted figures to show that the working days lost through strikes in this country were comparatively infinitesimal. I shall deal with that point later on. I am sorry the member for Menzies is not in his seat, though perhaps it is well he is not because I would not say as much behind his back as I would if he were here. Of course he would not be able to listen to me without interjecting, and I know what that would bring forth. The hon. member was not satisfied with slating everybody in general, but he must needs throw Tom Walsh across the floor of the House and attempt to flog this side of the House with Tom Walsh. I do not know Tom Walsh beyond what I have read of him in the papers. I am told he was in Newcastle in 1890-91 when I was in Queens-

land, and that he was connected with the Seamen's Union there at that time. If so he is a far older man than I thought. I believe the Minister for Railways met him on the verandah of his own domicile in Perth one night—that memorable night when the Minister described his visitors as thugs and hooligans. From the Minister's description of Tom Walsh, I thought he was a man between 30 and 40 years of age, but if he is the man who was in Newcastle in the early nineties, he must be well up to 60 years of age now. However, I do not know him and I am not anxious to be too well acquainted with him, and I do not want members on the Government side to make innuendoes and couple my name with his. I am not aware that the Nationalist Party had anything to do with Walsh's arrival in Western Australia. I do not know that the "Young Argonauts" gave him a luncheon, and I was invited to attend. I am naturally inquisitive, and I would have gone like a shot to hear Walsh, because, having followed his utterances for so many years, I would have liked to see him. Unfortunately I did not open the invitation until five minutes to one—it had arrived only by that morning's post—and therefore I missed the opportunity. Still I read in the newspapers what Walsh had to say. My going to hear him, however, would not have associated me with him in any way. I tell members opposite that they will need to get some better ammunition than that before they will be able to damage the Nationalist Party in the eyes of the people. It is well for them to know that they cannot enhance their popularity with the people by making false statements of that kind about the Nationalist Party. Members opposite were very keen in their criticism of the member for Katanning, but when he made a charge against them that they should have been able to disprove, they did not reply to him. I refer to the charge that McKay's, the implement makers, desired to start a branch of the industry here, but were blocked by the trades union. That statement has been made by the hon. member for Katanning on a previous occasion, but members opposite have passed it over. The statement could not be refuted because the workers of this State know only too well that is true. If I desired to oppose the member for Katanning, I would oppose him on lines that were cogent to the policy

he represented. The hon. member accused members opposite of keeping industry out of this country; in other words he accused them of being responsible for the unemployed who are marching the streets to-day.

Mr. Richardson: There is a lot of truth in that, too.

Hon. G. TAYLOR: There may be. I am merely making my deductions from what has occurred.

Mr. Lindsay: And also responsible for the high price of agricultural machinery in this State.

Mr. Richardson: Quite right.

The Minister for Railways: What have the Government to do with agricultural machinery?

Mr. Lindsay: They stopped McKay's from starting here.

The Minister for Railways: It is the first time I have heard that charge made against the Government.

Mr. Lindsay: The union stopped them.

The Minister for Railways: I am talking about the Government.

Hon. G. TAYLOR: The member for Albany (Mr. A. Wansbrough) brought up the old sore that was just hinted at last session of the Main Roads Board episode from about the 2nd or 3rd January of last year up to the 6th February. I am sorry that the hon. member brought it up. Before he had got very far he found himself in troubled waters. I hope to deal with that matter a little later. He also spoke about the King Napier-road, and said that two years plans had been drawn up and the delay had been caused by the Federal people. I shall also deal with that later. It is passing strange that my friends supporting the Government change their views on the unemployed question and about the workers generally whenever they get on to that warm side of the House on the right of the Speaker. I have sat on both sides with you, Mr. Speaker, and I know how cold is the atmosphere on the opposition side and how warm the atmosphere on the Government side. When my friends were sitting in the cold of the opposition, they were irritable; they were always looking for quarrels and any stick was good enough to beat the Government with. If they heard of one man looking for a job, they almost created an unemployed procession out of the one

man. But to-day they are as silent as the grave. Anybody from any part of the English-speaking world arriving in Perth during the last few months would never dream that they were the stalwart standard-bearers. Their voice is not heard anywhere in the interests of the unemployed. As I shall be dealing with the unemployed question a little later, I shall defer further remarks until that stage. I should like to say a few words on a subject brought up by the Leader of the Opposition and supported more ably than I can support it. I refer to various paragraphs in the Auditor-General's report. The Leader of the Opposition quoted pages 6, 10, 11 and 28. He read extracts from pages 6, 10 and 11 that already appear in "Hansard" and shall not read them again. But I consider it necessary to direct attention to page 2 on which appears the following—

From the 1st October, 1925, the debt due to the Commonwealth on account of loans for discharged soldier settlement was reduced by £796,000, and the State has not been called upon to provide interest from the revenue fund on this amount. The Agricultural Bank has paid to the credit of the revenue fund interest to the 30th June, 1927, on loan moneys supplied for advances to soldier settlers, portion of which will not be recovered from the settlers.

Those statements should have been answered. The Auditor-General added—

The individual losses by the bank on the realisation of securities, to March, 1927, were recouped to the bank by the Treasury from the Trust Account containing the 2½ per cent. interest concession from the Commonwealth, but losses arising out of the scheme of revaluation of soldier settlers' holdings have not been dealt with in a similar manner. To the extent these moneys were advanced through the bank the revenue fund has received, from the bank interest as if the money were still owing to the Commonwealth. The indebtedness of soldier settlers to the bank, which was cancelled on varying dates from 31st December 1925, under Section 3 of Act No. 26 of 1924 and for which allowance has not been made by the Treasury, amounted to £243,562 8s. 3d (principal and interest).

If we take the £796,000 and the £243,562 we get a sum of over a million pounds on which interest was not paid. That statement is rather significant. The Premier treated it in a light fashion, and said there were a few technical breaches of administration which did not count, and that this had been going on for all time. On the 13th of this month, according to the "West Australian" of the 14th, the Leader of the

Opposition in the Federal Parliament, Mr. Scullin, made this statement—

Mr. Scullin accused the Federal Government of having obscured the true financial position of Australia, and quoted the report of the Auditor General in support of his contention that time and again the Federal Government had furnished inaccurate figures and misleading financial statements.

