

14th July, 1926, which was read by the Clerk of the Council, as follows:—

PROCLAMATION

WESTERN AUSTRALIA, } By His Excellency Colonel Sir
TO WIT. } William Robert Campion, Knight
W. R. CAMPION, } Commander of the Most Dis-
Governor. } tinguished Order of St. Michael
[L.S.] } and St. George, D.S.O., Governor
in and over the State of Western
Australia and its Dependencies
in the Commonwealth of Aus-
tralia.

WHEREAS under the provisions of "The Constitution Act, 1889," it is made lawful for the Governor of Western Australia to fix the time and place for the holding of the first and every other session of the Legislative Council and Legislative Assembly: Now therefore I, the said Governor, in exercise of the said power so vested in me, and of all other powers enabling me in this behalf, do by this my Proclamation announce and proclaim that the Third Session of the Twelfth Parliament of Western Australia shall be holden for the despatch of business on Thursday, the 29th day of July, 1926, at the hour of 3 o'clock in the afternoon, at the House of Parliament in the City of Perth; and Members of the Legislative Council and Members of the Legislative Assembly are hereby required to give their attendance at the said time and place accordingly.

Given under my hand and the Public Seal of the said State, at Perth, this 14th day of July, 1926.

By His Excellency's Command,

P. COLLIER,
Premier.

GOD SAVE THE KING!!!

Parliament was opened by means of that proclamation. I say it without disrespect to His Excellency, but he had no right to say that he declared the Parliamentary session open. I do not know who put into his mouth the words of which I complain. I have been in the House for a great many years and certainly this is an innovation. On the 26th July, 1923, in opening the session the Governor said: "I now leave you to your labours trusting that by the aid of divine Providence" and so on. He says nothing about declaring the session open there. I say the Proclamation opens Parliament, and that it would not matter if the Governor did not come along till the next day. His mission here is to tell us the intentions of the Government for the ensuing session. He does not come here to open Parliament. Parliament is opened by the Proclamation. Therefore it was quite wrong to prevent us the other day from swearing in our new members before Parliament actually sat. I thank you all for the kind hearing you have given me, and I hope our de-

liberations this year will be characterised by the same success as has marked them in the past. I have pleasure in supporting the motion.

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

House adjourned at 8.32 p.m.

Legislative Assembly,

Wednesday, 18th August, 1926.

	PAGE
Questions: Police, Assault cases	340
Fremantle railway bridge	341
Inspection of Scaffolding Act, prosecutions ...	341
Wooroloo Sanatorium	341
North-West and Federal Government's proposals	341
Licensing Bench, appointment	341
Address-in-reply, Eighth day	342

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

QUESTION—POLICE, ASSAULT CASES.

Mr. MILLINGTON asked the Minister for Justice: 1, Has his attention been called to the recent assault on a little girl at West Leederville? 2, In view of the prevalence of such offences will he instruct the police to show greater vigilance for the prevention and detection of such offences, and to proceed against offenders of this kind, who are caught, to the utmost limit the law allows?

The MINISTER FOR JUSTICE replied: 1, Yes. 2, Every endeavour is made to prevent such offences and the utmost vigilance possible is exercised, but extreme difficulty is experienced in securing sufficient evidence to justify the arrest of offenders, owing to the children offended against being of tender age and unable to give a description of or identify the criminal. Additional patrol will be provided. Wherever sufficient evidence is available the police prosecute with the utmost rigour of the law.

QUESTION—FREMANTLE RAILWAY BRIDGE.

Mr. SLEEMAN asked the Minister for Railways: 1, Is he aware that only one shift is being worked on the Fremantle railway bridge? 2, Is there any reason why three shifts cannot be worked? 3, If not, will he see that three shifts are immediately put on so as to ensure railway communication with Fremantle as soon as possible?

The MINISTER FOR RAILWAYS replied: 1, Yes. 2, Yes, there have been only sufficient piles on hand to occupy one shift; owing to the boggy condition of the bush tracks supply of balance of piles ordered has been delayed. 3, As soon as the necessary material arrives at North Fremantle an additional shift will be put on. However, arrangements have now been made to work from daylight to dark on Mondays to Fridays inclusive, and a full shift on Saturdays and Sundays. It is undesirable and dangerous to carry out pile driving at night time under the conditions at present existing at Fremantle bridge. When conditions improve and the working of three shifts is practicable this will immediately be done.

QUESTION—INSPECTION OF SCAFFOLDING ACT, PROSECUTIONS.

Hon. G. TAYLOR asked the Minister for Works: 1, How many prosecutions have been instituted in connection with the Inspection of Scaffolding Act during the period June, 1925-June, 1926? 2, Against whom has action been taken? 3, What is the total amount of fines inflicted? 4, Was action taken in each case on the recommendation of the Chief Inspector of Factories? 5, If not, on whose recommendation?

The MINISTER FOR WORKS replied: 1, Eighteen; four were finalised in July, 1926. 2, W. Todd, H. Bently, A. Banks, A. Hill, N. Miller, G. Schofield, Thomas & Harrison, Wunderlich Ltd., Wood & Son, T. Hall, H. E. Moore, R. Bunning, G. N. Ellis, T. Clare & Co., New & Adams (2), S. J. Dibden, W. Stokes. 3, £8. 4, No. 5, In each case on the recommendation of the inspector who made the inspection of the scaffolding.

QUESTION—WOOROLOO SANATORIUM.

Mr. LATHAM (for Mr. Sampson) asked the Honorary Minister (Hon. J. Cunningham): 1, Are the Government aware that

the motor conveyance used by patients between the Sanatorium and the Wooroloo railway station is nerve racking and quite unsuitable, and that patients generally complain about it? 2, Is it intended to provide a more suitable type of conveyance? 3, In view of the complaints made regarding unpleasantness and annoyance caused by horses wandering about the Wooroloo Sanatorium grounds, keeping patients awake, and tramping over the gardens of patients, has it been decided to erect necessary fencing and thereby stop this annoyance. If so, when will this be done?

The HONORARY MINISTER (Hon. J. Cunningham) replied: 1, No. It is a Ford ton truck which has had 2½ years' service, and is used for both passengers and goods. 2, A contract transport arrangement has been suggested and this is now being gone into. 3, Complaints were made some two years ago, but these have not been reiterated recently. Financial stringency has caused the matter to be deferred. 4, It will now be reconsidered.

QUESTION—NORTH-WEST AND THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT'S PROPOSALS.

Mr. LAMOND (without notice) asked the Premier: Is it the intention of the Government to set apart a sitting of the House for the purpose of enabling members to discuss the proposals of the Federal Government respecting the future control of the North and the North-West portion of the State?

The PREMIER replied: As members will have noticed, the proposal reached me only during the last day or so. An opportunity will be provided for members to discuss the whole question.

QUESTION—LICENSING BENCH, APPOINTMENT.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL (without notice) asked the Premier: Has Mr. A. S. McClintock been appointed a member of the Licensing Bench and what are the terms and salary of the position?

The PREMIER replied: Mr. McClintock has been appointed for three years, the usual term, at a salary of £750 a year, the same as that received by other members of

the Licensing Bench, apart from the chairman, who receives £900 a year. The whole bench has been appointed for three years.

ADDRESS-IN-REPLY.

Eighth Day.

Debate resumed from the previous day.

MR. LAMOND (Pilbara) [4.40]: I do not intend to detain the House at any length. It is not my custom to make long speeches. There is no great virtue in making a long speech. Far too much of the time of the House is taken up in listening to long and very often tiring addresses. Perhaps it would be a good idea if the Standing Orders were amended to prohibit the reading of long and tiresome articles from the newspapers. If these articles are important I take it that every member has read them in his own home, and it is, therefore, only tiring to them to have them repeated.

Hon. G. Taylor: I am afraid you would do away with the Governor's Speech on those lines.

Mr. Marshall: That would be a terrible injury to the State.

Mr. Latham: If it was like the last one you would be right.

Mr. LAMOND: I congratulate the Government upon the sympathetic manner in which they have received requests at various times from my constituents, and the way in which they have dealt with them. Although they have not acceded to all the requests, most of them and those that are chiefly vital to the people of the district have received their sympathetic consideration. I say that even at the risk of incurring the displeasure of the member for West Perth (Mr. Davy). I wish particularly to thank the Minister for Works. We very much appreciated his visit of inspection to the North-West. We realise that, to the many important problems that will come before him, he will bring the knowledge he has acquired of the North, and will be better fitted to give his decision. I congratulate him further upon his selection of members of the Main Roads Board. We in the North are particularly pleased at the appointment of Mr. Tindale. That gentleman was for many years engineer for the North-West. He has an extensive knowledge of the conditions prevailing there, and we feel sure we shall be treated fairly and sympathetically

when the time comes to allocate the Federal road grant. I am pleased to have the Premier's assurance that a day will be set aside for a discussion upon the Federal proposals regarding the control of the North. This is a very important matter, and one that should receive the matured consideration of every member before the House decides whether to approve or otherwise of the proposals.

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: The Premier will have to spend a few weeks in getting all the information.

Mr. LAMOND: In view of this, my remarks will be reserved until the time comes for the debate. I believe that the development of the North-West is quite within reach of the State Government. It is not such an extraordinarily difficult problem as people would have us believe. Those who argue that the development of the North-West is beyond the powers of the State Government, usually have very little knowledge of that part of the State. If the development of the North-West is such a difficult problem, how is it that that part of the State has advanced to its present stage of development without any special Government assistance? Most of the successful men in the North-West, and particularly the pastoralists, are self-made men who landed here with the proverbial half-crown in their pockets.

The Premier: Yes, but years ago the cattle were not branded!

Mr. LAMOND: What the North-West has really suffered from is the fact that the wealth won in those parts has been spent in the development of other parts of the State; much of it, as one hon. member interjected, has gone to the Eastern States, and much to the Old Country. A fair proportion of the wealth won in the North-West and also in the goldfields areas has gone in the development of the southern portion of Western Australia, and more of it in the development of Perth.

Hon. G. Taylor: That applies to all outlying parts of the State.

Mr. LAMOND: That is so. Some of the valuable corner blocks in the city are owned by North-West pastoralists, who came here without money in years gone by. Those men, without any particular Government assistance, were able to develop their holdings. If hon. members look around Nedlands and Mt. Lawley they will see some beautiful homes built and occupied by holders of pastoral leases in the North-West. We are told that those pastoralists who con-

trol huge areas are hard up, and that it is impossible to develop their holdings without the expenditure of millions of pounds. On the other hand, in Monday's "West Australian" there appeared an interview with a North-West squatter who stated that his average clip this year would work out at about 8 lbs. per sheep. That will compare favourably with results in any other part of Australia.

Hon. G. Taylor: It took at least two to average that 40 years ago in the East.

Mr. LAMOND: Quite so. Hon. members should appreciate how quickly the North-West recovers from the effects of a drought. Less than two years ago at the end of the last drought, most of the stations had lost 50 per cent. of their stock. Yet to-day their herds are back to normal. One thing that has kept the North back is the fact that past Governments have always differentiated between the charges imposed for services in the North compared with imposts in the South. In my opinion an increase in the exemptions allowed on income tax derived from personal exertion would induce people to go North.

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: But you have been telling us how rich they are there.

Mr. Lamond: If that were done, it would be a set-off to the high cost of living in the North compared with the experience of those residing in the South. We are told that we cannot differentiate between the different parts of the State, and that the law must apply equally to the South and to the North.

Mr. Marshall: It is just as logical to argue that the law applies equally to the rich and to the poor.

Mr. LAMOND: I desire to make a few suggestions to the Government that I believe will assist in the development of the North-West without pressing heavily upon the Treasury. I cannot conceive whence the information was gained, or how the conclusion was arrived at, that the security respecting the erection of workers' homes in the North-West is not equal to that applying in other parts of Western Australia. The North-West has received more attention from both the Federal and the State Governments during the past few years and that portion of the State must go ahead. Even if it does not go ahead, it cannot be less prosperous than it is to-day, and has been for some years past. To-day we have married men working in towns such as Port Hedland, but their wives and families reside

in the metropolitan area. The wages paid in the North are sent down to the city for the maintenance of those families. If the operations of the Workers' Homes Board were extended to cover the people in the North, and the same conditions applied there as in the South, it would be an inducement to married men to keep their wives and families in the North. Although we are told that adequate security is not available in the North-West, I cannot appreciate what the additional risk can be. I have resided in that locality for 21 years and have not been out of the district for a full year since 1905. In all that time not one house has been blown down by a willy-willy, nor has one been lost through fire. That record will compare more than favourably with our experience in the metropolitan area. As a matter of fact, there is no greater risk in the North-West than there is in any other part of the State. It has been argued that some parts are mining centres, and that it is only a matter of time when the mines will be worked out and then workers' homes there will not be occupied. That argument cannot apply to Port Hedland, which has been maintained for many years past by the pastoral industry. No one would argue that that industry has not come to stay. We can look to it to extend rather than to diminish. In my opinion, the mining industry in the North-West will prosper. Much activity is being displayed by companies from the Eastern States, and recently huge areas have been taken up. I hope the Government will extend every assistance possible to the syndicates concerned, for the activities of the companies will revive mining in that part of the State. The battery charges furnish another instance to illustrate how residents of the North-West have to pay higher rates than operate in the South. It may be said truly that recently the cyanide charges were reduced.

The Minister for Mines: That means that the battery charges have been reduced.

Mr. LAMOND: That is so in some instances. I refer particularly to the Marble Bar district where the prospectors are not affected by the reduction because the gold that goes over the sands is not recovered.

Hon. G. Taylor: So, that they cannot get any advantage from the reduction?

Mr. LAMOND: That is the position. I wish the Minister could see his way clear to put our mining operations on the same footing as are those in other parts of the State. I would like to see him impose a uniform charge of 10s. per ton. If that charge were

levied, a considerably larger tonnage of ore would be milled in the Marble Bar district.

Hon. G. Taylor: What are you paying now?

Mr. LAMOND: The charge is 12s. per ton. While a reduction of 2s. per ton may not appear to be much, it would afford considerable relief to the prospectors in the district I refer to. People in the North-West are also hit hard by the railway charges. Those imposed over the Marble Bar-Port Hedland line are exceptionally high and I know of no other railway charges that approach them in any other part of the Commonwealth. The effect of these charges on the haulage of ore, for instance, is a matter that will seriously affect the future development of base metal mining in the North-West. There is a rate applying to ore under the value of £30 per ton. This would affect our lead ore, the value of which rarely exceeds that figure. Lead ore under a value of £30 per ton is railed in other parts of the State over a distance of 114 miles—I take that particular distance in order to compare the charges with those applying over the railway from Marble Bar to Port Hedland which is a distance of 114 miles—at a cost of 11s. 2d. per ton. To rail the same quantity of ore from Marble Bar to Port Hedland would cost 38s. per ton. So there is a difference of 26s. 10d., which might mean all the difference between the developing of a show and its being hung up for all time. I do not know why there should be this discrepancy. Tin ore is carried at 4d. per ton per mile for a 5-ton parcel. But tin is very scarce up there now, and the prospectors are not at all likely to have it in 5-ton lots; their parcels are more frequently in 5-cwt. lots, and the rate for less than 5 tons is 8d. per ton per mile. This discrepancy gives a big advantage to those in a position to claim the lower rate. Again, there is a big margin in the freight on wool on the Port Hedland line, as against the rates in other parts of the State. To send a 5-ton truck of wool from Marble Bar to Port Hedland costs £28 10s. as against £13 16s. 3d. over a similar distance in other parts of the State.

Mr. Lindsay: Not much wool travels on the railway up there.

Mr. LAMOND: It all goes by train. The railway depends on wool for a considerable proportion of its revenue. Then there is the freight on rams. I notice that the Government, very properly, are assisting the small cattle growers of Kimberley. But it is quite necessary that rams should be brought into

the country by those engaged in the sheep industry, and it is high time the railway freight on such stock was reduced. To rail a truck load of rams from Hedland to Marble Bar costs £8 4s., as against £4 2s. for the same distance in other parts of the State while for half-truckloads the respective figures are £5 9s. 4d. and £2 14s. 8d. I hope the Minister for Railways will review these rates and see if he cannot afford to give some relief. Very few men in the North breed their own rams. Therefore it is necessary to import them from the Eastern States or at least bring them up from the South-West. In either case it means shipping them from Fremantle to Port Hedland. Not infrequently does it happen that a boat will come into Port Hedland the day the train is leaving for Marble Bar. Since we have but a weekly train service, it means that the rams on the boat are hung up in Port Hedland for a week awaiting the next train. The same thing applies to perishable goods sent up from the South for Marble Bar. The ship will arrive at Port Hedland, perhaps the day after the train has left for the Bar. Perishable goods are then placed in the goods shed at Hedland, and by the time they can be sent on by train they are not worth sending any farther. I have suggested to the Commissioner of Railways that, instead of running the train to a weekly time-table, it should run from Port Hedland to fit in with the State Steamship Service.

Hon. G. Taylor: How often do the State steamers visit Port Hedland?

Mr. LAMOND: Once a month. I put up that proposition to the Marble Bar Road Board, and they agreed that it would be a great improvement. Actually, a fortnightly time-table would serve admirably for mail and non-perishable goods, and even if we have only 12 direct trains to the head of the line it would be very much better than it is to-day and, so long as the trains fitted in with the boats, would serve as an inducement for the people of Marble Bar to order their supplies by a State steamer. It could be arranged that the train would run to a fortnightly time table, and in the alternate week run to meet the boat, so that there would still be 52 services per year.

Hon. G. Taylor: That should not interfere much with the people at the head of the line.

Mr. LAMOND: The local people were very pleased with my proposition, but the Commissioner of Railways turned it down on the score that it would involve extra expenses.

diture in the working of the line. I cannot see that it would make any difference whatever to the working expenses; indeed it seemed to me nothing more than an excuse for turning down my proposition.

Mr. Marshall: The train should be compelled to wait for the boat.

Mr. LAMOND: Sometimes it is, but one can never be sure. If it were known for certain that the train would wait for the boat, people would order their livestock by the State steamer, and the day after the stock reached Hedland it would be landed at Marble Bar.

Hon. G. Taylor: The holding up of the train would not entail any difficulty?

Mr. LAMOND: None whatever, nor would it affect the running expenses. I hope the Minister for Railways will go into that matter with a view to acceding to the request of the people up there. When the Minister for Works was visiting the North, my attention was drawn to the acute position arising from the shortage of petrol. In several places we found that wool carting had to be suspended for that reason. It is no fault of the State Government. The position has been brought about by the regulations under the Navigation Act, providing that only a limited quantity of petrol shall be carried in coastal passenger ships. As it happens, all the ships trading on the North-West coast are passenger ships, and so the supplies of petrol are strictly curtailed. Consumers up North have told me that if they send down an order for 50 cases, they may or may not get as many as 20, the restricted shipment carried on each boat being allocated with a view to giving everybody a little to go on with. Station people are complaining bitterly of the position. It occurs to me that arrangements might be made for the "Kangaroo" to call once every six months at all the North-West ports and leave supplies of petrol on her way down from Java. In Port Hedland there is a big storeroom attached to the Customs House, where a large quantity of petrol could be stored. If such a plan were put into effect, it would be of great assistance to the development of the North-West. I want to express my appreciation of the great work being carried on in the North by the A.I.M. nursing homes. Before one of those hospitals was established at Port Hedland, it was necessary for maternity cases to come down to Perth. It meant very great expense. Married men in the North have told me that in those days

it cost £150 to bring a child into this world. That, of course, was seriously interfering with the populating of the North, in that married people would not go up there. They realised how heavy was such expenditure, which was unavoidable from time to time. The Port Hedland hospital is doing a splendid work. Recently we have handed to the A.I.M. the Government hospital at Marble Bar. The Government found it difficult to keep nurses up there.

Hon. G. Taylor: Why, did they get married?

Mr. LAMOND: Some married; others would not stay there.

Hon. G. Taylor: I thought York was the only place where they all got married.

