

**Legislative Assembly.***Wednesday, 20th August, 1941.*

	PAGE
Questions: Railways, water haulage to Narrogin ....	285
Growers Charge Act, regulations ....	285
Defence, lighters for troopships ....	285
Petrol importation ....	285
Trolley buses, Claremont service ....	285
Taxation, Senator Johnston ....	286
Perth tramways, extension ....	286
Leave of absence ....	286
Bill: Companies, restored to notice paper ....	286
Address-in-reply, ninth day ....	287

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

**QUESTION—RAILWAYS.***Water Haulage to Narrogin.*

Mr. **DONEY** asked the Minister for Railways: 1, What cost was incurred by the Railway Department for haulage by it of water from railway dams to the railway centre of Narrogin during the year 1940? 2, What was the quantity of water so hauled during that year? 3, What are the average figures over the last five years in respect of (a) cost, and (b) quantity, as set out in (1) and (2)?

The **MINISTER FOR RAILWAYS** replied: 1, £1,100. 2, 1,400,000 gallons. 3, (a) £800, (b) 1,100,000 gallons.

**QUESTION—GROWERS CHARGE ACT, REGULATIONS.**

Mr. **WATTS** asked the Minister for Lands: 1, Have regulations under paragraph (b) of Section 7 of the Growers Charge Act been prepared, and, if so, is it proposed to gazette them at an early date? 2, If it is not intended to gazette any such regulations will the Minister give the House the reasons for the failure to implement the legislation in question?

The **MINISTER FOR LANDS** replied: 1, No. 2, The matter is under consideration.

**QUESTION—DEFENCE, LIGHTERS FOR TROOPSHIPS.**

Mr. **BERRY** asked the Minister for the North-West: 1, Is it a fact that certain troopships are delayed in Fremantle for several days because of lack of adequate

lighterage facilities? 2, How many lighters are there at Fremantle? 3, How many are needed for prompt and efficient handling of troopships, so that no delay may result? 4, Were the lighters already in service built in Western Australia? 5, Are any new ones now in course of construction?

The **MINISTER FOR THE NORTH-WEST** replied: 1, No. 2, 3, 4, 5, In view of the national emergency it is not desirable that this information be disclosed.

**QUESTION—PETROL IMPORTATION.**

Mr. **BERRY** asked the Premier: 1, Is it a fact that large cargo spaces are available on Blue Funnel ships coming from the Far East to Fremantle? 2, If so, would the State Government make representations to the Federal Government to amend the Navigation Act during the period of petrol shortage so that petrol in drum lots could be transported in this available and unused space? 3, Could empty drums be returned on troopships or through mediums in addition to the Blue Funnel ships now trading between Fremantle and Singapore?

The **PREMIER** replied: 1, Space is available on Blue Funnel vessels to a varying extent, dependent upon the amount of cargo that must be lifted from Singapore and Java ports. On some voyages the vessels are fully laden from those ports. Space available is increased when the shipment of cattle from North-West ports ceases. 2, The Navigation Act would not be applicable. The loading and carriage of petrol on those vessels from Singapore would be controlled by Straits Settlement regulations. 3, There would be no objection to the return of empty drums on other ships, if and when space is available. It is impossible to give any definite information on this matter which would be subject to negotiation with the Shipping Control Board on each occasion when drums were to be shipped.

**QUESTION—TROLLEY BUSES, CLAREMONT SERVICE.**

Mr. **NORTH** asked the Minister for Railways: 1, What extra vehicles are required to bring the Perth-Claremont trolley service up to the normal standard of departmental efficiency? 2, Are any vehicles procurable, and if so, what steps have been taken? 3, Is

anything being done to obviate overcrowding of school children in the mornings?

The **MINISTER FOR RAILWAYS** replied: 1, Another six trolley buses are considered necessary. 2, Six trolley bus chassis have been ordered from England for some considerable time but the delivery is uncertain. In addition, steps have been taken to ascertain whether delivery of trolley bus chassis can be made in America. 3, Yes. In some cases school hours have been staggered and the question generally is under consideration with the Transport Board.

### QUESTION—TAXATION, SENATOR JOHNSTON.

Hon. W. D. JOHNSON asked the Premier: 1, Did the State Treasury take any official notice of the following, which appeared in the "Daily News" newspaper of the 27th February last:—

Officials Visit M.P.'s Home.

Commonwealth officers, acting under instructions from the Taxation Department, visited the Adelaide-terrace home of Senator E. B. Johnston today. It is understood that they took possession of certain documents. During the morning indications of unusual activity were apparent at Senator Johnston's home. When a "Daily News" reporter called he found several Commonwealth officers sitting on a garden seat in the grounds. They gave non-committal replies when asked the object of their visit. Inside the house was the Deputy Commissioner of Taxation (Mr. Mears). He, too, would give no information. Later at his office Mr. Mears was asked under what authority the visit took place and who authorised it. Mr. Mears declined to comment or to give any information. He pointed out that he was compelled by his oath of office not to reveal information of a confidential nature pertaining to his duties and he adhered to that stand with firmness.

Similarly no information was forthcoming when a telephone call was put through to Senator Johnston by a representative of this paper. He professed ignorance of any visit by authorities to his home.

2, Did the visit referred to in the report actually take place? 3, Did the visit, if any, have any connection with State revenue as affected by the Senator's taxation liabilities? 4, If so, were investigations continued? 5, If discontinued, was discontinuance due to any payment being made to the Taxation Department? 6, If so, could the sum be made public? 7, Did the investigations disclose any breach of the taxation laws, and if so, will action be taken?

The **PREMIER** replied: I have no official knowledge of the matters raised by the hon. member and I am informed by the State Commissioner of Taxation, who is also the Deputy Federal Commissioner of Taxation, that he is prohibited from divulging or communicating, except in the performance of any duty as an officer, any information respecting the taxation affairs of any person. Section 9 of the State Income Tax Assessment Act imposes the prohibition upon the Commissioner for State Income Tax purposes and Section 16 of the Commonwealth Income Tax Assessment Act contains a similar prohibition for Federal Income Tax purposes.

### QUESTION—PERTH TEAMWAYS, EXTENSION.

Mr. J. HEGNEY asked the Minister for Railways: 1, Is the report appearing in the "Daily News" on the 14th inst. under the heading "Tram Routes may be Longer," an indication of Government transport policy? 2, If it is, will he inform the House whether consideration was given to the proposal (a) to extend the tram route along Beaufort-street from the terminus to Shaftsbury-avenue, (b) to duplicate the line, (c) to reduce the number of stopping places with a view to speeding up the service? 3, If consideration was given to the proposals mentioned in (2), what are the reasons for their rejection? 4, When may I expect an answer to my letter of the 3rd June wherein I submitted the above proposals?

The **MINISTER FOR RAILWAYS** replied: 1, I did not see the report. 2, These are under consideration. 3, See answer to No. 2. 4, When finalisation has been made.

### LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

On motion by Mr. Doney, leave of absence for two weeks granted to Mr. Patrick (Greenough) on the ground of ill-health.

### BILL—COMPANIES.

*Restored to Notice Paper.*

**THE MINISTER FOR JUSTICE** (Hon. E. Nulsen—Kanowna) [4.35]: I move—

That this House, in accordance with the provisions of the Standing Orders relating to lapsed Bills, resume consideration of the Com-

panies Bill, and that the Bill as amended by the Royal Commission be re-printed, and its consideration in Committee be made an order of the day for the next sitting of the House.

**HON. C. G. LATHAM** (York) [4.36]: As this Bill is most important, I shall not offer any objection to the motion of the Minister for Justice; but I desire a complete undertaking from the hon. gentleman that this House will have full opportunity to go thoroughly into the measure. The Bill passed its second reading during last session because the House held that in the best interests of companies now operating here, or to operate in the State in future, we ought to have an up-to-date Companies Act. The members of the Select Committee, later converted into a Royal Commission, have had full opportunity to discuss the provisions of the Bill amongst themselves; but it is a highly complicated piece of legislation, and therefore I want an undertaking that the Chamber will be afforded every opportunity to understand fully what the measure means, before it goes into Committee. There will be no second reading, and so we shall have the Bill before us in Committee immediately.

Mr. Cross: It is nearly a new Bill now.

Hon. C. G. LATHAM: I only want an undertaking such as I have indicated. I offer no opposition to the motion.

The Premier: The Government will not rush the Bill.

Hon. C. G. LATHAM: I want the Bill left here for a day or two so that we may grasp its provisions before it goes into Committee.

**THE PREMIER** (Hon. J. C. Willcock—Geraldton) [4.38]: The report of the Royal Commission was laid on the Table yesterday.

Hon. C. G. Latham: Members have received their copies today.

The PREMIER: I agree with the Leader of the Opposition that this is a tremendously important Bill and will have a great effect on the business of the commercial and accountancy sections of the community, and therefore should be fully considered. I may mention that measures of this kind have taken three or four years to get through other Parliaments; but because we have the experience of those other Parliaments to guide us, and the Select Committee, later Royal Commission, had that experience also in framing its report, the matter has not been so complicated here. The Government

has no desire whatever that the Bill should be rushed through without adequate consideration; on the contrary, it desires the House to give the most serious consideration to this measure, which will have a highly important effect on Western Australian business. If the Leader of the Opposition is anxious that consideration of a particular clause should be postponed, the Government will meet his wishes. While acknowledging the splendid work devoted to the Bill first by the Select Committee and then by the Royal Commission, and having regard to the arduous and onerous duties those bodies undertook, we think it only fair that the House should in the first instance fully consider the report which has been presented. We also desire that in addition to the full information possessed by the Minister in charge of the Bill, the complete knowledge of details of the various clauses possessed by the members of the Select Committee and Royal Commission should be available to the Chamber as a whole. Though the Government, believing that the Bill represents a vast improvement on the present position, is anxious that it should pass, yet we have no desire whatever to rush the measure through. With that assurance I hope the Leader of the Opposition will be satisfied.

Question put and passed.

## ADDRESS-IN-REPLY.

### *Ninth Day.*

Debate resumed from the previous day.

**MR. THORN** (Toodyay) [4.40]: I feel privileged in having the opportunity to speak to the Address-in-reply debate. It is one of the few privileges left to private members that we should insist upon retaining. If we neglect the opportunity to speak on this debate, where we can cover a wide field, we shall lose perhaps the last privilege that private members enjoy.

I congratulate the member for Yilgarn-Coolgardie (Mr. Kelly), who has just taken his seat. Undoubtedly he put up a good fight, because that seat had been held by Labour for many years. The brilliant retinue of Ministers who proceeded to that electorate must be rather disappointed over the result.

The Minister for Mines: Not a bit! We went to help a mate, and that is what the Labour movement stands for.

Mr. THORN: We are in agreement there. I notice from the Press that the Minister for Lands, while in the Yilgarn-Coolgardie electorate, said that he felt pained about some remarks made in this Chamber by the Leader of the Opposition (Hon. C. G. Latham) regarding the gold tax. However, the Minister told only the part of the story that suited his purpose. He did not tell the whole story, and at the conclusion of his address there was loud and prolonged applause. It is remarkable how deceptive electors can be at times; because one would think, on reading that article, that the Labour candidate was home and dry. The ballot-box, however, told a different story. The Minister on that occasion was not convincing.

We have listened during this debate to numerous speeches dealing with Australia's war effort. Our leaders have been criticised in this Chamber, and there has been much destructive criticism of them outside. My suggestion to members and to the public generally is that they should have faith in our experienced leaders, especially those who have received a military training. By our standing behind them and expressing that confidence and giving them all the support we possibly can, there will be no doubt about carrying the war to a successful conclusion.

We have heard much about a new world order that it is said will be the outcome of the war. In my opinion, it is foolish for men with public responsibilities to talk about new orders. The great problem confronting us is the defeat of our enemies, who have been preaching new orders in Europe, while the Yellow Man in the East has been preaching a new order in the East and the South. Our repeated talk about a new order will only result in spreading propaganda for the enemy. Surely, we, as democrats, know our job. As other speakers have said, there is nothing wrong with our democracy. We believe in it; we preach it. Why on earth should we even mention the policy of some of our enemy countries ruled by dictators? If we do not attack this problem in an efficient manner, we may get a new order when the troops return. Our young soldiers now oversea, who are bearing the banner of the Empire, will expect us to place them in industries on their return. That is the work confronting us now.

Hon. W. D. Johnson: That is post-war reconstruction.

Mr. THORN: Yes. I agree with the member for Guildford-Midland. We should be well on with that work.

Hon. W. D. Johnson: Hear, hear!

Mr. THORN: Our soldiers are obtaining a wonderful experience in the various arms of the services. They are being trained in great numbers and will, on their return, be a valuable asset to the Commonwealth. We must realise, however, that we cannot possibly place all our soldiers in trades when the war is over. The Navy, the Army and the Air Force are training men today who will become extremely expert tradesmen, and we must attack the problem of placing them on their return. After the 1914-18 war, land settlement schemes were inaugurated, some of which proved failures. Nevertheless, those schemes resulted in some benefit to the State. I venture the opinion that another land settlement scheme will have to be formulated after the war, because land settlement is one of the most important avenues in which to place our returned men. After the war I feel we shall be able to whip up production, as many markets overseas will be available to us. Today many men are leaving the land in order to return to the trades that they followed before they went on to the land; but they will undoubtedly be forced to give up those positions when our soldiers return. I hope there will be no more advocacy of a new order for the British Empire. I trust that we shall all have a full realisation of our responsibility to the Commonwealth and the Empire, and will make provision to defend this great Democracy and the wonderful freedom we enjoy by doing our duty by those to whom we are responsible. If that attitude is adopted no new orders will be required.

Mr. Fox: So you are satisfied with present conditions?

Mr. THORN: It is ridiculous for the member for South Fremantle to make a remark like that, but I am sorry to say that he has always had a pessimistic outlook. At least his remarks in this Chamber have indicated as much to me.

Hon. C. G. Latham: Except those on the onion Bill!

Mr. THORN: Yes. He was all right on the onion Bill. We are in agreement on that matter; but I wish he had more faith

in his fellow men and would not display such a pessimistic view of the future, because if the position is honestly analysed it will have to be admitted that whatever Government has been in power has always made provision to care for and feed our people.

Mr. Fox: Yes, to a certain extent. It is all right for you fellows!

Mr. THORN: I do not want to continue answering the hon. member because I know his interjections are disorderly, but the fact remains that the majority of the people on the land whom I represent do not enjoy the basic wage. Their income is far below that. We get no help from the hon. member, and I do not see that he has anything very much to cry about.

Before leaving the question of the treatment of soldiers, I wish to refer to a broadcast made by our Prime Minister recently, in which he told the whole of Australia that the policy of the Federal Government was still that of preference to returned soldiers. I am very much afraid he is not fully aware of the activities of some of his departments. One member of the Federal House informed me that there are jobs for returned soldiers but the jobs for which they get preference are mostly of the pick-and-shovel variety. I propose to refer to an appointment made recently in this State, namely, that of Professor Alexander to the position of Educational Officer to the Forces in Western Australia. Most of us know Professor Alexander and are aware that his views are really those of a pacifist, but now he enjoys the rank of major as an educational officer in this State. He is also carrying on his work at the University. He has been given permission by the board to continue his job there and is being paid for that, too. We are acquainted with some returned soldiers who are exceedingly eligible for that position and their names were submitted to the Defence Department. The men to whom I refer are men of broad vision and wide experience. They were State school boys and subsequently joined the teaching staff of the Education Department, eventually rising from the bottom of the ladder to the top. They now rank amongst our inspectors of schools. They have travelled the State and know their fellow men. Their names were submitted to the department but were absolutely ignored. Strings were pulled in Melbourne to enable Professor Alexander to

be appointed to the position. That was most unfair and was certainly not giving effect to the policy broadcast by the Prime Minister a few weeks ago. Men like those to whom I have referred are the type we want as educational officers, men with broad vision and plenty of experience. Professor Alexander is probably a professor in words only, but our State school inspectors are educationalists from every point of view. If all had been fair, one of those men would have received the appointment.