It is quite a proper thing for the Leader of the Opposition in the Federal Parliament, when in Western Australia, to accuse the Commonwealth Government, on the report of the Commonwealth Auditor General, of putting up faked balance sheets and misleading the public, but it is not right for the Leader of the Opposition in the State Parliament to read the report of the Auditor General to show that the Premier, the Leader of the Labour Party, is doing exactly the same thing. It is not likely the people will allow the Auditor General's report to be flouted, or treated without that respect due to it. What happened when the Leader of the Opposition accused the Premier with not replying to his statements? The Premier was dealing with the sum of £365,000 being a cross entry. The Leader of the Opposition said that the ascertained loss on soldier settlement should be written off against the sum held by the Treasury on the day it was written off from the Agricultural Bank. The Premier said this had been done, but the Leader of the Opposition replied, "The Auditor General says it is not." The Premier then said, "If he says that, he is wrong." That is a straight-out challenge to the honesty and accuracy of the Auditor General's department. It is a statement this House should take cognisance of. The Auditor General is the servant of Parliament and his reports are addressed to Parliament. When the veracity of his reports is impugned by the Premier, it is the duty of the House to ascertain who is right, the Auditor General or the Premier. Presumably the Premier knows more than the Auditor General, according to his own words. Has the Auditor General done this to pull the wool over our eyes, or has he done it in a straightforward and fearless manner, in fulfilment of his duties, and of the sections of the Act under which he works? This House should take notice of the Auditor General's report, the more so in view of the statement of the Premier that he is wrong. I will leave it at that.

Hon. Sir James Mitchell called attention to the state of the House.

Bells rung and a quorum formed.

Hon. G. TAYLOR: I am not surprised that members opposite have not cared to hear these references to the Auditor General's report. I have now finished with that matter. We heard the Premier castigate the meeting known as the Conference of Municipal and Road Districts to deal with road administration, and held in Perth on the 7th August, 1928. The Premier described that combination of people, members of municipalities, chairmen of road boards from one end of the State to the other, as wild and woolly, as nonentities, and as persons no one would bother listening to. He was very pleased, too, that the chairman of the Main Roads Board, Mr. Tindale, did not make any remarks at that meeting. Let us see how wild and woolly and nondescript those people were.

The Minister for Railways: The chairman of the Main Roads Board did not go to that meeting.

Hon. G. TAYLOR: He was sitting on the platform as close to me as is the Leader of the Opposition.

The Minister for Railways: Not the meeting the Premier described as wild and woolly.

Hon. G. TAYLOR: Yes.

The Minister for Railways: No.

Hon. G. TAYLOR: I was on the platform and made some remarks from there.

The Minister for Railways: The Premier described the first conference as wild and woolly.

Hon. G. TAYLOR: I was not at the second conference. The Premier was pleased to say, in reply to an interjection by the member for Toodyay, that that was a conference of sensible people.

The Minister for Water Supply: I saw you there.

Hon. G. TAYLOR: I was at the first conference.

The Minister for Water Supply: Not the first conference.

The Minister for Railways: You are making a mistake.

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: The hon. member was a delegate at the first conference.

The Minister for Railways: The chairman of the Main Roads Board did not go to the first conference.

The Minister for Mines: He was never inside the door.

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: It is the same door and practically the same people. Do not quibble.

Hon. G. TAYLOR: I have not got it down in black and white.

The Minister for Railways: I think you have made a mistake, that is all; I am not contradicting you.

Hon. G. TAYLOR: Any other remarks I make I am prepared to prove in black and white. I know my friends will deny anything.

The Minister for Railways: Not at all.

Hon. G. TAYLOR: Some 30 resolutions were brought forward from various places, dealing with Main Roads Board matters. There were resolutions from the Victoria Road Board, the Murchison district, the Federation of Local Authorities and Industries, the Dumbleyung Road Board, the Kulin Road Board, the Greenbushes Road Board, the Municipality of Geraldton, the Williams Road Board, the Broome Road Board, the Carnarvon Municipality, the Balingup Road Board, the Claremont Road Board, The Armadale and Kelmescott Road Board, the Harvey Road Board, the Melville Road Board, the Gosnells District Road Board, and the Municipality at Guildford. I am reading from the agenda, and there is no denying that document. The Premier was pleased to speak disparagingly of all these representatives because they dared to question the administration of the Main Roads Board. He also accused members of this House of wangling in their credentials. As I was the only member to put in a credential, I naturally assume he referred to me. I had a credential from the Mt. Margaret Road Board to attend the conference.

The Minister for Railways: I do not think he was referring to you.

Hon. G. TAYLOR: I was the only member who presented credentials. I want to be honest with the House. Mr. Kempton rose to speak and some disturbance occurred. Delegates said, "Who are you representing, where are your credentials?" He said he was speaking for the Murchison people, that he had been associated with them for 14 years, and was qualified to speak on their behalf. I think he moved a certain motion. When he sat down the member for Williams-Narrogin rose. He was greeted with the same remark. He had no credentials, and did not presume to have any. He said the mayor had given him the privilege of speaking, and he moved some amendments, which were carried. Later on a number of motions tending to do away with the Main Roads Board were cast out

en bloc. A motion was then moved for the appointment of a Royal Commission. The business I had been asked to take part in had been disposed of. I had by that time been about two hours in attendance. The last-mentioned motion was moved just before the luncheon hour. I caught the chairmans' eye and said, "In case I am mistaken for a member of Parliament, I will produce my credentials," and these I handed in. I told the conference I would not have entered upon the discussion but for the fact that on the previous Thursday I asked the Government if it was their intention to appoint a Royal Commission to inquire into the administration by the Main Roads Board. I told the conference that, but said I was doing it for a reason totally different from that for which the conference desired an investigation. I told the conference that many statements had been made to the effect that the Main Roads Board were interfered with by the Government. I said, "Whether it be true or not, I do not know, but that will never be ascertained unless there is some mode of inquiry, and I believe the Main Roads Board themselves would not shirk an inquiry. I was going to ask for an inquiry, but since hearing expressions of opinion at this conference I have moderated my views on the point." Then the conference adjourned for lunch. I do not know what occurred afterwards. According to the Press, the motion was carried, though with some dissent. It appeared from the Press reports that the motion was carried immediately after I sat down; and the Premier waxing eloquent, said people who were nonentities and not worthy of consideration had moved in the matter. He was very pleased when the member for Toodyay (Mr. Lindsay) said that had Mr. Tindale, the chairman of the Main Roads Board, addressed that conference in the way he addressed the Road Boards Conference on the following day there would have been no trouble, and that the chairman of the conference had stated that the items on the agenda paper referring to the Main Roads Board and their faults and difficulties would not appear in the future; that the chairman of the Main Roads Board had said whatever had occurred in the past would not occur in the future, because in the future he was going to meet all the wishes of the road boards in every way, and he had every hope that in future road board working would be smooth. The Premier, on the other hand, tells us that the whole fault lies with the

Federal Act, and not at all at this end. Now, the Federal Act has not been altered. How could Mr. Tindale make such a statement to the Road Boards Conference in view of that Act of Parliament under which he had been operating for 18 months, which remained unaltered, and which the Premier said was the stumbling block? There is a difference of opinion somewhere, and I rather fear the chairman of the Main Roads Board will not be able to deliver the goods he promised to the Road Boards Conference. If the Act was bad in the past, then, not having been altered, it must be bad now. The Premier was ill-advised in passing such strictures on those people, calling them wild and woolly, and saying that members of Parliament went to the conference for propaganda purposes.