Mr. LAMOND: The Port Hedland hospital is receiving a Government subsidy of £75 per annum. At the hospital indigent patients are treated as at a Government hospital. Never are patients turned away on account of their inability to pay. People who go to the North for employment often find that the climatic change affects their health temporarily, and they have to seek treatment in the hospital. Such people are not in a position to pay for treatment. The committee find it very difficult to meet the liabilities, and this year there is a deficit of £170 or £180. I appeal to the Premier to increase the subsidy to that hospital. The demands on the hospital have increased to such an extent that the building is inadequate. It was originally intended as a maternity ward, but it has long since passed that stage and all sorts of cases are treated there. The Government might well provide a maternity ward, which would not cost much, and also increase the subsidy. I appreciate the fine work being done for the North-West by Airways Limited. When accidents occur in portions of the North far removed from a medical officer, an aeroplane can be secured and patients can be conveyed to hospital within a few hours. The Government should provide more landings for the aeroplanes so that, when there is an emergency call from an isolated part, a convenient and safe landing may be available. I understand the Minister has approved of a small amount to provide a landing at Marble Bar. Another landing ground is required at Nullagine, the residents of which are situated in a worse position than are those at Marble Bar. The Marble Bar people are at the head of the railway and can telephone

for a motor trolley to convey a patient to the nearest doctor, but Nullagine is 200 miles distant from the nearest medical officer and it has no landing ground for aeroplanes. Bamboo Creek, a big mining centre, and Warrawagine station also require landing grounds.

Hon. G. Taylor: Would a landing ground cost much?

Mr. LAMOND: About £50. I think the station owners would co-operate with the Government and the work could be done cheaply.

The Minister for Works: Nearly all the stations have landing grounds.

Mr. LAMOND: Only those along the aerial route as far as the De Grey station. The stations inland have no landing grounds. I must not resume my seat without referring to the Port Hedland water supply, which has become a hardy annual. I am pleased with the work the Government are doing to provide a water supply. An hon. member in another place last night spoke of the Government having failed to fulfil their pre-election promises to the North-West. I am in the happy position of being able to say that I made no promises, other than that I would advocate the construction of certain works. The hon. member in question said that we had been engaged in criticising the Mitchell Government. No member in this House or in another place criticised that Government more than he did. He could not say anything bad enough for the Mitchell Government. In reply to his statement let me say that no previous Government have done half as much for the North as have the present Labour Government, and the people of the North admit it and appreciate it. One of the oldest residents of Port Hedland, a member of the road board who is not too much in my corner, was good enough to say that the present Government had done so much for Port Hedland that he was ashamed to ask for anything more. He had no requests to make to the Minister.

Mr. Chesson: He must be a modest sort of chap.

Mr. LAMOND: Still he had taken it for granted that an amount would be included in next year's Estimates to provide a water supply. During the last election campaign supporters of the then Government urged me strongly to wire to Perth asking what the Labour Party, if returned to power, would be prepared to do in the way of pro-

viding a water supply for Port Hedland. I declined to forward such a wire because, as I told them, I belonged to a party that did not offer bribes of that description. The people of Hedland were notified that an important wire had been received from the then Government and were summoned to a meeting to hear what it contained. The wire stated that if the supporter of that government was returned a sum of £300 would be expended in prospecting for a water supply.

Mr. Latham: I do not think that ever came from the then Premier.

Mr. Marshall: So you know now why their candidate was defeated.

Mr. LAMOND: The Labour Government, without making any pre-election promise, have spent £900 to give Port Hedland a water supply.

Hon. G. Taylor: They went three times better.

Mr. LAMOND: The gratitude of the people in the North-West generally for what the present Government have done for them, will, I think, be reflected at the next general elections and the Labour party will be returned stronger than they are at present. Let me once more congratulate the Government on having shown such promptness in ordering an up to date motor ship for the North-West coast. That is something northern residents have been requesting for many years. I hope that before the new year the boat will be operating on the North-West coast.

MR. HUGHES (East Perth) [5.31]: A particularly bright spot in the work of the Government, and in fact one of the best things ever done by any Western Australian Government, is the removal of a number of men from the gold mining industry, because of their being affected with miners' complaint. I do not share the hope that mining will develop in this country. I said before, and I say now, that I hope the day will come when there will be no gold mining in Western Australia or in any other part of Australia. The history of the industry shows that it is essentially a wasting asset; it lasts for a time, and then the mines work out. If the intrinsic value of the gold won were a hundred times as great as it actually is, that would not compensate for the suffering and the loss of human life entailed by the industry. Though not representing a gold mining constituency, I know something

about the industry; and I would sooner that relatives of mine should work simply for tucker than that they should work underground in a mine for £20 a week. The miner takes his life in his hands every time he goes below, and I can say from my own experience that his womenfolk live in constant dread. The women tremble to open the door when a knock comes at night for fear lest it should be the fatal message that someone dear to them has been killed or injured.

Hon. G. Taylor: I think you are drawing the long bow.

Mr. Heron: No. There have been four fatalities this week.

Hon. G. Taylor: But there are not very many accidents.

Mr. HUGHES: The records of the industry in Western Australia show a considerable number of accidents. There is no need for me to tell the member for Mt. Margaret (Hon. G. Taylor) that in Kalgoorlie to-day there are young men—I may say that some of them went to school with me—dying of miners' complaint.

Hon. G. Taylor: Unfortunately that is true.

Mr. HUGHES: One meets in Kalgoorlie quite young men who say that they have only six or twelve months to live owing to miners' complaint. No industry is worth having that takes such a toll of the State's population. I would not put a shilling of Government money into mining. I have had prepared a return showing the amount of public money that has gone to assist mining in this State during the last 20 years. The total is £613,752. That includes all descriptions of mining: it does not refer to gold mining alone.

Hon. G. Taylor: To what years does that apply?

Mr. HUGHES: To the 20 years from 1906 to 1926. The annual expenditure has been increasing. Most of the total has been spent during recent years. In 1906 and the years immediately succeeding, very little Government money went into mining. However, if that amount of £600,000 odd had been invested in agriculture or secondary industries, it would have provided the State with a lasting asset. True, there is always the possibility of discovering another Golden Mile; but I would not be prepared to risk a single shilling of public funds on such a possibility. Although not a mining member, I received from the Kalgoorlie Chamber of

Mines a copy of a certain pamphlet. I do not know why the chamber sent that pamphlet to city members. To me it seems a most impertinent pamphlet. It speaks about "criminals on the Golden Mile." Surely the Kalgoorlie Chamber of Mines are the last people in the world who should hold up their hands in horror on that score, since by their neglect and refusal to take ordinary precautions hundreds and hundreds of men have been sent to untimely graves. That is the result of the refusal of the mining companies to spend a mere fraction of their excess profits on precautionary measures. And yet the Chamber of Mines have the impertinence to issue and circulate such a pamphlet. Let me instance the Boulder Perseverance mine, which has a capital of 2,000,000 shares paid up to 1s., and which has paid in dividends to date a total of just on £1,500,000, equal to 15 times the capital. The mine has paid 50 per cent. on the investment over a period of 30 years. Yet the company were not prepared at any time to disgorge even a part of their excess profits for the purpose of preserving the lives of the men engaged in the gold-mining industry. If it is evil to kill men, surely it is evil to fail to save life owing to excessive greed and the lack of even an atom of decent humanity. The Chamber of Mines certainly should be the last people to throw the first stone.

Hon. G. Taylor: What pamphlet are you referring to?

Mr. HUGHES: A small pamphlet circulated recently. I got a copy, and I suppose the hon. member interjecting received one. I am told the matter in it was reprinted from the "Kalgoorlie Miner." The money that goes into mining would produce much better results if spent on settling people on the land, and in making additional areas available. There is land hunger in Western Australia to-day, and dozens of people anxious to engage in agriculture are not able to obtain land. Now I wish to offer some remarks on the criticisms of certain members relative to what they call compulsory unionism.

Mr. Sampson: Compulsory unionism in order to secure employment.

Mr. HUGHES: Yes. We hear a great deal about men being compelled to become members of unions. However, that is something which the Labour movement learnt from its opponents.

Hon. G. Taylor: I do not think so. At any rate, we learnt it very early.

Mr. HUGHES: I happen to be connected with an institution that is entirely apart

from the Labour movement, and which offers a pretty good example of compulsory unionism. I refer to the Institute of Accountants. A member of that institute not only has to pay subscriptions, but is liable to have his diploma taken from him—a diploma which he gained by passing examinations and for which he paid when he received it. It is the credential by virtue of which he earns his living. Yet the institute can take it from him. I doubt if anywhere else there exists so severe a form of compulsory unionism. We have heard about limiting the number of apprentices. I know of a recent case in which a father had to pay £300 before his son was permitted to enter a profession. Moreover, the boy has to work five years for nothing.

Mr. Thomson: Do you think that is fair?

Mr. HUGHES: The hon. member thought so.

Mr. Thomson: No, never. You cannot prove that.

Mr. HUGHES: The case I mentioned has reference to the legal profession. The boy's father has to pay a premium of £300, and the boy has to work five years for nothing. Members opposite have waxed indignant about restriction of apprenticeship.

Mr. Sampson: And justly so.

Mr. HUGHES: I have never heard them make any vigorous complaint about the restrictions on boys desirous of entering the professions.

Mr. Thomson: As to that, I suggest you read the evidence given before the select committee on the Factories Bill.

Mr. HUGHES: Nevertheless, I have never heard any vigorous protests in this House from hon. members opposite.

Hon. G. Taylor: The sons of the people whom you represent here never enter the professions.

Mr. Sampson: There is a shortage of tradesmen, but not so far as I know of professional men.

Mr. HUGHES: There is a shortage of professional men. If the hon. member will look at the figures relating to income tax, he will see that there could be a marked increase in the numbers employed in the professions and that then there would still be sufficient work to provide much more than the basic wage for those engaged in the professions.

Mr. Latham: But do you think everyone could render the same services as some of those professional gentlemen?

Mr. HUGHES: Does the hon. member interjecting think that every boy put to a trade can render the same service?

Mr. Latham: I do not.

Mr. HUGHES: Well, that is my answer to the hon. member. From the opposite side of this House there have been complaints as to limitation of the number of apprentices. That, however, is something which the trades learnt from the professions. Besides limiting their numbers, professional men require substantial premiums from pupils; and I have never heard any serious complaint on that score from members opposite. Where there is limitation of apprentices, there are more tradesmen than the demands of the trade require.

Mr. Sampson: Do you remember when certain dentists were not allowed to practice here?

Mr. HUGHES: Why did not the hon. member remedy that?

Mr. Sampson: I endeavoured to do so. I wanted your assistance in that year.

Mr. HUGHES: I know of a family in East Perth who have had to send their boys to the Eastern States because of the action of the member for Swan (Mr. Sampson) when in office. The hon. member had his printing done at the Fremantle prison; and one result was, as I have stated, that a family in East Perth had to send their sons East.

Mr. Sampson: That is all nonsense, and it is untrue.

Mr. HUGHES: Boys had to go to the Eastern States to find work because the hon. member had printing done at the prison.

Mr. Sampson: That is unadulterated nonsense.

Mr. HUGHES: It has been the subject of controversy every year and these boys have had to go to the East because they could not find work here.

Mr. Sampson: You should give facts. There is more work in the printing trade to-day than there are men to do it.

Mr. Sleeman: There are printers walking the streets to-day.

Mr. Sampson: Give the names, or withdraw your statement.

Mr. HUGHES: The hon. member will not deny that there was a long controversy about the matter.

Mr. Sampson: I do not know anything about it.

Mr. HUGHES: The hon. member will not deny that while he was Colonial Secretary

there was a great deal of controversy about printing being done at the prison.

Mr. Sampson: You are shifting your ground now.

Mr. HUGHES: I know of two boys who had to go to the East because they were not able to get any work in the printing trade.

Mr. Sampson: I do not believe it; you are making statements that you are not prepared to support.

Mr. HUGHES: The hon. member knows that what I am stating is true.

Hon. G. Taylor: Do not bother about sticking too closely to facts when you are making a speech.

Mr. HUGHES: I do not wish to follow my friend's example. We do not hear any complaints about restrictions on professions; it is only in the case of trades that we get restrictions, and there never has been a shortage of tradesmen. My experience is that there are always tradesmen looking for work. I can remember the time when 80 per cent. of the building tradesmen were unemployed in Perth, and even now I am coming into daily contact with tradesmen looking for work. If the hon. member knows where there is work in the printing trade, I can find him a couple of men to-morrow.

Mr. Sleeman: And I can find him four or five at Fremantle.

Mr. Sampson: There is plenty of work.

Mr. HUGHES: I do not know where it is, and apparently they do not. There never has been any shortage of tradesmen in Western Australia. Unemployment is as bad this year as it was last year and the year before. Apparently the problem is beyond the scope of any Government in this State to handle by reason of the seasonal occupations. Of necessity there must be a reserve of labour and there comes a period in each year when work cannot be found for a number of people. There thus comes an accumulation of unemployed in the city. We cannot blame the men coming into the city, because there they consider they are in sight of the Government, and that pressure can be brought to bear in the hope of stimulating work. It does seem a remarkable thing that we are going 16,000 miles to bring people to this country, while at the same time we cannot find work for all those that are here. There must be a couple of thousand men who lack permanent employment in this State and yet we are spending money to bring migrants out from home. These migrants, too, in many cases displace our own workers. The position

with regard to our own boys is becoming serious. It is practically impossible to find work for boys between the ages of 16 and 21. If I went round my electorate I could collect in one afternoon between 50 and 60 lads who have no occupation and apparently no prospect of getting work to do. No provision is made for the rising generation.

Mr. Sampson: But every provision is made to prevent them being occupied.

Mr. HUGHES: If a boy has nothing to do, he meanders around until he develops a tendency to avoid work when he reaches man's estate. Amongst the importations from the Old Country there must be a percentage of misfits, no matter how careful the selection may be at the other end. The policy of settling people on the land is apparently the only one that can be instituted in Western Australia. There is not much likelihood, irrespective of what Government is in power, to bring about the socialisation of industry which would be the only remedy for the unemployment problem. No other remedy is possible. So long as we have the capitalistic system there will be trade cycles and there will be periods of boom and periods of depression, and with the depression there will always be unemployed.

Mr. Latham: And you think that the socialisation of industry will prevent that?

Mr. HUGHES: I do. The capitalistic method of organising industry has not prevented that. We have had a few hundred years of the competitive system, and instead of preventing it, it has aggravated the position and we find now that in Great Britain it has reached a climax.

Mr. Latham: Do not you think that the cause of the climax there is the aftermath of the war?

Mr. HUGHES: Was there not a large number of unemployed in European countries before the war? Most of the countries have arisen out of the competitive capitalistic system.

Hon. G. Taylor: There is no other system.

Mr. HUGHES: If that is so, it is sufficient condemnation of it. Whilst we have that system there will be periods of unemployment. In Western Australia something in the nature of the socialisation of industry could be done. With its vast tracts of land, the State could be developed on a plan of socialisation. We could then handle our unemployed.

Mr. Latham: I would not like to be overseer for you.

Mr. HUGHES: And I should not like to work on a job where the hon. member was overseer.

Mr. Latham: You would make no profit out of your farming operations.

Mr. HUGHES: The present system prevents our boys from making a living. Of course, if members opposite consider that because a few are acquiring means, success will follow everywhere, then that is all right.

Mr. Latham: Do you not think a great deal of trouble arises out of the unfair treatment meted out to employees of the Government in regard to wages and shorter hours?

Mr. HUGHES: I have not heard of any Government employees getting any great increase in wages. Most of the statistics I have seen show that the increases belong to pastoralists, professional men and also the business community.

Mr. Latham: What is the average earned by a professional man in Perth?

Mr. HUGHES: I think you will find that the average publican makes about £20 a week.

Mr. Latham: Is that a profession?

Mr. HUGHES: It is a commercial undertaking.

Mr. Latham: I was talking of professions.

Mr. HUGHES: In the medical, legal and dental professions you will find that the incomes are somewhere about £14 or £15 a week.

Hon. G. Taylor: The legal profession's fee has been 6s. 8d. so long as I can remember.

Mr. HUGHES: Probably in recent years they could have starved, had it rested with the hon. member. It is not the man on the basic wage who has been getting large increases of pay. If we take the statistics over a number of years, we find that men on the low scale of wages are badly off as compared with the increases received by others.

Mr. Latham: The average income of the artisan is £448, and of those engaged in professional services, it is £680.

Mr. HUGHES: How many artisans are there who do not pay taxation?

Mr. Latham: Those who dodge it.

Mr. HUGHES: They do not receive enough money to bring them within the scope of taxation.

The Minister for Railways: Or they have large families.

Mr. Sampson: There are briefless lawyers.

Mr. HUGHES: And there ought to be briefless printers. No doubt the unemployed problem is the most serious one at present facing the State. It cannot be handled under the existing system. As there is not likely to be any material alteration in that in the near future, it behoves us to see what can be done to solve the problem now.

Hon. G. Taylor: Wait until after March.

Mr. HUGHES: I am prepared to wager that by next June we shall have just as acute an unemployed problem, irrespective of the result of the election, as we have now. I am not satisfied with the conditions under which the policy of preference to unionists is carried out. In many cases it is not preference to unionists, but preference to 25s. If a man has 25s. he can buy a union ticket. He then receives the benefit of the principle as against the man who is not possessed of the 25s. He may be a blackleg from the Eastern States, or a man who has all his life been opposed to the principles of trade unionism. If he has 25s. he gets the privilege of employment at the Labour Bureau as soon as he takes out his ticket. I know of many men who have no union tickets, but who have always been sound trade unionists. They have to stand back simply because they have not the 25s., and other men take their places. There ought to be some method other than this under which employment could be made available.

Mr. Sleeman: A man does not need 25s. He can belong to some other union that is cheaper.

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: They do not get the preference.

Mr. HUGHES: The A.W.U. has no preference over any other union. If the hon. member would go to one of the pick-ups at the bureau, he would find that all those who belong to unions are given the preference.

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: Is there no agreement between the Minister and the A.W.U.?

Mr. HUGHES: If there is, it is not observed.

Hon. G. Taylor: It is alleged that there is one.

The Minister for Railways: Oh, no!

Mr. HUGHES: The A.W.U. have not preference at the bureau.

Mr. Sampson: The other union tickets are not effective.

The Minister for Railways: Where did you hear that?

Mr. Sampson: It has been stated.

The Premier: By an anonymous person in the Press. There is no truth in it.

Mr. Sampson: A baker told me that he had a union ticket, but could not get employment.

The Premier: It was an untrue, anonymous statement in the Press.

Mr. HUGHES: Members should be careful of the statements they make. I know of my own knowledge that the tickets rank equally. I have seen men called in at a pick-up. So long as they had union tickets, no matter what they were, they went in.

Mr. Sampson: You do not stand for that, do you?

Mr. HUGHES: I stand for trade unions. I am most vigorous concerning the rules of the Institute of Accountants, to which I belong at present, more so perhaps than with regard to any other union.

The Premier: If it were not for unionism, the whole principle of arbitration could not exist.

Mr. HUGHES: I think the member for Swan (Mr. Sampson) is a member of the union covering the industry in which he is an employer.

Mr. Sampson: Certainly.

Mr. HUGHES: I believe he is a prominent member.

Mr. Sampson: Why not?

Mr. HUGHES: He stands strongly for the principle of employers combining to safeguard their own interests.

Mr. Sampson: Why should a man be prevented from earning his living when he has a wife and family who are starving, and no private relief work is available?

The Minister for Works: I know of a case of a man whom certain master printers tried to drive out of the printing business.

Mr. Sampson: I do not know of that.

Mr. HUGHES: In another case a person has to be a member of a union in order that he may receive a certain education.

Hon. G. Taylor: You have to be a member of a union to become a teacher.

Mr. HUGHES: A student cannot attend the University unless he becomes a member of the Undergraduates' Association, the fee for which is one guinea.

Hon. G. Taylor: That ought to be stopped.

Mr. HUGHES: It is all right. The association is doing good work, but unless a student pays up his guinea to join the association, he cannot attend one lecture.

Mr. Mann: Why should not the University get the guinea?

Mr. HUGHES: The association is doing good work. If the University had the money, it would have to do the work.

Mr. Mann: The University is very short of funds.

Mr. HUGHES: So are some of the students.

Mr. Latham: It should not be short if the "West Australian" is sold.

Mr. HUGHES: In the case I mention it is compulsory for the students to join the organisation, although the University itself is free. I have never heard the member for Swan protest against this sort of thing.

Mr. Sampson: I do not support the procedure.

Mr. HUGHES: When everything is examined, we find that the policy of preference to unionists has been copied by trade unions from our political opponents.

Mr. Latham: Do not aggravate that position by keeping men out of a job who have no money with which to buy union tickets.

Mr. HUGHES: They are not being kept out.

Mr. Latham: They are.

Mr. HUGHES: That is nonsense.

Mr. Latham: They cannot join a union if they have not the money.