Reference has already been made to the orchard tax, which has caused a good deal of trouble amongst fruitgrowers. I regret exceedingly that I was ever persuaded by certain fruitgrowers to agree to the imposition of that tax.

Mr. Warner: We all have our soft moments!

Mr. THORN: The tax is absolutely wrong in principle and the fruitgrowers were extremely foolish to agree to any scheme to tax themselves. Owing to the difficulties and setbacks the fruitgrowing industry in this State has experienced since the outbreak of war, the extra taxation has pressed very heavily upon the fruitgrowers. I hope to be able to convince the Minister that he should allow this tax to lapse.

The Minister for Lands: You will have to be more convincing than you were in your remarks concerning the Yilgarn-Coolgardie episode.

Mr. THORN: That is another matter! I agree with the Plant Diseases Act under which every grower of fruit is registered and has to pay a shilling registration fee. That is very necessary in order that fruit-fly and plant diseases may be properly controlled, but to impose a tax like the orchard tax is entirely unfair. Many districts have never been visited by an inspector. Wooroloo has never had a fruitfly inspector although the district has paid this tax since its inception. I met a grower from Swan View this morning and he said, "We have never had a visit from an inspector. There has never been one on my property." A member from another place asked for some information about this tax, and it was revealed that the Government had an unexpended surplus of £1,200. Is it fair to extract a tax from fruitgrowers for a special purpose and then for the growers to find that it has not been expended?

The Minister for Lands: It will be.

Mr. THORN: I hope it will not be, and that the Minister will agree to wipe it out.

Mr. Withers: What will happen in an emergency? Where would we get money?

The Minister for Lands: You put up a motion for its institution.

Mr. THORN: I never dodge an issue. I have said I am sorry I ever supported the tax, because I realise it is wrong in principle. The Agricultural Department supplies inspectors for all other sections of the service and those officers police the various Acts. If the Minister obtains a shilling registration I think it is up to the department to find the balance of the money to control diseases. I sincerely trust that the Minister will agree. There is another matter I want to bring to the notice of the House. Some growers refused to pay the tax in the beginning and have never done so, and no action has been taken against them.

The Minister for Mines: Why?

Mr. THORN: That is what I want to know. There must be a weakness in the law or the Minister has no confidence that the magistrate will fine the offenders. The whole position is weakened when growers declare they will not pay and do not do so.

The Minister for Lands: Do you know of any specific case?

Mr. THORN: The Minister should not ask me to mention names. I do not want to do so now, but the Minister knows.

The Minister for Lands: The Minister does not know.

Mr. THORN: He does not know!

The Minister for Lands: No.

Mr. THORN: But I mentioned the names and the Minister wrote them down in front of me.

The Minister for Lands: Yes, and I sent the names to the inspector and he told me your contention was entirely wrong.

Mr. THORN: My contention was not wrong, because the inspector himself told me about those people. I assure the Minister that I am not endeavouring to put anything over him, and I think he knows the position just as I do.

The Minister for Lands: I do not!

Mr. THORN: But I gave the Minister the names!

Mr. SPEAKER: The Minister said he did not know, and the hon. member must accept the Minister's assurance.

Mr. THORN: I do. I would not doubt his assurance.

The Minister for Lands: It would be easy to launch prosecutions in your district or any other district.

Mr. THORN: That proves the correctness of my contention.

The Minister for Lands: No, it does not.

Mr. THORN: If prosecutions could be launched, that can only mean that the fees have not been paid. Owing to war-caused difficulties, the fruit-growing industry as a whole has suffered severely. Growers have lost their markets, and have no means of disposing of surplus output. A further disability is that our output has been sold at very low prices. The growers who go in for export grapes have had a particularly bad time, because cool storage space is required for their output and owing to the shipping position this has not been available. The dried fruit growers have been in a more fortunate position, in that the whole of their pack is now in London, apart from a few tons that have been stowed away in Davy Jones's locker. However, the price paid by the British Department of Food Supplies is lower than the average for the three years preceding the outbreak of war. I think we are entitled to that price for our output, rather than that which has been paid. Now we are faced with the necessity to meet added costs, and that disability is not provided for by way of any compensating payments to us. The redwood boxes for export fruit have proved successful and their appearance is much better than the whitewood boxes formerly utilised. From the shipping point of view, the redwood boxes arrive in London looking clean and attractive instead of soiled and showing signs of handling, which characterised the whitewood containers. Generally speaking, however, all sections of the fruitgrowing industry are having a hard struggle. That applies to those engaged in the production of wine. Our output cannot be shipped oversea, and the effect of that has been that more Eastern States wine has been dumped here, with consequent adverse effects upon the local market.

I make an appeal to the Minister for Works to ascertain whether it is not possible to secure supplies of bitumen to complete

main road work that has been commenced already. I am parochial in this respect in that I refer to the Clackline-Piawaning-road. The Main Roads Board carried out the foundation work two or three years ago, and did a particularly good job. Now the work is being chopped to pieces all for the want of the necessary finishing off. I understand the difficulty confronting the Main Roads Board is to get bitumen supplies. I hope that will be overcome because the work to date has involved the expenditure of a considerable sum of money and the road as it stands is going to rack and ruin. If the surface could be bitumenised, it would be economical.

**MR. J. HEGNEY (Middle Swan) [5.5]:**

In common with other members, I propose to make use of the Address-in-reply debate to deal with a few matters of general importance but of particular concern to my electorate. I was rather amazed at the statement of the member for Toodyay (Mr. Thorn) regarding the new order, to which so many references have been made in this Chamber during the past few days. He suggested that we should not talk about the new order but should get on with the task of winning the war; and that a discussion of such a nature was playing into the hands of the enemy and would convey such information to them as the Axis powers desired, particularly Japan. Last week we read of the meeting in mid-Atlantic of the two great leaders of the English-speaking nations—the President of the United States of America and the Prime Minister of Britain. After that historic meeting, they issued a joint declaration to the people of the world, giving them renewed hope of a better social state in the days to come after the defeat of the Nazi regime in Europe had been accomplished. It would be well for us to read and re-read that declaration because if brought to fruition, it will furnish hope to many people throughout the world. If that result is not achieved, I see little hope for the future. The eight-point declaration was as follows:—

The statement issued by the President and the Prime Minister, it will be recalled, was read in a broadcast yesterday afternoon by the Deputy Prime Minister (Mr. C. R. Atlee). The eight points of their joint declaration of common principles in the national policies of Britain and the United States are as follows:—

1. Their countries seek no aggrandisement, territorial or other.

2. They desire to see no territorial changes that do not accord with the freely expressed wishes of the peoples concerned.
3. They respect the right of all peoples to choose the form of government under which they will live, and they wish to see sovereign rights and self-government restored to those who have been forcibly deprived of them.
4. They will endeavour, with due respect for their existing obligations, to further the enjoyment by all States, great and small, victor or vanquished, of access on equal terms to the trade and raw materials of the world which are needed for their economic prosperity.
5. They desire to bring about the fullest collaboration between all nations in the economic field with the object of securing for all improved labour standards, economic advancement and social security.

Thus members will see that these great statesmen—the President of the United States of America and the Prime Minister of Britain—set out in the declaration that they are anxious to inaugurate a better social era, to secure economic advance, improved labour conditions, and to establish social security now—not after the war is won. The observation by the member for Toodyay, therefore, was hardly in accordance with the high ideals expressed by these two great leaders of the English-speaking races.

6. After the final destruction of Nazi tyranny, they hope to see established a peace which will afford to all nations the means of dwelling in safety within their own boundaries and which will afford an assurance that all men in all lands may live out their lives in freedom from fear and want.
7. Such a peace should enable all men to traverse the high seas and oceans without hindrance.
8. They believe that all the nations of the world, for realistic as well as spiritual reasons, must come to abandonment of the use of force. Since no future peace can be maintained if land, sea and air armaments continue to be employed by nations which threaten or may threaten aggression outside their frontiers, they believe, pending the establishment of a wider and permanent system of general security, that disarmament of such nations is essential. They will likewise aid and encourage all other practicable measures which will lighten for the peace-loving peoples the crushing burden of armament.

That is a magnificent declaration not only to

the peoples of the British Empire and the United States of America, but to all people. The ideal of those men is to establish economic and social security for the people throughout the world. When the Nazi tyranny has been overcome, they intend to make another attempt to reduce armaments, to secure a better adjustment between nations so that there will be no need to resort to war in order to settle international disputes, and to ensure world peace for all time. I was pained to hear the remarks of the member for Toodyay. His speeches are generally sound, but his observations on the planning for the new social order were not in accord with the best thought being expressed at the moment.

At the conclusion of the 1914-18 war we heard references to a new order and post-war reconstruction. We were told of the ideals to be striven for. We were told that that war was one to abolish war, to make the world safe for democracy, to usher in a new era and make the world a place fit for heroes to live in. Many people regarded this talk as propaganda, and unfortunately many of the principles laid down by statesmen of that day have not come to fruition. Many of the men who returned maimed and crippled after fighting for their country had to enter the economic struggle with the rest of the community and help to pay the debt incurred during the war period. If the people expect post-war reconstruction when the present struggle has ended, I think they will have to wake up and take more interest in the matter. They will need to tell the rulers of the world and representatives in Parliament exactly what they want, and not allow the money power to use the machinery of government to exploit them, repress them and make their economic conditions possibly worse than they have been during the last 25 years.

Mr. Marshall: That is what will happen.

Mr. J. HEGNEY: During the 1914-18 war much was said about ushering in a new era, but we are still far from solving the economic and political problems of the last 25 years. The only way we can judge of what is likely to happen is to apply our experience of the past. If we take history as a guide, it is evident that the great mass of the people, the great trade union movement and the producers, all of whom are engaged in the economic struggle, must interest themselves in these problems. Otherwise

the people will continue to drift in the doldrums after this war has ended.

Recently the Press published an interesting article epitomising the present system much better than I can, and as some members may have missed the item, I intend to bring it to their notice. The report stated—

"Health is not mainly a medical problem with which doctors can deal," asserts Dr. John Dale, once of Perth, in a paper published by The Medical Journal of Australia.

"It depends mainly on economics and education," he says. "We can only assess and advise."

Dr. Dale refers to "hundreds of thousands" in Australia who cannot get enough to maintain the right degree of health, though "the physical essentials themselves, as distinct from their cost, exist in superabundance."

"The situation now," he says, "is that the profession already appreciates, or is coming to appreciate, that there are two outstanding medico-sociological problems. These are the prevalence of deficiency disease, particularly among the poor though not limited to them, and secondly the importance of psychological factors in disease."

"Though in recent decades the condition of the poor and of their children, especially as the birth rate diminished, has tended to improve in many respects, the state of affairs, particularly since the last war, has been such that probably a majority of doctors have felt that things could not go on in such a way, and that far-reaching changes in the social system would have to be made."

"We (in Australia) had and have our tens of thousands 'on the dole,' our tens or hundreds of thousands of children who, because of poverty, do not and cannot get the essentials of health."

"We also have a large proportion of our families either outcast or under the continuous threat of unemployment with its consequent physical and mental disease and degradation."

"Australian investigations also show that the children of the poor are smaller than those of the more fortunate, and investigations among the poor in Melbourne city show that the fourth and later children are, after the first six months, distinctly smaller than the first children. One also realises how great is the mental as well as the physical damage resulting from unemployment and the fear thereof. When one thinks of the large proportion of our fellow citizens who are outcast, unemployed or unemployable, or who are forced into congenial labour—round pegs in square holes and vice versa—and who by unhappy and harsh environment in their early years have been thwarted and mentally deformed, one realises the possibilities of applied psychology and the urgent need of thorough-going educational reform."

Dr. Dale asks his colleagues to press for a new order now. The absurd paradox of poverty and increasing insecurity in the midst of plenty and increasing potential security, made the situation intolerable, he said.

"The dreadful cruelty of this tautalisation demands," he declares, "that we, secure, privileged and trusted, who are in a position to estimate and assess the influence of poverty, anxiety and insecurity upon health, should insist on a solution of the paradox."

Mr. Marshall: Unfortunately, it is only too true.

Mr. J. HEGNEY: That is the condition of affairs not only in Melbourne, but also in other cities and is due to the economic conditions prevailing. It is due to unemployment, want and destitution, the undernourishment of men, women and children, and to their being ill-clad and badly housed. Dr. Dale's remarks apply to this State. Our major task at the moment is to win the war and we can best help by supporting the defence authorities and those governing Australia, but it is our duty not only as representatives of the people but also as citizens to try to find a solution of these problems, which, to a large extent, are bound up with the financial problem. I have no intention of dilating at any length on the financial situation, but many of our difficulties are attributable to the ever-growing burden of interest on the community. The heavy demands made upon the financial resources of the State are responsible for many of our problems not being dealt with effectively.

I was pleased to learn that the Premier, despite the capitalistic system as we know it, was in his administration of the affairs of State able to show a credit balance. That was incumbent upon him because of the agreement entered into recently at Canberra at the Loan Council meeting. It was then resolved that the State Treasurers should undertake to balance their ledgers and refrain from increasing taxation. The field of taxation was to be left to the Commonwealth Government for defence purposes. Nevertheless, the Premier has been able to show a surplus of £11,111. Having regard to all the difficulties confronting him, and to the fact that he had to administer the affairs of state in difficult times, he has been able to show that balance.

When speaking on the Supply Bill, the Leader of the Opposition suggested to members, more particularly to those on this side of the House, that they should take more interest in how the money was spent, and said it was our job to scrutinise and check all expenditure. Unfortunately for this Parliament, the control over finance has in the main been removed. Of the State's revenue of approximately £11,000,000, something

like 42 per cent. is used in making fixed payments by way of interest to the bondholders, and in exchange and contributions to the sinking fund. Notwithstanding that members of this Parliament are said to represent the people of the State, they have no say whatever in 42 per cent. of the revenue that is enjoyed by the State. The Government has other commitments in administrative directions, such as in respect of the police, the railway system, education, health matters and so on. These are fixed commitments, and except for variations in the policy guiding those departments, we have little or no say in their expenditure. The State Parliament has long since lost its power over financial matters, and has no say in connection with any loan raisings. The control is now in the hands of the Loan Council. Ministers who make up the executive have to go, cap-in-hand, to the Loan Council. Their proposals are criticised before they get there by a co-ordinator appointed by the Commonwealth Government. The various State Treasurers who are responsible to the people of their State often find their viewpoint set aside and that of the Co-ordinator General accepted. I notice that at the last Loan Council meeting the Treasurers submitted proposals for the raising of approximately £43,000,000. They required that money in order to carry on the various activities they thought should be carried on in their own States. The Treasurers submitted a schedule of works and set out that they required a loan of £43,000,000 in the aggregate so that those works might be put in hand. The Co-ordinator General made his report, and I believe advocated the raising of a loan of only £17,000,000. Eventually a compromise was reached, and a loan raising for the period in question of £20,000,000 was agreed upon. Of that sum Western Australia received £1,185,000. Many years ago the Parliament of this State may have had some control over finance, but from the point of view of which I am speaking, it now has very little.

One of the greatest difficulties confronting us is the heavy burden of interest. That burden will tax the resources of the Commonwealth to the utmost. I was reading a book the other day, wherein the author gives a classical example of the type of burden to which I refer. He said that in 1888 the Government of New South Wales borrowed £16,000,000 for railway purposes. Up to the conversion period in 1924 that State had

paid £25,908,000 in interest on the original loan. When the loan matures in 1955, the author of the book computed that New South Wales would have paid £49,826,000 in interest, and would still owe the original £16,000,000. This sort of thing is going on in private finance as well as in Government finance. How long is it likely to continue?

