

occur occasionally. This House is supposed to represent all the people. It does, and the hon. member knows the type he represents. Long before Parliament met he was preparing this speech. He has all his friends here, those who have been deluded by him. He has moved a pious resolution which does not give his friends 1s. Every penny that the Government receive by way of revenue or loan is used for the unemployed and the payment of the services of the country. The total revenue received by the State last year was £9,500,000. The financial emergency collections amounted to £820,000. The revenue pays all the services of the country, and provides for education, interest £3,500,000, child welfare and unemployment relief, £84,000, and so on. Every penny of revenue received by the State is expended in services or in work. The Loan Council has loaned to this State £2,350,000. The suggestion that the financial emergency tax is sufficient to place all men, depending on the Government for employment, on full-time work shows entire ignorance of the position. Our revenue is barely sufficient to meet our expenditure. The great bulk of the men employed by the Government are employed on works financed out of loan. These loans come from the Loan Council. Before the commencement of the financial year a meeting of the Loan Council was held, and each Government was allowed a certain amount of loan money based on the total amount it was possible to raise each year. If the money collected from the financial emergency tax was used for giving full-time work on all Government works, the deficit created by that would have to be recouped from loan funds. We would have to take from loan funds a similar amount to meet the deficit on the revenue account, and we would be as we were. And so the position would be the same. There is not the slightest difference whether the money is taken from the financial emergency tax or from Loan funds. So the position would not be improved by the passing of the hon. member's amendment. The amendment is absolutely puerile. It does not provide for the expenditure of a shilling. It cannot, because the Government have spent every penny of the money, except that last year there was a surplus of £50,000, which is now expended also. So every penny of the money from the financial emergency tax and every penny of the money borrowed has been given

to the service of the State and to provide employment. That position cannot be affected in the least degree by the amendment moved by the member for East Perth.

On motion by Hon. C. G. Latham, debate adjourned.

House adjourned at 11.32 p.m.

Legislative Assembly.

Tuesday, 1st September, 1936.

	PAGE
Federal Senate, vacancy filled	246
Address-in-reply debate, apology by Mr. Speaker	246
Questions: Railways—1, Overtime details; 2, Institute at Collicie	247
Life Saving Clubs	247
Country water supplies	247
Education, Kenwick school site	248
Address-in-reply, eighth day—amendment	248

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

FEDERAL SENATE—VACANCY FILLED.

Mr. SPEAKER: I desire to report that at a joint sitting of both Houses, held in accordance with the requirements of the Standing Orders, Mr. Thomas William Marwick was duly elected as a Senator in place of the late Senator W. Carroll.

ADDRESS-IN-REPLY DEBATE.

Apology by Mr. Speaker.

Mr. SPEAKER: I wish to take this opportunity to refer to what was, to me, a very unfortunate episode during last Thursday's debate on the Address-in-reply. During the course of the proceedings, I found it necessary to call the Minister for Employment to order, and in doing so I used some very undignified language, from the point of view of the Speaker. I offer no excuse whatever, as the language was both unjustifiable and undignified. I simply wish

to take this opportunity to apologise both to the House and to the Minister for Employment.

QUESTIONS (2)—RAILWAYS.

Overtime Details.

Mr. STYANTS asked the Minister for Railways: 1, What was the total overtime, in hours, worked in the Government Railways by (a) engine-drivers, (b) firemen, (c) cleaners for the period from the 1st November, 1935, to the 30th April, 1936? 2, What was the total overtime worked by engine-drivers, firemen, and cleaners for the year ended the 30th June, 1936? 3, What was the total cost to the Railway Department for such overtime including penalty rates on the daily and weekly basis? 4, What was the average number of hours of actual cleaning work performed per engine during these periods, not including time usually credited to cleaning when cleaners are engaged on other duties, such as lighting up, etc.? 5, In how many instances were enginemmen kept on duty continuously for over nine hours in one shift for the above-mentioned period? 6, What action do the Government intend to take to give effect to their policy regarding the abolition of preventable overtime in the railway service? 7, Is it the intention of the Government to issue instructions for the immediate engagement of sufficient engine-cleaners to allow of their being trained for footplate work, to be available when required, to prevent overtime being worked by classified enginemmen?

The DEPUTY PREMIER (for the Minister for Railways) replied: 1, The total overtime (a, b and c) was 42,976 hours. 2, 68,432 hours. 3, Six months ended 30th April, 1936, £7,900; twelve months ended 30th June, 1936, £13,100. On the other hand, the time not worked but added to make up the 44 hours per week was:—Six months ended 30th April, 1936, 23,021 hours for £2,810; twelve months ended 30th June, 1936, 52,726 hours for £6,425. 4, Six months ended 30th April, 1936, 1.6 hours; twelve months ended 30th June, 1936, 2.3 hours. 5, 23,164. In the majority of cases the length of shift was between 9 and 10 hours. 6, The policy of the Government and of the Railway Commissioner is to avoid all preventable overtime, but in a service such as the Railways, it is impossible

to work the running staff exactly 8 hours per day or 44 hours per week. As will be seen from the answer to question 3 the number of hours not worked but paid for as undertime for the twelve months is in excess of 75 per cent. of total number of hours of overtime. 7, The responsibility for the engagement of staff is one that the Railways Act places upon the Commissioner, who is fully seized of the Government's policy.

Institute at Collie.

Mr. WILSON asked the Minister for Railways: 1, What is the position regarding the promise made by the Railway Department to establish an institute at Collie? 2, When will the promised financial help be made available for the above purpose?

The DEPUTY PREMIER (for the Minister for Railways) replied: 1, The matter is under consideration, and is largely a question of finance as funds become available. 2, See No. 1.

QUESTION—LIFE SAVING CLUBS.

Mr. NORTH asked the Treasurer: In view of the splendid services rendered by the life saving clubs in this State, are the Government prepared to assist to the extent of relieving the clubs of land tax, and, in cases where applicable, of water rates?

The DEPUTY PREMIER (for the Treasurer) replied: It is undesirable to exempt any institution whose funds permit them to be owners of land whilst leaving liable other bodies equally worthy of exemption.

QUESTION—COUNTRY WATER SUPPLIES.

Mr. DONEY asked the Minister for Water Supplies: What was the amount spent by the Water Supply Department on country water supplies during 1935-36, excluding the amount spent upon the reconditioning of the goldfields main during that period?

The DEPUTY PREMIER (for the Minister for Water Supplies) replied: Capital expenditure on water supplies to towns controlled by the Minister under the provisions of the Water Boards Act, £18,752 6s.; capital expenditure on water supplies for the benefit of farmers, £51,071 15s.

QUESTION—EDUCATION, KENWICK SCHOOL SITE.

Mr. CROSS asked the Minister for Education: 1, Has approval been given for the site of the proposed new school at Kenwick? 2, Has the erection of the building been decided upon? 3, If so, when will work be commenced?

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION replied: 1. A site is being investigated as to suitability and cost. 2, Not yet. 3, As soon as money is available for both land and building.

ADDRESS-IN-REPLY.

Eighth Day—Amendment.

Debate resumed from the 27th August on the motion for the adoption of the Address-in-reply, and on the following amendment moved by Mr. Hughes:

That the following words be added to the Address-in-reply:—“But we regret that Your Excellency’s Speech contains no statement to the effect that your Ministers intend to use the sums collected and to be collected under the Financial Emergency Tax for the provision of full-time employment of those citizens at present on part-time relief work, and for the relief of necessitous farmers.”

HON. N. KEENAN (Nedlands—on amendment) [4.40]: I listened with considerable surprise and disappointment to the reply made by the Minister for Lands and Acting Leader of this House to the speech of the member for East Perth (Mr. Hughes) on Thursday last. Ninety-nine per cent. of the reply by the Minister consisted of abuse of the member for East Perth.

Mr. Raphael: Did he not pass some of it back?

Hon. N. KEENAN: No doubt it was in protest against what the Minister termed the abuse hurled by the member for East Perth. Owing to the fact that the member for East Perth has been absent from this Chamber for some years, it was pardonable for him not to be aware of the rules of debate, or rather should I say, the dogma which appears to have grown up in late years. That dogma is that any member of the Labour Party can say at any time anything he chooses regarding any person in this House or out of it, and it is considered quite right and proper to do so. For instance, I can recall when the then Leader of the Labour Party, the Leader of this House,

informed members of this Chamber that I had personally prostituted all my political beliefs and convictions merely for the purpose of acquiring a life pass over the railways.

Mr. SPEAKER: I hope the hon. member realises to what he is addressing his remarks, and will confine his speech to the amendment.

Hon. N. KEENAN: I am addressing myself to the reply made by the Acting Leader of this House, and surely I am in order in dealing in general terms—

Mr. SPEAKER: I am sorry, but the hon. member must confine himself to the amendment before the Chair. The hon. member knows as well as I do that on the Address-in-reply he can deal with anything he likes.

Hon. N. KEENAN: I submit, Mr. Speaker, that I find myself in a position of very great embarrassment, because I am attempting to reply to a speech that was made after, and not before, the amendment had been moved. I desire to refer to a few instances only that establish what I regard as an extraordinary position, which was illustrated in that speech, and then to deal purely and simply with the subject matter of the amendment. I ask your favour and grace, Mr. Speaker, to allow me to make these introductory remarks, which I shall bring to a conclusion at an early moment. I was pointing out that in this House there have been occasions, one of which I was referring to, when the grossest insults have been flung across the floor of the Chamber at members sitting on the Opposition side of the House, insults without any possible ground or basis to warrant their being uttered. Yet there was not a single murmur of discontent or disapproval on the part of gentlemen who now sit on the Treasury bench.

Mr. Raphael: If members on the Opposition side of the House are looking for insults, they will get some, and I will not mince my words.

Hon. N. KEENAN: I am sure the member for Victoria Park (Mr. Raphael) is quite capable of being most insulting.

Mr. Raphael: Yes, and you can have it.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. Raphael: If Opposition members want it, they can get it.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! The member for Victoria Park had better keep order.

Hon. N. KEENAN: I am sure that the hon. member's capacity for insult has not yet been plumbed.

Mr. Raphael: No, and I will not mince my words.

Hon. N. KEENAN: If the member for Victoria Park will allow me to proceed with my speech, I shall be obliged. So utterly ridiculous was the suggestion made by the Leader of the House in my case that the fullest use that trivial pass was actually put to was one single time it was used in 25 years. Yet it was sufficient to warrant a jibe of that character! Then again, I remember that when the State Transport Co-ordination Act was before this Chamber in the form of a Bill, the member for West Perth (Mr. McDonald) and I were desirous of ensuring that in the measure were provisions that would enable those who lost their livelihood as a result of its enactment, to obtain compensation. Such a provision is already in force in legislation in other parts of Australia. Again, the Leader of the Labour Party and the Leader of the Government flung in our faces the jibe that we were hired to speak for others, that we were selling our positions. There was no doubt that that absolutely worthless and abominable jibe met with no disapproval from members sitting on the Government benches. And even in the case of the present Acting Leader of the House, although I confess he does not often offend in that respect, I have heard him sling across the House insults at members on this side. And all that is based on the dogma which has been attempted to be brought into existence in this Chamber, namely, that the members on the Government side of the House are perfectly free to say what they choose, however violent, about members on this side, but if a single member of the Opposition, even with some justification, attempts to say anything reflecting on the character of those sitting opposite, the Standing Orders are immediately quoted to show how disorderly that member's conduct is.

Mr. Marshall: That is a reflection on the Speaker.

Hon. N. KEENAN: And then the offender is made the subject of all that abuse and vilification in which the Labour Party so highly excel. And this is the dogma, we should remember, in consonance with which the member for East Perth (Mr. Hughes) being unconscious of its existence, has

been violently assaulted. I myself refuse altogether to accept such dogma as existing. I am prepared to return courtesy with courtesy, indeed with added courtesy, but if I am made the subject of any personal attack, then I am prepared to retaliate. And it may well be that the member for East Perth shares that view, because he, of all the public men I know of, has been made in the course of the last few years the butt of the greatest attack of concentrated venom that has been launched during that period. I have said that the reply of the Deputy Premier to the speech made by the member for East Perth consisted of 99 per cent. of abuse and was only 1 per cent. pertinent to the issue raised by that hon. member; and that 1 per cent. was an evasion of that issue. For what is the real issue contained in the amendment moved by the member for East Perth? It deplores the fact that the moneys which have been extracted from the pockets of the taxpayers under the Financial Emergency Act have been used only to a very small extent for the purpose of relief of unemployment, and to a very large extent for purposes that are wholly foreign to the Act.

Mr. Withers: That is why there was such a rush on your side to second the amendment.

Hon. C. G. Latham: It required only one seconder.

Hon. N. KEENAN: The member for East Perth clearly demonstrated the fact that so small a proportion is used for the relief fund, and so large a proportion for other purposes.

The Minister for Employment: What other purposes?

Hon. N. KEENAN: Among other purposes, for the personal gain of the Minister who interjected. The member for East Perth demonstrated that by the figures he brought forward, and which the Minister did not even dare to question, or attempt to deal with. What was the reply of the Minister? I am always under the disadvantage in this House of not being able to hear distinctly what is said from the Treasury Benches, particularly when it is said by the Deputy Premier. So although I paid every attention to his speech the other night, I often had difficulty in grasping his meaning. But what I did understand as being the gist of his observation, was that the cost of unemployment, if it

were to be paid from revenue, would be more than the revenue could meet, and so it has to be met out of loan moneys. And, further, he said the amendment was nonsensical, that what is raised by the financial emergency tax is carried into general revenue, which is responsible for everything, including to some extent unemployment relief. For that reason the Minister suggested that the amendment moved by the member for East Perth was nonsensical. But I suggest it is not the amendment that is nonsensical, but the reply of the Minister. If the Minister in his office of Acting Leader of the House—and I presume he holds also the post of Acting-Treasurer in the Government—if he could have given the House information which would have established the impossibility, having regard to the charges the revenue has to meet, of facing the expenditure on the relief of unemployment, if the Minister had established that fact—and with the figures at his command he should have been able to establish it—then the matter would have ended, for no one can ask any Ministry to do what is impossible. But of all the people on this earth it lies least in the mouth of the Ministry to advance such a statement. There is no man and no woman in the community not willing to bear his or her share of any sacrifice necessary to meet circumstances which still survive of the financial crisis. But the sacrifice must be in common. Is it then to be wondered at that many among the people, including the part-time workers, complain that the moneys raised under the financial emergency tax are used for purposes other than those primarily intended, as for instance, the making good of the payment of Ministerial salaries? Is it to be wondered at that people should be aggrieved at being called upon to pay part of the sacrifice whereof the favoured eight have relieved themselves? They have relieved themselves of all sacrifice and restored their salaries in full, and that too from moneys primarily intended for the relief of unemployment. Are the two conditions at all comparative, the position of the part-time worker and the position of the occupants of the Treasury benches, the position of those scarcely above the breadline, and the position of men who are rolling in luxury?

Mr. Withers: I am sorry for the workers in your office.

Hon. N. KEENAN: Is there any possible comparison? For instance, in order that we may show what comparison there may be, let me take the case of an institution in my own electorate, the Old Men's Home. In that institution the allowance of tobacco was cut down at the time when the crisis of the financial depression was in our midst, at a time when it became necessary to see that every effort was made to keep the ship of State afloat. The cutting down of that commodity resulted in a saving of about £400 per year. That was the total amount saved by that cutting down, by that sacrifice on the part of the old men. And it stands to-day, although this Ministry have recouped themselves every penny that was taken off their salaries at that time, and although to-day they are entirely delivered from any sacrifice whatever. The amount restored to this Ministry, indeed to one Minister alone of the eight, would have been almost sufficient to restore the tobacco to 500 men in the Old Men's Home; what has been granted to one of the Ministers would have been almost sufficient to restore the tobacco to those 500 men. But of course the comforts, and possibly even the needs, of those old men—what are they in comparison with the luxuries and pleasure of a Minister? Of course I can understand the soul of the member for Northam being wrung with anguish to think of a Minister's pleasures and luxuries being in any way reduced: the £1,500-a-year-man whose troubles are so dear to the member for Northam is very near the mark that a Minister occupies. So is it to be at all wondered at that there is a solid belief entertained by many people at large, and entertained by the part-time workers, that the moneys that have been raised for the relief of unemployment and for the relief of those who are the victims of circumstances created by the financial crisis, are being used for quite other purposes foreign to the raising of the tax, and foreign to the intention with which this Chamber authorised the tax to be collected? It does not lie for one moment in the mouths of those on the Treasury benches to deny that this belief is held, and particularly in the strongest and most manly class. I said that if the Minister could have satisfied the House and established, as it was his duty

to establish, that the resources of the Crown are at present insufficient to warrant the adoption of a policy of full-time employment, and if he could have shown that there was no legitimate present expectation of increasing those resources to an extent sufficient to deal with all the claims likely to be made upon the Crown in the near future, —if he could have done that he would have done his duty in that respect, and then all parties in the House, no matter where they sat, would have accepted his statement. But he has done no such thing. All he has done is to burke the issue. It must be realised that those who are still suffering from some sacrifices that were inherent in the financial crisis, are not prepared to accept a wholly evasive reply from those who, being in the position of custodians of the public purse, have used that position to restore to themselves the very last penny that had been cut from their salaries. Now it may be—and I cannot shut my eyes to the fact—that the position of this State does not warrant the steps which the member for East Perth is so anxious should be taken. Without a more definite knowledge of our financial position as it will be in the future, and without a more definite knowledge of our commitments as they will be in the near future, it is impossible for me to possess that certain information on which I could base a concluded opinion. There are obviously dangers which must be guarded against and which may not be wholly capable of being guarded against. For instance, there would undoubtedly be a rush to this State from other States of Australia if we offered better and more attractive terms than are being offered elsewhere.

Mr. Cross: Quite a number of people are coming here now.

Hon. N. KEENAN: That might be so. Although that is a danger, I am not quite satisfied that it cannot be effectively guarded against.

Mr. Raphael: Let them be here three or four months.

Member: Would not they buck?

Hon. N. KEENAN: One method which is possible, though I should not say finally that it is constitutional, having regard to the Federal tie, is that of enforcing a certain period of residence on those who come into the State before they are qualified for benefits to which older settlers are entitled.

Mr. Raphael: They are supposed to be in the State three months.

Hon. N. KEENAN: Still, the fact remains that we shall have to find a way out of those difficulties. It must also be considered—

Mr. Raphael interjected.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! The member for Victoria Park must keep order.

Several members interjected.

Hon. N. KEENAN: I propose to resume my remarks as soon as those gentlemen interjecting have settled their differences.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member may proceed.

Hon. N. KEENAN: I was about to say that another possible danger and difficulty might arise through the attraction of people to the public service in the nature of public works who for the present are quite prepared to struggle along on their own account. Consequently, the matter is one in respect of which I should require far more information than I have at the moment before I could give a concluded opinion. For that reason, normally, I should not vote for this amendment, because I have no certain grounds on which to act, but I do intend to vote for it, and my reason for so doing is to enter a protest against the attitude of Ministers who have taken the opportunity to remove from their own persons the last trace of any sacrifice arising from the financial position.

Mr. Lambert: Do not forget that you have received your share.

Hon. N. KEENAN: I am not sharing in any Ministerial salary. If I were, I should be ashamed of myself. I intend to vote for the amendment as a protest against the action of those who have taken advantage of their power to give themselves relief which they are not prepared to give in any form or shape to others who are more in need of it. That is the only reason why I support the amendment.

Mr. Raphael: Are not you drawing £600 a year now?

Hon. N. KEENAN: I do not wish to bandy any words with the hon. member. I have said that I am prepared to vote for the amendment, not because the facts are clear that would warrant the adoption of a policy involving so many other considerations, but because I am prepared to cast a vote in protest against the actions of those who are in charge of the destinies of the State.