The Minister for Railways: I think you are mistaken.

Hon. G. TAYLOR: I took down the Premier's remarks. Mr. Sewell, mayor of Geraldton, was appointed chairman of the joint conference, and he wrote a dignified letter to the Press pointing out that the Premier's remarks, as recorded in "Hansard" and in the newspapers, were uncalled-for and undignified. Mr. Sewell added that he was amazed to find the Premier would stoop to such things. In the letter which appeared in the "West Australian" a few days later, it is stated that if the Premier had conferred with his colleague—I presume either the Chief Secretary or the Minister for Railways—was meant, seeing that both Ministers come from Geraldton, and presumably respect the mayor of that town—he would have held quite a different view. The Premier had passed strictures on the mayor's chairman of the conference, saying he was unable to control the meeting.

The Minister for Railways: He said there was an uproar.

Hon. G. TAYLOR: There was no uproar while I was present. The proceedings were very quiet. Possibly the Press did not accurately report the proceedings. I could imagine that when a show of hands called for from 120 or 130 people, there is difficulty in counting, and so there is bound to be some disturbance.

The Minister for Railways: The Press said that while Scaddan was speaking there was uproar.

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: I do not know what that has to do with us.

Hon. G. TAYLOR: The Premier was indiscreet in making that attack on the conference, and also in making that reference to—the Minister for Railways has mentioned the name—Mr. Scaddan. Mr. Scaddan did speak, and spoke at some length; and apparently there was an idea that one could not speak for more than a minute or so. Some member of the conference said to Mr. Scaddan, "Your time is up," and there were calls of "Time," and Mr. Scaddan sat down. Now, Mr. Scaddan is rather a boisterous speaker, and he does not mince matters. One does not need to be right alongside him in order to hear him. He did say something which perhaps might have justified the Premier's remarks about him. I remember his saying something to the effect that he did not think the Main Roads Board was being used for political purposes; that, or something to that effect. If the Premier had been sitting on the platform listening to Mr. Scaddan as I was, he would not have taken the slightest notice of what was said.

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: The threat of a Royal Commission was the trouble.

Hon. G. TAYLOR: Yes. If the Government have nothing to fear, why did the Premier wax wild in this Chamber and say, "You may take it from me that there will be no Royal Commission"? If there is nothing to fear, why not have a Royal Commission to determine whether there is any truth in the allegations? We do know—the member for Albany (Mr. A. Wansbrough) referred to it—that there was wonderful activity and great anxiety in the Government ranks during the early part of last year, from about the 1st or 2nd January up to about the 5th or 6th January, to get men away into the country districts to make roads. It was rumoured far and wide that those men were sent into the country without tools or implements, without anything with which to construct roads, but that they did not fail to take their fountain pens so as to be able to fill in claim cards. I was not there, and know nothing about the matter; but these allegations want sifting, and a bald statement from the Ministerial bench that they are not true will not satisfy the public. These things have been reported far and wide. If the member for Toodyay (Mr. Lindsay) were in his place, he could either bear out or contradict what I have to say. Com-

ing down from my electorate in April, three months later, I heard that a number of men had been sent to Baker's Hill, which adjoins the Northam and Toodyay electorates, and that the first thing they were alleged to have done upon getting off the train was to go to the post office for the purpose of putting their names on the roll. It was said that they did this without a delay of more than 20 minutes. They applied to have their names put on the Northam roll, and the man in charge at the post office happened to be a deputy returning officer or postal vote officer for the Toodyay electorate. He said to the men, "You cannot put your names down here for Northam; you will have to go to Northam to do that. Where are you living?" They said, "Here." He said, "How long?" They said, "We just came to-day. We are going to work on the roads, and we want to put our names on the roll." Of course there was an altercation, and there was also a hotel, and where there is a hotel there is usually a drop of beer, and where there is a drop of beer people will talk even more freely than they do in this House. After the men had had a couple of pots, they were not satisfied with the official's decision. They went back to him—so the report goes—and said, "Do you think the Government are flats? They know what to do. They sent us up here and said, 'Put your names down for Northam as soon as you get up there.'"

The Minister for Railways: Oh!

Hon. G. TAYLOR: The member for Toodyay arrived a few minutes afterwards; I believe he drove up in his motor car. Seeing this number of men in his own district—

The Minister for Railways: That officer at Toodyay should have had those men prosecuted, if what is stated is correct.

Hon. G. TAYLOR: Why?

The Minister for Railways: If I knew of a man who, having been in a district one day, applied to have his name put on the roll, that man would be prosecuted.

Hon. G. TAYLOR: Anyhow, the Statute of Limitations might block it. The member for Toodyay, travelling in his electorate, pulled up at the hotel. Probably he has frequently pulled up at hotels in his electorate. Even you or I, Mr. Speaker, do not pass an hotel in our electorates. It is not wise. The member for Toodyay asked what

was the trouble. The hotelkeeper replied "They are going to some road work." I suppose the member for Toodyay, in his usual way, called for a drink and asked somebody to have one. Five minutes later he got about that a member of Parliament was there. Some of these men went up to the member for Toodyay—so the story goes; if the hon. member were here he could either confirm or contradict me—

Mr. Lindsay: I am here. It is quite right so far.

Hon. G. TAYLOR: The men said to the member for Toodyay, "You are a member of Parliament, aren't you?" He said, "Yes, I am." They said, "We have been trying to get our names down here, and we cannot get them down. We want them down for Northam." The member for Toodyay said "You cannot get them down; you are in Toodyay." They said, "No." He said "Yes. I am member for Toodyay. That is the polling booth over there." Being an amateur politician, and meeting many people in what is a large and new district, the hon. member carried a map of the electoral boundaries. He went to his car and brought the map over. That is how the story goes. He opened out the map and said to the men, "There you are; there is the boundary." Apparently he satisfied them. That is the story I heard. The member had not been there 24 hours. They have been there only a few hours. I do not suppose they had been there for 24 hours when the member for Toodyay came along. But, anyhow, they were determined to get on the roll for Northam. The only conclusion I can come to is that they thought my chief was in jeopardy and said it for themselves. "We are not going to lose a good man like this; we must get on the roll to see that Sir James Mitchell is returned at the next election." I suppose that was one of the reasons. On the other hand, some of my friends, who are less generous, might say that those men were sent up there with a strict injunction by the Government to put their names on the roll, and stuff the Northam roll so as to make a shambles—if I may use the expression—of getting the Labour man in and putting out the Nationalist, Sir James Mitchell. Be that as it may, the Minister for Justice says that the local official should have reported the men and got them put in gaol. What is the use of trying to put that over me? After all the

