State. If there is no opposition from the police—which means the licensing inspectors—an application goes through without much trouble. It has always seemed to me that £384 a year is an inadequate salary for an officer of such great influence. There are five inspectors of police drawing £420. In my opinion the liquor inspector, who is the head of the liquor inspection branch, is at least as important, and has at least as great responsibilities, as any other police inspector.

The MINISTER FOR JUSTICE: I will go into the whole question and give it full consideration.

Mr. MANN: I think this item of liquor inspector refers to an officer who was taken over from the State Hotels, and who has great experience in testing liquors. My reference is to Inspector McHenry. When the liquor inspection branch of the Police Department was established, he was the only man possessing a knowledge of liquor inspection; and he has had to coach the officers now working under him. I do not know what salary he drew while in the State Hotels, but in view of the importance of his present position the salary is inadequate.

Mr. DAVY: I find I was under a misapprehension. The officer I wished to refer to was the Chief Inspector of Licenses, Inspector O'Halloran, not the inspector of liquors.

Item, Inspectors, £4,437:

Mr. HUGHES: The officers who have been superseded should have an opportunity of showing they were efficient and should not have been overlooked. The board should have power to inquire into the cases of officers who have been victimised during the past few years. It is the duty of the Government to rectify such cases. If the careers of the men concerned had been taken into consideration, senior men would have been promoted. I was sorry to notice the attitude of the member for Mt. Margaret.

Mr. Taylor: You misunderstood me. I meant that, no matter how wisely a Minister might administer his department, there would always be some dissatisfaction.

Mr. HUGHES: I hope the Minister will give the men who have been superseded the right to go before the board and have their cases investigated. Had one or other of the senior men been given the opportunity to carry out the investigations in the case referred to, they would have succeeded. I know of one of the most shocking cases of victimisation that has occurred within the past six or seven years, and those circumstances should be reviewed as well.

Vote put and passed.

Progress reported.

House adjourned at 1.45 a.m. (Friday).

Legislative Council,

Tuesday, 28th October, 1924.

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

QUESTION—FRUIT MARKETING LEGISLATION.

Hon. J. DUFFELL asked the Colonial Secretary: 1, Is it a fact that the Minister for Agriculture, in reply to a deputation of fruit-growers in August last, asking for an Act to be passed on the lines of the Queensland Fruit Marketing Act, gave a definite assurance that he would introduce a similar Bill, but that there was no possibility of his doing so during the present session? 2, If this be correct, are the Government aware that the consequent delay in bringing forward such a Bill will be disastrous to many fruit-growers in this State inasmuch as the growers are being exploited by merchants and speculators?

The COLONIAL SECRETARY replied: 1, Yes. 2, No; but it is believed that the additional knowledge being obtained from Queensland will more than compensate for any disadvantage caused by delay.

BILL—INDUSTRIAL ARBITRATION ACT AMENDMENT.

Second Reading.

Debate resumed from 22nd October.

Hon. J. E. DODD (South) [4.35]: First of all I should like to thank the Colonial Secretary for having had a copy of the Act placed on each member's desk. It is a very wise thing to do, especially when there are so many amendments. Mr. Colebatch, as Minister, did it on several occasions, and it has been found of great convenience to members. Anything I may say on the Bill is entirely uninfluenced by any issue other than my own experience and convictions. Whatever takes place outside in respect of the Bill, has nothing to do with me. I am here to give utterance to my convictions, the result of my experience of industrial measures. If there is anything I can do to assist the Minister I will gladly do it. First of all I will support the Bill. I agree with most of its provisions, although there are some with which I do not agree. In importance the Bill transcends all other issues we have

had during the present session. When one looks into industrial arbitration and considers the power given to the court to exercise over the citizen, one cannot fail to appreciate the importance of the measure. No man has more power than has the President of the Arbitration Court. The court in its findings enters into almost every social relationship existing. The court can make or unmake the individual, and indeed can make or unmake the State. Immense powers were given to the court under the old Act. The Bill is extending those powers; and, further than that, is extending powers in an undesirable direction when it confers greater powers on the Minister administering arbitration. Now a few words about the necessity for arbitration, and why we believe in it. I am not going back very far. It is rather remarkable that in Great Britain and America, the two great English-speaking countries, Labour opposes compulsory arbitration, does not believe in it, will not have it at any price. The only arbitration that Labour in America agrees with is arbitration in the direction of helping the weakest in the community. Labour in America has agreed to a minimum wage board for women and children, but not for men. It is only in Australia, New Zealand and Canada, of the English-speaking countries, that arbitration is really in vogue. I remember when as a lad I had my first experience of strikes. A strike occurred in Wallaroo mines, South Australia. That strike did not do much good. Prices were low and wages were low. However, one thing that appealed to me in that strike was the subsequent victimisation. I want to explain what gives rise sometimes to the demands made. It was victimisation that gave rise to the demand for preference to unionists. I well remember that, as a result of that strike, men were boycotted for all time at the Wallaroo mines. One old gentleman, a follower of the same creed and a worshipper at the same church as the manager of the mine, was pitilessly boycotted. Only last year he was buried at Karrakatta at an age of something like 80 years. I know another old gentleman, now residing at Claremont, who was also boycotted after that strike. As a very young man I remember the Broken Hill strike in 1890. There had been a strike in 1888 with the object of imposing compulsory unionism throughout the Barrier mines. It was successful in the Broken Hill Proprietary. But in 1890, the year of the great maritime strike, a good deal of money was going out of Broken Hill to assist the maritime workers, when the mine owners decided upon retrenching as many men as they could. At last the unions took up the challenge and called out all the men in Broken Hill. The men came out. At that time good wages prevailed and so, too, did good prices. After six weeks of strike the men went back to a 46-hour week instead of the 48-hour week they had been working; and they had also the understanding that all men on the Barrier Range should be compelled to join a union and pay union dues; in fact the dues had to be paid before a man took up his pay at the mine office. We also had an agreement that any future troubles should be settled by arbitration. That was my first experience of arbitration. I should like to show what I consider to have been the break down of compulsory unionism at that time. Things went very well until 1892, when the mine owners declared they would have to work the mines on contract. They decided to terminate the agreement with the men. The whole trouble arose over that word "terminate." It was contended that the question of whether the agreement could be determined should be referred to arbitration. The mine owners held that they were entitled to terminate the agreement without arbitration. That brought about the big strike of 1892. Every man on the Barrier Range was a unionist, was compelled to be a unionist before he could get his money at the mines office. I have always said that compulsory unionism at that time was the weakest link in our chain. We were well supported by all the unions throughout Australia. We had a wonderful organisation, yet we were beaten out of sight. No union at Broken Hill to-day could be beaten as we were then; for the railway men are now organised, whereas at that time they were not. As I say, compulsory unionism was our weak link, for the men compelled to join the union were the first to give in. The result of that strike and of some shearers' strikes brought about the demand for arbitration. No individual nor any party holds a monopoly of humanitarian legislation. Party supporters are often to be heard saying, "We did this," and "We did that." But, after all, arbitration in Australia and in New Zealand was brought about by men, some of whom were Liberals, while others were of the Labour Party. As a party the Labour Party had very little to do with the establishment of arbitration. Even here in this State all our earliest laws for the bettering of the conditions of the worker were introduced by the James Government. They introduced compulsory arbitration in 1900, the Workers' Compensation Act, the Trade Unions Act, and several other Acts. No member of that Ministry belonged to the Labour Party. It remained for the Labour Party to try to better the system, and to introduce reforms, but so far as the beginning of arbitration is concerned, and many other reforms that followed, no one has a monopoly of the legislation. The great event at the end of the war was the Peace Treaty. I should like to say a few words upon the charter that was given by that treaty to Labour. It is one we would do well to study. I suppose most of those who attended the Peace Treaty at Versailles

were what we could call Tories, and a large number of Liberals. When they can issue such a charter as they did it shows that all parties at times endeavour to do something for the benefit of the world at large and humanity. Article 23 of the charter reads—

> That they will endeavour to secure and maintain fair and humane conditions of labour for men, women and children both of their own countries and in all countries to which their commercial and industrial relations extend, and for that purpose will establish and maintain the necessary international organisations.

The Preamble reads—

> Whereas the League of Nations has for its object the establishment of perpetual peace and such a peace can be established only if it is based on social justice, and whereas conditions of labour exist involving such injustice, hardship and privations to large numbers of people as to produce unrest so great that the peace and harmony of the world are imperilled, the high contracting parties, moved by sentiments of justice and humanity, as well as to secure the permanent peace of the world agree.

These were the principles—

> (1) That labour was not to be regarded as a commodity: (2) the right of association for all lawful purposes; (3) payment of an adequate wage; (4) eight-hours day, or a 48-hour week; (5) weekly rest, preferably Sunday; (6) abolition of child labour and provision for continuing education; (7) equal pay for men and women for equal work; (8) equitable treatment for all workers; (9) suitable inspection for men and women.