Mr. Fox: You retire from your legal practice and assist some rising youth.

MR. SAMPSON (Swan—on amendment) [5.6]: I was amazed to note the very placid acceptance of the statements of the member for East Perth (Mr. Hughes), not only by members on the Government side of the House but by Ministers themselves. To me it seemed they were stricken dumb with the enormity of the offence of which they are alleged to be guilty.

Several members interjected.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. SAMPSON: It was stated by the Deputy Premier by way of reply that the member for East Perth would not dare to make similar statements outside the House. I took the opportunity during the election of listening to the candidate who was afterwards returned for East Perth—

Mr. SPEAKER: I hope the member for Swan intends to debate the amendment.

Mr. SAMPSON: Yes; I intend to debate the amendment. Not once, but on several occasions very definite statements were made in respect to certain matters which were further ventilated in the House last Thursday night. The statement that the member for East Perth had taken advantage of the privilege of Parliament falls to the ground.

Mr. SPEAKER: I must ask the hon. member to address himself to the amendment. That is the only matter at present before the Chair.

Mr. SAMPSON: As I understand the position, the member for East Perth has moved an amendment in order to bring forward certain matters relating to various charges against the Government. I hope I shall be allowed to refer to what purported to be the reply of the Deputy Premier.

Mr. SPEAKER: So long as the reply is confined to that, the hon. member will be in order.

Mr. SAMPSON: It was stated that the member for East Perth had taken advantage of the privilege afforded by this House in order to make certain statements. As regards many of them, that was not true. The hon. member had, without any reservation, levelled charges at the Government when on the hustings, and as far as I have heard, no action was taken by members of the Government to stop it.

Mr. Withers: Did he mention necessitous farmers in those statements?

Mr. SAMPSON: The matter before the House is a serious one and calls for a full and complete reply from the Government. A matter that received special considera-

tion during the recent election, and was dilated upon at considerable length by the gentleman who is now the member for East Perth was the imposition by the Government of a policy which made it essential for men on relief work to pay a portion of their earnings for a union ticket. It was said during the election that those funds were to be used by a union—

Mr. SPEAKER: I am not going to allow the hon. member to speak along those lines. If he thinks he can continue to do so, he will find himself greatly mistaken. He may discuss the matters contained in the amendment and no others.

Mr. Raphael interjected.

Mr. SPEAKER: The member for Victoria Park had better keep quiet.

Mr. SAMPSON: I shall be in order, I think, in referring to remarks made by the present member for East Perth previous to the election, statements which were made in the open and of which the Government must have had full knowledge. A matter to which he particularly referred, and one which I believe most members of this House were opposed to, was the charging of those workers, who had insufficient money to provide themselves with food and clothing, with, allegedly, the expenses of the election of members on the Government side of the House. If such were not done, why was the matter allowed to go by default? Members of Parliament were injured seriously in their reputation by the silence of the Government. If the Government had had a reply to offer, there was an opportunity to give it. Shall I be in order in asking if the Government propose to persist in imposing this charge upon men working on relief jobs?

Mr. SPEAKER: That has nothing to do with the amendment. The hon. member may deal with that when speaking on the motion for the adoption of the Address-in-reply.

Mr. SAMPSON: I hope that any Minister who speaks will deal with that aspect. Nevertheless, I accept your suggestion, Mr. Speaker, and will endeavour to bring it up on the motion for the adoption of the Address-in-reply.

The Minister for Mines: You are going to have two "goes"?

Mr. SAMPSON: Yes. I should have liked to hear the Minister for Mines.

The Minister for Mines: You will hear me.

Mr. SAMPSON: He is usually a valiant and by no means dumb member of the Government, and I had expected him to protest against some of the remarks made last Thursday night.

The Minister for Mines: You will hear me, but not on this amendment.

Mr. SAMPSON: The Minister for Mines quietly accepted what was said.

Mr. SPEAKER: Will the member for Swan address himself to the amendment.

Mr. Raphael: He has not yet touched on it.

Mr. SAMPSON: I have some doubt as to whether it would be practicable to do all that the amendment suggests. That is a matter which I am seriously considering, but I am not doubting the propriety of my rising to protest against the lamb-like and placid way in which the Government allowed the statements to be made previous to their being voiced in this House.

Mr. Raphael: What are you worrying about?

Mr. SAMPSON: You are one of the causes of worry to me. If it were possible to bring in legislation—

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

Mr. SAMPSON: I shall endeavour to do so. The reason why I was concerned about the statements made previous to the election—

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! I shall not address myself again to the hon. member.

Mr. SAMPSON: The reason why I was so concerned about the speech made the other night was that for a long time I have been convinced that relief workers should not be treated as they have been. We know full well that they are not given the privileges that ordinary workers enjoy. They cannot approach the Arbitration Court and they are not permitted, I understand, even to attend union meetings.

Mr. Raphael: You do not know anything about it.

Mr. SAMPSON: There is no question that all they are required to do is to pay up. But those men cannot be shut up, because they have been too unfairly treated.

Mr. Wilson: Tell us what you and your Government did for them.

Mr. SAMPSON: It is not my intention to speak at length, but I could not allow this subject to be discussed without expressing my strong disapproval of the inaction

of the Government. Their inaction postulates or indicates a damaging reflection on every member of this Parliament. Various charges have been made, and the Deputy Premier has promised that into one at least of these there will be a full investigation. I hope that the Government, realising the seriousness of the matter as the general public regard it, will make full inquiry into all the charges. Unless they do that, they cannot possibly hold the confidence of the people of Western Australia.

MR. LAMBERT (Yilgarn-Coolgardie—on amendment) [5.18]: The hon. member who has just resumed his seat states that the lack of any explanation from Ministers suggests that they are struck dumb. Let me suggest to the hon. member that if he were struck dumb the public life of this country would not be impoverished.

Mr. Sampson: If you learnt to speak wisely, it would be very much improved.

Mr. LAMBERT: Without imitating the copious flood of tears shed by the hon. member—

Mr. Sampson: Why depart from your general manner?

Mr. LAMBERT: —I believe that every man and every woman in this Chamber desires to see as soon as possible a restoration to full time and full wages for every man and every woman in Western Australia. But indulgence in hypocritical attitudes is a line of conduct beyond my understanding. I was surprised to hear the member for Nedlands (Hon. N. Keenan) declare that it was impossible for him to compute whether it was practicable to have a restoration of full-time employment. What an admission to come from one who is a leading citizen of this State! Surely the hon. gentleman knows perfectly well that junior telephone attendants could collect the whole of the necessary information in ten minutes. It seems remarkable that there should now be cavilling at the fact that Ministers have restored their salaries. No forcible protest was made against the restoration of the salaries of private members. Members were compelled by sheer force of circumstances to review both their financial position and the emoluments they received for the service they gave the public. We have seen the spectacle, when a Bill for the increase of private members' salaries was before the House, of members waiting behind the dais to see how the vote went and then coming in

to vote with the minority. Nevertheless, those members accepted the full emoluments voted by Parliament.

Mr. Wilson: That is true.

Mr. LAMBERT: Reverting to financial emergency taxation, if the member for Nedlands had referred for a moment to the preamble of the original Bill agreed upon by the States and the Commonwealth, he would know that in that preamble there is neither printed nor implied a word suggesting that the whole of the amount derivable at the present time from that taxation should be devoted solely to the restoration of full-time employment and full-time wages. The preamble to the measure has a wide application. If the hon. member consulted it for a moment he would see that no such thing as has been suggested was even implied. No man or woman in this country is more desirous than I am of the restoration of full-time work and full-time pay, knowing that a country on half-time work is a country definitely impoverished. The member for Swan (Mr. Sampson), throwing back his locks, tried to make the people believe that he is absolutely pained to think of men and women in Western Australia being on half time. Let me give him a little information from the report of the Commissioner of Taxation for 1934-35. I will show him under what category he comes. He has had the colossal impudence to suggest that members on this side of the Chamber, in moving for restoration of full-time work and getting back to something like financial equilibrium, were merely inspired with the desire to pick up a paltry two or three hundred pounds extra. I am utterly surprised to think, in view of the deep respect I have for the member for Nedlands (Hon. N. Keenan), that such a suggestion should have emanated from him. The hon. member knows full well that it is the policy of this party, who are here to protect the common cause of the workers—and if we cannot do that, the sooner we get out the better—

Hon. C. G. Latham: But you don't do it.

Mr. LAMBERT: We do not want men and women to go on suffering by reason of the fact that they are not able to secure adequate wages and adequate food. We do not want to parade an absolute battenning upon the partial suffering and partial sacrifice of the workers. The effrontery which the

member for Swan has exhibited in standing up here and speaking as he did to-day is beyond my understanding.

Mr. Sampson: One need not go far to achieve that.

Mr. LAMBERT: Let us see under what category that hon. member comes. I quote from the report of the Commissioner of Taxation, with which the member for Swan is conversant; and this information is most pertinent to the amendment. There are only two ways, so far as I know, in which this State can obtain additional revenue. Either financial emergency taxation must be increased, or land and income tax must be. I shall indicate—

Mr. Sampson: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, I desire to ask whether you will give me permission to reply to the member's meanderings after he has finished.

Mr. LAMBERT: What is this person's point of order?

Mr. Sampson: I feel that if he is to make a statement more or less hysterical—

Mr. SPEAKER: What is the hon. member's point of order?

Mr. Sampson: I should have the right to reply.

Mr. SPEAKER: I do not know what statement the member for Yilgarn-Coolgardie is going to make. We can discuss the point later.

Mr. LAMBERT: So far as I am concerned, he can take a week off to reply. What strikes me—and this is in close correlation with financial emergency taxation and land and income taxation—is the importance of seeing who are the people that make sacrifices apart from those taxed at the source. According to the report of the Commissioner of Taxation, persons in the range from £201 to £300, numbering 12,836, with incomes totalling £2,937,025, paid £15,144; people with incomes ranging from £301 to £500, numbering 8,866, with total incomes of £2,912,544, paid £24,011; and people with incomes over £5,000, numbering 37, with total incomes of £270,242, paid £35,458. To try to make out that members on this side of the Chamber are not anxious to restore to every man and every woman in this country the incomes to which they are entitled is mere political hypocrisy of the lowest and vilest kind. At this juncture I have no desire to—

Mr. Sampson: Say anything intelligible.

Mr. LAMBERT:—no desire to traverse the line of conduct adopted by the member for East Perth (Mr. Hughes). There will be manifold opportunities to do that later. I address myself now distinctly to the amendment which the hon. member has before the Chair. I hope that the people will not be fooled into the belief he desires to impress upon them merely because he puts up a semi-hysterical and semi-political excuse to sabotage the Government. If an improvement in the condition of the people could be brought about by a change of Government to-morrow, I would welcome such a change. If it were possible in the slightest degree to remedy some of the social ills of to-day by a change of Government—

Mr. Hughes: You and I can do that without shifting from our seats. You can do it from there, and I can do it from here.

Mr. LAMBERT: From the aspect of the progress and stability of Western Australia, I do not care which seat I occupy. I repeat again, and if necessary will repeat a dozen times, that the Government are desirous of restoring full-time employment. They have committees sitting which are absolutely concerned with that very matter, and concentrating upon it. We do not come here merely to move abstract motions. If the member for East Perth is desirous of having full-time employment and full-time wages restored to the workers of this country, let him as an accountant make a clear survey of the report of the Commissioner of Taxation and find out where we can get another million of money from the surplus that is going into banks and insurance companies, and into city and suburban properties. Let him find that out, and then let him get up in this House, if game enough, to state that as a clear declaration of policy. In that case we could bring down a taxation measure similar to that operating in Great Britain to-day. If we had a measure of the same kind, we would have sufficient funds available to send every man and every woman back to full-time. I wonder whether some of those who have expressed themselves as favouring this action would be prepared to have placed upon them a tax entailing sacrifice equal to that which people in Great Britain are being called upon to make to-day? Members of some of the oldest families in that country, families going back hundreds of years, have had to sell their homes to pay taxation. Let

the member for East Perth (Mr. Hughes) and the member for Swan (Mr. Sampson) suggest that we should lay down a formula of that description. If they are prepared to do that, I am prepared to march with them. Until then I say there is no useful purpose to be served, or any practical solution of the difficulty to be found, in either moving or supporting abstract amendments. The Speaker stated the question.

HON. C. G. LATHAM (York—on amendment) [5.32]: I fully expected that after having a week-end to consider the amendment moved by the member for East Perth (Mr. Hughes) the Government would have put up some reply.

Several members interjected.

HON. C. G. LATHAM: May I suggest that hon. members remain as quiet now as when the member for East Perth was speaking on Thursday night? The silence could have been cut with a knife then.

Mr. SPEAKER: I will look after them.

HON. C. G. LATHAM: I have a perfect right to speak to the amendment and until such time as you pull me up, Mr. Speaker, I shall take no notice of interjections. I can understand that the Acting Leader of this House, the Deputy Premier, may not have had an opportunity of replying to the remarks of the member for East Perth the other evening. When an amendment to the Address-in-reply has been moved in the past, it has always been regarded in this House, as far as I am aware, as an expression of want of confidence in the Government. I assumed that the other evening the Deputy Premier would have moved the adjournment immediately to give himself time to consider a definite reply to the charges made by the member for East Perth, but a whole week-end has passed and we find Ministers still sitting silent. If that silence means anything, it means to me that the Government are not prepared to make any answer to the charges. Therefore I contend that every member on the other side of the House must support the amendment moved by the member for East Perth.

Mr. Sleeman: Are you supporting it?

HON. C. G. LATHAM: Every member must support it. I agree with the member for Nedlands (Hon. N. Keenan), the Leader of the National Party, that the Government are the only people who can tell us what moneys are available, and how far they can go with respect to meeting the wishes of

the member for East Perth. This Government has just finished a year with a surplus revenue, a revenue in excess of any ever collected from the people of this State. The highest amount previously collected was in 1928-29, but that did not reach the amount received last year.

Mr. Rodoreda: And we have never had so many charges on it.

Hon. C. G. LATHAM: As a matter of fact, the Government have been relieved of charges. The overseas interest account has been considerably reduced. The exchange on overseas interest has been reduced. So I suggest that the Government have had more money at their disposal. On top of that they have had not less than £100,000 from the hospital tax, and £60,000 from the Lotteries Commission, which has indirectly relieved the Treasury. There has been more money to spend than has been available at any time since there has been a Government in this State. Loan funds have gone up considerably. In view of all these facts, I contend that the member for East Perth made out a very definite case, namely, that we were justified in asking the Government to do something more than they have done for those two sections of the people he mentioned, the necessitous farmers and the unemployed. I propose to deal with the necessitous farmers. One hon. member stated that so long as the Government did not offend his electors, he was going to support them. We are not here representing individual electors. It is by the collective wisdom of this House that we govern and the majority, of course, rules. Therefore it is not what the individual likes. If we are to take up the individual aspect and see how it affects our electors we will have a poor sort of Government.

The Deputy Premier: Collective guile and sophistry.

Hon. C. G. LATHAM: If there is any guile, it is on your side of the House, and on the front benches, too. Have I not heard it? Have I not heard the language used to the worker and to the commercial man and to the pastoralist? If there is any guile at all in this House, it is in members on the front benches opposite. Do not let us get on to that aspect. I believe the Acting Leader of the House did wrong in replying immediately to the member for East Perth. He should have taken time to consider his reply. He allowed himself to be worked up

by the very serious charges made against the Government, and was not in a fit state to reply. But one would have thought the Minister for Employment would have taken the House into his confidence and told us the position. There has been nothing but silence. It is time we on this side of the House took strong steps to force the Government to tell us exactly what the position is. For the last three years they have been allowed to go on at random. They have had such an extraordinary majority, that they have been able to do as they liked. But the position has changed and I contend that if this amendment were carried and it meant the resignation of the Government, people would say, "Well done." The member for East Perth has fought two elections and defeated a Minister of the Government. He defeated the then Minister for Employment on the very issue which is before us now. Prior to the election, the ex-Premier went to East Perth and said he was going to make a Government issue of it.

Mr. Thorn: He said that if the ex-Minister for Employment went out, he would go too, and he has gone.

Hon. C. G. LATHAM: Important Ministerial changes have taken place since then. The House is justified in carrying this amendment. The member for Yilgarn-Coolgardie (Mr. Lambert) used a lot of words, but I do not know that he said very much, except that he suggested, as far as I can judge, that there was only one way of relieving the situation, and that was by additional taxation. The member for East Perth suggested that, and rightly so, because after all if we can give back to ourselves the salaries we enjoy to-day, and Ministers can have their salaries restored, surely we might do something for those living below the breadline. I have never hesitated to express myself in this respect. The Government have done nothing to assist the farmers in this State. If they were to put these men in a position to provide themselves with income from their farms, that would be the means of providing a great deal of employment in other parts of the State. We know that 53 million bushels of wheat won from the soil will mean a great deal of employment, on the railways, at Fremantle and in fact everywhere. The same thing applies in a general way to the dairying industry, so that it is not only that employment is provided on the farm, but it is employment in many other avenues. There-

fore I am surprised at the dumbness of the Government.

The Deputy Premier: You are always asking for something.

Hon. C. G. LATHAM: We are always asking but we never get anything. I do not propose to deal with questions not affected by the amendment, but I repeat that the actual position is that the Government have never done anything, and neither have they come forward and said "We cannot do anything." I do not agree with the remarks of the member for Yilgarn-Coolgardie (Mr. Lambert) and neither do I agree that it is necessary to increase taxation in this State, because the Government have a great amount of money that could be diverted to other avenues, considerably more revenue and loan money than we ever had. I suppose it is impossible to expect the Government to provide employment for everyone in the State—and that has never been possible. But I do say that relief can be given to the man not in receipt of the basic wage, the man below the bread-line. When members opposite were sitting on this side of the House and when we had two millions less revenue, and the loan funds that were available to us were about half the total at the disposal of the Government to-day, all kinds of charges were made against us; but when we did ask the people to make sacrifices, we started on our own salaries first and we made the cut bigger on the higher salaries. What did the present Government do immediately they got back to power? They restored part of the salaries to the higher paid officials before giving consideration to the man on part time employment. I believe members opposite are with me when I say that my desire is to see that all the money available is spent on providing employment. The member for Yilgarn-Coolgardie said he would gladly change places with me. I will accept his challenge as soon as the Government care to throw it out.

Mr. Withers: God help the workers.

Hon. C. G. LATHAM: It was all dope that was put up by members opposite at election time, solely to mislead the people; otherwise there would not be so many in the unfortunate position in which they find themselves to-day. I heard the dope put up at East Perth, and I was ashamed to have to be associated with the people who were responsible for it. It was all done to mislead, and it is such statements that make the people doubt the sincerity of any

Government, or for that matter, any Parliament. So I accept the challenge thrown out by the member for Yilgarn-Coolgardie who spoke on behalf of the Government because the Minister refuses to reply to the charges made by the member for East Perth.

Mr. Hegney: You will accept anything.

Hon. C. G. LATHAM: There is one thing I will not accept, and that is the word of hon. members on the Government cross benches. While it is true that the word of some of them can be accepted, there are many members sitting on that side of the House who merely go out and spread pernicious propaganda and dope to mislead the electors, and that sort of thing is attempted in this House too.

Mr. Fox: What a pity they are so dense!

Hon. C. G. LATHAM: When the Leader of this House can refer to the electors of East Perth as fools, as the Minister for Lands did on Thursday evening when replying to the speech made by the member for East Perth (Mr. Hughes), members opposite will put up with anything.

Member: Some of them.

Hon. C. G. LATHAM: The member for East Perth holds a very high position in this State. He is a member of an honourable profession, and within a few months he has twice been elected to this House.

Mr. SPEAKER: I am afraid the hon. member is slipping away from the amendment.

