

three years ago, the engineers told us that there was still a life of eight years in the old bridge. I assume that a lot of preparatory work will be required, even if the Government decide to build a new bridge. By the time those preparations are made and the bridge is completed, not much of that eight-year period will remain. I trust that before long some definite announcement will be made regarding this all-important work.

Hon. G. W. Miles: I suppose you anticipate that, now you have two Ministers from the West Province.

Hon. G. FRASER: Ministers do not take us into their confidence regarding such departmental matters, and we have no more knowledge in that respect than the hon. member. This, of course, is not merely a Fremantle matter, but is one that affects the whole of the State. I support the motion for the adoption of the Address-in-reply.

On motion by Hon. H. Tuckey, debate adjourned.

House adjourned at 9.52 p.m.

Legislative Assembly.

Wednesday, 9th September, 1936.

	PAGE
Questions: Foreshore, Swan river	492
Harvey Irrigation area	492
State Insurance Department and Government employees	492
Poor Persons' Legal Assistance Act	493
Queensland forest and tobacco areas	493
Papers: Milling school site	493
Worker's compensation claim	498
Yampi Sound iron leases	501
Bullsbrook airport	505
Case of settler Moses	493
Motions: Youth employment, to inquire by Board Traffic Act, to disallow regulations	500
Charges against Ministers; to inquire by Royal Commission	506

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

QUESTION—FORESHORE, SWAN RIVER.

Mr. NEEDHAM asked the Minister for Works: 1, Has he yet received any report from the Joint Committee representing his

department and the City Council on the question of the control of the foreshore between Barrack-street and Mounts Bay-road? 2, If so, what is the nature of such report? 3, Is there any prospect of an early start being made with the work of reclamation and beautification of this part of the foreshore?

The MINISTER FOR WORKS replied: 1 and 2, No. 3, No policy of reclamation and beautification can be determined until the authority of control is settled, and the question of the various uses to which the respective parts of the area are to be put is decided.

QUESTION—HARVEY IRRIGATION AREA.

Mr. McLARTY asked the Minister for Water Supplies: 1, In view of the serious position that has arisen in the Harvey irrigation area owing to the shortage of water, causing approximately 4,600 acres to be excised, is it his intention to give immediate consideration to making provision for additional water storage in this area? 2, As 22½ per cent. more land than can be watered by the present weir is still in the area, how does the Irrigation Commission intend to water this area?

The MINISTER FOR COUNTRY WATER SUPPLIES replied: 1, Provision on the Estimates for survey of possible reservoir sites is contemplated. 2, It is considered that not for several years would the whole of this percentage of land need irrigation supplies, and that in the meantime progressive methods of water saving should meet increasing demands.

QUESTION—STATE INSURANCE DE- PARTMENT AND GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES.

Mr. DONEY asked the Minister for Employment: What are the premiums per £100 of insurance paid by the Public Works Department to the State Insurance Department for part-time relief workers, quarrymen, timber fellers, general labourers and the department's clerical staff?

The MINISTER FOR EMPLOYMENT replied: The insurance of the Public Works Department employees is arranged on a flat rate basis. The rates charged are 20s. per cent. for the clerical staff and 160s. per cent. for other workers.

QUESTION—POOR PERSONS' LEGAL ASSISTANCE ACT.

Hon. C. G. LATHAM asked the Minister for Justice: Has the Law Society of Western Australia, or a public solicitor, been appointed for the purpose of carrying out all or any objects or purposes of the Poor Persons' Legal Assistance Act, 1928-31?

The MINISTER FOR JUSTICE replied: The Law Society of Western Australia was appointed, and such appointment was gazetted in the *Government Gazette* of the 29th January, 1932.

QUESTION—QUEENSLAND FOREST AND TOBACCO AREAS.

Mr. SAMPSON asked the Premier: 1, Is he aware that shares are being offered in Western Australia for alleged questionable forestry and tobacco propositions in Queensland? 2, In view of misrepresentations made in respect to certain Queensland tobacco and forestry propositions (limited companies) and the losses already sustained by a number of Western Australian citizens, following the purchase of shares in these more or less worthless companies, will the Government give consideration to the bringing down of a Bill to amend the Companies Act whereby it would be mandatory on the promoters that before shares were offered to the Western Australian public, investigations were made by a qualified Government officer, a sufficient guarantee deposited, or such other means taken as may be practicable, thus ensuring to the public protection from unsound propositions?

The DEPUTY PREMIER replied: 1, No. 2, The consolidating and amending of the company laws is under consideration and the matters mentioned in the question will be submitted for attention.

PAPERS—MILING SCHOOL SITE.

HON. P. D. FERGUSON (Irwin-Moore) [4.35]: I move—

That all papers dealing with the acquisition of a school site at Miling, and the erection of a school thereon, be laid upon the Table of the House.

I understand that the Minister for Education is agreeable to these papers being laid on the Table of the House, and will there-

fore content myself with formally moving the motion.

Question put and passed.

MOTION—YOUTH EMPLOYMENT.

To inquire by Board.

MR. LAMBERT (Yilgarn-Coolgardie) [4.36]: I move—

That in the opinion of this House, a Board (with statutory powers, if necessary) should be appointed to inquire into and investigate generally the question of employment of the male youth of the State, having regard to the social and economic conditions which are likely to result by their non-employment, and in view of the increasing number of young females engaged in clerical and other occupations which could be filled by males, and, further, with a view of rationalising employment on an equitable quota basis of all juvenile workers.

In asking for a review of the present unfortunate position of the male youth in employment in this State, I wish it clearly to be understood that I am making no suggestion that female labour should be displaced, and have no such desire. Most people who since the War have given consideration to this question realise that it is one of the most important and pressing matters with which we are concerned. I refer to the social, economic position, and the condition of our youth employment. It is not my wish that through any action that may be taken by the Government, female employment should necessarily be displaced. It must be obvious to those who have even in a superficial way considered the displacement of male youths from employment, particularly since the close of the War, how distressing a thing that is, and must recognise that the position must ultimately be met, and can only be met, by legislation. I understand that Miss Ada Bromham is president of the Women's Service Guild. She was at a meeting of that Guild the other day, and without any knowledge of the purport of my motion, made an attack upon me. She suggested it was a scandalous thing that I should desire to displace female labour from employment. She called upon the women of the State to crowd the galleries, and show their opposition to any motion that I might move along these lines. This reminds me of the spinster who was very good at instructing a young mother how to nurse, clothe and feed a baby, using a celluloid doll as an example.

Miss Holman: I do not think that is funny.

Mr. LAMBERT: Whether she can very closely appreciate in her position as a spinster the question of the absorption of male youths into out economic life, I will leave members to judge. I think I had better address my remarks to those who have been affected by the displacement of the male youth of the country in many avenues of employment, where I think young men could be better employed. My idea in moving this motion is to draw attention to the increasing propensity on the part of employers, not only in this State, but in other parts of the world, to employ female labour. In the first instance they took advantage of the fact that a big proportion of the male population went overseas to serve in the forces. They made that their excuse for employing female labour. The extent to which this practice has been followed is indicated clearly by the fact that in every insurance company, every bank, and every commercial and retail house, most of the employees are females, whether as typistes, clerks or in other positions. I desire to make no comparison between the efficiency of male and female clerks. This House should lay down as a first principle that the best way to reach a solution of the problem, and root out an anomaly that exists to-day, is to endeavour to bring back to useful employment in our economic structure the male youth of the country. If we depart from that well-founded principle, which has existed ever since civilisation began, we shall be taking a dangerous step for which we can offer no reasonable excuse. Many financial institutions realise that until male youths are brought back into employment, we shall have a most deplorable social state, as a result of which our youths will be walking around the streets without any work, while females are employed in lucrative positions that might well be occupied by males. The statistics that I will present in a little while regarding the male and female students at the University will demonstrate strikingly the necessity for making provision for the distribution in industry of our youths. Unless we are to write it into our political philosophy that we must for all time have a large army of male unemployed helped by direct contributions from Consolidated Revenue and kept on sustenance or part-time

work, there must be some reasonable solution found for our present difficulty.

Mr. North: Among the savage races the women do all the work.

Mr. LAMBERT: And if we continue to proceed along the lines that have been followed to a large extent since the war, women will do our work. I do not know that there is not an appreciable proportion of the male population of the civilised world that would be prepared to allow the females to do all the work, provided the males could stop at home and smoke their pipes in luxury.

Mr. Marshall: That is the trouble; the women don't even provide them with tobacco.

Mr. LAMBERT: I do not know that tobacco is the least of the comforts the women could possibly provide. The serious phase of the problem is demonstrated in certain of our big established institutions to-day where it is easy to determine whether the females or males predominate in employment. So far as we can rectify that position, either statutorily or otherwise, preference should at least be given to males without causing any great disadvantage, as the member for Forrest—

Miss Holman: The member for Forrest will speak for herself. You do not know what I shall say.

Mr. LAMBERT: Then I am in much the same position with the hon. member as Miss Bromham is regarding my motion.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! The hon. member will address the Chair.

Mr. LAMBERT: At any rate, one can anticipate what the other may say. It is certainly the prerogative of women to suggest that girls who work alongside boys should enjoy equal pay and equal terms of employment. I definitely subscribe to that principle. If thinking people would only realise the detrimental effect that discrimination between the sexes is having on our social and economic conditions to-day, they would be prepared to concede the fact that both sexes should stand upon the same plane in that particular respect. Much propaganda has been indulged in by interested parties regarding employment of female labour. The problem was touched on lightly but forcefully by the member for Subiaco (Mrs. Cardell-Oliver) in the concluding portion of her speech on the Address-in-reply. Undoubtedly there is considerable exploitation of female labour, particularly with regard to girls who have just

passed the school leaving age. The exploitation is appalling and in some instances most disgraceful. It is remarkable that some of the established organisations—and particularly do I refer to the one the members of which listened to their spokesman the other evening when she gave what she considered was the line of demarcation I was proposing to set up between male and female labour—did not concentrate upon the exploitation that is going on to-day. Some of the large retail emporiums are not only engaged in building up big business to the detriment of the smaller trading concerns in the suburban areas, but are exercising no discrimination whatever regarding the female labour they employ. It is all very well for some persons who desire to voice their appreciation of work with regard to female labour in Western Australia, but the exploitation that has been going on should receive attention. In the columns of the "West Australian" recently a correspondent rightly pointed out that daily we see hundreds of girls drawn from the various suburban areas crowding into trams and trains to take their positions in the big emporiums at 15s. a week. That sort of thing not only displaces male labour, but adds very considerably to the iniquitous system of centralised industry. So Miss Ada Bromham, in giving her idea of the investigation I sought into this economic problem, has misrepresented, within her own limited sphere, the object I have had in view. I do not know that, from her comfortable environment at Claremont, Miss Bromham is competent to speak upon a subject like that under discussion.

Hon. P. D. Ferguson: Don't you live down that way yourself?

Miss Holman: Oh, he is a man, so he must be competent!

Mr. LAMBERT: I do not know that I am not competent to discuss this matter respecting which this particular lady rushed into her gilded circle and spread herself in discussing my motion before it had been dealt with in this House. If I am not more competent, it will be conceded that I am at least as competent to discuss it as Miss Bromham, and I certainly regret that the army of women that she invited to occupy the galleries are not here to listen to some of the home truths I would have presented.

Miss Holman: Go ahead; they can read them.

Mr. LAMBERT: No, the hon. member will convey them to the women. One phase of the problem is that at our University there are 798 undergraduates. They attend an institution that is being maintained at enormous cost to the State. It is supposed to be a free University. It is one of the most richly endowed and most expensively run of the Universities in Australia. The authorities have taken advantage of the fact that it is the declared policy of the State to conduct a free University. In that direction, the aspirations of the Labour Party, in their desire to make available free University education, may be open to more than one interpretation. The interpretation placed upon that policy by those in control of the University to-day is distinctly out of step with the ideas of the Labour Party.

Mr. Thorn: The University has a Government subsidy of £34,000 a year.

Mr. LAMBERT: Not only is that subsidy available, but year in and year out the Government are called upon to provide additional money for tutorial and constructional purposes at this seat of learning. The time has arrived when the Government should cry a halt and consider to what extent the State should be called upon to provide these additional funds for the University. I admit that the establishment of a free University was a very fine conception, and the fact that every person who can possibly avail himself of the educational facilities offered has that opportunity, shows that there are some very fortunate people in the State. I believe, however, that the institution should be run along different lines from which more beneficial results would be likely to accrue. If we had a system of liberal bursaries for young people, male and female, in the country districts, it would be of greater advantage compared with the existing system that seems to be primarily for the scholars who can go from the secondary schools in the metropolitan area to the University. It cannot be gainsaid that the University to-day is not getting anything like the results that should be expected of it. In my opinion 25 or possibly 50 per cent. of the undergraduates of to-day are not likely to find a niche for themselves in any branch of science in our economic life. They may provide a most beautiful niche in the social side of the life of the State.

Mr. Doney: How are you going to determine beforehand who is likely to succeed?

Mr. LAMBERT: If the hon. member is going to interject, let him interject, but without mumbling. I cannot hear what he says.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! The hon. member will address the Chair.

Mr. LAMBERT: The number of undergraduates they have to-day probably increases the expenditure at the University by 50 per cent. That would not be so if we had liberal bursaries applicable to male and female students in country districts. If we were to classify those receiving University education as between country and city, it would be found that 80 per cent. of them are drawn from the metropolitan area. And after they leave the University, while we have had some brilliant scholars from it, and some that have gained distinction in other parts of the world, many others are intellectually on the same plane as children in the country districts of Western Australia. Take the Perth Technical College, which is not altogether a free technical college. There they have 618 students. A large proportion of those are leaving every year, and it is to be expected that they will be absorbed in industry or in some other occupation. From the Methodist Ladies' College last year 38 pupils left, from the Guildford Grammar School 35 left, from Perth College 85 left, from St. Hilda's 41 left, from the Scotch College 42 left, and from the Perth Technical College, with its various schools, 4,143 left, while from Wesley College 27 left, and from the Presbyterian Ladies' College 30 left. The whole of those scholars must be absorbed into the industrial life of the community. That is, of course, if their scholastic term, until they leave, is to be of any use to the community. It is very nice at a University to learn French and German, very nice, as the Archbishop said the other day, that they should establish a school with Professor Beasley at its head, to study Russian culture.

Mr. Cross: It would not be of much use.

Mr. LAMBERT: I am not going to say that it would not be other than useful. But there are lots of studies carried out by people privately, people who pay for their own studies. I do not know that many of these institutions should be liberally endowed by the Government in order to pay for what should be private study, however comforting it may be to take it at an institution.