I doubt if a better charter than this could possibly be issued. It stands to the credit of those who constituted the Peace Treaty that they are willing to issue this to countries that, I suppose, are ten times more backward than British countries, and request that it should there be put into operation. I am pleased to say that many countries are putting it into operation. The first conference of the International Labour Office was held at Washington in 1919. It was that conference which decided to recommend the adoption of an eight hours' day. The last public address I gave other than in Parliament was on this very subject some four years ago when I spoke on the League of Nations from the industrial viewpoint. I said I regretted very much that the Labour Party would not send a delegate to the Washington Conference. Mr. Curtin and Mrs. Cowan were on the platform with me that night, and we had a good meeting. I was rather amused to read the criticism levelled at the Commonwealth Government because they had not ratified that recommendation. The Labour Party refused to send a delegate to take part in the agenda paper at that conference because they thought Australia was too far ahead in legislation. The United States Secretary of Labour, Mr. C. E. Hughes, opened the conference, and in doing so used these words—

> Since the days of Moses as the spokesman, the angel, the walking delegate of the brickmaker's of Israel until the present time, the relationship that should exist between employers and employee, the best means of securing the acme of production while safeguarding those who toil and the equitable distribution of that which has been produced have ever been present questions.

These are a few remarks I wish to make regarding the international office of labour to show what is being done in other parts of the world as well as in Australia. I am glad that since that time Mr. Curtin has been sent to Geneva to attend the last meeting of the Labour Convention there. It is wonderful what has been accomplished by that body in raising the status of the employees in some parts of the world, more especially in Asiatic countries. I should like to refer for a moment to the cost of strikes. Very often we hear people talking about the cost of arbitration, but one has only to take part in a few strikes to realise how much more costly they are than arbitration. If we knew the figures, some of us would be staggered by them. It is estimated that the six months' coal strike in England in 1912 cost £50,000,000. The Boer War cost Great Britain £200,000,000. If the strike had lasted three years it would have cost £100,000,000 more than that war did. The founder of arbitration was Pember Reeves of New Zealand. I commend this statement of the Minister for Labour in New Zealand when introducing a Bill there in 1894. I am not sure whether Pember Reeves was Minister then or not. At all events, the Minister said—

> The law was never intended to prevent strikes, and never could, and neither this nor any other law ever could. The object is to discredit strikes because they are a national calamity. Like boomerangs they generally come back and strike the man who throws them. This has been the case in our limited experience.

We can take that statement to heart. Many people say that arbitration has utterly failed because we still have strikes. No argument could be more absurd. Because we have a Criminal Code one does not say we should do away with the police, the magistrates, or the judges. The Criminal Code does not prevent crime. The Minister for Labour in the Legislative Assembly pointed out that we cannot expect to do away with strikes altogether. The only thing we can do is to attempt to discredit them. I have heard agreements cited showing that there was no

necessity for arbitration. Agreements made in Kalgoorlie have been pointed to as showing that there was no necessity for arbitration. If it had not been for the court behind the agreements, and the power of the court which could be called upon, I am sure that some of the agreements would never have been made. One side or the other would have broken away. The parties, however, knew the court was there, hence the agreements were entered into. I do not like to hear people say they are not in favour of arbitration. Sometimes failures might have been obviated if those in authority had said what they thought. It is often wiser to tell one's friends the truth than to gloss it over. If sometimes men were told what was likely to happen and that they would lose ground, I do not think there would be so many failures. The failures in arbitration have not been altogether due to the men, for employers have been fined for lockouts. Members will recollect the terrible time that some unions had in getting to the court before the last Act was passed. They were met at every turn by some technicality. The shop assistants could not get to the court until the amending Act of 1912. I have always thought arbitration was the right thing. If, however, a union does not want arbitration, let them strike it out of the rules and have nothing to do with it. They should not put it into the rules and then say, "We will strike if we wish." That is not a fair and honourable way of dealing with the matter. Some workers may say that arbitration law exists whether it is put in the rules or not, but it would be more honourable for a union or an employer, who does not intend to abide by arbitration, to cut it out of the rules altogether and say so. I am glad to say this does not represent the great majority. There are wild individuals in all phases of society who will say, "Perish the Labour movement, perish everything, perish the whole thing, so long as we get our aims; and to get our aims we are going to strike." Another party will say, "How can you strike in view of your constitution?" but the reply will be, "Scrap your constitution; move the chairman out of the chair, and have another meeting." That sort of action can only end in the defeat of the union. I have always opposed it. Every man who is in an industry should belong to a union. A man would be foolish who stood outside a union. I hope the Bill will accomplish what has been claimed for it. Whether it will or not, it is hard to say. I hope the various innovations proposed in the establishment of boards will so facilitate the settlement of disputes that they will do away with a lot of the friction of the past. The Bill has been copied largely from New South Wales, Queensland, New Zealand and the Commonwealth. I might say almost the whole of the Bill has been copied. The Government have been wise to profit by the experience which they have been able to gain from the various Acts in the other States. I do not agree with the contention of Mr. Lovekin that the very fact that we have these Acts before us is sufficient to show us what we can do to improve our laws here. That is a false argument. I also regret that Mr. Walsh was recalled from the Eastern States. Reports have often been obtained by sending to the Eastern States men employed in the Government service, but in regard to this matter, the sending of Mr. Walsh to the other side was quite justified. We want to know how the various boards operate in Queensland, in New South Wales and in other places. We know by their Acts of Parliament that those boards are in existence, but we have nothing whatever to guide us so far as arbitration is concerned, unless the information that we should have is contained in the file now on the Table of the House, and which, I regret to say I have not yet been able to read. I do not consider that there was any need to send all the members of the Royal Commission to the Eastern States to collect information, but Mr. Walsh was undoubtedly one of the most suitable officers to be obtained for the mission, and probably one of the most unbiassed. No one better than he could have been secured to find out for us what the nature of the work was that was being performed in the other States under the various Acts there. No fewer than nine measures dealing with arbitration have been introduced to the Western Australian legislature. The first was submitted in 1900, and that was in operation until 1902. In 1909 a short Bill was put through, and in 1911 the Scaddan Government brought in their first measure, which was rejected. In 1912 we passed the present Act. In 1914 we had a war measure which was also defeated. I had the privilege of piloting three of those Bills through this Chamber, and I hope Mr. Drew will have a happier time with this Bill than I had in 1912. Two Bills were brought in by the National Government, and now we have the 1924 Bill, making nine in all. The principal features of the Bill now before us are the extension of the term "worker," preference to unionists, the question of registration, appointment of a president and various boards, the basic wage, the 44-hour week, the Minister's power and the inspector's power, and the ballot for citation. Those are the matters that appeal to me. With regard to registration, there is no memorandum in the Bill with reference to Clause 3, nor have I been able to find that that clause has been copied from any other Act. I should like a good

deal more information upon this matter of the registration of unions before I record my vote. The registration confers very wide powers indeed. It practically does this, that any 15 persons can form a society and these 15 persons may represent 15 different industries. All the safeguards of the present Act as to being members of any particular industry, have been removed. There is some protection given in the amendment to Section 19, which provides that the registrar shall refuse to register a union provided there is a union to which the intending members can conveniently belong. That is all right so far as we go at the present time, but suppose a new place springs into existence. Suppose there is a new goldfield or a coal field discovered, or a new industry is started, it is possible for 15 men who belong to 15 different industries to apply to the registrar to become registered. No other union would be allowed to register after that, because those who had applied in the first place to be registered could get enough members to take in every branch of industry. I do not know whether that is the intention of the Labour Party or not, but I wish to say that it is the widest power given regarding registration in any Act that I can find. In Queensland, those who apply for registration must be members of a certain calling, and "calling" is defined. We do not define "calling" in our Act, although "calling" is mentioned in several places in the Act and in the Bill before us. But we do not define "calling" by itself. In Queensland there must be 20 members of a certain calling before they can register, and in New South Wales they have to be members of a trade union before they can register. When we read this in conjunction with Clause 55 there are opened up such possibilities that I do not care to give utterance to my views on them just now. Clause 55 provides—

> An industrial matter or dispute may be referred to the court by an industrial union or association pursuant to a resolution of the governing body of the industrial union or association passed in such manner as is prescribed by the rules of the industrial union or association.

At the present time there has to be a vote taken of the whole of the union before a citation can be made. Members will therefore understand the very wide power that it is proposed to give. What is the governing body? Some unions have different governing bodies from those of other unions, and a governing body may consist of four or five persons. If any society has been registered, a society comprising all branches of industry, and the governing body say is sitting in Perth, it has the power to pass resolutions. That is giving too much power altogether. Provision is made in the Act to enable a union to register under certain conditions, although the members of that union may not all be connected with one industry. I believe the idea of that was to get over the question of the registration of the A.W.U. So far as that body is concerned, the Kalgoorlie and Boulder miners are registered. I understand also that there are other branches of the A.W.U. registered. I cannot yet see the real purport of the amendment contained in the Bill. All I can say now is that it is wide, and that if it is for the good of the union and for the good of the community, I shall vote for it. I am afraid, however, that the way it reads at present, being so much wider than any other, the subject is open to argument. Then we come to preference to unionists. That was first mooted in order to combat victimisation, and I believe here in Perth it is difficult for some bodies of men and women to become registered or to form themselves into societies on account of their fear of victimisation. A great deal can be said on many sides with regard to preference. I have never been very keen on preference ever since the Broken Hill strike of 1892. I think that preference, so far as industrial unions are concerned, may be justified. But when it comes to political unions, then it is rather different. I think we look upon politics as being almost as sacred as religion. No one has a right to interfere with anyone's religion; no one has a right to interfere with anyone's politics. If it is right to say to a man "We are going to compel you to contribute to political funds" it would be equally right to say "We will compel you to contribute to religious funds." If it is right to say to a man that you are going to compel him to contribute to a Labour newspaper, it would be equally right to say that you are going to compel him to contribute to any newspaper. I have many times drawn attention to this aspect, and I have been supported by a number of leading men in the Labour movement. I had a friendly debate on this subject in 1907 with one of the leading men in Kalgoorlie. After all, I do not know that there is much in the way of preference. The Bill only seeks to give power to the court to grant preference. I do not know that we shall be going very far wrong in granting that power. It exists in the Federal Act. We know what has happened in the way of victimisation, and possibly the only way in which to meet it is by declaring that we shall give preference. Next we come to the question of the basic wage. I support the Government in their proposals. I am very glad they have got out of the ruck of trying to fix the basic wage merely on the increase and decrease of the cost of living. In 1920 that proposal was made and I strongly opposed it then. I do so now, and I am glad the Government have sought to put in some other provision than that of the increase or decrease of the cost of living. I would like to draw the attention of the Minister to

Section 8, paragraph (b) of the Queensland Act, which reads—

> The court shall be entitled to consider the prosperity of the calling and the value of the employees' labour in addition to the standard of living, but in no case shall the rate of wage be made lower than the rate of wage declared by the court.