Hon. C. G. LATHAM: I am referring to the Minister for Lands who put up such an extremely bad case in reply to the amendment moved by the member for East Perth. I endorse the remark made by the member for Nedlands (Hon. N. Keenan) that the Minister replied to a very limited extent. He gave a few figures that conveyed nothing to the House, and said that the money available was required to provide employment through the services of the State. Money has always been required for that purpose, and always will be. What is necessary is proper administration; and if that were carried out, much more money would be available for the purposes sought by the amendment.

Mr. Withers: The newspaper said that the Minister gave knock for knock.

Hon. C. G. LATHAM: I do not read the "Worker."

Mr. Withers: That was in the "West Australian."

Mr. Hughes: That is their puppet.

Hon. C. G. LATHAM: Members must appreciate the fact that we are required to interest ourselves in the people as a whole, and our responsibility is to do all we possibly can for those who cannot help themselves. The amendment aims at that.

Mr. Lambert: Would you promise to give effect to the amendment?

Hon. C. G. LATHAM: If the member for Yilgarn-Coolgardie (Mr. Lambert) after having made his speech, had not run from the Chamber only to return to make interjections, he would have heard what I said regarding his statements, and I do not propose to refer to them again. As a matter of fact, Parliament ought to be furnished with some information in reply to the amendment. It is very important from the Government point of view. It amounts to a no-confidence motion, and should not be regarded lightly. Members opposite should not desire to support the Government merely because the Deputy-Premier rises in his seat and vilifies the member who moved the amendment, following up with a few figures and the intimation that the thing is impossible. That is not the way to secure a vote in this House. I ask the Government to give consideration to this matter to ascertain whether anything further can be done. I do not suggest that the member for East Perth did not make out a case; he certainly indicated how the money could be obtained. Surely the Government should tell the House and the people generally what the position actually is and whether additional revenue could be secured from that source.

Mr. Withers: The amendment represents merely an expression of regret, and is not one of no-confidence.

Hon. C. G. LATHAM: I have looked through many volumes of "Hansard" dating back to a period long before I entered this Chamber, and this is the first occasion of which I could gain any knowledge that an amendment of this description has not been regarded as one of no-confidence. The amendment should be regarded seriously by the Government, and they should submit an answer to the case that has been made out.

Mr. Rodoreda: It all depends from whom the amendment emanates.

Hon. C. G. LATHAM: That does not matter at all. If it came from some members on the other side of the House, it would probably receive less consideration. The member for East Perth was justified in moving the amendment. Only a little while ago the former Premier (Hon. P. Collier) advised the people in London by cablegram that Western Australia had definitely emerged from the period of depression. Let members consider the encouragement that such an assurance would give to people in Western Australia who are in part-time employment, or are in receipt of wages that bring them below the bread line. It is the cause of those people that has been championed by members sitting on the Government side of the House. The ex-Premier told the wealthy investors in London that everything was all right in this State and that they could go ahead. The ex-Premier could send a cable message to that effect, although we know that thousands of men are in receipt of less than the basic wage from a Labour Government!

Mr. Lambert: Do you suggest that the former Premier's message did any harm?

Hon. C. G. LATHAM: It showed the people in part-time employment at least that the then Premier did not know what he was saying. He could not possibly have known what he was saying, for we have Ministers of the Crown, including the deputy head of the Government, telling us that the State cannot afford to do what is suggested. The Government cannot speak with two tongues on this most important question. It is useless to tell the investors in London that we are out of our difficulties and out of the slough of depression, when the workers know perfectly well that we are not, just as the agriculturists, the group settlers and a large proportion of the Government employees, are conscious of the fact that they are still in receipt of less than the basic wage. Notwithstanding these facts, members sitting on the Government back benches keep in power Ministers who are doing exactly what the Government they deposed did, and have even done worse than their predecessors in office.

Mr. Lambert: Would you support legislation to give every male and female worker at least the basic wage, if we can find the money?

Hon. C. G. LATHAM: Is the member for Yilgarn-Coolgardie (Mr. Lambert) speaking on his own behalf, or is he the mouthpiece

of the Government? If he is the mouthpiece of Ministers who sit quietly on the Treasury Bench, we should know, and we could then give consideration to his query.

Mr. Lambert: I will be with you if you agree to support such legislation.

Hon. C. G. LATHAM: Is the hon. member the mouthpiece of the Government? The silence of Cabinet Ministers may indicate that he is. This is a very serious matter, and if Ministers cannot make out a better case than has been indicated so far, the position is a sad one for the State. What effect must the cablegram sent by the former Premier have had on the unemployed? The member for East Perth represents a great many of that section of the community, so he was justified in expressing himself as he did with regard to his amendment. Every member, provided he keeps within the requirements of the Standing Orders, has a perfect right to express himself to the fullest possible extent.

Mr. Patrick: He had a mandate.

Hon. C. G. LATHAM: He had two mandates. He fought two elections and defeated the former Minister of the Crown who was in control of employment matters. The member for East Perth defeated the Government at that election because the ex-Premier, speaking at one meeting, said, "This is going to be a Government issue. Either you will have Hughes for East Perth and not the Government, or the Government and not Hughes." Those are not the exact words that Mr. Collier uttered, but that was the effect of what he said. Despite that, on Thursday last we had the spectacle of the Deputy Premier displaying great annoyance, and vilifying the member for East Perth, although he failed to reply to the charges made against the Government.

The Deputy Premier: Vilified!

Hon. C. G. LATHAM: A little while later on I will have something to say that will make the Minister for Mines smile.

The Minister for Mines: You are at liberty to say what you like.

Hon. C. G. LATHAM: Fancy the Minister for Mines saying, "I wish I had had some of the money taken from the starting-price bookmakers."

Mr. Raphael: Don't we all?

The Minister for Mines: And I say it again.

Hon. C. G. LATHAM: The finances of the Government must be very strained indeed when they have to take 15s. per week

per youth from the funds raised from the public for the assistance of the unemployed youths of the State. For what purpose do the Government intend to use that money? They propose to send these poor unfortunate young fellows into the mining areas looking for gold.

Mr. Wilson: Well, what about it?

Hon. C. G. LATHAM: Did it require a special appeal to the public for that? Formerly the Minister for Mines used to stand up in his place in this Chamber and tell members what he was doing for the unemployed. He told us that he was sending them out on 15s. a week. The money collected from the public for the purpose of assisting unemployed youths should at least be used for the purpose of providing the young fellows with a trade, even though they may not avail themselves of work in that trade for years to come. I am surprised at the Minister for Mines allowing money to be used for such a purpose. He is a member of the Appeal Committee who made the recommendations.

The Minister for Mines: No.

Hon. C. G. LATHAM: I am sorry if I have charged the Minister with being what he is not.

The Minister for Mines: That is just like most of your other statements.

Hon. C. G. LATHAM: I am informed that the Minister is a trustee of the fund, and as such he should not have allowed the money from the fund to be used for the purpose I have indicated. Surely we should do something better for the youth of the State than to send them out on a job that that does not require any special skill. It does not necessitate much technical knowledge to teach the young Australian to use the pick and shovel or swing an axe. Plenty of lads in the city can do it now. On the other hand, apparently we had to make an appeal to the public for funds to send youths into the mining areas to engage in prospecting at 15s. a week.

Mr. Patrick: After consultation with the Minister for Mines.

Hon. C. G. LATHAM: And the Minister would have grabbed the chance with both hands.

Mr. Patrick: But he said they did not do so.

Hon. C. G. LATHAM: A little while ago the Commonwealth Government provided

the Minister with money to assist the prospecting scheme.

The Minister for Mines: Give the right figures this time.

Hon. C. G. LATHAM: I shall not worry about figures.

The Minister for Mines: You were astray.

Hon. C. G. LATHAM: Although these facts have been referred to, Ministers are content to remain in their seats, or to make speeches by interjection.

The Minister for Mines: No, we are not.

Hon. C. G. LATHAM: We cannot force Ministers to rise and speak. I hope I shall be able to give them an opportunity to speak later on.

Mr. Rodoreda: The member for East Perth gave them that opportunity.

Hon. C. G. LATHAM: The member for East Perth has done more than that; he has made charges against the Government that should not go unchallenged. If something is not done, I for one will not be prepared to allow the matter to end there. To do so would be to implicate myself in the charges, for that impression might be gained if I were to sit silent.

The Deputy Premier: You may be implicated in one of them.

Hon. C. G. LATHAM: I do not think so.

The Deputy Premier: Yes, in one charge at any rate.

Hon. C. G. LATHAM: I do not know of any charge in which I could be implicated, but if the Minister will indicate what he means, I shall make my position clear. I know that our people have not obtained a penny from the starting-price bookmakers. I consider the suggestion made by the member for East Perth that if the Government could provide 60 per cent. of the unemployed with full-time work, that very act would enable the other 40 per cent. to be absorbed, is very wise. That contention was made repeatedly from the Opposition side of the House before the member for East Perth advanced it, as one method by which an improvement could be effected in the employment position. That suggestion was advanced before the present Minister for Employment entered the House.

Member: There has been a change of mind.

Hon. C. G. LATHAM: It proves how quickly members can change their minds. It requires merely a change from one side of the House to the other. At any rate the

suggestion made by the member for East Perth is worthy of consideration by the Government. The Government had a wonderful opportunity to give effect to the policy they advanced when they sat in Opposition and were without any responsibility. During the past three years they have allowed the position to drift along, and they have waited, Micawber-like, for something to turn up. The gold-mining industry and the timber industry have improved considerably, and there has been a general improvement all round.

Mr. Cross: Together with better administration.

Hon. C. G. LATHAM: At the end of the last financial year, the Government had collected more revenue from the people than ever before recorded, and now they say, "We cannot do any better than we are doing." They have not attempted to do anything better. They have made no attempt to do it, none whatever; no attempt has been made at all. The House is justified in carrying this amendment, and the Government will be fully justified in taking it as a want-of-confidence motion. There is a lot of work being done, and waiting to be done, in the city, particularly the sewerage works. The other evening a statement was made in the House that if I had my way I would spend no money whatever in the city. That is not the policy of this party, and I do not allow members of other parties to interpret the policy of this party to suit themselves without contradiction from this side. There is a great deal of work offering, and the Government are insisting upon connections being made with the sewerage system much more urgently than has ever been done before. That provides employment.

Member: Well, what about it?

Hon. C. G. LATHAM: Surely I can make out a case for the Government without the hon. member becoming offended! The Government are pushing on with those sewerage connections, although I do not know where the residents are going to get the money to pay for them.

Mr. Lambert: When the sewerage is put in, it is mandatory for the people to connect with it.

Hon. C. G. LATHAM: Well, that is something new to me. Of course if a house is not served by a septic tank, then what the hon. member says is right; but if the householder already has a septic tank, he can carry on without connecting up with the

sewerage. An additional rate of 2d. has been struck to provide for these connections.

Mr. Raphael: Will not the abolition of the pan charges more than compensate for the increased rate?

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! The hon. member must be allowed to proceed.

Hon. C. G. LATHAM: When the member for Victoria Park finishes his interjections, of which he makes so many, I will get on. There are many ways by which employment can be found. I have always given the Government this much credit, that difficulties in the way of providing employment have been that they have refused to spend a great deal of money on material and equipment when the whole of the available money was required for the relief of the wages men.

Mr. Lambert: Would you take 50 per cent. off all incomes to support the policy?

Hon. C. G. LATHAM: I would take the whole of the hon. member's income if I could get him to live up to the policy of his party. There are many ways in which people can be employed, and I believe that the best way is to get our industries, particularly our primary industries, established once more. We on this side are forever preaching that doctrine here, but I am afraid it falls on deaf ears. If at present prices we could get our wheat producers back to where they were previously, they themselves would absorb at least 50 per cent. of the men at present without full-time employment.

Mr. Lambert: You know that the Federal Government are killing the primary producers.

Hon. C. G. LATHAM: I have never heard of any other Government who have done so much for the primary producers. The Federal Government have given £12,000,000 to the farmers.

The Deputy Premier: To the creditors of the farmers.

Hon. C. G. LATHAM: If that be so, we ought to have an inquiry into what is being done by the board appointed by the Minister. Are not they carrying out the Act? If not, it should be seen to. The Federal Government have behaved very generously to this State and to our industries. What I want to know is whether the Deputy Premier is prepared to extend some of the sympathy of his Government in the direction adopted by the Federal Government.

The Deputy Premier: This Government has given £2 for every £1 given by the Federal Government.

Hon. C. G. LATHAM: That statement is not correct.

The Deputy Premier: It is correct.

Hon. C. G. LATHAM: It is not. I have gone carefully through the public accounts and through the report of the Agricultural Department, and I say the Minister's statement is like many others that are made by the Minister, especially those on Thursday evening last, when he really did not know what he was saying. There have been advances made by this Government, but they expect a man to pay interest before he has been able to earn anything from his farm. I want the Government to take seriously the amendment moved by the member for East Perth, for it reflects on the Government and on this Parliament. I also want the Leader of the House to tell us that he is going to have an official inquiry into the charges that were made by the member for East Perth. They were levelled at you, Mr. Speaker, amongst others, and were levelled at us. Never before have I heard an Address-in-reply debate containing such serious charges as have been made by the member for East Perth. I cannot dissociate the remarks of that member from the amendment, because there is no doubt the amendment was moved in order to force the issue and so get better conditions for those people who are on the basic wage. The Government dare not hold office any longer than is necessary to appoint a judge of the Supreme Court to inquire into those charges. If the Government fail to do that, I will endeavour to force that issue every time I rise in my place in the House. I will support the amendment moved by the member for East Perth, in the interests of the farmers and in the interests of those people whom Ministers and Government supporters have been returned to represent.

THE MINISTER FOR EMPLOYMENT (Hon. A. R. G. Hawke—Northam—on amendment) [6.7]: The Leader of the Opposition was very much concerned regarding the silence of Ministers and supporters of the Government in connection with the amendment put forward by the member for East Perth. Actually, we were waiting for some member on the Opposition side to support his colleague from East Perth to the extent of putting up at least one argument

or one reason in favour of the amendment that has been moved to the Address-in-reply. When the Leader of the National Party rose to speak to the amendment, I hoped that he might be able to evolve from his fertile imagination some argument in support of the amendment, but he, too, failed utterly to mention a single argument in favour of that amendment. The Leader of the Opposition did at least make some remarks that were appropriate to the amendment; he at least stressed the need for additional assistance being granted to necessitous farmers in various country districts. But that was the limit that he reached in support of the amendment. So, seeing that the member for East Perth has spoken, and seeing that the Leader of the Opposition and the Leader of the National Party have spoken, and not one of the three of them has put forward a single reason or argument in favour of the amendment, members of the Government have concluded that the Opposition members are not able to put up a case of any kind in support of the amendment. And although there is really no case to reply to, it has been decided by Ministers that a statement shall be made regarding the position in order that members opposite might know that not only is this amendment futile, but is indeed a very dangerous amendment in regard to the relief workers of Western Australia. It is remarkable that both the Leader of the Opposition and the Leader of the National Party said that they were not really in a position to judge of the question, that they were not in possession of the information they should have in order to allow them to come to a conclusion upon the contents of the amendment. Yet each of them, before sitting down, said strongly and definitely that he was going to support the amendment. So it would seem that both the Leader of the Opposition and the Leader of the National Party have made up their minds to support the amendment irrespective of what it means and irrespective of its worthlessness. It does seem to me that the Leader of the Opposition and the Leader of the National Party carry their responsibilities very lightly and very carelessly when they bind themselves to a course of action in a given direction although they have no real knowledge of the subject and do not desire the information that they ought to have. Would it not have been better and more reasonable for them to take the proper course, for the two leaders in question

to have waited until the necessary information was put forward before expressing themselves one way or the other?

Hon. C. G. Latham: We tried to make you get up, but you would have gone on without doing so.

The MINISTER FOR EMPLOYMENT: You did not try anything of the sort, but even if there had been such an attempt made, what bearing has that on the point I am putting forward?

Hon. C. G. Latham: But for the consideration of the Speaker, I would not have been able to address myself to the amendment.

The MINISTER FOR EMPLOYMENT: I am putting forward the point that the Leader of the Opposition and the Leader of the National Party both declared that they were not in possession of the information that they ought to have had. Nevertheless, they bound themselves to vote in a certain direction, and I say that even if they were in possession of the required information, they would still have made up their minds in the same direction.

Mr. Wilson: Agin the Government.

The MINISTER FOR EMPLOYMENT: It is obvious to everyone who gives reasonable consideration to the question that those members opposite who will support the amendment will not support it for the purpose of endeavouring to assist in relieving the workers or the necessitous farmers, but will support it merely for the purpose of endeavouring to discredit and harass the activities of the Government who have so many problems to consider.

Hon. C. G. Latham: There are no problems just now.

The MINISTER FOR EMPLOYMENT: I come now to a consideration of the speech made by the Leader of the National Party in connection with this amendment. That hon. member rose for one purpose and one purpose only, which was to increase the volume of vilification that had been levelled against this Government by the member for East Perth in his speech on Thursday last. There was no object other than that. The hon. member was not concerned with the wording of the amendment or of what it meant, but he rose for the purpose of assisting the member for East Perth in his attack on the Government.

Sitting suspended from 6.15 to 7.30 p.m.

The MINISTER FOR EMPLOYMENT: The Leader of the National Party, as I mentioned before tea, appeared anxious to join in the scurrilous attack made against members and ex-members of the present Government by the member for East Perth. The Leader of the National Party made quite a song about the fact that Ministers, together with members of Parliament and other salaried employees of the Government, had had their salaries fully restored to them in recent times. Judging from the statements made by him, one would consider it a crime to accept the salary set down for the position which one fills and for the duties which one carries out. While the member for Nedlands, with his tongue in his cheek, bitterly condemns Ministers for accepting the restoration of their salary cuts, he was eloquently silent regarding the fact that he himself had accepted restoration in full of his own Parliamentary salary. He spoke about the pleasures and luxuries enjoyed by Ministers. It is not exaggerating to say that the annual income of the hon. member must be four times greater than the annual income of any Minister of the Crown.

Mr. McDonald: I think that is a bit of an exaggeration.

Hon. C. G. Latham: He wishes it was so.

The MINISTER FOR EMPLOYMENT: I am sure it is no exaggeration.

Mr. Doney: Where did you get the figures?

The MINISTER FOR EMPLOYMENT: If anything, it is an under-statement. I calculate the figure on an account which the hon. member rendered to one of his clients a few months ago, but in any event it must be clear that the annual income of the member for Nedlands is far in excess of the annual income of any one of the Ministers.

Hon. N. Keenan: I will change with any of the Ministers.

The MINISTER FOR EMPLOYMENT: Even though that be the position, the member for Nedlands did not hesitate speedily to accept the restoration in full of his own Parliamentary salary. The hon. member talked of the pleasures and luxuries enjoyed by Ministers and talked of them in a most envious way. The public do not need to be reminded that the hon. member himself was a Minister in a Government not so many years ago. If the pleasures and luxuries of Ministerial life were so many in number and so great in variety, it is remarkable that the

hon. member deserted the Government of the day and allowed the other Ministers to face up to the terrible responsibilities of those, the worst years of the depression.

Hon. C. G. Latham: Money did not count with him then?

The MINISTER FOR EMPLOYMENT: No, it did not, because money does not worry him. All that counted with him on that occasion was a realisation of the fact that, if he remained a member of the Government and took equal responsibility with other Ministers for the acts that the Government were compelled to do, he would have been in grave danger of losing his political seat in the Nedlands district.

Hon. P. D. Ferguson: History repeats itself sometimes, you know.

The MINISTER FOR EMPLOYMENT: Those are facts. Judging by the speech made by the Leader of the National Party to-night, there can be no doubt whatever that he has entered into an unholy alliance with the member for East Perth with the object of carrying on a continual campaign of abuse and vilification against members of the Government.

Mr. Hughes: What about the abuse you put over in Brisbane-street, East Perth?