controversy which has taken place in the Press and on the public platform, what is the use of saying that those men should be prosecuted? We know full well that the people are convinced that this sort of thing went on. Do we not know that names were put on in other electorates? Has it not been stated that names were sent in on post cards, and that union secretaries carried around cards dated the 5th and the 6th January to the 6th February, cards dated so that they could be put in at any time? Statements to that effect have been made in dozens of cases where I have been. Am I not justified in saying that the matter should be cleared up? In what way can it be cleared up? Not by a select committee of this House, but by some person appointed as a Royal Commissioner. One Royal Commissioner could clear it up in a few days. Personally I know nothing except hearsay, but that hearsay is so prevalent and so pronounced that there should be an investigation. The excuses made on the other side of the House are extremely lame, and that lameness is accentuated when the Premier will not allow an investigation. No man or woman is afraid of anything when he or she is innocent. Those who are afraid are those who are satisfied there is overwhelming testimony to convict them. Why not investigate these matters and clean the whole thing up once and for all? We do know beyond doubt, from the figures supplied in the Auditor-General's report, that the Federal Government refused to pay over £30,000 that had been spent from January to February or April, and the State Government had to foot the bill. The Federal Government refused to pay because Western Australia had broken the terms of the agreement into which the State had entered with the Commonwealth. I do not know whether that is true, but it should be cleared up.

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: The Federal Government refused to pay £30,488.

Mr. Davy: There is no hearsay about the Canning-road. That should be investigated.

Hon. G. TAYLOR: That work was done out of loan funds.

Mr. Davy: But it was done by the Main Roads Board.

Hon. G. TAYLOR: For the moment, I am concerned about the money that we should have received from the Federal Government under the agreement that we were to provide 15s. for every £1 contributed by the Federal Government. The action of the Federal Government showed that they were not going to endorse the expenditure of money utilised for

propaganda work or for political purposes; they indicated that the money they would make available was to be used in making roads that were required. The position should be cleaned up once and for all. It is perhaps rather late in the day, and the Government got off very lightly last session when they might have been attacked on this question.

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: That could not be done until the Federal Government had dealt with the position.

Hon. G. TAYLOR: However, the Federal Government have brought the State Government to a sense of what is right and what is wrong in the observance of such an agreement. In effect the Federal Government said to the State Government, "You entered into a contract with us, and you have broken faith with us. We will not pay." That breach of contract was committed because the State Government could not wait until tenders were called. Had they done so there would not have been any roll-stuffing. Had they done that, the men would have had to remain on the job for four weeks before they could have made application for enrolment. Can anyone say it is honourable to ask any person to go to a particular electorate and put in a claim card for enrolment straight away, long before that man is entitled to sign a claim card? So far from staying four weeks in a place, some of the men had been there hardly four days before they had signed their claim cards.

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: There was an incident at Northampton, too.

Hon. G. TAYLOR: That was a shocking incident. There were some old tools at the road board office long east aside as useless so I am told, tools that were bought up by the Government so that men who were hurried out on to the road, would be able to do some work. It is this sort of thing that gives colour to the suggestion that the Government lent themselves to roll-stuffing for political purposes. I shall not proceed further with this subject. I hope that after these very mild remarks, the Government will be awakened to a sense of decency, and clear up these matters once and for all.

Mr. J. E. Smith: Why not move for a Royal Commission?

Hon. G. TAYLOR: We have no chance of getting it. Coming to the unemployed question, we have listened to the statement made by the member for Fremantle (Mr. Sleeman) about the attitude of the police in maintaining order in the streets. I have a

newspaper cutting that refers to the member for Fremantle and the action of the police in intercepting the procession. The member for Fremantle gave us a description of the proceedings as he saw them. The Premier promptly denied his statements. Those two hon. members do not agree; in fact, there was quite an altercation between them. I do not know who was right. From their respective standpoints, I do not suppose either considered he was misrepresenting the true position to the House. I was not there, so I cannot say what the real position was, so I am under the painful necessity of having to read the published report of the occurrences as viewed by the "West Australian" reporter. He was an impartial witness and saw the whole business.

The Minister for Justice: We have read that report.

Hon. G. TAYLOR: That does not matter. I must place the position before the House. The report was as follows:—

The Unemployed. Further City Disorders. Police clear Streets. Eight Men Arrested. Ugly situations threatened in the city yesterday as a result of further encounters between the police and the unemployed. Twice during the day the police dispersed demonstrators, and a serious disturbance resulted in Wellington-street on the second occasion. Eight men were arrested, and subsequently the unemployed declared that they intended to demonstrate again this morning, reinforced by a contingent of over 200 men from Fremantle.

The disorders of Monday were repeated, in less protracted form, outside the Treasury building, at the corner of St. George's-terrace and Barrack-street, in the morning. A procession of about 400 unemployed left the Labour Bureau at 10.15 a.m., and after marching in an orderly manner through the main streets of the city, arrived outside the St. George's-terrace entrance to the building at 10.30.

Here their progress was interrupted by the Commissioner of Police (Mr. Connell) and the Chief Inspector of Police (Mr. Sellenger), who stepped out of a stationary motor car and held up their hands as a signal for the men to stop. The injunction was obeyed, and the Commissioner told the men at the head of the procession that it was still possible, and indeed desirable, for two men to arrange a deputation to the Premier—

We know what the position was. The men wanted a deputation of four to wait on the Premier, and the Premier wanted a deputation of two. The Commissioner of Police told the men what the Premier desired. Then the report proceeds—

At this a laugh arose, and one of the men said to the Commissioner, "Are you going to

rush off to the Premier now?" Mr. Connell said that he did not wish to barney words with his questioner, and thereupon the men resumed their march, and swung around from St. George's-terrace into Barrack-street, obviously with the intention of again demonstrating outside the Treasury entrance, from which they had been driven on Monday.

They had not gone more than ten yards up Barrack-street, however, when they were met by a solid phalanx of police, the first line of opposition (about a dozen constables and a sergeant), being quickly reinforced by many other foot police, who came up at the run, a squad of mounted men being held in readiness for any emergency.

There was a brief and heated argument between the leaders of the unemployed and the uniformed men, and then the police suddenly linked arms and commenced to advance, driving everyone before them. A crowd numbering many hundreds had gathered at the intersection of the two thoroughfares, and when at this point the police abandoned their line formation and commenced to jostle separate groups of the unemployed, a storm of hoots arose, with a strong note of menace in them.