It is possible that some act of legislation or some economic factor may cause an industry to be particularly flourishing, while the cost of living may be dropping. That may apply to a big concern like Boans' or Foy & Gibson's. Is it a fair thing that the workers employed in those industries should suffer a reduction? It may be pointed out that in the mining industry one mine may be prosperous and paying dividends while another mine alongside it is paying nothing, but I am referring to the industry in general. There may be an industry reaping largely increased benefits, while the cost of living is decreasing, so it would be wise if the court had power to consider the prosperity, as has the court in Queensland.

Hon. J. J. Holmes: Or the reverse.

Hon. J. E. DODD: Again, on the automatic adjustment of the basic wage, I came into conflict with the previous measure. One member, who does not happen to be in Parliament at present, said it was the policy of the Labour Party to have an automatic adjustment of wages. I doubted his statement at the time, and last year or the year before Mr. Millington, as secretary of the Labour movement, entered an emphatic protest against any automatic adjustment of the basic wage. There are circumstances operating apart from the mere increase or decrease in the cost of living. Any other circumstances should be taken into consideration, and the Government may consider that will cover the point I have made regarding the prosperity an industry may be enjoying notwithstanding a decline in the cost of living. The court is to be given power to create a number of boards. It would be well to give those boards a trial, but I should have liked to hear the experience of other States where they are operating. They can certainly do no harm, and they may do much good. Demarcation and reference boards are very necessary, and if the industrial boards are likely to relieve the congestion of the court, we shall be making a step in the right direction by providing for them. The Government are on the right track in seeking to bring all the workers they can within the scope of the measure. Domestic workers have as much right to come under the Act as have any other section of workers. They were included in the Bill of 1912, but the proposal was defeated. If they are included, the clause relating to the powers of inspectors will have to be altered. Wide powers are given to factory inspectors and, according to the Bill, similar powers will be given to every industrial inspector and to every union secretary and president, and to every man whom the union secretary or president may appoint. These are the powers given to an inspector of factories under Section 16 of the Act of 1904—

> Every inspector may enter, inspect, and examine a factory at all reasonable hours by day and night when he has reasonable cause to believe that any person is at the time employed therein; enter by day any place which he has reasonable cause to believe to be a factory; make such examination and inquiry as may be necessary to ascertain whether the provisions of this Act and the regulations thereunder and of all laws and by-laws relating to public health are complied with, so far as respects the factory and the persons employed therein; examine and question, with respect to matters under this Act, every person whom he finds in a factory or whom he has reasonable cause to believe to be employed in a factory, and require such person to sign a declaration of the truth of the matters respecting which he is so examined.

Those extensive powers were given largely to enable factory inspectors to deal with Asiatics engaged in furniture manufacturing. Can the Government possibly intend that similar powers shall be given to union officials and to any unionist appointed by the president or secretary? I do not think so. Fancy a man or woman going to one's private house at any hour of the day or night and making such interrogations! In Queensland, Section 89, Subsection 3, reads—

> No industrial inspector shall have any authority under this Act to enter a private dwelling house, or land in connection therewith, unless some manufacture or trade in which labour is employed is carried on therein.

That is a fair compromise. In New South Wales Subsection 2 of Section 6 provides—

> No inspector shall have any authority under this Act to enter a private dwelling house or land used in connection therewith unless some manufacture or trade in which labour is employed is carried on therein.

Surely this is an oversight on the part of those in charge of the Bill. They can never intend that the powers given to factory inspectors to deal with Chinamen and others should be applied to private dwelling houses. Something might be done to help big unions regarding the citation of cases in the court, but I am doubtful whether we shall be acting wisely in doing away with the ballot. To those members who think that the Act should remain as it is, let me point out that the A.M.A. at Kalgoorlie some years ago had something like 1,500 members. We were going to take a case to the Arbitration Court, and we had to give notice of

the resolution to every member. It was very hard to get into touch with every member. After the resolution was passed, every member had to vote upon it. There again we were met with the same trouble. Anyone who has been connected with a large union knows how difficult it is to put a ballot paper into the hands of every member. We had to send stewards around and spend a good deal of money in order to make the ballot complete. What was the result? The opposition union, the A.W.U., wanted to get to the court first, and decided to test this matter. They got hold of two members of the A.M.A. and charged the A.M.A. with having failed to supply the whole of the members with a ballot paper. They brought the two members from Kalgoorlie to Perth to say that they had not been supplied with ballot papers. One of the witnesses had not been in the box long before the judge claimed acquaintanceship, and I think that was responsible for the applicant union being defeated. Anyhow we were allowed to proceed with our citation. Still, there was the difficulty. Surely to stipulate two-thirds or one-half of the members would be far better. There may be quite a number of members who do not care to go to the Arbitration Court. Many unionists have very little faith in the court, and yet they may be forced to go to the court. I shall support the Government in their endeavour to be free in choosing a president of the court. I cannot see that all the brains of the community are centred in a judge, although a majority of people would certainly have more faith in the integrity of a judge than of a layman. At the same time there are laymen who could fill the position of president equally as well as could a judge. If a layman be appointed I cannot see how the Government will carry out some portions of the Workers' Compensation Act. I do not think a layman can be appointed under any other Act, though in South Australia a layman was appointed, but I think he was one of the old appointees taken over. Let me now refer to the power given to the Minister under this Act. I do not know that a good deal of power may not be necessary; but some of it, I think, can be dispensed with. Under Clause 2 the Minister has the status of employer, and can be a party to a dispute. The clause makes reference to technical schools. In the definition of "worker" there appear certain words which assuredly require some better explanation than has yet been offered. The words are as follows:—

> The term includes any person working with or without reward or remuneration for the purpose of acquiring a knowledge of a trade or industry, or a branch of a trade or industry, otherwise than as a student attending a technical school certified as such by the Minister. . . . .

I would like to know whether that definition includes a person going to a school for the purpose of acquiring some knowledge of the mechanism of a motor car. Scores of people buying cars or owning cars are getting their knowledge of driving from schools, as well as sufficient knowledge of the mechanism of a car to enable them to carry on. Is the definition going to compel the man who is teaching them to pay them wages instead of their paying him something? I quite understand the desire of the Government to prevent the operation of certain schools which may be seeking to get outside an award, but this term is very wide indeed. Then the Minister, through the Government, which is to say, the Executive Council, appoints the president of the court; and the Minister may refer to the court industrial disputes. He can refer a dispute when conferences have failed. If all that power is given to the Minister, there is really no need for any industrial unions at all. Under the Bill the Minister will have sufficient power almost to deal with any case without the intervention of any union whatever. I was interested to read Clause 14, which gives the Minister some of that power. Paragraph (b) provides that the court shall have power to settle and determine—

> all industrial matters and disputes referred to it by the Minister, as being proper in the public interest to be dealt with by the court, and irrespective of whether the parties to any dispute are registered industrial unions or not, if the dispute has caused a cessation of work. . . .

That may be all very good; if the Minister can do anything to stop industrial disputes, it should be of benefit to the community. But then the conclusion of the paragraph extends that power to—

> all industrial matters and disputes as to which a conference has been held under Section 120a and so far as no agreement has been reached, and which the Minister has referred to the court.

I find that the marginal note to the clause makes reference to the South Australian Act No. 1453, Sections 17 and 36. On reference to Section 17 of the South Australian Act, however, I find that it reads very differently from this clause, saying—

> The court shall have jurisdiction (a) to deal with all industrial matters pursuant to this part over all industrial matters which are submitted to it.

Further, paragraph (c) of Section 17 of the South Australian Act provides that the court shall have jurisdiction—

> over any industrial matters as to which a conference has been held under Section 20, and which, not having been finally and completely dealt with or settled at such conference, the president has referred to the court.

This Bill says that the Minister shall refer such matters to the court. In Clause 16, to which I would draw the Colonial Secre-

tary's attention, some mistake has apparently been made in the wording. The clause reads—

> Section 62 of the principal Act is amended by inserting the words "the Minister" after the words, "by the" in Subsection 1.