The MINISTER FOR EMPLOYMENT: I shall deal with the member for East Perth in good time.

Mr. Hughes: But you ran away on that occasion.

The MINISTER FOR EMPLOYMENT: I did not. As I was saying, there is no doubt that the member for Nedlands has entered into an unholy alliance with the member for East Perth for the purpose of carrying on a continual campaign of abuse and vilification against members of the present Government. In future we need feel no surprise when we find them following each other in the debates in this House, snarling out their hymns of hate against Ministers and supporters of the Government. There can be no doubt whatever that both of them will do everything possible to interfere with the Government, to harass the Government in their operations, and to prevent them from concentrating on the business of the country. There can be no doubt whatever that those two members, separately and together, will seek to create the greatest possible amount of political discord and ill-feeling in this House. I can imagine a situation where, in effect, they will offer up a hymn of hate something on the lines of

that spoken by Romeo to Balthasar as recorded by Shakespeare:—

By heaven, I will tear thee joint by joint,
And strew this hungry churchyard with thy
limbs:

The time and my intents are savage-wild,
More fierce and more inexorable far
Than empty tigers or the roaring sea.

We can imagine those two gentlemen working together and hurling challenges of that kind at the members of the Government. Or again, in the words of Malcolm to Macduff, we might hear them snarling out this hymn of hate—

Nay, had I power, I should

Pour the sweet milk of concord into hell,
Uproar the universal peace, confound
All unity on earth.

Mr. Hughes: That sounds like a sermon.

Hon. C. G. Latham: Or a bit from the Repertory Club.

The MINISTER FOR EMPLOYMENT: That summarises the feelings and intentions of the Leader of the National Party and the member for East Perth towards members and supporters of the Government. I come now to deal more particularly with the actual amendment. If a psychologist studied the amendment and was asked what type of person, in his opinion, was responsible for its preparation, I have no doubt he would declare the amendment to be the production of a paranoic.

Mr. Hughes: You should not pinch my joke, you know.

Mr. Wilson: It was not your joke.

The MINISTER FOR EMPLOYMENT: The amendment, as originally proposed, has been, to some extent, added to. The idea now contained in the amendment is that the Government should use the whole of the proceeds of the financial emergency tax to provide full-time employment and to relieve necessitous farmers in the State. During the last financial year, a sum of £800,000 was raised by the imposition of the financial emergency tax. During the present financial year, provided the legislation remains the same in character, the amount likely to be collected will be the same, or perhaps a little more than for last year. If the Government were to adopt the proposal contained in the amendment, the result would be the automatic creation of a deficit of £800,000 in our revenue and expenditure accounts. Even in face of that, members of the Government might be inclined

to look favourably upon the proposal, if its adoption meant full-time employment for our relief workers. I would impress upon members the fact that the Loan funds made available to the State have to finance works, and any deficit that may occur in the accounts. If this £800,000 were earmarked for the two special purposes referred to in the amendment, there would be a deficit of £800,000. No member who has yet spoken has suggested that the State should deliberately create a deficit of that amount, and I do not think any member of the House would make such a suggestion.

The Deputy Premier: We could not finance it.

The MINISTER FOR EMPLOYMENT:

If we did take £800,000 from revenue and applied it in the directions suggested, a deficit to that amount would automatically be created and would have to be financed. It could be financed in one way only, and that is out of Loan funds made available to the Government. Practically all our Loan funds to-day are used for providing employment. If, therefore, we took £800,000 from revenue and used portion of it to provide work, and portion to relieve necessitous farmers, we would automatically have to take a similar amount from our loan funds to meet the deficit in the revenue and expenditure account. What would be the use of doing that? Would the relief workers be advantaged one penny by financial trickery of that nature? They would not be one penny the better off under the proposal suggested, that of using the proceeds of the financial emergency tax for the purpose indicated. Before I conclude I will prove to members that the adoption of the proposal would rob the relief workers of £400,000 per annum. The amendment has no merit in it. It is a delusion and is worthless. How the relief workers and the public could be impressed by an amendment of that kind, and by the action of the member responsible for it, is beyond my comprehension. How the Leader of the National Party and the Leader of the Country Party could commit themselves to supporting it, even though they admit they did not know the position, is also beyond my comprehension except, as I have already stated, that they are supporting the amendment not for the purpose of benefiting the relief workers or the farmers but to harass and, if possible, destroy the Government.

Hon. C. G. Latham: They are destroying themselves; you need not worry about us.

THE MINISTER FOR EMPLOYMENT: Actually this proposal is purely a propaganda effort. When the member for East Perth was elected, those people he was able to dupe and deceive expected mighty things of him. After labouring for three or four hours the other night, the only thing he was capable of producing was this worthless, useless and dangerous amendment.

Mr. Hughes: You find the workers dangerous to your people?

THE MINISTER FOR EMPLOYMENT: I will explain to hon. members the effect this amendment would have on relief workers. Judging by one or two of the speeches this afternoon, one would conclude that the financial emergency tax was imposed upon the people for the sole purpose of raising money with which to relieve unemployment.

Hon. C. G. Latham: That was changed after we went out of office.

Mr. Withers: Let us get the original.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order!

THE MINISTER FOR EMPLOYMENT: I propose to quote from the debates that took place when the measure was before this House.

Mr. Patrick: Quote some of the speeches.

THE MINISTER FOR EMPLOYMENT: I shall quote from the speech delivered by Mr. J. H. Smith, ex-member for Nelson. He said—

The Premier says this is not an unemployment tax, and that the money to be raised is to go into Consolidated Revenue.

During the Committee stage of the Bill, the member for Geraldton (Hon. J. C. Willcock) moved that one of the clauses be amended as follows:—

That in lines 2 and 3 of subclause 2 "the Consolidated Revenue fund for the use of His Majesty" be struck out, and the words "a trust fund at the Treasury which shall be expended in providing work for the unemployed" be inserted in lieu thereof.

Mr. Hughes: That is interesting. What is the party?

THE MINISTER FOR EMPLOYMENT: It will be found on page 1336 of "Hansard" for 1932. Every member of the Country Party and National Party in office at the time opposed the amendment, with the result that it was defeated.

Hon. C. G. Latham: Now show us what your Government did.

Mr. Marshall: You are consistent only in your inconsistency.

Mr. Hughes: Was there a division on that amendment?

THE MINISTER FOR EMPLOYMENT: I do not propose to become a clerk for the use of the member for East Perth in this matter.

Mr. Hughes: You could be worse employed.

THE MINISTER FOR EMPLOYMENT: At a later stage in the discussion on the amendment Mr. Kenneally, formerly member for East Perth, said:—

I am afraid the money will be used to bridge the gap in the deficit.

Thereupon the then Minister for Railways, the late Mr. Seaddan, interjected:—

No one is denying that.

Quite so.

Hon. C. G. Latham: Now tell us how much money we found for the unemployed that year.

THE MINISTER FOR EMPLOYMENT: I have that here too.

Hon. C. G. Latham: Let us have it.

THE MINISTER FOR EMPLOYMENT: There can be no doubt whatever that this financial emergency taxation was for one purpose, and for one purpose only, namely that of bridging the dangerous or ruinous gap that existed between revenue and expenditure in the years 1932 and 1933. That was the purpose of the imposition of the tax, and that financial emergency money is urgently needed to-day for the purpose of bridging the gap between revenue and expenditure. I have already pointed out that if the £800,000 of financial emergency proceeds were taken from revenue and earmarked for special purposes, there would be immediately created a deficit of £800,000 in the revenue and expenditure account. I declare that no member of this Parliament, even though he be without any responsibility so far as the carrying-on of the government of the country is concerned, dare do anything which would drive this State back to the position obtaining in the years when very heavy deficits were the order of the day. One would imagine that financial emergency tax proceeds to-day were not being used for any useful purpose; one would imagine that the £800,000 raised last year as a result of emergency taxation was squandered, or not used at all. I propose briefly to indicate that every pound of money

raised under the financial emergency tax is used to carry on the ordinary, essential affairs of State, and that without that money it would be impossible to carry on adequately the services now conducted in Western Australia. Financial emergency tax money to-day helps to pay the salaries and wages of permanent employees of the Government. It would be impossible for the Government to carry the number of permanent employees they are carrying, except for the aid which financial emergency taxation gives in that regard. And so it can logically be argued that financial emergency taxation to-day is helping to keep thousands of men and women in Western Australia in permanent and full-time employment at ruling award wages in Government undertakings. The Public Health Department is to some extent financed from revenue which the Government receive in the ordinary way. Cannot it also be logically contended that the money raised under this emergency taxation assists in the carrying-on of the educational activities of the State? Last year the Government of Western Australia expended on education £665,000 from revenue.

Hon. C. G. Latham: Where did Governments always get that money from?

The MINISTER FOR EMPLOYMENT: From taxation imposed upon the people.

Hon. C. G. Latham: Did they always get it from revenue?

The MINISTER FOR EMPLOYMENT: Yes.

Hon. C. G. Latham: Well, then there is nothing new in it.

The MINISTER FOR EMPLOYMENT: Nothing new in it except this, that if the emergency tax money of £800,000 a year were not available, there would need to be a severe policy of pruning in the activities of the Education Department, and in the activities of every other Government department.

Hon. C. G. Latham: Well, that did not happen when we were over there.

Ministerial Members: Oh!

Mr. Marshall: What next?

The MINISTER FOR EMPLOYMENT: I suggest to the Leader of the Opposition that he confer with the Leader of the National Party, who was Minister for Education in his Government, to learn whether severe pruning did not take place in the Education Department during those years.

Mr. Tonkin: What about the Training College?

Hon. C. G. Latham: What about it?

Mr. Tonkin: Who closed it down?

Hon. C. G. Latham: Who had a surplus of teachers?

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! The Leader of the Opposition can make a speech by and by.

The MINISTER FOR EMPLOYMENT: The activities of the Child Welfare Department are a charge on the revenue of the State. Last year £127,000 was expended in the carrying-on of that department. Is it not fair to claim that some of the money raised under the Financial Emergency Tax was used for the purpose of providing assistance to unfortunate families dependent upon the Child Welfare Department for their subsistence? A sum of £70,000 was also provided for unemployment relief. So it is clear beyond the shadow of any doubt that the money raised under the Financial Emergency Tax Act to-day is being used for the purpose of financing essential State activities. As I pointed out a few moments ago, some of it is also being used for the purpose of providing full-time employment for the wages and salaried staffs of the Government of Western Australia.

Hon. C. G. Latham: You have a surplus of £84,000 for buses.

The MINISTER FOR EMPLOYMENT: If the £800,000 of financial emergency taxation was not available to the Government as ordinary revenue, then there would be a deficit of £800,000 in the affairs of the State. How could that deficit be met? It could be met in the same way as the deficits of the previous Government were met—out of loan moneys made available to the State from year to year. And what was the result of that procedure? As the result of having to take £1,000,000 or £1,500,000 per year from loan moneys to finance their deficits, the previous Government found it impossible to provide employment for the large number of men looking to the Government at that time for employment or for sustenance. If such a position were facing the present Government, we would be driven back to the unfortunate conditions existing in this State three or four years ago. The members of the present Government are determined to bring about a very early improvement in the conditions of the relief workers in Western Australia. But we refuse to indulge in any financial legerdemain for the purpose of building up false hopes in the minds of relief workers and their dependants. The Leader of the Opposition

this afternoon was ungenerous enough to assert that the members of the present Government had not done anything in the way of seeking to improve the conditions of the relief workers. I can assure you, Mr. Speaker—and I know you will be fair enough to give my statement reasonable consideration—that during the last few weeks every Minister has given his time and his abilities to an endeavour to evolve a system that will confer upon the relief workers of Western Australia better conditions and better circumstances than have been their lot for some time past. I am in a position to go further and say that the Government have already decided that, as from the 5th October of this year, an improved scheme for the relief workers of Western Australia will be set in operation.

Hon. C. G. Latham: Why did you not do that last year with all your revenue?

THE MINISTER FOR EMPLOYMENT: When we set that improved scheme in operation, the Leader of the Opposition will say, as he has said before, that the Government are making the conditions of the relief workers too attractive.

Mr. Withers: That is the rub.

Hon. C. G. Latham: Be truthful!

THE MINISTER FOR EMPLOYMENT: This afternoon, for petty, party political purposes, the Leader of the Opposition charged the Government with having given no consideration to the question of improving the condition of the unfortunate relief workers throughout the State.

Mr. Marshall: What a beautiful alliance, the Leader of the Opposition and the member for East Perth!

Mr. SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. Marshall: He does not like his new-found friend too well.

Mr. SPEAKER: The member for Murdoch had better be quiet.

THE MINISTER FOR EMPLOYMENT: The primary producers held a conference in Perth recently and passed a resolution, the essence of which was that they protested strongly against the Government providing for relief workers while the farmers were not able to obtain the labour necessary to assist them in carrying out their farming activities.

Mr. Cross: They want to pay only 10s. a week.

Hon. C. G. Latham: That is better than starting-price bookmaking.

THE MINISTER FOR EMPLOYMENT: When that resolution was sent to me, I caused inquiries to be made at the Labour Exchange to ascertain whether any men were wanted by farmers. The books of the Labour Exchange were absolutely blank in that regard. Thus it would seem that the resolution carried at the Primary Producers' Conference was adopted not because of any real necessity, but for the purpose of discrediting the Government in the eyes of the country people throughout the State. I come now to the consideration of a question mentioned by the Leader of the Opposition by interjection a few moments ago. The matter was also referred to by the member for East Perth (Mr. Hughes) in the sensational speech he made on Thursday last. The figures I propose to quote illustrate just what happened regarding loan expenditure and unemployment relief during the last six years. The Mitchell Government, in their three years, expended £1,500,000 in unemployment relief from revenue, and from loan funds, which, of course, represent the money that provides the work, they spent £3,500,000. The £1,500,000 that was provided for unemployment relief was used to finance bare sustenance for the unemployed. During the three years of the Labour Government, from 1933 to 1936, we expended from revenue on unemployment relief only £354,000, or £1,200,000 less than was spent by the previous Government during their term of office. The member for East Perth would cunningly use those figures for the purpose of proving that the present Government had expended far less in unemployment relief than the previous Government. He would place those figures before his audience and twist and distort them in such a way as to prove that the previous Government spent five times more on unemployment relief than the present Government.

Mr. Hughes: Yes, from revenue.

THE MINISTER FOR EMPLOYMENT: The hon. member would not have said that.

Mr. Hughes: Yes, I would.

THE MINISTER FOR EMPLOYMENT: Let us look at the position a little further. During our three years of office we expended double the amount from loan funds for works as compared with the amount spent from that source upon works by the previ-

ous Government. The explanation is that when the Labour Government took office in 1933, they determined that it was a suicidal policy to go on, year after year, providing unemployed people with bare sustenance, and resolved to alter the policy and as quickly as possible put into operation a plan to enable the unemployed to be provided with work, as against bare sustenance. Every relief worker in Western Australia to-day knows—and 90 per cent. of them are honest enough to admit it—that the conditions to-day are far better for them than they were three or four years ago. The number of unemployed men on bare sustenance as at the 31st March, 1933, was 4,360. The Labour Government then came into office, and the number of unemployed on bare sustenance as at the 31st March, 1936, or three years afterwards, was 436, a reduction of practically 4,000 in the number of families on the bare sustenance level. I submit, Mr. Speaker, that the efforts of the Labour Government, although not completely successful, although not as successful as the members of the Government desire them to be and are determined to make them at the earliest possible moment, have resulted in the condition of the unemployed during the last three years being improved to a very great degree. I have already shown that the adoption of the altered conditions set out in the amendment moved by the member for East Perth would merely have the effect of taking £800,000 from revenue and using it for other purposes, which would automatically mean the creation of a deficit of £800,000 in the revenue and expenditure accounts of the State. That would force the Government to take £800,000 from Loan Funds for the purpose of financing the deficit, which would mean £800,000 less available for the purpose of providing work for the relief workers of the State. I propose now to give a few moments consideration to the inspiration which the member for East Perth had when he decided to tie on to his original amendment the tag suggesting that some of the money raised by the financial emergency tax should be used for the purpose of providing relief to necessitous farmers. I have already shown that the amount of financial emergency tax available is £800,000 a year. At least £800,000 a year would be required to provide full-time employment. So the amendment moved by the hon. member would not achieve full-time employment. It is reasonable to suggest that if his idea

were adopted by the Government, the £800,000 would be equally divided, £400,000 being used for the purpose of providing work for the unemployed and £400,000 for assisting necessitous farmers. If that idea were operated, the actual result would be this: £800,000 would be taken from revenue; £400,000 would be used to assist necessitous farmers and £400,000 would be used to provide employment; but at the same time, £800,000 of loan money now being used to provide employment would have to be taken for the purpose of financing the deficit in the revenue and expenditure account of the State. So when this amendment is analysed, when the idea in the amendment is subjected to a careful examination, it becomes obvious that the operation of the idea would give to the relief workers £400,000 a year and would take from them £800,000 a year which is at present being used for the purpose of providing them with employment. The brilliant proposal of the member for East Perth, if put into effect, therefore, would worsen to the extent of £400,000 a year the conditions of the relief workers. The amendment as he originally proposed to move it would have been neither to the benefit nor to the disadvantage of the relief workers. The result would have been the same; their position would have been the same. All that would have been involved would have been a little extra book-keeping work by the Government. The sum of £800,000 would have had to be taken from revenue and used for certain purposes. Then £800,000 would have had to be taken from loan to finance the deficit thus created. With one hand £800,000 would have been taken from here and put there and with the other hand the same amount would have been taken from there and put here. On balance the result would have been the same. But when the member for East Perth tied a tag on to his amendment providing for some of the financial emergency tax money to be used for the purpose of assisting necessitous farmers, he reduced his amendment to an absurdity, and made it dangerous. If the Government took up the idea in the amendment and operated it, the relief workers, as I have already indicated, would suffer to the extent of £400,000 a year.

Mr. North: So we need social credit after all.

The MINISTER FOR EMPLOYMENT: We may need social credit, but we do not

need Hughesian credit of the queer description contained in his amendment.

Mr. Hughes: I think we should trust ourselves to the hawks.

THE MINISTER FOR EMPLOYMENT: In his anxiety to play up to the members of the Country Party, the member for East Perth has exposed his insincerity and his worthlessness as an advocate for the welfare of the relief workers of this State. It is true the members of the Country Party have some justification for supporting the amendment because if the amendment were acted upon by the Government, £400,000 would be taken from the financial emergency tax and used to assist necessitous farmers in Western Australia. They have been looking for some justification for supporting the amendment as moved by the member for East Perth. But the necessitous farmers of this State would only be benefited at the expense of the relief workers. The £400,000 that would be used to assist the necessitous farmers would have to be taken from the funds now used for providing employment for the relief workers. Bad as the conditions of some of the farmers of the State may be, I feel sure they would not desire to have their positions eased at the expense of the relief workers and their families. It is extraordinary that an independent member representing an industrial constituency should be the farmers' champion in this House. The proposal in his amendment virtually amounts to an attempt to teach his grandmother to suck eggs, that is, in his relationship to the members of the Country Party. Why has it been necessary for an independent member representing a city constituency to make this move in the interests of the necessitous farmers of the State? The Leader of the Country Party spoke on the Address-in-reply debate, but he moved no motion of censure or no-confidence against the Government. He made no move to provide additional assistance for the farmers of Western Australia. It remained for the member for East Perth to raise his voice on behalf of the farmers.

Hon. C. G. Latham: That was very kind of him.

THE MINISTER FOR EMPLOYMENT: It remained for him to take some action to try and assist them. So it would appear that the Leader of the Opposition and the members of the Country Party have been recreant to their trust, that they have been slipping on their jobs and have had to be spurred

into activity by the independent member representing East Perth. I was under the impression that there were no primary industries carried on in East Perth, so during the day I made some close inquiries. I wondered why the member for East Perth was so concerned about the farmers. I knew, of course, that he was trying to get members of the Country Party into the net to support his amendment, but I thought there might be some other reason.