Mr. Hughes: Russia is an experiment in the working man's fate. Do not you think we ought to study it?

Mr. LAMBERT: No, I think the experiment in the working man's fate is wrapped up in the member for East Perth.

Mr. Hughes: That is only evading the question.

Mr. LAMBERT: I at once concede that probably the boldest experiment since the dawn of the Christian era has been made and is still being made by Russia to-day, regrettable as it may appear to many that the achievement and the revolution that led up to the achievement should ever have occurred.

Mr. SPEAKER: I presume the hon. member is going to connect this with the motion before the Chair.

Mr. LAMBERT: This directly points to the greater portion of the meaning which underlies the motion I have moved. It is at one with the desire properly to rationalise employment in this State. We find to-day that there are men well conditioned, not only in commercial callings, not only in the banks and not only in Government employment, who have each three or four girls employed in Government or other institutions to the displacement of the male youth of this country. If we were bold enough, as we should be, and courageous enough to set up an inquiry to find out all about the bread-winning males who are earning over the basic wage up to £300 per annum, and who have anything from one to four daughters employed in institutions, and regrettably in most of the Government services of the State, the result would make this Assembly sit up and take notice. Whilst there are countless girls and youths to-day displaced from labour, we find that every man of influence, whether he be a bank manager, an insurance manager or the manager of a big wholesale or retail store, can get the whole of his daughters employed; and in the aggregate those girls bring far more money into the home than does the actual head of the family, the breadwinner himself. While this state of affairs continues, we shall have this big unit of unemployed male youth, and we shall have the spectacle of the sustenance worker, and the spectacle of the taxation we have to levy to keep this unit in partial employment. It is necessary for us to have a review, as other peoples have had in other parts of

the world to show the extent and degree of the employment relationship between the male youth of the country as against the female youth. To-day in offices there are typewriters, and in the banks they have adding machines, and 99 per cent. of those manipulating them are females. And those institutions which alone are gaining the whole of the profit from the employment of female labour have no concern regarding the economic position. I was speaking to a local director of a bank, at present in this House, and he informed me that as a matter of policy the bank with which he is connected does not propose to employ any further female labour. That, I am sure, is not due to any hostility to the employment of female labour, but is on the broad and sound basis that the basic principle and the foundation upon which we must build the structure of to-morrow, is the useful absorption of our male population.

Mr. Hughes: Will that bank take deposits from female clients?

Mr. LAMBERT: I dare say it will, but I am not going to answer the hon. member in his spirit of levity; because banks at all times, apart from the fact that they say prayers every morning for a certain person, he who invented interest, will take deposits from anybody, without asking questions. I do not know that I need to stress this matter. The House would be well advised to set up a competent authority to inquire into the number of male employees and female employees, particularly in those avenues of employment that, possibly, from an economical and social viewpoint, would absorb the male youth of this State. I am not going to be misrepresented or misunderstood by any person who rushes along to some women's service guild to misrepresent my position in this respect. I have not sought any publicity in this matter, and if those who are seeking publicity persist, they will find that I can get equal publicity—which seems to be their main food in life. I desire to move this motion and have it seriously discussed. I hope that, having drawn the attention of the House to this question, I shall be successful in that aim. I am not infallible, nor do I desire to stand infallible in the moving of the motion, or to stand immune from constructive criti-

cism in my suggestion that these problems should be tackled. But I do say with the whole-hearted wish that without depriving those who may take the opposite view, of the right to speak from the angle from which they see the problem, I hope they will treat it on broad general lines. I think as the outcome of a healthy, useful and non-prejudiced discussion, at least something should come of it, or at least in those departments and institutions that we can regularly reach to rationalise properly the unit between male and female employment, provided that the Government have the courage to give effect to this all-important and all-pressing economic problem with which we are confronted today.

MR. NORTH (Claremont) [5.15]: I second the motion, not in the sense of taking part in the controversy raised by the hon. member, but because I believe that these questions, whatever their merits might be, should be probed. We might well contrast the extraordinary attitude adopted when people desire to probe social questions with the tremendous amount of inquiry and investigation that takes place in all other avenues. I have in mind such matters as television, radio and motors. Investigation, probing and inquiry are constantly being conducted into those matters; scientists the world over are engaged on the problems raised, and all the benefits accruing from the investigations are made available to the people. Only recently the construction of a new telescope was undertaken in America to be twice as large as the one previously used. This was designed to probe the problems of the heavens, and yet on a question where so many thousands of lives might be said to be at stake, and where so much misery is involved, there is a hesitancy even to find out what are the facts. Therefore I support the motion without definitely committing myself at this stage as to what are the merits or the facts. Let us ascertain the position. If the hon. member's assertions can be proved, well and good. It might be found that nothing could be more attractive than the little typist in the office, and it might be found that the male would be better employed in the countryside. Investigation might show that the female is better for typing duties, but that is not to say that the present scandalous waste of resources should

continue, that so many thousands of elderly men possessed of no particular ability should hang on until they reach the grave, while many young men are lounging around lamp-posts or doing things that need not be referred to in this House. What is the real objection to making inquiry into social questions? Let me refer to some of the inquiries that have been undertaken or are in progress at the moment. We had an inquiry into wheat, we are having one into banking, and another into nutrition. Shortly, I hope, we shall have one into the existence of slums.

Mr. Hegney: An inquiry is even being conducted by Dr. Serventy to find out the number of fish that shags on the river consume.

Mr. NORTH: The hon. member will insist on poaching on the Claremont preserves. There seems to be a hesitancy, or a dread, in regard to investigating such questions as those raised by the hon. member. Yet, to solve other problems, experts are engaged the world over week after week. It is now possible to pick up broadcasts from Germany and other distant countries where, a few years ago, it was possible only to make noises that would hardly carry as far as Kalamunda. Yet the question raised this afternoon is of far greater importance to human comfort, and still there is a feeling of hesitancy about conducting an inquiry. I will not say that matters of the kind are ridiculed, but people are certainly inclined to put their fingers in their mouths. The real reason why such questions are delicately avoided, I consider, is because on almost every occasion when an investigation is made, no action follows. The decisions are shelved and pigeonholed. That is apparently the reason why so many people hesitate to urge inquiries along the lines of the hon. member's motion. I should like to tell the hon. member a little incident that occurred at a meeting of the Returned Soldiers' League, Claremont, just before the elections. A discussion arose on this very matter, and one gentleman pointed out that there was not a member of the State Parliament who was game to bring up the question of men taking positions now filled by girls. In reply to that, we have the hon. member's motion to-night.

On motion by Minister for Employment, debate adjourned.

PAPERS—WORKER'S COMPENSATION CLAIM.

HON. C. G. LATHAM (York) [5.22]: I move—

That all papers relating to a claim for compensation under the Workers' Compensation Act, 1912-1924, by the widow of the late Thomas George Mead, who died at Quairading on 11th January, 1935, following upon injuries received while in the employ of the Main Roads Department, be laid upon the Table of the House.

I hope the House will agree to the tabling of the papers. It is rather unfortunate that I should have to bring a case of the kind to Parliament, because usually such actions are fought in the courts of law. In this instance, however, the person affected happens to be a widow of a one-time sustenance worker with a family of four children. The husband was killed through an accident in a gravel pit near Quairading in the early part of last year, either through returning to the pit before all the explosions had taken place, or at any rate during the blasting operations. I had an opportunity to peruse the coroner's notes. The verdict returned was accidental death. Naturally the widow thought that she was entitled to compensation, but I understand that the case was referred to the Crown Law authorities and they ruled that she was not entitled to compensation because of some technical objection that was raised. We have a State Insurance Department in which the Government insure all their employees. They refer cases to the Crown Law officers, who seem to be the deciding factor as to whether a claim shall be paid. That might be all right if the person concerned possessed sufficient money to test the legal opinion in the court, but this is a widow without a penny in the world and with four children to support. May I say, by way of digression, that the Government have done all they could to provide for the support of the widow and children. I would not like the House to gather the impression that I am charging the Government with having been remiss in that direction. The woman has no funds with which to test the case. I believe the matter was referred to the Trades Hall authorities and that they have been prepared to accept the decision of the Crown Law Department. I am not satisfied that that is all that can be done in this case. The woman is entitled to some compensation for the loss of her husband. There are four

children to be maintained, and the widow, I presume, like other parents, is desirous of giving the children the best possible education. Had she received compensation, she might have been able to set up in a little business to provide for the support of the children and probably for their education. I am not asking for the papers merely to have them tabled. I am hoping that, after members have had an opportunity to peruse them, we might be able to do what the woman cannot do on account of the lack of funds. We might investigate the case by select committee and see if it is possible to grant her some financial assistance.

The Minister for Employment: Are you aware of the details of the accident?

Hon. C. G. LATHAM: All I know is that the coroner returned a verdict of accidental death. To test a decision of the Crown Law authorities, one must have a fair amount of capital. There is no doubt in my mind that the views of the Crown Law officers are often backed by the knowledge that they have the State's money behind them to enable a case to be taken to the higher courts. If the claimant begins by winning in the first court, the Crown Law Department might appeal against the decision and the case might be carried from court to court until the claimant has no money left. The principle is wrong. If the man had attempted to commit suicide, the verdict of the coroner would have been to that effect.

Mr. Sleeman: How did the man meet his death?

Hon. C. G. LATHAM: Through an explosion in a quarry. Evidently he returned to the quarry before the whole of the charges had exploded. I do not know how many charges there were. I was informed that there was certain evidence available that would probably lead the court to believe the man had been advised that the whole of the charges had exploded, but after investigating that statement, I admit that the evidence was not substantiated. I asked a question of the Minister for Justice.

The Minister for Works: All legal questions must be referred to the Crown Law Department.

Hon. C. G. LATHAM: I have no objection to that being done. I was referring to the Poor Persons' Legal Assistance Act. There may be reasons for the department's

decision, but suppose the department declined to pay anybody compensation, unless the unions were strong enough to contest the cases, it would be impossible to collect compensation.

The Minister for Works: If it is possible to pay, we do so.

Hon. C. G. LATHAM: This is one case in which payment, I think, could have been made. Some legal point must have been raised; otherwise the decision of the coroner would have been accepted. The coroner heard the evidence, and I venture to say the Crown Law officers did not. They might have received a report from the engineer or from the foreman in charge of the work; I am not in a position to say whether they did or not. I have not seen the Crown Law papers. It seems to me a problem which this House must face. Suppose the persons concerned went along to obtain assistance as poor persons.

Mr. Sleeman: What union did the man belong to?

Hon. C. G. LATHAM: The A.W.U. He could not belong to any other union. The A.W.U. I shall say nothing about, except that to my mind they did not do all they should have done.

The Minister for Employment: They did everything that was possible.

Hon. C. G. LATHAM: Then it is up to this House to do something. I consider that we should investigate the case. If the A.W.U. saw the papers, they would come to the same conclusion as I reached.

Mr. Sleeman: Was the widow advised by a solicitor?

Hon. C. G. LATHAM: The widow informs me that that is not the case, though she was sent along to a firm of solicitors by the then secretary of the union. However, it is useless for a woman to go by herself to a firm of lawyers, as hon. members must know. Under those conditions a woman breaks down and cannot state her case. I do not know what facts even the lawyers had to advise the woman upon. Apparently, sufficient was not done. As for obtaining legal assistance as a poor person, that matter is in the hands of the Crown Law Department, who, I understand, advise whether the case is one that falls within the Act in question.

The Minister for Employment: I do not think there is a lawyer in the State who would advise the woman to go to court.

Hon. C. G. LATHAM: That is a charge against the coroner.

The Minister for Employment: No, it is not.

Hon. C. G. LATHAM: Anyway, the Minister seems to know all about the matter. The coroner would be the man who would have the sworn evidence before him.

The Minister for Employment: The coroner could not have returned any other verdict.

Hon. C. G. LATHAM: Then there is justification for my bringing the case before the Chamber.

The Minister for Employment: I am not objecting to that.

Hon. C. G. LATHAM: A variety of verdicts could have been returned. One might have been attempted suicide, or suicide; but from what I have gathered from those associated with the deceased person, there were no suicidal tendencies whatever in the case. The coroner's verdict might have been one of culpable negligence. There is no political capital to be made out of the matter, because the Government are doing everything possible for the widow and children. We should try to find some means of assisting cases which call for assistance. I do not think the Government will oppose the motion. The matter will not rest there, however, because I shall move for the appointment of a select committee to investigate the case. I know that the members of such a committee will view the case in the light disclosed by the papers. I trust that the Minister will include in the papers to be tabled the notes of evidence taken at the inquest.

THE MINISTER FOR EMPLOYMENT

(Hon. A. R. G. Hawke—Northam) [5.35]: I have no objection at all to the motion, and am quite willing to have the papers tabled. The only facts connected with the case that I wish to mention are these. Some shots were set. The men concerned with the putting-in of the shots then left the place where the shots were put in, and travelled to a safe distance from that spot. The late Mr. Mead suddenly remembered that he had left certain of his belongings near the place where the shots had been put in, and he returned for the purpose of obtaining those things. At that time, unfortunately, the shots exploded, with the

result that Mr. Mead suffered injuries which at a later date caused the loss of his life.

Mr. Sleeman: Was compensation refused him on that account?

Hon. C. G. Latham: Yes.

THE MINISTER FOR EMPLOYMENT: That is so.

Question put and passed.

MOTION—TRAFFIC ACT.

To disallow regulations.

MR. WATTS (Katanning) [5.37]: The notice of motion standing in my name reads—

That the new regulations to be numbered 30 (7) and 30 (8) of the Traffic Regulations, 1931, as published in the "Government Gazette" of the 17th July, 1936, and laid upon the Table of the House on the 11th August, 1936, be and are hereby disallowed.

It appears to me that I should ask for leave to withdraw this notice of motion, as the regulation which is the subject of the motion was repealed by another regulation which has been laid on the Table of the House. However, in view of the terms of the new regulation, I think I shall have to give notice of a further motion.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member can have his motion amended.

Mr. WATTS: Very well, Sir. The regulations which are the subject of the motion I shall presently move require the provision of brakes on trailers, apart from the regulations governing appliances on motor vehicles. The new regulation 30 (7) reads—

New regulation, to be numbered 30 (7):—Every trailer shall have an efficient braking system, the brakes of which act upon—(a) at least two wheels, in the case of a trailer having not more than four wheels; and (b) at least four wheels, in the case of a trailer having more than four wheels, so constructed that the brakes are capable of being set so as effectually to prevent two at least of the wheels from revolving when the trailer is not being drawn. For the purpose of these regulations, a breakdrum shall be deemed to form part of the wheel and not of the braking system.