Mr. North: That system is now being changed.

Mr. J. HEGNEY: In days gone by we know that war debts were not paid, and in many instances were wiped out. In the Commonwealth, debts are still being paid in connection with the last war, and the national debt of Australia has increased to over £1,000,000,000, and £800,000,000 of this was incurred because of the last war.

Mr. Marshall: You mean £806,000,000.

Hon. C. G. Latham: Interest is not being paid on that amount.

Mr. J. HEGNEY: Of course it is. Does the Leader of the Opposition contend that the bondholders who invested money in those loans are not getting their interest?

Hon. C. G. Latham: Great Britain has not been paid any interest for many years.

Mr. J. HEGNEY: I am not speaking of overseas loans, but of loans raised in this country. This is the system of finance as we know it. If it is continued, the people of the country, the farmers and others, will find their standard of existence fall lower and still lower.

Mr. McDonald: Let us stop borrowing.

Mr. J. HEGNEY: We know that private banks have made an effort to hang on to their control of the monetary system. We also know that the Commonwealth Bank has on many occasions come to the aid of the private banks and prevented a financial collapse. The private banks have endeavoured to use the Commonwealth Bank in order to gain greater financial strength than it had hitherto enjoyed. If the Commonwealth Bank was directed so as to be of paramount importance to the people instead of to the Associated Banks, much greater service to the people would result. We know that half the net profits of the Commonwealth Bank go towards liquidation of the national debt. If the Commonwealth controlled the Australian banking system in the same way as it controls the Australian note issue, much larger amounts would

be made available for the reduction of that debt, as well as for aiding the revenue. The question of finance is of paramount importance. Not only supporters of the Labour movement hold that view; it is shared by men in many other walks of life. Business men speak of the hold the Associated Banks have on the commercial life of Australia. Unless the present system is altered, poverty, destitution, and unemployment will continue. It is necessary for the people of all countries to rise up to end the system. Under our economic conditions, it cannot go on.

The alternative to the present system after this war will be communism. It is useless to say that we can continue under the old order, seeing the difficulty of the hungry people in Europe and the disabilities of Australia in regard to the cripples produced by the war. Unquestionably, the present social system cannot continue. The Australian people will want a greater share of what they produce. In Western Australia itself numerous people are not receiving even the basic wage. That wage merely provides for the needs of a man with an average family. It does not give him nearly enough to pay for those things which would raise his standard of living and improve his status. The man raising a family is claimed to be the backbone of the country; yet he is called upon to rear his family on much less than the basic wage. That remark applies not only to wage earners, but to farmers, whom members opposite represent. Under the present system, farmers in particular suffer severely.

Hon. C. G. Latham: And when we try to obtain relief for them, you oppose us!

Mr. J. HEGNEY: The incomes of men in the back country amount to much less than the basic wage. Until the workers and the farmers combine to fight for their common interests, their economic position must worsen.

Several members interjected.

Mr. J. HEGNEY: I fail to understand members of the Country Party supporting the St. George's-terrace farmers. In the Eastern States we find Labour keeping Country Party Governments in power. In Victoria a difference is found to exist between the National Party and the Country Party regarding the real interests of the

farmers and the workers. It is a pity Western Australian farmers do not wake up and realise where their interests lie.

Hon. C. G. Latham: They will wake up next March!

Mr. J. HEGNEY: It is to be hoped they will wake up on the right side. If they wake up and support our friends opposite, they will find themselves in greater difficulties than those under which they suffer today.

Last year the Commonwealth Government introduced a system of child endowment. That system provides weekly payments of 5s. for children from the age of one year to 16 years; but there is a string attached to it. Having made the weekly payments available, having proclaimed to the people of the Commonwealth that child endowment was coming into force, after having been promised for 20 years, the Commonwealth Government proposes to take away the deduction of £50 for each child in respect of income taxation.

Member: That was always part of the proposal.

Mr. J. HEGNEY: There is already provision for that under the Federal Income Tax Act. National and Country Party members have tinkered with this question too long. The Bruce-Page Government won an election on the issue of child endowment. That Government appointed a Royal Commission to inquire into the subject. The Commission lasted for two years, taking evidence all over Australia, but merely produced a pigeon-hole report. The workers of the Commonwealth asked the Commonwealth Arbitration Court to increase the basic wage by 14 per cent., giving various reasons. Although Chief Justice Beeby did not reject the application, he postponed consideration of the matter. He was not opposed to an increase, but he thought that in view of the dangers with which the Commonwealth was faced the application should stand over for six months. Meantime a child endowment scheme has been put into operation. It is claimed that that plan represents a great saving to big employers. Wage earners are asked to pay a wages tax now. They would be much better off if on that basis the basic wage had been increased. Certainly the present basic wage does not give the workers too much. If a man has to support a wife and three children on the basic wage, that worker has to face great difficulties. The child endowment system

gave relief, but relief having been given with one hand there is a proposal to take it away with the other. That means putting it all over the workers of the Commonwealth. I trust the Federal Parliament will not carry the proposal.

We have heard a good deal about shipbuilding in Australia. It has been pointed out that Mr. Menzies, the Prime Minister, has been the stumbling block to the development of the industry in Australia. It is very strange that two years of the last war were needed to develop shipbuilding in Eastern Australia. The submarines were active then as they have been during this war, and the need for ships was urgent. Nevertheless, two years elapsed before an attempt was made to build ships in the Commonwealth. Indisputably, the Australian workman is capable of building ships. In Victoria, New South Wales and Queensland ships of 8,000 and 9,000 tons have been built, and they proved of great advantage. South Australian workers also have augmented the Australian fleet. These facts make it plain that Australians are fully capable of producing ships. But I ask why the policy of shipbuilding in Australia has not been continued in peace-time? Why has it been necessary for the Commonwealth and States always to go abroad to supply their requirements in the way of shipping? Qualified boilermakers and shipwrights have been at grass during peacetime because no shipbuilding work has been available and but very little repair work. The men drifted into other vocations. I myself have worked in the shipbuilding industry in New South Wales. During the last war I worked on the cruiser "Adelaide" and other vessels; the unit with which I was engaged subsequently disbanded, the men having to look for employment elsewhere. That occurred in peacetime. We have been at war for two years before the shipbuilding industry has been revived in the Commonwealth. We have in Australia skilled artisans, boilermakers, shipwrights, engineers and others, and the trade unions concerned have agreed to a dilution of unskilled labour.

Mr. Needham: We also have boilermakers' assistants.

Mr. J. HEGNEY: My friend, who in his early career was a boilermaker's assistant, reminds me that we still have boilermakers' assistants. The unions concerned agreed to a dilution of unskilled labour for the pur-

pose of reviving this industry. If a survey were made in our own State, we would find that we have many workmen capable of building steel and wooden vessels.

Mr. Berry: I have a list of 120 skilled men

Mr. J. HEGNEY: But those men probably would have to be taken away from some other industry. Some boilermakers at the Midland Junction workshops were, in their earlier years, working in shipbuilding yards in England. Australians who have served their time to the industry are also available here. But how many of them have drifted to the Eastern States where work is plentiful? The policy of the Commonwealth Government has been not to give as much help to Western Australia as to some of the other States. Ours is the most vulnerable State of the Commonwealth from a strategic point of view, and consequently something ought to be done to erect works here to train men. In this way our population would increase and our skilled workers would not be forced to go to the Eastern States to find work. During the 1914-18 war our engineers had no trouble in securing employment in the engineering industry, but I know of highly qualified turners now who, having just retired from the Government workshops at the age of 65 years, cannot find a job in munition works.

Mr. Hughes: There is a job in Adelaide waiting for them.

Mr. J. HEGNEY: The hon. member has more time than I have to read the morning paper. I am speaking of Western Australia. Unless we build up heavy industries in this State, we certainly cannot hope to retain our tradesmen. The Premier has made repeated representations to the Commonwealth Government to establish as many industries as possible here; and I am pleased to note that we have secured some substantial defence contracts for the Midland Junction workshops. I recently was given the opportunity to inspect the workshops with the member for Guildford-Midland (Hon. W. D. Johnson) and other persons, and saw what was being done in the new annex as well as in the workshops. Members would be surprised to see the high-class work carried out at the workshops. The men themselves are keen to get all the defence work possible; they even held meetings during the lunch hour urging the management to make representations in the

proper quarter for a larger share of defence contracts. Unfortunately, the workshops have not got all the work they would like to get.

I am pleased to note the decision to proceed with the erection of munition works at Welshpool, which happens to be in my electorate. I trust that before many months have elapsed work will have commenced there. These works should have been erected long ago to give Western Australia a fairer share of defence contracts. Every credit is due to the Premier for his efforts in this direction. I hope we shall also get the opportunity to build steel and wooden vessels in this State, even though the number might be small. It would be an indication that the Commonwealth is out to assist this as well as other States of the Commonwealth.

I desire to refer to one or two matters concerning my electorate. In the Lieut.-Governor's Speech reference is made to technical schools. A technical school is long overdue at Midland Junction. A site has been available for years past, but the Government, owing to shortage of money, has been unable to proceed with the building. Because of the proximity of the large workshops, a technical school, properly equipped, should be built at Midland Junction. It would serve the needs of the suburbs adjacent to Midland Junction and the surrounding districts. We have also been endeavouring to obtain a high school at Midland Junction. Ministers of Education have visited the district and finally a site was selected, but so far the school has not been built. A number of schools in the electorate require attention. At Belmont many school children are being housed in a condemned building which was at one time a residence. I know the Minister for Education has visited the place and that the matter is to receive attention when funds are available. That building should certainly be demolished and a better classroom provided for children attending the school, who also need proper accommodation for bicycles and other equipment. Rivervale is a large and growing centre within three miles of Perth. The playground at the local school needs re-grading and the building will deteriorate if something is not done to it. I hope the Minister for Education will have this matter brought to his notice by his representative in this Chamber, the Minister for

the North-West. The same applies to the Redcliffe school. I have a report from the Belmont Park Road Board dealing with the condition of the schools in its area. It is a health report and concerns the condition of the lavatories and sanitary conveniences. I intend to forward the document to the Minister immediately. The Redcliffe school building needs attention and the school ground requires gravelling. That applies also to the Carlisle school which is in the Middle Swan area, though many children from Victoria Park attend it. The grounds of that school require gravelling, surfacing, etc.

It is deplorable that sufficient money is not spent on our schools. The time has arrived when much of the money being spent on roads should be diverted to education. I know the Treasurer is facing the difficulty of apportioning revenue so that the various services will receive adequate attention. Although the Education Vote has been increased from year to year, unfortunately a large amount is still required for expenditure on the improvement of school buildings throughout the State, because I suppose that what applies to the Middle Swan electorate applies to other electorates. Considerable sums could be spent on buildings and equipment and more up-to-date sanitary conveniences. Money should be diverted from the traffic fees and spent on the best asset the State has, namely, its children, who will be its future men and women. Since I entered Parliament 12 years ago I have been urging that improvements should be made to the Bayswater school. Some improvements have been effected but a good deal more requires to be done. About 12 months ago the ground was gravelled, but, unless it is surfaced, a good deal of the gravel will be washed away and the bare sand will again be revealed. The drainage requires attention as does the front of the school which is definitely dangerous. Many children have been hurt through the corrugations and I hope that provision will be made on the Estimates for further improvements.

Another matter I have advocated for the Middle Swan electorate is an extension of the tramway system to Salisbury-street. I have urged that the tram line be extended to Shaftsbury-avenue, where the road board has declared a townsite, but I noticed in a report the other day that only

11 chains of extension are to be provided. I wonder whether the Minister has given attention to the proposition I discussed with him and subsequently submitted in writing! That extension is warranted. A good deal of development is taking place at the end of the line and the people are clamouring for transport facilities. Further, the line should be duplicated from Crawford-road to the terminus. In addition, I consider that the service could be speeded up by the elimination of many unnecessary stops, although those using the trams may consider some of the stops necessary. The Beaufort-street service is one of the best paying lines in the State and it should receive attention. The people out that way have no bus transport, although representations have been made to the transport authorities on a number of occasions for the extension of the bus service to that area. In the circumstances, it devolves upon the tramway authorities to see that an extension of the tram service is made.

The time has arrived when there should be one authority in this State under whose jurisdiction all the transport services could be placed. In that way economy would be achieved and overlapping would cease. The best service possible would be available to the people, and two transport systems would not operate side by side. I hope the extension I have suggested will be approved and that the Treasurer will provide funds for the purpose. People who have had to do a good deal of walking in that district for many years past should be given proper transport facilities.

I do not propose to weary the House any further. I thank members for the patient hearing they have given me. This is the last Address-in-reply to which we shall have an opportunity of speaking before the elections, and it is fitting perhaps that we should take this opportunity to wish each other the best of luck in the forthcoming contest and to express the hope that we shall meet again in this Chamber next year.

**MR. SEWARD** (Pingelly) [5.57]: I take this opportunity to offer my congratulations to the new member for Yilgarn-Coolgardie (Mr. Kelly). Although he is not exactly a member of the Country Party, I know we have his sympathies, and feel sure that we

can look forward to his hearty co-operation and support in the passing of measures for the benefit of the State and particularly that section of the people represented by the Country Party. On account of his extensive knowledge of his own electorate and of the State generally, I feel sure that his co-operation will be of considerable value and I wish him a lengthy term of office in this House.

I desire to sound a note of warning. On almost every side at the present time we hear congratulatory references to the very bright prospects ahead of the State from an agricultural point of view. While I admit that the prospects at present are bright, I would stress the fact that we are by no means out of the wood. We have had beneficial rain and there is an abundant growth of different crops throughout the State. On the other hand there is little reserve moisture in the ground, and unless we receive good rains between now and the end of the season the crops may not turn out as well as we hope. I know that in one part of the State 50 per cent. of the crops sown are even now beyond hope of redemption. The dams are almost empty and the people in the district of which I am speaking will begin carting water next week. Fortunately, this experience applies to a very confined area in the State. However, in the area to which I refer there was a great water shortage last year, and I am afraid that unless there is a heavy downpour of rain—such a downpour is hardly likely at this period of the year—the water position in that part of the State will be more acute than it was last year.

I express pleasure at the fact that Parliament has been called together so that we may ascertain whether it is possible to do something more to secure the establishment of munition works in this State. One cannot, I think, be struck very favourably by the work accomplished by the Government in that regard during past months. I fear that were it not for the pressure brought to bear on the Government by outside organisations, we would not be so far advanced regarding munition-making as we are today. For some time now we have heard references to a report that was prepared as a result of an investigation carried out by a Commonwealth committee. Much outside pressure has been brought upon the Government to secure the release of that report for public information. We trust the report

will be favourable to the interests of Western Australia but, so far as I am aware, no indication has been afforded the public as to what is embodied in it. I wonder if those who have been pressing for the publication of the report have some inside knowledge as to whether the report is favourable to us or not. However, I sincerely hope that they are successful in having the report made public, and that as a result there will be increased munition work in Western Australia.

Particularly do I hope that is so regarding shipbuilding, to which the member for Irwin-Moore (Mr. Berry) made striking reference. I do not know whether the Government has taken any steps to conduct a survey of the labour available in the State, and suitable for such an undertaking. I imagine that would be a necessary preliminary to be carried out without delay. Various members have made the statement during the course of the current debate that sufficient skilled labour is not available locally for work of this description. Such members may have more accurate information than I possess, but I have received several inquiries from men as to what steps are necessary to secure employment in munition works. As far as I was able to judge, they appeared to have the necessary qualifications. It would be advisable for the Government to authorise a survey of the industrial position, and thus ascertain exactly what labour is available and where it is located, so that it could be secured in the event of munition works being established.

The Premier: That has been done.