Mr. Hughes: That is a fishing industry.

THE MINISTER FOR EMPLOYMENT: So I sent a special officer into the East Perth district with a view to ascertaining whether there were any primary industries carried on there.

Hon. C. G. Latham: You have officers who can waste their time like that?

Mr. Marshall: To give you information you ask for.

THE MINISTER FOR EMPLOYMENT: The report which that officer presented showed that the only primary industry carried on in East Perth is the primary industry of filth-farming. During his speech the member for East Perth touched on certain phases of the Government's employment policy, and the phrase "Starving women and children" was mouthed by him on several occasions. He used the phrase so frequently as to convey the impression that he was exploiting the phrase for the purpose of seeking to obtain publicity and notoriety. Personal and political advancement have sometimes been achieved by men low-minded enough to exploit the position of starving women and children.

Mr. Hughes: For instance, at the last general election the promise of full-time work.

THE MINISTER FOR EMPLOYMENT: If a man has the necessary peculiarity of mind, it is an easy matter to gain personal notoriety and advancement by posing as the special protector of unfortunately placed women and children.

Mr. Thorn: From what book did you get that?

THE MINISTER FOR EMPLOYMENT: From a book that the hon. member would not be able to comprehend. When two years ago the member for East Perth was busy persecuting Mr. Clydesdale, M.L.C., he became almost hysterical on the question of the one-man one-job principle. He abused and condemned and vilified Mr. Clydesdale because he was holding two jobs.

Mr. SPEAKER: I hope the hon. member will connect this up with the amendment.

The MINISTER FOR EMPLOYMENT: Yes, Mr. Speaker. At that time the member for East Perth was abusing and vilifying Mr. Clydesdale because he was carrying out two jobs while other men in the community had only part-time work, or no jobs at all. At that time the hon. member seemed to regard the holding of more than one job by any one person as the supreme social crime. But in recent months we have heard nothing at all from the member for East Perth regarding this sacred principle of one-man one-job. There must be some substantial reason for his silence on the question. The reason suggests itself immediately—the hon. member who two years ago regarded the holding of two jobs by one man as a crime, as something that ought to be condemned at every possible opportunity, now holds down at least four paid jobs in the city. If he were in the least sincere in his talk about starving women and children and unfortunately placed relief workers, he would do the manly thing and shed some of the several paid jobs he now holds. That would be a real vindication of his professions of interest and of sympathy in the affairs I have been indicating. Until he does something in that direction, relief workers and the general public and all starving women and children in this community will be justified in believing that his protestations are nothing but a hollow mockery. So I say the member for East Perth could assist to provide full-time employment for one or two men who are now on part-time work by discarding some of the paid jobs he himself is carrying on. He professes to be interested in the sufferings of certain people of this State and to be anxious to do something at the earliest moment for the purpose of relieving some of those people. On the 25th June of this year the hon. member waited on me with a deputation to urge that consideration be given to the question of affording full-time employment to all relief workers in Western Australia. With great patience I pointed out to the members of the deputation that the Government were limited in their activities by the funds made available to them from time to time. I suggested that full-time employment could not possibly be made available unless the amount of money in the hands of the Government were increased. The member for East Perth said that additional taxation ought

to be imposed. I pointed out some of the difficulties in that regard. Then he himself promised to draw up a scheme and send it to me as early as possible for the consideration and decision of the Government. In the professed opinion of the member for East Perth at that time, the question of improving the conditions of relief workers was vitally urgent. He frequently claims, even in these days, that the present sufferings of those people should be lifted from their shoulders without delay. As I mentioned, he gave this undertaking on the 25th June that he would prepare and send to me a scheme providing for increased taxation, so that the Government could consider the scheme and make an endeavour to obtain more money with a view to providing more employment; yet from that date to the present moment I have not received a single line from the hon. member proposing a new taxation scheme. It is abundantly clear that the interest of the member for East Perth in the relief of workers evaporates as soon as he has exploited a certain phase of their position for his own publicity purposes. The other night the hon. member taunted the Minister for Mines regarding an alleged change of opinion on the part of the Minister. The hon. member said that many years ago the Minister for Mines and some of his colleagues were in the habit of condemning the activities of Mr. Claude de Bernales, but that now there was not any condemnation; rather was there an attempt at co-operation and understanding between them. And the hon. member asked, in the most dramatic way, who had changed, the Minister for Mines or Mr. Claude de Bernales. The other evening when the member for East Perth was making his speech, especially in those periods when he became most reckless, some members opposite were urging him on; and we know that some members opposite are fraternising with the hon. member and encouraging him and using him and applauding his efforts. Yet when the member for East Perth was in this House ten years ago or more—

Hon. C. G. Latham: You know nothing about that.

The Deputy Premier: Never mind: we know.

The Minister for Mines: We are not going to allow you to say what we wish to say.

The MINISTER FOR EMPLOYMENT: I have no doubt the Leader of the Opposition does not want this to be said, but it is going to be said.

Hon. C. G. Latham: I do not care. You are pretty reckless at all times.

The MINISTER FOR EMPLOYMENT: It is quite apparent that the Leader of the Opposition is very unhappy at the moment.

Hon. C. G. Latham: Not the slightest bit.

The MINISTER FOR EMPLOYMENT: Ten years ago or more, when the member for East Perth was in this House, members of the anti-Labour Party did not applaud him, did not encourage him, but condemned him and sought to accomplish his political defeat. Yet to-day they are working hand-in-hand with him. So I ask, who is it that has changed? Have members of the party opposed to the Labour Government changed, or has the member for East Perth changed?

Hon. C. G. Latham: Members of the Labour Party have become very conservative.

Mr. Raphael: It would be if you tried to get into it.

The MINISTER FOR EMPLOYMENT: The member for East Perth charged Ministers with being cruel and with having used their positions for the purpose of intimidating and bludgeoning relief workers and others into obeying Government policy. There is no need to give a detailed reply to a statement of that description, except to say that the conditions of every relief worker in Western Australia have been substantially improved as a result of the activities of Ministers of the present Government. What I am concerned about is the extreme audacity—one might justly say the hypocrisy—of the member for East Perth in this matter. There are two types of assassin in this community. In most communities there is only one type, but unfortunately we in Western Australia have two types. There is the type that assassinates life: there is the other type, a lower and more despicable type, that seeks to assassinate character. The assassin of life quickly destroys his victim, and thus gives him early release from the physical sufferings inflicted upon him. The assassin of character, on the other hand, seeks to spread the suffering over the longest possible period. This type of assassin always

possesses sufficient low native cunning to realise that, in the process of assassinating character, the mental, the physical and the nervous systems of the victims are slowly but surely undermined. He knows, too, that frequent attacks upon the character and reputation of a man have the effect of creating suspicion in the minds of a large number of the public. As the constant dripping of water wears away stone, so the constant insinuations and charges made against a man's character will cause that character to be weakened and finally broken down in the public's estimation of it. The object of the member for East Perth is clear. He desires to destroy the present Government and is prepared to go to any lengths, no matter how dishonourable and how discreditable they may be, to attain that end. Members on the Opposition benches—some of them, not all—are inclined to encourage the member for East Perth in the scheme he is now seeking to perpetrate. Members of the Opposition should be careful in this matter. If members of one Government can be destroyed by the scurrilous methods now being employed by the member for East Perth, members of other Governments in the future will be destroyed by the same methods.

Mr. Withers: Practice making perfect.

The MINISTER FOR EMPLOYMENT: If the member for East Perth proceeds from success to success, his methods will encourage other low-minded individuals in the community to follow his example. Other individuals of that type will seek places in the public life of the State, and if the methods I have mentioned are encouraged here, they will succeed, with the result that public life in this State will, with the passing of time, become as bad as, if not worse than, the public life in one other State of the Commonwealth and in certain other countries overseas. The price of political existence in this State will then depend upon one's willingness and ability to discard every sense of decency and every scruple of principle and indulge in muck-raking campaigns in the different districts of the State. The ordinary amenities of life as between man and man will become completely impossible. Decent men will then shun the public life of Western Australia; the low-minded and the dishonourable will then constitute the majority and will take

control of the machinery of Government. By that time the State will be but a short step from anarchy and chaos. In my own mind, I feel reasonably sure that at least some members of the Opposition will not imperil the future of the State merely for the purpose of using the member for East Perth in order to gain some temporary or early political advantage.

MR. McDONALD (West Perth—on amendment) [8.38]: If the amendment now before the House is not carried, it is my intention to move a further amendment to the motion for the adoption of the Address-in-reply which, I think, will meet the situation more justly than the amendment framed by the member for East Perth. In saying that I feel unable to support the amendment, I do so with a full sense of responsibility. I consider that the member for East Perth was well justified in bringing before the House the matter of unemployment, and in initiating a debate which, in the end, should result in benefit for the unemployed and possibly for the necessitous farmers in the State. As has been said by the Leader of the National Party, I feel that there has not been placed before members sufficient material to enable them to form a judgment on a matter of such importance. With the Leader of the Opposition, I believe that it would have been wiser if the Minister for Employment had risen earlier in order to place before the House the facts that he has lately given us as a guide to the real issues involved in the amendment of the member for East Perth.

Mr. Lambert: You are paid to get the information yourself. Why do not you get it?

Mr. McDONALD: I have listened with interest to the facts placed before the House by the Minister for Employment, but I have not listened with the same interest to the rhetoric he has displayed or to his re-incarnation of the younger Pitt.

Mr. Lambert interjected.

Mr. SPEAKER: Will the member for Yilgarn-Coolgardie refrain from interjecting?

Mr. McDONALD: I am impressed by this fact, that the provision of full-time employment, if that were possible, or of better conditions for the unemployed and for distressed farmers, can be achieved only by one of two methods or perhaps by both.

One is by additional loan funds, and I am unable to see any chance of getting additional loan funds, because the whole trend of the financial market in Australia during the last year or two has been to indicate that loan funds for governmental purposes are likely to be less plentiful in future than they have been in the past. If they are obtained they can only be obtained at rates of interest that no country would wish to pay. The other alternative is to increase the rates of taxation. Although I am fully aware, as the member for East Perth has said, that the Royal Commission on the Disabilities Grant said we were under-taxed, I have always felt that that was not a fair reflection upon the taxation provisions in this State.

Hon. C. G. Latham: That was long before the financial emergency tax was imposed.

Mr. McDONALD: That is so. That tax now brings in between two and three times the total amount that is brought in by the ordinary income tax.

Mr. Raphael: The Chamber of Commerce has asked for a reduction in income taxation.

Mr. McDONALD: I do not think that we can without careful consideration entertain the idea of increasing taxation in this State. Western Australia, perhaps of all the other States, is less able to meet severer taxation. From the last Commonwealth Year Book it will be seen that the average sum per head in the savings banks in Western Australia is lower than the average in any of the other States of the Commonwealth with the exception of the Northern Territory. The average in this State in 1935 was £24 per head of the population, and in one of the other States it was £39, or more than 50 per cent. above our average. We are not able to look for an increase in loan funds or an increase in taxation for the provision of the necessary resources from which to give full-time employment.

Mr. Lambert: The savings bank is not a true barometer of the earnings of the people.

Mr. McDONALD: No one ever said it was, but it is one of the factors to which any person looks when he wants to ascertain the financial position of the people. I feel that the amendment cannot be taken lightly. I do not regard it as nonsensical, or as something that will be taken lightly by the people to whom it is primarily addressed, namely those who comprise the part-time workers in particular, and those who make up our

distressed farmers. My reading of the amendment makes me feel that the meaning it would convey to the part-time workers is that the State is able to furnish full work for all men who are unemployed, and that those who voted for it were of opinion that the State was able to finance full-time work.

Mr. LAMBERT: Would you vote to make full-time work statutory?

Mr. SPEAKER: If the hon. member does not cease interjecting I shall have to deal with him.

Mr. McDONALD: Not having the resources available to the Government, I feel I could not put myself in the position of holding out to the unemployed any promise of full-time work. I want to be understood as not concurring in all respects with the policy of the Government on unemployment. There are many aspects in which benefits could have been given in the past to the unemployed, and in particular to those who are on sustenance and are not in a physical condition to do full-time work.

Mr. LAMBERT: Why don't you indicate what you want?

Mr. McDONALD: In opposing this amendment, I am not endorsing any other aspects of the unemployment policy of the Government. I have come to the conclusion that, without very much more consideration, I would not be prepared to vote for the amendment. I believe that the part-time workers would read this as meaning that we were promising them full-time employment. I think we should be raising in their minds hopes that we could not fulfil. For that reason, if this amendment is rejected, I propose to move another, which I hope will be accepted, to the effect that the time has now arrived when the whole position of unemployed workers on relief work should be reviewed, this to apply also to necessitous farmers, with the object of seeing to what extent their conditions can be improved.

Hon. W. D. JOHNSON: That has already been done.

Mr. McDONALD: We should then see to what extent we could give increased employment to those workers who are on part time. It is said that this has already been done by the Government, and will be done in the future. I propose to move this amendment so that the House may affirm the principle for the information of relief workers and farmers, indicating that we recognise the time has arrived when the whole position should be reconsidered. We can then listen

to the proposals brought down by the Government, and can determine, in the light of the information given to us, what best can be done to assist those who are passing through a most difficult time, and whom it may be possible to assist in view of the recent improvement in conditions, compared with those which have existed in the past. I am not going to commit myself to the amendment as I read it, because I do not think on my interpretation that we can fulfil what it would lead the workers to believe they were going to get.

Mr. LAMBERT: I should like to know whether the hon. member is going to embody his amendment in specific terms.

Mr. SPEAKER: I have only one amendment before me.

MR. TONKIN (North-East Fremantle—on amendment) [8.48]: The member for West Perth (Mr. McDonald) has taken a reasonable view of the amendment, and I congratulate him upon his fairness, but I doubt whether he will make much progress with the amendment he has forecast. The member for East Perth (Mr. Hughes) regrets that the Speech contains no definite statement that the amounts collected or to be collected from the financial emergency tax will be applied to finding full-time employment. If one were to feel hurt because of the absence each year from the Governor's Speech of a specific mention of various matters dear to one's heart, one would be moving amendments of this character with unfailing regularity. For example, every year His Excellency's Speech omits things that we would like to have mentioned. Take the case of the member for Fremantle (Mr. Sleeman). That hon. member would like to see in the Lieut.-Governor's Speech some mention that the Government intend to build the Fremantle bridge. But because that project is not mentioned, we do not assume that the Government have no intention of building the bridge. We are prepared to accept the Speech as almost a formal matter. It is well known that in recent years a custom has grown up of mentioning only a few things in the Speech delivered to Parliament. Only a few of the measures under contemplation find any mention whatever in it. This Speech does mention that full-time employment is a definite objective of the Government. The Speech also foreshadows measures for uniformity of taxation and for financial emergency legislation. I am pre-

pared to believe that the Government, despite the fact of there being no mention of such in the Speech, intend to do everything possible to introduce full-time employment for the unemployed of Western Australia. I wish to tell members opposite that they have no monopoly of the desire to improve conditions for the unfortunate people who are not yet in full-time employment. Whence comes this new-found solicitude opposite for unemployed workers? As the Minister for Employment has reminded the House, it was only last session that the Leader of the Opposition warned the Premier not to make relief work too attractive, because he feared that the farmers would not be able to get sufficient labour on their farms, since the work they were offering would suffer greatly in comparison. I should be highly pleased to see the necessitous farmers get more money, because then some of my constituents at North Fremantle would receive wages which are still owing to them. Some of the young fellows have had to work on the farms, and as a result find that they have worked four, five, and even six months without receiving any pay whatever. They would certainly benefit if the necessitous farmers received some additional money.

Hon. P. D. Ferguson: There are not many cases like that.

Mr. TONKIN: Quite a number.

Ministerial Member: Most of them.

Hon. P. D. Ferguson: That is an insult.

Mr. TONKIN: It may not be an insult. I would welcome the payment of the money which is owing. What the hon. member has interjected does not alter the fact that those young fellows, starting on their first job, have had a bitter experience.

Hon. P. D. Ferguson: In other walks of life men have not been able to get their wages.

Mr. TONKIN: What has that to do with the statement I made?

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

Mr. TONKIN: It does not alter the fact I have stated. I repeat, I would welcome assistance to necessitous farmers because it would enable them to pay wages due.

Mr. Patrick: Other people, I suppose, have not been able to pay wages.

Mr. TONKIN: Probably.

Mr. Patrick: Then why pick out the farmers?

Mr. TONKIN: Because the amendment mentions farmers. Why was that reference to farmers added to the amendment of the member for East Perth? I can imagine a kind of dialogue taking place behind the scenes. No doubt the member for East Perth approached the Leader of the Opposition and said, "What about the amendment? Are you going to support it?"

Hon. C. G. Latham: That statement is not true—not one word of it.

Mr. TONKIN: Very probably the Leader of the Opposition said, "I am not greatly concerned about relief workers; my concern is for the farmers."

Hon. C. G. Latham: Mr. Speaker, may I say that I deny that statement?

Mr. SPEAKER: It is only an imaginary statement.

Mr. TONKIN: I did not say that the Leader of the Opposition made any such statement.

Hon. C. G. Latham: No; but you are imputing it, which is worse still.

Mr. TONKIN: I am not imputing anything at all. I said I was drawing on my imagination. I am entitled to do that, whether the hon. member likes it or not.

Hon. C. G. Latham: Do it by all means!

Mr. TONKIN: I am merely imagining that such a dialogue took place. In view of the statement of the Leader of the Opposition that relief work was too attractive, I can imagine his saying to the member for East Perth, "Now look, how can I in the face of the statement I made previously——"

Hon. C. G. Latham: You will get enough of that presently.

Mr. TONKIN: "—ask for better conditions? If you will be so good as to tack these few words on the end, that will salve my conscience, and I can then come in and support the amendment." No doubt the matter was amicably fixed up between them and so the words were added to the amendment.

Hon. C. G. Latham: There is some doubt about it.

Mr. TONKIN: I would like to know how the necessitous farmers are to get more money and also how the relief workers are to get full time, if taxation is not to be increased?

Hon. C. G. Latham: Change the Government.

Mr. TONKIN: The Leader of the Opposition sets his face against increase of taxation. He will not have that at any price. This is what he had to say last session about increased taxation, when speaking on the Financial Emergency Tax Bill—

I hate this additional taxation. I hope that next year it will be reduced.

Further on, the hon. gentleman said that he would move for a reduction then if he were certain as to the amount of money which would be raised. The Leader of the Opposition does not intend to support any move for increased taxation. He hates additional taxation. He wants money for necessitous farmers. That must mean less money for the unemployed workers. I tell the Leader of the Opposition that he cannot have his cake and eat it too.

Hon. C. G. Latham: It all depends on who makes the cake.

Mr. TONKIN: He must have it one way or the other. If the necessitous farmers are to get an extra amount of money, then of course the relief workers must receive less. In view of the fact that the Leader of the Opposition believed last session that relief work was even then too attractive, such a result would cause him no heart-burning whatsoever. But it shows hypocrisy on his part when he gets up here and endeavours to make the House believe that he is sincere in asking for full-time work for the unemployed and for money for necessitous farmers as well. We none of us want to be placed in a false position. There is not a member on this side of the Chamber who is not in favour of full-time work for the unemployed. Voting against the amendment is not an indication that we on this side do not want steps taken to bring about that position. At the last general election the Leader of this Party stated that one of its objectives was full-time work. That is again stated in the Speech of His Excellency—that the Government's objective is full-time work. Of course it is only a matter of commonsense that the party representing the workers must be only too anxious to give them full-time when the money available makes such a course possible. I was indeed pleased to hear the announcement of the Minister for Employment that a move is to be made to improve the conditions of the unemployed. I hope that such a move will prove only a

forerunner to another move which is not very distant. I trust that before the end of the year we shall have reached a position where a debate of this nature will not be necessary at all, where the unemployed will be in enjoyment of full-time work at full basic-wage rates, and where we shall be able to see some continued improvement in the condition of the country. I have no desire to detain the House any longer, and therefore simply state that I intend to vote against the amendment, not because I want to deny these people full-time work, but because I realise that the amendment as moved is futile and will not achieve what every member of the House desires—the earliest approach possible to the best conditions which the State can offer.