The new regulation, to my mind, is entirely unnecessary, and will be a source of considerable expense to persons throughout the State, and particularly in the country districts, who use trailers lawfully for the purpose of their business or for other purposes. I have inquired into the ques-

tion of expense as far as I am able to do so, and I understand that the braking system to be fitted to trailers so as to comply with the proposed regulation could not be fitted at a cost of less than £8; that is, to do the work satisfactorily and in accordance with the proposed regulation. I put it to hon. members that there is no case where the absence of brakes on a trailer has been brought to notice as resulting in an accident to anybody. Indeed, I believe it is a comparatively rare occurrence that a vehicle with a trailer is involved in an accident in the ordinary way. When we come to consider the fact that the trailer itself, being pulled by another vehicle, must of necessity restrict the speed of that other vehicle, it becomes fairly plain, to me at all events, that there is no need to fear that accidents will occur because the trailer has no brakes. As I said, the use of these trailers in country districts is considerable. They are usually quite light vehicles, the property mostly of farmers who use them for the purpose of bringing small loads into and out of the towns where they are accustomed to do their business. To fit brakes on those trailers would, as a general rule, require the rebuilding of the trailers themselves. They are frequently built with a back axle taken from a car and front wheels. And consequently it would be necessary, as the average front wheel used has no brake, under the terms of the new regulation to substitute fresh wheels. Therefore I am of opinion that the amount of expense I mentioned a moment ago is probably a low estimate. As I said at the beginning, to me the regulation appears to be entirely unnecessary. It is going to inflict heavy expense on persons not able to afford it, and will in no circumstances assist towards the safety of other vehicular or pedestrian traffic upon the roads. The regulation seems to me one of those which are promulgated without too much thought of the result. I understand that in other parts of the world there are regulations concerning brakes on trailers. I believe, however, that such regulations are limited to trailers of large capacity. The regulation here proposed does not apply only to trailers of heavy loading, but to all trailers, in the same way as the regulations providing for appliances on motor vehicles, of which they are intended to form a part, apply to every motor vehicle in the State. In the interests

of the people I have referred to, and those who may hereafter wish to use trailers, it seems to me this regulation should be disallowed. I believe I have shown that it is unnecessary and is likely to be a source of considerable expense to those least able to afford it, without doing any commensurate good. I move—

That the new regulations to be numbered 30 (7) and 30 (8) of the Traffic Regulations, 1931, as published in the "Government Gazette" of the 17th July, 1936, and laid upon the Table of the House on the 11th August, 1936, be and are hereby disallowed.

On motion by Mr. Doney, debate adjourned.

PAPERS—YAMPI SOUND IRON LEASES.

HON. C. G. LATHAM (York) [5.43]: I move—

That all papers relating to applications for and the granting of leases at Yampi Sound be laid upon the Table of the House.

For some considerable time a good deal of information has been circulated through the Press about leases which have been granted to certain interests for what are known as the Yampi Sound iron deposits. The iron deposits concerned are regarded as probably the richest in Australia, and perhaps the richest in the world, and in dealing with them the State should, therefore, be careful in anything it does regarding their disposal. From the information supplied to us by the Press from time to time—whether it is authentic or not would be disclosed by the tabling of the papers for which the motion asks—apparently there is a firm named Brasserts, an English firm, which I have attempted to trace in order to ascertain its exact position in Great Britain. One would have expected to find the firm engaged extensively in the steel and iron industry. As a matter of fact I could find only one small reference to them in the documents I was able to peruse. I found them set down as H. A. Brasserts, constructional engineers, London. A constructional engineer is a totally different person from a man engaged in foundries connected with the smelting of iron ore. On the surface it looks to me—and the Minister will probably be able to advise the House whether it is so or not—that the firm of Brasserts in London and Brasserts in Western Australia are just mere dummies for Japanese interests. If that is so, this House

should give very serious consideration to the matter. If it simply means that Japan is to get control of this iron ore—I notice that they are finding £600,000 for the project—and perhaps to transport from Yampi not less than 500,000 tons per year to Japan, this State should deal directly with Japan and if there are huge profits to be made, the State and not Brasserts are entitled to them.

The Minister for Justice: Another State trading concern?

Hon. C. G. LATHAM: I never suggested the State should engage in the business. I am surprised at the Minister knowing so much about it, seeing that he has just been elevated to the position of Minister for Justice and Railways. If he does know so much we shall be glad to have his information.

Mr. Sleeman: Do you object to it being sold to the Japanese?

Hon. C. G. LATHAM: If we are dealing with the Japanese, let us deal directly with them and get what is to be got out of it ourselves. There is no doubt that Brasserts will be paid a royalty for the use of their name. If that is the case let us deal directly with the Japanese people if it is intended that there should be negotiations with them. I do not know how much publicity was given to the fact that we had these leases available. I know that they have been held from time to time by mere speculators, men with no money to finance them. I am anxious to see if it is not possible for those iron deposits to provide a good deal of employment in Western Australia, and I believe it is possible. Why cannot we do the same as the Broken Hill Proprietary Ltd.? Why cannot we have smelting works at Fremantle or Bunbury?

Mr. Sleeman: Why have we not got them? We have iron deposits nearer than at Yampi.

Hon. C. G. LATHAM: We may have deposits nearer, but I doubt whether any of them are so conveniently placed as at Yampi, where they are right on the seaboard, and all that is necessary is to put a crushing plant there and the ore can be run straight to the ship. I have not been there, but am speaking from information which I have seen in the paper. I do not propose to rely on those articles, but to use them as a means of rousing sufficient interest in the matter in this House in order that we may ascertain what is being done in respect to

this valuable asset. If we could establish smelting works anywhere on the coast, we would be rendering very valuable assistance to our unemployed.

The Minister for Mines: How do you know that Brasserts will not do that?

Hon. C. G. LATHAM: I do not know what they will do. All I have is Press information that the Japanese are putting £600,000 into the project. The matter was subsequently brought under the notice of the Minister who commented upon it.

The Minister for Mines: I said I knew nothing at all about it, which is true.

Hon. C. G. LATHAM: The Minister should know something about these things. It was on account of that reply that I thought it was necessary to take some action in this House. What is the use of the Minister saying he has given away a lease to some firm or other, and that he does not know what they are doing with it?

The Minister for Mines: I do know what they intend to do with it.

Hon. C. G. LATHAM: Does the Minister know who is providing the capital or what quantity of ore is to be shipped from Yampi to Japan, if it is going to Japan? If it is not going to Japan, does he know where it is going? Does he know the number of employees likely to be engaged or what royalties, if any, are to be paid, and to whom? These are very pertinent questions. I do not suppose that one member of this House, including the Minister, is anxious to unload assets of this State simply because we have an offer for them to-day. So long as that deposit remains there it is an asset to the people.

The Minister for Mines: It is not an asset while it lies unworked. It must be used.

Hon. C. G. LATHAM: It is an asset while it lies there, even if it is not used for another 100 years. I am anxious that we should make the best use of it as quickly as possible. I know of no industry like the steel industry that gives such a fillip to a place, though I expect an objection to be raised to the suggestion that a mere 450,000 people should think about establishing steel works.

Mr. North: We must make a start.

Hon. C. G. LATHAM: Of course we must. If the Japanese can make a profit from these deposits, surely we can.

The Minister for Justice: You propose the Government should start steel works?

Hon. C. G. LATHAM: I never mentioned such a thing.

The Minister for Justice: Well who is going to start steel works?

Hon. C. G. LATHAM: Well, who? Because at the moment we have no one here to do it, are we going to hand over this valuable asset to a foreign country, which will turn the product into manufactured articles and return them to us? They might return it in a more substantial form than we should like.

The Minister for Justice: We have sold them a lot of old iron.

The Minister for Mines: Broken Hill Proprietary, Ltd., supplied them with 200,000 tons of iron ore, and not a word was said.

Hon. C. G. LATHAM: If that company did supply the Japanese with iron ore, I presume that the State—in whose business I have no right to interfere—got some royalty.

The Minister for Mines: So shall we.

Hon. C. G. LATHAM: Shall we? I have made discreet inquiries, and discovered that the sale price is £2 7s. a ton. I do not know who is going to get that, but I have strong objections to a firm like Brasserts coming here and allowing their names to be used to enable a foreign firm to develop this industry.

Mr. Sleeman: Two pounds seven shillings on board at Yampi?

Hon. C. G. LATHAM: I think we should have some information on the subject. I did not like the reply of the Minister in the newspaper that he did not know what was going to be done.

The Minister for Mines: You are not going to get me to commit the State in any way to Japan. Not under any consideration will I do it.

Hon. C. G. LATHAM: Then the Minister and I are in agreement, and this is the first time we have agreed for quite a while. The Minister always finds the opportunity to oppose everything I say.

The Minister for Mines: Oh no!

Hon. C. G. LATHAM: Anyway, I am not foolish enough to suggest seriously that smelting works can be erected at Bunbury and that Collie coal can then be used. I do not think Collie coal is suitable for smelting purposes; I think it would be necessary to import Newcastle coal for that purpose.

Mr. Marshall: You are now getting on to a delicate subject.

Hon. C. G. LATHAM: Of course, if Collie coal can be used, then let us use it.

Mr. Wilson: You can use Collie coal for any purpose.

Hon. C. G. LATHAM: We can use pulverised coal that might increase its calorific value. In any case, I do not pretend to be an authority on this question.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member is wandering away from the subject matter of the motion.

Hon. C. G. LATHAM: I think coal is closely connected with the subject matter of the motion because you must have coal for smelting. Anyway I shall not refer to Collie coal again. The most valuable thing of all is that the exploitation of the Yampi Sound iron deposits should provide employment for a great number of people if we can utilise the product here. I believe Great Britain is sufficiently interested in Australia to find the necessary capital to open up these deposits and turn them to good account. I do not suppose the Minister will object to placing the papers on the Table so that the matter may be cleared up. I am making my position clear that I am not going to allow Brasserts to get away with this so as to enable the Japanese or any other foreign nation to handle the deposits without our knowing something about the arrangement that has been entered into. I have made inquiries about this firm and as far as I have been able to gather they are not of a particularly high standing in Great Britain in respect of steel.

The Minister for Justice: What does that matter; they have the enterprise.

Hon. C. G. LATHAM: Let the Minister find out what he can about this firm. They are referred to as constructional engineers.

The Minister for Mines: They are constructing, or are about to construct, the biggest steel pipe factory in England. They are running it at the present time for Stewart and Lloyds.

Hon. C. G. LATHAM: I should like to differ. I guarantee they are not running it for Stewart and Lloyds.

The Minister for Mines: They are.

Hon. C. G. LATHAM: As a matter of fact Stewart and Lloyds run their own factory, and after all, the construction portion of Stewart and Lloyds's factory does not require great engineering skill. It is a well laid out building. The Minister may have in mind Dorman and Long's, who have a big reputation in England. Only this after-

noon I tried to find out from another source something about Brasserts.

Mr. Marshall: Do you think they could build the Fremantle bridge?

Hon. C. G. LATHAM: Time after time we have complained about the difficulty of finding work for our unemployed. The probability is that the Fremantle bridge is hung up for material with which to build it. It is not proposed to use wood there, but steel.

Mr. Marshall: According to the hon. member, it is only propped up just now.

Hon. C. G. LATHAM: Surely this is one way in which we can benefit our own people. Even if we were only manufacturing for the first five years requirements of the State, without any thought of export, it would be worth while. The Minister for Mines is sufficiently influential in London to be able to induce capital to come here, if the owners of it received an undertaking that, provided the price is reasonable, they would secure any orders the Government had to give for steel. I believe the Government would get the money.

Mr. J. MacCallum Smith: Many attempts have been made to get money into this State.

Hon. C. G. LATHAM: Attempts have been made to get money for many purposes, and it comes along in due course. I would rather see the iron ore remain where it is than hand it over to Japan.

Mr. Marshall: So would everyone else.

Mr. J. MacCallum Smith: Even if our own people were employed in getting it?

Hon. C. G. LATHAM: I am surprised at the hon. member. I should be glad to hear his views on the subject later on.

Mr. Fox: What about handing our wheat over to Japan?

Hon. C. G. LATHAM: It does not last long when it gets there.

The Minister for Justice: What about wool?

Hon. C. G. LATHAM: That does not last long either. I know, Mr. Speaker, you are not going to permit me to wander off on to wool and wheat.

Mr. SPEAKER: Quite right.

The Minister for Justice: Why do you not want to sell iron ore to Japan when you are willing that they should buy our wool?

Hon. C. G. LATHAM: The Minister must have a good idea of the reason for that.

The Minister for Mines: What is the difference? I should be pleased to hear it.

The Minister for Agriculture: What is the difference between making zip fasteners and woollen goods?

Hon. C. G. LATHAM: The Minister knows quite well.

The Minister for Mines: I want you to say what the difference is.

Hon. C. G. LATHAM: I heard the Minister interject that he did not want to dispose of any iron ore to Japan. That is sufficient reason for me to know that he understands what he is talking about. I hope the papers will be laid on the Table; there can be nothing in them to hide.

The Minister for Mines: I have nothing to hide.

Hon. C. G. LATHAM: I do not expect there is anything to hide. We ought to know what is in them. The Minister for Agriculture appears to be amused. There is nothing about this matter to amuse him.

Mr. SPEAKER: The amusement of the hon. Minister is not under discussion.

Hon. C. G. LATHAM: He is certainly attracting attention, if nothing else. We ought to know whether we are dealing with a foreign firm, and what the proposals really are. We know that once Japan has got the iron ore, it can do what it likes with it. I do not want the metal to come back to this country under conditions which will not be acceptable to us.

Mr. Marshall: In the form of military aggression.

Hon. C. G. LATHAM: There is a vast difference between the consumption of wheat and the manufacture of steel products.

The Minister for Justice: Why do not you get the Federal Government to interfere?

The Minister for Mines: The Federal Government have had a full statement of the position.

Hon. C. G. LATHAM: But they have taken no action.

The Minister for Mines: Not as far as I know.

Hon. C. G. LATHAM: I do not suppose the Federal Government are likely to interfere with the sovereign rights of the State.

The Minister for Mines: Oh no!

Hon. C. G. LATHAM: They try to keep out of that as much as possible.

The Minister for Mines: I think this is a matter in which they are interested; hence their being consulted.

Hon. C. G. LATHAM: I do not know if they were consulted, but all that has taken place ought to be laid on the Table. I hope

the Minister will give us an opportunity to know exactly what has happened. I want to ascertain whether we are dealing with Japan or a British firm, and what benefits will accrue to the State as a result of any arrangement between Brasserts and this State.

On motion by Minister for Mines, debate adjourned.

PAPERS—BULLSBROOK AIRPORT.

