

Clause 2—Amendment of Section 5:

Hon. A. J. H. SAW: The object of this clause is to delete the word "common" in Section 5 of the Act. The necessity for omitting that word arises from the proposal to abolish special juries. I think it would be well if the Honorary Minister agreed to consider the question of abolishing special juries before dealing with this clause, so that should the Committee decide that the special jury be retained, there will be no necessity for any argument on this clause or on those clauses that are in the nature of consequential amendments.

The HONORARY MINISTER: Dr. Saw's suggestion may be the easiest way to deal with the question. I move—

That the further consideration of Clause 2 be postponed.

Motion passed.

Clause 3—agreed to.

Clause 4—Amendment of Sections 18 and 19:

Hon. A. J. H. SAW: The same argument applies to this clause.

Hon. J. I. HOLMES: The Honorary Minister has not intimated whether he is agreeable to postponing this clause. I suggest that the further consideration of the Bill be postponed until the next sitting. I have a reason for making the suggestion and will give it to the Honorary Minister if necessary.

The HONORARY MINISTER: I thought members were ready to discuss the Bill, which has been on the Notice Paper for quite a time. The whole object of the Bill is wrapped up in one clause, and the sooner we get to grips the better. However, I am prepared to meet the wishes of members.

Progress reported.

House adjourned at 6.7 p.m.

Legislative Assembly,

Thursday, 8th October, 1925.

	PAGE
Questions: Group Settlement, dairy cattle ...	1213
Shipping Dues, s.s. "Volumnia" ...	1213
Paper: Migration Agreement ...	1214
Bills: Stamp Act Amendment, 1s. ...	1216
Bush Fires Act Amendment, 1s. ...	1215
Permanent Reserve No. 4566, 1s. ...	1215
Road Districts Act Amendment, 1s. ...	1215
Vermion Act Amendment, 1s. ...	1216
Divorce Amendment, Report of Select Committee ...	1215
Western Australian Bank Act Amendment (Private), 3s. ...	1216
Labour Exchanges, Report ...	1215
City of Perth, Council's Amendment ...	1215
Day Baking, 2s. ...	1215
Land Drainage, 2s. ...	1235

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

QUESTION—GROUP SETTLEMENT, DAIRY CATTLE.

Mr. BROWN asked the Minister for Agriculture: 1, What is the average cost per head of dairy cattle recently purchased by Mr. Hampshire? 2, Has any effort been made to purchase dairy cattle in Western Australia? 3, Is he aware that good dairy cows can be purchased in Western Australia at from £8 to £10 per head? 4, Is it a fact that good dairy heifers are being sold for butchers' meat in the markets?

The PREMIER (for the Minister for Agriculture) replied: 1, Those purchased outside the State averaged £4 1s. 4d. 2, Yes; since June, 1924, 3,500 head have been purchased in the State, and it is intended to purchase another 1,000 in the State before the end of this financial year. 3, Yes. See also answer to No. 2. 4, Yes; but the department deprecates this, and endeavours to prevent it, and advises farmers of the demand there is in this State for suitable dairy heifers. An article on this very subject was written in the last "Journal of Agriculture" by the Dairy and Pig Expert.

QUESTION—SHIPPING DUES, S.S. VOLUMNIA.

Mr. SLEEMAN asked the Premier: 1, What amount of wharfage dues was incurred by s.s. "Volumnia"? 2, What amount was paid? 3, What was the reason for the reduction? 4, What powers have the Harbour Trust Commissioners to write off moneys of this nature owing to the Trust?

The PREMIER replied: 1, The steamer "Volumnia" paid the full amount of port dues provided for by the regulation, that is, she paid full dues for the time she was working cargo, and she paid the distress rate for the period she was held up in the port under duress. 2, £908 1s. 9d. 3, There was no reduction. 4, Answered by Nos. 1 and 3.

PAPERS—MIGRATION AGREEMENT.

THE MINISTER FOR LANDS (Hon. W. C. Angwin—North-East Fremantle) [4.35]: I move—

That the papers containing the migration agreement made between the British Government and the Commonwealth Government, and the agreement made between the Commonwealth Government and the State Government, signed by the Premier on 6th October, be laid upon the Table of the House.

Question put and passed.

Ministerial Statement.

THE MINISTER FOR LANDS (Hon. W. C. Angwin—North-East Fremantle) [4.36]: The papers that have just been placed on the Table of the House contain the migration agreement made between the British Government and the Commonwealth Government, and the agreement made between the Commonwealth Government and the State Government, as signed by the Premier on the assurance being given that the amendments required by the State would be embodied in another document. A copy of such amendments, and telegrams and letters from the Commonwealth Government giving such an assurance, are attached to the papers. It will be noted that the new agreement is a considerable improvement on the agreement entered into by the British, Commonwealth, and State Governments in 1923, its scope being much wider regarding development generally. It provides for public works in addition to land settlement, and such works or land settlement can be carried out in any part of the State, subject to schemes being submitted and approved by the British and Commonwealth Governments. The British Government have a representative in Australia in the person of Mr. W. Bankes Amery, of the Overseas Settlement Office, for the purpose of considering schemes that are proposed, and to ad-

vise the British Government of such proposals. It is considered that his presence will save considerable time in finalising any proposal or scheme that is put forward. It will also be noted that the State is not confined to Crown lands, but can, if it is considered advisable, repurchase land for settlement, and make a charge for it accordingly. The agreement also provides that in the case of land settlement, 50 per cent. of those so placed under the agreement on the land may be other than migrants. Hon. members will further note that the agreement provides that for each and every £750,000 provided by loan to the State by the Commonwealth Government, the State must satisfactorily receive and settle 10,000 migrants. If it applies to public works development, the sum is £75 for each migrant, but for land settlement the loan allowed for interest reduction is £1,000 per farm. If the preparation of the farm costs over this amount, the State provides the money and can charge it to the holder of the land. The interest rate to be paid to the Commonwealth Government for moneys loaned under the agreement is 1 per cent. for the first five years, and for the succeeding five years one-third of the rate payable by the Commonwealth Government for moneys that are provided. The agreement also provides for assistance for losses on stock and equipment, with a limitation of £300 for each migrant on the land, the losses being equally divided between the British, Commonwealth, and State Governments. The term "migrant" under the agreement means a person nominated in Western Australia, or accepted as an assisted migrant by the Commonwealth authorities in London. The House will also note that the Commonwealth Government have given an assurance that they will make retrospective the application of the new agreement by superseding the original agreement entered into by the previous Government, thus bringing the schemes arranged by the previous agreement under the terms and conditions of the new agreement and its modification accordingly.

Mr. Sampson: It was always understood from the beginning that any amendment would be retrospective. I think this was stated by Mr. Colebatch.

The MINISTER FOR LANDS: I did not understand that.

The Premier: No, it was never understood to be retrospective.

The MINISTER FOR LANDS: Mr. Colebatch merely said that if the other States had a better agreement than ours, he would endeavour to bring ours into line with theirs.

The Premier: From that date. It was not to be retrospective.