Amendment put, and a division taken with the following result:—

Ayes	14
Noes	23
					—
Majority against	9
					—

AYES.

Mr. Brockman	Mr. North
Mrs. Cardell-Oliver	Mr. Sampson
Mr. Hill	Mr. Shears
Mr. Hughes	Mr. J. M. Smith
Mr. Keenan	Mr. Thorn
Mr. Latham	Mr. Warner
Mr. McLarty	Mr. Doney

(Teller.)

NOES.

Mr. Coverley	Mr. Needham
Mr. Cross	Mr. Nulsen
Mr. Doust	Mr. Raphael
Mr. Fox	Mr. Rodoreda
Mr. Hawke	Mr. Sleeman
Mr. Hegney	Mr. Styants
Miss Holman	Mr. Tonkin
Mr. Jonsson	Mr. Troy
Mr. Lambert	Mr. Wise
Mr. Marshall	Mr. Withers
Mr. McDonald	Mr. Wilson
Mr. Munsie	

(Teller.)

PAIRS.

AYES.	NOES.
Mr. Ferguson	Mr. Millington
Mr. Stubbs	Mr. Collier
Mr. Patrick	Mr. Willcock

Amendment thus negatived.

MR. McDONALD (West Perth) [9.4]: Having placed myself in the position of having to vote against the amendment moved by the member for East Perth (Mr. Hughes), I desire to move a further amendment to the motion for the adoption of the Address-in-reply with the object of asserting how I stand in relation to the position of the unemployed.

Mr. SPEAKER: May I suggest to the member for West Perth that he is now speaking on the Address-in-reply.

Mr. McDONALD: That may be so, Sir, but I do not intend, at this stage, to deal other than with the amendment I propose to move.

Mr. SPEAKER: I am merely drawing the hon. member's attention to the fact because he will have no further opportunity to speak on the Address-in-reply.

Mr. McDONALD: And that perhaps would not matter a great deal. I am not vain enough to think that any contribution I might bring to the debate would alter the course of the affairs of this State. Neither do I think that any suggestion I could make would be along the lines of the intentions of the member for North-East Fremantle (Mr. Tonkin) and be such that would lead us to the millennium. Possibly it will be so much time saved, and I may not be able to assist the House any further along the path of progress. I desire to move my amendment because, as the representative of a constituency where there reside a great many people suffering from the effects of unemployment, I do not want any misunderstanding as to the views I take in connection with any endeavour to place them in a better position. I am one of those—I am sure every member is in the same position—who are impressed every day by the difficulties through which the unemployed are passing, and hardly a day goes by but all are impressed in mind by the desirability of doing something to put those unfortunate persons into a better position. It may be said that the Government have already examined the position regarding the unemployed. I prepared my amendment this afternoon before I had the advantage of hearing the speeches made this evening, particularly by the Minister for Employment.

Hon. W. D. Johnson: Then why move it now?

Mr. McDONALD: Some may not agree with me, but I think the opportunity should be given to members to say that they think the time has arrived when the position of the unemployed and the distressed farmers throughout the State can be re-examined.

Hon. W. D. Johnson: Then you doubt the sincerity of the Government.

Mr. McDONALD: No, I do not doubt their sincerity; but I think members are entitled to express their opinion that the time has arrived when the whole position should be reviewed. If the Minister gets

up and says that that is already being done, I shall have no objection, and in those circumstances I cannot see that he can have any objection to the amendment.

Hon. W. D. Johnson: But it will have to go to the vote.

Mr. McDONALD: The amendment will give members an opportunity to express their views on the matter, and I shall content myself with moving it without further comment. It is entirely fair. I move an amendment—

That the following words be added to the Address-in-reply:—“but as no reference is made in Your Excellency's Speech to the position of citizens employed on Government relief works, this House is of opinion that the time has arrived when the Government should re-examine the whole position of relief workers and distressed farmers with a view to the improvement of their conditions and, as to relief workers, with a view to the provision of additional employment.”

Hon. W. D. Johnson: That is exactly what the Government are doing.

Mr. McDONALD: If they are, I shall be very pleased. I shall not deal with the matter further.

Mr. SAMPSON: I second the amendment.

THE DEPUTY PREMIER (Hon. M. F. Troy—Mt. Magnet—on amendment) [9.10]: Of course there is no truth in the statement that the Government have made no mention in the Lieut.-Governor's Speech of the subject matter of the proposed amendment. If hon. members will read the Lieut.-Governor's Speech they will find this statement:—

As finances permit, a vigorous policy of constructing essential public works is being pursued. Urgently needed employment is thus provided. The supplying of material required has created increased employment in private industry, and the money thus circulated has helped very materially in maintaining business activities and financial stability. The vigorous campaign in support of the use of Western Australian products which has proved so successful, will be prosecuted with unabated enthusiasm, as it constitutes the most fruitful means of creating permanent and full-time employment, a definite objective of my Ministers.

After listening to the speech of the Minister for Employment one would have hardly thought that this amendment was necessary, because the Minister stressed that the Government had, on a number of occasions, given every possible consideration to improving the conditions of relief workers, and that they proposed within the limits

of the country's income to give the relief worker the best possible conditions. That is the policy of the Government, and we do hope to improve the condition of relief workers in the course of a month or so. It would appear that the member for West Perth does not accept that statement, because he casts doubt upon the sincerity of the Government. He will not accept the guarantee of the Government, and this amendment is distinctly a vote of no-confidence in the Government. He said in effect that he for one did not believe the Minister. He had heard what the Minister had said, but he really did not believe him, and because he did not believe him he moved the amendment as a challenge and a direct vote of no-confidence.

Mr. Lambert: He appointed himself a trial judge.

The DEPUTY PREMIER: It could not be anything else but a vote of no-confidence. I do not propose to repeat what has been said by the Minister for Employment. He has given a very comprehensive statement to the House enunciating the policy of the Government very clearly and frankly, and I feel convinced that the majority of the House are prepared to take his word for it. I can understand the embarrassment of the member for West Perth. I do not want to attribute to him any sinister purpose at all; he is not that sort of man, and so I think I can say he is trying to do his best for the community, but this is not the way for it to be done. I admit that the time probably has arrived in this country when we should re-examine the whole position, not only of unemployment but also the capacity of the community to meet this situation—the taxation capacity of the people—and attempt to sum up the resources of this country. The member for West Perth stated that we could not borrow any more money. He is correct in that. It does not matter what people may say outside, or what the member for East Perth may say, but we know we cannot borrow any more money. We are within the Financial Agreement, and cannot borrow any further. The member for West Perth agrees that the community cannot be taxed any more. If we cannot borrow any more, and the community cannot afford to pay any more taxation, where are we? We are just where we were. The hon. member has not helped us at all. If a motion be moved in this House later on

that a commission be appointed to re-examine the whole position in Western Australia, as it affects the general community, the unemployed man, the distressed farmers, and the distressed group settlers—let it be gone into thoroughly and examined closely. I do not object to that, but this is not the time nor the place to do it. The hon. member says he has heard all that we have to say on this side. He agrees that people cannot pay any more taxation and that we cannot get any more loan money. So he has not helped us in the slightest degree, that is, so far as the unemployed are concerned. The Minister for Employment has given expression to the Government's resolution and determination, and beyond that the member for West Perth admits that we cannot go. The Leader of the Opposition stated to-night that the Government had not helped the farmers, and that the farmers are dragged in here on this amendment. I think I can say that if there is any body of people in this country to-day who are getting more relief than any other body it is the farmers.

Hon. C. G. Latham: Not from the present Government.

The DEPUTY PREMIER: The Leader of the Opposition said the other evening that all he could find in the way of advances to the farmers was £48,000.

Hon. C. G. Latham: I did not say advances.

The DEPUTY PREMIER: Well, of loans, £48,000.

Hon. C. G. Latham: Grants to farmers.

The DEPUTY PREMIER: This year there was made by the Industries Assistance Board advances to farmers totalling £165,411, refunds of interest £21,657, Agricultural Bank advances £28,468, releases against stock £22,428. So the Government found this year in advances to farmers no less than £285,000, and we have provided £285,000 to no other section of the community.

Hon. C. G. Latham: What rate of interest do you charge?

The DEPUTY PREMIER: These are the facts produced by the Under Treasurer of the advances made by the Government. There is no return showing the interest on the advances given by the Industries Assistance Board and the Bank, no return showing interest.

Hon. C. G. Latham: Well, there ought to be.

The DEPUTY PREMIER: Not only do the taxpayers provide that huge sum of money for the farmers, but they are now finding the interest which the farmers cannot pay, and the accumulated interest of the Agricultural Bank farmers is no less than £2,998,147, or nearly £3,000,000 owing in interest to the Agricultural Bank. And if we had that £3,000,000 interest we would have £3,000,000 additional revenue.

Hon. C. G. Latham: You mean to say you would get £3,000,000 additional revenue a year?

The DEPUTY PREMIER: If the farmers could pay interest we would have nearly £3,000,000 more to provide. The State Government find the interest on behalf of the farmers and we have to find an additional £119,924 a year to pay interest on the overdue interest. The community is carrying that load for the farmer. In addition, it has to be remembered that these advances made by the Bank may be gifts to the farmers, because in many instances they will not be able to repay the money. We know this because we have been told by the Opposition that the farmers are so over-burdened with debt that they will be unable to repay the money. If the farmers do not pay back the ordinary loan money advanced to them, they will not repay the assistance being granted to-day. That will be a dead loss to the State, except that the farmers will be kept on the land. The Industries Assistance Board have already agreed that the known losses representing amounts owing by farmers amount to nearly £1,000,000. That amount, the board state, will not be repaid. Those people who complain that they have received nothing have had everything; the rest of the community are carrying them. The mining industry did not receive similar consideration when the opposition parties were in power. The Mitchell Government refused to give the Youanmi mine a guarantee for £5,000 in order to keep 200 men at work, but sent those men on the trek, stating that it was not their business to help those people. Yet we help the farmers to the extent of millions of pounds and tax the community as a whole in order to do so. The amount raised by the financial emergency tax is used to help to pay interest owing by group settlers and other clients of the Agricultural Bank.

Hon. C. G. Latham: On money that you have spent there.

The DEPUTY PREMIER: If those settlers paid their debts to the Government, then we could do without the financial emergency tax. The proceeds of that tax, however, are necessary in order to assist to make good the amount that those settlers do not pay. The State Government entered into an agreement with the Federal Government to provide the farmers with wire netting, but the State Government took all the responsibility for non-payment or losses. The instalments on wire netting now due or overdue by farmers amount to £96,069, and we have to pay the Federal Government for that. Years ago the Collier Government installed magnificent water supplies at great cost in the country. The capital charge of those schemes is not charged to the farmers; it is a charge on the whole of the community. All that the farmer has to pay is the cost of reticulation, but water rates are now in arrears to the amount of £167,706. The general taxpayers have to find £167,700 from revenue to meet water rates which the farmers are unable to pay, or have not paid. Land rents, except those in respect to repurchased estates, do not represent money paid out by the Government, but land rents are now in arrears to the amount of £963,841. The Government are finding on behalf of the farmers nearly £5,000,000, and have to provide interest on loan money which the farmers do not pay.

Mr. Warner: But the farmers' products keep the country functioning.

The DEPUTY PREMIER: Settlers on repurchased estates have to pay rent, and the arrears on this account amount to £184,246. Those arrears of rent have been found by the community. When we consider those figures, can we understand any farmer complaining that the Government have not been generous to the industry? The community in Western Australia is a small one; they have provided all that assistance to the farmers, and yet we are told that the Government have done nothing for the farmers. The hon. member said we must find means to relieve the farmers. We are relieving them to the capacity of the State. There is even more to be said. In the last few months the Government have written off debts owing by farmers to the

amount of over £2,000,000, which is apart from all the advances and the relief provided. We have written off group settlements £1,700,000, and on account of repurchased estates we have recently written off £200,000, a total of nearly £2,000,000. The people of this State will have to bear that burden until the liability is removed. Many people seem to be under the impression that when we write off a debt, that is the end of it. The truth is that when we write off for the farmer, we write on for the rest of the community. The rest of the community have to meet the interest charges on that money until the amount is repaid. The Leader of the Opposition spoke of what the Commonwealth Government had done under the Rural Relief Fund Act. The Commonwealth Government provided £10,000,000 to help the farmers of Australia to pay their debts, not to provide new machinery, wire netting or water supplies, or in such like ways place them on a better footing. Western Australia is entitled to £1,200,000 of that money, and the trustees of the Rural Relief Fund Act are operating on the account. The position to-day is that the trustees have utilised £239,000 of Commonwealth money to adjust the debts of 811 settlers. In respect to 282 of those 811 settlers, the Agricultural Bank have written off £368,000, or £1,306 per settler. To-day for every 5s. of Commonwealth Government money that has been utilised in debt adjustment the Agricultural Bank has furnished 10s. The people ought to be told the facts. Every possible help has been given to farmers. Up to June of this year we authorised the purchase of 8,000 tons of fodder, and only recently I gave approval for the purchase of another 500 tons. We are assisting farmers every day. It is most ungenerous and wrong to tell the community that the amendment must be carried to compel the Government to pay attention to this matter.

Mr. McDonald: The farmers must get more machinery.

The DEPUTY PREMIER: The two classes of people who are getting all the help to-day are made up of the farmers, and the men who are employed in the city. All our revenue and loan moneys are distributed amongst those people. The great mass of the people that we represent on the gold-fields do not get 1s. They are, however, pay-

ing the taxes to meet the tremendous leeway represented by the expenditure on people in the city and on the land, who are not paying the taxes. They would not have any great objection to that if other people would only recognise it. They will not, however, recognise it. The cry all the time is "give more." The amendment suggests that the Government are not doing their duty. The whole of the resources of the country go upon the farmers and relief workers. The Government are doing their duty to the utmost of their capacity, and are doing it more than any other Government in this State has done its duty. What did our opponents do for the farmers? They were hopelessly impotent and did nothing. They did not bring down legislation to reduce the debts of the farmers, nor did they give the Agricultural Bank power to write down liabilities. They talk about the farmers receiving only 30s. a month, but they did not give the farmers £1 a month.

Mr. Sleeman: They did not even give them bulk handling.

The DEPUTY PREMIER: No.

Hon. C. G. Latham: It took you three years to make up your mind, and then you got a Royal Commission to make it up for you.

The DEPUTY PREMIER: Farmers have said to me, "There is one thing about your Government; when you say you will do a thing you do it. With our fellows we never know what they will do." Did the Opposition when in office bring down legislation to reduce debts, or write off £1,700,000 from the group settlers? They did none of these things, and yet they have the temerity to tell the House that we have done nothing for the farmers. I propose to speak later on, as I have not yet exhausted my opportunity.

Hon. C. G. Latham: Thank goodness for that.

The DEPUTY PREMIER: This amendment is entirely unnecessary. It suggests that the Government have not done a fair thing to the farmers or the workers. It is a definite challenge to the Government, and a vote of no-confidence.

Mr. McDonald: It does not suggest that.

The DEPUTY PREMIER: It comes from a gentleman who tells us that we cannot get a penny more from loan or taxation or any other source, and yet he moved an amendment of this character.

Mr. McDonald: I did not say that.

The DEPUTY PREMIER: The hon. member suggested that we could not get more money, and he would not support the amendment of the member for East Perth because he said it was insincere.

Mr. McDonald: I did not say that either.

The DEPUTY PREMIER: Because it conveyed to the people that they could get relief that they could not get. Is that the position?

Mr. McDonald: Yes.

The DEPUTY PREMIER: He went on to say that if he voted for the amendment it would convey to the people that they could get from the Government what the Government were not in a position to give. Like an honourable man he said he would not vote for it, and he did not do so. The Leader of the National Party and the Leader of the Opposition know the facts just as well as he does. When the Leader of the Opposition was in office he was helpless. The best thing that could happen is that a responsible man like the member for West Perth (Mr. McDonald) should be elected Leader of the Opposition. There is no hope for members opposite unless they have a responsible man who will face the facts. They want a man who will not throw dust in the eyes of the people. The member for Nedlands (Hon. N. Keenan) told the people that the Government were rushing the elections because they had a big deficit. He said the finances were in a dreadful condition and that we were rushing the elections because we were in a helpless condition. He did not know a word about it. The fact that we had a surplus shows that he was wrong and did not tell the truth. The statement was good enough for election time.

Mr. SPEAKER: The Minister had better get back to the amendment.

The DEPUTY PREMIER: His vote tonight was given merely to embarrass the Government. He wanted to pull the Government down by some means. He did not care twopence for the amendment moved by the member for East Perth. I do not say that the member for West Perth (Mr. McDonald) is not facing the facts, but the amendment does repudiate the promise made by the Minister for Employment, and does challenge the Government on the point of their sincerity. On behalf of the Government I cannot accept the amendment.

HON. C. G. LATHAM (York—on amendment) [9.37]: I do not know whether you, Mr. Speaker, are going to allow me to wander all over the place as you allowed the Deputy Premier to do.

Mr. SPEAKER: That is a reflection on the Chair.

Hon. C. G. LATHAM: I propose to deal with what the Deputy Premier has said. He took me to task for daring to suggest that the Government have not done anything for the farmers. I will read from page 26 of the last report, dated 30th June, 1936, of the Agricultural Bank Commissioners. The Minister says he has inside information. On the bottom of that page there is a section dealing with advances made to ordinary borrowers and group settlers. These figures appear for the year ended the 30th June, 1936—

	£
Purchase of stock	3,205
Purchase of machinery	1,861
Effecting improvements	3,071
Capitalisation of interest	22,772
Miscellaneous advances	6,848
Cropping advances	11,392
Fees for registration or securities	593
	<hr/> £49,742

The Deputy Premier: What about the I.A.B.?

Hon. C. G. LATHAM: In that connection the amounts advanced have been small. Most of the money has been advanced on settlements which took place whilst the Deputy Premier was Minister for Lands. Most of it was advanced in the mining areas known as South Southern Cross, and the other mining areas known as North Kalannie.

The Deputy Premier: This year's advance was apart from that.

Hon. C. G. LATHAM: I know. Most of the settlements that were effected whilst the Deputy Premier was Minister for Lands before took place in very doubtful rainfall areas, if there are such areas in the State. Most of the bad settlements took place because of that hon. gentleman's policy.

The Deputy Premier: You are a great bluffer.

Hon. C. G. LATHAM: The statement is true. Who settled the 3,500-farms scheme in what is called the lake country? The hon. gentleman did, and of course a large

sum has had to be written off. Who settled the South Southern Cross area? The hon. gentleman did.

The Deputy Premier: Who settled the Esperance area?

Hon. C. G. LATHAM: The hon. gentleman's Government did. Who built the railway there? The Labour Government who are the present occupants of the Treasury bench. They settled that country, and made a calamity of it. Last year the Agricultural Bank wrote off in respect of that settlement no less a sum than £465,000.

The Deputy Premier: What? In Esperance?

Hon. C. G. LATHAM: Yes, Esperance.

The Deputy Premier: Sir James Mitchell built the Esperance railway.

Hon. C. G. LATHAM: As a matter of fact, the final section of that railway was built by the present Government out of the Development and Migration Commission's money, the cheap money. Esperance is dealt with in a report by appointees of the Government.

The Deputy Premier: The Royal Commissioners on the Agricultural Bank?