Mr. SEWARD: I am pleased to hear that.

The Premier: Evidence was given before the committee on that phase.

Mr. SEWARD: I do not know whether that evidence has been made public.

The Minister for Works: It has not been published.

Mr. SEWARD: However, I am pleased that survey has been carried out.

The Minister for Labour: The Commonwealth Government will not allow the evidence to be published.

Mr. SEWARD: Is that so?

Hon. C. G. Latham: The Government has the only copies of the report available.

Mr. SEWARD: I do not know that the report will be published as a result of the representations of the Government.

The Premier: Yes, it will!

Mr. SEWARD: If it is published, the reason will be the activities of organisations outside this House.

The Minister for Labour: What a nice man you are!

Mr. SEWARD: I am glad the Minister has returned to his seat, because if some industries are established, particularly by private enterprise, the ventures will require more support than has been accorded, for instance, to the tobacco industry.

The Premier: Has the Government done nothing for that industry?

Mr. SEWARD: As I understand the position, Western Australia produces a certain quantity of tobacco leaf and yet, for some extraordinary reason, owing to an edict issued in the Eastern States, a certain proportion of the locally-grown tobacco must not be manufactured here but has to be sent to the Eastern States for that purpose. Despite what we have heard from the Minister for Industrial Development regarding the State's capabilities for the growing of tobacco, as a result of our being deprived of so much of our output the manufacturing concern established here will not be able to function to full capacity.

The Minister for Labour: Who is responsible for that?

Mr. SEWARD: The Commonwealth Government! At the same time, I cannot compliment the Minister upon the efforts he put forth to have the locally-grown tobacco manufactured within the State.

The Minister for Labour: Do you know what a fight we put up with that object in view?

Mr. SEWARD: To put it crudely, the Minister failed to put up an adequate fight to retain the work for this State. What is grown here should be manufactured here. He should have defied the Commonwealth Government to take the tobacco from Western Australia.

Hon. N. Keenan: A sort of Boston tea-party!

Mr. SEWARD: The Minister should have put up a determined fight against the Commonwealth Government.

The Minister for Labour: What would you do to prevent the Commonwealth from taking it?

Mr. SEWARD: If the Commonwealth threaten to put this over Western Australian industry, the people here should object to that course.

The Minister for Labour: What steps do you suggest should have been taken?

Mr. SEWARD: Some years ago a valuable industry was established in the western end of my electorate—Industrial Extracts Ltd.—and is manufacturing a very useful article. For some time I have been endeavouring to get the Railway Department to provide a better railway service on that line in order to cope with the traffic.

The Minister for Works: Do you know whom the Commonwealth has put in charge of the tobacco?

Mr. SEWARD: I am now dealing with industrial extracts. So far I have been unsuccessful in my endeavour to get a better railway service for the industry. All we asked for was one train a week or about 50 trains a year. Last year no fewer than 70 special trains had to be run to cope with the traffic, but the running of special trains does not fulfil the requirements of the industry. There is only limited time in which to load the trucks and overtime has to be paid to the men engaged in loading. The Minister for Railways kindly consented to visit the district recently and, as a result of his representations, I have every reason to believe that the improved service will be granted.

The Minister for Railways: The matter is being investigated now.

Mr. SEWARD: I hope our request will be granted. As the Minister observed, this industry is working in one of the wetter parts of the district and the task of hauling the logs into the mill puts a heavy strain on the roads, a strain far beyond the capacity of the road board to meet. Consequently it will be necessary for the Government to assist the industry by keeping some of the roads in a proper state of repair. About a quarter of a million of capital is invested in the industry and about 150 men, most of them married, are employed, and as the industry is located in a country district, it is worthy of receiving all possible support. I am sure the Minister will bear me out when I say that from our view of the activities, the company has reached the highwater mark of efficiency. The company is well controlled and is a credit to the directors. The product is one which, but for the activities of the company, would remain as waste timber lying in the bush.

Reference has been made to the recent meeting of the Loan Council. I congratulate the Premier on the result of the meet-

ing. I read with great pleasure the fact that, as an outcome of the work of the Premier, we received from the Loan Council almost the amount of money he asked for. I did not derive that pleasure from the amount of money he received because he put up a reasonable request. Had it not been reasonable, the Loan Council would not have granted him as much as it did. However, there was one aspect of the proceedings that did not please me so much. The Premier of New South Wales went to the Loan Council with a request for a large sum of money, and our Premier seemed to support him.

The Premier: The vote in regard to the reduction of loan money was taken early.

Mr. SEWARD: I am referring to the carrying of the final allocation by the Loan Council.

The Premier: No, that vote was taken on the first day.

Mr. SEWARD: That being so, it removes an unfortunate impression that I had gathered from the report in the Press. It seemed as though our Premier was supporting what the "West Australian" rightly termed the preposterous demands of New South Wales. I am glad the Premier was not doing that. As is well known to members, New South Wales has for years tried to exercise a dominating influence at Loan Council meetings. New South Wales originated the idea of asking the Loan Council to provide money for semi-governmental authorities as well as for the Government of the State. New South Wales is a huge State which has had longer than any other to develop its resources, a State where the severity of taxation is not nearly so high as it is here, and for it to make such demands at a time like the present was preposterous. I was pleased to read that the Premier of that State was sent back with less money than he sought and now has to revise his budget.

Members have often stressed the absolute necessity for ensuring that we get full value for money expended. The only way in which that can be done is by co-operation between the various Government departments. When speaking on the Estimates last year, I referred to the rabbit-proof fence and to the fact that no matter when one passed through the fence, one always found the gates open. When I offered that remark, the Minister for Lands made a note,

though I cannot say whether his note had a bearing on the matter I was dealing with. At all events, no alteration has taken place as regards the closing of the gates, and I feel that the State is really wasting money in maintaining a patrol along the fence. Here is another instance of lack of co-operation between departments. Last year I had occasion to ask for a school to be erected on a site within 10 or 15 chains of an existing gate in the rabbit-proof fence. A landowner donated the land and I passed on the application to the Education Department. I pointed out that it would not be necessary to construct another big gate in the fence but that a hand gate would be quite sufficient. There is a Government reserve on the opposite side of the road with ample trees where horses may be tied up and with a dam for water supply.

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

Mr. SEWARD: At the tea adjournment I was explaining how, when I made application for a school to be erected, I had pointed out to the department that it was not necessary to make another large gate in the rabbit-proof fence, and that a hand gate would be quite sufficient. When I next saw that department, I was informed that the Department of Agriculture would not for a moment consider putting another gate in the fence which would be only 15 chains from an existing gate. On the surface that seems reasonable, but the existing gate is situated in the lowest-lying place, quite close to the dam, with the result that the whole of that area with the exception of the road which is built up is under water.

Mr. Cross: What is the idea of another gate, in any case?

Mr. SEWARD: That was the reason why we asked for the erection of the school to be about 15 chains away from the existing gate. The department would not hear of it. The school had to be removed down to the edge of the watery place. After the school had been erected I went to have a look at it, and to my amusement I found that after having caused the school to be removed to this position, the department had put another large gate in the rabbit-proof fence, as well as another large gate into the school fence and a hand gate as well. So, having refused to put in one gate, the department put in three gates. I had occasion

to go along the other day to speak about a school which has been on the urgent list of a department for some time. I had to make great efforts to get the work done. The Education Department apparently failed to get in touch with the other department. I recommend Ministers to see that a little co-operation is carried on between the departments, as this would have the effect of considerably reducing administration costs.

References have been made in this debate to petrol rationing. That is, of course, a Federal matter; it is conducted under Federal authority although we in this State have to provide the staff to administer it. The first thing I want to draw attention to is that nobody who visits the Liquid Fuel Control office can come away without any other feeling than one of disgust at the lack of arrangements and the congestion existing in that department. A member of the public cannot get near the counter. Any communication sent to that office by a consumer invariably requires about a month to bring a reply. I do not know whose fault it is, but some inquiry should be made to see whether that state of affairs cannot be altered. Whenever I go to the office, I invariably receive the greatest courtesy from officers. As regards the assistant secretary, I do not know of a more over-worked man in the State. He is trying to do two or three men's work. That is not fair. Recently I read that the Leader of the Opposition had been appointed to the Fuel Control Board, and I sincerely hope that he will cause inquiry to be made into the state of affairs in that office, with a view to getting a better system arranged for. It is essential that the administrative work of that office should be smooth and harmonious, because the restrictions imposed under the present rationing scheme are naturally distasteful to the public, and it does not make people any more pleased with the scheme when they have to put up with such delays in the department.

I wish to draw special attention to the grossly unfair rationing scheme that obtains now. Whenever one comes to the city, one cannot help noticing the number of cars driven by petrol around Perth, and by the number of cars seen coming into the city between half-past eight and half-past nine in the morning, most of them carrying only one or two people. All those cars come

along bus, tram, railway or trolley-bus routes. Surely when the nation is being exhorted to be as careful as possible in the use of petrol, and is being stringently rationed, those cars might well be left at home by people going in to business.

Mr. Hughes: Have you ever noticed the military cars?

Mr. SEWARD: I shall not spare the military cars.

Mr. Cross: Those cars may be used for business in the day time.

Mr. SEWARD: They are parked in the city. If one walks past the picture palaces or the theatres, one sees the motors lined along, and they are not being used for business purposes. By way of contrast, let me refer to the people in the country, those in the farming areas more especially, who are limited to four gallons per month, and many of whom may be 10 or 15 miles from the siding. I contend that the restrictions are not justly imposed from the standpoint of people in the country. I cast no reflection on the local Liquid Fuel Board, who have no say. The rules are drawn up by officials in the Eastern States. I do hope, however, that the Leader of the Opposition will make the necessary representations to ensure that a more equitable distribution of the petrol rationing burden is brought about. I am not exempting the military authorities; I hold that considerable savings can be made in that quarter. Travelling along the Great Southern Railway one sees numerous cars coming from Northam to Perth, and I am sure they are not used on military service. Last session I mentioned that all the meat and provisions and so forth for the Northam Camp are carried by motor and not by rail. Full use should be made of the service provided by the Railway Department.

There is another matter I particularly wish to mention. I happened to go to a country town two or three weeks ago, and there I saw five cars in the street, and every one of those cars was owned or being used by a commercial traveller. All the cars were stocked up with samples. Surely those people can use the trains provided! They used them years ago. In fact, if the commercial travellers did not come into the country at all, the country would get on without them. They should be made to use either producer gas or the railway service. In another coun-

try place, I ran into a party of business men who had spent some days in that town and also were driven about in a petrol-driven car. The unfortunate farmer is rationed down to four gallons even if he is situated 10 or 15 miles from a railway siding. I hope the matter will be taken notice of by the Petrol Board, with a view to alterations being effected.

I do not know whether other members were in the same position as I was, but I feel we are under a debt of gratitude to the member for Victoria Park (Mr. Raphael) for mentioning this matter last night. It certainly was a great surprise to me to hear that oil companies in Victoria were using petrol-driven wagons to transport oil from Melbourne to Mildura. The member for Victoria Park was out in his estimate of the distance, 700 miles.

Mr. Marshall: That might include the return journey.

Mr. SEWARD: It is nothing like that distance. It is 300 miles at the most. I can go further: petrol is distributed all over Victoria by petrol-driven wagons, which is an extraordinary state of affairs. As members will recall, this State, upon the introduction of the State Transport Co-ordination Act, cut down its petrol-driven transport services, which were in competition with the railways. I know of men in country districts who had built up transport services to Perth. They were able to do the journey, which took the Railway Department two days, in one day; but they were put off the roads without the slightest compensation. Their business was simply cut away from them by the Act. But that is not the case in Victoria, where such businesses are still being carried on; in some cases they have built up a substantial goodwill. This State has made a big contribution towards the saving of petrol; and if the injustice—I so term it—mentioned by the member for Victoria Park continues, then this State has a genuine grievance, against the State of Victoria particularly. I sincerely hope the matter will be taken up by the Leader of the Opposition in his capacity of member of the State Liquid Fuel Control Board, with a view to having it rectified.

I noticed with pleasure in last week's Press that the Railway Department has decided to provide a faster service along the Great Southern railway by increasing the

number of Diesel car services. We shall have one Diesel car each way every day, and a Diesel car service to Albany two days a week. This will be most satisfactory. Members, particularly on this side of the House, have been voicing for many sessions the urgent necessity for a speeding up of our railway service so as to bring it up to the standard demanded by 1941. I was rather struck by a remark made by a resident of the Great Southern district when I informed him of the department's intention. He said the railways were getting up-to-date by reverting to the time table of 1909. That is a fact. We are to get the time table of 1909; that is, of course, with the addition of the Diesel cars. I bear in mind that the Albany train has been running as a mixed train three days a week. However, whatever time table is adopted I appreciate the department's action, which I believe will result in increased patronage of the railways.

Mr. Watts: What about getting the department to run the trains on time?

The Minister for Mines: One thing at a time.

Mr. SEWARD: We will go easy; we will get one thing at a time, as the Minister said. I hope the department will bear in mind the request that I have repeatedly made to put Diesel cars on the branch lines. Those lines are not constructed to take fast steam passenger services, but they can take the Diesel cars. If my suggestion is adopted, the residents along the branch lines will enjoy a fairly up-to-date service which will enable them to reach Perth on the same day as they leave their homes. I venture the opinion that the adoption of my suggestion will result in increased patronage of those services. As a matter of fact, I know of no better opportunity presenting itself to the Railway Department—with petrol rationing in force—to regain some of the traffic that was lost to it in the years immediately following the depression of 1930.

Before leaving this subject, I desire to refer to a question I asked the Minister for Railways a day or two ago, as follows:—

In view of the fact that the Midland Railway Company has abolished the surcharge of 1s. 6d. per ton on bulk wheat, will the Government Railways also discontinue charging 9d. per ton on bulk wheat carried over the Government railways? If not, why not?

**The Minister replied as follows:—**

No. The additional rate per ton does not reimburse the department for the extra cost involved in transporting bulk wheat as compared with bagged wheat.

A rather astonishing admission coming from the Railway Department! I remind members that when bulk handling was introduced both the Government railways and the Midland Railway Co. imposed an added charge. The Midland Co. imposed an added charge of 1s. 6d. per ton; but, as I said in my question, the company has now discontinued that surcharge and is transporting wheat in bulk at the same rate as that charged for bagged wheat. The company explained its reason for abandoning the surcharge in this way. The company had not had experience of handling wheat in bulk and consequently did not know what the cost would be, so it followed the Government lead, except, of course, that the company imposed a higher rate. The company found from experience that the extra charge was not justified and consequently, in fairness to the wheatgrower, it has abolished the surcharge.

A private company conducting its operations at a profit can afford to abolish the charge, yet the Government railways, which carry on continually at a loss, find it necessary to retain the charge. What an extraordinary position! It bears out evidence that was given to the Royal Commission on bulk handling which sat, I think, in 1934. Evidence given by the representative of bulk handling interests showed that the extra charge of 9d. per ton was not justified. It also bears out the contention of the New South Wales Commissioner of Railways, who appeared before that Commission and pointed out that the New South Wales railways made no extra charge for the carriage of bulk wheat, despite the fact that the department provided the extra trucks required to transport the bulk wheat. In this State, as is known, the wheatgrower provides the facilities to enable existing railway stock to carry wheat in bulk. Not only that, but to enable the department to carry a full load of wheat in a truck where previously that was not possible, the wheatgrower provides facilities by way of linings to the trucks. Notwithstanding all this, the grower is charged an extra 9d. per ton. This is grossly unfair and I trust the Minister will investi-

gate the matter again and as a result ascertain that the surcharge is no longer warranted.