Mr. HUGHES: At the pick-ups all union tickets rank equally. I have seen a number of pick-ups at the bureau. Never have I seen preference given to one union over another. There appears to be something wrong with the method of picking up, after they have obtained their union ticket. I know of men who have gone to the bureau for a job and registered their names. They have been picked up in a day or two over the heads of men who had been registered for six or eight weeks.

Hon. G. Taylor: I have seen that myself.

Mr. Heron: That goes on everywhere.

Mr. HUGHES: That is wrong. Men should be picked up in their order of registration. If a man has been out of work for three months, he should be taken in the order in which he entered his name.

The Minister for Railways: That is the general policy.

Mr. HUGHES: It does not appear to be so. The Premier has laid it down definitely that it should be done, but in many instances it is not done. I have known of men who have been passed over. A ganger comes along for a number of labourers. He says to a man, "You are not suitable." He there-

fore has to stand down, and is not even given a trial. I know of old men who have been registered for 11 months at the bureau. I have been told by people that, although these are aged men, they are physically strong, and can do as much work as the average young man. It does not follow that the man of 50 is unfit for hard work. If he has been accustomed to hard work all his life, he can at 50 or 60 still hold his own with plenty of young men.

Hon. G. Taylor: That has always been the case.

Mr. HUGHES: In the profession I am following at present, the old men are inferior to the young men. In that case the young men out-distance the old ones.

Hon. G. Taylor: In their own opinion.

Mr. Sampson: It is a happy conceit.

Mr. HUGHES: The gangers often pass over the older men. I suggest to the Minister that they should be told to pick the men up in their order of registration, other things being equal. If a man is found to be unsuitable, he can be put off a job afterwards. He could be told that, in the opinion of the officers of the department, he is unfit for the job, and must stand down. The men would then know where they were. Gangers have certain men with whom they are accustomed to work, and naturally want to get them.

Hon. G. Taylor: They want the men who can do the most work.

Mr. HUGHES: A man should not be refused employment merely because he is a little old. He should be given a trial, and if he is then not capable, he could leave the job, and would understand why.

Sitting suspended from 6.15 to 7.30 p.m.

Mr. HUGHES: I trust I will be pardoned for digressing in order that I may deal with a more or less personal matter, for this will probably be the last opportunity I will have to explain certain actions I have been compelled to take, so that I may place the matter before my constituents and others throughout the State who may be interested. Owing to circumstances that have arisen, I feel that no longer can I take the responsibility of supporting certain members of the present Government. That is not a step one takes without due consideration and respecting which one needs a good deal of evidence before deciding upon action. The members sitting on the Government side of

the House represent a party holding strong political principles. Personally I am not satisfied to allow our leaders merely to enunciate principles and do them lip service, while at the same time their private lives are an absolute negation of our principles.

Mr. Latham: Hear, hear!

Mr. HUGHES: The matter respecting which I find it necessary to sever my connection with the Labour Party, goes to the very root of Labour principles. It relates to special privileges allowed to certain citizens possessed of wealth. In 1923 the present Minister for Works, as a private member, introduced a Bill to abolish special juries. The Bill was passed in this chamber, but was rejected by the Council. In 1924 the same Bill was again passed by this Chamber and again rejected by the Council. In 1925 the Bill was again introduced by the present Minister for Justice and once more was rejected by the Council. The Minister for Justice had my support on the two occasions and if again he were to introduce such a Bill, he would have my support, but when I find that the very man who introduced the Bill to abolish special juries is a party to an application to the court for a special jury, I claim that no longer can I support him in any shape or form.

Mr. Latham: He should resign now.

Mr. HUGHES: When I find that that man was so unmoral as to come to this Chamber and denounce special juries and subsequently is a party to an application made to the court in order to deny justice to one of his colleagues, the action goes to the root of our principles.

Mr. Stubbs: How did he deny you justice?

Mr. HUGHES: I regard it as such a violation of the principles of the Labour Party, that I can no longer support him as the Minister in charge of the judiciary of the State. The member for Wagin (Mr. Stubbs) asks how I was denied justice.

Mr. Stubbs: And that is a pertinent question.

Mr. HUGHES: Let me answer the hon. member in the words of the Minister for Justice, who is now a party to an application for a special jury. When he introduced the Bill last session the Minister said:

At any rate, I believe that the special jury system has long outlived its usefulness. . . The reason for special jurors having special qualifications, is said by some people—and it is correct, too—to be because they belong to a different social status to people in the ordinary walk of life. On that account it is thought by people liable to come before a

special jury that those jurors should have particular qualifications regarding wealth. . . Then, again, certain provisions are made regarding other occupations of special jurors. . . It will be seen that the endeavour was to keep off the special juries anyone who had dealings with the common people.

The Minister told us that the object was to keep off special juries those who came in touch with the common people. I am one of the common people.

Lieut.-Colonel Denton: A rag time affair!

Mr. HUGHES: The Minister informed us further—

The whole principle regarding special jurors involves the social status of people who are entitled to be selected. People in the particular grades or social strata I refer to will be biased. . . When an issue is placed before them, they deal with it on biased lines. It is an entirely undemocratic principle, and should not be tolerated any longer.

Then he went on to say—

The right to have a special jury is evidently regarded as of some intrinsic value or people would not be prepared to pay for the concession.

The Minister told us it was worth paying something to have a special jury, and now he has been a party to being prepared to pay for a special jury and to reap the advantage he has referred to. That in itself is a complete answer to the member for Wagin and indicates how I was denied justice. The Minister proceeded further—

I am saying that the provision regarding jurymen shall be irrespective of the social status or wealth of the jurymen. . . Merely because an individual possesses certain wealth and certain property he should not have privileges greater than those extended to others.

Hon. members will see that that goes to the very root of the principle that all are equal before the law. I refused to believe that the member for Leederville (Mr. Millington), the Honorary Minister (Hon. J. W. Hickey, M.L.C.), the Minister for Justice (Hon. J. C. Willcock), the managing director of the "Worker" (Mr. Watson), Mr. Haynes, and one other gentleman whose name has slipped my memory, would be parties to an application for a special jury, especially in view of the denunciation of special juries that I have read to hon. members. I refused to believe that they would be parties to such an application, no matter at what cost it might be to their skins. I did not think that they would save their skins at the expense of a vital principle of the Labour Party. Unfortunately, however, I found

that it was true. When I realised that that was the position, I felt I must dissociate myself from it. A good deal has been said about the matter concerning which I complain. I am not going to ask members to believe that I was grossly libelled. I will relate one or two facts in order that members may judge for themselves. When the document regarding which I complain was issued from the "Westralian Worker" office, naturally I thought it was merely a matter of bringing it under the notice of the responsible people and there would be an adequate retraction. I called upon the general manager, Mr. Watson, and showed him the pamphlet. I will do him that justice and admit that he was annoyed that it should have been published. He told me he would get a meeting of the directors together in 10 minutes, and in order to put the matter formally before him, he asked me to send him a communication in the usual form. I have been taxed with doing something outrageous in issuing proceedings against the "Westralian Worker," the official organ of the Labour Party, to which I have belonged. Those proceedings were started at the request of their own managing director in order that he might place the matter before his co-directors! I instructed my solicitor to send him the usual formal notification that is despatched in such cases, and in the concluding paragraph of the letter the following appeared:—

Kindly inform me what persons instructed your company to print the said pamphlet and also what person in your employ was responsible for the printing.

I wish to stress the paragraph I have read. It has been said that I unjustly sued the parties responsible for publishing the pamphlet and the printer. Whom else could I sue? No one else could be sued when a question of libel was involved. The printer and publisher of the pamphlet had the opportunity of notifying me who was responsible for directing them to publish the pamphlet, so that I could join them in the action. Instead of getting the decent retraction I anticipated, in two or three days' time I received a curt note from the solicitors for the company couched in these terms—

Your letter of the 9th instant herein has been handed to us to deal with. We are instructed to accept service of any process your client may deem fit to issue in this matter.

I went in no hostile manner to the managing director, but merely complied with his request and sent him the formal document he desired. Yet I received in reply the big stick attitude we have heard of before! I received an invitation to commence proceedings. I do not think that treatment was such as my services to the Labour movement warranted. When we received the invitation to proceed, I wrote the following letter to the managing director under date the 12th June—

Dear Mr. Watson,—With reference to my conversation with you concerning the pamphlet printed by your company in which certain libellous statements concerning myself appear, I can only express my disappointment and disgust at your persistent refusal to make any effort to repair the injury done to my character. At the outset I called on you in this matter and expected some expressions of regret and some endeavour on your part to do something towards atonement. You requested me to have a formal letter forwarded you for the purpose of placing the matter before your board of directors. I therefore instructed Mr. R. D. Lane to forward you a letter accordingly. You have not answered that letter or shown any desire either on your own part or the part of your directors to meet me. I understand Mr. R. D. Lane also spoke to you and made an appointment but in place of keeping that appointment or making any suggestion for an amicable settlement between us, your solicitor, on your behalf, sent a curt note offering to accept service of any process issued. Do you think that in the face of your pernicious use of your printing machine to injure me, your action is fair and proper towards one who has never spared his health, energy or ability in defence of Labour's rights and principles both inside and outside of Parliament? Do you think you should have a free license to injure and libel me with impunity? Of course your friends may retain their salaried positions if you permit them to make any use they wish of the facilities at your disposal. You have previously libelled me in the pages of your paper the "Westralian Worker" and your editor at times has refused or neglected to publish my replies. Well, your disregard or your malice, whichever it might be, must be checked and in the face of your refusal to negotiate, I am obliged to take legal action to vindicate my character.

Following on that, the only course open for me was to issue a writ. I desire to leave the subject for the moment in order to answer statements that have been made by my honourable friends. There was one particular statement: I regard it as mild. There is one thing about the pamphlet—it is eminently fair. Everyone whose name is mentioned therein is scandalously libelled.

The other people concerned are in the Eastern States and I presume they do not know that the pamphlet is in existence. One statement in particular I intend to reply to. It is this—

Hughes may have a ton of ability, but I have what he lacks, that is, sincerity towards the worker.

It might be said that this pamphlet, although published by the "Worker," is not their work. It was published by them, and when it was brought under their notice, instead of their doing the honourable thing, they said, "All right, we will accept service of any process." In reply to the Minister for Railways, who fathers the suggestion that I am lacking in sincerity towards the workers, I say he is the last man in the world who ought to cast a stone on the score of lack of sincerity. If we turn to "Hansard" of the 19th September, 1923, we find this motion tabled in the name of the member for Geraldton (Hon. J. C. Willcock)—

That in the opinion of the House the long service leave conditions applying to the salaried staff of Government employees should also apply to the wages staff.

In the course of his speech the hon. member said this—

Prior to the last general election, Parliamentary candidates were circularised by the Railway Union on this point, and a majority of those who were returned to this House agreed that what applied to one portion of the service should apply also to the other. The Premier himself, in answer to the circular, said he would be prepared to give this very careful consideration. The Premier has now had a couple of years for that careful consideration, and I think he will agree that if it be just to concede a privilege to one section of the employees, it is equally just to concede it to the other.

In another portion of his speech the hon. member said—

The majority of members of this House agreed at the last election that they would support the removal of the anomaly. Those members now have an opportunity to fulfil their promise by supporting the motion.

The hon. gentleman has had two years in which to fulfil his own promise. For two years has he been Minister for Railways, yet has he done nothing to fulfil that promise. He made a great fuss, promising long service leave to the men and coming down to the House and moving that motion, for which we all voted. By the way, that is not right; we did not all vote for it, for the motion was negatived on the casting

vote of the Speaker. What has the hon. member done during the last two years to give the railway men this just concession? The ink with which his speech was printed was hardly dry when he found himself in charge of the Railway Department. What has he since done to fulfil his promise as a private member to the railway men? Absolutely nothing, and whenever we try to get information about it we are stalled off. His subsequent actions have shown to the House that his motion was only political birdlime, and that he was merely tickling the ears of the groundlings. Yet he has the cheek to adopt a pamphlet charging another man with insincerity! What did he do when we had before us the question of the police? It was a resolution of the party, yet he crossed the floor in defiance of the wishes of the party. Had I done that, I should have been expelled. This is the man who with his colleagues talks about insincerity! Following on the issue of proceedings, the matter was left in abeyance at the request of the defendants. I want to say for the defendants' solicitor that right through the piece he had more consideration for the Labour Party than for his own profits. Notwithstanding that this was a case in which the solicitor could have got a judgment of costs, win or lose, he preferred to have the matter settled out of court. His interests in the party predominated over his own personal interests, and he left no stone unturned to advise his clients to settle the action.

Mr. E. B. Johnston: Who is he?

Mr. HUGHES: He is in practice in the city under the name of Dwyer, Dunphy and Durack. He had every consideration for the welfare of the party. When I was about to go to the Eastern States in order to tell of the tactics that had been employed, I was asked to leave the case in abeyance in order to see if a settlement could not be arrived at. I agreed. I was due to go to the Eastern States on the 17th April. A couple of days before I left I was told that our honourable friends here would not settle on any consideration. On the day of my departure those gentlemen wrote to my solicitor demanding that the case be proceeded with immediately, threatening as an alternative that they would move to have it dismissed for want of prosecution. Then, notwithstanding that they knew I was away in the Eastern States, they went to a judge in Chambers and asked that the case be proceeded with

in my absence. The judge would not stand for that. I have never heard of anything meaner than the attitude of those gentlemen. While I was holding out the olive branch and trying to get a settlement, they were taking every advantage and trying to have the case brought on in my absence.

Hon. G. Taylor: That was their counsel's action.

Mr. HUGHES: The "Westralian Worker" is governed by a board of seven directors, and the directors, of course, say what shall be done. When I came back, a gentleman who had no pecuniary interest in the case put it to me, "Even now, why not have an amicable settlement?" I agreed to allow the directors to save their face, to let it drop, both sides to pay their own costs. Could I have gone further, seeing that I had been grossly libelled? Yet the directors would not agree to that. On that, of course, I had no alternative to instructing my solicitor to proceed. What do we find? When the case was listed for hearing, the solicitor for those people went to the court and applied for a special jury. The application by prominent members of the party for a special jury is the greatest violation of political principles I have ever known. A special juror must be possessed of £500 in wealth before he can take his seat. This is what the "Westralian Worker" itself had to say in regard to special juries on the 12th September, 1924—

The Special Jury. An Inquiry and an Anachronism. . . . The £500 property qualification for a special juror definitely excludes the worker. As was probably only to be expected, the Nationalists desire the retention of this weapon of privilege: which accounts for the championing of the special jury system in the House on Tuesday night by the member for West Perth. It is fortunate for the workers that the Minister for Public Works is in the House. No one who has not had the experience of having been subjected to the injustice of this archaic law could have so trenchantly exposed its unfairness as Mr. McCallum did. If the special jury had not been doomed before, its death knell was rung then; for not even the Upper House will now dare to urge that Western Australia should cling to an abomination capable of being so flagrantly misused in the sacred name of Justice.

That is what those gentlemen themselves think of special juries. The special jury is an abomination that can be misused in the sacred name of Justice. And the opening paragraph sheds tears because the £500 property qualification for a special juror de-

initely excludes the working man. By this article one would think that those responsible for its publication held that there was something wrong in excluding the worker from a special jury. We have always said it was a gross insult upon the worker to say that because he did not possess £500, he was not capable of dispensing justice. This party has lashed itself into a fury time and time again upon that very question. Yet it seems the worker is not a fit and proper person to hear their own case when the "Worker" is involved. The worker can be conscripted into taking the newspaper whether he wants it or not; he can be made to find the money for the newspaper and for the political party—he is now asked to subscribe £10,000 before the next election in order that the party may retain possession of the Treasury benches; he is fit to do that, but he is not fit to sit in judgment on the actions of the "Worker" newspaper. It is the most flagrant insult ever administered to the working class of Western Australia. I will read some extracts showing where members of the directorate talked about trial by one's peers. If they had a good case, what was wrong with a common jury that might have had eight unionists out of its panel of 12? Why did they want the business man, the commercial man, the man with £500? It must not be any tramway man, any shop girl, any navvy. No, they wanted the business man, the man with £500. The man they really wanted was the city landlord who, if he once got on the jury, would have more regard of the Fair Rents Bill than of the facts of the case.

Mr. Stubbs: You have a down on the landlords.

Mr. HUGHES: And they have a down on me.

Lieut-Colonel Denton: Are you broken-hearted about it?

Mr. HUGHES: No. I am satisfied that the Fair Rents Bill was a just measure. Moreover, I am prepared to be tried by the unionists who sent me to Parliament and who paid portion of my expenses. To revert to the question of hypocrisy, we hear a lot about preference to unionists, but it is not very well known that for years and years the "Westralian Worker" has been employing a non-unionist.

Hon. G. Taylor: Is that a fact?

Mr. HUGHES: It is. I was a member of the Metropolitan Council of the Labour

movement when the council took up this matter. This man was a canvasser. He was not only a non-unionist, but he opposed Labour candidates in a Parliamentary election whilst he was employed by the "Worker." There were dozens of good old battlers in the movement who could well do the job. Those people who have the cheek to accuse others of insincerity are prepared to come here and fight for preference to unionists, and yet are not prepared to put it into operation in their own institution.

Mr. Latham: He may be an extra good journalist.

Mr. HUGHES: He is not a journalist and the job requires no special skill. It is easy to answer those people when they level a charge of insincerity against anyone. I wish to read one or two extracts from the speeches delivered on the subject of the special jury—this abomination.

Mr. Latham: The Premier will not need to have another cross-bench put in the Chamber now.

Mr. HUGHES: The Minister for Justice speaking in 1924 said—

At present the sole qualification to serve on a special jury is not that a man is possessed of special knowledge or experience, but that he possesses a certain amount of wealth or follows a certain occupation, and people are apt to conclude that such a jurymen might be prejudiced in favour of an individual of his own social status, or in his own line of business. This has been the experience in many cases during recent years. People tried by special jury have expressed the opinion before the case was halfway through that they were not likely to get an impartial decision.

The opinion of the Minister for Justice was that those who went before a special jury would not get an impartial hearing; the case would be tried by prejudiced men. He continued—

We should remove the impression that a man who can afford to pay for a special jury may have whatever jury he likes.

How have they endeavoured to remove the impression? By taking advantage of the special jury provisions to save their own skins. That is how they have tried to remove the impression that a special jury carries a privilege. The member for Cue in the same debate said—

I am against the principle of special juries on the ground that that system accords a privilege to a certain section of the community.

Right through the whole of the debates on that Bill, the song sung was that a special jury is the privilege of the rich man, an abomination capable of being so flagrantly misused in the sacred name of justice. When we had no alternative to proceeding with the case, I was astounded to find that these people, in violation of one of the fundamental principles of the party, had applied for a special jury. I knew it would be madness for me to go before a special jury. As the Minister for Justice said, "Those people who pay for a special jury must think it is worth while." When he and his colleagues are prepared to pay for a special jury, naturally they think it worth while. It would be futile for me to appear before a special jury. Why not a common jury? Why not a jury of trade unionists? There is one other point to which I wish to direct attention. I learn that when this wretched document was issued it was because the people who had instructed the "Westralian Worker" had signed an indemnity guaranteeing the paper against any damages for libel. What sort of morality is that? What sort of morality is it for a Labour paper that stands for political and newspaper morality, and has devoted columns and columns to denouncing the other sections of the Press for their unfairness? Yet the "Worker" says, "If you come along and want some one libelled, the question is whether you have the money to pay for it. If you can afford to pay for the libel and will sign an indemnity, we will go ahead and print it." I presume that if a man was poor and could not afford to pay for it, he could not have the libel published. What sort of morality is that? If that is the morality of the party I can no longer be a member of the party. I can no longer subscribe to the people who have that standard of morality. What would be said if we learned that the "West Australian" had a system whereby any person could get anything he liked printed about someone else provided he gave a satisfactory indemnity? Why, we would screech down the town about the immorality of it, the breach of privilege, and the power of money. That sort of thing in my opinion should be made a criminal offence. If people in charge of a newspaper are so devoid of a sense of responsibility as to be prepared to print anything, provided the party desiring its publication has the money to pay for it, they should not be allowed to remain in possession of a printing press. When I was forced to retire from the action

owing to the special jury, I met one of the directors—it was on Friday morning—and I taxed him with having been guilty of a violent breach of principle. Strange to say, that same afternoon we received a letter from the company's solicitor taking full responsibility for the special jury. It has been said that the solicitor for the company acted on his own initiative, and got a special jury without consulting his clients. I do not think there is any solicitor in the State who would take the responsibility of charging his client with the cost of a special jury without first consulting him. It was very generous of that solicitor to take the blame. He wrote—

The application for a special jury was made by us as solicitors for the defendant acting in what we considered the best interests of our client (a limited trading company) without regard to political considerations and under the advice of counsel. We neither consulted nor received any instructions from our client as to the method of trial, and indeed would have been prepared to go to trial before a judge without a jury. However, we are submitting your letter to our client and will communicate the reply when received which should be by mid-day to-morrow. If the directors decide to waive their legal rights there will still be ample time to summon a common jury by the date fixed.