I think the Minister will find it is almost impossible to insert those words. I should prefer the powers which this Bill gives the Minister to be exercised by some other authority, if possible; I should say, the inspector, or the Department of Labour, might exercise them. To place such powers in the hands of a political head does not in my opinion altogether make for the good administration of the measure. There are numerous other matters to which I desire to draw attention, but which I think can be better dealt with in Committee. I have gone through three of the Acts so far as I could, to see how our Bill is shaped from them. Arbitration seems to me a sort of patchwork quilt in legislation, a thing of shreds and patches. When hon. members call to mind that since 1900 we have had nine Industrial Arbitration Bills, they will agree, I think, that the sooner we get down to ground work instead of patchwork the better it will be for the community and especially for the workers. If in this Chamber we had been dealing with economics instead of many of the matters that have been dealt with here, we might make much better laws. Our arbitration law is patchwork from beginning to end. We pass an Act, only to find in a few years that the measure is obsolete and that more legislation has to be brought in. The existing Act has been in operation for 12 years; the previous Act operated for 10 years; probably in another five or six years' time we shall have another arbitration measure. However, I support the second reading of the Bill.

On motion by Hon. J. J. Holmes, debate adjourned.

BILL—JURY ACT AMENDMENT.

In Committee—Defeated.

Resumed from the 23rd October; Hon. J. W. Kirwan in the Chair, the Honorary Minister in charge of the Bill.

Clause 4—Further amendment of Section 5 (partly considered):

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

Ayes	7
Noes	16
Majority against ..	9

AYES.

Hon. J. R. Brown	Hon. J. W. Hickey
Hon. J. E. Dodd	Hon. W. H. Kitson
Hon. J. M. Drew	Hon. T. Moore
Hon. E. H. Gray	*(Teller.)*

NOES.

Hon. A. Burvill	Hon. G. Potter
Hon. J. Cornell	Hon. A. J. H. Saw
Hon. J. Duffell	Hon. H. Seddon
Hon. J. A. Greig	Hon. H. A. Stephenson
Hon. J. J. Holmes	Hon. H. Stewart
Hon. A. Lovekin	Hon. H. J. Yelland
Hon. J. M. Macfarlane	Hon. J. Ewing
Hon. G. W. Miles	*(Teller.)*
Hon. J. Nicholson	

Clause thus negatived.

Clause 5—Repeal of Section 6:

Hon. A. J. H. SAW: I move—

That the Chairman do now leave the Chair.

Hon. E. H. Gray: Shame!

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

Ayes	12
Noes	10
Majority for ..	2

AYES.

Hon. A. Burvill	Hon. J. M. Macfarlane
Hon. J. Duffell	Hon. G. W. Miles
Hon. J. Ewing	Hon. J. Nicholson
Hon. J. A. Greig	Hon. A. J. H. Saw
Hon. J. J. Holmes	Hon. H. A. Stephenson
Hon. A. Lovekin	Hon. H. J. Yelland
	(Teller.)

NOES.

Hon. J. R. Brown	Hon. W. H. Kitson
Hon. J. E. Dodd	Hon. T. Moore
Hon. J. M. Drew	Hon. H. Seddon
Hon. E. H. Gray	Hon. H. Stewart
Hon. J. W. Hickey	Hon. J. Cornell
	(Teller.)

Motion thus passed; the Bill defeated.

BILL—INSPECTION OF SCAFFOLDING.

In Committee.

Resumed from 22nd October. Hon. J. W. Kirwan in the Chair; the Colonial Secretary in charge of the Bill.

The CHAIRMAN: Progress was reported on Clause 3, which had been partly considered.

Clause put and passed.

Clause 4—Appointment of inspectors:

Hon. A. LOVEKIN: I move an amendment—

That paragraphs (b) and (c) be struck out.

The amendment is consequential upon Clause 1 as amended. We decided to limit the operations of the measure to the metropolitan area, and in those circumstances it is unnecessary to provide for Orders in Council dividing the State into districts.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: As the amendment is consequential, I do not oppose it.

Amendment put and passed; the clause, as amended, agreed to.

Clause 5—Public inspectors:

Hon. A. LOVEKIN: The clause provides in two places for the Minister doing certain things as "he thinks fit." The repetition is unnecessary. I move an amendment—

That in line 1 the words "if he thinks fit" be struck out.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: There is no objection to the amendment.

Amendment put and passed.

Hon. A. LOVEKIN: I move an amendment—

That in lines 3 and 4 the words "thinks fit" be struck out and "may direct" be inserted in lieu.

Amendment put and passed.

Hon. A. LOVEKIN: The second paragraph of the clause provides that certificates of approval issued to qualified persons to act as scaffolding inspectors shall "only be issued upon the applicants furnishing, by examination, such evidence of fitness and competency as may be prescribed." I move an amendment—

That after "prescribed" in line 7 the words "in the regulations set out in the schedule hereto" be inserted.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: It is quite right that provision should be made in the schedule, but it may be necessary to alter those provisions from time to time. Those alterations will have to be effected by regulations. Before the Bill is dealt with finally, I intend to move that no regulations framed under the measure shall come into operation until 14 days after they have been laid on the Table of the House.

Hon. A. LOVEKIN: There is no objection to the Minister moving for the additional words he indicates. I thought everything was to be put in black and white in the Bill. The schedule sets out clearly what the nature of the examination is to be, and I cannot appreciate the necessity for any proposal to alter it. The schedule is the basis of examination for the inspector, and I do not want to see some regulation decreasing the value of the examination hurriedly passed through the House on a catch vote, as occurred the other evening. I will press the amendment.

Hon. H. STEWART: I support the attitude of the Minister. The Government must be allowed certain latitude in the framing of regulations. Parliament has the safeguard given in the Interpretation Act. Moreover, the Minister has said he will provide that regulations shall not come into operation until after they have been 14 days before Parliament. Latitude can justifiably be taken in providing for examinations.

Amendment put and negatived.

Clause, as previously amended, agreed to.

Clause 6—agreed to.

Clause 7—Powers and duties of inspectors:

Hon. J. J. HOLMES: This is a drastic provision. Power is given to an inspector to enter any place by day or by night. That is going too far.

Hon. A. LOVEKIN: It does not matter whether there be gear or scaffolding on the place or not, the inspector may enter by day or by night. I move an amendment—

That in line 1 the words "time by day or by night" be struck out and "reasonable time" inserted in lieu.

Hon. W. H. KITSON: I hope the amendment will not be agreed to. In many instances it is necessary that work should be carried out by night. It may be on some building that has to be finished within a given time, or it may be on urgent alterations or reconstructions.

Hon. A. Lovekin: Well, would not "reasonable time" be right in such cases?

Hon. W. H. KITSON: I do not think so. The inspector should have the right to inspect scaffolding at any time, irrespective of whether that time be reasonable in the eyes of others. The inspector will not go out of his way to inspect a building at midnight, unless he believes there is something there that he should see.

Hon. J. A. GREIG: Often scaffolding is used for the repairing of elevators, and generally such repairs are carried out during the night, when the elevator is not in any great demand. Because of that, the inspector, if he thought the contractor for the repairs was taking too much risk, should have the right to visit the job. I am afraid that "reasonable time" may lead to litigation as to its meaning.

Hon. A. LOVEKIN: If men were working on an elevator at night, that would be a reasonable time for the inspector to go there; but if no work was being carried out on the elevator, it would not be reasonable for the inspector to go there by night and make an official inspection. Nor would it be right for the inspector to go to the yard of some contractor during the night and demand to inspect the gear in that yard.

Hon. J. R. Brown: He would be detained for being illegally on the premises.

Hon. A. LOVEKIN: I wish the hon. member would not talk nonsense. If we want only what is reasonable, let us put it in the Bill.

Hon. H. STEWART: The instance quoted by Mr. Greig, namely that of an elevator being repaired, would come under the Inspection of Machinery Act.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: I hope the amendment will not be carried. In many instances scaffolding is erected by night, so why should not the inspector have power to inspect such scaffolding by night?

Hon. J. J. Holmes: Under the amendment he will have.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: But it is a limitation of power. Why should we place any restriction on the inspection of scaffolding and gear?

Hon. A. Lovekin: The answer is that what is reasonable time in one place is not reasonable time in another.

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

Ayes	10
Noes	10
A tie.	

AYES.

Hon. C. F. Baxter	Hon. A. J. H. Saw
Hon. J. J. Holmes	Hon. H. A. Stephenson
Hon. A. Lovekin	Hon. H. Stewart
Hon. J. M. Macfarlane	Hon. G. W. Miles
Hon. J. Nicholson	(*Teller.*)
Hon. G. Potter	

NOES.

Hon. J. R. Brown	Hon. W. H. Kitson
Hon. A. Burvill	Hon. T. Moore
Hon. J. Cornell	Hon. H. Seddon
Hon. J. M. Drew	Hon. E. H. Gray
Hon. E. H. Harris	(*Teller.*)
Hon. J. W. Hickey	

The CHAIRMAN: To provide opportunity for further consideration, I give my vote with the Noes.

Amendment thus negatived.

Clause put and passed.

Sitting suspended from 6.15 to 7.30 p.m.

Clauses 8, 9—Agreed to.

Clause 10—Scaffolding, etc., to be in accordance with the Act:

Hon. A. LOVEKIN: I move an amendment—

That all the words after "of" in line 1 be struck out and the following inserted in lieu:—"Such description as is set out in the schedule of this Act."

The schedule says how the scaffolding is to be erected, and it should be sufficient to leave it at that, without having new forms of scaffolding put up in new regulations.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: Some amendment is necessary to this clause, which might be postponed for the time being. Unless we make provision to amend the description of scaffolding by regulation, it will be necessary to amend the Act from time to time.