When the Bill to amend the Industries Assistance Act and to provide for the distribution of drought relief funds was before Parliament last session, members on this side of the House made every possible effort to have the money distributed under a special Act and by an authority other than the Agricultural Bank, preferably of course by the Rural Relief Trustees. Our efforts in that respect were unavailing; the Government insisted upon the work being done under the amended Industries Assistance Act and subject also to the severe restrictions imposed by that Act. We were assured at the time, however, that the Act would be administered sympathetically and that this regulation or that provision would not necessarily be imposed. If we had any belief in those promises it did not last very long. In fact, no inconsiderable amount of my time since last session has been spent in journeying from the country to Perth for the purpose of interviewing the Bank Commissioners with regard to the administration of the drought relief funds.

In saying that, I want to make it perfectly clear that I have never at any time presumed to ask the Bank Commissioners to do something which their business experience told them was not justified. When the Agricultural Bank Royal Commission was taking evidence, I think the statement was made that the practice was indulged in, but I have never presumed to do such a thing, because I have too high a regard for the Agricultural Bank Commissioners. I have not the slightest doubt that if I were so far to forget myself, they would not take very long to tell me I was exceeding my rights. I may add that I have never received anything but the greatest courtesy and assistance from the Commissioners and bank officers. The only occasions on which I have ever interviewed them have been when a farmer has come to me and given me particulars of his circumstances, and it appeared to me that he had a case for assistance. At those times I have gone to the Bank and set the particulars before the Commissioners to ensure that they were in possession of all the necessary details from the settler's point of view, and I have frequently found that they did not have all that information—why, I do not know. I repeat that I

have never attempted nor would I attempt to influence the Commissioners against their better judgment. I simply wanted to ensure that they had all the particulars of the cases in which I was interested

About a week ago I received the names of three men who submitted an application for drought relief as soon as their harvesting was finished, about February or at the very latest in the early days of March. They were granted relief but up to date have not received a penny of the money. No wonder people become discontented when a delay of six months takes place! I understand they are clients of an Associated Bank, and that bank, knowing that assistance had been granted, and hoping that it would eventually be forthcoming, supplied the money for the farmers to put in their crops and carry on. The bank, however, is charging the usual bank rate of interest I presume, so that, because of the delay, the farmers are prevented from getting the benefit of the cheaper money made available by the Commonwealth Government. That is decidedly unfair but is characteristic of the manner in which this money has been distributed. The unfortunate way in which drought relief is being afforded is having a serious effect on country districts. Any observer if he takes careful note of what he sees, when going through country towns, will find empty houses and a deterioration of business to a much more considerable extent than can have been occasioned by the war situation. The reason is that the people are becoming exasperated with the existing conditions and are abandoning their farms. I think a reference to this matter was made by the president of the Wheat and Wool Growers' Union at its conference yesterday, a report of which appears in this morning's paper. The want of policy that has prevailed regarding the administration of drought relief money has been largely responsible for the existing state of affairs.

When the Bill was before Parliament last session, the Minister explained that, after having given considerable thought to the matter, the Government had decided to make a few slight alterations to the Industries Assistance Act. When I say "slight," I am referring to the size of the amending Bill and not to the importance of the amendments. It was pointed out that, after the Act had been amended, the funds would be administered by regulation. I would like to ask the

Minister whether those regulations have been adopted or gazetted and, if so, why they have not been laid on the Table of the House? It is grossly unfair to the farmers. If the Minister were to go to the bank to borrow money for any purpose, the first thing he would want to know would be the conditions under which it would be made available. Farmers are no different from the Minister. They do not want one policy operating today, another tomorrow and a third next week; but that is what has been going on since the introduction of that measure. In the early stages of the operation of the measure last March, the Agricultural Bank insisted that before a man received any assistance, he must mortgage up to the hilt every asset he had. If he did not, he was not eligible for assistance. That was subsequently altered. In some instances the condition was waived; in others it was not. A certain policy should govern these matters. We were told when the Bill was before the House that there would be a policy, but there has not been.

Then there is the vexed question of the surrendering of wheat certificates, especially by those farmers who have paid off their statutory liens to the banks. The other day I asked the following question on that subject:—

Have instructions been issued by the head office of the Agricultural Bank to branch managers—(a) that wheat certificates for season 1940-41 held by Agricultural Bank clients who have received assistance from drought relief funds must be surrendered to the Bank regardless of whether a client has paid its statutory claims or not, and that the proceeds of such wheat dividends will be used to repay drought relief advances?

The answer I got was that that was not so. I think I am perfectly justified in making a protest, because that question was not answered correctly. I do not say that the Minister knowingly gave me an incorrect answer but he was not supplied with the correct reply to give to this House.

The Minister for Lands: It was a direct answer to your question, as you will see if you read the question.

Mr. SEWARD: Technically, I suppose, the Minister can get out of it that way, because he could say that the money is not used in the reduction of drought relief advances.

The Minister for Lands: I am not getting out of it. The reply was to the question you asked.

Mr. SEWARD: The fact remains that a return of wheat certificates is being demanded.

The Minister for Lands: Not for the purpose you submitted in your question.

Mr. SEWARD: When the farmer has received the money, the Bank has demanded it back. That is at variance with the practice of the Associated Banks. I think the Minister stated that when the advances were made it was not possible to appraise the value of the wheat crop. But since then it has been possible to do it and the Agricultural Bank is claiming that money regardless of whether the statutory claims have been met or not. In the case of the Associated Banks that money has been made available to the farmers. It is not a great deal; the dividend does not amount to much per bushel, but it gives the farmer a little to use on repairs or on other facilities for the farm or for the purchase of something about the house that might be necessary.

I asked another question—

If Question No. 1 is answered in the negative—  
that is, the question relating to instructions issued to branch managers—

—what instructions relative to the matters mentioned in that question have been issued by head office of the Agricultural Bank?

I know some instructions have been issued, although the Minister says they have not. The answer to the question was "No." I take it the Minister meant that no instructions had been issued. It is high time uniform instructions were issued and that the clients of the Bank knew exactly what were the terms under which they received this money. I draw the attention of the Minister to the fact that so far I have not seen any publication of the rate of interest farmers are being charged, although when a similar Bill was passed by the Victorian Parliament, to make possible the distribution of Victoria's share of this money, the rate of interest was quoted at  $1\frac{7}{8}$  per cent. If Victoria could quote a rate of interest, surely our Government should be open enough to state what rate of interest the people of Western Australia are going to be charged! The whole matter is enshrouded in mystery and farmers do not know where they are. The result is

members have to ask questions in Parliament to try to drag from the department some idea of the conditions affecting this money. That is not fair to the farmers or to us.

Another matter I wish to mention has reference to the position that arose regarding the supply of chaff to the Government last year. Members will remember the winter was characterised by an abnormally small rainfall. About last September, the Minister for Agriculture wisely caused a survey to be made of the prospects in the State. At the same time members of the Country Party conducted an extensive tour throughout the rural areas to ascertain the position for themselves. The Minister found his fears were well grounded and that it was extremely likely the State would experience difficulty in securing its chaff requirements. Consequently he appealed to the farmers to cut hay wherever their crops were suitable for that purpose. He was wise in making that appeal.

Mr. Warner: We asked him to do it.

Mr. SEWARD: Yes, but I think the Minister took action while we were actually on tour. At the same time, an order was issued setting out that the maximum price for chaff would be £8 a ton at sidings on a freight of 25s. That meant that under existing conditions the cutting of hay promised more favourable returns, with the result that a fair quantity of hay was cut. However, the appeal was made to the farmers, who responded as they always do when such requests are put to them. In due course the Agricultural Bank authorities, again wisely, went to the country and purchased their requirements at about £6 a ton at the sidings, which worked out at about £3 10s. to £4 in the stack. As the Minister pointed out when he made the appeal, even from the business point of view, the farmers would be recompensed by cutting for hay rather than stripping their crops, because few people anticipated that the price for wheat would be 3s. a bushel.

For the benefit of members who may not be conversant with the procedure, I may explain that the farmer does not have very much time in which to decide to cut for hay or to strip his crop. The crop may be ready for cutting for hay today, but in a week's time it will have gone beyond that

stage and must be stripped. Thus farmers have to make up their minds rather hurriedly. Many responded to the national call and cut for hay. As I have pointed out, the Agricultural Bank officials went out and purchased their requirements. Naturally they purchased as conveniently as possible in order to facilitate chaff-cutting arrangements. Hay-cutting is not carried out simultaneously in the various districts. For instance, along the Midland line this is done much earlier than in the Northam and York districts, where, in turn, cutting is done earlier than in the Great Southern districts. Thus many farmers were busily engaged in cutting their hay when the Agricultural Bank officials had already secured all their requirements. The result was that some of the farmers who had to cut their hay later than others in the earlier areas, could not obtain a quote of more than £2 a ton for their output. In many instances not even that price could be obtained.

Naturally those farmers thought—their belief was certainly well grounded—that they had been let down. They appealed to the Government to subsidise them for the difference between the price at which they were told chaff would be bought and that at which they had actually sold. In those circumstances the Government might have been called upon to subsidise them at a rate of £1 5s. per ton. In some instances the farmers did not require the money immediately and they decided to hold on to their hay in the expectation that genuine buyers would be secured at the original price. They had a perfect right to do so in view of what they thought was the responsibility of the Government. If ever a confidence trick was played on the farmers it was at this stage. The Government made a magnanimous offer to those who had cut hay that could not be sold. Certain farmers had cut hay and could have sold it at the price offered by the Government, namely, £6 at the siding. They refused to do so, hoping to secure a higher return.

The Minister for Lands: There were dozens of them.

Mr. SEWARD: They were grasping, and I have nothing to say in support of them.

The Minister for Lands: That applied to whole districts.

Mr. SEWARD: I do not support their attitude. There were, however, some who had cut hay in response to the Minister's appeal, and after the Agricultural Bank had secured its requirements, could not sell their stocks. Many were tractor farmers and did not usually cut any hay. Today some of them have upwards of 80 tons lying in the stack unsold. The Government said, "All right; if that hay is stacked, thatched, protected by a fence and insured and is not subject to any encumbrances or liens, we will lend you up to £1 5s. a ton for f.a.q. chaff." I do not think many farmers have such stacks entirely free of encumbrances and, therefore, practically all the farmers were excluded from participation in that offer! Many of them cut hay on the strength of the promise of £3 10s. a ton, and yet found they could not get £2 a ton for their output. Then again many of these farmers did not wish for a loan such as the Government offered. They merely wished to have the advantage of the promise of a return that would be the equivalent of £3 10s. in the stack. Those farmers had a perfectly legitimate claim against the Government, and it does not redound to the credit of the Administration that they should make such an offer as that which I have mentioned.

Should ever an appeal be made again to the farmers to cut hay under the circumstances I have outlined, the offer would have to be signed on the dotted line by the Government's representatives before I would advise farmers to respond. In this instance they were grossly misled and forced into a most unfair position. Almost anywhere throughout the rural areas, hay that remains unsold can be seen on the farms. I was rather surprised to read a letter that appeared in the "West Australian" recently dealing with the hay position. I cannot vouch for the accuracy of the statements contained in the letter, but no contradiction has yet appeared. The letter was from a correspondent in Mil-ling and read—

Your Parliamentary report of the 6th instant quotes Mr. G. B. Wood, M.L.C., as saying that the farmers were entitled to more than the Government advance of £1 15s. per ton on hay cut last year in response to the appeal of Mr. Wise as Minister for Agriculture.

That statement is not correct, because the advance was to be £1 5s. a ton.

Actually, though the Government advance is stated to be at the rate of 25s., this is paid

only on 75 per cent. of the total eligible tonnage, so that the actual advance to farmers is less than £1 per ton.

That represents another restriction. I do not know whether the statements contained in the letter are correct, but they have not been contradicted. Farmers will certainly be justified in the event of any future appeal if they insist upon the Government's representative signing on the dotted line before they agree to comply. I could say something about the methods employed in purchasing the hay, but I shall do so at a later stage when we are considering the Estimates. I have one instance regarding a man who was faced with a large loss because he was encouraged to cut hay that afterwards was not purchased.

The only other matter to which I desire to refer has relation to remarks made by the member for Brownhill-Ivanhoe (Mr. F. C. L. Smith) last night. The hon. member showed that he is still living in the suburb where retired farmers live, that is those who sold out their properties to advantage. He took it upon himself to justify the alleged abolition of the financial emergency tax. Incidentally, I happened to meet a young man in one of the banks today and he pointed out how his daughter, who has a position in an office, paid 5s. to 7s. in State taxation last year whereas this year she had to pay something like £5. He was interested to know how to account for such a huge increase. I replied, "We told you it was taking place but you took no notice."

Mr. Rodoreda: She must have been single.

Mr. SEWARD: The member for Brownhill-Ivanhoe reminded us of all the taxes that have been taken off, but I want to recall one to his mind because an instance of it was brought under my notice last week. A relief worker came to me and said, "I am still hanging out; I am not paying that 25s. for the union ticket." It is a most iniquitous attitude for the Government to adopt that, before a man can participate in the taxpayers' money by way of relief work, he must pay 25s. and join a union. It is wonderful how generous we can be with other people's money.

Mr. Withers: There is nothing political about it.

Mr. SEWARD: It is political and nothing else. After the speech delivered last night, I desired to recall that incident in order to complete the story. This relief worker has

so far succeeded in defying the representative of the union by refusing to take out a ticket, and I hope others will follow suit.

Mr. Doney: Is he still in his job?

Mr. SEWARD: Yes, and the House will hear from me if he loses it.

Mr. Withers: They do not have their dues collected by their employers.

Mr. SEWARD: I am not conversant with all the little intricacies of the Labour movement but I will accept the hon. member's statement.

**MR. HUGHES** (East Perth) [8.12]: I am afraid I shall have to limit my remarks tonight to a couple of hours. As a rule I do not talk parish-pump politics, but my electorate is one of a number of districts engaged in the most important primary industry in the State, one about which we should all be more concerned, and I feel that the Government has been very negligent in not providing facilities for its care and maintenance. I had occasion to catch a No. 34 tram running from Stirling-street to Lord-street and I saw a young couple who obviously had their first baby. On the footpath there was a perambulator. I inquired to ascertain what the vehicle was, because these things are becoming novelties. Before the tram started the conductor asked who owned the perambulator, and the young woman acknowledged it was hers. The conductor said, "I am sorry but there are two prams on the front and you will have to get off." She, her husband and baby had to get off. A few days later I was on the Beaufort-street line and at the corner of Money-street a young woman with a baby and pusher attempted to get on, and she was told she could not be taken. In that case I could see no reason whatever for not taking her because there were only about 10 people in the tram, which had accommodation for about 50 or 60, and it seemed to me that the pram could have been put in the rear where the conductor was. At about 3.30 p.m. yesterday, when I was coming to the House, I saw at the corner of William and Hay streets two young women with prams and babies and they were compelled to stand by while the tram went on.

I suppose one of the greatest disabilities suffered by this nation is the one-child woman, but if we are going to penalise young women in this way when they have their first child, we shall not be encouraging

them to have a second or third child. I make no pretensions to any engineering skill, but I had a look at a couple of trams today and commend to the Minister a suggestion I am about to make. From the wheelbase to the glass of a tram there is a space of 3 ft. or 4 ft. where a light is carried to show that the tram is approaching. At the rear of the tram this serves no purpose except to show a red light at night. It should be a simple matter to hang on the back of a tram a bracket from which a carrier could be suspended that would drop when required to hold prams, and fold up when not required for that purpose. If it were made of mesh such as cyclone wire, it would not matter whether it was 4 in. or 5 in. mesh, it would hold three or four prams, and a circular hole could be made so that when folded it would not obscure the light. I cannot see that such a device would in any way diminish the utility of the light displayed as a warning to vehicles overtaking the tram. Such a carrier made of light material could be fixed on the back of each tram and would take three or four or more prams. If there was any objection to this device or something was necessary to supplement it, a bracket could be fixed on the side and a couple of metal crossbars arranged to protect the glass from injury by the prams. We ought to encourage local production in this industry and not penalise it. I cannot imagine that to provide accommodation for five or six prams on each tram is beyond the engineering skill of the men attached to the Tramway Department. I suppose other people have noticed what I have described, and I suggest that the Minister would be doing good service to a section of the community if he made provision as I have suggested or in some other way.