"If the directors are willing to sacrifice their legal rights," but the directors were unwilling to sacrifice their legal rights. I wonder whether in the event of the solicitor advising them to reduce the wages of their employees on the ground that they would thus gain more profit, they would regard that as a sufficient excuse. It was very generous of the solicitor to take the blame, but I do not for a moment think that he acted without the instructions of his clients. As a matter of fact, we have it in the concluding paragraph that if his clients were willing, he would be prepared to revoke the application for a special jury. I hope they will not add further to their iniquity by endeavouring to saddle the blame on to the solicitor. In view of this I have been obliged to take the extreme step of severing my connection with the party. Of course I do not mind admitting that I do so with extreme reluctance. Ever since I was a boy I have sacrificed my energy, my time, and my cash in the interests of the party. When the tocsin sounded in East Perth and Labour had its back to the wall and there was a rough fight to undertake, I was the man who was asked to undertake it. I do not mind telling members it was a pretty rough fight, too. Mem-

bers will recollect that it arose out of the newspaper strike. The newspapers were obliged to back their candidate, and they did back him. Ever since then I have been considered fair game by the newspapers. Anything that could be thought of in that campaign was said; the rough stuff was good enough for me. Right through the State I have had to put up with the abuse. At the last election I had the same fight all over again. I have had to fight the bitter hostility of the Press. I understand the position of the capitalist Press. It is useless for them to waste their ammunition on a safe seat; it is sound tactics for them to concentrate where it is considered there is a chance of winning a seat. I do not blame the Press; it is their business. I can well remember on the Monday after I had won the seat for the first time going into the office of a prominent member of this concern who jumped out of his chair and said, "By God, the Labour movement owe you a debt of gratitude." And by God, they have paid it! They owe me a debt of gratitude, and they have paid it by denying to me what they would be prepared to give to a murderer—the right to be tried by a common jury. I am not one to cry over spilt milk. I have not in any way altered my principles because of the action of these people, but in the circumstances I feel that if I continue to support two members of the committee to remain in the Cabinet, I shall be condoning their action. I do not feel justified in doing that. If I am prepared to support them in their action, I am equally guilty with them. I have either to swallow them or to swallow my principles, and I am not prepared to swallow my principles. Therefore, I regret that I have been forced into taking the extreme step of severing my connection with the party for whom I have worked so long and from whom I have never received one penny piece as a paid official. I came into the party purely from conviction. All the influence surrounding me from a boy was anti-Labour: all my environment was the other way, but I came into the party from conviction and remained in from conviction. But I am not prepared to say that the party shall have no standard of morality. If we are going to have in charge of the Department of Justice men who are apparently unmoral and do not know right from wrong, men who are so hypocritical as to come here and denounce a principle and then take advantage of it outside, then we have come to the parting of the ways and no longer can I

assist to keep such men in office. I thank the House for the patient hearing given me to present this case, because I feel that a vital principal is at stake. I am glad I have had an opportunity to explain it fully to the public.

THE MINISTER FOR RAILWAYS

(Hon. J. C. Willcock—Geraldton) [S.15]: I can hardly say that the speech made by the member for East Perth (Mr. Hughes) is entirely unexpected. Most of us who have known him during the past seven or eight years are aware that he is the kind of man who takes a peculiar view of almost everything that is done. He reminds me of the story of a woman who was watching a crowd marching down the street. Her boy was marching left when the sergeant was calling right, and the rest of the boys were marching right. She said, "Look at all the boys out of step with my Johnny." The member for East Perth seems to be of that type. He seems to be always out of step. Everybody else is wrong and the hon. member is the only judge of what constitutes sincerity, morality, right-thinking, and the true principles of the Labour movement. People who know the hon. member are aware that he has that temperament. They knew beforehand that he was likely to do the same in connection with the Labour movement as he had already done in connection with other institutions with which he had been associated. Before I knew the hon. member I used to read in the Press about him as the stormy petrel of football clubs and rowing associations. Everyone was wrong except this particular individual. When he got into the Labour movement, he was the only one who knew anything about its principles and could interpret what the Labour platform stood for. In almost every instance he was right and everybody else was wrong. This reminds me that not so long ago, when the hon. member was president of the Metropolitan Council of the A.L.P. and that council raised a considerable amount of money for the purpose of building a Trades Hall, and the council desired to let the building advantageously, he said, "Oh, no! I can do much better than that. I can make much more money for the Trades Hall than by allowing you to go on in the way you think best in the interests of the movement generally."

Mr. Hughes: On a point of order. The Minister's statement is entirely untrue and I ask that it be withdrawn.

Mr. SPEAKER: That is not a point of order.

Mr. Hughes: An amount of £3,000 was raised in one year.

The MINISTER FOR RAILWAYS: Yes, and the hon. member wasted pretty well all of it himself.

Mr. Hughes: No, I did not waste it.

The MINISTER FOR RAILWAYS: At all events, the hon. member deluded the council into entering upon a business undertaking. This was on the strength of his business experience. He led the Trades Hall into a tragedy which almost cost them the whole building.

Mr. Hughes: They went into that undertaking against my advice.

The MINISTER FOR RAILWAYS: Oh! When the hon. member had got them into the mess, he cleared out and left them in it.

Mr. Hughes: I was made managing director to clear up the mess. What had been done was against my advice.

The MINISTER FOR RAILWAYS: When the Labour Party were returned with a majority some two years ago, there was considerable speculation as to who would compose the Ministry. When Mr. Hughes was not selected as a member of the Ministry, he became disgruntled; and he has been disgruntled ever since. He has lost no opportunity of venting his spleen and spite, both inside and outside the House, against the people who, in his opinion, did not possess that tremendous ability which he displays, but who happened to be selected by other members to occupy Ministerial positions. The hon. member talks about his high principles and my immorality. Almost the first of my administrative acts which did not meet with his approbation related to the Auburn trial. The Crown Law Department, in its wisdom, decided to appoint a legal gentleman in the person of Mr. Haynes to represent the Crown at that trial. Thereupon the member for East Perth came to my office and wanted me to use my Ministerial position to throw Mr. Haynes out of the job, simply because the hon. member had had a quarrel with him. This man of morality and high principle, who talks about sincerity, comes along to me and says, "I have had a personal quarrel with Haynes, and as a Labour supporter I ask that you put him out of that job." What sort of man would I be to accept dictation of that kind? Yet that was the suggestion made by a man who talks about

sincerity and character, a suggestion made to a Minister who had been in office only two or three weeks. I say it was an immoral proposal.

Mr. Hughes: You were not prepared to take the responsibility. You put it on your officers. You were not man enough to say you would not do it. You hid behind your officers.

The MINISTER FOR RAILWAYS: The incident shows the hon. member's idea of manhood.

Mr. Hughes: You blamed the officers.

The MINISTER FOR RAILWAYS: I did nothing of the sort. I said that the gentleman had been appointed, and that I as Minister was not going to do anything against the interests of any particular person. I did not do it, either.

Mr. Hughes: But you were not game to stand up and say you would not do it.

The MINISTER FOR RAILWAYS: My actions prove that I was game enough to stand up and do anything. If I had been the weakling the hon. member says I was, I would have replied to him, "Very well, Mr. Hughes, because you have had a personal quarrel with this man Haynes, I shall do your behest irrespective of whether the Crown Law officers think this is the best man to conduct the case in the interests of the country. Just because you want me to put him out of a job for your own personal gratification, I will do so."

Mr. Hughes: You gave me your assurance that he would never get another case.

The MINISTER FOR RAILWAYS: I gave an assurance that everybody practising as a lawyer would get a fair deal according to his abilities.

Mr. Hughes: You gave me an assurance as I have stated.

The MINISTER FOR RAILWAYS: I did nothing of the kind. The hon. member was so annoyed about the matter that he said he would "get" me, whatever that meant.

Mr. Hughes: I never said any such thing.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order!

The MINISTER FOR RAILWAYS: The hon. member said he would "get" me.

Mr. Hughes: Where did I say it?

Mr. Taylor: What did the hon. member mean?

The MINISTER FOR RAILWAYS: I think it is an historic phrase of Mr. Tom Walsh. I apprehended it to mean that the

hon. member was not going to do me any good.

Mr. Hughes: Where did I say it? Why don't you tell the truth?

The MINISTER FOR RAILWAYS: Nobody tells the truth except the hon. member. Then at the time this Parliament opened Mr. Hughes stated at a party meeting that he desired permission from the party to move for an inquiry into the Police Department. While I would not say it, yet the information has gone forth that the party agreed he should move. There was nothing wrong in that. But while a man may be given permission to move a motion, that does not necessarily bind every member of the party to support the motion.

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: In that case he would not want permission.

The MINISTER FOR RAILWAYS: The hon. member moved the motion, but did not advance anything that would warrant the appointment of a select committee. As the responsible Minister controlling the Police Department, I said that if the hon. member put up a case which called for an inquiry, he would get it. But because he had the permission of the party to move the motion, and then did not get his own sweet will in connection with it, he accused me of insincerity and traitorous conduct.

Mr. Hughes: The inquiry was refused without discussion.

The MINISTER FOR RAILWAYS: That was the trouble. The case put up by the hon. member was so poor that upon the vote of the House, the motion was rejected. I suppose the hon. member felt that as an insult to his dignity, and because I was the responsible Minister, he got well up against me over it. I took the action that any Minister would take in connection with a department he was controlling. If a member brings forward a matter that warrants inquiry, and the House agrees with that view, the Minister will not oppose the granting of an inquiry. But on the occasion in question everything that was brought forward was satisfactorily explained, and so the inquiry was naturally refused. Within six or seven weeks of our taking office, the hon. member wanted us to have a Royal Commission with regard to persons victimised in the Police Department during the preceding 10 or 12 years. Because the Government would not agree to his proposal, he said we were not living up to our principles. I think one outstand-

ing feature in the character of a man of honour and principle is that he should not blazon forth what has taken place at a confidential meeting. It is generally understood that whatever takes place at a party meeting should remain absolutely amongst the members themselves. To make such things public is not, I think, the act of a man of high character.

Mr. Teesdale: I wish he would tell us more about what took place at party meetings. We did not get much out of him.

The MINISTER FOR RAILWAYS: The member for East Perth is so sincere, and is actuated by such high principles in his relations with the Labour Party, that he says he would be prepared to bring about the downfall of the Government if incidentally that meant putting Mr. Willcock out of the party.

Mr. Hughes: I said that during the last three or four days.

The MINISTER FOR RAILWAYS: The hon. member said it months ago. Such is the high moral character of the man of principle who is only actuated by that which is for the benefit of the Labour movement! Because he is splenetic, because he chooses to take a set on one unit in the movement, he is prepared to bring about the downfall of the Government.

Mr. Hughes: When did I say that? I only said it within the last few days.

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: He might have turned you all out!

The MINISTER FOR RAILWAYS: The hon. member was actuated solely by his championship of Labour principles, which are deeply imbedded in him notwithstanding the environment of his youth. That environment, he says, was anti-Labour, though Heaven knows where anti-Labour sentiments were to be found on the dumps of Kalgoorlie. The hon. member was brought up in Boulder, and yet he says the environment of his youth was such as should have made him anti-Labour. A young man brought up in that industrial centre could hardly be anything but a Labourite, one would think. While the Fair Rents Bill was being dealt with in this House, the hon. member was running a White City Carnival. He told us all about that in the Press. I take no exception to his having run the carnival. On the contrary, I approved of it at the time, and was pleased to know that he was taking such an interest in the affairs of his constituents that he would run a car-

nival for the purpose of providing East Perth with a hall.

Mr. Taylor: Was that where he made the £3,000?

The MINISTER FOR RAILWAYS: I do not know what amount he got, but it was considerable. It was to his credit that he advanced the interests of his constituents in that way. At this time the Fair Rents Bill was practically the only Government business on the Notice Paper. The Government were then waiting for the Upper House to send back some Bills. The hon. member told me he wanted to speak on the Fair Rents Bill. I said, "Very well, if there is an opportunity you will be allowed to speak, but we want to get the Bill through." That is all that took place, so far as I was concerned. After tea there was no other business and the Fair Rents Bill went through in about an hour. The next day out comes the "Daily News" with a statement by the member for East Perth accusing me of telling deliberate lies. He said in that statement—

All I wish to say at this stage is that it is mortifying to find myself supporting a Minister whose word is apparently unreliable. The Minister went back on his word and took the second reading division.

I do not admit having done so, and it was proved afterwards that I did not. Quite incidentally, one of my colleagues happened to be there and overheard all that was said, and he obtained the impression that what I said was correct. Yet the hon. member publishes that libellous statement about me in the "Daily News."

Mr. Hughes: You gave me an undertaking.

The MINISTER FOR RAILWAYS: I did nothing of the kind and that was proved by a witness.

Mr. Hughes: Nothing of the sort.

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: Bring an action against him for libel and have it heard before a grand jury.

The MINISTER FOR RAILWAYS: Although the hon. member is so anxious for the progress of the Labour movement, he takes these proceedings against the "Worker" newspaper, in order I suppose to bring about the downfall of labour, as well as the newspaper which has done more for the Labour movement than ever the hon. member could expect to do. He is so anxious about the "Worker" newspaper, that he would be prepared to rob it and at the same time, he does not hesitate to publish an

absolutely libellous statement in another newspaper about me.

Mr. Hughes: You know it is true.

The MINISTER FOR RAILWAYS: I know that it is not true.

Mr. Hughes: You gave me an undertaking.

The MINISTER FOR RAILWAYS: The hon. member is not telling the truth and he knows it. It has been proved to the satisfaction of a meeting at which the whole matter was discussed, that what I have stated is correct. If I had wanted to be vindictive and anxious to repay some of the "good" turns the hon. member has done me, I would have sued him for libel in connection with this matter. His statement to the Press about me was undoubtedly libellous. It was such that I got legal opinion about it. Anyone who knows anything about the law is aware that you libel a man who occupies the position of Minister of the Crown when you tell the world that he makes statements that are not true. If that does not constitute a libel I do not know what does.

Mr. E. B. Johnston: You should have taken it before a special jury.

The MINISTER FOR RAILWAYS: I am not discussing the matter of special juries. If I had desired to be vindictive, or if I had wished to uphold my honour as against the interests of the political Labour Party, I should have taken action against the hon. member at that stage. Probably then he would have been mulct in damages, and I suppose he would have gone bankrupt, and then would have had to resign from Parliament, and his career would have been ruined. Because I did not take action, he accuses me of insincerity.

Mr. Hughes: You accused me of insincerity.

The MINISTER FOR RAILWAYS: The hon. member says that I was one of the people who accused him of insincerity.

Mr. Hughes: Is that not so?

The MINISTER FOR RAILWAYS: No. I will tell him later on what happened in regard to that particular pamphlet, but so far as insincerity is concerned and wanting to do something to injure the Labour movement, if I had wanted to make money out of the hon. member in a matter like this, I assure him I would not have shown him any mercy.

Mr. Hughes: Did I want to make money out of it?

The MINISTER FOR RAILWAYS: Apparently the hon. member wanted to make

money out of the "Worker" newspaper, which is of the same political faith as himself. He wanted to do it the greatest possible injury he could. He thought he would be successful. He is no fool, and I suppose he considered that if he were successful he would be so at the expense of the newspaper.

Mr. Latham: No newspaper has any right to damage a man's character.

The MINISTER FOR RAILWAYS: I think the hon. member was trying to create an impression in the House that the article was published in the "Worker" newspaper. It was not published in the "Worker" newspaper. What happened was this: There had been considerable dissension in the ranks of a trade union, caused by the member for East Perth in the first place, and the desire of the union was that the whole of their organisation should have a report of the true facts of the position as it was dealt with at the conference. Their wish was that all the members should know what had taken place at the conference, and the disclosure, it was felt, would have an important bearing on the future success of the union. That was why the union wanted all its members to be made fully acquainted with the facts. Then what they did was to carry a resolution that the speeches which had been reported verbatim, should be printed, and copies circulated amongst the members of the union. That is all that was done and the hon. member would seem to imply that the "Worker" newspaper published the pamphlet to the world.

Mr. Hughes: It was circulated amongst the people in East Perth by the "Worker" and it was printed by the "Worker."

The MINISTER FOR RAILWAYS: Nothing of the kind; the hon. member is again telling an untruth. It was printed by the job printing department of the "Worker" for the Timber Workers' Union.

Mr. Latham: And they also print the "Primary Producer."

Mr. Teesdale: They are utterly damned if they print that thing.

The MINISTER FOR RAILWAYS: The article never appeared in the "Worker" newspaper. It was a faithful record of the proceedings that took place at the union conference, and was circulated for the information of the members of the union only.

Mr. Hughes: And circulated amongst the electors of East Perth.

The MINISTER FOR RAILWAYS: Let me return to the question of the Fair Rents

Bill and the publication of the gross libel on me by the hon. member. Even if I did find it expedient to get the Fair Rents Bill through this House, would I not have been doing a service to the Labour movement of the State if I had found it necessary to say, "I cannot keep faith with you because I thought in the interests of the movement it was necessary to get the Bill through at that stage." But no, the hon. member does not worry about the workers or the Labour movement; he worried because he did not have the opportunity of making a speech on the second reading.

Mr. E. B. Johnston: His speech may have converted the Upper House.

The MINISTER FOR RAILWAYS: The hon. member is so sincere in his advocacy of the principles of Labour that he would risk the rejection of the Fair Rents Bill so that he might have the opportunity of putting forward his views. Imagine the sincerity of a man of that type who would prefer to make a speech on the second reading of a Bill, and run the risk thereby of having the Bill defeated just because he wanted to air his views. And he is the man who talks about sincerity! I wish to refer to another instance in which the hon. member and I were concerned. It will be remembered that not so long ago there was serious industrial trouble in this State, and the Government found it necessary to put police on the wharf at Fremantle to prevent intimidation and lawlessness. At that stage Mr. Bruce and other people had declared that the State Government were not standing up to their responsibilities to the people.

Mr. Teesdale: It was one of the few things the Government did do.

The MINISTER FOR RAILWAYS: Of course, we did so. This did not suit my friend the member for East Perth. He got into association with a gang, some of them thugs and hoodlums and went to the houses of Ministers to try and intimidate them and make them do something which would not have been in the best interests of the community. This is the man who talks about high principles and character. He brought a gang of hoodlums and stood with them on the verandah of my private house on a Sunday evening.

Lieut.-Colonel Denton: Did you invite them to tea?

Mr. Hughes: They were the executive of the lumpers' and the seamen's unions.

The MINISTER FOR RAILWAYS: I do not care who they were. They looked a pretty poor old gang.

Mr. Sleeman: Why libel the other fellows to get even with Hughes?

The MINISTER FOR RAILWAYS: The hon. member should wait a minute and he will see whether I am libelling anybody. What really happened on that occasion was that the member for East Perth brought the gang of 16 or 18 on to the verandah of my private house for the purpose of instructing me—I was in charge of the administration of the Police Department—and demanding that I should withdraw the police from the wharf.

Mr. Hughes: They merely asked you to withdraw the police from the wharf.

The MINISTER FOR RAILWAYS: I will tell the House all about it without the hon. member's assistance. The hon. member can contradict me afterwards if he thinks it necessary. This gang directed me to take the police from the wharf. The hon. member was somewhat insulted at my not having asked him and his gang inside my house. I was prepared to sit and talk to them outside; that was quite good enough for me. My reply to them was that I would do what I thought was right in the best interests of the State. That was the answer that I gave after a quarter of an hour or 20 minutes discussion.

Mr. Hughes: You said nothing of the sort.

The MINISTER FOR RAILWAYS: I have told this tale to different people and the hon. member has never denied it before. My reply was that I would do what I thought was right in the interests of the State. I declined to say what I would do on the next day. Then Mr. Tom Walsh thought it was time that he took a hand.

Hon. G. Taylor: What, was he there?

The MINISTER FOR RAILWAYS: Yes, Tom Walsh was there, and there was George Ryce.