It was obvious that the unemployed had the sympathy of a considerable proportion of the onlookers and at this moment it seemed probable that a very serious disturbance was about to occur. The reserve force of mounted men rode up and the hooting died down. The foot police continued to jostle the unemployed, many of whom came in for rough handling.

This man-handling continued for some minutes, and proved too much for the morale of the unemployed, the majority of whom commenced to beat hurried retreat, with many of the police in pursuit. The fugitives streamed down St. George's Court and rejoined a number of their comrades who had been driven along Barrack-street.

The men met on the Esplanade, where several speakers vigorously denounced the Premier for what they called his "inhuman disregard of the unemployed." The police (a large number of whom were present, including nine troopers) were informed that their conduct had been brutal and barbarous.

The report proceeds to deal with the arrest of the spokesman and some of the other men. The report does not indicate that the actions of the men were reprehensible nor does it indicate any idea of deprecating the attitude adopted by the police. The report does not set out to say that there was no justice in the attitude of the unemployed, but in view of the attitude adopted by the member for Fremantle, I must proceed to read more from the report in the "West Australian"—

A large crowd of men followed the car to the lock-up, but no demonstration took place, and the men repaired to the Trades Hall, where a large and somewhat excited meeting was held under the auspices of the One Big Union of Unemployed.



From lock-up to Trades Hall—rather a good change! The report proceeded—

A motion was carried protesting against the Government's attitude towards the unemployed, and the action of the police in arresting Malpass, and it was agreed to conduct another demonstration to-day, the men forming at the Labour Bureau at 10.30 a.m., and marching through the streets. It was agreed to appoint four men to interview the Commissioner of Police with a request to have Malpass released on bail. One of the deputations—William Mackay (29), labourer—was arrested while acting on the deputation at police headquarters. With Chief Inspector Sellenger and the secretary of police (Mr. C. Trædgold), the Commissioner received the deputation and told them he thought that in the interests of the community Malpass should not be allowed bail.

Then the report describes the second demonstration in Wellington-street. I saw that demonstration from a tram car, but I did not know what it was; I thought it was an accident. This is a very graphic description of the mounted police racing on to the unemployed. The men must have been a little more ferocious than they were at the other place. The police man-handled them. I myself have been man-handled by the police. I was acting for the union when a disturbance took place. Practically 12,000 men were involved in the dispute. We as a body of unionists desired to stand up for our rights. Employers in those days did not agree that unionists had any rights. The police were sent there to guard certain men who were doing certain work that we thought they ought not to do. So I know how the police act in such circumstances. Reading from the report in my hand, I can see that on this recent occasion the police acted with great tact, for which they deserve every credit. Nobody can say that a body of men defying the law can be justified. They must maintain law and order. I believe the police had to do what they did. I wish to read this report of the demonstration in Wellington-street. It shows that the member for Fremantle (Mr. Sleeman) was not far wrong in his description. The report is as follows:—

Second demonstration. When the deputations returned to the unemployed meeting, their report was greeted with a storm of protest, and about 300 of the men formed up outside the Trades Hall with the intention of marching in fours through the city streets, finishing with a demonstration at the central police station. The procession moved off at 4.30 o'clock, and as they passed the police building the demonstrators loudly jeered and hooted at

a number of policemen outside. Followed by a large crowd the men swung into Wellington street, shouting questions and answers to each other, and singing snatches of "Solidarity." In the meantime, the Commissioner of police gave instructions to 10 troopers and about 50 policemen and probationary constables. Preceded by the mounted squad and three motor cars containing policemen and detectives a detachment of police under Chief Inspector Sellenger was sent after the procession. Coming upon the unemployed in Wellington-street, between Forrest-place and William-street, the mounted men set their horses amongst them, and for a moment there was a wild confusion of horses, men, street traffic and pedestrians who did not know which way to turn. Acting under instructions from their leaders, the demonstrators scrambled to the footpath, and, in a dense, protesting throng, moved forward in the direction of William-street. The remainder of the police had now reached the scene and, while the horsemen kept the unemployed off the road, foot police jostled them forward into a compact mass, picking out the men who appeared to be the ring-leaders. Galloping to the front of the procession, which had by this time turned into William-street, several mounted police rode on to the footpaths, and setting their horses in the face of the procession, turned the men about and forced them back to Wellington-street. There followed an uproar, a large number of the unemployed becoming incensed at the police action, and loudly voicing their opinions and shouting threats. The police scattered among the men, and the leaders and the most noisy were bundled into motor cars and driven to the police station. For some minutes the scene was one of wild confusion, protesting bunches of the unemployed spreading across the roadway, with the police jostling them and struggling here and there with intended arrestees. Horses pawed their way through the medley, which was further confused by traffic, and numbers of onlookers became entangled in the struggling mass. The street was cleared after about 20 minutes and the police retired. Five men were lodged in the lock-up as a result of the disturbance. They were:—William Eric Pearson (53), labourer, and Frederick Ison (21), labourer, who were charged with having hindered policemen in the execution of their duty, and James O'Connor (23), labourer, Ernest Vowell (21), labourer, and William John Groggett (72), labourer, charged with having created a disturbance in Wellington-street. Numbers of names were taken by the police, and it is understood that a warrant has been issued for the arrest of another man. During the morning episode, Walter Coppin, an invalid pensioner, was arrested by Detective-Sergeant Doyle and Detective Johnston, and charged with having refused to give his name and address to the police when requested to do so.

Then there is a report in reference to assistance and subsidies. After all that appearing in the paper, we find that on the next day there was another demonstration and more men were arrested. These statements in the

newspaper are the remarks of an independent eye-witness. I think the police deserve commendation for having handled the situation in the way they did, without knocking people about or having someone taken in the ambulance to the hospital. Under the headings, "The Unemployed," "Another Demonstration," "Police check Procession," "A Young Man Arrested," we get a full report of what occurred. Then there is an account of the court proceedings, the men being charged. One man, Coppin, an invalid pensioner, was fined 5s.

The Minister for Railways: Does it not strike you as peculiar that an invalid pensioner should have taken part in the demonstration?