The Minister for Railways: We are anxious to give all possible facilities.

Mr. HUGHES: I feel sure the Minister will do something. In wet weather it is very hard for a young woman, who has come to town with a pram or pusher, to be left standing on the kerb while two or three trams pass by without facilities for taking her. It is, usually, of course, those in the lower income groups, for persons in the higher income groups as a rule have cars.

I make another appeal to the Minister for Justice, even if it does not find a responsive ear in the House. Over 17 years ago a murder was committed in this city, and a young

fellow named Auburn, 21 years of age, was sent to prison for what is called the term of his natural life. At the time I protested against that convict-period sentence. In the old convict days of Tasmania a life sentence was 20 years, but when Auburn was sentenced a revision was made of the regulations and the sentence "for the term of his natural life" was re-established.

Mr. Raphael: It was an unjust thing to do, for one man!

Mr. HUGHES: We have gone further now. The Menzies Government has beaten that by establishing punishment for any term whatsoever. Under regulations promulgated by the Menzies Government, a man can be sentenced for a term extending beyond his natural life, although no means of enforcement are provided. It is hard to imagine a person so silly as to draw regulations providing for an indefinite term of imprisonment. I do not think it necessary to go into the rights and wrongs of the Auburn case. The man had a 28-day trial; he was convicted of murder, the worst crime in the criminal calendar; he was sentenced to death, but on the jury's recommendation that sentence was commuted to life imprisonment. The regulations, however, had been altered, and he was given the sentence in terms that have come down from the old convict days. He has now served in prison 16 years, and 16 years is a long term to serve, irrespective of what a man has done.

Mr. Raphael: He was convicted on circumstantial evidence, too!

Mr. HUGHES: Such evidence affords perhaps stronger proof of guilt than personal evidence, because witnesses can tell lies, whereas circumstances very seldom do. But that is not the point at issue. For the crime that this man committed he has served 10 years' imprisonment. I suggest that it would be better to execute a man than to cause him to serve 25 or 30 years' imprisonment. After all is said and done, Auburn did have this in his favour, that he was young, and this fact was taken into consideration by the jury.

During his imprisonment he has learnt one or two trades at Fremantle. I understand that if released he will have work to go to, employment outside Western Australia, and thus will be afforded an opportunity to make a living and a fresh start beyond the borders of this State. It was rightly said, at the time, that it was a terrible thing to deprive a woman of her hus-

band and a child of its father. But time is a great healer.

Mr. Marshall: There was not any child.

Mr. HUGHES: Time has healed one wound. The widow was re-married, and embarked on a new life some years ago. It appears to me that the ends of justice have been served. If there were any danger of this man committing another crime, then of course it would not be in the public interest, it would be unsafe to let him be at large. But prison is no place for a man who is in that state of mind; there is another place for him. Unfortunately the nature of the crime has frightened people off pleading for the man. It is not the kind of affair that wants to be stirred up. I say quite candidly that Auburn maintains to this day that he is innocent of the crime. I have informed him that that plea is of no use, because, innocent or not, he had a trial and the jury found him guilty; and any Government considering the case must start from the premise that Auburn was found guilty. After all, only a small percentage of the people in gaol ought to be there. I am sympathetic towards the wrongdoer. When I first studied the Criminal Code and went through paragraph after paragraph describing in all 700 or 800 transgressions and all the things for which one could be put in gaol, it made me quite nervous: No matter what crime a man has committed, 16 years' imprisonment is a long term. Had Auburn been sentenced to the ordinary term of 20 years which constitutes the life sentence, he would have had to serve 15 years less the remissions for certain things such as the accession of King George and one or two other remissions which all prisoners receive. In that case he would have been released some time ago. I appeal to the Minister for Justice on behalf of one forgotten man. I appeal to the Minister to give that man the chance to make a new start in life. He is now approaching 40 years of age. Sixteen years in prison has not improved him. I ask the Minister for Justice to reconsider the case and see whether he cannot give the man a chance to leave Western Australia and start life again.

On public works there is a system of hiring motor trucks, rather than the Government owning the trucks. Trucks are hired, and if I am to believe what was told to me during the week the Government is losing money in every way by the system.

A man who has a truck hired to the Government was receiving 35s. per day for its hire, in addition to which he was paid the normal wages as a truck driver. He not only suggested, but swore on oath, that after making allowance for petrol, replacement of tyres, insurance, license and a specially liberal allowance for depreciation, the total cost of running the truck was 15s. 6d. a day. So he made a clear profit of 19s. 6d. per day on the hire of the truck to the Government, or approximately 130 per cent. or 140 per cent. on his investment. The truck, which could be purchased for £170, was at the end of six months more valuable by reason of the shortage of trucks owing to the war. Such a truck could be completely paid for by the Government out of the profits made in six months, and then it would be worth from £130 to £140. I am not in a position to vouch for the accuracy of the statement, but it was sworn to on oath, and the man was quite specific in saying that 15s. 6d. a day was the maximum cost of running the truck for which he received 35s. a day. If that is so, the Public Works Department must be simply throwing away money.

Mr. J. H. Smith: Do not those trucks cost about £500?

Mr. HUGHES: They cost £500 new, but there is less depreciation when new than when they are old. The Public Works Department must have money to burn.

Mr. F. C. L. Smith: Was anything paid to the driver?

Mr. HUGHES: He got his wages according to the Arbitration Court award, in addition to the 35s. per day.

The Minister for Works: Could you supply the name of the man? The department does not hire trucks if it can possibly avoid doing so. The department has its own trucks, but where it has to pay, it pays the ruling rate.

Mr. HUGHES: I will give the Minister the name and let him have the statement. Quite frankly, I was somewhat sceptical about it when it was made.

The Minister for Works: I still am!

Mr. HUGHES: I am not vouching for the accuracy of the statement. Nevertheless, it was sworn to.

The Minister for Works: We will get a refund from that man.

Mr. HUGHES: I was extremely interested in the speech of the member for Brown Hill-Ivanhoe (Mr. F. C. L. Smith). In a very forceful way, he castigated persons who criticised members of Parliament or did anything to prejudice our democracy. I draw his attention to the fact, however, that this Chamber is not democratically elected. We have not a democracy in Western Australia because, as has been frequently and rightly said by members on the other side of the House, the Upper Chamber is elected on an exceedingly restricted franchise. No matter what the Government may do or say, no matter what legislation it passes, the determining factor is the Legislative Council. However, I am quite convinced the Government would not interfere, even if it could, with the Legislative Council. It has been the Government's sheet anchor for years.

The Minister for Mines: Try us!

Mr. HUGHES: The Minister is not the Government, I am sorry to say. This House is not elected on a democratic basis, either. If anything, the basis is worse than that of the Legislative Council. As the member for Brown Hill-Ivanhoe said, the only basis should be an adult vote. But it is only democratic when each adult's vote is given the same weight. In this Chamber we have the extraordinary position that ten or eleven votes in the metropolitan area are equal to only one vote in some other parts of the State. Some of the metropolitan constituencies have electors equal to four or five seats outside the metropolitan area. There is certainly nothing democratic about a Parliament where one person has the same voting strength as have eleven others. The voting system for the Legislative Assembly is much worse than is the system for the Legislative Council. That does not appear to worry the member for Brown Hill-Ivanhoe.

The Premier: The Legislative Assembly is not worse off in that respect than is the Legislative Council.

Mr. HUGHES: Both Houses are in a bad state. After all, the position in this House could be remedied, as it has the power to give each elector one vote; one man, one vote.

Mr. Wilson: You might be given a chance this year.

Mr. HUGHES: Let the Government bring its Bill down and I shall give my vote on its merits. It should have been brought down last week and the Government's position would have been more secure. What I think was extremely ungrateful on the part of the member for Brown Hill-Ivanhoe was his attack on the Opposition. The Government ought to be grateful to the Opposition. I have never known of a Government whose strength rested more in the Opposition. The member for Brown Hill-Ivanhoe does not like the Opposition because it stands for law enforcement. He gave us a dissertation on what an Opposition should be. He does not stand for an Opposition believing in law enforcement. He does not believe in law enforcement, nor does he believe in non-enforcement of the law. What he believes is that the law should be enforced with discretion; that is, some people should be prosecuted and some should not, which is the way the law is enforced in Western Australia today. Only last week a case in point was brought under my notice. A man had opened a starting-price betting shop in Mt. Hawthorn.

Mr. Withers: Not another one, surely?

Mr. HUGHES: The day he opened his shop he was raided without warning.

Mr. Marshall: Without warning?

Mr. HUGHES: Without warning!

Mr. Marshall: That is an offence!

Mr. HUGHES: It is a breach of the constitutional convention. He was raided without any warning whatever and fined £75.

Mr. Marshall: That is a greater offence.

Mr. HUGHES: He was raided again the following Saturday night for betting in the street and was fined £7 10s. Six weeks later he was raided once more; two men were taken from his shop, one of whom was fined £75 and the other £30. That is all right, I suppose, if we are to have law enforcement; but fifty yards away there is another betting shop, which had not been raided for about 13 weeks. So one shop is raided four times in seven weeks and two men are taken on the second raid, whereas a shop 50 yards away has its immunity of 13 weeks. I do not suggest that the police should raid anyone for starting-price betting. It should be a question either of the enforcement or the non-enforcement of the law, and as I have said repeatedly on the platform and in this House, it is just as much an offence for a bookmaker to bet on the racecourse, as it

is for starting-price bookmakers to bet in Perth and elsewhere.

Mr. Marshall: Quite right!

Mr. HUGHES: There should be an attitude of consistency. The Government should say, "As far as starting-price betting is concerned, we are not going to enforce the law at all." This system of throwing the responsibility on to some police officer to say whether the law shall be enforced or not, leads to all sorts of repercussions. Here is a man who was prosecuted four times in seven weeks.

Mr. Withers: Did he pay his fine out of his profits?

Mr. HUGHES: The only conclusion that man can come to—and I say it is a logical conclusion—is that the other shop is under protection. He has been prosecuted to keep him out of competition with the other shop. There is no other logical explanation. There is a sort of convention that once in 13 weeks a raid comes, and the bookmakers are given proper warning.

Mr. Marshall: That is all right.

Mr. HUGHES: Yes, they get proper warning, and that is fair enough. But why is a sudden raid made on one man; why does he, as they say in the vernacular, "go off" four times in seven weeks? If it is not to protect his competitor from opposition, what is it for? We have now apparently established not only that some people may function in this business but apparently also that the forces of law are being used to cover monopolies in an unlawful occupation. It has its humorous aspect. I think this is worth recording in "Hansard." On Monday week a man was charged in the Perth Police Court with having kept a common gaming house, a criminal offence for which he could be sent to prison for three years. A detective gave evidence. He produced in Court the instruments of the crime, the betting books, the corpus delicti. The man was fined £75. Half an hour later that detective went into the passage and returned to the criminal the instruments with which he had committed his crime, in order that he could commit another one on the following Saturday. That is grossly unfair from this point of view: If a man is charged with burglary and is caught in possession of a jemmy and the other instruments of this ancient and ignoble trade, the police seize the instruments, and if he is convicted they retain them.

Why does not the burglar get back his jemmy and other instruments of crime?

Mr. Withers: They do not even auction them at the police sale!

Mr. HUGHES: No, they keep them in the police museum. Surely we have reached a ludicrous state of affairs when a man who has been arrested and convicted can have his instruments of crime handed back to him so that he can carry on and be available for another raid when his next turn comes around in 13 weeks' time! It demonstrates that a happy spirit exists amongst the police and the criminals. It shows a commendable spirit of co-operation in keeping the industry going, but from the point of view of the Police Force it is deplorable.

Mr. Marshall: I'll say it is!

Mr. HUGHES: You cannot expect a young police officer to get the right spirit regarding his job if he is trained to know that certain people are immune from prosecution by the law and that certain people have to be prosecuted, and that when men commit crimes they are, after conviction, able to receive back the facilities for committing further crime. The inevitable consequence is that the young police officer says to himself, "Somebody high up must be getting well paid for this," and after a while he adds, "Why should I not get something too? If somebody in high authority is getting paid, what is wrong with my taking a little on my own account?" I suggest to the Government that it would be much better to declare that it does not propose to enforce Section 210 of the Criminal Code; to say, "We will not prosecute anybody rather than have this farcical state of law existing." Unfortunately, this Government is not the only offender in this direction. I saw some questions on the notice paper asked by the member for Guildford-Midland (Hon. W. D. Johnson). I did not exactly catch the answer.

Mr. Raphael: It was "yes" or "no."

Mr. HUGHES: I do not know whether it is permissible for a private member to amplify an answer given by a Minister. I take it that if such a procedure is irregular, you, Mr. Speaker, will not permit me to proceed. I think I could have answered the hon. member's questions if he had asked me.

Mr. Marshall: I will go and get him.

Mr. HUGHES: The hon. member can tell him. I noticed that the member for Guildford-Midland asked whether the Taxa-

tion Department officers raided the home of Senator E. B. Johnston. They did. They raided his home and seized private papers from his safe, and that was done in culmination of an investigation lasting over 18 months. The second question asked was whether the visit had any connection with State revenue as affected by the Senator's taxation liabilities. It did! It was the sequel to 18 months' investigation into extensive, clever evasion of taxation by Senator E. B. Johnston.

The Premier: You are finding him guilty before he is tried.

Mr. HUGHES: He is not going to be tried.

The Premier: Is he not?

Mr. HUGHES: Is he?

The Premier: Ah! Hook, line and sinker!

Mr. HUGHES: I do not think he will be. As a matter of fact, I think it is fairly common knowledge that he has paid up and that there is to be no prosecution. I think it is quite well known; it is a matter of common knowledge. I think the reason he is not to be prosecuted is also a matter of common knowledge. The final question was—

Did the investigations disclose any breach of the taxation laws, and if so, will action be taken?

As is probably well known to people besides myself, what was involved was a comprehensive, long-extending arrangement for tax evasion. Not only did the investigation disclose that the honourable Senator had evaded taxation, but that he had defrauded some of his partners in his nefarious hotel transactions.

Hon. C. G. Latham: How did you get all this information?

Mr. HUGHES: I have it.

The Premier: No, the hon. member is fishing.

Hon. C. G. Latham: He seems to indicate he has some foundation for his remarks.

The Premier: No. He was not in the House when the reply to the question was given.

Mr. HUGHES: The Leader of the Opposition need not worry about the foundation for my statements because I have the information direct from one who was examined by the Taxation Department, and to whom it was disclosed the honourable Senator had defrauded. There is no doubt about my information, nor yet about its source. If the

Leader of the Opposition doubts my testimony, why not move for the appointment of a select committee to investigate the matter and ascertain whether I am wrong in my statements. If he has any doubt and will take the course I suggest, I will write out now an apology and a withdrawal of my statements, and hand it to the Leader of the Opposition under seal. He can read it to the House—

Hon. C. G. Latham: A very poor recommendation after ruining a man's reputation.

Mr. Marshall: What reputation?

Hon. C. G. Latham: You know that is so.

Mr. Marshall: I know of one case in which a claim for damages was made and the judge awarded a farthing.

Mr. HUGHES: At any rate, I make that offer to the Leader of the Opposition. When that hon. member can honestly come to the House and say there was no foundation for my statement, he can read my apology and broadcast it to the world. Of course, the Leader of the Opposition knows that what I say is correct.