Hon. G. Taylor: My word, you are lucky to be alive to-day.

The MINISTER FOR RAILWAYS: I suppose so. Houghton was also present.

Mr. Teesdale: Was Miss Shelley there?

The MINISTER FOR RAILWAYS: No, she was not there. When Tom Walsh considered it was time he took a hand. He buttoned up his coat in Napoleonic fashion and said threateningly, "Now, you take the police off the wharf: if you don't we will

settle them first and then we will settle you, too." I said "You go for your life."

Mr. Hughes: No, you didn't.

The MINISTER FOR RAILWAYS: Well, Parliamentary procedure would not allow me to repeat the exact words. The only difference is that I used an adjective starting with the letter "b." The hon. member has never denied it before.

Mr. Hughes: As a matter of fact it was not Walsh who said that.

The MINISTER FOR RAILWAYS: It was Walsh. The hon. member is again making a misstatement. It was Walsh who said it, and moreover Walsh never denied it. The character of Walsh is pretty well known; nobody has ever said that Walsh would deny anything he had said.

Hon. G. Taylor: Did Walsh speak at all?

The MINISTER FOR RAILWAYS: Of course he did. I do not complain about Walsh's having said it; what I complain about is that the member for East Perth should stand by and back up the man who said such a thing, at all events should not dissociate himself from such a remark, made on my verandah.

Mr. Hughes: Were we not out of the gate when that remark was made?

The MINISTER FOR RAILWAYS: No, we were on the verandah. However, they could not get anything out of me. I knew Walsh's idea of the right course to take, and I told him exactly what I would do. I did not mind what Walsh said, but I did object to the member for East Perth standing by and not dissociating himself from Walsh's remark. Had I wanted to be vindictive or to do any injury to the hon. member in return for the many "kindnesses" he had previously done me, I had an attractive opportunity. There were two independent witnesses who heard that remark, namely, my own wife and the member for Greenough, who happened to be at my place at the time. Both were able to swear that the remark was made, and so I could have had Walsh and the whole crowd of them arrested for threatening my life.

Mr. Hughes: They didn't threaten your life.

The MINISTER FOR RAILWAYS: Had they come there, not for the purpose of intimidation but to peacefully put a proposal before me, there would have been only two or three of them; but instead of that, they agreed to bring a big crowd and so put the wind up me. There was a gang of 16 of them.

Mr. Hughes: Were they not an orderly crowd?

The MINISTER FOR RAILWAYS: Well, they said they would settle me if I did not do certain things. Perhaps that squares with the hon. member's idea of orderliness. If the hon. member had wanted to do the manly thing, he would have said, "Well, I came here merely to show these people where you live, and I entirely dissociate myself from these violent remarks." On the contrary, he associated himself with them, and had I desired I could have had him and the rest of the crowd put into gaol.

Mr. Hughes: Why didn't you do so.

The MINISTER FOR RAILWAYS: I didn't want to.

Mr. Hughes: You knew I was not a party to that remark.

The MINISTER FOR RAILWAYS: Did the hon. member hear that remark?

Mr. Hughes: Yes, I did.

The MINISTER FOR RAILWAYS: Well, he did not dissociate himself from it.

Mr. Hughes: It was merely a remark passed at a deputation.

Mr. Lindsay: Whoever heard of a deputation going to a Minister's private house?

The MINISTER FOR RAILWAYS: Although I have had several opportunities to put up something against the member for East Perth I have deliberately refrained from getting him into trouble.

Mr. Hughes: I only introduced a deputation.

The MINISTER FOR RAILWAYS: You admit you were there when a man declared that he was going to settle me.

Mr. Hughes: That is perfectly true.

The MINISTER FOR RAILWAYS: Well, I will leave it at that. The hon. member has spoken of insincerity. I do not know whether we have ever had a more shameful exhibition of insincerity than that displayed by the hon. member when the Bill to increase the payment of members was before the House last session. He got up and railed against the proposed increase of Parliamentary salaries; he talked for an hour and a half and declared that he could do his Parliamentary business in the course of 20 minutes per day.

Mr. Hughes: Don't be silly.

The MINISTER FOR RAILWAYS: Well, perhaps in the end he said an hour per day, although certainly at one stage of his speech he said something about 20 minutes per day. So sincere was he in his

condemnation of the Bill that, after violently attacking the provisions of the measure devised to increase his salary amongst others, possibly because he feared that if he were here at voting time and had to vote in accordance with the view he had expressed the Bill might be lost, he found he could not spare the time to do here when the vote was taken. He may have had the idea that if here at the time he might be compelled to vote against the Bill, so he took the safe course and remained away.

Mr. Hughes: He goes home to tea every night. The Bill was sneaked through in his absence.

The MINISTER FOR RAILWAYS: That is the sincerity of the hon. member the political morality that actuates some members. I think the House will agree that my sincerity is at least equal to that of the member for East Perth. Now the hon. member has decided upon a turning point that, in any case, was inevitable. He has always been out of step with everybody else. He can never agree with anybody for any length of time. Let me just run over the history of the case: The late member for Forrest (Mr. J. B. Holman) was secretary of the Timber Workers' Union, and when his death created a vacancy the member for East Perth desired to secure the position. He went down to the timber areas and forced himself upon the people there.

Mr. Hughes: I had 14 requests from branches before I left Perth.

The MINISTER FOR RAILWAYS: The executive of the union decided that the member for East Perth, having no interest in the timber industry, and knowing nothing about it, had no claims on the vacant post and could not seriously be regarded as a proper person to occupy the position.

Mr. Hughes: Who decided that?

Miss Holman: He was not eligible.

Mr. Hughes: They wouldn't let the members of the union decide it: the executive decided it.

The MINISTER FOR RAILWAYS: This is what occurred: The hon. member was not allowed by the executive to stand. Under their constitution he was not eligible. But in his view it did not matter what dissension and strife, trouble and expense was created for that or any other Labour organisation with a £10 a week job that

e wanted. He could not get the job, and he was not particular what discontent, dissension and quarrels might arise. That is the sincerity of the man. In order that he might get a certain position he was prepared to go to any length. The Federal Council ruled that he was not eligible for the post. The Timber Workers' Union was almost rent in twain through the hon. member. It was deemed of sufficient importance to hold a conference, and to this conference came the general president and the general secretary of the union. Because of all the dissension and strife caused by the member for East Perth it was decided that there should be a thorough discussion by a body representing the whole of the union. And in order that there should be no hole and corner methods, that nothing should be said without opportunity being afforded for reply, it was resolved by motion that a verbatim report of the proceedings should be taken and confidentially circulated amongst the members of the union.

Mr. Hughes: They were circulated in East Perth.

Miss Holman: If so they came back from the mills from some of the hon. member's friends.

The MINISTER FOR RAILWAYS: The proper and honourable thing for any union to do in respect of such an inquiry was to provide for a verbatim report in order that all members of the union might know exactly what happened. Having decided upon such a report, it was only natural that the union should go to the "Worker" newspaper Co., who always did their printing. They went to the "Worker" and asked for a verbatim report of the proceedings of the conference to be put up in pamphlet form for the confidential information of members of the union. Probably it was as a privileged document. Even if it were a little libellous, it was only right that the members of the union should have the fullest information.

Hon. G. Taylor: Did the paper ask for an indemnity?

Mr. Sampson: If they did ask for an indemnity it would suggest that the matter was libellous.

The MINISTER FOR RAILWAYS: Nothing of the sort. An indemnity is most always sought by people printing libellous documents.

Mr. Sampson: A most unusual thing! I have never heard of it.

Mr. E. B. Johnston: You did not have one from the "Primary Producer."

The Premier: We have one from the "Primary Producer" now.

Mr. Sampson: It is evidently necessary.

The MINISTER FOR RAILWAYS: An indemnity was obtained and whatever action was taken in connection with the pamphlet was not a matter for the "Worker" directorate. Responsibility for the statements made and for the printing and the publication of them was taken by the Timber Workers' Union in the interests of their members. Having published the pamphlet, the union sent copies of it to the members. To listen to the remarks of the member for East Perth, one would think that the union had got out a circular or dodger and had done something to misrepresent him to the people of Western Australia. Instead of that, a confidential document was printed and sent to the members interested.

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: I do not know what all this has to do with the Address-in-reply.

The MINISTER FOR RAILWAYS: The member for East Perth has accused me of insincerity. He has quoted a letter received from the solicitors for the "Worker" directorate. I knew nothing of a special jury until after the hon. member had withdrawn from the case—on Saturday. Consequently, whatever was done by the solicitor was done in the interests of the newspaper by the solicitor. When people seek legal advice they say to the lawyer, "We are being subjected to what we consider to be an unwarranted and unnecessary attack. We want you to take advantage of every provision that the law allows to repel that attack." That is what we did. We were out to protect the interests of the shareholders of the "Worker." That is all that has been done in this case. The legal adviser, acting bona fide and in the best interests of the newspaper by which he was being paid, took whatever action he considered necessary. If the directors of the "Worker" had endeavoured to prevent the solicitor from doing something that he considered to be in the best interests of the paper, if we, amateurs in law, had tendered certain advice or told him to take some other course and we had been mulcted in a loss of £4,000 or £5,000 and the "Worker" had been ruined, what would have been our responsibility to the shareholders? I could not take the responsibility

of adopting such a course. If a man submits his case to a medical practitioner or to a legal practitioner and pays him to do his best the only course is to accept his advice and go right on. That is all we have done.

Mr. Teesdale: It would be much easier to divulge the writer and leave out the "Worker" newspaper altogether.

The MINISTER FOR RAILWAYS: Of course it would.

Mr. Teesdale: You have been asked for the name of the writer and you have not given it.

The MINISTER FOR RAILWAYS: The document, on the face of it, speaks for itself.

The Premier: It is the report of a conference.

The MINISTER FOR RAILWAYS: If the member for East Perth will hand me his copy of the report, I will show it to the member for Roebourne. It is not a question of the writer; it is a verbatim report of a union conference.

Mr. Teesdale: Someone must have put the report together.

The MINISTER FOR RAILWAYS: Who puts the "Hansard" report together?

The Premier: It was taken down in the same way as the "Hansard" report is taken down, and printed.

Mr. Hughes: Who signed the indemnity? Why don't you tell us that?

The MINISTER FOR RAILWAYS: Even now I do not know who signed the indemnity.

Mr. Hughes: That is what I want to know.

The MINISTER FOR RAILWAYS: The Timber Workers' Union accepted the responsibility for informing their members of what took place at the conference.

Mr. Hughes: You would not tell us that you had an indemnity or that the union had given it.

The MINISTER FOR RAILWAYS: I do not know that we would be justified in telling the hon. member anything. If a man sets himself out to attack the bulwark of the Labour movement from the Press standpoint, to put the newspaper in such a position that it might become insolvent, and to do grievous harm to the movement generally, I do not know that we should be anxious to facilitate him. I do not know that it would be the duty of anyone to give him information if he wished to buccaneer the funds of the union to his own pecuniary advantage. If at any time while I am on the "Worker" directorate I see some bludgeoning buccaneer

wishing to grab the funds by legal process or otherwise, I shall give him no assistance. On the other hand I shall take any action that the law allows to protect the interests of the "Worker" shareholders and of the movement generally. The hon. member spoke of insincerity. It is ridiculous to argue that. I do not subscribe to the system of special juries. Even though on principle I am opposed to special juries, if it meant taking advantage of this provision of the law to prevent someone from ruining the Labour movement, I would be prepared to take it. I would take advantage of everything the law allowed me to protect the shareholders of the "Worker" from any buccaneering pirate who wished to steal their funds by legal process or otherwise, and I would be prepared to take the responsibility for so doing.

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: If they libelled your member, surely you would protect him.

The MINISTER FOR RAILWAYS: Yes. The hon. member spoke about special juries. If we looked at the matter from the political standpoint and thought there might be other special jury capitalists who, imbued with dishonest motives and desirous of injuring the Labour movement, were asking themselves whether they could do the greater damage by ruining the "Worker" and standing up for the member for East Perth, they would probably decide in favour of injuring the newspaper, which has been a power in the land.

Mr. E. B. Johnston: And create another capitalist, too.

The MINISTER FOR RAILWAYS: If the member for East Perth was so sincere there were plenty of courses open for him to take. If he merely desired redress, he could have taken his complaint to the ruling body of Labour, the State Executive of the A.L.P. who have power to settle disputes between individuals in the movement.

Hon. G. Taylor: My experience of the body is that you might as well summon the devil and hold the court in hell.

The Premier: It has been purified since the breakaway of a few years ago.

The Minister for Agriculture: I knew the member for Mt. Margaret at Cue.

The MINISTER FOR RAILWAYS: Some years ago members of the Labour movement on principle opposed the granting of freehold tenure of land. Would that prevent the member for East Perth from owning a freehold block?

Mr. Hughes: I have no freehold land.

The MINISTER FOR RAILWAYS: But would the mere fact of his opposition to freehold tenure prevent him from owning a freehold block? Would he say, "No, get thee behind me, Satan! Do not tempt me against my political principles. I am not in favour of freehold tenure. If you offer me £10,000 worth of freehold I will not accept it." It is ridiculous. The hon. member would grab it with both hands.

Mr. Lindsay: He was offered 1,000 acres if he would go and work it, but he would not work it.

Mr. Hughes: Proving that I did not want freehold.

The MINISTER FOR RAILWAYS: The solicitor's letter quoted by the member for East Perth is correct. I was not consulted about the special jury. I knew nothing about it. Probably the hon. member will not believe me, but other members know my record and I think they will accept my word. If it had been submitted to my judgment whether we should have a special jury or a common jury, I would have chosen a common jury; but if it was a matter of defending the "Worker" which has done so much for Labour in this State, I would take whatever advantage the law permitted in order to prevent the paper's being mulcted in serious damages.

Mr. Teesdale: In spite of what you said in this House against special juries?

The MINISTER FOR RAILWAYS: In spite of anything.

Mr. Teesdale: Then there is a sort of degree.

The MINISTER FOR RAILWAYS: I am prepared to take advantage of the law, whatever it is. I am prepared to avail myself of the Privy Council, the High Court or anything else the law allows. So long as I act within the law, I am out to protect the assets of the company in which I have a vital concern and whose shareholders it is my duty to protect.

Mr. Latham: It will be safe to leave the special jury provision on the statute-book.

The MINISTER FOR RAILWAYS: I am not in favour of special juries. If it had been left to me I would have had nothing to do with a special jury, but having placed the matter in the hands of a solicitor to do what he thought best, I as a layman would not interfere with him.

Mr. Teesdale: Be consistent! You should interfere.

The MINISTER FOR RAILWAYS: If the "Worker" had been mulcted in damages,

I might have been accused of not conserving the interests of the paper.

Mr. Teesdale: And go back on your principles?

The Minister for Agriculture: The workers own the newspaper and both sides stood equal before the law.

The MINISTER FOR RAILWAYS: If it was a question of a capitalist or a landlord opposing the member for East Perth, there might be something in it.

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: Right's right, wherever it is, surely!

The MINISTER FOR RAILWAYS: If it came to a special jury wishing to do the Labour movement the utmost harm, they would have given a verdict against the "Worker" because of its being such an influential force.

Hon. G. Taylor: Notwithstanding that, you have confidence in the special jury.

The MINISTER FOR RAILWAYS: I was not consulted; I had no say in the matter. All I did was to say we must protect ourselves from this unwarranted attack and get legal advice. The legal adviser was instructed to act in the best interests of the "Worker" directorate. I do not wish to say anything more. Regarding the charge of insincerity, I am prepared to put my record against that of the hon. member and leave it to the House, to the people outside, but particularly to the Labour movement to whom I am chiefly responsible, to decide between us.

MR. MARSHALL (Murchison) [9.15]: I have listened attentively to the speeches that have been delivered on the Address-in-reply. The debate that has just taken place is a portion of the discussion to which I am not prepared to refer. I regret that anything of that kind should have come before the House. I agree with a lot of what was said by the member for Nelson (Mr. J. H. Smith). He entered a protest against the procedure that is always adopted on the occasion of the opening of Parliament. He complained that it led to members of this Chamber, who are the direct representatives of the people, being directed to another place, whose members represent bricks and mortar and broad acres, and being obliged to stand and listen to the Speech while the members of another place were seated. I see no justification for members of the Assembly—

The Premier: Going there at all?

Mr. MARSHALL: That is so. We become contaminated quickly enough as it is without being compelled to visit another place on the occasion of the opening of Parliament.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! The hon. member is disorderly in reflecting upon another place.

Mr. MARSHALL: If I have done so and it is offensive, I will withdraw the remark. We should not be compelled to visit the Legislative Council on these occasions.

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: They would not mind if you stayed away.

Mr. MARSHALL: I have always endeavoured to stay away. I prefer the sanctity of the bush at such times. I should like to see the whole procedure abolished. There is no justification for all this paraphernalia and all this regalia which is the order of the day on those occasions, neither can I see any important reason for protracting this debate. The time of the House would be better occupied in dealing with legislation of a character that is of importance to the people. As it is, we go through an antique procedure that has been handed down to us from the ages past, of debating this particular motion. It does not appeal to me. The time of the House is wasted in listening to a Speech, the contents of which are known to everybody, and which merely foreshadows the programme of legislation to be dealt with and refers to matters of the past that are known to the general public. In order to carry on that procedure we have to spend two or three weeks of the commencement of the session in going through this debate. I do not know why we do it. The whole thing is objectionable to me. I see no occasion for the 21 guns, the brass band, and the soldiers wearing their decorations. One could well imagine one was at the Royal Show. This custom has been handed down to us from about the 12th century, but no one has seen fit to abolish it. We could with advantage do without it.

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: What about Wiluna?

Mr. MARSHALL: That promises to be one of the biggest goldfields in Western Australia. In other respects it is rather a nice spot. From time to time members opposite have desired to impress upon the public the fact that there is no such thing as class distinctions or classes struggling for a living, and that everything is equal, fair and just for all. The first words we find

in the Speech are these—"Mr. President and hon. members of the Legislative Council; Mr. Speaker and members of the Legislative Assembly." I need do no more than read these words, from which members will see whether any distinction is made or not. Of course there are distinctions, even on the occasion of the opening of Parliament.

Mr. Sampson: You draw a strict class line.

Mr. MARSHALL: I do, but the intelligence of the hon. member might not be capable of perceiving it.

Mr. Sampson: That depends on the way I am looking.

Mr. MARSHALL: I would rather see a motion passed at the end of the session that the Speech for the following session should be taken as read. That would save a lot of expense and facilitate the business of the House.

Mr. Lindsay: Surely you would not deprive the ladies of a fine social function?

Mr. MARSHALL: I do not know that it is a very creditable one. The whole thing could be cut out without doing injury to anyone. One portion of the debate appeals to me, namely the efforts of the Opposition to arrive at a basis on which to attack the Government. Three points have been raised as a reason for referring to the objectionable administration of the Government in the eyes of the Opposition.

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: What are they?

Mr. MARSHALL: The member for West Perth (Mr. Davy) declares that we should forsake the worn-out miners, give them no compensation, and pay no heed to their cares.

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: He said nothing of the sort.

Mr. MARSHALL: He suggested we should not go on with the insurance measure, and that there were technical differences between two Acts of Parliament. He said we should forsake the worn-out miners while we wrangled a little more over the matter.

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: He said you were not treating them fairly because there is no law under which they could be so treated.

Mr. MARSHALL: They appreciate the fact that they are better treated since there has been a change of Government. When the measure was first introduced, there was no mention of compensation in the Miners' Phthisis Act. It was not until the then

Opposition fought the Bill that the then Minister for Mines withdrew it and amended it.

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: What are your other points?

Mr. MARSHALL: Another was that of preference to unionists. It is a wonder the United Party and the Country Party did not move a no-confidence motion owing to the growls they have uttered against the Government.

Hon. G. Taylor: We are like your party; we are divided.

Mr. MARSHALL: We know the members of the Country Party are the sole representatives of the primary producers. The cross-benches indicate that night after night.

Mr. Lindsay: I fill them rather well.

Mr. MARSHALL: The redeeming feature about them is that they represent the primary producers as well whether they are out of their places or in them. The member for Katanning, when speaking against the principle of preference to unionists, was utterly wide of the mark. The hon member has had no education in the industrial movement, having been an employer practically all his life. Therefore he cannot conceive the principle of preference to unionists as it is conceived by those with actual experience of industrial conditions. He said it was positively unfair that the present Government should utilise the money of the taxpayers to enforce a party principle—that principle, of course, being preference to unionists. If the hon. member had been consistent, I would not have referred to this matter at all. The hon. member says it matters not what man offers his services to the Government, they should be accepted by the Government without any enforcement of the policy of preference to unionists.