The MINISTER FOR LANDS: This means bringing most of the present group settlements under the terms and conditions of the new agreement. It is unnecessary for me to remind hon. members of the advantage this is to the State. It will mean the saving of a very large sum of money. As the agreement has now been signed by the Premier, the terms of which provide for moneys at a low rate of interest for ten years, it is the intention of the Government to proceed actively with migration, and they propose to place before the British and Commonwealth Governments at an early date schemes for the construction of public works, so urgently necessary for the development of the State in addition to land settlement.

BILLS (5)—FIRST READING.

1, Stamp Act Amendment.

Introduced by the Premier.

2, Bush Fires Act Amendment.

3, Permanent Reserve No. 4566.

Introduced by the Minister for Lands.

4, Road Districts Act Amendment.

Introduced by the Minister for Works.

5, Vermin Act Amendment.

Introduced by the Minister for Lands
(for the Minister for Agriculture).

BILL—DIVORCE AMENDMENT.

Report of Select Committee.

On motion by Mr. Mann, report of the Select Committee appointed to inquire into this Bill, received and read.

BILL—WESTERN AUSTRALIAN BANK ACT AMENDMENT (PRIVATE).

Read a third time and transmitted to the Council.

BILL—LABOUR EXCHANGES.

Report of Committee adopted.

BILL—CITY OF PERTH.

Council's Amendment.

A Message having been received from the Council notifying that it had agreed to the Bill subject to an amendment, the Message was now considered.

In Committee.

Mr. Lutey in the Chair; the Minister for Lands in charge of the Bill.

The CHAIRMAN: The Council's amendment is as follows:—

“Clause 5, Subclause (3).—Insert after the word ‘new,’ in the fifth line, the words ‘except for the purpose of completing a building already in course of erection at the time of the prescribing of the new building line as aforesaid.’”

The MINISTER FOR LANDS: Some doubt has existed in the minds of the legal fraternity as to whether the Bill as agreed to in the Assembly would prohibit buildings now in course of erection being completed, or whether it would prohibit compensation being paid in respect of buildings erected before the new street alignment is fixed by the City Council. It is in order to make the position clear regarding those buildings in relation to compensation, that the amendment is suggested by the Council. I move—

That the Council's amendment be agreed to.

Question put and passed.

Resolution reported and the report adopted.

BILL—DAY BAKING.

Second Reading.

Debate resumed from 29th September.

HON. SIR JAMES MITCHELL (Northam) [4.55]: When moving the second reading, the Minister for Works stated that the Bill was introduced because the Labour section of the League of Nations at a conference said that it should be introduced. I do not know whether the Geneva lever is a bit stronger, in the Minister's opinion, than the Royal Commission appointed to inquire into this and other matters here. We should have waited until we received the Royal Commission's report.

The Minister for Works: Which Commission do you refer to?

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: The Prices Commission.

The Minister for Works: That Commission is not inquiring into the question of day or night baking.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: It is one of their functions to inquire into this question.

The Minister for Works: It is not.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: The Commission cannot report until this question has been considered. The Minister knows full well that in considering the price of bread, the cost of production is affected by night or day baking. Parliament should have the report of the Royal Commission before considering the Bill now before us. I know from one member of the Royal Commission that they have some special knowledge on this question. I do not wish to imply that any opinion has been expressed regarding day or night baking, but I know the members of the Commission have taken evidence on that question. The point to be considered is whether bread can be baked satisfactorily during the day time and supplied satisfactorily to the people. We must not forget that 80 per cent. of the bread supplied is consumed by men of small means, and their convenience must be considered in dealing with this question. Everyone hopes that, if possible, all work may be done in daylight. I do not know whether it is possible, but the Minister has admitted that the whole of the work in connection with the baking industry cannot be done during the day time.

The Minister for Works: Nor could all of it be done during the night time.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: The Minister admits that a certain amount of work must be done during the night time, even should the Bill be agreed to. What that amounts to can only be determined by those who are conducting the industry. The Minister has his inspectors and I presume has a greater knowledge than we have regarding the whole matter. The fact remains, however, that some work will have to be done at night each week. People have to be properly fed, and those who undertake the duty of supplying people with food, recognise that it must be done at some cost to the comfort of those engaged in the work. It is unavoidable. In the butchering business people have to work during the early hours of the morning, and so it is with those engaged in the delivery of milk as well. I cannot understand people objecting to bread that is a few hours old. Some who live in

the country have their bread delivered by rail and often it is 24 hours before it reaches them. In some instances people get their supplies only twice a week. We all want to see that the public is properly served. Whether or not that can be done by day baking, I am not in a position to say. I should like to see bread very much better baked, a little more time given to it. It may be because it is baked by night that much of it contains undue moisture, and so is not particularly wholesome. Whether that will be changed by day baking, I do not know. I hope it will be. Those supplying bread have a good many things to contend with. First there is the question of statutory weights. Perhaps it is because of this that sometimes we get bread sent out before it has been properly cooked. The Bill brings not only those employing others, but men doing their own work into line in respect of day baking. When Parliament sets about restricting work, as we are doing now, to day time, it is difficult to argue that we should not bring all people baking bread under the same conditions. It shows how impossible it is for Parliament to take a hand in any question like this without creating some anomaly. I confess that if I were asked to say that people who do their own work should be subject to the regulations set out for those employing others, I should resist it strenuously, for I think those who do their own work should work largely as they please. However, I cannot argue that if a man employing others has to bake by day, those who bake for themselves should not be restricted in the same way. We are not engaged in setting up restrictions that will be general, but are merely applying those restrictions to a special trade. I am told that those who bake for themselves to-day can send out hot bread, whereas those that are employing others are restricted to sending out cold bread baked the day before. I do not think the Minister should put upon people any greater restriction than is necessary. Pastry-cooks are permitted to cook by night because their goods, if baked the day before, would not find a market. The Minister, when dealing with this question, should remember that pastry shops sell not only pastry, but rolls also, and that rolls are in demand only while fresh. I do not know whether it is in the Minister's mind that such people should have the right to bake rolls as well as pastry by night, whether he intends to exempt them from the operations of this measure. If

should be sufficient if he applied the restriction to bread alone.

The Minister for Works: In Geneva the decision covered pastry and flour confectionery, too.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: Why the Minister adheres so strictly to all that was said in Geneva, I do not know. We have some knowledge of our own conditions, and of our own people; some knowledge of their willingness to pay a price for pastry cooked by night. It is a more costly operation than cooking by day. If people are willing to pay a special price, and other people are willing to work by night for the extra price, I do not see why the Minister should raise any serious objection to it. It is quite a different matter when it comes to the baking of bread. I hope the Minister will allow pastrycooks to cook rolls as well as pastry by night. Then, again, the Minister will have to consider the question of country bakers, men in small centres who do all their own work and who frequently have to bake by night. After all, I suppose we can so amend the Bill as to exempt men working under such conditions in small centres. That question can be considered when in Committee. I hope the Minister has already considered it and will be prepared to listen to argument in that respect.