Hon. A. Lovekin: And then we get back to amendment by regulation.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: We would require power to do that by regulation. I intend to move later on an amendment providing that the regulations shall be laid on the Table of both Houses of Parliament for 14 days. During that period any member will have an opportunity of moving to disallow them before they come into operation.

Hon. A. Lovekin: In view of the statement of the Colonial Secretary, I would like to withdraw the amendment.

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: It is my intention to move an amendment to Clause 1 with regard to restricting the operations of the Bill to the metropolitan area. I will also include Clause 10 in the recommittal, for that, too, will have to be amended.

Hon. J. CORNELL: The Mines Regulation Act was passed in 1916. It is composed almost entirely of regulations, but it can only be amended by an amending Bill. If we are going to adopt an innovation in respect to this Bill, I shall be very careful how I record my vote on the question of the regulations being laid on the Table of both Houses of Parliament.

Hon. J. J. HOLMES: Mr. Lovekin appears to be satisfied with the proposal regarding regulations being laid on the Table of the House. Hitherto it has been customary to frame regulations during recess, and to give effect to them then. By the time Parliament has met the industries concerned have found out the effect they have had. Under the present proposal no one will have had any experience of the regulations when they are laid on the Table, and no one will know whether they are loaded or not.

Hon. A. LOVEKIN: At present the regulations are gazetted, come into operation, and fees paid under them cannot be recovered even if the regulations are subsequently disallowed. The method suggested by the Minister is much better. The regulations will be on the Table for us to read and understand.

Clause put and passed.

Clause 11—Inspector may give directions as to scaffolding, etc.:

Hon. A. LOVEKIN: I move an amendment—

That the words "he thinks" in line 8 be struck out, and "may be" inserted in lieu.

We want it to be definite that such and such a thing is necessary.

Hon. J. Cornell: That will be what the inspector thinks.

Hon. A. LOVEKIN: The point will arise as to whether a thing was in fact necessary. We do not want to know what the inspector is thinking but what he is doing

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: I cannot support the amendment. It would lead to no end of litigation. An inspector would be on the defensive; he would have to prove that the directions were necessary and every time he issued instructions he would be met with a lawsuit. An inspector has no arbitrary power in this matter. An appeal is provided for as will be seen by Subclause 3, and that is sufficient protection for the owner.

Hon. A. LOVEKIN: The reason the Minister has given is the very reason why we should alter these words. No inspector should be allowed to approach a contractor and give him instructions. Then when the owner is put to a lot of expense it may be found that the regulations are not necessary, that the inspector may not have considered the position at all. In passing legislation of this kind we should ensure that the inspector only gives reasonable instructions.

Hon. J. NICHOLSON: I suggest that a way out of the difficulty will be by striking out the word "such" wherever it appears, and make the sentence read, "may give directions," and then also strike out the words "as he thinks necessary." The clause will then read—

> . . . he may, by notice in writing, give directions to the owner in order to prevent accidents or to ensure a compliance with this Act.

Hon. A. Lovekin: That amendment will do.

Hon. J. NICHOLSON: It will get over the difficulty the Leader of the House fears, and it will meet Mr. Lovekin's desire.

Hon. A. LOVEKIN: I will withdraw my amendment if Mr. Nicholson will move one on the lines he has intimated.

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

Hon. J. NICHOLSON: I move an amendment—

> *That in line 7 "such" and in line 8 "as he thinks necessary" be struck out.*

Amendment put and passed.

Hon. A. LOVEKIN: I move a further amendment—

> *That in Subclause 3 the words "who shall hear and determine the dispute in manner prescribed" be struck out.*

As the clause stands it will mean, "prescribed by the new regulations." We already have in the schedule the prescribed manner in which a magistrate shall hear and determine a dispute. The method of approaching the court will be found in Clause 24.

Hon. J. DUFFELL: I suggest that the consideration of this clause be postponed until after Clause 14 has been dealt with. An amendment is proposed to that clause, and if it be carried Mr. Lovekin's amendment will be consequential.

Hon. A. J. H. SAW: Unless a police or resident magistrate hears and determines a dispute he will not be able to give a decision. The words in the clause that should come out are, "in the prescribed manner."

Hon. A. LOVEKIN: The amendment I propose will bring the subclause into line with the schedule.

Hon. J. DUFFELL: In view of the principle underlying the proposed amendment to Clause 14, Mr. Lovekin might allow his amendment to stand over.

Hon. H. STEWART: The procedure we have followed in the past has been that with the concurrence of the Minister a clause has been postponed until others in the Bill have been dealt with. That is often done in order to facilitate business.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: I am in favour of Mr. Lovekin's amendment. I think it is necessary, but I am still more in favour of Dr. Saw's suggestion, although it is not essential, because the procedure is provided for in the schedule. I have no objection to the consideration of the clause being postponed. I therefore move—

> *That the consideration of the clause be postponed.*

Motion passed.

Clause 12—Not keeping scaffolding in conformity with Act:

Hon. A. LOVEKIN: I move an amendment—

> *That in line 5 the words "if no other penalty is provided" be struck out.*

There is no principle involved in the amendment except that if the clause goes back to another place in this form it will look as if we and the other House had not given the Bill close attention. There is a general penalty if no other penalty is provided.

Amendment put and passed; the clause, as amended, agreed to.

Clause 13—Inspector to be notified of accident:

Hon. A. LOVEKIN: Is this clause intended to read as it does? Scaffolding or gear may be stacked in a contractor's yard. I think the clause is intended to refer to scaffolding or gear in actual use.

The Colonial Secretary: I cannot see anything vague about it.

Hon. A. LOVEKIN: Make it read "erected or in use."

Hon. A. J. H. SAW: As the accident must have been caused by the scaffolding or gear, it would be immaterial whether it was in use or not.

Hon. H. STEWART: I move an amendment—

> *That in line 3 the words "at or in any place where there is scaffolding or gear" be struck out.*

That will make the clause clear and will give all the scope desired.

Amendment put and passed; the clause, as amended, agreed to.

Clause 14—Inquiry into cause of accident:

Hon. A. LOVEKIN: The clause begins "In the event of an accident happening to scaffolding or gear," etc. It does not matter what happens to the scaffolding. No doubt it is intended to refer to an accident "due" to scaffolding or gear. I suggest that the word "due" be inserted.

Hon. J. NICHOLSON: The clause is not well framed, but I doubt whether Mr. Lovekin's suggestion will express the intention. There is a possibility of an accident happening to scaffolding, due not to the scaffolding but to something else. I suggest that "or where" be struck out and the word "whereby" inserted in lieu.

Hon. A. BURVILL: I suggest that the deletion of the words "to scaffolding or gear" would make the clause clear.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: I was not satisfied with the clause and I referred it to the Parliamentary draftsman. I am informed there was a Privy Council case turning on the point whether an accident was due to a train or to a bridge, and it was decided that there could be an accident to the bridge. The clause means what it says. If an accident happened to scaffolding, the best thing to do would be to put it in good repair. I am assured that the clause is copied from the Queensland Act.

Hon. A. J. H. SAW: All good things do not necessarily come out of Queensland. The clause intends that where any accident occurs to scaffolding or gear without any consequent injury to human life, an inquiry should be held. Whether it is desirable to hold an inquiry to ascertain who was responsible for the faulty work is a question for those who have to do with buildings.

Hon. E. H. HARRIS: Even in the case of an accident unattended with human injury, it might be advisable for the department to hold an inquiry with a view to preventing the recurrence of such an accident, which might not again be unattended with human injury.

Hon. A. LOVEKIN: Every time a prop is snapped or a board falls, is there to be an inquiry involving people in all sorts of trouble?

Hon. J. Nicholson: The provision is permissive.

Hon. A. LOVEKIN: We should not encourage footling inquiries into every little accident.

Hon. E. H. HARRIS: Until the accident at Forrest Place occurred, the Inspection of Machinery Department merely estimated what a crane should be able to lift and merely estimated the strength of a tie-rod. Since that accident, everything is tested.

Hon. H. STEWART: The main trouble arises out of the point raised by Mr. Lovekin, whether inquiries might be held because of some triviality. However, the provision is not mandatory; and Mr. Lovekin cannot think that a Minister would order an inquiry because a bolt has broken or a plank has fallen.

Hon. A. Lovekin: Ministers sometimes do erratic things.

Hon. H. STEWART: The words "or as in the last preceding section" might be added to the provision.

Hon. J. J. HOLMES: When I first read the clause I did not like it, but the more I look into it the more satisfied I am that if the provision is to remain it should remain as it now reads. If an accident does occur in connection with scaffolding, and there is no loss of life and no personal injury, that is due more to luck than to good management.

Hon. J. CORNELL: The more I look at the clause the less I understand it. I have an amendment which I shall move later, providing it is applicable. The clause as it stands undoubtedly deals with two forms of accidents which can occur in connection with scaffolding—through faulty erection, or through overloading. An inquiry might be as necessary into an accident which did not result in injury to a workman as into one which did result in such injury. In the case of a scaffolding accident not attended with bodily injury, the inquiry, if one is directed by the Minister, is to be attended by a representative of the builders' workers. An inquiry into an accident resulting from faulty scaffolding would be attended by a representative of the employers and by a representative of the employees. In connection with last session's Bill, I compared this provision with Section 35 of the Mines Regulation Act. If a person is killed as the result of a scaffolding accident, it is a matter for the coroner and not for the Minister. Under the Mines Regulation Act a representative of the person killed is entitled to attend the inquiry. The trouble with this clause is the attempt to interweave two different forms of inquiry.