Mr. Lindsay: That was quite a logical utterance, too.

Mr. MARSHALL: The hon. member now interjecting had something to say on the subject, but I shall not take him to task, as he does not understand the position. Really the matter is not worth wasting much time over. An industrialist who will accept wages and conditions won through efforts in the Arbitration Court without contributing anything towards the cost of those efforts, is worse than a pickpocket, seeing that a pickpocket does at least take the risk of being caught and punished. But the other fellow says, "I will contribute no financial aid towards the effort to secure better conditions and wages, but I will take

such better conditions and wages as may be secured through the court." I consider the arguments of members opposite hardly worth answering. However, one feature of the attitude of the member for Katanning is worth noting because of its inconsistency. He was, I believe, a member of this Chamber in 1917, when £20,000 of the taxpayers' money was divided amongst a lot of scabs off the Fremantle wharf. They were not paid for services rendered, such as the unionist employed to-day renders to the Government. They were paid by the Government of the day for scabbing. The services they had rendered on the wharf had been paid for by the shipping combine, and in order to subsidise their disloyalty the Government of the day took the money of the taxpayers and paid it to the scabs in accordance with the recommendation of a Royal Commission. The member for Katanning, to be consistent, should have objected to that payment. But so long as the principle in support of which public money is paid represents scabbing and disloyalty, he does not object. On the other hand, he objects to unionism.

Mr. Lindsay: He objects to compulsory unionism.

Mr. MARSHALL: If I am correctly informed, it is only three days since a section of the primary producers sent a deputation to the Minister for Agriculture inviting him to introduce legislation which would bring about compulsory unionism.

Mr. Lindsay: I was not on that deputation.

Mr. MARSHALL: But the hon. member is a representative of the primary producers.

Mr. Lindsay: That was not done by the primary producers.

Mr. MARSHALL: I know hon. members opposite believe in unionism, but it would be a sorry thing for unionism if its activities were limited to the extent to which those hon. members would permit them to go. I have been through the mill, and know hon. members opposite.

Mr. Teesdale: I hope you are not including me.

Mr. MARSHALL: I would not include the hon. member in anything.

Mr. Teesdale: That is all right.

Mr. MARSHALL: The member for Katanning referred to the marvellous freedom which was won through the signing of Magna Charta at Runnymede. I do not know whether the hon. member has studied

history deeply, but if he thinks that the working classes of the England of that day won much freedom through the signing of Magna Charta, he has not read history aright. All that Magna Charta did was to transfer power from a despotic sovereign to a pack of nobles and barons and their concubines who were if anything worse than the king. In point of fact, it was not until about 400 years later—

Hon. G. Taylor: You were there at the time!

Mr. MARSHALL: If the attitude of the hon. member in this Chamber is any criterion, he was there long before, so devoid is he of modern ideas. If the member for Katanning had known his subject fully, he would have been aware that King John's son, Henry the Third, revoked Magna Charta almost before the ink was dry on that document. What freedom have the working class people of England to-day, several centuries after the signing of Magna Charta?

Mr. Lindsay: The Labour Party have been in power.

Mr. MARSHALL: The Labour Party did not hold office very long.

Mr. Lindsay: This is not the first time you are holding office.

Mr. MARSHALL: Nor will it be the last. Our periods of office have been brief, a fact due not to our political administration or our political programme, but to political trickery.

The Premier: Our terms have been brief but glorious.

Mr. MARSHALL: Since the last Federal election we have not heard any more about Walsh or Johannsen. All that business is gone. Walsh and Johannsen are in the ice chest for two more years. In due course they will be unearthed, and then there will be more industrial trouble and fresh upheavals. While foolish workers lend themselves to such tactics, they will remain in the position they occupy to-day. It is all a matter of education. Probably one or two little stunts such as that now being indulged in by the Bruce-Page Government, who are trying to put the workers back about a century—

Hon. G. Taylor: I don't like their chances.

Mr. MARSHALL: Neither do I. However, the attempt is being made. When the workers not only of this country but of the whole world awoken to the political trickery that is practised from time to time, then, but not until then, will they get relief through political avenues. As for Magna Charta, the toiling masses won no freedom

through it; nor do the workers of to-day enjoy any considerable measure of freedom. If it is freedom to toil or starve, then they have freedom. The workers must either toil or go hungry.

Mr. Teesdale: But everybody toils a bit. Even you toil a bit.

Mr. MARSHALL: The hon. member is quite right. I toil a great deal.

Hon. G. Taylor: You look like it.

Mr. MARSHALL: The hon. member cannot expect me to say that of him.

Hon. G. Taylor: I did not expect you to.

Mr. MARSHALL: If ever the hon. member toiled, it was to become an opportunist. I fail to see where the freedom of the workers comes in. The workers of to-day have not even the choice of employers. Owing to economic pressure, a worker dare not leave one job for fear of not getting another.

Hon. G. Taylor: Let me tell you I am not anxious to leave this job.

Mr. MARSHALL: No, but the workers are anxiously awaiting an opportunity to rid the hon. member of it. I made one such prognostication here with regard to a member sitting behind the late Government. I told him he was not too popular with his electors. He replied that he had won his seat twice without the assistance of Labour, and that he would do so again. But he has been out of this House ever since the election which took place shortly afterwards.

Mr. Teesdale: Don't tell me the same thing, for Heaven's sake!

Mr. MARSHALL: I have too much respect for the hon. member.

Hon. G. Taylor: You are pretty hard on me, though; and there are not too many of us left.

Mr. MARSHALL: I do not know that anyone outside the Treasury has much chance of gauging the exact financial position of the State.

The Premier: That is where I come in.

Mr. MARSHALL: Until the Budget is delivered by the Treasurer, it is not possible for a private member to know exactly how the finances stand. The Governor's Speech merely states the total receipts and the total expenditure. Consequently there is little enlightenment regarding the details of the State's financial affairs. I will refer briefly to the Premier's attitude on the per capita payments. It is creditable to the hon. gentleman that he took early action

n the matter. The payments mean a great deal to Western Australia. I do not know what they mean to the other States, but to judge by what took place at the Conference of Premiers it seems that every State will be very unfavourably affected if the Commonwealth proposals are adopted. I also desire to congratulate the Federal Government. I do not know of any political body that is so apt at having the tune called by others who pay the piper. A few months ago a conference of manufacturers was held in the Eastern States. I have seen no account of the resolutions carried at that conference, but it has been reported in the Western Australian Press that there was a lengthy discussion on direct taxation. One paper went out of its way to publish a flashlight photograph of the conference group, in which the Western Australian delegates appeared prominently. Over the head of one, who is a member of the Legislative Council, there was a cross, and underneath the photograph were the words: "Direct taxation must go." I do not suggest that someone ran down Flinders Lane to the Prime Minister's office and told him that direct taxation would have to go. It is remarkable, however, that the conference had scarcely dispersed before the announcement was made that direct taxation was to go, and with it the per capita payments. The position is very clear. Manufacturers are hampered by direct taxation only, because they derive all the benefits from indirect taxation through the high tariff. Therefore, one would be right in inferring that the Australian manufacturers informed the Federal Government that they should relinquish direct taxation. If all political bodies accepted such intimations, it might be better for some people. I will not proceed further with this subject, because it can be left to the Premier to see that the State gets a fair deal. It is clearly seen that the National Government are not backward in taking a sly hint from those who pay the piper, who keep them in political office, and who pay for propaganda that stirs up the passions of the people at election time with references to Tom Walsh, Johannsen, and others.

Mr. Stubbs: But those people are on your side!

Mr. Sampson: Now give us something about manganese.

Mr. MARSHALL: I do not know about manganese, but no one can be at ease in

the hon. member's presence. With reference to recent happenings, I have much in common with the views of the member for Fremantle (Mr. Sleeman). I do not wish to be misunderstood. I am no more anxious to retard the progress of the State than is the Premier, the Minister for Lands, or any other member of Parliament. I believe that if the progress of Western Australia warrants a migration scheme, then a policy upon sound economic lines is permissible. If the migration policy is to have the effect of displacing Australian-born workers, and if migrants are to get preference over Australians in the development of our rural areas, I, as an Australian-born, must enter an emphatic protest. Speaking on the Address-in-reply last night, the Minister for Lands argued that, under the present agreement, there was provision relating to public works. I do not know whether the agreement has been ratified, and it does not matter to me, because it will not receive my support. I do not consider it is in the best interests of the State at the present juncture. Regarding public works, the Minister for Lands said that the Commonwealth Government—not the Imperial Government—would contribute practically the whole cost of the migration policy, and that we would receive £75 per head for each migrant for all public works. I fail to see how it can be argued logically that we should import migrants for public works, when we have an overdose of unemployment already within the State.

The Premier: The hon. member misunderstands the position. It does not follow that because provision is made in the agreement regarding public works, it means that the migrants are to carry out those public works. It does not mean the importation of labour for those particular works.

Mr. MARSHALL: I quite understand that. If we borrow money under the terms of the migration agreement, and assuming we require £500,000 for new public works, before we get that money we must bring in a certain number of migrants.

The Premier: The construction of these public works will enable us to place men on the land and not on those works.

Mr. MARSHALL: I understand there is a clause in the migration agreement respecting land settlement. We cannot have our cake and eat it too. The money we shall receive will be for specific works, and we will be obliged to bring in a certain number

of people apart from those required for land settlement.

The Premier: Not necessarily for public works.

Mr. MARSHALL: I think the Premier is correct. There is this point to be remembered. The Minister for Lands said that if 50 per cent. of the migrants settled on the land proved efficient, the scheme would be successful.

Mr. Clydesdale: Canada relies on a 20 per cent. efficiency.

Mr. MARSHALL: That is all right, but what becomes of the 50 per cent. who are not efficient?

Mr. Sleeman: They join the others who are already unemployed.

Mr. MARSHALL: Of course, that is the position. They are all over the State to-day. Apart from that, under the agreement we will bring in a number of migrants who will not be allocated to land settlement, but will be admitted purely as industrialists. I intended to ask questions, with a view to finding out how many nominated migrants have come out.

Mr. Sampson: That information has been furnished.

Mr. MARSHALL: Then I have overlooked it. The references in the Governor's Speech do not convey the information I require. I do not desire to oppose any legislation, nor do I wish to be hostile to any agreement arrived at between the Federal or Imperial Governments, or between those Governments and the State, nor do I desire to do anything that may prove injurious to the State. On the other hand, I will not stand for any agreement or policy, irrespective of what party may be in power, that will merely mean the transfer of the unemployed from the heart of London to the heart of Western Australia.

Mr. Teesdale: Don't forget that you get £1,250,000 free of charge with them!

Mr. MARSHALL: That is what is influencing the hon. member.

Mr. Teesdale: It is not hard to take, and the Treasurer appreciates it.

Mr. MARSHALL: We all appreciate cheap money. What the hon. member overlooks is the question as to how our economic salvation will be worked out under any agreement that merely transfers the unemployed from one part of the Empire to another.

Mr. Teesdale: We require population so that we may settle them here.

Mr. MARSHALL: Of course, we do.

Mr. Teesdale: I recognise that we do not want unemployment.

Mr. MARSHALL: The question arises whether we can have both under existing circumstances.

Mr. Teesdale: The country is big enough, and Heaven knows we have not reached our limit yet.

Mr. MARSHALL: The country is big enough to take in all England, including the sovereign head. It is big enough to take one or two other nations as well, but the fact remains, the State is not sufficiently developed to absorb those people. We cannot even absorb those who are here to-day.

Mr. Sampson: Nonsense!

Mr. MARSHALL: We are issuing doles to the unemployed now, and have been doing so during the last few months.

Mr. Teesdale: We cannot avoid that altogether, but we can absorb them when the migrants come here.

Mr. MARSHALL: I can see what is happening to-day! In order to get cheap money, to which one cannot be too hostile because it helps in the development of the State, we are sacrificing the manhood of our Australian citizens.

Mr. Teesdale: But the Government are dealing with the few now out of employment. Give them time!

Mr. MARSHALL: It is not a matter of these men being out of employment for a few weeks or so, but some have been in and out of employment for a year or more. They have got sufficient merely to keep body and soul together. This is no innovation that has crept in during the last few months.

Mr. Latham: It has been so during the last two years.

Mr. MARSHALL: The unemployed problem commenced to become acute when the mining industry started to decline rapidly.

Mr. Teesdale: Every State has had its share.

Mr. MARSHALL: But we are not doing justice to the people of Western Australia.

Hon. G. Taylor: They have not too much to complain of.

Mr. MARSHALL: The hon. member is not compelled to associate with those I meet daily.

Mr. Latham: In the city?

Mr. MARSHALL: Yes, and, strange to say, I know of a similar instance in a town 600 miles away.

Mr. Latham: There are a good many people who go out looking for work on manganese deposits, and so on.

Mr. MARSHALL: I am fully conversant with the position in my own electorate. On my last visit there, I met three men. Fortunately, the Minister for Works was there at the time and knew one of them. They had been sent up by the Labour Bureau. When I asked who had sent them there they said Mr. Hitchins had rung up a departmental officer. They did not know who that officer was, which was fortunate for the officer but unfortunate for me. He inquired of the railway line from Meekatharra to the Forshoe deposit of manganese would be started. They said, "Yes, immediately. Send them along." Those three men were destitute and were being maintained by the local community. I wired to Mr. Hitchins to see if sustenance could be granted till they got work. Also I wired to two or three employers who, I thought, wanted men. We got work for them, but no sustenance. At all events the unemployed market of the city was relieved to that extent. I do not want that sort of thing in my electorate. It is utterly unjust to send men 600 miles to a railway head and then leave them destitute.

Mr. Teesdale: But you found work for them.

Mr. MARSHALL: We had to find it.

Mr. Sampson: Surely three extra men on the Murchison is not a very important matter.

Mr. MARSHALL: It meant displacing other men. The same thing applies in respect of the migration agreement; we are merely putting one lot of men out of work to put in another.

Mr. Sleeman: You do not find foreigners amongst the unemployed.

Mr. MARSHALL: No, because the employers find their cheap labour amongst the foreigners.

Mr. Latham: Who amongst the employers is getting that cheap labour?

Mr. MARSHALL: I cannot say.

Mr. Latham: Of course not. It is just another wild statement, such as you usually make.

Mr. MARSHALL: I will make some bolder statements directly. I believe 2,000 or more foreigners from southern Europe have landed in this State within the last two years. No matter where you go in this State, you will not find one of them unemployed.

Mr. Latham: It shows they are pretty good battlers.

Hon. G. Taylor: How do you explain that?

Mr. MARSHALL: In this way: The Minister for Agriculture had to circularise those drawing money from either the Industries Assistance Board or the Agricultural Bank that they were to expend that money on Australian or British labour.

Mr. Latham: It was a scandalous instruction.

Mr. MARSHALL: None of us hold you responsible for anything you might say.

Mr. Lindsay: Surely the instruction was not issued by the Minister for Agriculture.

Mr. MARSHALL: Well it was issued by the permanent head. It is very easy for one to make a slip of the tongue. I remember when the hon. member himself made a slip that might have landed him in the divorce court. I want to compliment the Y.A.I., upon their latest movement. It is well worthy of the Government's support, and those responsible for it should be duly commended. But to support a migration scheme under which, merely because we can get cheap money for development—

Mr. Latham: Development provides work.

Mr. MARSHALL: I want to emphasise the point that if our migration agreement is only going to transfer unemployed from one part of the Empire to another to displace Westralian workers, it will get no support from me.

Hon. G. Taylor: You do not charge the migration policy with having put those three out-of-works into the Murchison district?

Mr. MARSHALL: No, but we never know what influence it might have. But for the migration policy, those three men might have been employed down here. The same thing is happening on the Eastern goldfields to-day. Men and women displaced by the decline in mining are not coming down here to take up other avocations, are not going into the agricultural districts in a vain quest for land, but are leaving the State. So it seems we are merely paying to bring out people, not acclimatised to Australian conditions, to take the places of our Australian born. I have nothing against the migrants themselves, but just as I am inclined to be loyal to the land of my birth, so are the migrants coming into this State.

Mr. Latham: You will be disloyal if you do not get more people to put on the land waiting to be peopled.

Mr. MARSHALL: Unless I can see a great change of policy regarding land settlement, a change that will provide greater consideration for young Australians, I will

not support the migration scheme. The foreigners within our gates are employed, while Australians are looking for work.

Mr. Sampson: How do you explain that?

Mr. MARSHALL: By the love of the employers in this State for cheap labour. I want to see Australians getting preference, not only in land settlement, but in employment also. These migrants are induced to come out here by misleading posters, holding up Australia as a great garden flowing with milk and honey. They are told it is the best country in the world for the workers.

Hon. G. Taylor: So it is.

Mr. MARSHALL: I agree. But there is a great desire on the part of the employers to upset it all.

Hon. G. Taylor: Oh, nonsense!

Mr. MARSHALL: It is all very well for the hon. member to take up that attitude, but I knew him when he was of another political faith and when he used stronger words than mine in support of the view I am putting forward. I knew him when he was pushing a bicycle through Kookynie and swallowing more fire in one evening than I have done the whole of my life.

Hon. G. Taylor: You could not get men to do work in those days. There was so much work to be done and so few to do it.

The Premier: Them was the days!

Mr. MARSHALL: I have seen as many as 30 or 40 men attending at each mine at each shift, and that at the very time when the hon. member used to go through there. Of course we had unemployed then. I will say this, that because of so many new discoveries many of the best men were constantly on the move, and so other men got their turn at employment. But we had unemployment then as bad as it has ever been. Coming to the mining industry, I want to commend the Government on their administration and also on the legislation they have introduced, legislation that has had a beneficial effect upon the industry. I do not hold out very much hope for any great progress in the industry for some time to come. If the yes-no high tariff-freetrade combination in the Federal Parliament continue to hold office for any great length of time, there will be very few industries left in this State. It is not to be expected that the mining industry would be attractive to investors when we see almost daily in the various market reports that there is some Government, perhaps three or four, going on the market for a loan. At present money

is dear, which indicates that there are in abundance avenues of investment offering gilt-edged securities. With finance in such a condition, it is not to be expected that investors should be prepared to take a certain amount of risk in gold mining or any other form of mining. I do not think it will be until other avenues of investment dry up somewhat and money becomes cheaper that we shall be able to reach that stage, and some time must elapse before that will happen.

Mr. Sampson: You are glorifying capital.

Mr. MARSHALL: That is more than I can do for the hon. member; I would never glorify him.

Mr. Latham: It would not be much of a compliment if you did.

Mr. Teesdale: You do not want the one per cent. cut down, do you?

Mr. MARSHALL: In my district and in almost every goldmining district, deposits have been unearthed which, had they been discovered 25 or 30 years ago, would have brought thousands of pounds. There are finds like that at Mt. Vernon carrying in places very rich ore, but the poorest of which is payable. It has been tested over a length of three or four miles, and though it has been under offer for some time, no one will offer a reasonable price for it.

Mr. Clydesdale: How far is it from a railway?

Mr. MARSHALL: A long way. Mt. Samuel is 60 miles distant, and that in turn is over 100 miles from Leonora. There is another belt known as Cole's Find near Wiluna.

Mr. Heron: That should come when the railway is built to Wiluna.

Mr. MARSHALL: When that happens the hon. member will not be a member of this House. Cole's Find has been tested by the State battery recently, and is yielding good results. It is a fine belt of country and though it is close to the most attractive of the outer fields—Wiluna—no one will undertake the working of those leases. There is also the Jimble Bar deposit of which I cannot speak personally, but which I am informed is a very good surface deposit. A friend of mine sampled it along the surface and said it was one of the finest he had seen. No development work had been done at the time, and of course it was impossible to say whether the values went down. There we have Nabberu, and also the Mistletoe belt of country. If those belts had been discovered 20 years ago—

Mr. Mann: Or at any time prior to the war.

Mr. MARSHALL: That is so—they would have brought thousands of pounds. In fact, people would have rushed them. In the early days mining companies in the Old Country sent representatives here, and some of them were dismissed because they did not buy propositions. I knew of one or two who were dismissed because they would not spend the money given to them.

Mr. Mann: If Wiluna proves all right, do not you think the others will come also?

Mr. MARSHALL: Wiluna is a field peculiar to itself.

Mr. Panton: Like the hon. member.