Hon. G. Taylor: You are still optimistic, expecting anything of the Minister.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: I may be. I have in mind men who have started baking in a small way. Although the quantity of bread they bake at first is certainly not very great, it is of importance that they should be able to do it, not only to themselves, but to the people whom they serve. I have no intention of opposing the second reading. First of all, I believe that where the work can be done by day it should be so done; secondly, I feel that all those who supply bread to the public should supply it under more or less the same conditions, whether they do their own work or employ others. I want to make it clear that in my view we should not restrict the man who desires to get out of the rut and start for himself. Nearly every man who in this country has made his own way, has made his way from very small beginnings. After all, it is by the enterprise of such men that countries like ours are built up.

MR. MANN (Perth) [5.10]: I do not know what has influenced the Minister to

make the starting hour 8 o'clock. If he made the starting hour 6 o'clock and arranged for an earlier finish, it would meet the wishes of the employees and be of greater service to the trade. The first reason why night baking has been the vogue for so many years past is that it is difficult to manage the dough during excessive heat. Probably when the dough is set at midnight there is every appearance of a cool day, but by 7 o'clock or 8 o'clock in the morning a stinging hot day has set in, and before the dough can be turned into bread there is every possibility of its souring. That is why night baking has been the general practice, namely, in order that the dough may be handled and managed in the cool hours of the night, as against the warm hours of the day. Science and advancement in methods have enabled bakers to overcome that difficulty to some extent by newer forms of yeast and of machinery. However, the difficulty still exists that on a hot morning it is impossible to handle the dough satisfactorily and put it into bread in time to save it from going sour.

Hon. W. D. Johnson: Only in exceptional cases.

Mr. MANN: Even so, if the risk is there and we can avoid it while still giving the operatives reasonable hours, why should we not try to do so? In my view, however, the cases will be rather more than exceptional in very warm weather. There may be two or three doughs already set, one following on the other, each set at a certain temperature. The first dough is put into the oven, but with extreme heat from 8 a.m. onwards the other doughs come on faster than they can be used, with the result that a large percentage of the dough is soured and goes to waste. The member for Guildford (Hon. W. D. Johnson) is connected with the trade, and he knows that what I am saying is correct.

Hon. W. D. Johnson: The difficulty does exist, but only to a limited extent.

Mr. MANN: Well let us try to avoid it. There may be every appearance of cool weather when the doughs are set at a temperature to meet the expected weather. They have to be warm enough to come on in reasonable time. But suddenly warm weather sets in, and by 8 o'clock in the morning it is exceedingly hot, while by dinner-time one or two of the doughs may be sour and unfit for use. If the Minister had made the starting hour 6 a.m. and arranged for an

earlier finish it would have been much better. I spent some of the earlier years of my life in this trade in Victoria, and so I know a little about it. It is not pleasant working by night, and if we can avoid night baking I will gladly help. I think the Minister did not say what influenced him to make the starting hour 8 o'clock. Many tradesmen have to start work some hours earlier than that. The milkman starts at 6 o'clock or earlier, the tramwayman before 6 o'clock, and so, too, railwaymen, and butchers and others.

Hon. W. D. Johnson: Even the domestic slaves start at 6 a.m.

Mr. MANN: I do not know about domestic slaves; I suppose we are all slaves.

Hon. W. D. Johnson: I am speaking of myself and of having to go out to chop the wood.

Mr. MANN: The Legislature has seen fit to fix different hours in summer as against winter time for the butchering business, because the weather has an effect upon meat.

Hon. W. D. Johnson: That might be done in the baking trade.

Mr. MANN: That is what I wish to point out. The same difficulty exists with regard to dough as to meat. The dough matures more quickly and needs to be handled more expeditiously in the hot weather as against the cold weather. The Minister has made a mistake in setting 8 a.m. as the starting time for baking. If he would agree to make the hour of starting 6 a.m. in winter and 5 a.m. in summer, the operatives could cease work earlier, it would suit the trade and there would not be the risk of losing dough or having sour bread. If a baker had a pastrycook working at night time and he finished at 8 a.m., another baker would have to be employed to make rolls. Roll baking is not heavy work, and I do not know why the Minister has not made provision to permit of the baking of rolls with pastry. Bakers of bread do not bake rolls to any great extent; some bake a certain number of rolls for special customers, but roll baking is more the work of pastrycooks. With the alterations I have indicated, the Bill will be acceptable and should prove beneficial.

MR. THOMSON (Katanning) [5.17]: I have received requests by telegram and letter from every baker in my constituency, I have received letters forwarded to members of another place by bakers at Albany and Mt. Barker, and I have seen

telegrams from Wagin and Narrogin all to the effect that country bakers will be confronted with a very difficult proposition if this measure becomes law.

Hon. W. D. Johnson: Did you get any wires from the employees?

Mr. THOMSON: A majority of the bakers in the country districts do their own work and employ perhaps a lad to deliver the bread. The passing of this measure will inflict a great hardship upon them in that they will no longer be able to do their own work. This will mean that costs will be considerably increased. Again and again we have heard complaints of the abnormally high cost of living; it has been contended that the workers are not receiving sufficient wages to keep body and soul together, and yet almost every measure with which we have dealt this session will have the effect of still further increasing the cost of living. We have evidence from many bakers that this measure will involve increased costs and that it will be impossible for them to carry on without employing hands. Where a man is doing his own baking and can manage with the assistance of a youth to deliver the bread, he is able to supply his customers at the general price and has a paying proposition. Under the provisions of this measure, however, the business will become unprofitable owing to the extra charge that will be involved by the employment of hands.

Hon. W. D. Johnson: Explain how that will happen; I cannot follow you there.

Mr. THOMSON: I should not expect the hon. member to follow me because, for many years, he has been an advocate of day baking. He is entitled to his opinion. I am voicing the views of men who are dependent upon baking for a livelihood.

Hon. W. D. Johnson: I want you to explain how day baking will require more men than night baking.

Mr. THOMSON: Often a man in business in the country not only bakes the bread but delivers it also.

Hon. W. D. Johnson: He could do that under this measure.

Mr. THOMSON: This proposal is the outcome of a decision of the Geneva Convention. From the point of view of a majority of the convention delegates, I am not prepared to say that day baking would not be more suitable than night baking, but we have to consider the climatic conditions of Western Australia. If I were a baker

I would unhesitatingly say, "Give me night baking as against day baking, particularly in the summer time."

Hon. W. D. Johnson: Have a go at it and see.

The Minister for Works: Yes, he has not done any night work.

Mr. THOMSON: According to members opposite, I never know anything.

The Premier: Any man who has done much night work would not favour it in preference to day work.

Mr. THOMSON: That again is a matter of opinion.

The Premier: It is not a matter of opinion; it is a matter of experience.

Mr. Sampson: Literary men claim that they do their best work at night.