MR. J. MacCALLUM SMITH (North Perth) [6.6]: I move—

That all correspondence in connection with the naming of the Bullsbrook Airport be laid upon the Table of the House.

I move this motion formally.

Hon. C. G. Latham: Why do you want this motion?

Mr. J. MacCallum SMITH: The Minister has already promised to offer no objection to the papers being laid on the Table. I have no desire to take up time by giving my reasons for the motion.

THE MINISTER FOR MINES (Hon. S. W. Munsie—Hannans) [6.7]: Just before the Deputy Premier left the Chamber, he asked me to state that he had no objection to these papers being laid on the Table of the House, and that he will present them later on.

Question put and passed.

PAPERS—CASE OF SETTLER MOSES.

MR. BOYLE (Avon) [6.8]: I move—

That all papers in connection with the dispossession of R. G. Moses, of Nukarni, by the Agricultural Bank be laid on the Table of the House.

I am moving this motion in the hope of finishing up a very troublesome question with respect to this man. I have to acknowledge the courtesy of the soldier settler representative of the Agricultural Bank in allowing me access to the files and papers in connection with the dispossession of this settler. The soldier settler representative has not actually given me access to the files, but he has given me a mass of information.

The Minister for Lands: But you said he had given you access to the files.

Mr. BOYLE: He gave me a lot of information.

The Minister for Lands: Who was the officer?

Mr. BOYLE: The soldier settler officer of the Agricultural Bank.

The Minister for Lands: He is a man in whom we had a lot of trust.

Mr. BOYLE: I should like these papers to be tabled.

Hon. C. G. Latham: It was ages ago that that happened.

Mr. BOYLE: Fully six months ago.

Hon. C. G. Latham: It was before that.

Mr. BOYLE: Possibly it was before that. Actually I asked to see the file in November last, but, owing to the intervention of the holidays, it was probably January or early in February before I was given the information. I do not ask for these papers in any spirit of hostility. I really thought that something should be done for the settler's wife. She is an Englishwoman who came out some years ago. It is really more on her account that I am taking this course. I should like to see the Government afford her an opportunity to return to the Old Country. The case is a deplorable one. I am not defending the settler in his attitude on the farm. It is an amazing case. The settler in question appealed to the King and to the late Lord Jellicoe. I feel that a good deal of responsibility is cast upon me to succeed where these eminent and distinguished people failed. I merely want to see that everything possible is done for these people, and that is why I am moving the motion.

HON. C. G. LATHAM (York) [6.10]: Because the people concerned have from time to time seen me over this business, I support the motion. They feel they have been badly treated. In consequence, they have a grievance, and have broadcast a report unfavourable to land settlement in Western Australia. I understand they claim they were dispossessed of their property when they were entitled to remain upon it. Moses saw me a little while ago. I said I did not think the Minister would agree to table the papers unless we had his (Moses's) authority. Moses said at once, "You have my authority." These papers are not being asked for out of mere curiosity. We have the approval of the man himself that they should be tabled. For a long time Moses felt he had a grievance. He saw me at different times when I was in office. From memory, I should say he had

not been badly treated. If there has been any harsh treatment in his case, it must have taken place during more recent years. I have my doubts whether the member for Avon (Mr. Boyle) really did see these papers, but he may have seen excerpts from them. I do not think the bank officials would show their files. A little while ago I asked to see a Bank file. I had seen many files before. On this occasion I was quickly informed that no Bank files were available to any member of Parliament.

Mr. Boyle: I did not have the papers in my possession for one moment.

Hon. C. G. LATHAM: I do not think any Bank official would be guilty of showing the files. What the hon. member saw was probably an excerpt from the file showing what the position was. Information is supplied to members from time to time when asked for, to indicate what the position is with respect to particular settlers. I have never had inside information.

The Minister for Lands: You say you have seen files.

Hon. C. G. LATHAM: I have seen them. One deals with so many files when in office that one cannot commit them to memory.

The Minister for Lands: You said Moses had not had fair treatment.

Hon. C. G. LATHAM: He has always had a grievance.

Mr. Boyle: What objection is there to a settler seeing his own file?

Hon. C. G. LATHAM: It would not be advisable to show confidential reports and files. It would probably be difficult to prove all there was on the file, although the officer making the reports may know the statements are perfectly true.

Mr. Marshall: What should be confidential in the ordinary business transactions that occur between a Bank and its clients?

Hon. C. G. LATHAM: In all banks, insurance companies and the like, confidential reports exist. I guarantee there is a confidential report about the hon. member in many business houses, and to his credit, too. From my long association with the officials of the Agricultural Bank, I should think that the clients of that institution do get a fair deal.

On motion by the Minister for Lands, debate adjourned.

MOTION—CHARGES AGAINST MINISTERS.

To inquire by Royal Commission.

HON. C. G. LATHAM (York) [7.31]: I move—

In view of the charges levelled against certain members of this House by the member for East Perth in his speech on Thursday, the 27th August, which charges affect the character of all the members of this House, it is, in the opinion of this House, desirable that a judicial inquiry be instituted to make a thorough investigation into the allegations made, the person appointed to make this investigation to have the full powers of a Royal Commissioner, and such extended powers as may be deemed necessary in order that the statements made shall be thoroughly sifted so that the honour of this House may be thoroughly re-established.

The motion deals with certain charges that were made by the member for East Perth (Mr. Hughes) on Thursday, the 27th August, and those charges were of a serious nature. I thought that the Government, without the necessity for any motion, would have appointed a judge to conduct an inquiry into the allegations. I regret that so far no notice has been taken publicly by the Government of the charges levelled by the member for East Perth. I do not propose to pose as a judge in dealing with this matter, but shall content myself with submitting reasons why I contend the Government should immediately appoint a judge of the Supreme Court to investigate the charges. To my mind those charges are very serious, and I have extracted from the speech of the member for East Perth portions that I consider should receive the attention of the Government. Speaking of the present Premier, the member for East Perth made this charge—

This gentleman is the man who, as Minister for Justice, stopped Crosthwaite's trial because he was a wealthy squatter. This is the man who puts justice on the auction block for sale, the man who perpetrated the Yellowdine mining frauds, one of the worst instances of fraudulent practice in the mining history of this State.

The next statement I shall quote is one in which the member for East Perth again referred to the present Premier in connection with "The Worker," and he said—

The shareholders of that newspaper were defrauded of a controlling ownership by an organisation of five men, known as the Labour Efforts Association of which the present Premier is the Leader. It got registration only

because the present Premier was prepared to violate the traditions of the Minister for Justice and grant an improper certificate.

I do not propose to quote any more in that respect, but that refers to the second charge. The next allegation was against a member of another place and the member for East Perth went on to say—

But Mr. Gray went to the Trades Hall at Perth, and he and his colleague took, unlawfully, £721 out of the funds of the industrial unionists of this State to pay for Mr. Gray's legal transgressions. Never was money used more fraudulently. There was a plain misappropriation of funds. That sum of £721, the property of Western Australian unionists was misappropriated by Mr. Gray and his colleagues. If there was any decency in this State, if there was anything like fair play, so long as public men can misappropriate people's money we ought not to put anyone in gaol.

The next charge deals with an ex-Minister for Public Works who to-day holds the very high position of Chairman of the Agricultural Bank Commissioners. In referring to Mr. McCallum, the member for East Perth made the following statement—

Why did he not set an example to the groupies? Why did not he, as a Minister of the Crown, pay off his indebtedness to the Agricultural Bank? But no! When it applied to him, it was quite a different thing. It did not matter if the State was ever paid, and I suppose no officer of the Agricultural Bank would dare to take steps to enforce payment because we have a system in this State whereby certain people are above the law.

The next charge referred to the same gentleman, and the member for East Perth said—

I do want to refer to two matters which I consider are grave scandals, two things that rank this State as having been governed in the past by gangsters and grafters. The State of Western Australia is a paradise for gangsters and grafters.

That is a very serious statement. It not only reflects upon Ministers of the Crown but upon every member of the House. The member for East Perth went on to refer to the transfer of the control of the Town Planning Commissioner from the present Minister for Lands to the then Minister for Works, and stated—

The then Premier suddenly transferred from the Minister for Lands to Mr. McCallum, who was then Minister for Works, the portfolio governing town planning; and three days before Mr. McCallum retired from public life he reversed the decision of the Minister for Lands and granted leave for the pub and the picture show.

He also said—

Another strange thing is that in the "Government Gazette" announcing Mr. McCallum's appointment as Minister controlling town planning, that gentleman promulgated a set of regulations allowing Johnston to have the pub and his friend to have the picture show.

Then he went on to say—

The statement about the Nedlands hotel is true. The "Government Gazette" issued about two or three days before McCallum's retirement contained McCallum's appointment, and contained the regulation giving the right to have the pub. If my statement is not true, the "Government Gazette" is false. It was a strange denouement. It was a strange thing to take the portfolio out of the hands of the Minister for Lands, who would not promulgate the regulations, and transfer it to a Minister retiring from public life who would.

Then the member for East Perth went on to refer to prosecutions under the Police Act or Criminal Code, I am not sure which, and said—

We also know that certain people who run betting houses are exempt from prosecution. In East Perth those who conduct some shops are prosecuted, while others are not.

He further stated—

We know that a legislator can run a betting shop in this place and in this State without fear of prosecution. The Goodwood race-course is owned by a Melbourne millionaire, and is managed by one of our legislators. We know what goes on weekly and yet there is never a prosecution.

Again he said—

There is another point. Why is a fine of £10 warranted at Boulder and one of £60 in Perth, for similar offences?

Then the member for East Perth said—

It is a scandalous thing that before the last election the starting-price bookmakers were promised immunity and sympathetic consideration if they subscribed to the party funds of the Government Between them they put up £350.

Then in the course of the speech, the member for East Perth said that the money was given to a representative of the Government on behalf of their funds. The member for Yilgarn-Coolgardie (Mr. Lambert) interjected and said, "Can you tell me that man's address?" The member for East Perth replied in the affirmative and then I interjected, "Statements like that are no joke." The Minister for Mines followed up with the statement, "I am sorry

I did not get some of it." Further on the member for East Perth said—

We do know that at the time of one election a junior police officer, who was a member of the starting-price betting squad, said to his sergeant, "Shall I be wanted?" The sergeant replied, "No, it is a close season for a couple of weeks. There is an election on." No one was prosecuted for a fortnight. It is decidedly unfair that the starting-price bookmakers should be induced to contribute to the funds of the party opposite on the understanding that there would be no rigid enforcement of the law against them. They should not have the law enforced against them so long as one of our legislators is permitted to run a private betting concern.

I do not propose to deal with the whole of the speech by the member for East Perth, but these charges I have extracted embody statements that cannot be allowed to go unchallenged. It is not only the honesty and integrity of Ministers that is at stake, but the honour of every member is impugned by such statements. In the first place the charges against Ministers are in respect of very serious offences, and we cannot regard ourselves as free from blame if we allow those charges to go unanswered. We, as the custodians of the laws of the State in the interests of the people, must see that the characters of our politicians are above suspicion, so far as we can do so. While we are not in a position to judge whether these allegations are right or wrong, it is for the Government immediately to take steps to deal with the matter. No one is more capable than a judge of the Supreme Court to undertake that task. It is true that the Deputy-Premier, who replied to the member for East Perth straight away, said that the hon. member could have a commission or a select committee. Personally I would not be satisfied with a select committee.

Hon. P. D. Ferguson: Nor would anyone else be satisfied.

Hon. C. G. LATHAM: The charges are far too serious, and consequently I hope to hear from the Government that they are prepared to have a judicial inquiry. If we allow these charges to go unchallenged and do not clear up the position, we cannot expect people to have any respect for the Parliamentary system. We know that the names of politicians as such are often bandied about, and all sorts of wild statements made about them. I am pleased to think

that up till now, there has been no justification for any of those suggestions. On the other hand, if we allow these charges to go by the board without any investigation we, in effect, associate ourselves with those who make these charges against politicians. We must maintain confidence in the Parliamentary institution. There is nothing else that I know of that we can offer in place of the Parliamentary system, and if we do not maintain the dignity and integrity of this House, the people themselves will be justified in taking the matter into their own hands. I know of nothing better than the constitutional form of government that we enjoy at the present time. So we cannot allow anyone, either inside or outside this Chamber, to make such charges as those I have indicated, without taking notice of them. I regret to say that those charges have been made not only inside this House but elsewhere. During the last few days I have had an opportunity to peruse a publication that was freely circulated during the last elections, and I also ascertained that in October, 1934, a public meeting was held at which very serious charges were made against the Government. I draw members' attention to the provisions of the Parliamentary Privileges Act, which is included in our volume of Standing Orders. Section 14 of the Act reads as follows:—

14. The publishing of any false or scandalous libel of any member touching his conduct as a member by any person other than a member is hereby declared to be a misdemeanour.

And it shall be lawful for either House to direct the Attorney General to prosecute before the Supreme Court any such person committing any such misdemeanour.

And any such person convicted before the said Court of any such misdemeanour shall be liable to imprisonment for any period not exceeding two years, or to a fine not exceeding one hundred pounds, or to both such punishments.

So Parliament has in its own hands the protection necessary against any person who libels a member of Parliament outside the House. I did want to quote that section in order to show members that the control of this sort of thing is entirely in the hands of Parliament. And, while I am not going to attempt to interpret this section, I believe that if any member of Parliament felt that he was entitled to avail himself of the section, he could take action himself; but if he did not desire to take action, and Parliament

thought fit to do so, Parliament could invite the Attorney General or the Minister for Justice to take action. Of course that does not apply to action against a member of the House; but at the time those charges were made, the member for East Perth was not a member of the House, so I suggest the section might be used for the purpose of clearing the names of those persons against whom the charges were made. There is a precedent for this, because not long ago in the House of Commons a Minister of the Crown was under suspicion of having been the means of leakages from a Cabinet meeting. In comparison with the charges made by the member for East Perth that, of course, was nothing at all, as impugning the honesty and integrity of all members of Parliament. Yet when the attention of the British Government was drawn to it, they immediately appointed a judicial commission to inquire into it. And when that commission found that a certain Minister was responsible for the leakage, that Minister immediately resigned. I am not at the moment expressing my opinion as to what ought to take place if the finding of the Royal Commission clears the Government's name, or if on the other hand the Commission should find that the Government were guilty, as stated in those charges. We can discuss all that when we reach that stage. But the matter is so serious that I say the House, knowing the high traditions that have been behind it for so many years, cannot allow those charges to go without some investigation, and I consider no one competent to conduct that investigation except a judge of the Supreme Court.

Mr. North: From outside the State?