Hon. C. G. LATHAM: Not at all. I listened to the hon. gentleman. Now he is going to have a Royal Commission to inquire into the Government's policy. In reply to the member for West Perth (Mr. McDonald) the Deputy Premier said, "You can have an inquiry by representatives of this House and another place, an inquiry into everything." We have been living on Royal Commissions for the last three years. Now we are to have a Royal Commission to inquire into the policy of the present Government. All the money written off has been written off on account of the blunders of the present Government. The great bulk of the money advanced in the group settlement areas was advanced while the present Ministers were on the Treasury bench. I wish members of the Chamber knew more about land settlement. During the years 1924 to 1927 a million annually was spent there—spent while the Minister for Lands was a member of the Government.

Mr. SPEAKER: Are those settlers distressed farmers?

Hon. C. G. LATHAM: Yes. Let no mistake be made about that. I am surprised that members representing group settlers are prepared still to support a Government with

a group settlement policy so hard that wire nails can be made out of it.

Mr. Withers: Name one group settlement supporting the Government!

Hon. C. G. LATHAM: The group settlers supported the Government until they got absolutely sick of supporting them. Even to-day the group settlers are some of the worst-treated people in any Western Australian industry. The Deputy Premier would have the House believe that these men can make money out of nothing. Naturally they have to earn an income before they can pay interest. Does the Minister's statement convey anything to the House? Does he blame the farmer? Surely the condition of the farming industry is the cause of the present position, the low prices which have been ruling for the farmer's commodities. Is there any body of individuals employed in any Western Australian industry who have made the sacrifices made by the wheat farmers of this State since 1930? Members opposite representing farmers know the sacrifices made by them. The Deputy Premier says, "Look at that three-quarters of a million of money!" He even suggests that the matter could be so manipulated that if he got the interest, he would have three millions more of money. Money advanced by the Industries Assistance Board has not all been lost. It was used for the purpose of paying land rents, various Government charges, and also charges on land that had reverted to the Crown, having been sold over and over again. The Government have added to their revenue from that source. The Industries Assistance Act originally introduced by the member for Guildford-Midland (Hon. W. D. Johnson) produced three-quarters of a million pounds during the very first year of its operation—in the form of land rents, water charges, and Agricultural Bank interest. That statement is absolutely true, and I can verify it. For the Deputy Premier to say that the farmer is not doing his whack is utterly wrong. The farmer has done a great deal to help the people of Western Australia. The city has been built out of his efforts. No less than £90,000,000 has been brought to this State in overseas capital by the farmer's exports—a terrific sum. All those magnificent buildings which have come into existence in Perth during the last few years have been built out of the work of the farmer.

The Deputy Premier: And out of the mining industry.

Hon. C. G. LATHAM: I suppose the hon. gentleman will boast about the million and a quarter going overseas to pay dividends to investors. Does that money come here? I will admit that there is a connection between all industries and all labour in the country districts, and that all these factors go to build up the city. The statement is justified because the back country builds up the city; but let us not decry the farmer simply because his industry does not permit him to make interest payments. We should sympathise with him. Hon. members know we sympathised with men who found themselves out of employment. While sitting opposite we did everything possible for those men.

Mr. Sleeman: They got plenty of sympathy from you, but nothing else.

Hon. C. G. LATHAM: We gave them all the money we could find, and we got very little thanks for it. It was our Government that set up the high payments to unemployed. Our policy did that, not the policy of the present Government. The present Government have merely continued our system. The avalanche of unemployment which came upon our Government was so great as to make it impossible to find work for all the men, and so they had to be given sustenance. It was our policy that gave to part-time relief workers £1 per week above the sustenance rate of 7s. per unit. How much have the payments to them been increased by the present Government? Very little indeed. The unemployed were to have full-time employment for a certain period, and then sustenance whilst stood down, according to the present Government. But has that policy been carried out? Certainly not. It may be that the present Government were unable to carry it out, but still those promises were made. Every time the Minister for Lands gets up in this House and condemns the farmers for not doing something that they are not able to do, I shall cross swords with him. All I am sorry for is that the farmer finds himself in such a plight that he has to go to the like of the Minister for Lands to ask for time. All the money that the Minister has talked about is charged against the farmer's land. Who pays the debts of this country? The men engaged in our primary industries. They are the only ones who cannot pass charges on. The manufacturer of goods puts all his taxation on to the price of his goods,

and of course collects it from the purchasers. But the man who has to depend on overseas markets for his surplus is the unfortunate man who pays the piper every time. I get extremely disgusted when I hear hon. members decrying the farmers and saying they will not pay wages. The farmer is as honest as any other man in the community. If the farmer does not pay his employees in some instances, it is because he finds he is unable to do so, but that seldom happens. To talk about men on the land desiring to employ hands at low rates is ridiculous. Members sitting on the Government cross-benches have from time to time mutilated the statement I made in that regard, and they have done it for the purpose of leading the public to misunderstand me. They know very well that when I said we should not make the conditions applying to sustenance workers too attractive, I was referring to single men. I tell Government members that to-day single men are not getting any help from the Government at all. I have endeavoured repeatedly to get assistance for them, but I have been pointedly refused and told by the Minister that it was not the function of the Government to assist them. Those single men can sleep on the Esplanade; they can cover themselves with newspapers as they were doing when we took office; they can scratch for food where they can get it!

Mr. Sleeman: And that was too attractive!

Hon. C. G. LATHAM: Members opposite can make capital out of my statement that our industries should be able to get such labour as they can carry. I do not care one iota what they say. I am not depending on my position in this House for an existence, but if they think they can hound me out of public life by making mis-statements about me, they can go for their lives.

The Deputy Premier: Sob-stuff.

Hon. C. G. LATHAM: It is not. The Minister talked about some statements that were made by the member for East Perth (Mr. Hughes), but I have heard some of the filthiest statements made by him and hurled at us.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! The hon. member is getting away from the subject.

The Deputy Premier: On a point of order, the Leader of the Opposition has not heard me make filthy statements; I do not make them.

Hon. C. G. LATHAM: May I tell the Deputy Premier some of them, and he can judge for himself.

Mr. SPEAKER: No, I will draw the hon. member's attention to the fact that he is well away from the amendment.

Hon. C. G. LATHAM: Then I will return to it. I am not here for my remarks to be misreported and misinterpreted by members opposite. I have always honoured my word. I am not like some public men who say that should the necessity arise, they will break their word; I will not do so. The workers will always get a fair deal from me while I am in public life, irrespective of the side of the House on which I may be sitting. When we talk about the farming community, I deplore the spectacle of a Minister telling us that the State has lost all this money, when, in point of fact, any such loss was caused by the muddling of the Deputy Premier himself. The group settlement scheme is a monument to maladministration. Does the Minister pretend to tell me that the group settlers received the benefit of £1,250,000 spent, year after year, for three years? When the Minister took over the Lands Department, he spent £780,000 during the first year he was there.

The Deputy Premier: On them?

Hon. C. G. LATHAM: No, not on them; you squandered it. Of course that money was not spent on the farmers. Then a magnanimous Government came along and wrote it off. The ex-Premier made the statement on one occasion, "We advanced £7,000,000 and we wrote off £4,000,000." That was not a statesmanlike utterance, although I give Mr. Collier the credit for being a very good man in public life. Moreover, if that was his statement, the fault was not his but that of his Ministers. To-day one of the worst settlements we have to handle—I do not desire to break the hearts of the people there—is the one south from Southern Cross where the miners were placed on holdings. It certainly was a pity to put men, who were entitled to better treatment, on such land. It is for the purpose of assisting those farmers that the Minister for Lands is getting a little of his own back. He will get a great deal more when we discuss the Estimates, for by that time I shall have been able to go into the matter more fully and shall supply the facts, which practice I like to adopt. There was the 3,500 farm scheme that the Minister repudiates to-day, but the

fact remains that those men were put there during his administration, and the undertaking was given them, not in writing but verbally, was that they would receive £1,500 per farm. We know all the facts; that was the implied provision that was made for those settlers who are engaged in an industry that has done so much for the State in the past. Those men find themselves in the position, due to the fact that the price of their commodity is so low, that they cannot make ends meet. Let us be sympathetic, and let them feel that we who are in charge of the affairs of State will give them reasonable and sympathetic treatment. The State will reap the benefit. Members who represent Fremantle constituencies know very well that the most prosperous time for the workers there was when they had the greatest quantity of wheat to handle.

Mr. Sleeman: And now you are killing them with dust.

Hon. C. G. LATHAM: The member for Fremantle (Mr. Sleeman) refers to dust in connection with bulk handling of wheat, but he does not say that the Labour Government introduced the system of handling cement in bulk, only to make the declaration later, "We have done wonderfully well because the scheme has saved us a lot of money."

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member is getting away from the amendment again.

Hon. C. G. LATHAM: If it were not for the bulk handling facilities, more men would be employed handling wheat, but would we get any financial advantage from that? Of course not. From a Governmental point of view, what does it matter about a little bit of cement? When the interests of our main industry are at stake and we can save £250,000 in the purchase of sacks from the Calcutta market, surely we should effect that saving. The hon. member suggests that we did not promote bulk handling, but the facts are that we did all we possibly could. Then the Minister had his leg pulled by the company, which enabled him to publish a certain letter during the election campaign. These improvements did deprive men from getting employment from that particular source, but progress will force itself upon us irrespective of whether we desire it or not. I make this appeal on behalf of those who are engaged

in industry in adverse and unfortunate conditions. At least let us be generous and endeavour to ascertain what we can do for them. I do not want to be on the Treasury Bench, but I want the Government to be sympathetic to people who are engaged in our principal industry.

HON. W. D. JOHNSON (Guildford-Midland—on amendment) [9.58]: I suggest to the member for West Perth (Mr. McDonald) that he does not proceed with his amendment, but asks leave to withdraw it.

Hon. C. G. Latham: He will not get the chance.

Hon. W. D. JOHNSON: I would rather the Leader of the Opposition forced the amendment on the House than the member for West Perth who deservedly has a reputation for not being mixed up in political trickery. The amendment is a political trick. The member for West Perth may have been perfectly unconscious of what he was doing when he drafted the amendment. When doing so, I do not think he quite realised the effect it would have on other members. The position I submit to him is that when the member for East Perth (Mr. Hughes) moved his amendment, the former, when analysing it, discovered, as he has already explained, that it would be wrong to support it, as it would amount to conveying to part-time workers that they would derive some assistance that it would be difficult to provide. Not having detailed information he hesitated, and gave the reason why he did so. After analysing the position he decided he must get out of the difficulty somehow, and this afternoon he drafted the amendment now before the House. The member for West Perth forgets that he will put some members in a worse position than that in which he finds himself. I do not think he intends to force anyone into that predicament. When he drafted that amendment this afternoon he must have known the Government were busy in regard to a review of the position on the very lines suggested by the amendment. I am speaking of a review of that portion of his amendment dealing with sustenance workers. At a party meeting in the early stage of this session we were informed that the Government were giving special attention to the question of getting away from part-time employment and I was authorised to make an official statement to the public that that

was receiving special consideration, and had been specially debated at the party meeting. The member for West Perth must have known that, because it was in the public Press, and it must have convinced him that that Government were applying themselves on exactly the lines of his amendment. Finding himself in difficulties, he drafts his amendment in face of all those facts and the Minister for Employment tells him definitely that the Government are doing exactly what he suggests should be done. And his amendment, as the Leader of the House has explained, casts doubt on the sincerity of the Government and questions whether they are really going to do what the Minister says they are doing at the moment. The Minister even went to the length of saying when the improved conditions would come into operation. What does this amendment mean? It means that we are called upon to vote on an amendment of no-confidence in the Government because they will not do what they say they are doing. I submit to the member for West Perth that that is not a reasonable position in which to put any of us. I know he did not intend it but it is a very old political trick, that of anticipating what the Government are going to do and then moving a motion suggesting that it be done; so that the Opposition gets the credit of any improved condition that is given to the people. That is exactly what the hon. member suggests. He suggests that we vote on the amendment so that he will get the credit of having suggested what the Government are already doing. If we vote for the amendment, we vote with him as not having confidence in the Government's statement, as not believing that the work is being done, and not giving credit to the statement that the improved conditions will come into operation on or about the 5th October. If we vote against the amendment, we are open to be accused of denying improvements to the conditions of the people concerned; not immediately, because at present it is in the public mind; but after it has gone out of the public mind, "Hansard" will be produced to prove that on a certain date we voted against improved conditions for the relief workers. I urge the hon. member to realise exactly where he is placing members. He found his difficulty and tried to overcome it, but in face of what the Minister has stated this afternoon, he is

placing us in a worse position than that in which he found himself. I suggest to him that he does not try to force the amendment.

THE MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE

(Hon. F. J. S. Wise—Gascoyne—on amendment) [10.4]: Briefly, I desire to clarify the position in connection with the distressed farmers in a certain area, to which the Leader of the Opposition a few minutes ago briefly referred. I desire to correct a possible misinterpretation of something that he said, and I feel he will have no objection to that because it will be supplying the true facts of the case. I refer to the area known as the Esperance settlement, which the Leader of the Opposition accused the present Minister for Lands of having initiated. It is very clearly set out in Part II. of the report of the Agricultural Bank Commissioners, not only who initiated that settlement, but who insisted that that settlement be carried on.

Mr. Marshall: H. K. Maley found it and declared it a new province.

The MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE: It is very clearly set out that on the 25th February, 1920, the then Minister for Lands, who had the support of the present Leader of the Opposition, sent a very definite statement—

Hon. C. G. Latham: I was not here. Never mind, go on.

The MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE: —to those in control of land settlement at that time, and it was signed by Sir James Mitchell, the then Minister for Lands, that in connection with the Esperance-Mallee area, it was to be an instruction to proceed with the subdivision of the Mallee lands at once; dams were to be put down and certain areas to be cropped. Objection was at once raised by the late Mr. A. R. Richardson, then chairman of the Industries Assistance Board, who said the members of the board must disclaim all responsibility for the loss and disappointments, which they considered must inevitably follow the settlement of that area, which was pushed on by the then Minister for Lands. So it is quite idle and useless for the Leader of the Opposition to say that the present Minister for Lands initiated that settlement, or had anything to do with it.

Hon. C. G. Latham: I did not say "initiated" it.

The MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE: The hon. member said the present Minister for Lands was responsible for the Esperance settlement.

Hon. C. G. Latham: Yes, I will show you presently.

The MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE: Following on the objection by the then chairman of the Industries Assistance Board, a further instruction was given as follows:—

You cannot be held responsible for any failure of the land to do what is expected of it. (Sgd.) The Minister for Lands.

The disaster that befell those men who were forced into that district to take up land which was in doubt at that time was saved from being a complete disaster by the action of the present Minister for Lands who reconstructed that area—by the officers immediately in control, and by direction of the present Minister for Lands. The Leader of the Opposition knows that, so why should he endeavour to mislead the House by saying that the present Minister for Lands initiated that settlement.

Hon. C. G. Latham: No, I said he was responsible for it.

The MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE: And the only settlement possible in that district has been made possible by the reconstruction initiated by the present Minister.

MR. HUGHES (East Perth—on amendment) [10.8]: I feel that all the abuse that has been hurled upon me during this debate has not been without result because for the first time in the last decade the position of the unemployed has been discussed before this Chamber and viewed from various angles. I do not quite understand why the member for West Perth is worried about the application of the previous amendment. We must realise that there are new standards abroad, and even at the risk of having the epithets hurled at me that I had from the Leader of the House, who in his speech likened me to a man he knew whose domestic life was rotten—yet the Minister said he never made filthy statements—I could say something particularly nasty to the hon. member if I cared to get on to the question of domestic life. In addressing himself to the amendment, the Leader of the House referred to my domestic life and I hope I

will not be precluded from answering his remarks.

Mr. SPEAKER: I can assure the hon. member he is not going to address himself to any of the speeches made on the previous amendment, but is going to address himself to this amendment. He can make up his mind about that.

Mr. HUGHES: Well, I will answer the Leader of the House on that aspect in public at any time and at any place, and will not run off to New Zealand at the public expense if he accepts the challenge.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member must confine his remarks to the amendment. I hope I shall not have to keep getting on my feet to tell him so.

The Deputy Premier interjected.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! The Minister should know better than to interject, especially when the Speaker is on his feet.

The Deputy Premier: I am sorry.

Mr. HUGHES: Of course I bow to your ruling, Mr. Speaker. The Leader of the House said that from only two sources could we get additional money for the relief of the unemployed and part-time workers and necessitous farmers, and he said that both of those avenues are dried up. I say the hon. gentleman is entirely wrong. As is very ably demonstrated by Lloyd George in his book on "War Debts and Reparations," there is no limit to the distribution of wealth by means of internal taxation and internal borrowing. So long as we are not obliged to go to foreign countries to borrow money, those sources of wealth are not dried up. We were told that the member for Nedlands is receiving £6,000 per annum. If the hon. member is receiving that amount and a so-called Labour Government is compelling a man to keep a wife and two children on 52s. a week, is it not time that we used the legislative machinery to compel the hon. member to disgorge some of this £6,000 per annum? If I have four well-paid jobs, as the Minister for Employment asserted, some of my employers must be doing what has been alleged against the farmers—defaulting. If I have four well-paid employments, why do not the Government bring in taxation to compel me to disgorge some of my earnings for the benefit of less-fortunate fellow-citizens? I will swap my estate to-morrow, assets and liabilities, with any member on the Government side of the House.

Mr. Marshall: I will take you on.

Mr. HUGHES: The hon. member has five children, but the youngest of them will be earning before my eldest is earning. It is said that the member for West Perth (Mr. McDonald) will get nowhere by the investigation he proposes. I submit that every discussion we have in this House, every effort we make to get the community to realise their obligations to the less fortunate citizens is in the interests of those people and is getting us somewhere. The member for Guildford-Midland (Hon. W. D. Johnson) need not worry about the member for West Perth claiming the credit, because I assure him that if I had not launched the previous amendment, the member for West Perth would not have launched this one. As regards getting money from the Federal Government, it is absurd to say that the Loan Council are limiting us to what we are receiving at present. As a matter of fact they are providing a £1,000,000 deficit for Queensland this year. At the recent meeting of the Loan Council the Prime Minister stated that arrangements had been made to borrow £31,000,000 in the previous year, but owing to inability to spend it they had had to carry over £5,000,000.

Mr. Lambert: No, £3,000,000.

The Deputy Premier: That is something new.

Mr. HUGHES: It was published in the "West Australian" that they had a carry-over of £5,000,000 and the Labour Premier of Queensland asked for funds to meet a deficit of £1,000,000. It is absurd for Ministers to say that, if we incur any more liabilities, the Loan Council will not finance them. There is no need for the Loan Council to finance them. Ultimately the continuous borrowing, not only in Australia, but in other parts of the world, will cause such a stage to be reached that nations will repudiate through sheer inability to carry the load. I do not suggest that we should evade our responsibilities by borrowing money at high rates of interest and passing the burden on to posterity. We should be prepared to readjust matters by means of a redistribution of wealth through taxation. I would sooner see no one above the basic wage than I would see one man below it. If it is necessary to take from me, who have four well-paid jobs, according to the gentleman who discovered a filth-factory in East Perth and, I am happy to say, removed it when he departed, then a way is open to the Govern-

ment to do it. I have one job at £600 a year as a member of Parliament and I am paying financial emergency tax at the rate of 9d. in the pound, exactly the same rate as is being paid by a man on £400 a year. I say that I should be paying 1s. in the pound. The Government have said that a man on £5 a week must pay 5d. in the pound and a man on £6 a week must pay 6d. in the pound. On that line of reasoning I should be paying 1s. on £600, and I would gladly pay it, too, provided I knew it would be applied for the relief of people less fortunate than myself. But I have strong objection to the proceeds of the tax being used as money is being used at present to give Ministers on the Treasury bench another £6, £7 or £8 a week. The Government found £100,000 this year in order to increase the salaries of people in receipt of over £10 a week. Then members have the audacity to say they are sympathetic to the unemployed. We heard about hypocrisy to-night. We heard about the hypocrisy of the Leader of the Opposition in supporting my amendment. I say in defence of the hon. member that that was not a sign of hypocrisy; it was a sign of intellectual evolution. We have plenty of money in this State. I do not know whether I shall be in order in quoting from the Press of to-day.