Mr. THOMSON: It is purely a matter of opinion. The Federated Master Bakers' Association of Australia issued a statement of reasons why the Federal Government should not support the decision of the Geneva Convention in favour of day baking. This is a domestic question, and it should not be governed by the decision of an international labour conference held at Geneva. If the proposal be given effect to here, it will certainly add to the cost of production. That is clearly set out in a statutory declaration accompanying the master bakers' statement to the Federal Government. Further, such an enactment would interfere with the liberty of the subject. Members on the Government side laugh, and I quite expected my remark to evoke hilarity from them. It is a remarkable fact that every Bill introduced by the Minister for Works is restrictive.

The Premier: Nearly every Bill that any Minister brings in is restrictive.

Mr. THOMSON: This fact is marked in connection with industrial legislation.

The Minister for Works: Particularly the legislation introduced by the Minister for Works.

Mr. THOMSON: The Minister for Works is introducing those Bills and it may be his misfortune that it is his duty to do so, but he must bear the responsibility. The Federal Court of Conciliation and Arbitration, presided over by Mr. Justice Rich, concluded after most exhaustive inquiry that to abolish night work would be against the interests of the public, the employees and the employers. Why should baking of all businesses be specially selected for the

abolition of night work? Why are not the Government consistent in abolishing night work? We start at 4.30 in the afternoon and continue on the average till 11 p.m. and sometimes we sit all night.

The Minister for Lands: None of us starts at 4.30, I suppose.

Mr. THOMSON: That is the remarkable thing; Ministers are administering their departments all day before coming to Parliament. Let us apply the abolition of night work to this House. The Government are not consistent. Why should night work for the manufacture of fresh bread for the people be abolished when no attempt is made to stop the manufacture of flour or of biscuits, the printing of papers, or the running of trams and trains? The Government find that it would be impossible to stop those activities and that it would not be in the interests of the public to interfere with them. But why specially select the baking business for the prohibition of night work? In my opinion the reason for the introduction of this Bill is to be found in the Industrial Arbitration Act Amendment Bill, and it was indicated by the Minister for Works when dealing with that Bill. The Government are out to stop the small man, who is endeavouring to build up a business for himself.

The Minister for Works: No.

Mr. THOMSON: I do not doubt the sincerity of the Minister's endeavour to give effect to the resolutions carried by the Geneva Conference. That is, no doubt, a laudable object; but I do not think we should be bound, necessarily, by resolutions passed at Geneva. Only one representative from Western Australia attended that conference, and he was not sent at the request of the people of Western Australia.

The Minister for Works: He was sent there to represent Australia.

Mr. THOMSON: He was not sent at the request of the people of Australia.

The Minister for Works: He was nominated by the Federal Government.

Mr. THOMSON: Quite correct. He was asked to go to Geneva and take part in a conference which was to decide whether Western Australia should have day baking or night baking! The thing is too absurd. If the Minister is prepared to hand over to a conference held in Geneva the domestic arrangements of Western Australia, no other representative of Australia—

The Premier: This proposal can be justified on its merits, quite apart from the Geneva Conference.

Mr. THOMSON: That is a debateable point. I hold that it is not in the interests of the workers themselves or of the people that night baking should be abolished.

The Premier: The same argument has been used ever since the Stone Age.

Mr. THOMSON: The same kind of argument continues to be used on the other side. To be consistent, we should provide that no newspaper must be printed at night.

Hon. W. D. Johnson: Oh, don't be silly.

Mr. THOMSON: It is so easy to say "don't be silly" when the argument does not suit the other side.

The Premier: Why ask for the impossible?

Mr. THOMSON: It is just as logical to argue that trains and trams should not run at night because their doing so means compelling people to work at night and to sleep by day.

The Minister for Works: Do the trams run all night?

Mr. THOMSON: I suppose some tram conductors and motormen do not get home until 2 and 3 a.m.

The Minister for Works: They get home much earlier than we do sometimes.

The Premier: Nobody is arguing that all night work should be abolished, but we say that here is a case where it can be diminished.

Mr. THOMSON: That is a debateable point. One can abolish almost everything by Act of Parliament. We have passed a Bill to abolish the rights of private persons to conduct registry offices. The Government can do almost anything by legislation so long as they have the necessary majority behind them. It does not follow as a matter of course, however, that such legislation is right. The logic of this Bill is on the lines of the argument that trains which now run at night should stop when they come to a certain stage.

The Premier: Oh!

Hon. G. Taylor: It would be highly inconvenient.

Mr. THOMSON: It would be just as logical, because the train staff have to sleep during the day.

The Minister for Lands: In Java no trains are run at night, and nobody is dissatisfied.

Mr. THOMSON: We are not living in Java. In Java everything is much cheaper

than here. I do not think the Minister for Lands is sincerely desirous of introducing Javanese conditions into Western Australia. Now I propose to read some extracts from "Statutory Declarations and Statements from the Federal Master Bakers' Association of Australia"—

That the master bakers are utterly opposed to day baking is clearly indicated by a motion unanimously adopted at the conference held at Hobart in October, 1924. Every State of the Commonwealth and the Dominion of New Zealand was represented. The discussion showed that day baking added to the cost, resulted in bread of poorer quality, and is opposed to the public desire.

The name of the member for Guildford shines here—

Mr W. D. Johnson, M.L.A., ex-secretary of the union, is desirous of passing legislation making day baking generally compulsory, the present position being that some of those not employing labour do work at night. So the statement that day baking is firmly established in Western Australia is not in conformity with the facts.

That is the statement which the member for Guildford is alleged to have made.

Hon. W. D. Johnson: Day baking is firmly established here so far as the Arbitration Court is concerned.

Mr. THOMSON: The pamphlet continues—

It is true the Victorian and New South Wales unions went on strike, but equally true they were badly beaten. Master bakers do not want day baking, because experience has taught them it is unsatisfactory to their customers, who will not have stale bread, and whom it is their business to please.

The Minister for Works: The explanation is that they do not do the baking.

Mr. THOMSON: I proceed with the extract—

I believe I am absolutely right in stating that the great majority of master bakers are strongly opposed to day baking. As far as my information goes, that is correct. The recent conference, which was fully representative, every State of the Commonwealth being represented and also the Dominion of New Zealand, unanimously carried a resolution condemning it. Western Australia's climatic conditions make day baking unsatisfactory for the following reasons:—(1) The employees' health is impaired by the intense heat of summer, added to the heat of the bakehouse. (2) The bread is of an inferior quality, owing to the dryness of the climate. From the employers' standpoint the greater cost, plus the reduced output, forces us, after a long trial, to condemn day baking. And I make this solemn declaration, conscientiously believing the same to be true, and by virtue of the provisions of the Statutory Declarations Act, 1915.

The Minister for Works: By whom is that declared?

Mr. THOMSON: By Mr. T. C. Ferguson, at Perth, on the 4th March, 1925.

The Premier: That is the end of it. He declares his opinion upon oath.

Mr. THOMSON: That opinion is substantiated and borne out by the conference, which carried the resolution unanimously. It is the opinion of the conference.

Hon. W. D. Johnson: Those are the little men you are so concerned about!

Mr. THOMSON: The men who have written and telegraphed to me are men who are doing their own baking, and they are strongly opposed to the passing of the Bill.