Hon. C. G. LATHAM: I do not care where the judge may come from, for even if he were from outside the State, he would have all the necessary qualifications. That is a matter for the Government, and if the Government find that they have no judge available—I do not think our judges are so overworked as all that—it must be remembered that no doubt the member for East Perth would be asked to substantiate his charges, and in the meantime the judge appointed as commissioner could carry on his own normal work. I think, too, when the Government do decide on an inquiry, it cannot be confined to the members of this House. There are others outside the House who were involved in these charges, and I suggest that the investigation would have to

include those other persons. I think I have stated the reasons for the motion, and even if I had said nothing at all, the very utterances that have already been made are sufficiently serious to warrant the Government in appointing a Royal Commission. Actually I fully expected that the Deputy Premier would have announced on the day following the making of the accusations that a judicial inquiry would be held. But while we are waiting for that inquiry, the challenge must hang over members of this House until the names against whom the charges were made have been cleared. I am not here to judge the case at all. I have simply to ask the Government to appoint a judge to conduct an inquiry. I suggest that if the powers contained in the Royal Commissions Act do not give the proposed Royal Commission sufficient scope, Parliament should give to him the necessary powers to enable him to clear up this matter once for all. Some members may think I have over-stressed the charges affecting the character of all members of the House. But when the member for East Perth referred to the Government as being a corrupt Government, he included not only the Government side of the House, but the Opposition side as well. So I say that all members must carry the stigma until cleared.

The Deputy Premier interjected.

Hon. C. G. LATHAM: If those charges are rightfully levelled against the Government, why have not we found them out and ventilated them? We are here to see, as far as we can, that the State is well governed, and if there is anything in the nature of a misdemeanour committed by a Minister of the Crown, it is our duty to draw attention to it, and do such things to correct it as lie within our power. So I say there is not one member of the House who is not directly or indirectly implicated. I hope the Minister will agree to appoint a judge of the Supreme Court to investigate the charges.

THE DEPUTY PREMIER (Hon. M. F. Troy—Mt. Magnet) [8.5]: I do not intend to oppose the motion. The Government have considered the charges made by the member for East Perth and have not ignored them, as the Leader of the Opposition suggested. But it has not been possible for Cabinet to give them full and immediate consideration,

because three members of the Government were absent, and since the Government of the country have been referred to as a Government of "gangsters and grafters" every member of the Government is implicated. I should like to reassure the Leader of the Opposition that other members of Parliament are not concerned. No charges have been made against other members of Parliament, but only against the Government, and the Government are the gentlemen who sit on the Treasury bench and administer the affairs of the country for the time being. In discussing the question before the House, the relevant subjects are the matters of mal-administration and corruption which were charged against the Government by the member for East Perth in his speech the week before last. Before I enter upon this discussion, I wish to say a few words concerning the member for East Perth. I have been told by some members that in my remarks the other evening, I made comments about his domestic affairs.

Mr. Hughes: So you did.

The DEPUTY PREMIER: "Hansard" doesn't show any such thing. What I said was that he reminded me of another man in Australian politics, a man in another State. I know the history of that man, who was always saying that every other man was a scoundrel. He even poked his nose into the domestic affairs of people. His own were rotten. But he was a politician in one of the Eastern States. So I hasten to remove that grievance from the mind of the hon. member. I have nothing whatever to say regarding his private life and domestic affairs, because so far as I know they are all that could be desired. I believe I can say that his private life is all that it should be. I make that correction in order that the hon. member may not have that grievance. It is of no use his looking in "Hansard" for something I have not said. I have been here for many years, and I am sure there has never been a speech made in this House which for slander and insinuation could be ranked with that of the member for East Perth. And he showed no modesty about it; he absolutely revelled in it; he was on his own ground and in his own atmosphere. Even the member for Nedlands (Hon. N. Keenan) who clothes himself with the cloak of superiority, could find excuses for the member for East Perth, saying that it was pardonable in him because he had been away

from the House for so many years, and did not know the customs. But it was not the rules of debate that were infringed by the member for East Perth, but the rules of decency. His attack on the Premier was unwarranted and very cowardly. He knew that the Premier was a very sick man who had passed through a critical stage of ill-health. The Premier is a very sick man to-day. I can tell the House that the attack by the member for East Perth on the Premier has so disturbed that gentleman that his health is not satisfactory at the present time. He is very worried about that attack on him, and it has done his health no good. Members of the House know the Premier very well, and except in the heat of debate when men temporarily lose control of themselves, there is not another member who would refer to him in the terms used by the member for East Perth. The hon. member repeated the charge and attacked the Premier on more than one occasion. The member for East Perth is harbouring a grievance against the Premier because of an interjection reported to have been made in this House. I told the House that the Premier never made that interjection. The member for East Perth, although the member for Nedlands apologised for him, did not claim that any allowance should be made for any remark of his. In opening his speech he said—

I do not agree with the speaker who deplores recriminations. It all depends upon what is meant by "recriminations." If certain people can perform corrupt acts and then, when criticised, hide themselves behind the word "recrimination," we never would have any decent Government at all.

After having heard and read the speech of the member for East Perth, I consider that the word "recrimination" does not meet the occasion. The hon. member embarked upon a campaign of insinuation and slander which, as I have said, I do not think has ever been equalled in any Parliament in Australia. In the minds of many people in this country the hon. member is not entitled to criticise anybody at all, no matter what his record might be. The Government, however, do not propose to allow his statements to pass unchallenged. Any member of a Government who was guilty of an offence such as that charged by the member for East Perth could not remain a member of the Government. What is the position of the hon. member if the charge is not proved?

That, also, is something which the House must take into consideration. I have been at some pains to examine the hon. member's speech to ascertain definitely what charges of bribery, corruption and graft he levelled against the Government. He said very definitely, as the Leader of the Opposition pointed out, that the State was being governed by gangsters and grafters. The hon. member will be given an opportunity to say who the gangsters and grafters are. The terms are not altogether synonymous, though they have a somewhat similar association. On investigation I find that a gang signifies a number of persons acting together for any criminal purposes or at least not good or respectable. So, as the whole of us are associated here, we are all gangsters and we have got together for some criminal purposes. By "graft" is usually understood the acquisition of money by dishonest or unjust means; by taking advantage of a public office or any position of trust, or employment, to obtain fees, perquisites, profits on contracts. Which members of the Government were guilty of that offence? I want to know which members of the Government have accepted graft? What are the circumstances and what was the occasion on which they accepted graft? The hon. member made that very definite statement that members of the Government had accepted graft. He will be asked to prove who accepted graft and what were the circumstances and the occasion under which they accepted it. The second charge by the hon. member was that the Government corruptly exercised their authority in regard to the granting of mining reservations. Which member of the Government did that and in what way did he act corruptly? Was he guilty of taking sums of money or any other form of profit which could be deemed to be graft? That charge cannot be evaded; the hon. member must stand up to it. It is a charge that he will be given an opportunity to prove. The third charge was that Mr. McCallum ex-Minister for Works, had the ex-Premier, Mr. Collier, in the unfortunate position in which he could blackmail the then Premier into doing anything he wanted. He said—

He had the Premier of the State in an unfortunate position in which he could blackmail the Premier into doing anything he wanted. The Premier was in the unfortunate position that he had to leave the State and, when he returned the gun was put at his head . . . he (Mr. McCallum) demanded from

the Premier the job of Commissioner of the Agricultural Bank at £2,000 a year.

That was a very distinct and emphatic statement. If Mr. McCallum put a gun at Mr. Collier's head and blackmailed him and forced him to appoint him as chairman of the Agricultural Bank Commissioners, Mr. McCallum has been guilty of a very heinous offence which makes him unworthy of the position. The hon. member will be called upon to prove that allegation which he has so definitely made and which I can say his chances of proving are absolutely hopeless. Fourthly he said that the present Premier, when Minister for Justice, corruptly exercised his authority so as to permit of the registration of an association under the Associations Incorporation Act which took over the management and control of the "Worker" newspaper. He added that the shareholders of the newspaper were defrauded of a controlling ownership and the "Worker" now belongs to five men who obtained the ownership by fraud, and that the Premier is one of those five men who secured the ownership by fraud. Well, the hon. member will have every opportunity to prove that. It is a very serious charge to lay against a Premier that he secured the ownership of the paper by fraud. What are the facts of the case? I give the facts only because the Premier desires me to do so. He is in a state of health when this sort of thing has disturbed him so much that his health has not improved and would not improve under the charge. He has asked me to state the facts. The Premier and others associated with him are merely trustees holding in trust the shares for the shareholders of the company. They receive absolutely no return; they draw no directors' fees, and they lose all interest in the shares immediately they retire from the position of trust. They act as trustees; they never draw a penny profit and they never draw a penny for their services.

Hon. C. G. Latham: Should not that be a matter for the judge to decide?

The DEPUTY PREMIER: Yes, but it is definitely a matter for the country. Not only do the directors receive absolutely no return or remuneration of any kind, but they are specially precluded under the constitution of the association from doing so. The hon. member said the association got registration only because the present Premier was prepared to violate the traditions

of the Minister for Justice and grant an improper certificate. That is a very grave charge against the Premier and is absolutely without foundation. The same procedure was followed as in regard to all other associations. The rules submitted by the applicant were referred to the then Crown Solicitor, Dr. Stow, for advice as to whether the association was one to which the facilities of the Act should be extended. Dr. Stow said there was no objection provided certain amendments were made to the rules. That was done, and the certificate was issued in accordance with his advice. Those are the facts regarding the "Worker." If the hon. member knows anything to the contrary, he will have full opportunity to state it. The fifth charge made by the hon. member was that the Licensing Court is subject to the corrupt influence of the Government and that certain people, owing to this evil influence, are able to get licenses while others are not. Who are those persons? The hon. member stated that there had been seven or eight petitions for a pub, and added:—

It is an extraordinary thing how licenses are granted by the Licensing Bench. Seven, I think, applications were made for a license in Mt. Lawley. Each petition had the required number of signatures. The blocks of land appeared to be more or less the same. All the applications were rejected, till suddenly Senator E. B. Johnston comes along, makes an application, and it is granted without any trouble. I want to know why Senator Johnston can get a license whilst nobody else can. The Licensing Bench to-day is apparently the monopoly of one or two men, and the sooner we abolish the Licensing Bench, the better for the honour of Western Australia.

What are the facts? Altogether there have been eight petitions for licenses in the Inglewood area, including Mt. Lawley. For Railway-parade, Maylands, one application was made on the 12th August, 1925, for a wine license, but that application was withdrawn by the applicant. For Fifth-avenue there were three applications, two of which did not get before the court. The third, which did get before the court, was successful. The petition for that license was signed by the member for East Perth. I think it has been stated that his wife signed it also. Anyway, he signed it, and now he says it is an extraordinary thing how licenses are granted. The first application for Fifth-avenue was made on the 2nd July, 1929. The solicitors withdrew the petition on learning that there would not be a majority of signatures. Subsequently the Attorney General in the Mit-

chell Government, Mr. Davy, refused to allow a supplementary petition to be put forward by the same people. The second application was made on the 28th November, 1933. That was not referred to the court as it lacked the necessary majority. The third application, made on the 11th February, 1935, contained a majority of 148 petitioners, including the name of Mr. Hughes himself. As I have stated, this was referred to the court and was successful. This application, about which Mr. Hughes now complains—

Mr. SPEAKER: The Minister should refer to the member for East Perth.

The DEPUTY PREMIER: The member for East Perth says there was something peculiar about the granting of the petition. Did not he request that the license be granted? Did not he sign the application? What complaint can a man have, after signing an application in support of a request, when the request is granted? There is something contradictory in the nature of a man who signs a request begging and praying for something to be granted, and then takes objection when it is granted. The only successful application to the court for Fifth-avenue—the only one that got to the court—was the petition of the 11th February, 1935. The others were rejected by the Electoral Office because they did not have the statutory majority of signatures.

Hon. C. G. Latham: There were other applications.

The DEPUTY PREMIER: Certainly, but not for Fifth Avenue. I intend to deal with the others. The only successful application in respect of Fifth-avenue was that which the member for East Perth supported by signing the petition. Now, as regards Ninth-avenue, there were three applications, two of which did not go before the court. The hon. member spoke about all these people going to the court and being rejected. Only two of the whole lot went to the court; the court only saw two. The first application was on the 9th May, 1931, during the time the Mitchell-Latham Government were in office. The petition contained a majority of 42 signatures. The court refused that application on the ground that there was no demand for a license for residential purposes and that it would be inopportune to grant any license, having regard to the financial depression. The court could not be influenced at all by members on this side of the House, by a

Labour Government, because that application was made when the other party were in office. And so, out of all the applications, the only application heard by the court during the present Government's term was one granted last year, which satisfied the electoral requirements and which was supported by the member for East Perth himself. The second application in respect of Ninth-avenue was on the 7th November, 1933. It lacked the necessary majority, and was never referred to the court. The third application was on the 27th November, 1934. It also lacked the necessary majority, and was not referred to the court. Now with respect to Central-avenue. One petition was received on the 12th December, 1933. It included 921 signatures, which were rejected as informal, and the petition was withdrawn. The matter never went to the court. Only two applications went to the court in respect of the whole of Mt. Lawley. The others had been rejected because of non-compliance with electoral requirements. One was refused when the Mitchell-Latham Government were in office, and therefore the matter could not have been influenced by any other Government. The only application granted was granted last year, and that application was supported by the member for East Perth himself. The hon. member said in this Chamber that there were seven applications, and he asked—

Is it not peculiar that Senator Johnston got one, and that all the others were rejected by the court?

I say that court saw only two applications—one in 1931 and one in 1935. The hon. member also referred to Nedlands, making a similar charge with regard to the hotel there. There were three applications for a hotel license at Nedlands. The first was on the 29th January, 1930. There was opposition by the police, by residents, and by the University Senate. The court considered that the objection from the University must carry weight, and the application was refused. The second application, in respect of Barron-avenue, was on the 18th December, 1933. It was not dealt with immediately by the Chief Electoral Officer, pending the issue of new regulations and because of the Legislative Council biennial elections. However, the certificate of the Chief Electoral Officer was supplied on the 21st June, 1934. The third application was

on the 6th June, 1934, relating to Florence road, and a certificate was issued by the Chief Electoral Officer on the 5th July, 1934. The majority for Barron-avenue was 59, and the majority for Florence-road 250. The only opposition was formal, by the inspector of police. The premises were four streets west of those suggested in the 1930 application, which was refused mainly owing to the objection of the University Senate. The court gave preference to the Florence-road application in view of the greater depth of the block and in view of the premises being erected fronting to the main road.

Hon. C. G. Latham: That was not a business area at the time the application was made.