Hon. C. G. Latham: I do not, and I will not allow you to implicate me, as you have implicated your friend.

Mr. HUGHES: Very well!

The Premier: The Leader of the Opposition should certainly not allow that, otherwise the member for East Perth will go out and say, "I made the statement on the floor of the House and the Leader of the Opposition did not deny it."

Mr. HUGHES: I do not regard it as the business of the Leader of the Opposition to be the public defender of all associated with the Country Party or the Opposition generally.

Hon. C. G. Latham: Nor yet of the accuser, I hope.

Mr. HUGHES: I do not want the hon. member to defend me. If he thinks there is any doubt about what I have said, I remind him that I have said plenty on the public platform. Of course, there is a reason why Senator E. B. Johnston will not be prosecuted. The reason is powerful and political. It would be very awkward for the Federal Government if Senator Johnston were prosecuted for tax evasion. He might be convicted and sentenced to two years' imprisonment, and then the Government's majority in the Senate would be lost.

Hon. C. G. Latham: No, it would not be lost.

Mr. HUGHES: Of course it would.

Hon. C. G. Latham: Certainly not!

Mr. HUGHES: But that should not stop the State Government from instituting proceedings against Senator Johnston. If the Premier considers that tax evasion has taken place, he can institute proceedings. For my part I do not want to see anyone prosecuted. Nevertheless, what I regard as grossly unfair is that every day in the week prosecutions are launched against taxpayers for minor offences, in which not £2 is involved. Perhaps, although taxable they have not furnished returns. Such people are fined various amounts. On the other hand we find that a man holding a high position has systematically evaded taxation for years, put in false returns, and resorted to all the expedients under the sun to evade prosecution. We find that after 18 months of close investigation, in which the evasion is established clearly, the offender goes scot free. The small fry guilty of evasion does not escape. Why prosecute the little fellow and let the big fellow off?

I know of one instance in which a member of this Chamber was fined £50 for not furnishing a return. He did not make any noise about it. He said, "I did not put my return in; I will pay up and say nothing about it." That man had no intention of evading taxation and his action was merely due to an oversight. To me it is a terrible thing that this particular gentleman to whom I have referred can go scot free, while the small man is prosecuted. It seems to me that it amounts to a convention of our system today, that if a person has high political protection, irrespective of the party he belongs to, he is immune.

Hon. C. G. Latham: That is a serious statement to make.

The Premier: I do not believe in finding a man guilty before he has been tried.

Mr. HUGHES: But this man is not going to be tried.

The Premier: You say that. You keep on chipping at me and I may tell you something.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order!

The Premier: But I do not think I will.

Mr. HUGHES: Anything the Premier tells me I will accept without prejudice. The member for Brown Hill-Ivanhoe (Mr. F. C. L. Smith) accused the Opposition of

"cashing-in on confusion." That was a fine piece of alliteration, but what confusion has been availed of by the Opposition on which to cash-in? I suppose the present is the least critical Opposition I have known in the course of 11 years.

Hon. C. G. Latham: Even including you?

Mr. HUGHES: Even so! I have seen Oppositions much more vigorous than is the present one. Then again the member for Brown Hill-Ivanhoe said the Opposition "exploited discontent." That is a fine charge to emanate from a member sitting on the Government side of the House. The whole philosophy of the Labour movement is based on discontent. Their appeal is to those who are discontented with their lot in life.

The Premier: No, it is to secure progress.

Mr. HUGHES: I hold that such men are rightly discontented. The man who has not a decent living for himself, his wife and children has every right to be discontented, and the whole philosophy of the Labour movement is to stir up discontent.

The Premier: No.

Mr. HUGHES: The party's philosophy is to make that discontent articulate and to exploit it for political purposes.

The Premier: No; the object is to maintain solid progress upwards.

Mr. HUGHES: What I suggest has been the position with the Labour party for years; and for 15 out of the last 18 years we have had a Labour Government in office in this State. Where are there signs of tangible, solid progress?

The Premier: You have not done too badly.

Mr. HUGHES: That is no thanks to the Premier.

The Premier: As a citizen of the State, you have had your share in the general prosperity.

Mr. HUGHES: That is no thanks to the Premier, who tried to put through a special Act of Parliament to deprive me of my living.

The Premier: No, that is not correct.

Mr. HUGHES: Yes, you did.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! I think the member for East Perth is commencing to reflect upon the Premier.

Mr. HUGHES: Curiously enough, I have to admit frankly that what little education I have is due to the policy of free education, which I first obtained from a State school and later from a night school. I think I had

the privilege of attending the first night school class established in Boulder by the Education Department. It was not established by a Labour Government but by an anti-Labour Government. Labour did not come into power until 1911, and technical education and night schools for State school children had been going on for a couple of years. Therefore one has to acknowledge, as one ought to do, that the opportunities for poor boys to get a liberal education were given by anti-Labour Governments in the first place.

The Premier: We do not deny that anti-Labour Governments sometimes do things for the benefit of the State.

Mr. HUGHES: This is the first time to my knowledge that mention has been made in this House of the fact that night schools to enable the children of poor people to get a better education were established by an anti-Labour Government.

The Premier: That might have been due to the importunities of the Labour Opposition at the time.

Mr. HUGHES: I think we used to pay a nominal fee of 5s. per term. Labour, after coming into power, extended the facilities for technical education to those people who could not afford to pay. I am not sure when the University was opened.

Hon. C. G. Latham: In 1911!

Mr. HUGHES: There the State provided for free education. I do not know whether the Premier disagrees with what I have done, but I have taken full advantage of the educational facilities provided by the State.

The Premier: Better men than you have done so.

Mr. HUGHES: I concede that others have done so; I cannot go further. After all, I did not get all my education either in the University or in the State school. When I left the State school, I gravitated through the two-up school on the Golden Mile and learnt things there. I did not attend college and I have not the privilege of wearing an old school tie. In the years when I should have been at college, I was probably out in Brown Hill-Ivanhoe learning to play two-up. While on the subject of two-up schools, I must admit that in those days they had not reached the strength and extent they have at present on the Golden Mile.

The duty of the Opposition is to bring before the House those things that are making the people discontented, and the

people of Western Australia have plenty to make them discontented after 15 years of Labour Government. The hon. member gave some history of Parliament and said that Parliament causes the natural development of the party system. That, to a certain extent, is true. The party system is not without its virtues, and this is right so long as people are obliged to subscribe only to matters of principle and so long as those elected to control the Government are the elect of the Government party. But when a departure is made from those basic principles, and instead of being obliged to subscribe to party principles, one is obliged to subscribe to party personality, and say that whatever a certain man does is right, and others must subordinate their views and violate the party principle because it suits the personal action of a certain individual, it is a complete negation of the party principle.

This, I think, is one of the things responsible for the very wholesome and extensive growth of Independents in this House. That is the most helpful sign, and no doubt the member for Brown Hill-Ivanhoe will agree that there should be periodical changes of Government. It is not good for any institution to be for too long a period under the same management. I am satisfied that whatever the party opposite has done, it would be in its interests and in the interests of the country to have a change. After 15 years of office, Labour Ministers have grown tired and weary. There are no ideas emanating from them for the progress of the State and the party system has been defeated because the Government has grown old in office. The logical development of the party system would be to let a new broom operate for a year or two.

Nothing very serious will happen to the people of this State if a change of Government takes place. There will probably be some wholesome alterations in administration. We might get back to the view that the Civil Service is a public service and not a Government service. One of the worst things the present Government has done has been to destroy the Civil Service as a public service and make it a Government service. The fact that appointments to the Civil Service are governed mainly by the political alliances of the aspirants tends to destroy the basic principles of the Civil

Service, which no longer continues to be a public service, but becomes a Government service, with the knowledge amongst officers that they must function in the interests of the reigning party rather than in the interests of the general public. This is one of the worst things that could happen under democratic government. One of the things mainly responsible for the rise of Mussolini in Italy and Dr. Brüning in Germany was that members of the public service understood they were not public servants but were servants of the reigning Government and must model their conduct for political purposes rather than for the public good. In those countries many people became disgusted with the position.

Mr. F. C. L. Smith: How do they get on in the United States of America where the service is changed with each change of Government?

Mr. HUGHES: That is a bad system, but we have got very close to it in Western Australia because recently no appointments have been made unless the appointees have been of a certain political colour. A department that was administered by the member for Brown Hill-Ivanhoe affords one of the worst examples of this. The wholesome thing is the increase in the number of Independents in this Chamber. It is a public recognition that what is wanted in Western Australia is people who are free to cast their votes here purely in the interests of the State, without consideration of party alliances and party advantages. I feel no doubt that there will be an accretion of Independents here in the next Parliament.

The Premier: We do not notice their independence very much! They just sit over there.

Mr. HUGHES: Let me tell the Premier something I noticed yesterday, just to show how much he does notice the existence of Independents. In fact, I almost thought the new member for Yilgarn-Coolgardie (Mr. Kelly) was a prince of the blood, from the way he was called upon yesterday the moment he entered the Chamber. I never before in my political life saw such wooing of a member of Parliament. I sincerely trust the hon. member will not be induced to sacrifice his independence. On that topic I wish to say how much I regret the absence of George Lambert. The late Mr. Lambert was almost the last of the old goldfielders. With the Minister for Works and myself, Parlia-

ment has just about come to the end of old identities from the early goldfields. There is, of course, the Johnny-come-lately, the member for Murchison (Mr. Marshall), who blazed the track and gave the water supply and featherbeds and generally made life easy for the dwellers outback. It is a hopeful thing, if interpreted in the right light, to have the member for Yilgarn-Coolgardie facing an ordeal, his entry into this Chamber of the intellectually elect of the community. From experience I say that one enters here with fear and trembling, expecting to be confronted with one knows not what. It is therefore an ordeal. The member for Yilgarn-Coolgardie—whether he has blue blood in his veins or not I do not know—certainly had more attention paid to him than did any other new member within my experience. He was not here two minutes before he was called upon by the Leader of the Opposition, who in turn was followed by several members of the party on my right. The moment the “living” was vacant, the Premier called, speedily followed by the Deputy Premier.

Hon. C. G. Latham: You are cross because you thought you were going to get another member to join your party!

Mr. Hughes: I could not get in.

The Premier: You were too slow!

Hon. C. G. Latham: Far too slow.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order!

The Premier: You missed the bus again.

Mr. HUGHES: Yes; but I will take the present opportunity to give the member for Yilgarn-Coolgardie a little advice, which he can take for what it is worth. My advice is, “Let them woo you, let the party leaders cultivate you, let them make up to you politically as much as they like, but let there be a limit; get the advice, and follow it, that Ophelia’s father gave to her on the night he heard Hamlet was coming round to see her!” This is very nice and very helpful, because it portends to me, in my simple and unsophisticated way, that there must be some importance attaching to Independents in this Chamber.

Mr. Withers: They do straighten up the Opposition and keep them there.

Mr. HUGHES: It may be that they are designed to play an important role in the future. We may have not less than six Independents in the next Parliament. Probably the Independents will then have the grave responsibility of deciding who are to govern. The Independents may have to de-

cide to whom they will give the plum of office. I think I can say for them that their conduct in the next Parliament will be guided by strength and wisdom.

The Premier: You are appointing yourself their leader, are you?

Mr. HUGHES: No.

The Premier: It seems like it.

Mr. HUGHES: I have not had time to consult the Independent members because the Premier and others do not allow me an opportunity.

The Premier: You are too modest, undoubtedly!

Mr. HUGHES: And the Premier has a lot of luck!

Mr. SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. HUGHES: All I have to say to the Independents is, "Remain independent and keep the political opinions on which you were elected." When the Independents have been here as long as I have, they will probably be able to form a better assessment of party machinations.

Much criticism has been levelled by members opposite at the Federal Government. I agree that the Federal Government has treated Western Australia very badly, and I cannot conceive that any person could be a strong supporter of the Federal Government without being hostile to this State. I believe we do not exist so far as the Federal Government is concerned. The Prime Minister, Mr. Menzies, has been attacked here; but Western Australia has been neglected only because it has been the wish of Western Australian Labour members in Canberra that it shall be neglected. Mr. Menzies has done nothing to Western Australia except with the consent and co-operation of Mr. Curtin. Mr. Menzies could not have neglected Western Australia if Mr. Curtin had been prepared to stand up for this State. It is a well-known fact that Mr. Menzies has been Prime Minister solely because of the man whom he terms "my friend Mr. Curtin."

It is idle for members opposite to traduce the Federal Government for neglecting Western Australia unless they are prepared to say, "Mr. John Curtin, the Federal member for Fremantle, is equally responsible." If, with the position Mr. Curtin holds and the power he can wield, he had co-operated with other members of his party in the Eastern States, he could have insisted that Mr. Menzies and his Government should ex-

tend more consideration to Western Australia. This State, therefore, has nothing to hope for from Mr. Curtin either. It does not seem to matter to Western Australia which political party is in power in Canberra. The domination will continue to come from Melbourne and Sydney. Mr. Curtin has never lifted a finger to help Western Australia, never spoken one word, never used his position to assist us. We might as well have no representative at all. And he has been able to help. Had he not been in a position to advocate this State's claims and insist upon the Federal Government doing something for Western Australia, we could have excused him. We could have said that he was in a minority and consequently unable to force the hand of the Federal Government. But he has been in a position all along to do that. As a matter of fact, he was concerned about not being forced into the position of Prime Minister.

Mr. F. C. L. Smith: You are grossly misrepresenting the facts.

Mr. HUGHES: It is easy to say that. Mr. Curtin has been able during the past two years to stand up for Western Australia, but he has not made any effort to do so. It is well known that Mr. Menzies has been in close co-operation with Mr. Curtin. In everything that Mr. Menzies has done he has first consulted Mr. Curtin. It is also well known that Mr. Curtin has caused his party, whenever he could, to go against the New South Wales group in order to get things done in Mr. Menzies' way. That is why Mr. Menzies said in the Melbourne Town Hall, "My friend Mr. Curtin." That would be all right if there were no criticism of Mr. Menzies from members opposite, but it is grossly unfair to attack him and assert that the Commonwealth Government will do nothing for Western Australia, when our own member—the member for Fremantle, Mr. Curtin, who is a colleague of the member for Brown Hill-Ivanhoe—will not do anything. All he had to do was to say to Mr. Menzies, "Western Australia is entitled to a fair share of the war expenditure and you are not giving it that fair share. I owe it to my constituents and to the State of Western Australia to see that you do the fair thing by that State." Not so; he does just what Mr. Menzies wants him to do. Then his colleagues attack Mr. Menzies for doing what he (Mr. Menzies) has done in co-operation with Mr. Curtin and probably

at his request. It is no use the member for Brown Hill-Ivanhoe saying that is a misstatement; it is absolute fact.

The Premier: You make me laugh.

Mr. HUGHES: Probably this is above the head of the Premier. It is one of the unfortunate defects of the party system.

The Minister for Works: You are not good enough to be an intellectual snob. Be careful!

Mr. SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. HUGHES: I am not trying to be an intellectual snob. I am pointing out that members opposite should be fair and lay the blame on Mr. Menzies and Mr. Curtin jointly. Members opposite should say that both have neglected the State, not pick out one all the time and attack him. I agree that the criticism is justified; the Eastern States do not care two hoots about Western Australia. The member for Brown Hill-Ivanhoe spoke of the industries that had been established in the Eastern States. Are we to get our share? It is mean to lay the blame on Mr. Menzies and say he will not give us a fair deal, when our own representative will not lift a finger to help us. Of course, the member for Brown Hill-Ivanhoe does not think the Opposition should indulge in political propaganda, but this is all political propaganda. All public questions have a political bearing and must be approached from the angle of the people who have to deal with them. I myself do not agree with Mr. Menzies. He talks about playing at politics, but has done his share of that during the last two years. I have heard him criticise the Labour Party for opposing his party's candidate in the Swan election; his party had, nevertheless, just previously opposed the Labour Party in the Kalgoorlie election. Surely, if his party was right in opposing the Labour Party, during the war, at a by-election at Kalgoorlie, the Labour Party was right in following his party's example by opposing the U.A.P. candidate in the Swan election. What is the use of holding an election if people are not to be allowed to stand?