Hon. J. DUFFELL: There is another phase concerning Subclause 1. It sets out that, in the event of an accident happening to scaffolding or gear, or where any loss of life or serious bodily injury has occurred, the Minister may direct an inquiry to be held before a court consisting of a police or resident magistrate and, if the Minister thinks fit, a person skilled in the use and construction of scaffolding and also a member of a building trade union. I move an amendment—

That in line 5, all the words after "consisting" be struck out with a view to inserting the following:—"of three members, one of whom shall be a member of the Builders and Contractors' As-

sociation, one a member of the Building Trade Union, and a chairman, who shall be appointed by the Government.''

The clause with the proposed amendment would be more satisfactory than the provision in the Bill. The magistrate would then have two men who would be in a position to discuss with him the pros and cons of the question at issue.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: Most of the cases to be dealt with will be taken by the police magistrate or resident magistrate, and in special cases only will it be necessary to have the assistance of the individuals indicated in the clause. If the amendment be carried, there will be three members of the court on every occasion, although the accident to be inquired into may be of a twopenny-halfpenny description. Instead of the magistrate dealing with the matter by himself, the court will consist of three, and wrangling between the opposing parties will lengthen the hearings.

Hon. J. Nicholson: Why not leave it to the magistrate alone?

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: It would be far better, although I approve of the clause as it stands.

Hon. J. DUFFELL: Clause 14 does not refer to trivial accidents, but to those involving loss of life or serious bodily injury. The court, if constituted as I suggest, would be able to deal with questions more effectively and would not be a permanent tribunal but one appointed from time to time to deal with particular accidents.

Hon. J. J. HOLMES: I prefer the clause to the amendment, although I do not like either of them. I do not see the necessity for packing any bench to deal with these matters, which should be left to the resident magistrate.

Hon. A. Lovekin: If the others are appointed they will be merely partisans, as is the position with the Arbitration Court.

Hon. A. J. H. SAW: I agree with Mr. Holmes. I have confidence in the magistrates who will deal fairly with the parties concerned in such accidents. Subclause 11 provides that any costs and expenses ordered by the court to be paid by the Minister and any remuneration paid to persons forming the court, shall be paid out of moneys provided by Parliament for the purpose of the measure. Thus, the long-suffering public is to shoulder the burden of this extra impost. I would like to see the clause amended to leave these matters in the hands of the magistrate alone.

Amendment put and negatived.

Hon. A. J. H. SAW: I move an amendment—

That all the words after ''magistrate'' in line 5 be struck out.

The CHAIRMAN: The Committee having already decided that the words proposed to be struck out shall stand as part of the clause, the Committee cannot now reverse that decision. The hon. member can achieve his purpose on recommittal.

Hon. J. J. HOLMES: What is the explanation of Subclause 8, which provides that the court shall report to the Minister, as far as possible, the cause of an accident together with the circumstances attending that accident, and the court is also to add ''such observations as it thinks fit.'' What will this lead to? The court should arrive at a decision, not the Minister.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: Any comments that the court may see fit to make for the information of the Minister will be useful to him. The court is not an ordinary legal tribunal, but one set up for the purpose of investigating the causes of an accident. The comments of the court are to be forwarded to the Minister so that they may be placed on record.

Hon. A. LOVEKIN: I move an amendment—

That Subclause 5 be struck out.

There should be some better evidence of the fact that a person has authority to act at such inquiry.

Amendment put and passed.

Hon. A. LOVEKIN: I move an amendment—

That in Subclause 9 all words after ''as'' in line 2 be struck out, and ''the court may order'' inserted in lieu.

The words proposed to be struck out are quite unnecessary. Already the court is clothed with discretion to disallow the expenses, in whole or in part, of witnesses. By the same reasoning every witness should have such expenses as the court may order. It may easily be that skilled witnesses will be called. Such witnesses, of course, should be paid on a higher scale than that observed in a court of petty session.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: The amendment will deprive the court of all discretion as to costs.

Hon. J. Nicholson: No. It will give the court greater discretion.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: At present the court has power to disallow the expenses of witnesses. Why should we not give the court discretionary power?

Hon. J. J. Holmes: That is what we are asking for in the amendment.

Hon. A. LOVEKIN: The subclause as it stands limits the court to such expenses as would be allowed in a court of petty sessions. The amendment will give the court discretionary power, both as to allowing and disallowing witnesses' expenses.

Hon. J. NICHOLSON: Provision is already made for the calling of technical witnesses. As Mr. Lovekin points out, skilled men may be called, and it would be unfair if the court were limited to the scale allowed in a petty court. The amendment gives the magistrate even wider discretion as to witnesses' expenses.

Hon. T. Moore: Full discretion is given in the subclause.

Hon. J. NICHOLSON: No. It prescribes that witnesses' expenses shall be those allowed in a court of petty sessions. The amendment will be fairer to both sides before the court.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: It is to be an ordinary inquiry, and provision is made for witnesses' expenses to be on the petty sessions scale. Under the amendment, Supreme Court expenses could be allowed.

Hon. A. Lovekin: That is in favour of the worker.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: No, it is in favour of the contractor. Discretion would be given to the magistrate as to whether witnesses were paid on the Supreme Court scale or on the scale of the petty court.

Hon. A. J. H. SAW: In view of what has been said by Mr. Nicholson, I will support the amendment.

Hon. A. LOVEKIN: The amendment is entirely in favour of the worker, who will have to call skilled evidence as to his injury. Why should, say, Dr. Saw have to attend the inquiry and stay there all day for 7s. 6d., which is what he would be allowed under the subclause? Under the amendment, the amount to be allowed him would be at the discretion of the magistrate. As I say, the worker will require skilled evidence and, under the subclause, he will have to pay for it out of his own pocket.

Amendment put and passed.

Hon. A. LOVEKIN: I move an amendment—

That in Subclause 12 before "industrial union" the words "any person interested and/or" be inserted.

There may be many others interested in this matter besides the employers and employees, such as insurance companies, etc.

Hon. J. Nicholson: The amendment will have a very wide application.

Hon. J. CORNELL: An interpretation clause would be necessary to define those who might be interested. I should like to move to insert at the beginning of the sub clause the words "a representative of the person killed or injured and." The only persons interested would be the principals. These are the owner or contractor, the representative of the worker, and the representative of the person killed or injured.

Hon. A. Lovekin: I will withdraw my amendment if Mr. Cornell moves his.

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

Hon. J. CORNELL: I move an amendment—

That at the beginning of the subclause the words "a representative of the person killed or injured and" be inserted.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: I have no objection to Mr. Cornell's amendment.

Hon. J. J. Holmes: It seems to me we are superseding the coroner in this subclause.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: No. This inquiry is solely to investigate the condition of the scaffolding in case of death or serious accident. In all probability a coronial inquiry would also be held.

Amendment put and passed.

Hon. J. CORNELL: I move a further amendment—

That in line 6 the words "represented at" be struck out, and "present at and take part in" be inserted in lieu; and that in lines 6 and 7 the words "the representatives of the unions" be struck out.

Amendment put and passed; the clause, as amended, agreed to.

Clauses 15 to 22—agreed to.

Clause 23—General provisions as to penalties:

Hon. A. LOVEKIN: I move an amendment—

That in the last line of Subclause 3 the words "or the chief inspector" be struck out.

The clause will then read "no prosecution for any breach or contravention of this Act shall be instituted without the authority of the Minister." There should be no superior authority to enable prosecutions to be laid.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: I hope the Committee will not agree to the amendment. It has been the practice in recent years to throw the whole responsibility on Ministers and the result is that Ministers' time is engaged in detail work. The chief inspector should be in a position to decide whether or not a prosecution should take place.

Hon. H. STEWART: I do not consider that the actions of the present Government are in accordance with the way in which the Minister speaks. It would be a very good thing if heads of departments did put the law into effect.

Hon. E. H. Harris: Including the Electoral Department, where they never prosecute.

Hon. H. STEWART: That is so, and where there are many gross violations. The tendency of all Governments is to shelve responsibility. They are afraid to take responsibility lest it should act against them. I am fully in accord with the Leader of the House and I wish he would act in the way he has spoken.

Hon. J. J. HOLMES: We ought to take the Minister at his word, and strike out "Minister" from the clause; then there would be no fear of political influence as the chief inspector would carry out his duty without interference.

Amendment put and negatived.

Clause put and passed.

Clause 24—Proceedings before justices:

Hon. A. LOVEKIN: I move an amendment—

That paragraph (d) be struck out.

The paragraph reads "the authority of any inspector or other officer of the State to take any proceeding or to do any act shall be presumed until the contrary is shown." Under that any inspector or any officer can do anything he likes in connection with the proceeding. Yet Subclause 3 of the previous clause sets out that no prosecution shall be taken except with the authority of the Minister.

Hon. A. J. H. Saw: Is this another innovation from Queensland?

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: This is not an innovation. I have seen it repeatedly in Acts of Parliament and it simply indicates that an inspector would not be required to produce proof of his appointment every time he desires to take action.

Hon. J. NICHOLSON: The difficulty can be got over by the proceedings being taken in the name of the chief inspector, because he has full power under Clause 23.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: In the initial proceedings it would be presumed that the inspector had power, but in the box his authority could be questioned.