The DEPUTY PREMIER: It was a business area, so far as my memory serves me. But I will deal with that point later.

Hon. C. G. Latham: It was not a business area at the time when the application was made.

The DEPUTY PREMIER: I cannot vouch for that exactly, but I shall come to it later when dealing with the town planning administration. If the area was not a business area then, it was only because the Nedlands town planning scheme had not been gazetted. Before that scheme was gazetted, however, any area was a business area.

Hon. C. G. Latham: It was gazetted when I was Minister.

The DEPUTY PREMIER: Then this was a business area.

Hon. C. G. Latham: Not that area.

The DEPUTY PREMIER: Before the Nedlands town planning scheme was gazetted, any area there was a business area. After that scheme had been gazetted, that was a business area.

Hon. C. G. Latham: It was not.

The DEPUTY PREMIER: Well, what was a business area?

Hon. C. G. Latham: The business area was further down, further east.

The DEPUTY PREMIER: The Nedlands town planning people are entirely responsible for that, because I had nothing whatever to do with it. The member for East Perth also said in this Chamber—

Then comes along another gentleman who wants a hotel. He selected a block of land, to all intents and purposes equivalent to the one on which the hotel was afterwards built. He

applied for the license, but in came Senator Johnston again for a license on the opposite corner. Last in was first home; the Senator got the license. But the Minister for Lands, the member for Mt. Magnet, held out on them, not wanting to let them have either the picture show or the hotel. He would not pass the necessary regulation.

With respect to the hotel, that statement is utterly untrue. I stated here the other evening that the question of a hotel being established in Nedlands was never submitted to me officially; but, having looked at the files since, I want to make a correction. I find that the Nedlands Road Board did write to me asking me did I approve of a hotel in that area and on that site. I told the Nedlands Road Board that it was not a matter within my jurisdiction, and that I was not prepared to give an answer in that regard. And it was not within my jurisdiction. It was not for me to say whether a hotel or a picture show or a garage or a store or any other business should be established in a business area. It was for the person desiring to establish the business to obtain the consent of the local authority. Then, if there were people in the locality who objected to the local authority giving that consent, an appeal could be made to the Minister and the town planning authority.

Hon. C. G. Latham: But you over-rode the local authority as regards the picture show, you know.

The DEPUTY PREMIER: The Leader of the Opposition knows nothing about it.

Hon. C. G. Latham: I do.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order!

The DEPUTY PREMIER. Perhaps the Leader of the Opposition knows more about it than I know. Whatever I did, I stand by. I am sure no member of this Chamber will be prepared to say that I acted corruptly in the matter.

Hon. C. G. Latham: I do not say that.

The DEPUTY PREMIER: I did not think the hon. gentleman did. But probably he knows more about the matter than I do. I acted on the advice of the Crown Law Department. When the Nedlands Road Board agreed, I agreed to the establishment of a picture show at Nedlands in that area. A number of people objected, and objections have to be heard by the Minister. I heard the objection, as laid down by the Act. I

heard both sides, and on the advice of the Crown Law Department I ruled that a picture show was not a shop; and I stuck to that. But I never ruled on the question of the hotel. There were no objections to the hotel. The people of the locality raised no objection to it. It never came before me as the result of any objection, for my ruling or decision; so the member for East Perth is entirely wrong in stating that I ruled against the hotel and opposed its establishment there. The matter was not within my authority to refuse, and the matter had not been submitted to me as Minister controlling town planning. The member for East Perth states a lot of things that are not exactly true. He gets some information, and then he forms his own conclusions. The hotel license was granted seven months before the administration of the Town Planning Act was transferred from my department to the Public Works Department. I repeat, the license for the hotel was granted seven months before the administration of the Town Planning Act was transferred to the Public Works Department. I come now to the transfer of the town planning administration. The member for East Perth said that the administration of the Town Planning Act was transferred to the Minister for Works, Mr. McCallum, so as to facilitate the establishment of a hotel and a picture show at Nedlands. The hon. member said the Minister for Lands held out against the picture show and the hotel. He will have an opportunity of obtaining the facts regarding that aspect. The next charge of the member for East Perth is that the Government, and particularly the Premier, when Minister for Justice, tampered with the course of justice in a case relating to one Crosthwaite, and that in the interests of Crosthwaite the Premier tampered with the course of justice. The hon. member said that in the interests of Crosthwaite, justice was bought from the Premier. He said that the Premier, Mr. Wilcock, put justice up to auction. Well, if the Premier put justice up to auction and Mr. Crosthwaite was able to buy justice, then I am sure the Premier does not wish to be Premier of this country any longer. If those are the facts I am sure the Premier will retire. I also want to give a few facts, because the Premier wishes to have them stated. The member for East Perth said that the prosecution against Crosthwaite was quashed because he was a

wealthy squatter. Of course that insinuates that a wealthy squatter bought justice. In fact, the hon. member has stated that. There could be no worse insinuation. I do not think the hon. member will have much chance of proving it. The other night he spoke about the paper he published in East Perth. He said that some 18 months ago he printed that paper and was not taken up. He asked, "Why did they not sue me?" I ask, What has been the experience of members who sued the member for East Perth? What was the experience of Mr. Clydesdale? Mr. Clydesdale paid the member for East Perth damages, and subsequently sued him for the money but could not get it back.

Hon. C. G. Latham: He did get it back.

The DEPUTY PREMIER: Yes, when he threatened the member for East Perth with bankruptcy proceedings. Then he got it back, later. But the member for East Perth told us the other night that he is in debt to the extent of £1,000. Then what hope is there of getting anything from him now? One could only spend one's own money in paying one's own costs. He has been emboldened by having got away with it at East Perth, and so he thought it must be all accurate. That is his method. No member of this Government sued a poor man and ruined him, or wrecked his business. If the Government have sued individuals, they have done so to protect the interests of the community. Every man is not an honest man, no matter whether he be poor or rich, and the Government have to sue the dishonest man for the good of the community at large, for nobody expects a man to be allowed to go free if he does wrong. But while the Government may have occasion to protect the community against an individual, no member of this Cabinet has ever sued a man for his last crust, or broken a man in his business and forced him on to the old-age pension. In this paper the member for East Perth certainly libels Mr. Willcock. He talks about how the telegraph wires ran hot when Mr. Willcock decreed that Crosthwaite should be tried at Carnarvon; he says that the witnesses were stopped from leaving Carnarvon; and that the trial was withdrawn from the list for the Criminal Sessions; and that Crosthwaite went scot-free, thanks to the intervention of the Minister for Justice. He goes on to inflame the public mind by making certain statements

about the Bidgenia Pastoral Company. He states—

The Bidgenia Pastoral Company, of which Mr. Henry Crosthwaite is the manager, is a very valuable pastoral property, although the number of shareholders in the company were only five, of whom the first is a man well known in the racing world of the eastern and western States of Australia, Mr. John Wren. The second shareholder, holding something like £78,000 worth of shares, is the manager himself, Mr. Crosthwaite; whilst the third name on the list of shareholders is the gentleman who attends to Mr. Wren's racing interests in Western Australia and between times occupies the position as an Honourable Member of the Legislative Council of Western Australia—Mr. Alexander Clydesdale, M.L.C. Surely the strenuous efforts made to detect, convict and punish the poor man for his slight transgressions are brought into striking relief with the generous treatment meted out to the wealthy and influential station owner from the North-West? And if the confidence of the ordinary citizen in the impartiality of the administration of the law is to be maintained, a full, complete and convincing explanation of this case should be forthwith made by the Minister for Justice (Mr. J. C. Willcock, M.L.A.) and every one of his colleagues and supporters.

That is the stuff he wrote. Unquestionably, it is libellous, but, having regard to Mr. Clydesdale's experience, was it likely that Mr. Willcock was going to waste his money suing the member for East Perth in the law courts? I will give the House and this country some details of the Crosthwaite case. I will show how far this rich squatter was able to corrupt the Minister for Justice, how this rich squatter was able to buy justice! The first case against him was a charge of attempting to do grievous bodily harm. On the 16th December, 1933, he was committed for trial at Carnarvon. He applied for trial in Perth, on the ground of local hostility. After perusing the depositions, the Crown Prosecutor advised that the charge be reduced to one of assault. It was then decided by the Minister that Crosthwaite should be dealt with summarily at Carnarvon, where the offence was alleged to have been committed. So the Minister sent this man back amongst his enemies to be tried! Crosthwaite asked to be tried in Perth because of the hostility against him in Carnarvon, but the Minister decided that he should be tried in Carnarvon. Is that preferential treatment?

Mr. Hughes: Was he tried in Carnarvon?

The DEPUTY PREMIER: Never mind about that; there are a lot of things to be told yet.

Mr. Hughes: He was not tried there.

The DEPUTY PREMIER: It does not matter whether he was tried there or not. The statement was that he corrupted Mr. Willcock, that he paid for justice. That is what the member for East Perth has to prove, not where he was tried, but that Crosthwaite corrupted the Minister, and that the Minister put justice up for sale. Those are the charges to be proved. In January, 1933, a charge of perjury was laid against Crosthwaite, as a result of the evidence given by him in a civil action in November, 1931. Sanders, the appellant in the civil action, represented that perjury had been committed. He was advised by the Crown Law Department that the Crown never instituted proceedings in connection with an allegation of perjury except on representation from a presiding judge or magistrate. But further particulars being submitted by Sanders, the Crown Law officers advised that, notwithstanding the universal practice, there was some ground for an inquiry. An inquiry was made by the police and the unusual course subsequently adopted of charging Crosthwaite with perjury at the instigation of an individual. For the first time in the history of this country a man was tried for perjury at the instigation of a private individual. A further unusual step was taken in instructing the Crown Prosecutor to conduct the case at a preliminary hearing at the police court in the Gascoyne district. So this man Crosthwaite, who could buy justice, who corrupted the Minister, received treatment such as no other offenders in Western Australia ever received. He was put on trial for perjury at the instigation of a private individual, committed for trial and sentenced to 12 months' imprisonment. Yet we are told by the member for East Perth that Crosthwaite got preferential treatment. If he had said that Sanders bought justice, it would not have been quite so preposterous, but in view of the treatment meted out to Crosthwaite, it is a most extraordinary thing to say that Crosthwaite had bought justice. Crosthwaite was also prosecuted for the attempted corruption of a witness, the police taking action following a statement by one of the witnesses in the perjury charge. He was found not guilty by a jury. In no way did the Minister for Justice come into this matter. It is absurd to suppose that the Minister for Justice is personally aware of

every action taken by the Crown Law officers. In the matter of filing an indictment or entering a nolle prosequi, the Minister must be guided by the legal advisers of the department. The Crown Law Department does not investigate every appeal of an unsuccessful litigant, because, if it did, it would be setting itself up as a court of appeal superior to the other courts. It does not take action on behalf of persons laying a charge of perjury. If it took action against persons for this offence, it would take action on every case heard in the courts, for if there were two sides put forward, some person would obviously be telling an untruth. This is the first occasion on which a man has been charged with perjury at the instigation of a private individual. On that charge Crosthwaite was convicted; yet in face of all those facts the member for East Perth says Crosthwaite was given preferential treatment.

Mr. Hughes: Did he serve his sentence?

The DEPUTY PREMIER: There is another instance in which the services of the Crown Law authorities were enlisted by R. B. Sanders in the prosecution of a claim against H. Crosthwaite, arising out of the original court proceedings. The Minister for Justice approved of an application by Sanders for legal assistance in accordance with the Poor Persons' Legal Assistance Act. This was forwarded to the Law Society, which, by its representative, succeeded in effecting a settlement whereby Sanders recovered from Crosthwaite the sum of £60 on account of his claim and costs. Yet we are told that Crosthwaite bought justice, that he corrupted the Minister. The hon. member will have the fullest opportunity of proving his charges. The hon. member made a further statement that certain starting price bookmakers were promised immunity and sympathetic consideration if they subscribed to the funds of the Government prior to the last general election, and that between them they put up the sum of £350. I understand that the hon. member was secretary of the starting price bookmakers at one time.

Mr. Hughes: I hope you will give yourself the chance to prove that statement.

The DEPUTY PREMIER: If the hon. member denies it, I will accept his denial, but it is what I have been told during the last few days.

The Minister for Employment: He was, but on probation only.

The DEPUTY PREMIER: The hon. member will be asked who were the people that were promised immunity for the sum of £350.

Mr. Rodoreda: He got it for them pretty cheaply, anyway.

Mr. Hughes: Let us have the fullest investigation; don't shut anything out.

The DEPUTY PREMIER: The member for East Perth also said—

It is also known that certain people who run betting houses are exempt from prosecution. In East Perth those who conduct some shops are prosecuted while others are not.

Who are the people in East Perth that were exempt from prosecution and who are the people not exempt, and who was the Minister they corrupted? The ninth charge is that the Premier perpetrated "the Yellowdine mining fraud, one of the worst instances of fraudulent practice in the history of the State." The charge is a very serious one. If the Premier perpetrated any mining fraud, I am sure he would not wish to retain his position as Premier. The member for East Perth also said it in his publication. The member for Nedlands (Hon. N. Keenan) is not altogether guiltless. He made a charge at the last election. I am surprised at the hon. member. I have heard him boasting about his association with mining, and the charge does not come well from him. He should set a much better example.

Hon. C. G. Latham: There is no need for sarcasm.

The DEPUTY PREMIER: Let the hon. gentleman mind his own business.

Mr. Marshall: That shows their inferiority.

The DEPUTY PREMIER: If it is sarcasm, it is forced upon me. I am beginning to resent these things. Mr. A. E. Weston was the secretary of the Yellowdine Gold Options Co., No Liability, and replied to the member for Nedlands when he made his attack upon the Premier. If the member for Nedlands wants to say that the Premier perpetrated the Yellowdine mining frauds, let him say so.

Hon. N. Keenan: You know very well that my objection was that the Premier, when Minister for Justice, had signed a prospectus asking the public to take shares in what was a worthless proposition.

The DEPUTY PREMIER: He did nothing of the sort.

Hon. N. Keenan: He did; I saw the official prospectus myself.

The DEPUTY PREMIER: I am giving the facts. Why did the hon. member not tell the people of Nedlands all about his own association with the goldmining industry before attacking the Premier?

Hon. N. Keenan: I never sent out a prospectus like that.

The DEPUTY PREMIER: The hon. member is only boasting.

Hon. N. Keenan: Let us have an inquiry into it.

The DEPUTY PREMIER: The hon. member talks about the mining industry. I tell him that he has associated himself with all these charges. He hopes to pull down the Government by charges of corruption. He is very active about it. He makes a charge against the Premier that he perpetrated this mining fraud.

Hon. C. G. Latham: That is not in my motion.