Hon. G. TAYLOR: I suppose the old gentleman was jostled into it. Whatever way he got there, it cost him 5s., in addition to which, of course, he was locked up in the first place. But he got that for refusing to give his name. Now we come to our old friend William John Roberts, aged 72. I do not see what punishment he got. Bail was asked for some of the prisoners, but the magistrate thought it was not wise to let them out while there was so much agitation. Now I reach a part that I wish to impress on the House. I do not know whether the unionists had any specific justification for the statements that they made and the resolutions that they passed at their meeting. They are the best judges of that and they, not I, are responsible for their own statements. I am responsible merely for pointing all this out in justice to the country, because of the attitude of the Government on the unemployed question when, some years ago, they sat here on the Opposition side. Had this occurred when the Mitchell Government were in power, our friends opposite would have brought down the ceiling in their eloquence in defence of the unemployed. They would have talked of the down-trodden worker, and we should have been told, "This is the way in which the atrocious Mitchell Government treat the wage slaves." We would have heard all that old stuff dished up, stuff to pull the wool over the eyes of the electors.

The Minister for Railways: Well, why talk about it?

Hon. G. TAYLOR: I have facts behind anything that I may say. Here is a report of a meeting of the timber workers—

Union's strong protest. The board of management of the West Australian Industrial Union of Timber Workers. "The timber workers are disgusted with the Government's attitude in regard to the unemployed," said

Mr. McKenzie, the secretary of the union yesterday. "While protesting against the action of the police, it realises that the Government are at fault and the police are being placed in the unenviable position of having to carry out the instructions of the Premier and his Ministry." "The following resolutions," added Mr. McKenzie, "were passed by the meeting of the board controlling the Timber Workers Union:—We, the Industrial Union of Timber Workers, protest strongly against the action of the Government and the police interfering with and breaking up the unemployed processions, and it calls on the Government immediately to instruct the Commissioner of Police to discontinue molesting the unemployed."

That is very strong. It is quite a different proposition from saying that one is stopping a procession or maintaining law and order. Out of the mouths of their own men the Government stand condemned when they are accused of molesting the unemployed. The report continues—

We consider it the duty of the Government to provide work for the unemployed of the State by the reconstruction of roads and the cutting of sleepers for the Southern Cross railway, and by providing work for the timber men under the reforestation scheme, thus benefiting the State as a whole and absorbing the unemployed who are practical bush workers.

Practical bush workers! There we have the statement of the secretary of the Industrial Union of Timber Workers telling us that amongst the unemployed who are being molested by the police at the instigation of the Collier Government are practical bush workers. That is rather a commendation for the body of despised unemployed about whom we have heard so much. The report goes on to say:—

Realising that the position is such that there are numbers of men who will not be able to secure employment for some considerable time, we demand that the Government make immediate relief for all in need, irrespective of whether they are married or single, and that relief be made available to the unemployed in the country towns. As a number of men will be thrown out of work in the near future owing to the decision of Millar Timber and Trading Company to close down some of its mills as a result of lack of orders, we request the Premier to reply to the deputation from the State Executive of the A.L.P. and the West Australian Industrial Union of Timber Workers that waited upon him asking for employment to be provided for these men. Although four weeks have elapsed since the Premier received the deputation, he has not yet conveyed to us his intentions. We deplore the action of the Premier in having policemen to escort him and to guard his offices from those who have worked for him and assisted to place him in power. We assure Mr. Collier that there is no need for him to

be accompanied by police, or to use the police to intimidate the workers who have placed him in the position he now holds. We demand that the Premier and other members of the Ministry meet the unemployed in the Unity Theatre and fully discuss with them the position with a view to preventing the unseemly conduct of the police.

If I stood up in this House and condemned the Government in language much milder than that, there would not be, as there is to-night, a conspiracy of silence amongst members opposite. There is not one word of interjection; not one word. My friends opposite sit in silence and accept it, knowing that is the simplest way to get out of it.

**The Minister for Railways:** The Premier replied to that on the following day.

**Hon. G. TAYLOR:** Now we come to another section of employees. The Press report is headed, "A.W.U., Attitude of Government Criticised." The report states—

At the annual meeting of the executive of the A.W.U. in the Trades Hall yesterday delegates representing the Kalgoorlie, Geraldton, Meekatharra, Northam and Perth districts of the union discussed the unemployment question and adversely criticised the attitude adopted by the Government towards the unemployed. The following resolutions were carried:—"The A.W.U. protests strongly against the action of the police in breaking up the unemployed processions and it calls upon the Government immediately to instruct the Commissioner of Police to discontinue molesting the unemployed."

Here again they use the word "molesting," which conveys so much. I do not know whether they were justified in using that word, but the fact remains that they did use it, and I say that members opposite are condemned out of the mouths of their own supporters, not by me. The report continues—

Realising that the position is such that large numbers of men will not be able to secure work for some time, this union asks the Government to make relief available for all in need, whether married or single, and that relief be made available in all of the country centres as well as in the metropolitan area.

I think I have made it pretty clear that the member for Fremantle, when he spoke of what happened between the police and the unemployed, described what he saw. When we take the description that appeared in the Press also, one wonders how the Premier could say that the statement of the member for Fremantle was not correct, but that he, the Premier, saw what happened. We have it from the Press that the police

had to join hands and shove the unemployed back as a wall of humanity. The police had to jostle them back; mounted police galloped about and rounded the unemployed back, much as cattle would be rounded up in a yard. I have been in that position, and I know what the police have to do. I say that the police are quite right in maintaining order, but I also say that the unemployed were not breaking the law, except that they persisted in demonstrating in front of the Premier's office on the question of whether the deputation to the Premier should consist of two or four men. The unemployed said it should be four; the Premier's secretary said two, and no more. That is borne out by the action of the Commissioner of Police when he held up his hand to the crowd next day and said "Stop! There is yet a hope of two of you meeting the Premier as a deputation." Why did the Premier bring all this trouble on the State because of a difference of two in the number of the deputation? The Premier would be equal to discussing the question with the 600 men, let alone four. What happened when the Prime Minister, Mr. Bruce, came to Perth? A deputation marched solemnly down Hay-street. The trams right down Hay-street and in William-street as far as Hoyt's Theatre had to be stopped until the procession got out of the way. I was in one of the trams, and I know what happened. The unemployed had intercepted the Prime Minister before that, and Mr. Bruce spoke to them. There was no jostling on that occasion; there was no necessity for the police. When the men marched to Hoyt's Theatre I was present and I spoke to the police. The police told them to enter the theatre in an orderly manner. Quite a number went in. There was no disturbance. At the meeting that night in His Majesty's Theatre when the building was packed from floor to ceiling and the men started to demonstrate, they did so in no violent manner. I have known a hundred people on the goldfields to be much more disorderly. What did the Prime Minister do? He put up his hand, and said, "Wait a minute; what is your grievance?" He answered questions about his administration, about the alien laws, migration and finance for at least an hour and a half. Though there were 2,000 people present, it was quite an orderly meeting. No police were needed; no one was called upon to interfere. Had the Premier adopted a

similar attitude toward the unemployed, they would not have become incensed. But they were incensed by hunger, by loss of dignity and by the attitude of the Premier in insisting upon their sending a deputation of two men and not four men. That is what I complain about. I am not going to blame the Government for the unemployed because I should have to blame every Government in every English-speaking country since the war. All of them have been troubled with the problem of unemployment. There is any number of unemployed in the Commonwealth at present. Still, I do not believe that unemployment is caused as some of my friends opposite contend, and I am not going to say that the unemployed will not work. I believe there are a number of men in all communities incapable of doing laborious work. In many instances they were never brought up to it. Many of them are clerical workers who have been jostled out of their jobs. They are not able to do manual labour and compete in a big labour market at high rates of wages where naturally the best men are picked up. The least capable are not wanted by the employer; whether he be Liberal, Labour or Marxist, he picks the best, and thus there are always some unemployed. I think I have made it abundantly clear that I consider the police did their duty. I do not associate myself with any member who considers that the police overstepped their duty. The police have a union, but they were never trained in industrial matters at the Trades Hall. If they had been——