Hon. W. D. Johnson: Tell me one who is doing his own baking.

Mr. THOMSON: Mr. Hobbs.

Hon. W. D. Johnson: He employs men.

Mr. THOMSON: Mr. Hobbs bakes bread himself. I have seen him in his bakehouse with his sleeves up, working.

Hon. W. D. Johnson: Undoubtedly.

Mr. THOMSON: Then there is Mr. Dennis, who does the same thing; and at Albany Mr. Day does his own baking. The member for Albany (Mr. A. Wansbrough) can confirm that.

Mr. A. Wansbrough: Mr. Day does not employ labour.

Mr. THOMSON: There are letters and telegrams from other bakers. The member for Wagin (Mr. Stubbs) can deal with the bakers who are conducting their business there.

Hon. W. D. Johnson: They employ labour just as the Katanning bakers do.

Mr. THOMSON: Now I go to Queensland, for which State I am sure members opposite have a deal of sympathy. A lot of legislation has been introduced into this House because it exists in Queensland and has, we are told, proved highly beneficial there. I have here a statement made by the secretary of the Master Bakers' Association of Queensland.

The Premier: Time will be saved if we take it for granted that the master bakers of Australia are unanimously against day baking.

Mr. THOMSON: The Queensland statement contains the following:—

Night baking, in our opinion, is ideal in a climate such as ours, since it enables the baker to—(1) have more regular control of his requirements for the following day; (2) combat climatic changes in the making of

doughs; (3) supply the public demand for a fresh loaf. On the other hand, we have experienced that with day baking, commencing time 8 a.m., we are constantly striving to produce a loaf and deliver it the same day, and in endeavouring to do this we find that with the carters starting at 7 a.m. they have to start their early morning deliveries with bread baked the day before, for which there is absolutely no demand; and it is with great difficulty that bread baked the day previously is disposed of.

Mr. Marshall: That is the great trouble.

Mr. THOMSON: As the member for Murchison suggests, it is the great trouble. After all, it is to be presumed that the people who are in the business endeavour to supply the public with what they want.

Hon. S. W. Munsie: It is not always good that the public should get what they want.

Mr. THOMSON: When we go into a shop, we go in for what we want, not for what the shopkeeper desires us to take.

The Minister for Lands: Very often we do take what the shopkeeper wants us to take.

Mr. THOMSON: We are arriving at a stage of restriction when it is proposed to say by Act of Parliament that we shall not eat fresh bread but must eat stale bread. Presently we shall be told that we must not drink any substance other than bore water or perhaps hills water. I strongly object to such restrictions. I quote from the Queensland statement further to show the position which will be reached here if this Bill passes—

The fresh breakfast roll or loaf has quite disappeared from the breakfast table of the public, who now have to content themselves with stale bread, and especially on Monday mornings with bread baked on the preceding Friday, or nearly three days old. Although day baking has been in operation over 10 years, we are as utterly opposed to it now as when it was first inaugurated, and look forward in the hope that we may revert to night baking, when the master baker and employer will again be in the position of being able so to control and conduct his business as to fit in with the public requirements.

Under this measure bakers will not be able to conduct their own businesses or supply the needs of the public.

Hon. W. D. Johnson: Why has the Arbitration Court laid down that bread shall be baked during the day?

Mr. THOMSON: Why did the Federal Arbitration Court declare that that should not be enforced?

Hon. W. D. Johnson: The Federal Arbitration Court has never been approached on the subject.

Mr. THOMSON: The hon. member cannot have been listening, because here is a statutory declaration stating that the Federal Arbitration Court, presided over by Mr. Justice Rich, after a most exhaustive inquiry concluded that it was against the interests of the public, the employees, and the employers to abolish night work.

Mr. Marshall: What industry was he dealing with then?

Mr. THOMSON: Baking.

Mr. Marshall: I do not think so.

Mr. THOMSON: The Western Australian bakers who were in business were never consulted. Of course that does not matter. Then this follows:—

Night baking of bread by long established custom proved so satisfactory inasmuch that the making of doughs is not finished until bread carters return from the day's delivery, with a report which enables the baker to gauge the next day's requirements. The bread is baked in the cool hours of the night, cooled off, and delivered first thing in the morning. The carters are finished, and the day's deliveries are recorded by the clerical staff in reasonable time.

I have quoted several extracts to show that the Bill, if passed as we have it before us, will inflict a distinct hardship on those who are in business in the country districts, and who endeavour to supply the needs and requirements of the people around them. I am not so optimistic as the Leader of the Opposition about inducing the Minister to amend the Bill in this direction, because from the experience we have had in dealing with other Bills of this class, we know that we have not been permitted to do anything. One must of course commend the Minister, but those of us who are in the minority are entitled to put up a fight for what we believe to be right. I do not suppose that we shall be able to carry any amendments to the Bill, but I do urge the Minister that if it is his intention to insist on the Bill becoming law, to make it applicable only to the metropolitan area, where we have large bake-houses, and so give the bakers in the small country districts a reasonable chance of carrying on as they desire. In many cases in the country men not only bake but deliver the bread. If the Minister agrees to my proposal, he will be supplying to the people a long-felt want.

The Minister for Works: What is this long-felt want?

Mr. THOMSON: In some parts of the country, trains are run once a week and it is possible to deliver bread at such intervals only. There are cases where women are not able to bake good bread, and they are obliged to get in a week's supply. We also know of instances where bread is sent out by the mail. Again, the proposal of the Minister is a direct attack upon the liberty of the subject. A man who desires to begin on a small scale and then to work his way up by carrying on his operations in certain hours, will not be permitted to do so. A man engaged in baking and who may be desirous of bettering his position, will be debarred from doing so. The Minister should realise that legislation of this description, imposing restrictions, is playing into the hands of the large employers and monopolists. The small man is not given a chance to get out of the rut. By working a little extra time the small man might eventually be able to build up and establish a sound business. Restrictions such as these are not in the interests of the State. I shall oppose the second reading.

MR. STUBBS (Wagin) [5.50]: I have listened to the speeches that have been made on the second reading of the Bill, and I have come to the conclusion that the Minister, when framing the Bill, did not give sufficient consideration to the different parts of the State. The metropolitan area is compact. I can give instances that should convince any fair-minded man that if the Bill passes as it is framed, it will inflict a hardship on several families in my electorate. I fancy that the same remark will apply equally to people in other parts of the State who have also started in a small way in the hope of eventually making a competency for themselves. One matter that cannot be refuted is that climatic conditions in the eastern parts of the State are not conducive to the baking of good bread if that bread be baked in the day time. If the Minister will limit the operations of the Bill to the big towns in the metropolitan area and exempt the people in the back-blocks who do not employ labour, I shall give him my support.

Hon. W. D. Johnson: There are employees at Wagin.

Mr. STUBBS: One baker there employs his son.

Hon. W. D. Johnson: Other labour is employed at Waging.

Mr. STUBBS: The men I have in mind are working for themselves.

Hon. W. D. Johnson: But whilst you are assisting them, you are injuring others.