The DEPUTY PREMIER: It is all in the motion.

Hon. C. G. Latham: There are no charges against the Government or anyone else in the motion.

The DEPUTY PREMIER: Whatever shares the Premier holds in this company he paid for in cash. They slumped badly afterwards, and probably have not yet recovered. He holds only a small parcel. It is well to mention that all the shares were fully paid up before he became a director. The fact that he was a director had nothing to do with the matter, because the shares were paid for by him. There have been two annual meetings of shareholders, and no complaint or scandal has been referred to at either of them. The secretary of the company has set out all the facts, how the Premier was interviewed, and how he agreed to act as a provisional director. There was no scandal and there was no fraud. The company has safeguarded the interests of shareholders as probably no mining company in this State has done before. The hon. member will have a chance to prove what he said. These things concern the Premier very much. Another matter referred to by the member for East Perth (Mr. Hughes) was what he termed the Clydesdale case. He had a lot to say about that. Every member here knows all about it. The member for East Perth has got away with it in the country. Later on sanity will return to many people, and they will understand the facts. The hon.

member said, "God forbid we should put another Clydesdale blot on the Constitution." He also said, "This violation and degradation of the public life of Western Australia went unchallenged." It must have been something very bad to have been referred to in those terms. It must have been a very corrupt thing to appoint Mr. Clydesdale as chairman of the Lotteries Commission. But it was our friends opposite who appointed him.

Hon. C. G. Latham: Real friends?

The Minister for Mines: And they were fully justified in doing so.

The DEPUTY PREMIER: The member for Nedlands had a hand in it. Members opposite were responsible for this so-called violation and degradation of our public life. Do they want an inquiry into this?

Hon. C. G. Latham: Yes. I have no objection to any inquiry.

Mr. Raphael: You're shot.

The DEPUTY PREMIER: The member for East Perth said, "I want to do something to help the unemployed . . . when it is a case of a wealthy man backed by a racecourse millionaire, nothing stands in the way, and the Government are all-powerful." This so-called wealthy man was Mr. Clydesdale, and the racecourse millionaire is John Wren. Mr. Clydesdale was appointed Chairman of the Lotteries Commission by the Mitchell Government after the passing of the Lotteries Control Act of 1932. As "Hansard" shows he was appointed on the assurance of members of the Government that he ran no risk of losing his seat by accepting the office. Later on it was found he had infringed the Constitution. It was therefore necessary to protect him from the unexpected consequences of taking a position he accepted in good faith. Meanwhile the Mitchell Government were defeated, and it devolved upon the Labour Government to see the matter through by placing Mr. Clydesdale in the position of immunity that had been promised him. The Government were in honour bound to do this. It was a matter of honour and decency that the man the Government appointed to this position, and to whom immunity was promised, should be protected. Members opposite were also desirous that Mr. Clydesdale should be protected. They supported the Bill; indeed only a few members opposed it. Extracts from the debate show how this was done.

The Leader of the Opposition, the member for York, said—

I have previously stated that it would be almost impossible for me not to support a Bill legalising the position of a member of another place on the Lotteries Commission because the previous Government must accept some responsibility in offering a member of Parliament such a position.

They had to accept the whole responsibility. They offered the position, and gave it to Mr. Clydesdale. The member for East Perth now calls that a degradation in the political life of the country. The Leader of the Opposition went on to say—

I would draw attention to the fact that in 1894 an Act was passed by the Parliament of Western Australia based to all intents and purposes on the same principle as this Bill. A certain gentleman who was a member of Parliament occupied also a position on a board, and was being paid by the Government of the day. In the present instance the member of Parliament is not being paid by the Government. I have very little more to say except to point out that this is an unusual piece of legislation. As I said before there is a precedent for it. I think the House should endeavour to guard against the introduction of this class of legislation. The principle of the Bill we are now discussing is practically identical with that of another Bill we passed recently. I will support the second reading.

The hon. member followed the honourable and right course, the only course, when he supported the Bill. Is it possible that any Government could give a promise to any member of Parliament, and see that promise deliberately broken? Could any man in the community give his word to another man that he would be protected, and subsequently desert him?

Hon. C. G. Latham: Parliament ratified the appointment by passing the Bill.

The DEPUTY PREMIER: Who would put a man in that position and then desert him when in trouble, and after he had taken the risk for which he was promised immunity? No man does that sort of thing, no decent man, and yet that is spoken of as an act of degradation and corruption. What does the member for Nedlands say about that?

Mr. Raphael: He said too much. He prevented the amendment that caused the trouble, from going through.

The DEPUTY PREMIER: The member for Nedlands said—

The late Attorney General had informed me that he had come to the legal conclusion that the holding of the position of a member of the commission would not be holding an office of

profit under the Crown; or rather from the Crown, because there is an important distinction in our Constitution Act. It is not illegal to hold an office of profit under the Crown, but only illegal to hold an office of profit from the Crown. The late Mr. Davy formed the conclusion, and there are many reasons to support it, that owing to the difference in the wording "from the Crown," and "under the Crown," unless the profit came from the Crown, it is not within the scope of the prohibition. Being aware of that I asked Mr. Scaddan the object of inserting this particular clause in the Bill in view of the fact that the Crown Law officers considered it wholly unnecessary. Now, doubts have arisen . . . it is the duty of the House and the duty of whatever Government is in power to resolve that doubt, and so release any person who acted bona fide on the advice of the Crown Law Department from liability arising from that advice.

The member for Nedlands said it was the duty of the House and was the duty of the Government, too, to put this right. We are now saddled with that appointment and it is referred to as an act of degradation. The Government made up of members opposite were responsible for the appointment. When it was found that Mr. Clydesdale would get into trouble, to the credit of members opposite they did their best honourably to put the thing right.

Hon. C. G. Latham: I thought you said we were not implicated.

Mr. Marshall: You have been trying to get into this fight all night.

The DEPUTY PREMIER: The member for East Perth took action against Mr. Clydesdale because he had accepted the position that had been offered to him by the Mitchell-Latham Government. Mr. Clydesdale accepted that position on the assurance from the then Government that he ran no personal risk.

Mr. Marshall: He accepted the chairmanship only on that basis.

Hon. C. G. Latham: I think Parliament agreed to that when they passed the Bill.

The DEPUTY PREMIER: The member for East Perth sued the wealthy man, but why did he not sue Mr. Harry Mann who was also a member of the Commission but was a poor man? He did not sue the latter because he was not a man of means and now the member for East Perth talks about being impartial!

Mr. Hughes: Will you submit that statement to the Royal Commission too?

The DEPUTY PREMIER: Having regard to the degradation of the whole thing,

why did not the hon. member sue Mr. Harry Mann?

Mr. Hughes: Will you allow the Royal Commission to test the accuracy of that statement?

Member: Have the decency to be quiet.

The DEPUTY PREMIER: Of course, he did not sue Mr. Harry Mann but he sued the wealthy man.

Mr. Hughes: I could not sue Mr. Harry Mann and you know it.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order!

The DEPUTY PREMIER: The member for East Perth secured damages and he put those damages in his pocket. Mr. Clydesdale appealed and won the appeal. He could not get his own money back from the member for East Perth. Yet the member for East Perth talked about Clydesdale starving his wife and family. He had no regard for Mr. Clydesdale's family.

Mr. Hughes: When did I say that?

The DEPUTY PREMIER: That was passed around at East Perth.

Mr. Hughes: Tell me one instance when that was said.

The DEPUTY PREMIER: The hon. member squealed about his wife and family, when the money was not his own. Mr. Clydesdale could not get a penny back although the money was his. He had to force the member for East Perth into bankruptcy before he could get that money, and the member for East Perth glories in the whole thing. He calls that the manly thing to do and you know, Mr. Speaker, that the law says that the man who takes action along these lines must be a common informer, and in most countries the man who adopts that attitude is loathed, shot, exiled, or sent to Coventry. But the member for East Perth regards himself as a hero and glories in it. He led the attack against Mr. Clydesdale, got money from him and would not pay it back. Fancy glorying in that! He says that he was defending the Constitution, but he would not have defended the Constitution if it had not been for the money. His whole aim, of course, was not to get money, but to defend the Constitution! He wanted to clean up the stable and to purify the public life of Western Australia! That was his sole object; but when Mr. Clydesdale's appeal succeeded, it was impossible for him to get the money back from the member for East Perth. That deals with the Clydesdale case, the obloquy of which the present Government have carried whereas it

rightly should have been carried by the Mitchell Government.

The Minister for Mines: The Clydesdale case was quite all right. There is nothing wrong about it, except in the eyes of the mongrel who took action against him.

The DEPUTY PREMIER: Then the member for East Perth had a lot of minor charges to make. The publication that he spoke of is full of them. He got away with them then and having done so, he has become braver. The member for East Perth talked about the undemocratic character of the A.W.U. and referred to sustenance workers and talked about how Mr. Johnson had been appointed secretary by a few members. Mr. Johnson was appointed to his position under the rules of the organisation which provide as follows:—

Should any branch officer (other than the three persons appointed trustees of the New South Wales branch) or other member of the executive die, resign or be removed from office, his place shall be filled by some person to be appointed by the remaining officers and other members of the Executive, and such person shall hold office for the residue of the term for which his predecessor was elected.

Mr. Johnson succeeded Mr. Watts who had died and held the position formerly occupied by Mr. Watts for the term of Mr. Watts's original appointment, at the conclusion of which he has to go up for election.

Mr. Hegney: He is up for the election now.

The DEPUTY PREMIER: Yet we were told by the member for East Perth—

Mr. Hughes: How many sustenance workers will get a vote?

The DEPUTY PREMIER: The member for East Perth said that Mr. McCallum had owed the Agricultural Bank £2,300 and would not pay it. He said that no officer of the bank would dare to make him pay the amount.

Mr. Hughes: I said he had not paid.

The DEPUTY PREMIER: Mr. McCallum was an Agricultural Bank client just as others have been and will be. He borrowed money and he paid back all he was entitled to pay. He met his interest charges and made his repayments as they fell due. He did not default in any way, and so if he had that money on loan, his position was all right, so long as he was not defrauding the bank.

Hon. C. G. Latham: But he could not owe the bank £2,300.

The DEPUTY PREMIER: I do not think so; I am merely taking the figures quoted by the member for East Perth.

Hon. C. G. Latham: I think the Act provides a limit of £2,000.

The DEPUTY PREMIER: That is so. When Mr. McCallum accepted his present position, he paid off the whole of his liability to the Agricultural Bank. Was there anything wrong in that? Is it wrong for a man to borrow money bona fide and having done so, to pay his debts, to pay all that is due in respect of that borrowed money—only to be held up to contempt in this State? Of course, it may be something new to the member for East Perth that a man should pay what he owes and that may be why he expressed such surprise. Mr. McCallum repaid the money and is no longer a client of the Agricultural Bank. The member for East Perth paid a very poor compliment to the officers of the bank when he stated that they were probably afraid to push for the payment of the money. They had no occasion to push for it. If a man pays what he owes, that is all he is asked to do. I have dealt with most of the matters that were referred to. The member for East Perth did say that Mr. Gray, M.L.C., and others went to the Trades Hall and took money; he does not say it was given to them, but says it was taken fraudulently. I do not propose to oppose the motion. The Government have agreed to accept it. We would have decided the matter earlier had the Premier been well, had the Minister for Works been back from the Eastern States and had the Minister for Railways been re-elected earlier at the by-election. We agree to the fullest inquiry.

Mr. HUGHES: I move—

That the debate be adjourned.

Motion put and negatived.

MR. HUGHES (East Perth) [9.10]: I do not intend to reply to the vitriolic attack that the Deputy Premier has made upon me. I think a lot of good will be done in the interests of the State if we have a full investigation of all the Government's transactions and discrimination in the enforcement of the law since 1924. I hope the Deputy Premier will not constitute himself the judge by drawing up the terms of reference for the Royal Commission. It is impossible to have an impartial inquiry if one party is to draw up the terms of reference. If the Deputy Premier

desires an impartial inquiry, I will draft the allegations I have made in public and will set out *seriatim* the administrative acts upon which I based my allegations. If the Commission is to have full scope of inquiry, we should be allowed to call public officers, and Mr. Mann, from the Fremantle Trades Hall, should also be put in the box. It would be very easy to burke inquiry by so drawing up the terms of reference that the inquiry would be restricted to phrases taken from their context. It would be a monstrous thing for the Government to evade the issue by so drawing up the terms of reference. Let the Government appoint a judge of the Supreme Court and allow me to submit my allegations of where I think they deviated from the proper course that should be followed by Ministers, and then let the judge decide what the terms of reference should be. That is the proper legal method in arranging an inquiry. One party is not allowed to take words from their context and draw up the terms of reference so that the other side can be prevented from producing evidence. If that course were adopted the judge would then be in a position to say, "I am sorry, Mr. Hughes, but that is outside the terms of my reference." Let us have a full inquiry. In ordinary legal proceedings, a general statement is made first, and then, if the other party desires to go on with the fight, a statement of claim is lodged setting out the details *seriatim*. Then the other side set out their statement of defence, and so the details are before the court. The Deputy Premier talks about an impartial inquiry. Instead of leaving the matter to the judge, what does he do? The Deputy Premier goes over certain items that occurred to him, and makes his defence before the case for the other side is presented. Thus he does not want an impartial inquiry, for he makes a statement that he knows is not true. He says I did not prosecute Mr. Harry Mann. He knows I could not do so, for the reason that Mr. Mann and Mr. Clydesdale were appointed to the Lotteries Commission in February. In the following April there was an election, and Mr. Mann lost his seat. Mr. Clydesdale went on and took his seat in Parliament. The offence against the Constitution, as the Deputy Premier knows full well, is that of taking a seat in Parliament. No action could lie against Mr. Mann, yet the Deputy Premier comes here and makes a statement that he knows is not true. Although he talks about an impartial

inquiry, he makes a statement here that he knows full well will be prejudicial to that inquiry. I would like to go back to 1924 and examine the whole acts of the Leader of the House and his colleagues regarding the administration of the law. And if he wants that, let him make a general reference; let the reference that is to be made to the Royal Commissioner be settled between the Leader of the House and me, and if we cannot agree, let a judge of the Supreme Court settle the reference. Then I will put up the allegations *seriatim*. The hon. member said that Crosthwaite's charge was reduced from one of attempted murder to one of assault. But what he did not tell us was that Crosthwaite's trial had been transferred from Carnarvon to Perth by order of the Chief Justice of Western Australia, and that the then Deputy Premier—the present Premier—stepped in and stopped the trial. What happened? The hon. member said the file was to go back to Carnarvon for the trial. As a matter of fact, the file went back to the Perth Police Court, and there it stayed, and Crosthwaite never stood his trial at Carnarvon or elsewhere for the serious offence of shooting at a citizen. Let the facts come out and let the public of Western Australia draw their own inference, and it will be found that the evidence will be there to substantiate what I say. But of course the hon. gentleman, before the inquiry comes on, gives information which he hopes, I suppose, will prejudice the inquiry. He will draw up all the terms of reference, and if he draws the terms of reference so as to exclude the essential information, I tell him I will have nothing to do with the inquiry, but will go on making my statements in public. I say, let a judge of the Supreme Court settle the terms of reference. The hon. member talks about the pamphlet. Now someone on that side has said that I must be a goat. I would be if I were to allow the hon. member to frame the terms of reference. What could be fairer than to allow a judge of the Supreme Court to settle the reference? What could be easier than for the hon. member to say to the judge that the member for East Perth had made allegations against the Government, and then let those allegations be put in proper legal form, and let the hon. member answer them in the proper way? Then we would have an impartial inquiry. I could so frame the terms of reference that half the essential evidence would be excluded. As for the making of charges,

did the hon. member see the copies of the "Westralian Worker" issued during the last election campaign?