The member for Brown Hill-Ivanhoe had much to say about our mining industry and what the Government had done for it; but he carefully refrained from telling the House how English investors in the industry had suffered. I commend for his perusal some reports forwarded to the

British Board of Trade by Sir William McIntock. As a matter of fact, our mining industry was used as an instrument to defraud British investors of four and a half million pounds. Mining flotations, as Sir William McIntock pointed out, were based on reports of engineers who had never seen the mines. In cases where mines were under water, glowing prospectuses were issued which induced English investors to part with £7,000,000, of which £4,500,000 was absolutely lost to them. The result is that in London our mining industry is synonymous with fraud. The Government knew, or ought to have known, that those mines were wild cats. The records of our Mines Department would show that the mines were not capable of standing up to the prophecies in the prospectuses. In the case of the Southern Cross United mine at Southern Cross, a so-called expert furnished a report stating there was 3 oz. dirt. When treated, there was not 3 dwts., and English investors lost just on £500,000 in that mine alone. They never had a chance to get their money back. As a result of Sir William McIntock's reports and the activities of the shareholders who had been induced to invest in these companies, the London Stock Exchange banned eight of them. The Board of Trade conducted an extensive investigation. Sir William McIntock has issued several reports of considerable length concerning the manipulations of our mining industry, and these are exceedingly bad from the point of view of Western Australia. Yet the Government stood idly by and allowed any report to be put over.

The Minister for Works: Do you remember the Hampton Plains boom in 1920? The Labour Government was not then in power. That was one of the worst instances of mining fraud in the State, and it was the Kalgoorlie investor who lost, not the British investor.

Mr. HUGHES: But the Kalgoorlie investors did not lose a tithe of what the British investor lost.

The Minister for Works: I do not stand for that sort of thing.

Mr. HUGHES: I commend to the Minister for Mines and Cabinet generally the investigation that has taken place in London. It must have been of an extraordinarily ex-

haustive nature because here is one schedule that has been compiled setting out the ramifications of the following gold mining companies:—The Anglo-Australian, North Kalgurli, Southern Cross, Commonwealth Mining and Finance, Murchison, Beryl, Meekatharra and Great Boulder Mining and Finance. Altogether there are 28 subsidiary companies. The final result of it all is that approximately £7,000,000 was extracted from investors in England on the strength of prospectuses that were absolutely false. It was disclosed that the Gladstone mine, a few miles north of Kalgoorlie, was reported on by an engineer and the report was published in the prospectus to the English investors. That mine was under water. The engineer never saw it underground at all because the water had risen. I understand that the water filters into the Sand Queen and then percolates from the Sand Queen to the Gladstone. However, when the report on the mine was made—and I am not purporting to give this from my own investigations but from the reports of Sir William McLintock who carried out an inquiry for the British Board of Trade—the mine was given a glowing future, although the man making the report had never gone underground because he was prevented from doing so by the water.

Mr. Marshall: Who made the report? He was not a Government official.

Mr. HUGHES: I think it was Henry Urquhart.

The Minister for Works: He did not have his head office at the Trades Hall.

Mr. HUGHES: I did not bring in the Trades Hall. The Minister is doing that.

The Minister for Works: I suggest you would not find any mining experts there.

Mr. Marshall: It was hypocrisy to designate him as a mining engineer; he never was one.

Mr. HUGHES: Surely it was the duty of the Government, or of the Mines Department—when it was known at the time that men of his type were putting out glowing prospectuses and reports for the purpose of getting capital from English investors—to do something to stop it and safeguard the industry! It is all a sad story. I do not know whether the Minister for Mines has the reports of Sir William McLintock that have so far been issued, or whether he has the tremendous analysis that was made, but I am pleased to say that the people who

perpetrated that injustice on Western Australia are not going to get away with it as easily as they thought, because men with money have launched proceedings in the High Court to test the validity of some of those prospectuses. Those responsible for them can be brought to book only by people with enough money to stand up to expensive litigation. I understand that is being done. I do not know whether provision has been made in the Companies Bill to prevent that sort of thing, but I hope something will be done to safeguard Western Australia from another mining boom and the ramps that take place.

The Minister for Mines: We especially put that up to the committee from the Mines Department and I assume that the Bill will contain such provisions.

Mr. HUGHES: The Hampton Plains affair was bad enough, but this following on top has had the result that if someone has a legitimate mining proposition in Western Australia and writes to London with the object of obtaining financial support, the people in London will not have anything to do with the venture. They are afraid to look at a proposition from Western Australia as a consequence of what has taken place. One of the leading men responsible for the perpetration of this fraud was an ex-Governor of this State, Sir William Campion, who allowed his name to be used to introduce the perpetrators to people with money. He made use of the fact that he had occupied a Vice-Regal office and people were induced to participate in those schemes on the strength of the recommendation of an ex-Governor of the State.

Mr. F. C. L. Smith: Were they looking for dividends or to sell their shares at a profit? That is the point.

Mr. HUGHES: They were probably looking to make a profit.

Mr. F. C. L. Smith: I think they were.

Mr. HUGHES: I understood that was something the hon. member whole-heartedly approves of.

Mr. F. C. L. Smith: Not when they gamble on what people can be induced to believe about mines.

Mr. HUGHES: I do not think that is the right attitude to take.

Mr. F. C. L. Smith: That is the attitude they do take.

Mr. HUGHES: It is all right for these fraudulent prospectuses to be perpetrated

on the European investor in the name of Western Australia! It is all right to take them down!

Mr. F. C. L. Smith: They have been taken down ever since the £1 share was introduced.

Mr. HUGHES: The £1 share was not introduced in the Hampton Plains days; it has nothing to do with the matter.

Mr. F. C. L. Smith: Has it not?

Mr. HUGHES: It has nothing at all to do with getting people to invest money in mines. What makes people invest money in mines are the glowing prospectuses that are produced.

We hear much talk about secondary industries in this State. I suggest the reason we have not more secondary industries in Western Australia is that we have not more population. If we had 10,000,000 people living in Western Australia, secondary industries would come as a matter of course. The reason Melbourne and Sydney are able to have secondary industries and stamp out any competition from this State is that we have only a handful of people. I suggest that the first way to establish secondary industries in this State is to endeavour to populate the State. I am quite satisfied we will not do it locally. East Perth cannot make up for the deficiencies in other constituencies in that connection, but I suggest that there is an avenue that might possibly be explored. We should set an objective. We should find out what we consider would be the maximum capacity this State can hold by way of population. If we are satisfied that our natural resources are capable of accommodating and feeding 10,000,000 people, we should hitch our wagon to a star and say we are going to put 10,000,000 people into Western Australia over a certain period.

In Europe at present thousands of people are homeless and anxious to leave those countries where wars are periodical. Many children in France must have lost their parents. Some committee could be established here to investigate the possibilities. It would be far better for the Government to undertake the task than for a committee, for personally I am not too much enamoured of committees. Certainly the Government is responsible for the administration of the affairs of State. Let it accept the responsibility, and secure assistance where it can. In view of the present conditions in Europe, I think it would be satisfactory if now,

while the war is in progress, we could set up some scheme whereby we could absorb from that Continent many people, particularly children, who would be anxious to migrate. At a pinch we could accommodate a million such persons in Western Australia, if we could get them within the next 12 months. We could not provide them with flats in the city, but we could give them sunshine and fresh air. They could live in log cabins and they would turn out all right. Many of us commenced life in humbler circumstances than those associated with log cabins.

[Mr. Withers took the Chair.]

Mr. Sampson: They would be better off here than where they are now.

Mr. HUGHES: Yes, if we could get them. I read a report in the Press that there were 14,000 French soldiers in Syria who were in an invidious position. They did not wish to return to France. It would be splendid for Western Australia if those 14,000 French soldiers with their wives and children could come here.

Mr. Berry: How would you keep them alive here? What would they do?

Mr. HUGHES: So long as we have wheat, meat, fruit and vegetables they would do quite well. They could do without custard tarts for the time being. The hon. member wants to know how we could feed such a large number of people. Are we not in these days suggesting that the farmers take a holiday or, at any rate, cut out two-thirds of their wheat production because we cannot transport food supplies to where they are required? For many years we have endeavoured to transport food to people in Europe. What about getting into reverse gear and bringing out the people from Europe to eat the food here? Why not use our ships for that purpose?

The Minister for Works: That is the trouble with the French; they have gone into reverse gear.

Mr. HUGHES: And that cannot be undone for the time being. We should not limit such a move to the people of France. There must be thousands of people living along the western borders of Russia who are anxious to get away from that vicinity. There are Yugo-Slavs, Greeks, and many others who might be prepared to migrate to Australia. It would be a good thing if

we got a mixture of those people who would be prepared to put up with a little hardship for a year or two. Even if they had to do that, the hardship they would experience in Western Australia would be no greater than that which they experience today. I know the issue involved is one of transport in order to get them here. At the risk of being called an intellectual snob by the Minister for Works—

The Minister for Works: You brought that on yourself by patronising the Premier.

Mr. HUGHES: I suggest there is an avenue the Government could well explore. If within 10 years we could increase the population of Western Australia from 500,000 to 2,000,000, we would have secondary industries developing naturally within the State. Are we not capable of establishing 2,000,000 people in this State? Surely we are! However, I suggest that objective as an avenue that could well be explored. Any Government would do the State a service if it adopted as its major policy the filling of our empty spaces. The present war should have given us a fright, and we should be seriously concerned about filling up those spaces. I have suggested one means of doing so.

During the course of the debate we have heard a good deal about the new order that we are to have at some future time. Why do we require a new order? Two years ago any person who talked about such a vital change was classified as a Bolshevik or Communist or something equally undesirable. When Major Douglas suggested the establishment of a new order by means of financial reforms, he was viciously attacked. Why is it that people who formerly attacked anyone who advanced such a suggestion, now say that we require the inauguration of a new era? I do not believe such people are sincere in their declaration. Why is it that only when a war develops, they contemplate such a change? The reason that suggests itself to me is that they are afraid that if the workers of Great Britain did not fight for them, they would lose their privileges and properties. Thus the new order was held out as a bait.

Mr. Marshall: And this is not the first time during a war that there has been talk about a new order.

Mr. HUGHES: No, I do not think such people are anxious to establish a new order.

Mr. Marshall: I am positive they are not.

Mr. HUGHES: The difficulty about establishing a new order is obvious. I shall read a quotation—

As so often happens in the course of history, the main difficulty is not to establish a new order of things, but to clear the ground for its establishment. Prejudices and egotistic interests join together in forming a common front against the new idea and in trying by every means to prevent its triumph, because it is disagreeable to them or threatens their existence. That is why the protagonist of the new idea is unfortunately, in spite of his desire for constructive work, compelled to wage a destructive battle first, in order to abolish the existing state of affairs.

Those words appear in "Mein Kampf" by Adolf Hitler! Is that not the trouble? Does not this fool, this megalomaniac we all reckoned him to be, indicate the trouble? We have first to root out the old order; and to do that, we must get rid of the old mentality. We have to get rid of the old ideas; we have to clear the ground. The people who establish the new order will be the soldiers when they return from the war. If they are not misled, as they were after the 1914-18 war, and told not to have anything to do with politics, they will need to make an effective demand, because the new order that some people would establish for us in Western Australia is an order of Nazi terrorism.

The Commonwealth Government has gone to absolutely absurd lengths to prevent us from reading certain literature. Some of the regulations would stifle freedom of thought and freedom of speech entirely. I do not suppose many people would be safe from prosecution if their homes were raided and they had done any reading of importance over the years. They would be bound to have in their possession literature that is regarded as subversive. The Commonwealth has gone to absurd lengths to prevent people from reading. English publications criticising the administration, dealing with international and economic topics, things that are freely published in England, would bring anybody in Australia charged with their possession six months' imprisonment. Why is it necessary to stifle our right to read what we desire and think as we want to think? This is the new order that some people would like to introduce. They would adopt the Nazi principle of insisting that we should read what they prescribe. Some people, of course, would establish a system of tyranny.

About the meanest example of Nazi tyranny imaginable occurred in this city during the week. A young woman named June Carder took action in the courts on a claim that she had been libelled. It is supposed to be the right of every person in this community, if he thinks that legal injury has been done him, to go to the courts for redress. Whether he is right or wrong, he has that fundamental privilege of seeking redress. During the court proceedings, Miss Carder was working and her employer did, as every employer would be bound to do; he gave her time off to attend the court. She lost the case and lodged an appeal. It is the right of every citizen to go to the court of appeal if he thinks that a wrong decision has been given. While the appeal was pending, Miss Carder obtained employment with the Victoria League Camp Comforts Fund, which has quarters in Forrest Place. The officials of that organisation are—Board of Control, R. O. Law (chairman), S. W. Perry, O.B.E., W. L. Sanderson, O.B.E., M.C., G. Nelson, Mrs. Adam Johnston, Mrs. Frank Davies, Mrs. H. J. Gray, H. Jessop, J. Totterdell and W. Broadhurst; Hon. Treasurer, R. B. Goode; Hon. Secretary, Mrs. E. Cohen; Assistant Secretary, Mrs. W. G. Chandler. Miss Carder was carrying out her duties to the satisfaction of her employers. On Tuesday morning the "West Australian" published a statement that she had provided the necessary security and that her appeal was to proceed. The manager told her he had read in the paper that she was proceeding with her appeal, and promptly dismissed her from her employment. He did not give her a week's notice; he dismissed her there and then. He instructed her to say that she had left her job because she had the prospect of getting permanent work. She was paid a week's wages officially by the treasurer of the society, and a week's wages unofficially. Surely that is a fine new order! Because a citizen says, "I am going to exercise my legal right to go to the court as I feel that an injustice has been done," though she has acted according to law and complied with all the instructions of the court, some person with Nazi instincts deprives her of her livelihood.

Mr. Marshall: Are you sure that that was the reason for her dismissal?

Mr. HUGHES: Yes. It is a bad state

of affairs if someone who happens to think differently from the employer is to be told, "You must not exercise your legal rights. If you do, I will deprive you of your employment." That is typical of the Nazis. So those people have established a new order for us. They have established in the first instance the fundamental philosophy of the Nazis that might is right, and that one shall not act except with approval. What is the second instance of the new order? The member for Victoria Park (Mr. Raphael) told us last night that a soldier he knew, returned from the present war, has been obliged to go back to Marquiss-street on the dole. There are the first manifestations of the new order—terrorism and the dole! If we are not alert to safeguard the rights of the poor people, we will find that the new order will be complete subjection.

The Minister for Works: If that man is able to work, we will give him a job tomorrow. He need not go on the dole.

*[The Speaker took the Chair.]*

Mr. HUGHES: If he is not able to work, the Commonwealth Government should make adequate provision for him. To make provision in such a case should be a charge against war funds. I am not vouching for that case; I am merely quoting the statement of the member for Victoria Park.

Mr. Wilson: That is so, but you are giving it publicity.

Mr. HUGHES: I think it should receive plenty of publicity.

Mr. Wilson: Yes, if it is true.

Mr. HUGHES: If it is true, it should be shouted from the house-tops in the early stages to show that this is not the new order we want. We do not want men to return to the old dole; we do not want to establish a system of Nazi terrorism as in the case I have mentioned.

Mr. Wilson: Hear, hear!

Mr. HUGHES: I consider that the member for Victoria Park did a public service in bringing that case before the House.

On motion by Mr. Kelly, debate adjourned.

*House adjourned at 9.59 p.m.*