Mr. SPEAKER: No, the hon. member is not allowed to read a newspaper in this House.

Mr. HUGHES: Members may have noticed in the "West Australian" that whereas for August of last year the Treasury showed a deficit in the vicinity of £50,000, for August of this year there is a slight surplus. This indicates that the Treasury is bursting with money, literally bursting with it. The conversion of a substantial deficit for a month into a small surplus is more than a little burst. There must be plenty of money.

Mr. Withers: People are generally better off on pay-day than they are the week after.

Mr. HUGHES: What particular pay-day does the 31st August represent in Government affairs? What particular pay-day is there about that date which does not equally apply to the 30th September? The Deputy Premier talked about the money they had written off on account of the farmers. That was only making a virtue of necessity. The money was written off group settlement

because it was a bad debt. The people of the State had to pay that and are paying it. He talks about writing down five millions. Last year, from the financial emergency tax, the Government received nearly £850,000, and from the hospital tax nearly £200,000.

Hon. C. G. Latham: £206,000.

Mr. HUGHES: That represents over a million pounds in revenue that the Government received last year.

The Deputy Premier: It is all spent.

Mr. HUGHES: The Minister increases his own salary £6 or £7 a week. To give him this increase, he increased the salary of everyone else receiving over £10 a week. I do not object to the Minister increasing his own salary. If he could say that no one was receiving below the basic wage, then Ministers would be entitled to their pre-depression salaries. But they have got the increase at the expense of the unemployed in the metropolitan area. If they had not received these increases, another £100,000 more per annum would have been available. In order to give these increases, they had to allow the financial emergency measure to lapse. The result was that everybody earning over £500 a year had his pre-depression salary restored. On the showing of the previous Treasurer, that cost the country £60,000 for six months. We hear a lot about hypocrisy, and about not being able to apply a wages tax to the relief of the unemployed. That was characterised as political hypocrisy. In 1932 when the attempt was first made to establish a wages tax, the member for Geraldton (Hon. J. C. Willcock), according to "Hansard" of the 20th October of that year moved an amendment, that a trust fund be established at the Treasury and expended in providing work for the unemployed. That hon. gentleman is now the Premier. He moved that a wages tax be imposed and earmarked exclusively for the relief of the unemployed. He said that a wages tax should be established as a trust fund and used for no other purpose than this. He was supported by a number of members. I will read the division list on the side of the ayes showing that the following members voted for this amendment: Messrs. Coverley, Corboy, Cunningham, Hegney, Johnson, Kenneally, Lamond, Mar-

shall, Millington, Sleeman, F. C. L. Smith, Troy, Wansbrough, Willecock, Withers, Nulsen and Miss Holman. The pairs were Messrs. Wilson, Collier, McCallum and Panton. In 1932 all these gentlemen considered that a wages tax should be used exclusively as a trust fund for the relief of the unemployed. In 1936, when the emergency tax fund exceeds £800,000, all these gentlemen say, "It is nonsensical to endeavour to make this a trust fund for the relief of the unemployed." That is hypocrisy. No one can take any exception if I use strong language in the House, because I have been the subject of abuse under Parliamentary privilege for the last three years. I do not desire to use Parliamentary privilege. If I had my way, I would abolish it, and make a man just as responsible for what he says on the floor of the House as when he says it outside. I would make members stand up to what they say in the House.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member is getting away from the amendment.

Mr. HUGHES: Those gentlemen who in 1932 wanted a wages tax converted into a trust fund for the relief of the unemployed, in 1936 say it is nonsensical.

Hon. P. D. Ferguson: They were in Opposition then.

Mr. HUGHES: They have every right to their opinion, but I object to them accusing of political hypocrisy other people who claim that this money should be employed for the very purpose for which members opposite said in 1932 it should be employed. The unemployed unfortunately have been the plaything of politics for the last six years. The Deputy Premier says to-day the Government have not the money to provide full-time work. Money that now comes into the hands of the Government is over a million and a half in excess of what it was three years ago. He says they have no money, and yet three years ago when the wages tax was producing only £200,000 they issued a circular telling the unemployed they would give them three months full-time work, and sustenance during standing-down. Not one of the unemployed has had that promise fulfilled.

Mr. Hegney: Yes, they have.

Mr. HUGHES: They have had full-time work lasting one week in six.

Mr. Raphael: I can quote one man, namely Marshall of Carlisle.

Mr. HUGHES: One solitary man.

Mr. Raphael: I could give you a hundred.

Mr. HUGHES: One man on full-time work notwithstanding that the unemployed were promised three months' full-time work and sustenance during the stand-down. If the Government can give full-time work to Marshall of Carlisle, why not to the workers of East Perth? Why this favouritism to the Victoria Park electorate?

Mr. Raphael: They might not want full-time work in East Perth.

Mr. HUGHES: That is a poor old get-out. Why does this man Marshall of Carlisle get full-time work? He may be related to some one of more importance than Marshall of Carlisle. He might be a relative of the member for Murchison.

Mr. Marshall: He is not related to me, anyhow!

Mr. HUGHES: The Government got out of that promise by saying they had not the money to give these people full-time work. They want us now to accept, without qualification, the board's statement that on the 5th October something is going to be done—they do not tell us what. If we sit down till the 5th October and then want to know something in this House, they will say, "Why didn't you take the matter up on the Address-in-reply?" That was how, when I tried to earmark the money, they hid behind the Standing Orders. We would not be justified in waiting till the 5th October. According to Treasury figures, we are now getting a surplus where we used to have a deficit. We ought to be told immediately what is the Government's plan of relief, because we have had painful experiences in taking the Government's word in respect of unemployment. The member for Guildford-Midland (Hon. W. D. Johnson) pleads with the member for West Perth not to press the amendment, because it will place some members in an awkward position. The member for West Perth is doing a public service when he is making other members show in this House whether or not they are sympathetic to the unemployed.

Mr. Fox: But that hon. member will not agree to additional taxation.

Mr. HUGHES: The hon. member interjecting will not go as far as 1s. in the pound for himself. Will he go to 5s. in the pound for the man on £60 a week? I have risked

your displeasure, Mr. Speaker, time and again in trying to extract from the hon. member how far he will go. Why should the Government hesitate, without reference to anybody on this side of the Chamber? Why this sudden solicitude for the wealthy men on this side of the House? If the money is needed for the relief of unemployed workers and distressed farmers, members opposite should be prepared to vote for the proposal no matter what we on this side may think. In order to ensure that everybody gets full-time work and decent wages and conditions, I am prepared to vote for a Bill that will carry the emergency tax up to as much as 10s. in the pound. We would then be in this position: A man receiving £120 a week would be obliged to contribute £60 a week to the Treasury. Of course, the more we took from such a man by way of emergency taxation, the less State income tax would he pay.

Mr. Hegney: You would only get £130,000 by that means.

Mr. HUGHES: Only £130,000! I think the hon. member has overlooked the grades. By taxing at 4d. in the pound on £4, 5d. in the pound on £5, 7d. in the pound on £6, and up to 9d. on £80, and stopping there, we get £840,000. But if we continued on a graduated scale, the rates would be 9d. on £9, 10d. on £10, 15d. on £15, and 30d. on £30. I refuse to believe that all we would get out of that taxation would be £130,000.

Mr. Hegney: I did not say that.

Mr. HUGHES: Then I am sorry I misunderstood the hon. member. I thought he said that a graduated scale of taxation up to 10s. in the pound would produce only £130,000. If that refers only to the higher group, look at what we would get from groups lower down in the scale; and even then our taxation would not be out of the ordinary. Take the position in Europe today. John Gunther, an authority on European internal politics, says in his work "Inside Europe" that in most European countries 40 per cent. of the State's income is needed for armaments. Take Western Australia in comparison; we do not have to bear taxation for armaments; we do not have to allot 40 per cent. of our total income to that purpose. We are free from that. Our taxation can be expanded, but of course it would not be necessary to expand our taxation to such an extent that everybody would be put on full-time work. Once we got a

certain number on full-time work their day by day and week by week spending would create a turnover that would provide for the balance of the unemployed. In 1936 we ought to say that we stand for a re-alignment. I think Norman Angell calls it temperamental re-adjustment. In his new edition of "The Great Illusion" Norman Angell says that we must have a temperamental re-adjustment if this civilisation is to survive. There is no reason why we in Western Australia should lag behind Rumania or Czecho-Slovakia or America. Even in the United States, the most individualistic country in the world, the presidential election is going to be fought on the question of The Forgotten Man. The Forgotten Man of Western Australia is the relief worker of East Perth, a place the member for Northam has referred to as a filth factory. Admittedly the workers of East Perth do not live in such palatial residences as that which the Minister inhabits since he attained to office. Now, the filth factory—

Mr. SPEAKER: I think the hon. member had better get away from that argument and return to the amendment.

Mr. HUGHES: The Minister was allowed to indulge in it.

Mr. SPEAKER: The Minister was not allowed to do that. This is a new amendment altogether. The hon. member has wandered all round the place. I have given him every latitude, and now he wants to take a little more.

Mr. HUGHES: I rose to answer the contention of the Leader of the House that both our avenues for obtaining more money are choked—land taxation and income taxation. I assume that that is a definite declaration of policy that the Government will not increase taxation for the benefit of necessitous farmers and relief of unemployed workers.

Mr. Raphael: The member for West Perth assumed that that was so.

Mr. HUGHES: As we know—

Mr. Raphael: The Leader of the House never said that at all.

Mr. HUGHES: I think the Leader of the House did say it. He agreed with the member for West Perth, and used, concerning that hon. member, a word which we have not heard in the House this session. The Minister was so pleased with the member for West Perth that he referred to him as a gentleman,

the first time one member on this side of the House has been referred to in such terms during the present debate. The Deputy Premier said specifically that the member for West Perth (Mr. McDonald) was right and that we could not get any more money from the Commonwealth or by means of taxation.

Mr. Raphael: He did not say that at all. He remarked that the member for West Perth had said that, and he asked how it was to be rectified.

Mr. HUGHES: How does the member for Victoria Park suggest we can rectify it?

Mr. Raphael: For a start, you can sit down.

Mr. HUGHES: It is absurd; the member for Victoria Park (Mr. Raphael) knows he can stand much additional taxation.

Mr. Raphael: I would not mind owing more taxation, but not paying more.

Mr. HUGHES: Even at the risk of being told that I am using the unemployed for political propaganda purposes, I propose to go on until there are no unemployed. If Government members desire to put one over me in that direction, why not put the men back on full-time work, and thus prevent me from using that method of political propaganda? However, I am not ashamed of the charge. When I supported members sitting on the Government side of the House, you will remember, Mr. Speaker, that we paid a man £6 a week to organise the unemployed to demonstrate outside the Treasury buildings. We did that because we believed then, as I believe now, that the lower ranks of the workers must be organised in their struggle for better conditions, for if they are not, they will not secure any improvement. Take some of our friends who sit on the Government cross-benches. They do not lift their voices on behalf of the relief workers.

The Minister for Mines: Rats!

Mr. HUGHES: They voted against making money available for them.

Mr. Raphael: They voted against your amendment because they wanted to vote against hypocrisy.

Mr. HUGHES: The member for West Perth has more or less toned down the original amendment in the one he has drafted.

His amendment is not acceptable to me as compared with the one I moved, because of the fact that the money is there. If the amendment now before the Chair is carried and an examination is made of the position, it will be found that, in comparison with European countries and with the other States of Australia, we in Western Australia are a much under-taxed people. I would not limit relief measures to taxation but would extend the examination to other avenues whereby we can distribute amongst the people the power to buy the things they want from the other section of the community who have those things for sale. It is rank hypocrisy for Government members to tell the unemployed that they are sympathetic, seeing that when they got the chance to vote some relief for the unemployed, they opposed it. The unemployed are not so unsophisticated as to accept that. Having swallowed the famous 1933 promise, they are by no means unsophisticated now. They realise to-day that they have to move for themselves, and we would be doing the unemployed an injustice if we accepted the promise of the Minister for Employment that as from the 5th October next something nebulous is to be done. If something is to be done on the 5th October, it is only because certain of us have organised the unemployed in order that they may demand better conditions and so force the hands of the Government. It must be remembered that the ex-Premier said there would be no alteration in the policy and no reduction in the amount of money available for relief work. Now we are told there is to be some improvement: if that is so, it is merely because we have stirred the unemployed to shift for themselves. We have told them that they, as the forgotten men of Western Australia, must do as their American brethren have done, and demand redress. We have told them that they must force the position. We have succeeded, and I am glad, even despite all the abuse hurled at me. The Minister for Employment can wax eloquent and search the dictionary to get all the terms he wants and he can turn to Shakespeare to find filthy, vile epithets that he and his colleagues have already made use of about me, not openly but under cover of parliamentary privilege. I support the amendment.

MR. RAPHAEL (Victoria Park—on amendment) [10.46]: I cannot allow the opportunity to pass without adding to the debate on the amendment, which has been moved to ease the feelings of the member for West Perth (Mr. McDonald). In his introductory remarks that hon. member told the House that he was unable to support the amendment moved by the member for East Perth (Mr. Hughes) but was prepared to allow himself a clear get-out, leaving the baby to be carried by members of the Labour Party. I tell both the member for East Perth and the member for West Perth that they are not the custodians either of the thoughts or of the deeds of the unemployed. The chairman of the Parliamentary Labour Party (Hon. W. D. Johnson) has already told the House that the first thing discussed at the party meeting was that of unemployment. Yet the member for East Perth suggests that, owing solely to his efforts, the time has arrived when he has moved the Labour Party into some humane effort on behalf of the unemployed.

Mr. Hughes: I did not call them the Labour Party.

Mr. RAPHAEL: It would not matter what the hon. member called them; they would not take any notice of his remarks. We can take with a grain of salt any suggestion by the hon. member. As other speakers have been allowed to diverge a little from the amendment, I wish to deal with one of the meetings held in Victoria Park by the member for East Perth.

Mr. SPEAKER: Then the hon. member will be definitely out of order, and he will not do it.

Mr. RAPHAEL: I desire to connect one matter with another. As a certain amount of latitude has been allowed other speakers—

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! The hon. member is reflecting upon the Chair and that is quite out of order. The hon. member can make a speech without reflecting on the Chair and I hope he will do so.

Mr. RAPHAEL: Then that curtails my remarks in that I cannot link up one matter with another. The position of the unemployed in this State, as compared with the conditions operating in other States, could be taken into consideration by this House. We all realise that the unemployed have been utilised for party political propaganda

by Nationalists, Country Party members and Independents alike. I have had the pleasure of listening to speeches by the member for East Perth on seven occasions.

Hon. P. D. Ferguson: You must have liked them.

Mr. RAPHAEL: On each occasion it was the same story and I enjoyed it. He has a wonderful memory for his own fibs, and is generally amusing. The unemployed of South Australia, until the British Medical Association took action, were treated wretchedly. For instance, a child up to 12 months of age was granted 1s. 9d. per week to be reared on one pint of milk per day, and from 12 months until it was 14 years of age it was granted 2s. 8d. per week, not in cash, but in orders for groceries and food. In Western Australia we are not in a happy position, for we claim that 7s. per week is not sufficient to live on, and so action has been taken to induce the present Minister to increase the amount. May I say that for decency's sake, following on a re-shuffle of the Cabinet, opportunity might have been given the Government to function before being attacked as they have been. A number of young men, politically young men, have gone into that Cabinet and to my mind they are going to make good. I think those men should be given opportunity to prove their worth before being attacked by the political heads of the Opposition of the House. The member for West Perth is usually fair, but this amendment constitutes the most unjust action he has taken in the House. He knows that the Minister for Employment has been in his job for only a few months, and I ask what the hon. member could have done in that short period to improve the condition of the workers. We have a definite promise that the Government will improve those conditions of the workers that come under Government relief. If we are to believe what we have been told by the Minister to-night, if extra taxation is not levied and further funds not raised and the scheme is not put into operation, money must be taken from other sources to recompense the amount that will be used to find full-time jobs for the part-time workers. Would the hon. member suggest that the widows and children receiving payments from the Child Welfare Department should be taxed for this purpose?

Mr. Hughes: No, I would tax you.

Mr. RAPHAEL: Well my friend has four jobs while I have but two, so whatever taxation I may have to pay I shall have the satisfaction of knowing that he has to pay on all four of his jobs. Has the hon. gentleman given consideration to those thousands of men who were turned out of the railway service by the coalition Government during their regime? Would the hon. member support a resolution that certain of those men have to be put on a lower wage in order to make up for that deficit? His idea is only for increased taxation. How many members on that side who so ably walked across the floor to support him in his amendment will support him in his new taxation scheme? I think he would be a beacon light for those members to gaze upon, but I feel also that he would be gazed upon with apathy by those members. Would the member for Subiaco (Mrs. Cardell-Oliver) raise her voice in support of taxation to give the kiddies an extra pint of milk per day?

Mrs. Cardell-Oliver: Decidedly.

Mr. RAPHAEL: There was another proposal put up to the hon. member, who so ably went before the unemployed for their votes, but she was not so keen about that; she said she would give it consideration. I say definitely that the hon. member, if she was sincere in her talk of how she wanted to assist the unemployed she should have made up her mind about the second plan also. I do not intend to labour the question any longer, for I will have opportunity on the main Address-in-reply debate to speak my mind more fully but I do hope that we on this side shall let it be definitely known where we stand, that we are four square behind the Government and are going to give that Government the chance to function, just as the people gave them a mandate to function. I hope that the Opposition will not be given opportunity to take control of the Treasury benches. We have been given a mandate from the people and we are going to carry out that mandate for the next three years. I hope that when the 5th October arrives, not only will members opposite be satisfied, but even the member for West Perth will also be satisfied with the improved conditions that will be forthcoming, so far as the Government can find the money.

Amendment put, and a division taken with the following result:—

Ayes	15
Noes	22

Majority against 7

AYES.

Mr. Brockman	Mr. North
Mrs. Cardell-Oliver	Mr. Sampson
Mr. Hill	Mr. Shearn
Mr. Hughes	Mr. J. M. Smith
Mr. Keenan	Mr. Thorp
Mr. Latham	Mr. Warner
Mr. McDonald	Mr. Douey
Mr. McLarty	(Teller.)

NOES.

Mr. Coverley	Mr. Needham
Mr. Cross	Mr. Nulsen
Mr. Doust	Mr. Raphael
Mr. Fox	Mr. Rodoreda
Mr. Hawke	Mr. Sleeman
Mr. Hegney	Mr. Styants
Miss Holman	Mr. Tonkin
Mr. Johnson	Mr. Troy
Mr. Lambert	Mr. Wiza
Mr. Marshall	Mr. Withers
Mr. Munzie	Mr. Wilson
	(Teller.)

PAIR.

AYES.	NOES.
Mr. Stubbs	Mr. Collier
Mr. Ferguson	Mr. Millington
Mr. Patrick	Mr. Willcock

Amendment thus negatived.

On motion by Mr. Sampson, debate adjourned.

House adjourned at 11.2 p.m.

Legislative Assembly.

Wednesday, 2nd September, 1936.

	PAGE
Questions: Iron imports	292
Railways, permanent way material	293
Group Settlements—1, case of Coudridge; 2, area held by Michellides, Ltd.	298
Fremantle gaol, young prisoners	298
Report, Standing Orders Committee	298
Address-in-reply, ninth day	293

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

QUESTION—IRON IMPORTS.

Mr. NULSEN asked the Premier: How many tons of iron were imported into West-