The Deputy Premier: They were very tame.

Mr. HUGHES: Were they? I could take action against the "Westralian Worker" for libel, and get substantial damages. But the hon. member is safe; it would not cost him a penny; the unfortunate workers who put their money into the "Westralian Worker" would be the sufferers.

The Minister for Employment: That is a poor get-out.

Mr. HUGHES: I will make an offer. Let Ministers give an undertaking that they will pay personally out of their own pockets any damages I get from those articles, and I will give them an opportunity to prove my case before the Supreme Court. They will not take that offer; it is too fair, because they could not shift, as Mr. Gray did, the burden on to someone else.

The Minister for Employment: The only libel you would be able to get against the "Westralian Worker" would be on the principle of the greater the truth the greater the libel.

Mr. HUGHES: Will the hon. member undertake to pay out of his own pocket whatever damages and costs I get in such an action?

The Minister for Employment: I challenge you to start an action against the "Westralian Worker."

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! We are getting right away from the motion before the Chair and are dragging in new matter altogether.

Mr. HUGHES: The question of election libels was put in.

Mr. SPEAKER: The motion before the Chair is for an inquiry into allegations made by the member for East Perth on the 27th August.

Mr. HUGHES: I am not afraid of any impartial inquiry that the hon. gentleman may institute; but it will not be an impartial inquiry if he himself settles the terms of reference, because they could be so settled that the essential information to prove my allegations would be excluded. But with a general reference to a judge, the judge can settle the issue. The hon. gentleman says I had a grievance against the member for Geraldton because of an epithet that he used in this House against me, and he says the epithet was never used. Let me answer that.

Of course, whether the epithet was used or not—

Mr. Raphael: It was not used by the member for Geraldton. I heard who used it, for I sat behind him.

Mr. HUGHES: Yet you have remained silent all the time! Let me, in answer to the explanation of the Leader of the House, make this explanation: Every week "Hansard" is circulated to the general public. Hundreds of copies go out, and hundreds of copies went out containing that offensive remark on the 1st October, 1934, or thereabouts. In the Assembly Hall in Perth I drew attention to the remark of the then Deputy Premier, and in the next issue of the "West Australian" there was an intimation of what I had objected to. Yet not one word of withdrawal. Why did not the Deputy Premier then say he had not used the remark, and that "Hansard" was in error? Would not that have been the proper thing to do? But no, the hon. gentleman remained silent. He never made any effort to intimate to me personally or to the public that he was being accused of having made a remark that he did not make. He never said one word, even on the floor of the House, for I watched the debates to see if the hon. member would rise in his place and say there was a mistake, that he had never used such a word. What other inference could I draw than that, when the statement was brought under the hon. gentleman's notice and he remained silent and therefore stood by his statement? When I came to the House and had opportunity to answer members on their own footing, I raised this question again, and for the first time, two years after the event, the present Deputy Premier says the statement was never made. I submit that if the statement was not made, and if any injustice has been done to the present Premier by his having been accused of having made that statement, he alone must take the blame, because he remained silent from the 1st October, 1934, until September, 1936. But when I came into the House I found that in the official record file of "Hansard" the epithet had been altered, and another less offensive epithet inserted in lieu. I was treated like the gentleman who is insulted in public and then granted a private apology. I say that had the Deputy Premier taken the opportunity at any time between the 1st October, 1934, and the present time to withdraw that statement I would have accepted his withdrawal

promptly, and said no more about it. But so long as I was prepared to remain silent, he also remained silent. And no attempt was made to recover the "Hansard" that had been distributed. It was not a case for an apology by the hon. gentleman. All that he had to say was that he had not made the statement, that it was a mistake in "Hansard": so the blame, if any, rests on the member himself. Now, of course, the epithet has been withdrawn. If at this coming inquiry the evidence is allowed to be put in, I will show an abuse of power by the members of the Government, an abuse of power unprecedented in any other Anglo-Saxon country. But of course it may be that the reference will be limited. If the Minister wants to clear up all the allegations, I say that the use of Government power to force the sustenance workers to pay for the A.W.U. was alone an improper and corrupt use of Government power. Let that statement be submitted to a judge—is the action of the Government in forcing the sustenance workers to contribute to the A.W.U. an improper use of Government power? On the facts, the judge will answer yes, that it is very improper. But, if the Minister has his way, that will not be included in the terms of reference. Let the hon. gentleman also include the question as to who wrote the libellous pamphlet for which Mr. Gray was blamed. They know well enough that someone else wrote it, and that the someone else is in hiding and that to enable him to remain undiscovered they had to go to the Trades Hall and find money for the purpose. Let that be put in the terms of reference so that we may get to the bottom of the question whether Mr. McCallum has retreated from public life or not. I have no doubt that if I am allowed to put in the evidence, and if public officers are allowed to testify, every one of my allegations will be proved. The hon. member to-night became very alert when some mention was made of getting a departmental file. "What," he said, "did you get a Government file?" McCallum and Mann came to me in the Trades Hall, and they proposed to write a pamphlet about me, for which they were going to get a police file. Mr. Treadgold is prepared to swear on oath that Mr. Mann never had a police file and never applied for one. So, if Mann got the file, he got it from a Minister of the Crown. The file was made available. As members from Fremantle know, Mann had no more to

do with writing the pamphlet than you, Mr. Speaker, or I had. The pamphlet was taken down to him. All that Mann did, as the handwriting in the pamphlet shows, was to correct two grammatical errors. Those corrections are in Mann's handwriting. Let the hon. gentleman submit that to a judge, and let Mann get into the witness box—he has refrained from doing so up to date—and state on oath who took the pamphlet to him. Then we will get to the bottom of the matter. That is where we have to start with Mr. McCallum's retirement from public life; we have to start with that pamphlet. We have to find out who took it to Gray. Let the public officers who had the pamphlet submitted to them go into the witness box and testify without fear of victimisation. Then we will get to the bottom of things. We will not need to have a judge because the public will draw their own inferences. The public are as well able to do that as is a judge of the Supreme Court. Let the evidence go to a judge. I assure the House of this, that if all the judges not only of our Supreme Court but in the British Empire were to find that Gray's pardon was a bona fide transaction and a proper use of the Royal prerogative, they would not convince ten people in the Empire, because the general public can judge for themselves whether the Gray pardon was a bona fide and proper use of Government power. I welcome the inquiry, but I hope that the terms of reference will be so drawn that all the evidence upon which I based my allegations may be given. I hope that the Government will not themselves draw their own references, but will allow them to be drawn by a judge of the Supreme Court after I have made my allegations categorically and they have answered them. Then we shall meet on even terms. I shall be able to call evidence in proof of what I have said, and the questions that I wish to have submitted to the judge can be submitted also. What an extraordinary inquiry would be one in which the Minister proposes to submit certain questions to the judge, and I am not allowed to submit any at all! We have not had anything like that since the days of the old Star Chamber. Let the hon. gentleman draw his questions for submission to the judge, and let me draw mine. Then let the judge decide whether or not the evidence is within the scope of the reference. If we do that, we shall have an independent and im-

partial inquiry. I venture to say that if the Yellowdine Options mining affair was submitted to a judge, and he was asked whether the flotation was in the best interests of the mining industry of Western Australia, and whether it was the type of flotation that a Minister of the Crown should be associated with, there would be no doubt what he would answer when he had the full facts. The hon. gentleman did not tell us all the facts. He did not produce the prospectus; he did not produce the minutes of the meeting. He told us that the shares were all allotted before the hon. gentleman came into it, but he did not tell us the basis. I do not propose to tell the House. Let him submit this question fairly and squarely to a judge. We will produce the documents. A judge will not require anything but the documents. All he will want to know will be regarding the various companies mentioned—the three or four companies. Speaking from memory, in one of the minutes, after the Minister for Justice became a director, the company stated, "We are purporting to sell the lease to a London company for sale to another company and the price we are getting is £100,000, but in reality we are getting only £50,000 because we are passing back £50,000 out of the £100,000." Is that a practice to put over the London investing public? To all intents and purposes, it is telling the London investor that a mine is being sold for £100,000, but in reality the go-between company has a string on it. What the London investor was told was being paid for at £100,000 was in reality being paid for at £50,000. That is one of the reasons, in fact the main reason, why it is impossible to sell Western Australian gold mines in London today—because of that type of flotation. If that is a proper transaction for a Minister of the Crown to be associated with, I am surprised. The Minister for Justice should have said, "Certainly not; we are not going to practise a deception like that on the London investor. If it is £50,000, the sum of £50,000 must be stated in the prospectus." The hon. gentleman did not tell us of those minutes. He did not get a copy of the minutes; he got a cutting from the newspaper. Let the matter be sifted by a judge, and we will see whether the Government can prove that they have exercised their powers as Ministers of the Crown properly during the last 12 years, whether they have not exercised them for

the benefit of their friends, whether they have not discriminated in the enforcement of the law for the benefit of one citizen as against another, whether the law is impartially administered in Western Australia to-day. Did not one of their friends, one of their stalwarts, go up to the public offices and kick a door in, and when a police officer went there, instead of taking the man to the lock-up, pacified him?

Mr. SPEAKER: I have already pointed out to the hon. member that he is not going to introduce fresh charges. He must deal with what he stated on the 27th August. He cannot introduce fresh charges under this motion.

Mr. HUGHES: The Deputy Premier roved all round the world.

Mr. SPEAKER: He did nothing of the sort. He answered charges made by the hon. member on the 27th August. The hon. member will stick to those charges.

Mr. HUGHES: If I am not to be allowed to follow the hon. gentleman, I have nothing further to say. I welcome an inquiry, but I want to see that the parties are placed on equal terms to frame their allegations and prove them. Let the hon. gentleman frame some of the allegations he made against me and see how far he will get. They have already been subject to judicial decision and always in my favour, but the hon. gentleman wants to go behind them. I did not prosecute H. W. Mann because he did not sit after he was appointed a member of the Lotteries Commission. The Lotteries Commission killed him at the poll, and if the white-haired boy of the Government had had to go to the poll, the Lotteries Commission would have killed him also. He, however, has not had to go to the poll since he was appointed to the Lotteries Commission. It is fortunate for Mr. Clydesdale that he has not had to face the electors. Had he been required to do so, he would have suffered the same fate as befel Mr. Mann. The offence was sitting and voting in Parliament after being elected to the Lotteries Commission. Mr. Mann did not have an opportunity to sit. Yet the hon. gentleman, knowing the dates on which the appointments were made, asked why I did not prosecute Mann. He did not tell the House that, before those two members were appointed to the Com-

mission and when their appointment was only being talked of, I met Mr. Mann in the street and told him he would be very foolish to accept appointment on the Lotteries Commission because, if he and his colleague did so, they would lose their seats under the Constitution and render themselves liable to a penalty.

Mr. Hegney: Did not the member for Nedlands advise them on the legal position?

Mr. HUGHES: I do not know what the hon. member told them.

Mr. Hegney: He told the House.

Mr. HUGHES: The point is that I told Mr. Mann, and he can be put into the witness box to verify my statement.

Mr. Raphael: That would not make it true.

Mr. HUGHES: My interpretation of the law happened to be true. Because the Government were not prepared to allow the judge to adjudicate, they stepped in and interfered with the jurisdiction and tried to alter the law. My opinion was much sounder than that of the member for Victoria Park. I have no doubt that, if Mr. Mann were put on his oath, he would say that I warned him beforehand. I suppose he was justified in acting as he did, if he obtained advice from the member for Nedlands on the questions of law, for the member for Nedlands is an eminent lawyer who stands high at the Bar. As a matter of fact, I had some difficulty in beating him in my first case. I have no doubt that, if I am allowed a full investigation into the licensing business, as to how and why licenses are allotted, it will be of some service to the State. If the hon. gentleman wants to curtail and hamstring the inquiry by himself fixing the terms of reference, of course we shall get nowhere, because the essential information will be excluded. If I am not allowed to put my references in, it will be a very lopsided inquiry indeed, and will not convince anybody but the hon. gentleman who wants to be convinced.

Question put and passed.

House adjourned at 9.13 p.m.

Legislative Council.

Thursday, 10th September, 1936.

				PAGE
Question: Repurchased estates				525
Address-in-reply, eighth day	525

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

QUESTION—REPURCHASED ESTATES.

Hon. W. J. MANN asked the Chief Secretary: 1. How many repurchased estates have been re-valued during the past two years? 2. What is the total amount of reduction made (a) in capital, (b) in interest? 3. In what districts have these re-valuations and reductions been made? 4. When will the remaining repurchased estates be re-valued?

The CHIEF SECRETARY replied: 1. Fourteen. 2. Capital, £94,394; interest, £120,719. 3. Victoria, Avon and Swan. 4. Six more estates will be re-valued in the near future. It is not intended to re-value estates where the blocks should have already been freehold, or where, from the knowledge already available in the department, it is obvious that the estates are not over-valued.

ADDRESS-IN-REPLY.

Eighth Day.

Debate resumed from the previous day.

HON. C. G. ELLIOTT (North-East) [4.30]: In speaking to the Address-in-reply I propose to concern myself chiefly with the goldmining industry. It is very satisfactory to know that the industry is making a steady annual increase in gold production, the relative figures for the past seven months, compared with the same period in 1934 and 1935, being—

1st January to 31st July, 1934—	372,288 ounces.
1st January to 31st July, 1935—	318,349 ounces.
1st January to 31st July, 1936—	458,524 ounces.

Taking into consideration the fact that the large producing mines are steadily increasing their ore reserves notwithstanding the large tonnage treated monthly, and that several properties are responding satisfactorily to