Mr. STUBBS: The bakers in my electorate set their bread early in the evening, have a few hours sleep and then proceed with the baking. Another important point is that certain trains run only once or twice a week and they carry large quantities of bread to the railway workers who have not the facilities to bake their own. Those people will get bread several days old if day baking is insisted upon. I shall not oppose the Bill if the Minister agrees to limit it to the metropolitan area, where there are facilities for cooling. In the country towns the methods adopted are still primitive and therefore the positions cannot be compared. When the Bill is in Committee I hope I will be permitted to move an amendment which will have the effect of exempting the country bakers from the operations of the measure.

HON. W. D. JOHNSON (Guildford) [5.55]: The Bill is really not the outcome of any decision arrived at at the Geneva Conference. The discussions that took place and the decisions arrived at were quoted as evidence that the question of day baking is not limited to Western Australia, but is world-wide. When a question is world wide, and when it is possible for workers in various parts of the world to make a subject of this description an issue at the Geneva Conference, hon. members should be big enough to realise that there is some reason for it. The member for Katanning asked why the Bill was introduced. Surely he is big enough to realise that if a subject becomes a question of importance at the Geneva Conference, and the Conference is sympathetic to the extent that it recommends the abolition of night baking, it ought to be patent that the Conference realises that the workers have been suffering some disability. The agitation for day baking has been going on in Australasia for at least 30 years. It is 20 years, as far as I can remember, since there was a strike in Perth of the operative bakers for the purpose of trying to bring about day baking. The bakers were successful for a time, and, unfortunately, the difficulties of those days exist again now. Some master bakers hav-

ing a little humanity in their compositions, recognised the disabilities of the workers in the industry and agreed to day baking. They found however, that their opponents were taking advantage to such an extent of what they were doing that they were forced to return to the old order of things. The workers continued to agitate, and during the last 20 years there have been no end of conferences on the subject. Ultimately in 1919 the matter went before the Arbitration Court and it was at that time that I became more actively associated with the question. In the application that we submitted we specified day baking. Fortunately the court decided at that time to prohibit night baking, and introduced baking from 6 a.m. to 6 p.m. That was accepted by the employers. It was not fought to any extent in the court. I admit they opposed it, and they did their best to convince the court, but there was not that bitterness of feeling that the speech of the member for Katanning (Mr. Thomson) would lead us to believe existed. The master bakers have some little humanity in their composition. They are not all like the member for Katanning, who thinks only of profits all the time. They did have some consideration for their employees. Quite a number of the master bakers were not opposed to the application of the union that the court should introduce day baking. We succeeded in getting a decision from the court in favour of day baking. That necessitated a re-organisation of the industry. The master bakers promptly got to work and established their businesses on the day baking basis. Immediately they commenced to do this, the old system that had undermined the day baking when it was first introduced as a voluntary agreement between the employers and the employees came into being again. The non-employers of labour, recognising that they were not bound by the court, owing to the limitation of the court, to bake during the day, set to work to bake at any hour that would give them a competitive advantage over those who were bound to observe the Arbitration award. We then began to see that men who were bound by the award were having their business interfered with. The organisation that had been established on the day baking system was slowly but surely being undermined by the operations of the other men who were outside the arrangement. In many cases these people

deliberately watched the businesses of those who were in a big way, employing labour, and were bound by the award, with the object of visiting the shops with which they were doing business. They would then discuss with those shopkeepers the question whether if they could get their bread at a different hour, and a little newer they would transfer their business to them, although it meant undermining the business of the other men. In that way they gradually got hold of a number of these shops and big customers, and took the business away from the establishments that were employing labour and with which they had been trading for many years. These shops and big customers began to go over to the small men, who were establishing businesses wherever they could get a bakehouse. Unfortunately, some of the employees were selfish enough to take advantage of the situation. I anticipate that during the debate this will be hurled against us. As one who is associated with the union I am sorry to admit that greed actuated some of the motives of the employees who then resigned from the union.

Mr. Mann: Is not all humanity alike?

Hon. W. D. JOHNSON: Unfortunately, when men have banded together to secure industrial conditions, and when they can see a possibility of getting a little profit for themselves by undermining that for which they have fought for years, there are always a few who will do that. In this case the number, I am proud to say, was limited, and very few left the union for the purpose of establishing businesses. There were several shops where the families were used in order to do the night baking. These places organised their business so as to do a maximum amount of harm to those bakers who were bound by the award. The employees could see that something would have to be done to prevent this unfair competition. They could see that the employers were not getting fair consideration, that it was unfair to tie them up, and that their businesses should be interfered with by those who were working all kinds of hours and under all kinds of conditions with the deliberate purpose of affecting the trade of the others. We, therefore, set to work. It was at this stage that I came back into the union to try to put the day baking system upon a more practicable and definite basis. I had been the advocate before the court, and thought that everything was all right as soon

as we got the award. As I say, it was not long before these unfair conditions crept in. The position became so troublesome that it required special attention on the part of the union. We had many conferences, not only with the employers of labour, but with the non-employers of labour. We tried at various times to reason with them and to show how unfair it was to the others. The master bakers at Fremantle, and what are known as the small bakers, met and admitted the unfairness of the position. They agreed at one stage that they would attempt as small men to limit their baking to day baking hours, or to conduct their business within reasonable limits of the day baking conditions, so as not to compete unfairly with those who were bound by the award, and to give them a reasonable opportunity of conducting their business under the award conditions. Unfortunately, there are always a few disgruntled individuals. I think only two men broke away from the undertaking, but these were sufficient to make the conditions impossible. Again, we had to depart from the voluntary agreement which had been arrived at, because one or two would not comply with the wishes of the vast majority. We have had numerous compulsory conferences in the Arbitration Court, and numerous expressions of opinion from Presidents of the court, who have all realised the difficulty in regard to the day baking provision. We got these conditions established in 1919, and they continue to-day. That is worth emphasising. The court first introduced the system in 1919. I am prepared to admit that we have had all sorts of difficulties. Since that time we have been on the verge of strikes on more than one occasion. We were obliged to have the provisions of the Act in regard to compulsory conferences put into operation, but we have always been able to avoid a real cessation of work, although the conditions at times made it appear as if it would be impossible to carry on. Despite all these difficulties we have been able to get other agreements and other decisions given, until to-day we are maintaining the day baking provision. I do not think there is any possibility of the court going back on its decision of 1919. It is because of the limitations of the Arbitration Act that this Bill has had to be introduced. It is advisable to put on record that when some years ago an amendment of the Factories and Shops Act was being discussed members of another