Mr. Sleeman: They would be much better.

Hon. G. TAYLOR: If they had been trained at the Trades Hall, I assume from my long experience that when they were called upon to protect the Premier they would at once have whispered along the line, "This is the gentleman who last year said we ought to be wrapped in cotton wool. Let him be wrapped in cotton wool with the unemployed." Then they would have had a stop-work meeting in the barracks. Nothing would have happened to the Premier except that he would have had to speak to four of the unemployed instead of having 600 chased away by the police. I tried to get something for the police when the Police Act Amendment Bill was before us last year. With the assistance of other members I was able to get the Committee to agree to the provision of a promotional board, but before we got back to our seats the Premier said, "That is the end of your

promotional board." The Bill was not brought up again. During the discussion I had put up a case for the police. They were comparing themselves with other civil servants, and what called for the Premier's retort that they should be wrapped in cotton wool was my reference to their arduous duties and dangerous calling. During the unemployed demonstration there were 30 or 40 police to hold back 600 men. Police have been knocked down at night with bottles and have been sandbagged, and the Premier says with contempt, "Wrap them in cotton wool." The Premier thought he would silence me on the subject, but he did not succeed. I hope the Bill will come to light again, but if it does not—I do not make any threats—I shall do my best to keep the matter well before the House. We have heard a lot about the unemployed and I cannot help referring to these features because they all have a bearing on the question. I wish to read this to show the difference in the attitude that is adopted now and the cool check of some people. I am referring to the "West Australian" of July, 1923, in which the following advertisement appears:—

Metropolitan Council A.L.P. A meeting of the unemployed will be held in the Trades Hall, Perth, this afternoon at 2 p.m. All unemployed are requested to attend. A. H. Panton, Secretary Trades Hall, Perth.

This advertisement appeared in "Situations Vacant," so that the people would not miss it. How different is the attitude to-day?

Mr. Lindsay: How many turned up?

Hon. G. TAYLOR: I believe 37, and five of these were hod carriers, who were off duty for the afternoon. This advertisement was inserted in order to harass the Mitchell Government. That Government had kept the men employed with less loan funds, and considerably less revenue than the present Government have; in fact kept the people employed to such an extent that a few months before the elections, and in the cold month of July, it was necessary to advertise from the Trades Hall in order to get the few unemployed together, march them down Barrack-street in front of the public past the Weld Club, and on to the Esplanade. So that they would be recognised, the member for Menzies (Mr. Panton) was the standard bearer. Where is the standard bearer of 1928? He has fallen down on his job. He was not there.

Have any of my friends, who were willing to help the unemployed in the days of the Mitchell Government, now turned round and accused the Collier Government for propaganda purposes, with not having found employment for these people? The party on this side of the House has been out of office for the last 4½ years, but it has not endeavoured to make the unemployed discontented, either publicly or privately, or do anything to create ill feeling on their part against the Government. Members opposite at all times sneer at and endeavour to depreciate us in the eyes of the public. They may regard the Leader of the Opposition and the member for West Perth merely as political foes, but they look upon me, and ask the workers to look upon me, as a natural enemy. That is why I am speaking on this occasion, and pointing out that the Government stand condemned out of the mouths of their own people. I would remind members opposite what I said between 1889 and 1891 during the turmoil in Queensland, when the workers were in the same position in relation to the police as the unemployed were in Perth. I stood by those workers as a Labour man and protested against police molestation. All the executives of the union protested against the Government molesting the unemployed with police. The only difference between the Collier Government and the Government in office in Queensland in those days was that the former did not have a Nordenfeldt gun trained upon the body of men. I stood by the workers then and I stand by them now. I am pleased they have weighed the Collier Government in the balance and found them wanting. I am glad I have not had to do it—the Government have brought this upon themselves. I must have everything in black and white or my friends opposite will contradict me. I am fortunate to-night in being in possession of certain documents. They realised I had something to say, and they have adopted the usual orderly conspiracy of silence that they generally adopt when I am addressing the House. It is on such occasions that I feel inclined to trim them up.

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: You have them thoroughly scared.

Hon. G. TAYLOR: I have them cowed. They are more cowed than the unemployed were by the police.

Mr. Lindsay: That is a new method of handling people.

Hon. G. TAYLOR: I have something here I wish to read. I should have taken it as my text.

The Minister for Mines: I am enjoying this.

Hon. G. TAYLOR: Members opposite are hemorrhaging inwardly. I would like to break this bond of loyalty to silence, the silence of caucus, for I have been there myself. I have here a report of a meeting held on the 29th August, 1922. It is headed, "The Government criticised" (that is the Mitchell Government.) "Immigration Policy," "Denounced by Mr. Collier," "Tramway Extensions." The then Leader of the Opposition (Hon. P. Collier) is firing off against the Government and says—

The employers quote the state of the export market as a reason for this (that is the unemployed) and he (the speaker) would agree to the extent that it was brought about by the economic and social system under which we lived. It was the responsibility of the Government to find work for its citizens.

That was the statement of the then Leader of the Opposition in 1922. He is not quite so satisfied now that it is the function of the Government to find work for its citizens. He continued—

While there were thousands of men in the State anxious and willing to bring that policy to fruition, they were unable to do so.

In the opinion of the Leader of the Opposition of that day, it was the function of the Government to find work for its people. That is what my friends have been saying for months and years. The Government have now come to the conclusion that that idea is exploded. They have held responsible positions, and their responsibilities have brought caution, discretion and those other attributes that are necessary to make a man's reasoning sound and solid. I know my friends opposite will say that these paragraphs were reported by a capitalistic Press. This is what the same Press said on the 30th July, last, when the whole of the road boards and mayors of municipalities came to the rescue of the Government. When they found the Premier was in a tight corner, and the unemployed were attacking him for

work, and he was calling out for the police to protect him—

The Minister for Railways: That will do.