Hon. J. J. HOLMES: If we agree to the amendment, it will not make any difference to the Bill. The previous clause deals with the authority.

Hon. A. LOVEKIN: If we pass the amendment an officer will not be misled into doing something he has no right to do. Objection would be taken to the information before the inspector went into the box.

Amendment put and passed; the clause, as amended, agreed to.

Clause 25—Regulations:

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: I move an amendment—

That the following subclause be inserted: (1) The regulations in the schedule to this Act shall have effect and the force of law in such parts of the State as the Governor shall, by Order in Council, constitute and define as districts for the purposes of this Act: Provided that such regulations may be annulled, altered, or superseded by regulations made under the authority of Subsection (2) of this section"

Hon. A. LOVEKIN: I ask your ruling, Mr. Chairman, whether it is competent for the Minister to move the amendment, which is in direct contradiction to a clause already negatived. We have agreed that the measure shall apply only to the metropolitan area, and now the Minister is seeking power to apply it to other areas.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: I intend to recommit the Bill and move an amendment providing that the Act shall have effect only in the metropolitan area, but that it may be extended by the Governor-in-Council to other parts of the State, provided that the order is published in the "Gazette" and both Houses are given an opportunity to disallow it.

Hon. J. J. Holmes: I thought you were opposed to government by regulation.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: We are. We propose that no regulation shall have effect until it shall have been sanctioned by Parliament.

Hon. A. LOVEKIN: Until the Bill shall have been recommitted, I submit it is not competent for the Minister to move his amendment, because it is in direct contradiction to a previous resolution.

The CHAIRMAN: I rule that the Minister cannot move the amendment at this stage, as we have already decided that the operation of the measure shall be confined to the metropolitan shop area. The Minister, however, may achieve his purpose on the recommittal of the Bill.

Progress reported.

BILL—STATE LOTTERIES.

Second Reading.

Debate resumed from the 22nd October.

Hon. A. BURVILL (South-East) [9.43]: The Minister, in introducing the Bill, made no attempt whatever to justify the principle of gambling or even to assume that it was right. The Bill is an expediency measure to tax a section of the people by legalising gambling. The Minister confessed that Parliaments and Governments had been up to their necks in this traffic for many years. Now he seeks to make a wrong principle, not right, but legal. His excuse, in effect, was that gambling by private enterprise had been rampant and profitable, and that the State should have its cut out of it. Hence we have this State Lotteries Bill. The Minister admitted that our Criminal Code, by Section 212, specifically prohibited lotteries as an evil. The Minister further admitted that already there is too much gambling and betting in the community, and that the law against them is a dead letter. He went on to state that no Minister who had been in office since legislation against gambling was passed had been able to administer it, and that no Minister who attempted to administer it would survive a fortnight. He further stated that the bookmakers had practically abolished the Act of Parliament which made it a crime for them to bet, and that the bookmaker, the manufacturer of bettors, was not only tolerated but recognised by Parliament. And yet the Minister went on to say that it was the Government's intention in part to control and in part to abolish the gambling rampant throughout the country. However, he was careful not to commit himself to any such statement as that all private gambling would be abolished. There are some private interests in gambling that the Minis-

ter is afraid to tackle. Is it necessary for the Government to legalise gambling before they can take steps to control it? The principle seems to be that of setting a thief to catch a thief. Surely, if the Government's hands are clean of the traffic, it would be far easier for them to stop gambling. The Minister said that an immense amount of money was going to Tasmania for sweeps, and that he desired this Bill in order that the Government might enter into competition with that form of private enterprise. If competition is the life of trade, there is no hope for State enterprise against private enterprise in this respect. Apparently the object of the Bill is to make competition the life of gambling, or at least an incentive to it. In the same ratio as gambling increases shall we extinguish the spirit of thrift. The Minister stated that the morals of Tasmania had not suffered more than those of any other State, but that is a specious argument. The gamblers in the Tasmanian sweeps are not all in Tasmania, but largely in the other States. As a fact, the morals of the whole of the Commonwealth have been affected by the evil of which the headquarters are, and have for years been, in Tasmania. The same thing applies in Queensland, and now we see an attempt to introduce the evil into Western Australia. Where will it end? Further, to tempt persons to gamble, the Minister boasts that we will go better than Queensland by making the prizes free from income tax, thus putting a premium on the vice of State gambling. I protest against this measure to legalise an evil for the purpose of making money. The greater the evil, presumably, the more money will be made. If the evil dies out, then the gambling tax will gradually diminish until it vanishes. If gambling decreases, we shall have to put on an honest tax to assist our hospitals and charitable institutions. The triumph of right is not going to be obtained by non-resistance to evil. This measure aims at the cultivation of evil. For education we have an honest tax, but in order to support our hospitals and charities we intend to gamble. As a taxing measure the Bill will cost more to administer than any ordinary taxation Bill.

Hon. T. Moore: What tax do you suggest should be put on for hospitals?

Hon. A. BURVILL: A straightforward tax for hospitals and charities, whereby every elector would pay his just proportion.

Hon. T. Moore: Would you raise the income tax for that purpose?

Hon. G. W. Miles: Impose a stamp tax of 6d. in the pound on all receipts, including receipts for wages.

Hon. A. BURVILL: There are many ways of imposing an honest and just tax which everybody would pay. The tax under this Bill would be paid only by gamblers. Like other members, I have received quite a number of letters regarding this gambling Bill, letters of protest. I propose to read extracts from three which have reached me from the women of our State. The West Australian National Council of Women, representing 20 or 30 organisations, protest against the passing of the Bill and approve of a proper hospital and charities Bill. The Women's Christian Temperance Union of Western Australia, a separate body from the body I have just mentioned, write—

> We feel that gambling is morally wrong and fosters the spirit that endeavours to get something for nothing, and is opposed to the cultivation of those independent, self-reliant, and sturdy qualities which have made our nation great. We ask you to use your vote and influence against the passing of this Bill, which we feel will strike a blow at the honour of our land, and undermine the national character.

The Women's Christian Temperance Union also passed the following resolution:—

> We view with the gravest concern the action of our Government in their attempt to legalise and promote State lotteries for the purpose of raising money for charitable institutions; believing as we do that such action is against the best interests of the community; that it will foster and cultivate the gambling spirit of the people, especially in the young and rising generation. We further declare that the trend of such legislation will be to defeat its own ends, in that it will draw funds from legitimate channels, and will thereby create a greater demand for charities in the future. On the contrary, we affirm that the suppression of the gambling evil will materially help to minimise the need for charitable relief, as has been amply demonstrated by legislation in other countries. We call upon the Government to put into operation the law as it now stands, in which all sweeps, lotteries and gambling devices are illegal.

The Mothers' Union of Bunbury write entering a strong protest against the State Lotteries Bill on the following grounds:—

> 1, That nothing that is recognised to be harmful should be legalised. 2, That charities should draw their partial support from some Government measure which would receive the whole-hearted approval of the community. 3, That the young should have no further encouragement towards practising the evils of gambling than they already have.

Every organisation that is against this gambling Bill is in favour of an equitable and straightforward hospital and charities tax. I have much pleasure in opposing the second reading of the Bill.

On motion by Hon. H. Seddon debate adjourned.

BILL—CLOSER SETTLEMENT.

Second Reading.

Debate resumed from the previous sitting.

Hon. J. A. GREIG (South-East) [9.58]: I desire to commend the Government on having made an honest attempt to bring in a Bill that will provide what is, according to their way of thinking, a proper method of dealing with the closer settlement question. Clause 7 of the Bill provides that if the owner does not agree with the decision of the board to be appointed, he can appeal to the Supreme Court. The clause seeks to fix a fair valuation of the improvements, and of the added value given to the land by improvements. I take the clause to mean that if a man took up a piece of Crown land at 10s. per acre and paid £1 per acre to have it cleared, and then, upon its being cleared, found there were too many stones on it to allow it to become a payable proposition for cultivation, and then spent £2 per acre upon clearing the land of stones, and that the value of the land improved was then £7 per acre, its unimproved value would be assessed at £4 per acre.

Hon. J. Nicholson: The land would be improved by the clearing away of the stones.