place introduced an amendment providing for a condition that did operate in the baking industry. The amendment was to the effect that where an award of the court or an agreement had been made, establishing a certain industrial condition or a certain industrial practice in any particular industry, that industrial condition should be made a common rule so far as all factories were concerned, and they also made a bakehouse a factory. When we got that through we thought our troubles were over. General approval was expressed. We immediately negotiated with the employers to draft an agreement to take the place of the Arbitration Court award which was just about to expire. Under that agreement we all recognised that we should take advantage of the amendment, and, using it, we drafted our agreement on the basis of the amendment under the impression that it would operate. After we had finalised our industrial agreement, we found that there were men who were not prepared to abide by the agreement, and were not prepared to admit the existence of the factories legislation. They refused to discontinue night baking. The factories legislation led us to believe that we had power to prevent night baking by non-employers of labour. Having discovered that certain men refused to recognise this amendment to the Act, or the agreement which had been registered in the court, we took action. We secured evidence and made it available to the factories inspectors for the purpose of prosecuting. The case went to the Crown Law Department, which discovered that there was a slight technical difficulty with regard to the amendment of the Act. It was ascertained that whilst the particular section that had been inserted in the Act operated in the way we thought it was intended to operate, there was a difficulty with regard to the definition. The department advised us that we were not able to enforce the agreement that had been entered into, and that the department was not able to enforce the amendment to the Act. Thus we were knocked back, although we were of opinion that we had overcome the difficulty. This compelled us to go to the court again. We approached the court for the purpose of seeing whether we could not do something under the Act, and again we were advised that there were difficulties in the way. It was at this stage that we were compelled to turn our attention to obtaining legislation which would give us that which

the best classes of master bakers admit is necessary, and which the employees throughout the State are absolutely unanimously in favour of. It has been said that this is restrictive legislation, and that it interferes with the liberty of the subject, and nonsense of that kind. After all it is only in keeping with the Early Closing Act. No one would talk of repealing that Act to-day. Of recent years we have improved that Act from the employees' point of view.

Sitting suspended from 6.15 to 7.30 p.m.

Hon. W. D. JOHNSON: We have introduced here, and made more rigid, legislation as to early closing of shops. The Early Closing Act applies to employers of labour in large establishments, and also to small shops which have no employees. But the Act gives special consideration to small shops by extending their closing time from 6 p.m., which the large employers must observe, to 8 p.m. In this Bill the Minister has done exactly the same thing, giving an additional two hours to non-employers. The employer of labour is bound by Arbitration Court awards to work his men only eight hours, but under this Bill the non-employer has from 8 a.m. to 6 p.m. Thus the Minister has applied to the baking industry the principle adopted in connection with ordinary store keeping. Some members have said that we should not interfere with men who are struggling to establish businesses of their own. Whilst there may be some argument for consideration, as has been admitted by the Minister in the provisions of the Bill, there are strong reasons why we should protect children against being worked excessive hours. I have had occasion to visit establishments in the metropolitan area at night for the purpose of investigating the conditions of labour, and I can assure members that I have seen women and children working in bakehouses, under pretty bad conditions, at 10 and 11 o'clock at night. Once I visited a bakehouse that was doing a large business and by taking special advantage of the Arbitration Court award was doing a maximum amount of injury to the old-established bakeries; and there I found a little boy, between 10.30 and 11 p.m., standing on a petrol case and trying to help his father in the baking. Those are not conditions that we should encourage, or even permit. Practical experience of that kind tells us that there is justification for limiting

the hours of labour. We know that if we refrain from making any limitations whatever, families are compelled to do unfair things, compelled by reason of competition. If by legislation we can put the competition on a fair basis, making it reasonably possible for a man to earn a living without injuring either his family or his fellow men in the industry, surely it is our duty to do so. Accordingly this legislation should be passed. Some men have started in to undermine the business of their competitors, some of these having been in the trade for as long as 25 years and having built up large establishments employing much labour. The man coming in deliberately sets himself to cut into such a business and take away the very cream of it by going round soliciting the customers and offering them special inducements. The result is that the new man gets so much trade that the limitations of his bakehouse and oven render it impossible for him to cope with the trade. It is then that the children are brought in. The man does not do the work himself; he does it plus his children. I unhesitatingly declare that many a mother in the metropolitan area, and in the country districts as well, will be pleased at the introduction of legislation that will prevent the possibility of herself and her children being called upon to work in the bakehouse at night. While we are doing a fair thing by those women and children, we are doing no injury to the man, because we simply give him an opportunity to compete under fair conditions within the limitations everyone else has to observe. The member for Perth (Mr. Mann) spoke of the Minister's decision to include in the Bill the baking of rolls, while excluding pastry-cooking. The Bill is not all I would like it to be. I hold that its operation will not be sufficiently extensive. However, the Minister has not seen eye to eye with me in that respect. He feels that if he establishes day baking, it is sufficient to go on with. Still, this measure is not as comprehensive as the corresponding legislation of other Australian States; neither does it go to the full extent of the resolution carried by the Geneva Conference, which included pastry-cooking. The member for Perth holds that because the Minister excluded pastry, rolls should also be excluded. But rolls are not baked by pastry cooks. A roll is made of the ordinary yeast dough, and so far as I know it is exclusively baked by bakers. Perhaps a large

establishment like Albany Bell's finds it possible to make a yeast dough for the purpose of producing rolls. However, it is a special operation, and one not carried out by the ordinary pastry cook. It is a separate and distinct process. Therefore, by excluding rolls we shall largely undermine the operations of the Bill, because all a baker would have to do would be to make his first batch all rolls, and then again there would be unfair competition introduced by people without consideration for their employees and equally without consideration for the health and comfort of their families. Therefore I appeal to the Chamber to realise that it is just as essential to include rolls as to include bread. A roll is exactly the same as bread, except that it is baked under slightly different conditions. Nevertheless, the baking of rolls is done by the baker and is regarded as part and parcel of the baking trade. The member for Perth, in dealing with the hours proposed by the Bill, mentioned that under certain atmospheric conditions dough made at night for the purpose of baking at day matures faster. In other words, sudden heat has an effect upon the dough. But the baker now has become expert in regard to the setting of his dough, so as to discount any difficulty of that kind.

Mr. Mann: He cannot tell what the weather will be next day.

Hon. W. D. JOHNSON: No; but he so sets his dough as to be ready for any eventuality of that kind. The master baker always arranges to have a look at the dough and to do what is called "knocking it back" if it is maturing too fast. The hon. member has sufficient practical experience to know that in that way a dough can be prevented from maturing before the specified time. While that applies generally in the industry, I admit that there are occasions when a dough cannot be "knocked back" sufficiently. But in those exceptional circumstances it is always the practice of the trade, a practice obtaining to-day, under Arbitration Court provisions—

Mr. Mann: You will admit that day baking would make the position a bit worse?

Hon. W. D. JOHNSON: If there is a special difficulty of that kind, the Arbitration Court award is not enforced. It is recognised that something exceptional has occurred, and the men go into the bakehouse a little earlier. If the inspector comes round, they at once explain to him that the

dough was a bit fast, and that therefore they were called in earlier. If that position is found in one bakehouse, but not in other bakehouses in the metropolitan area, one knows that the excuse is not genuine. The heat would apply to the whole of the metropolitan area, and all the bakers in the metropolitan area would have to go in a little earlier. Such a case might occur once in twelve months. During the time I have been connected with the union I do not know of more than two or three occasions when it has happened. It does happen, but it is so seldom that there is no need to make any special provision in the Bill to anticipate such a difficulty.