Mr. MARSHALL: There is no field comparable to it. It is an extraordinary belt that compares favourably with the Golden Mile in length and width, if not in richness. Mass production is the only possible chance in these days of a yes-no high protection freetrade Federal Government.

Mr. E. B. Johnston: The Treasurer is all right.

Mr. MARSHALL: I intended to get extracts from some of the speeches of Dr. Earle Page on the subject of the tariff, before he took a seat on the Treasury benches, with a view to quoting them for the edification of members on the cross benches. They make wonderful reading. The most incomprehensible thing is how Dr. Earle Page could possibly make such a political somersault.

Mr. E. B. Johnston: Oh, no!

Mr. MARSHALL: Of course the hon. member has done the same thing himself, so he could see no fault in the Federal Treasurer. I compliment the Government on the favourable consideration they have given the mining industry, but there are many minor changes that might be considered.

Mr. Mann: They have done all the big things?

Mr. MARSHALL: All that any intelligent Government could have done, but as no intelligence was displayed before they entered office, much remained for them to do.

Mr. Mann: That is rather a qualification of your previous statement.

Mr. Sampson: Could you say it again?

Mr. Latham: He cannot finish it now.

Mr. MARSHALL: Not if I am to be Parliamentary. Certain anomalies exist. I regret that the Minister could not see his

way clear to concede the requests of the Prospectors and Leaseholders' Association of Meekatharra regarding the objectionable position in which a person is placed when he desires the forfeiture of a lease.

The Minister for Agriculture: I shall forfeit more, if necessary.

Mr. MARSHALL: I believe in the leases being worked, and the Minister can rely upon my support in that direction. I agree with these men, however, who regard it as objectionable to have to jump a lease and then apply for the forfeiture. Let me quote one case. The Minister knows the parties. There is a great mining magnate in Perth who claims to have done more to develop the mining industry than has any other individual, but wherever I have travelled in this State and inquired about leaseholders whose leases were not being worked, his name has been mentioned. If holding mining leases and preventing others from working them is developing the mining industry, his claim is justified.

The Minister for Agriculture: Who is the man?

Mr. MARSHALL: Claude de Bernales.

Mr. Teesdale: He did a bit for Wiluna.

Mr. Mann: He brought the capital into Wiluna.

Mr. MARSHALL: He did nothing of the kind.

The Premier: He is taking it out. He is getting £10,000 for his share, and has put nothing in.

Mr. Mann: He induced others to put money into Wiluna.

Mr. MARSHALL: Let me tell the member for Perth that if any man was responsible for keeping money out of Wiluna, it was the same gentleman. He paid practically nothing for the leases and the equipment on them.

Mr. Latham: Those leases were open to others.

Mr. MARSHALL: No, not until I came into Parliament. Not until then were they open to others.

The Minister for Agriculture: Where does he hold leases now that are liable to forfeiture?

Mr. MARSHALL: I wish to deal particularly with the procedure necessary to secure the forfeiture of a lease. Before doing so, let me tell the member for Perth that the gentleman referred to, having secured the Wiluna leases for a mere song, now wants many thousands of pounds for

the same property. Many years ago I understand he turned down a proposition offered by a company on the Golden Mile, the cash value of which would have been sufficient to equip and develop the Wiluna mines. If the previous Minister for Mines had forfeited those leases when application was made for their forfeiture—they were no good to the prospector who would have merely picked them over—

Mr. Mann: You have to thank him for the company.

Mr. MARSHALL: I shall not thank an exploiter for anything. At one period the leases were worked by that gentleman and the wages were not paid until recently, many of the men having died and others having left the State so that the liability was very much reduced. I have no time for a man that sweats others and hangs up valuable portions of the State awaiting premiums that are undeserved. Members say he brought money into Wiluna; he kept money out of Wiluna. It was the business people who kept Wiluna going; they kept the employees of Bernales in food and clothing. The member for Perth will remember that when he entered Parliament, at about the same time as I did—the electors alone were responsible for that—these leases were in liquidation. At that time it was not possible for a prospector to apply for the forfeiture of a lease for breach of the Mining Act until he first obtained permission from a judge of the Supreme Court. If a man wanted to apply for the forfeiture of any lease that was in liquidation he would have to obtain the permission of a Supreme Court judge in Perth before he could do so. The sly gentleman who owned these properties knew this. He violated all the principles of the Mining Act, but did not care about that. He knew the cost would be too great for any ordinary prospector to go to the expense of applying for forfeiture in this way. What the people did, however, was to get together the funds to enable them to finance one of their number to go through this procedure. Application was then made for the forfeiture of one or two of the leases. On the second or third occasion, when the application was heard at the Warden's Court, the advocate for the gentleman in question declared that the prospector was a professional jumper.

The Minister for Mines: Who was that?

Mr. MARSHALL: George Gazford.

The Minister for Mines: He is a fine old chap.

Mr. MARSHALL: In a small community people become well acquainted. If one of their number owns a mining tenement he knows that none of his friends would make any attempt to jump his lease. The people in the district think it would be advisable if the Government Inspector of Mines, in the course of his ordinary tour were empowered to see for himself what leases were being worked and what others were being neglected. If in his opinion a lease was not being worked as it should be he could then summon the lessee before the warden to show cause why it should not be forfeited. When mining was cheaper than it is now, people did not mind a man owning a lease that was out of operation, because there were probably others offering a good opportunity as that one offered. To-day the cost of mining and prospecting is so high that people desire to get as close as possible to the State batteries. When a lease is not being worked a good deal of dissension is caused in the community, and they generally wrangle with the lessee. There would be no harm in the Government inspector summoning the holder of such a lease to show cause why it should not be forfeited.

Mr. Clydesdale: Are many of these leases held up?

Mr. MARSHALL: There are some. Prospectors like to get close to a battery. The subsidy granted by the Minister is much appreciated, for it has brought the prospectors within a radius of five miles of a battery, although their shows may be 30 miles away as the crow flies. I am informed that even with this concession the tonnage treated at State batteries has not increased. I think that is partly due to the increased cost of mining. It is very difficult now to get anyone to back a prospector, for owing to the cost of mining this sort of work has become very expensive. I am informed that there are several low grade propositions close to State batteries. Ministers for Mines have often stated that the great trouble with State batteries is that they are out of work for so long during the year that they depreciate greatly in value. If they were kept continually in operation, they would not deteriorate nearly to the same extent. The prospectors say that some advantage might be derived if low grade ore were crushed free of charge. This would keep employed a number of persons who would

carry on their work in the hope of striking something better. I speak from personal observation of these matters. I know the officers of the State Batteries Department, and from a technical point of view could not wish for better. I believe they are sincere in their desire to do justice to the State as well as to the prospector. From what I have seen, however, of two batteries in my electorate, there seems to be a desire to kimp the expenditure required to keep them in repair. Some time ago the Minister for Mines visited Peak Hill and heard the complaints that were made to him. He said they could be attended to. I had a look at the State battery recently after it had been reconditioned. From the point of view of efficient returns it is not in as fit a condition as it was when the Minister was there.

The Minister for Mines: It is less than 2 months since I was there.

Mr. MARSHALL: Money was spent on reconditioning it with this result. I understand that it is to be put right. I should like to know how these things occur. There is the same slipshod method of reconditioning evidenced in the Meekatharra battery. The officers know better. Perhaps the money is not available. It is time more money was spent in the direction of putting the Meekatharra and Peak Hill batteries into an efficient condition. Certainly both of them are far from efficient at present. I have not seen the Meekatharra battery since the mortice blocks were reconditioned, but I shall take the first opportunity of doing so, and I hope I shall find a great improvement on the Peak Hill State battery. The Railway Department is a hardy annual with me. I am just about tired of trying to obtain some reform in the railway transportation of human stock and live stock on the Murchison.

Mr. Mann: You will get the reform when you get a change of Government.

Mr. MARSHALL: Possibly; but if the change brings back the old personnel, it will be a change for the worse. Hon. members opposite might at least admit that when in office they did very little for the mining industry.

The Minister for Mines: When they come back they will fight like Kilkenny cats.

Mr. MARSHALL: No doubt they will come back, but not within the next decade. The people of this State are too brewed to let them come back. With regard to railway transportation, while another member was speaking I in-

terjected that the condition of the rolling stock used between Geraldton and Meekatharra was an evidence of the inefficiency of our railway system. I repeat that expression of opinion now, and largely I blame the Murchison people themselves for the position that exists. Even when there were many thousands of people at Day Dawn, Magnet, Sandstone, and other centres of the Murchison, even in those days of prosperity, the people were singularly content to put up with anything whatever that the Railway Department liked to shove on them. In consequence the department have grown to look upon the Murchison as a depot for worn-out rolling stock, at all events in regard to passenger coaches.

Lieut.-Colonel Denton: Evidently you have not travelled on the Midland railway.

Mr. MARSHALL: No, but probably I shall do so some day. It can hardly be worse than the Murchison line. Strangely enough, nobody seems to be responsible for the running of the trains on the Murchison section. It does not seem to matter whether a train gets in on time or off time. I have been in correspondence with the department about the irregularity of the service. Although there is a schedule for the trains to run to, it seems to be impossible to secure punctuality. The member for Cue (Mr. Chesson) referred to this matter, and he would have been justified in using strong language with regard to it. Residents of Cue come to the railway station to catch the train at schedule time, about 2.30 a.m. The train may not have even reached Magnet by that hour. Consequently intending passengers do not know where the train is, or how long they will have to wait. All they can do is to lie down on the asphalt and wait. That is not proper treatment to mete out to people with long journeys before them. They should be entitled to expect that trains will run to schedule time. The time table has been extended twice, the last time by an hour; and still the trains are frequently as late as, or even later than, they were prior to the alteration of the schedule. I have also to complain of the water service on the trains. I wrote to the department on the matter, and have a promise that any occasion for complaint will be obviated in the future. Therefore I shall not offer further comments at this juncture; but if the promise is carried out in the same way as the promise that long-distance passengers would get preference of seats and of clean compartments when changing trains at Mullewa, the department

will know I have been speaking. I am becoming impatient, because it is a shameful state of affairs when women and children have to travel 600 miles without a drop of fresh water for them to drink. For the swell bugs from the Eastern States on the expresses the most up-to-date catering is furnished. They enter this city and get a line of orders for Eastern States houses and then go back again. They are catered for wonderfully. But good solid citizens who develop this State are put off with refuse.

Mr. Mann: Have you any trouble in getting the present Minister for Railways to remedy those defects?

Mr. MARSHALL: I have not troubled the Minister, because I have come to the conclusion that one can get as much from the department as from him.

Mr. Latham: You think you will get something from this House?

Mr. MARSHALL: If it is to be in the line of intelligence, it will never come from the hon. member interjecting. There is another complaint I have to ventilate. It is only a sample, though perhaps the most glaring one, of several complaints which have been brought under my notice regarding the transport of merchandise and live-stock on the train from Meekatharra. I have communications from Eves & Co., of that town, who lodged a claim to recover £7 7s. 2d. for sugar damaged in transit from Fremantle to Meekatharra.

Mr. Mann drew attention to the state of the House.

[Bells rung, and a quorum formed.]

Mr. MARSHALL: I would not refer to this matter were it not for the fact that it is one of many similar incidents. Furthermore, I wish to impress upon hon. members that the loss involved has to be borne by the workers at Meekatharra. Eves & Co. wrote to the Railway Department pointing out that the doors attached to the truck had become unhinged and had worked to and fro, with the result that about seven bags of sugar had been damaged and the contents lost. They got no satisfaction from the department and I took the matter in hand. To my communication I received the following reply—I will not quote the whole of the letter—

No. 2. The evidence elicited shows—

I do not know where the evidence came from. I assume the evidence was given by the officer responsible for the occurrence—

—that the consignment in question was duly loaded into van D576, a direct truck for Meekatharra, and the vehicle was in perfect order when despatched from Fremantle. The only explanation of the occurrence is that the doors became dislodged owing to oscillation whilst in transit.

That is the departmental explanation, but I will not have it. They may be able to put that sort of stuff over some docile members, but it will not wash with me.

Mr. Latham: What do you propose to do?

Mr. MARSHALL: I will tell the hon. member when the Estimates are before us. The departmental reply contained further references as follows—

No. 3. In dealing with these matters the Commissioner's viewpoint may be summarised as follows:—(a) The goods rate book provides an alternative risk for the conveyance of sugar; therefore it is optional for our clients to accept the risk or place it upon the Government. (b) The chance of damage through oscillation of truck whilst in transit is an ordinary risk of transportation and one which the Department is always willing to accept providing the owner of the goods elects to place the risk thereon.

Mr. Mann: Were the goods consigned at the owner's risk?

Mr. MARSHALL: Yes. The department say that the chance of damage from oscillation represents an ordinary risk and no one would object to that. However, I have corresponded with the department respecting another case but the one I quote is probably the most glaring. No one apparently is responsible and the Murchison people will have to shoulder the burden. I have also complained to the department regarding the system of marshalling trains. I am informed by the department that owing to the regulations the system cannot be altered. A train leaving Meekatharra is very often a mixed one and includes trucks of livestock as well as those containing sandalwood, refractory ores and other similar lines, in addition to the passenger coaches. Strange to say, the trucks of livestock are attached to the engine. The result is that at every siding the stock are shunted backwards and forward and are bumped continuously. It was suggested that the stock should be marshalled in front of the coaches for passenger traffic, but it was said that the odour might be objectionable to the passengers and therefore that proposal was not favourably received. I then suggested that the stock should be marshalled behind the passenger coaches, but again the departmental officials said it could

not be done owing to the regulations. Under the existing system the stock are landed in a condition altogether unfavourable to the growers, owing to the knocking about they receive, and that is quite apart from the inhuman aspect of such treatment to stock.

Mr. A. Wansbrough: Did you say it was a regulation?

Mr. MARSHALL: That was what they told me.

Mr. Withers: They were putting it over you.

Mr. MARSHALL: The officer who spoke to me on the telephone said that regulations prevented it. I would advocate putting the stock in behind the passenger coach so as to relieve them of all unnecessary knocking about. Another matter that seems to be settled to the satisfaction of the departmental officers, although not to mine, is in regard to the time absorbed by special stock trains. One must offer some thanks for the reduction in the hours of transit from 52 to 36. It is a considerable reduction, and the growers are duly grateful for it. But it does not say that all that is possible has been done. I have had a look at the railway time table to see how many stops are entailed in respect of a mixed train leaving Meekatharra, and how many stops would be necessary for a special stock train. I find that the ordinary mixed train has 57 stops in the 600 miles, but that for a special stock train the necessary stops should not exceed 15. It is strange that the one train can do the journey in 33 hours 50 minutes, while the special stock train, with nothing to hinder it but the necessary 15 stops for water and coal, must absorb 36 hours. I got a reply from the department pointing out that since the time table had been reduced to 36 hours nobody could expect anything further. From my knowledge of those trains and from the knowledge of the drivers themselves, a special stock train should average 25 miles per hour, plus half an hour per 100 miles for coal and water and the cleaning of fires. That would bring the stock down here in 28 hours, and I do not think it would be very difficult for the department to put this plan into effect. I want the growers who go out into remote parts of the State to be put as nearly as possible on the same basis as other growers relatively close in to the Midland Junction saleyards. The railway officers have done well, I admit, but there are still possibilities of further material reduction in the time absorbed in the transportation of stock by special stock

trains, and I hope the department will make an effort to reduce the schedule to 28 or 29 hours. I will certainly go into the matter more fully when the Estimates are before us.

Mr. Mann: Is not 25 miles per hour too fast for a stock train?

Mr. MARSHALL: Not on the Murchison line, where the running is both straight and level. I have put it up that in other countries special stock trains are given preference of the road.

Mr. Kennedy: That is not right. Passenger trains always come first.

Mr. MARSHALL: I will produce proof to the hon. member that there are countries where preference is given to special stock trains. Even if passenger traffic invariably had preference in other countries, it is not to say that we should follow suit. Personally I would rather lose half an hour in order to give the stock preference. If the conditions were equal for all growers I would not mind it so much, but as it is I feel compelled to do what I can in the interests of the outback growers. My proposition was not favourably received by the department, and when I suggested that two engines might be necessary the departmental officials said it would not be profitable. However, I am not at all prepared to admit that there is any loss to the department on a special stock train costing £420, which is the cost of a train from Meekatharra.

Mr. Mann: I was advised to-day that one rope for a mine at Leonora would cost £110 in freight. That is greater in proportion than the cost of a stock train at £420.

Mr. MARSHALL: It has been said that there is no increase in taxation, that where taxes have been increased it was for a specific purpose, and that the money would be expended to the advantage of those that paid it. That does not apply to the Murchison electorate. It is said that the proceeds of a tax such as the petrol tax can be expended for the benefit of the people generally, but such expenditure does not benefit the Murchison people. I am in accord with the member for Pilbara who quoted the rates of freight charged on the Port Hedland-Marble Bar line. He spoke truly when he complained of taxation in the shape of railway freights, as well as the taxation on income from personal exertion. Some years ago I tried to get an amendment made to the Income Tax

Assessment Act, but it was defeated. I suggested the introduction of a zone system, and the effect of the amendment would have been that in remote centres where the cost of living exceeded that of the city by 20 per cent. or more, the equivalent would be allowed by way of income tax deduction. Because a worker at Meekatharra, Peak Hill, Nullagine, or Marble Bar receives an increased rate of wages, it does not follow that the money is of greater benefit to him. The workers in such places receive higher wages only to enable them to live. Thus an anomaly exists. People in the metropolitan area enjoy great advantages in the matter of taxation. I urge the need for an amendment of our taxation assessment to make it more equitable to the workers far removed from the city, and give them some relief as suggested by the member for Pilbara.

Mr. Mann: Are you speaking of land tax?

Mr. MARSHALL: No, income tax from personal exertion. All Governments seem to overlook the unfair position in which people who go to the back country are placed. There is always an outcry against people flocking to the metropolitan area, but when people see that some benefit is to be derived from living there, it is only natural that they should flock there. I suppose no one will argue that it is not more comfortable to live in the city than in a place like Meekatharra. In the shape of indirect taxation an additional burden is imposed upon workers in centres far removed from the city. I have some figures of railway freights from Fremantle. Tea is charged £13 16s. 7d. per ton for a minimum of five tons. Sugar is charged £5 6s. per ton, and for lots of less than five tons the rate is £11 3s. 11d. I understand that storekeepers get their supplies in one-ton lots, so that they have to pay the maximum rate. That in turn is passed on to the consumers—the workers in the pastoral and mining industries.

Mr. Mann: Are not those things considered when wages are being fixed?

Mr. MARSHALL: The cost of living is taken in a comprehensive way, but what allowance is made by the Arbitration Court for such freights? None at all. What allowance was made under the basic wage for dental and optical operations? Only bare sustenance was allowed. If we could get some relief from this double taxation,

I would feel more satisfied. No one seems to notice these anomalies, and no one seems to care. The proposals of the Federal Government afford a good illustration of what is happening to the North. We might as well expect the Federal Government to administer the affairs of the State as efficiently as do the State Government as to expect the State Government to administer efficiently the affairs of the North-West. I have before me a map showing that 90 per cent. of the people of Western Australia are living in the red spot indicating the south-west corner of the State. What hope have the people outside that red patch of getting fair and equitable legislation as against the other 90 per cent.? The State is in the same position in relation to the Federal Government.

Mr. Davy: That is compensated for a little because you represent how many?

Mr. MARSHALL: The hon. member gives me credit for representing my constituents. That is more than I can give him credit for.

Mr. Mann: He was friendly to you and you gave him an unfriendly reply.

Mr. MARSHALL: I stress the point that we are paying one tax upon another, and it is time we received some relief, that is, if any encouragement is to be given to people to go into the back country. Many people will go into the remote parts to live if they receive reasonably favourable treatment, but when people become aware of the anomalies existing, they make for the city where the advantages are greatest. Recently I asked some questions regarding the petrol tax. It appears that the Minister for Works is going to be unfortunate in the matter of his tax; the Federal Government are after his scalp. What has interested me is the amount of money that the Government have been instrumental in putting into the hands of the combine. According to the replies to my questions, during the quarter ended the 31st March, 1926, £23,058 of public money was left in the hands of vendors of petrol to be utilised to their advantage for a period of three months. That sort of thing occurs each quarter in the year. They have been permitted to go on utilising public moneys in any way they think fit. There is no charge by the Government upon it. All that the petrol tax has done to the Murchison electorate is to place a further embargo upon its development, and to fatten the combines in the city.

Mr. Davy: You mean because the Government do not collect the tax immediately it is due.