Hon. J. A. GREIG: Yes. The Act provides for the actual value of the land, with improvements, that it would bring in the market. The owner is to be compelled to subdivide his land and sell to the Crown, if required, portion of his property, but Clause 10 also gives him the right to insist upon the Government taking the whole of the property if it is desired to take any of it. I would like to see a provision inserted in the Bill giving the owner the right to reserve a homestead block on a property resumed from him by the Government. Many old pioneers have built up homes for themselves outback, and it seems unreasonable that the Government shall take the whole of their properties and not allow them to retain 1,000 acres as a homestead farm for themselves. This is especially unreasonable when we remember that probably the men who will take over the resumed portions of those holdings will be inexperienced and less likely to make a success than those who have been on the land for many years. Most hon. members will agree with the statement that we have no equitable system of land valuation operating in this State. If a man neither increases nor decreases his holdings, he need not send any additional land tax returns to the Taxation Department. If the Bill be passed and the Government are given the right to resume land on the unimproved value on which taxation has been paid, it will not be fair because some men have not sent in returns for over five years. The value of land has increased during that period. Mr. Moore said that there were men requiring land every day, and I agree with that statement. Mr. Burvill placed before the House details showing the number of applicants for wheat land. During the last three or four years hundreds of men have asked me to assist them to secure blocks of good wheat country. They were not men with much capital. I received a letter to-day from one of the first of the Fairbridge Farm School boys. I had received a letter from the late Mr. Kingsley Fairbridge which he wrote on the day before he died, asking me to do what I could to assist the young fellow I refer to. He gave him splendid references, and said he would regard it as a personal favour if I would do something to assist the lad. For weeks past I have been trying to get the young fellow a block. He is prepared to take up virgin country or a suitable property from the Industries Assistance Board, but I have not been able to get any acceptable area within 15 miles of a railway. We should build more railways into the wheat belt. Some years ago I urged the Government to build railways into those areas where men could make comfortable livings and become prosperous in a very short period. Mr. Moore referred to the Noombling Estate and said that one recommendation of the Royal Commission appointed to inquire into soldier settlement was to the effect that the estate should be written down to the extent of £10,600 on the ground that too much money had been spent on the property. I do not believe that too much was paid for the estate, but we find similar difficulties wherever Government management is concerned. I have always contended that Government management is not as good as private control. If a capitalist had paid 31s. an acre for that estate and appointed a manager to look after it, it would be a paying proposition now, returning not less than 10 per cent. on the outlay. It is not a payable proposition to-day. When the Government purchased the property, instead of placing a manager in charge and stocking it up until they were ready to dispose of the blocks, they sold the stock straight away. Much of the area was poison country and the poison was allowed to grow up again, so that when the soldiers went on the blocks they lost sheep and cattle because they were inexperienced in dealing with poison country. If the Bill be passed —and I do not think it is necessary at this stage——

Hon. A. Burvill: You have just proved that the Bill is necessary.

Hon. J. A. GREIG: I have proved that land is required, but not repurchased estates. Where are there men who have done any good on repurchased estates? We have been repurchasing estates for the past 15 years and, apart from those re-

cently purchased, the Government have had to write down costs right through the piece.

Hon. T. Moore: The men who have been settled there have done well.

Hon. H. Stewart: What about the Avondale and Yandanooka Estates?

Hon. T. Moore: The Yandanooka Estate is all right and if the others can prove as successful, we should buy more estates.

Hon. J. A. GREIG: In my opinion we should see that the men who take up blocks on repurchased estates pay half the price down in hard cash. We could get men prepared to do that in these days when people from the Eastern States are looking for properties. We would make sure under such a system that the Government received back half the purchase money in cash. We would not have men of straw taking up blocks with Government assistance, nor would we have feather-bed settlers, who now hang around the streets of Perth waiting to secure improved farms, close to railway sidings.

Hon. J. Cornell: Some of those feather-bed men settled our back country areas in the early days.

Hon. J. A. GREIG: I maintain that everyone, except returned soldiers, should pay half the purchase price of repurchased blocks in cash. Reference has been made to speculators taking up land in advance of the construction of railways. That practice has been in vogue and such property owners have not been required to pay any rent for the first five years. I voted in favour of that provision, but I believe the Government should insist upon the specified improvements being carried out on such properties within the five-year period; otherwise the settlers should be put off the land. If men take up land for speculative purposes, the Government should enforce the improvement provisions of the Act. The suggestion was made to me that the Bill should be amended to make it apply only to land within 12½ miles of a railway. There are large estates outback in areas to which the Government propose to build railways. Those estates should be purchased before the railway is constructed. There are many such estates that could be purchased with great advantage to the State.

Hon. A. Burvill: You would not propose to purchase the estates unless it had been decided that a railway was to be built to the areas concerned?

Hon. J. A. GREIG: No. One member said that Sir James Mitchell had informed Mr. Hughes that there were many thousands of acres of land unutilised between Pemberton and Perth. Much of that land is between Perth and Pinjarra and was taken up 40 years ago. The people paid £1 an acre and secured the freehold. They ring-barked the timber and fenced in the holdings. Much of the land was poison country, and the holders were not able to run stock without going to considerable expense. It would be impossible for the Government to purchase those areas and place settlers on blocks there satisfactorily. With interest and other costs the land could not be made available at less than £3 an acre. That does not take into account rates and taxes paid by those landowners during the past 40 years.

Hon. H. J. Yelland: Has that land not returned anything to the holders?

Hon. J. A. GREIG: Practically nothing.

Hon. A. Burvill: Then they should be ready to get rid of it at any price!

Hon. J. A. GREIG: After paying the cost of surveys and providing for the construction of roads and other public utilities, the Government could not sell the land for less than £3 an acre. Even then, the settler who took a block would not be in as good a position as if he took up virgin country with 25 years in which to pay for it. There is no necessity for the Closer Settlement Bill, because it is better to build additional railways into new country rather than to repurchase old estates. We are told that we should make our railways pay and that is the only argument in favour of a closer settlement measure

Hon. G. W. Miles: How could you force into use the land you refer to?

Hon. J. A. GREIG: So long as the holders are paying land tax——

Hon. J. Cornell: Do you call that a land tax?

Hon. J. A. GREIG: Some people have been paying on an unimproved value of 12s. 6d. an acre and have paid land tax for years. I could buy that land improved for 4s. an acre.

Hon. T. Moore: That shows the quality of the land!

Hon. J. Cornell: Was it waterlogged?

Hon. J. A. GREIG: Some of it is poison-logged.

Hon. T. Moore: All the land along already authorised railways has been taken up.

Hon. J. A. GREIG: That is so. It is better to construct additional railways into new areas rather than repurchase estates. The Bill allows 10 per cent. for replacement. That is not enough. If a man purchased another property and had to replace his implements, his loss would be a great deal more than 10 per cent., to say nothing of his being out of a place for several months. I seriously suggest to the Minister that he withdraw the Bill and bring down a comprehensive Closer Settlement Bill embracing the Agricultural Lands Purchase Act, the Discharged Soldiers' Settlement Act, and a part of the Public Works Act. Under those existing Acts the Government can repurchase estates for closer settlement. The Government have not the money to repurchase estates, any more than they have the money to build new railways. So if they got the Bill through they would not be able to repurchase estates.

Hon. A. Burvill: Nor to build railways. So where are we?

Hon. J. A. GREIG: That is just where we are. If we had a consolidated measure combining the three existing Acts and the Bill, we would then have less confusion and so less litigation, and we would have one board instead of two.

Hon. G. W. Miles: But you congratulated the Government on the Bill.

Hon. J. A. GREIG: Yes, as being the best of the four we have had. A consolidated measure would be the best of all. The Government, when dealing with closer settlement, should give more consideration to our light lands, of which we have immense areas unselected alongside railways. The Agricultural Bank will not advance on blocks of inferior land.

Hon. G. W. Miles: They are going into that question.

Hon. J. A. GREIG: I hope it will be decided to spend money experimenting with those light lands.

Hon. H. Stewart: That is being done at Wongan Hills.

Hon. J. A. GREIG: There are in this State hundreds of miles of light lands, and they vary just as much as does the good land. So the Government should experiment with these light lands in every district. If the Agricultural Bank would advance to old settlers taking up a little light land—I do not suggest that new settlers should take up all light land—it would help make out railways pay, for the development of such land means extra wealth for the State. I will not support the second reading, because I hope to see a consolidated measure brought down.

Hon. J. CORNELL (South) [10.20]: During the week-end I had opportunity to compare the Bill with the three previous Closer Settlement Bills. In principle I find they are all identical. During the second reading debate on the first and the third Bills—the whole of the discussion on the second Bill was as to whether or not it was constitutional—I made my position clear, expressing the opinion that if in a country like Western Australia a Closer Settlement Bill was required, there was something radically wrong with our system of land settlement. I repeat that. It is a bad advertisement to have it go forth that in a State having so much land and so few people it is necessary to resort to closer settlement. My attitude in voting against the second reading of the first and third Closer Settlement Bills was based on sound reasoning. I did not care how much land a man held so long as he put it to legitimate use. If he did not do that, it seemed to me there was only one logical course to pursue, namely, to bring in land values taxation and force the land into use. I know that farmers are opposed to land values taxation. Still, no man has any valid claim to land if he is not prepared to put it to its legitimate use. The Minister, in reply, may argue that it is futile to endeavour to apply land values taxation. Just the same, until that contention be proved by an attempted application of such a tax, I will continue to believe that such taxation could be successfully applied. I will vote against the second reading of the Bill.

On motion by Colonial Secretary, debate adjourned.

House adjourned at 10.26 p.m.

Legislative Assembly,

Tuesday, 28th October, 1924.

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

QUESTION—STATE CHILDREN DEPARTMENT.

Retirement of Inspector F. Murphy.

Mr. MILLINGTON asked the Honorary Minister (Hon. S. W. Munsie): Is it his intention to lay upon the Table of the House the file of F. Murphy, ex-inspector of the State Children Department?

Hon. S. W. MUNSIE replied: It is not usual to lay the personal files of officers on the Table of the House. I am prepared to furnish the member for Leederville with any information he desires.

QUESTION—WOOROLOO SANATORIUM.

Meat Supplies.

Mr. MARSHALL asked the Honorary Minister (Hon. S. W. Munsie): 1, What is the present cost per lb. of meat supplied to the Wooroloo Sanatorium? (2) What is the estimated cost per lb. if purchased on the hoof and slaughtered at the institution? 3, If the estimated cost is higher, what are the chief factors causing same?

Hon. S. W. MUNSIE replied: 1, Beef, fresh, 8½d. per lb. Mutton, fresh, 9d. per lb. f.o.r. Fremantle. 2 and 3, Prices