Hon. G. TAYLOR: These despised bodies went to his rescue, and said, "Give us a pound and we will find another, and provide work for these people." They went to his rescue from one end of the State to the other, notwithstanding the manner in which he had treated them. This is what the Press said on the 30th July—

The Premier (Mr. Collier), has exhibited a practical sympathy with the unemployed in town and country by the measures he has taken to make work available to the extent he has done and is doing, for our too many idle hands. Whilst these undertakings are not relief work in the true sense that that phrase is commonly used, they are calculated to bring substantial relief where it is most needed. One recommendation of the Government's programme which has been promptly seconded by most of the local authorities, is that it provides against mobilising the unemployed entirely on work in and around the metropolis.

That is the same Press, the "West Australian," which four or five days earlier published the reports I have read.

Mr. Lindsay: It is hardly the same Press. It has changed hands and its policy since.

Hon. G. TAYLOR: Not in four days.

Mr. Lindsay: Since 1923.

Hon. G. TAYLOR: The last paragraph I have quoted was written on the 30th July, and those I read before were published on the 25th and 26th July. The report I read concerning the remarks of the Premier cannot be laid at the door of the Press. The Premier himself is responsible for what he said in the Town Hall, that it was the function of the Government to find work for its citizens. That was his view when he was Leader of the Opposition. I know it will be said that this is a capitalistic Press which desires to keep down the worker. I have read this comment to show that the Press are the friends of the Government and not their enemies. This is proof that the report of the proceedings of the unemployed and the police was a faithful one. It is very distasteful to have to bring the matter up in the House. I would not have brought it up but for the jibes at my friends on this side of the House. Whenever jibes are hurled at them, there is a ricochet which strikes me. Members opposite know that I will return all those jibes. I am not afraid of them. They may say what they please,

but I will come up smiling every time. I wish now to refer to the question of unemployed and road construction. I will read what appeared in the "West Australian" on the 13th February, 1927. This was a few days after the accusations were made against the Government for using the Federal road grant for political purposes. The Honorary Minister made a statement to the Press as follows:—

The Minister controlling the State Labour Bureau (Mr. J. W. Hickey) has received from the bureau a return showing that between January 1st and January 11th, over 1,000 men were engaged, mostly for work under the Main Roads Board.

Mr. Lindsay: How does that come about when unemployment difficulties exist only in the winter time?

Hon. G. TAYLOR: The newspaper goes on to say—

The Minister stated that further men for road work would not be required for some considerable time, and the men were warned against relinquishing other employment on coming to Perth from the country districts with the object of obtaining work on the main roads construction.

That was on the 13th February. A month previously accusations had been made against the Government for using their main road vote for propaganda work, just preceding the general election. That was the reason why the Federal Government stopped the payment of the £30,000 or £40,000—because of the breach of contract in hurriedly putting on day labour, so as to be able to swell the rolls. The Minister says the men were put on from the 1st January to the 11th. Hardly any of them were equipped with the necessary tools. Should public funds be used for political purposes? Are we to hold positions in this Parliament even as private members by attempting to bribe the electors, by spending Government money on elections, by sending numbers of men into electorates where the party is weak and where a few hundreds of stalwarts—Nationalist or Labour—would turn the election? That is political rascality, which should be stamped out at once if we want fair and honourable government. The Government cannot set a bad example to the people and expect the people to be honourable and straight. If the people know that the Government resort to these despicable tactics, what will they resort to outside? The people will say, "Is it because the Government are

immune from the jaws of the gaol that they can do these things while we cannot?" Is not that what the people will say? I warn my friends opposite that if they are innocent of all these charges which are laid against them by their own people—not by me—they should at once establish their innocence. Let them at once remove that stigma which has rested upon them for the last three or four years. I have given overwhelming testimony to show why it is necessary for the Government to appoint some honourable man or men to inquire into these nefarious political actions and see whether they can be justified or otherwise.

Question put and passed; the Address-in-reply adopted.

### BILLS (11)—FIRST READING.

- 1, Abattoirs Act Amendment.
- 2, Fertilisers.
- 3, Dried Fruits Act Amendment.
- 4, Feeding Stuffs.
- 5, Police Offences (Drugs).
- 6, Workers' Homes Act Amendment.
- 7, Electric Light and Power Agreement Amendment.
- 8, Electoral Act Amendment.
- 9, Traffic Act Amendment.
- 10, City of Perth Superannuation Fund (introduced by Mr. Mann).
- 11, Dog Act Amendment (introduced by Mr. Lindsay).

*House adjourned at 9.58 p.m.*

## Legislative Council,

*Tuesday, 28th August, 1928.*

				PAGE
Bills: Education, 2s.				
Pearling Act Amendment, 2s.,	Com. report	...	457	
Municipal Council of Collie	Validation, 2s.,	...	459	
Com. report	...	...	461	
Adjournment: Special	...	...	...	461

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

## BILL—EDUCATION.

### *Second Reading.*

**THE CHIEF SECRETARY** (Hon. J. M. Drew—Central) [4.35] in moving the second reading said: The consolidation of the Education Act and its amendments is long overdue. The principal Act was passed in 1871, and since then there have been ten amendments. As a result it has been a matter of great difficulty for anyone outside the Department itself to know exactly what our law is in regard to education. To gain this knowledge it would be necessary to examine the whole of the amending Acts passed since 1871 and find out not only what effect they had on the principal Act, but on the others that preceded them. Some time ago the Solicitor General was asked to prepare a consolidation of these measures, and the Bill is the result. In the first place, I wish to point out that it is not entirely a consolidation. Advantage has been taken in the preparation of the measure to include a few amendments of the existing law that the department considers will be helpful in the administration of the Act. These amendments I will briefly explain. Clauses 1 to 10 are all formal, and Clauses 7 to 10 give the Minister definite statutory authority to do what he has always done. In Clause 18, sub-clause 3, we propose to increase the penalty for the particular infringement of the Act referred to. Under existing legislation, a person who takes into his employment, or causes to be employed, any child under the age of fourteen years, who is not exempt from school attendance, is liable to a fine not exceeding £2. The smallness of the maximum penalty would indicate that the Department views such an offence as of a very minor nature, which is not so. There are some employers who are prepared to take risks in this direction, and the result is that the temptation is ever present to some parents to send their children to work instead of to school. This temptation would be removed if the employer were made to realise that the offence was not regarded lightly by the Legislature. It is proposed to increase the maximum penalty from £2 to £5. The Court will still have discretionary power to make the fine as low as the circumstances may warrant. Hitherto no punishment was provided for a parent who gave false information to an