Mr. MARSHALL: That is so. Immediately the Bill went through they charged as from the 1st January, and held the money until the 31st March. I suppose in the ordinary business way they handed over a cheque at the end of the quarter.

Mr. Davy: The Government hold a lot of the taxpayers' money, on which they do not pay any interest.

Mr. MARSHALL: It is not the duty of the Government to grease the fat pig.

Mr. Mann: How often should they pay the tax?

Mr. MARSHALL: If I had my way, no such tax would be inflicted. I do not see eye to eye with the Government in this matter. How long will it be before the Meekatharra road board district will be gazetted an area under the Main Roads Act? I hardly think I shall live long enough to see it. The people of the Murchison are compelled to contribute towards this tax, believing that some day in the distant future they will be compensated for the amount they have contributed towards the roads in the city and in the South-West. I opposed the Bill when it was before the House, and if I can do anything to defeat the scheme I will do it. My attention has been drawn to a feature in the system of taxation as applied to pastoralists. This is a case of three struggling persons, who left the mining industry to take up the life of pastoralists. As a rule on the Murchison, water is obtained at a shallow depth, but on this occasion after they had spent a long time in sinking, they failed to get water. They incurred an expenditure of about £300. Members will be surprised to learn that this amount was made the subject of taxation by the department, and the men were obliged to spend further money in filling up the shaft to prevent stock from falling into it. If it is proposed to develop the outer portions of the State, the Government will have to bring forward legislation of a preferential character, whether they like it or not. I do not agree that the North-West cannot be developed by the State, but it cannot be developed under the existing system. Some time ago the Minister for Works sent out a circular intimating that the Meekatharra Road Board, amongst other road boards, must pay a tax of 2d. in the pound for country wards and 1s. 6d. for town wards, otherwise no further

subsidies would be granted. I do not know what was in the mind of the Minister, but the action appears to be too severe. I know the general opinion is that when squatters are mentioned, there is nothing more to be said, because it is generally believed that they live in the lap of luxury and that they have no trials, tribulations, or troubles. That is not correct. On the Murchison there are many struggling squatters, repatriated soldiers and others, who find it burdensome to keep pace with their liabilities. I believe no information was elicited by the department when this circular was issued, and that no facts or figures were asked for. The circular was issued in a Mussolini fashion, and as much as to say, "There it is; do as I tell you or go out." I do not know whether the Minister has a right to say what should be done with public moneys. From time to time we allocate moneys for subsidising different road boards, and when it is allocated to that purpose it should be devoted to it. I take exception to the electors of the Murchison being taxed, and to the moneys derived from them being spent on roads in the South-West. On top of all this, we have received a circular saying we must impose further taxation upon ourselves and be called upon to do what Parliament says shall not be done. In this case, the road boards should have been consulted. I am constantly being approached by struggling squatters. It does not matter in the case of wealthy squatters whether the rate is 3d. or 4d. in the pound. It does matter in the case of those who have small properties, and who find the greatest difficulty in paying even the interest that is due. When these charges are made upon them in face of their other adversities it is very disheartening for them. I hope the Minister for Works will to some extent nullify the effect of the circular. I understand that the Meekatharra Road Board wrote to him on the matter. If they gave him any offence, it was not without some justification in the circumstances. I appeal to the Minister, at least for some consideration to the struggling growers. There is, too, the proposed increase in rates on town lots, which are mostly held by ordinary workers. Those workers are already labouring under quite sufficient disabilities. It is unfair continually to heap burdens on people who have a hard fight for existence. There seems to be no end to the imposition of tax after tax. I understood that there was to be exemption as re-

gards the entertainments tax. Incidentally I should like information as to the amount of revenue obtained under that tax. I was given to understand that our entertainments tax would be administered on the same lines as the Federal tax had been, and that exemption would be granted to patriotic and benevolent associations. However, I find that it is not so. There is a little picture entertainment conducted in Meekatharra for the benefit of a community of hard toilers, the only break in their monotonous lives, year in year out. The receipts go into a fund which is utilised to help men injured in the mines, or to pay their funeral expenses if they are killed. Even from this entertainment the tax is greedily exacted by the Treasury. I congratulate the Government on the heroic stand they have taken with regard to State insurance after the ferocious attack of the member for West Perth (Mr. Davy). Legislation on the subject is years overdue. A resolution calling for the establishment of a State insurance office was carried by this House several sessions ago. The member for West Perth certainly put up a noble fight for the retention of privileges by the most callous and cold-blooded section of the commercial community.

Mr. Latham: He was attacking the Government because of an illegal action of theirs.

Mr. MARSHALL: No. His attack was directed against State insurance.

Mr. Hughes: There are about 60 insurance institutions operating in this State.

Mr. Lindsay: There are 42.

Mr. MARSHALL: The tactics adopted by the insurance companies, even when operating under the Workers' Compensation Act, which involves some Ministerial control, are really wonderful. I have here a letter from a resident of the Greenough electorate. It has reached me just recently, and it discloses a marvellous system, the like of which I have never struck before. The company collect the insurance premium, and when one has paid it one finds that there is no insurance. I know of nothing that is more shuffling than the course adopted by the company. I cannot say whether their tactics apply to friendly societies, but they do apply to medical funds such as that established at Meekatharra. The Meekatharra fund helps to maintain the local hospital, thus reducing the calls on the Government in some slight degree. It also helps to provide cheap hospital treatment in cases of occupational accident and of illness. Evidently

not noticing the anomaly which existed, the company paid hospital expenses in two or three cases of men who suffered injury and were entitled to compensation under the Workers' Compensation Act but who happened to be subscribers to the hospital fund. The anomaly lies in the circumstance that those men incurred no expense by going into hospital, since they had protected themselves by subscribing to the fund. Latterly the company, and also other companies, have declared, "We are under no liability in respect of men who are already protected."

Mr. Latham: What does the State say?

Mr. MARSHALL: Exactly the same thing. However, I am not troubling about that. What I am concerned about is that the companies acknowledged liability at the start but woke up to the position later. Then they at once refused to pay. Having enormously reduced their liability, they did not see fit to make a corresponding reduction in the premium. They did not say, "In view of the existing medical funds we will reduce our premiums proportionately."

Mr. Latham: Has the State reduced its premium in those cases?

Mr. MARSHALL: No. How could the State reduce its premium?

Mr. Latham: The State might set an example, especially as it pays no income tax.

Mr. MARSHALL: The letter I have is from Mr. Skuthorpe, of the Surprise lead mines, and is dated the 13th instant. It encloses a letter from Mr. Rigg, manager of the Ocean Accident and Guarantee Corporation Ltd.—a beautiful name—to the metallurgist of the mine, which contains the following:—

Hospital charges. You are not liable for nursing, and in the event of accounts being received for hospital charges, the account must be rendered showing allowance for maintenance—

So nursing and maintenance go out of the scheme—

nursing, chemist's supplies, etc., the former items being paid by the employee.

The companies contend that all they are liable for under the Workers' Compensation Act is a little physic or lint or ointment, or the loan of a few splints obtained from a chemist's shop when there is an accident. Is such an attitude fair?

Mr. Latham: The companies pay for medical and surgical attendance.

Mr. MARSHALL: Nothing of the sort. The attitude of the insurance companies here, if nothing else, is sufficient to prompt any humane Government to introduce legislation to block them.

Mr. Latham: There is no objection to the Government introducing legislation.

Mr. MARSHALL: The liberal treatment meted out to the workers in Queensland, where State insurance is in operation, is a splendid advertisement for the Labour Government there. Everyone of importance who has visited Queensland has been impressed by the work of successive Labour Governments in that direction.

Mr. Lindsay: But the Government there pay only in accordance with the provisions of the Act.

Mr. MARSHALL: No, they give more than that. There was a great coal mine disaster and the Government paid out as much as £200 to the widows. Large sums have been spent in support of indigent persons, such as men or women not eligible for invalid pensions, but who cannot work.

Mr. Sleeman: There is no argument; State insurance is the best!

Mr. MARSHALL: Of course it is. Then there is the Lotteries Bill. I do not know whether it is the intention of the Government to introduce it again, but I consider they should adopt that course.

Mr. Latham: You should know! Have you not held your Caucus meetings?

Mr. MARSHALL: I cannot see any justification for the Bill not being introduced. If it were, I think it would be agreed to in both Houses this time. Why should thousands of pounds go out of the State for the purchase of tickets elsewhere? We have not stopped that practice. We cannot stop people buying lottery tickets, and it will always be so. If we had legislation here to permit lotteries we would be able to do more for hospitals and schools. I draw the attention of the Minister for Health to the urgent necessity for hospital accommodation at Wiluna. Some years ago a cyclone passed over Wiluna and the hospital building was damaged. The Public Works Department sent an inspector up to examine the building. It is the usual method followed by that Department. The most expensive way is adopted, involving a long trip for an inspector, travelling expenses and so on, all mounting up to add to the cost of the work. At that period

Wiluna was suffering from depression but to-day there is much activity there and upwards of 60 men are employed on the mines. The only hospital accommodation available is the remains of one ward, a hessian partition in the middle separating the male side from the female portion. The partition is so low that by standing on a bed, anyone can look over.

Mr. Sampson: That is hardly right.

Mr. MARSHALL: It is so. It was put there when either the hon. member or Mr. Broun was the Minister in charge of the Department. Now that Wiluna is progressing, I hope that the present Minister will take steps to remedy the position. Only recently a woman was admitted to the hospital and the nurse had to take her own bed out to the yard, so that the patient could have her room and receive attention. That is a scandalous state of affairs, and, in view of the activity at Wiluna, it will not be tolerated by the people much longer. Then the school building is absolutely disgraceful. The children should not be asked to go into such a room. I do not know when it was last renovated or painted. Boxes and cases supply the only facilities there and the desks are old and hacked about. I hope that the Minister for Education will give attention to that matter as well. As to Federal proposals we hear of, I will not hesitate regarding my attitude towards the road grant. The Minister for Works is enthusiastic about it and most people here favour it. For my part, I want nothing from the Federal Government in the shape of money. In view of the principle involved, I will have nothing to do with the proposal. I do not desire the Federal Government to put their hands in one of my pockets to take £1 out merely to have them put back 10s. into my other pocket. Any Government that would accept such overtures from the Federal Government simply provide a rod for their own backs. More and more the Federal Government are encroaching upon the domestic affairs of the State. The road grant is accompanied by specific conditions with which we must comply. They dictate terms regarding the migration agreement. They have established their own Public Works Department here, and that I fear is the first step towards taking over the control of the roads direct, carrying out their own works and spending their own money in various directions. The Fed-

eral Government assisted our people regarding wire netting. I do not know what the specified terms were. Now they are going to start in the mining industry, and so it will go on. I would far sooner have the Government bring in a Bill to abolish the tariff altogether, leaving us to raise our own taxation and spend the money as we think fit. They argue that it is not right for one Government to raise money for another Government to spend, as is the case with the per capita payments. They do not adopt that attitude regarding the other questions I have referred to, because there is a motive behind it all. They are trying to establish unification. A leader writer in one of the newspapers referred to an interjection I made during the speech of the Leader of the Opposition and said I had overlooked the fact that I belonged to a party that had endorsed the principle of unification. That gentleman knows nothing about the party. For his edification I may say there is in the party's platform nothing about unification, and that I am not a unificationist. I want nothing from the Federal Government, beyond a relaxation of their taxation. I say let the State raise its own revenue and look after its own affairs. We might just as well be governed from Downing Street as from Melbourne. As usual, all the tariff supporters in this House are out of the Chamber.

Mr. Latham: You are enough to frighten anyone out.

Mr. MARSHALL: It is a pity our constituents cannot have personal observation of the way in which the business of the State is conducted here. It is gratifying to see the interest members take in the discussions in the House. However, I am strongly opposed to protection. If I had my way, I would carry free trade to its fullest extent. I should not be like those members who say they would abolish protection and yet have an indirect tax for revenue purposes. I would not have an indirect tax in any shape or form; I would abolish the lot.

Mr. Latham: We will make you the next Treasurer.

Mr. MARSHALL: I would not accept the office, for I might be tempted to follow the example of the present Federal Treasurer and somersault. At one time I subscribed to the principle of protection, but I soon saw the folly of it. Protection has no beneficial effects. Those who scramble for protection say it brings good wages and conditions. When the Shylocks of protec-

tion want some advantage for themselves, they use that argument. Yet those people would be the first to introduce cheap labour if they could do it. They are not sincere in their protestations. If protection were really instrumental in raising wages and conditions, so high is the protection from which we are now suffering that there should be no further need for the arbitration court, State or Federal. But it is not so. Protection is of value only to those capitalists who want to bolster up certain industries for the time being. We have ever before us the contention that if the tariff were taken away there would be an influx of cheap commodities; in other words, if we did not have the tariff our markets would be glutted. With what?

Mr. Latham: Not with wheat or wool.

Mr. MARSHALL: I do not say our markets would not be glutted. But they would be glutted with necessary commodities. If the tariff barrier were to be lifted, in would come all sorts of good things required by the workers. Listening to the protectionists, one would think the workers then would not have to work at all; that they could simply take those commodities and use them. Of course the argument is absurd. Commodities would come in, but only in return for the commodities we were sending out. My chief objection to protection is that no man can say what it is costing the taxpayer. Apart from the dues paid through the Customs and the burden of collecting them—which keeps an army of officials from farming and other productive industry—nobody knows what the taxpayer has to pay for protection. We are beginning to see that one result of keeping the sugar combine in Queensland going is that all the firms manufacturing bye-products are going out of business in consequence of the high price of sugar. Although my proposed alternative would not overcome all the difficulties, I say that the subsidising of needful industries would be of far greater advantage to the country than is the policy of protection under which we are suffering to-day. The mining industry is almost choked out of existence by the tariff, and the pastoral industry has about reached the stage when only big companies, combines or trusts can afford to undertake the development of stations. Indirect taxation is so burdensome that all forms of production are being driven into the hands of combines and trusts. In the Meekatharra district there were three families on different portions of a lease. To-day

one company—and that not a local company—is holding the whole of that property. Every time the tariff has been increased costs of production have mounted up and demands have been made for increased wages. There has come an outcry for greater protection followed by still higher costs, and so it continues in a vicious circle, like a dog trying to catch its own tail. The best system would have been to subsidise industries, and the taxpayers would then have known what they were paying to keep a particular industry alive and what damage, if any, was being done to other industries. Protection tends to encourage the use of inefficient plant because, when the costs of production go up, manufacturers have only to apply for increased protection and so the use of obsolete machinery continues indefinitely. The member for Fremantle (Mr. Sleeman) has dealt with data that I had intended to use.

Mr. Sleeman: I am sure it was unintentional.

Mr. MARSHALL: There is another matter to which I must refer, namely, the payments made by the State for the maintenance of women and children left destitute as a result of the loss of their breadwinners. I might have touched on this matter when speaking on migration because there is some analogy between the two.

Mr. Sleeman: You are on a good tack now.

Mr. MARSHALL: After this the only topic remaining to be dealt with will be the Fremantle railway bridge. I have investigated pretty fully the system of relief to widows and children, and I am not blaming any particular Government for the existing state of affairs.

Lieut.-Colonel Denton called attention to the state of the House.

[Bells rung and a quorum formed.]

Mr. MARSHALL: The inadequacy of the maintenance granted has been brought under my notice by various people. The member for Collie (Mr. Wilson) is acquainted with one case. I am not blaming any particular Government; if anyone is to blame it is the Parliament, and if members desire to rectify the trouble, it is within their power to do so. It is really callous on the part of the State to grant such inadequate maintenance to children who have no one to protect them in life. The other day I was informed, in reply to a question, that the cost of main-

taining prisoners in the Fremantle gaol is 11s. 1d. per week, and allowing for items that would not apply to the maintenance of widows and children, that amount would be reduced only slightly. When we remember also that the catering for an institution can be carried out much more cheaply than for an individual, it shows how inhuman is the treatment that State dependants are receiving at the hands of Parliament. The present Government have liberalised the allowance to dependants, but there are directions in which I consider economies could be effected and increased allotments made to those people. It is almost inhuman that when a family have been left without a breadwinner we should expect them to exist and be educated and equipped for the battle of life on a smaller amount than the allowance for the maintenance of prisoners. I would rather spare expenditure in some other direction than ask those women and children to maintain themselves on the paltry pittance now granted them.

Mr. Sleeman interjected.

Mr. MARSHALL: The prisoners' allowance is according to regulation and doubtless is down to bedrock. I am sorry that it becomes necessary to bring up this matter from time to time. The departmental officers have an unenviable task, in that they are brought face to face with so many pathetic cases.

The Premier: I shall be able to increase the allowance this year.

Mr. MARSHALL: That being so, I shall not labour the point. I do not wish to harass the Government; if anyone is responsible it is Parliament. I intended to refer to the forms of application, but after the Premier's announcement I shall not do so. There are 3,500 individuals dependent on the Government and, if we cannot afford to feed and equip them adequately, we cannot expect them to develop into good citizens of the State.

The Premier: In many cases we give an allowance to the mothers.

Mr. MARSHALL: I know that. When it comes to big families, they are on all fours with other people who are working.

The Premier: Special cases are dealt with.

Mr. MARSHALL: The allowance of 9s. is inadequate. This will be the last Address-in-reply debate before the next elections. Before next session no doubt many of us will have fallen by the way.

Mr. Mann: Don't be pessimistic.

Mr. MARSHALL: To-night I have had occasion to speak straight to the Government. On the whole, however, I am satisfied that the administration of the affairs of the State has much improved during the last two years. An improvement is also shown in the character of the legislation foreshadowed. I should say that practically every member of Parliament appreciates the fact that good solid, economic, and efficient administration has been the order of the day during the life of the present Government. I thank the Ministers for that legislation which has proved beneficial to my electorate, and to the State as a whole.

On motion by Mr. Coverley, debate adjourned.

House adjourned at 12.13 a.m. (Thursday).

Legislative Council,

Thursday, 19th August, 1926.

	PAGE
Questions: Road making—1, Perth-Armadale Road ;	
2, Fremantle Road	386
Denmark, Medical Officer	386
Harbours, expenditure and revenue	386
Resolution: Financial relations, Commonwealth and	
States	387
Standing Orders suspension	387
Assembly's resolution	389

QUESTIONS (2)—ROADMAKING.

Perth-Armadale Road.

Hon. A. BURVILL asked the Chief Secretary: 1, How much money has been allocated to the Perth-Armadale road during the last three years from (a) State funds or grants, (b) Commonwealth funds or grants? 2, What proportion of traffic fees has been allocated to this road during the last three years? 3, How much was contributed by local authorities?

The CHIEF SECRETARY replied: 1, (a) £10,007 15s. in year 1923-1924; (b) £30,000 in 1926. 2, For the past two years

in which the traffic fees have been allocated, the amount of £12,510 2s. has been expended on work outside of the City of Perth. 3, The information is not recorded in the department.

Perth-Fremantle Road.

Hon. A. BURVILL asked the Chief Secretary: 1, How much money has been spent by the Government on reconstruction and maintenance work on the Perth-Fremantle road during the last 25 years? 2, How much was contributed by local authorities?

The CHIEF SECRETARY replied: 1, £61,798 16s. 10d., and in addition £12,486 17s. 4d. from the Traffic Fees Trust Account. 2, The information is not recorded in the department.

QUESTION—DENMARK MEDICAL OFFICER.

Hon. A. BURVILL asked the Chief Secretary: 1, Is he aware that the medical officer at Denmark has definitely refused to attend group settlers' wives, when in a critical position, unless they are brought into the local hospital? 2, Is he aware that the doctor has refused to see female patients, in a delicate state of health, on a Sunday when they have been conveyed in from the groups? 3, If not, will he cause inquiries to be made as to the accuracy of these statements?

The CHIEF SECRETARY replied: 1 and 2, Complaints have been made to this effect. 3, Independently of such complaints, the medical practitioner resigned the position of District Medical Officer as from 31st July, and the resignation has been accepted. The doctor concerned remains at Denmark, therefore, purely as a private practitioner, who is not subject to the authority of the department.

QUESTION—HARBOURS, EXPENDITURE AND REVENUE.

Hon. A. BURVILL asked the Chief Secretary: 1, What amounts have been expended in the construction of the harbours of Fremantle, Albany, Geraldton, Bunbury, Busselton and Esperance respectively, since work was first started? 2, What were the respective sums provided annually on the Revenue and Loan Estimates during such periods? 3, What amounts still remain unexpended? 4, What is the annual net revenue derived from these ports?