Mr. Mann: You agree that there will be a greater difficulty in summer than in winter.

Hon. W. D. JOHNSON: Undoubtedly, but the temperatures of bakehouses are so regulated in these days that the difficulty can be largely overcome. In winter the oven is kept a bit warmer and the materials necessary for working up the dough are kept warmer as well. In the summer the position is reversed and the ovens and materials are cooled down. Some bakers specialise in well water to keep the conditions as cool as possible. Various methods, too, are adopted to cool down the water and thus the master bakers protect themselves against the heat of the summer. In these days this problem presents no great difficulty. It is part of the ordinary routine of the baking industry.

Mr. Sampson: Can all bakers control the position at all times?

Hon. W. D. JOHNSON: It is very exceptional if they cannot.

Mr. Mann: But in country districts they have no ice.

Hon. W. D. JOHNSON: But they specialise with well water and have other methods for keeping the water cool. It has been stated that there is opposition to the Bill in the country districts. I will admit that there is opposition to it in the metropolitan area as well. There are a number of bakers opposed to day baking, but the opposition is based purely upon the £ s. d. point of view. If bread can be marketed when it is hot, or reasonably warm, and that trade is guaranteed, it would not be scaled off as heavily as if the bread were cooled down before delivery.

Mr. Mann: It will all come back on the consumer.

Hon. W. D. JOHNSON: Of course it is the consumer who pays. Hon. members can appreciate that in weighing off the dough where the turnover runs to thousands of loaves, if the baker can save an ounce on each 2-lb. loaf, it will make a considerable difference in the week's profit. It is because of that that the master baker likes to sell bread as hot as he can. If an inspector weighs a warm loaf, it will be heavier than if he were to wait for a few hours when the bread had cooled down. I have heard a master baker say that marketing hot bread makes a difference of 25 per cent. as against marketing bread baked to-day and marketed to-morrow. Hot bread is not as healthy as cold bread for the consumer, and in dealing in hot bread the profit to the master baker represents a loss to the householder. As a rule, the housewife who takes hot or warm bread, does not put it on the table immediately, but puts it away in the bread boiler or bread cupboard. When she takes it out, the bread does not weigh as heavily as when she put it in the bin. Evaporation has taken place and the water in the bread has passed off into the air. That means that the master baker has made so much extra profit. It is because of this that the master baker who considers profit rather than the health of the public or the health of his employees, is enthusiastic in his preference for night baking because under those conditions he can market with advantage to himself from the money-making point of view.

Mr. Mann: But he will not lose by the change. He will pass it on to the public.

Hon. W. D. JOHNSON: The fact remains that if we put the industry on a fair basis, the public will buy bread; if we permit it to remain on an unreasonable basis, it is not bread that the people will buy, but so much water.

Mr. Sampson: Will the Bill remedy that position?

Hon. W. D. JOHNSON: If we abolish night baking, the competitive needs of the day will not compel bakers to market hot bread. The man who bakes at night forces the man who bakes by day to endeavour to compete with the hot-bread trade and thus we again have in evidence the vicious circle of one trying to compete against another, each trying to get bread out as hot as possible so as to compete with each other, although the competition is not fair because the baker who does not employ labour has the advantage.

Mr. Sampson: The Bill will not make the sale of hot bread illegal.

Hon. W. D. JOHNSON: But it will make it difficult to market under those conditions. To-day the man who does not employ labour can bake bread at any time he likes. On the other hand we restrict the man who does employ labour. We should see that reasonable conditions of employment operate in the industry. Reference has been made to the position at Albany, Katanning, Wagin, and Narrogin. At Albany the employees are engaged in night baking, and why should Albany be called upon to continue baking at night? The climatic conditions do not force them to do it. I have been assured that the master bakers at Albany are not opposed to this legislation. They say they do not mind if everyone is put on an equal footing. The employees at Albany are unanimously in favour of day baking, and I do not think there is any bitter hostility on the part of the employers. Why should we be asked to give consideration only to the employers at Wagin or Katanning? There is no need for the employees to work at night there. If the industry is put on a day-baking basis, there is no need for Katanning or Wagin to be exempted from the Bill. To show that there is no need to exempt such country centres, I have only to point out that at Bunbury bread has been baked by day for some time. There, bread cannot be baked before 8 a.m. or after 6 p.m. and that has been the position for many years at Bunbury. Practice has established night baking in some places and it has simply been continued. Immediately we get legislation to put everyone on a fair basis, those concerned will be pleased that an Act has been passed equalising their competitive position. When that happens the conditions at Wagin, Katanning and Albany will be what they have been at Bunbury for so long past. The member for Katanning (Mr. Thomson) asked why the baking industry had been specially selected for attention and quoted newspaper production as another industry carried on at night. If that hon. member had extended his reading beyond the biased opinions expressed in the publication by the master bakers, he would have found, as the Minister pointed out, that the baking industry is looked upon as an unhealthy one, even when work is carried on during the day time. We find that men after a few years' experience in the industry are compelled to leave it be-

cause they have contracted what is known as "bakers' asthma." Many instances are to be found in our hospitals and elsewhere of bakers who are totally incapacitated because of ailments contracted as a result of the industry, long before they reach old age. It is such knowledge that influenced the Geneva Conference to give special consideration to the baking industry, because it had been found that those engaged in night baking are subject to the ailments to a greater extent than those employed in day baking. I do not claim that the Bill will abolish the occurrence of such ailments altogether, because some men have contracted bakers' asthma even when working by day. As it is an unhealthy calling, we can relieve the position of those engaged in it by limiting operations to day work. I believe the good sense of the House will lead to the Bill being agreed to. It is a fair compromise between what is wanted by the employees and what the Minister can see will be an instalment towards the establishment of day baking as requested by the trade union interested in the industry. The Minister has not conceded all that the union asked for. As it is an instalment, however, I ask the House not to interfere with the Bill. Although I would like to see the Minister go a little further, I am prepared to accept it as a fair compromise and I am confident that while it will place all upon a fair competitive basis, it will do a lot of good in the interests of women and children who are now called upon to work in bakehouses under conditions that medical evidence shows is not good.

Mr. Teesdale: Did you say women worked in bakehouses in Western Australia?

Hon. W. D. JOHNSON: Yes, a good many of them.

Mr. A. Wansbrough: And children too.

Hon. W. D. JOHNSON: That is so. Hon. members will realise that if medical evidence goes to show that men suffer as a result of work in connection with the industry, surely it needs no emphasis to point out the necessity for seeing that the interests of women and children engaged in the industry are not neglected as well. We have had day baking for some years in Western Australia, but it has only extended to a section of those employing labour. It is that section that is covered by the Arbitration Court award which applies only to those employing labour. It

is distinctly unfair that one section of a community should be placed at a special disadvantage of that kind compared with the position occupied by the baker who does not employ labour. Bread is a necessity of life and baking has to proceed day by day. We have world-wide advices that legislation of this description is required and I hope the House will give the Bill reasonable support. I was pleased to hear the speech delivered by the Leader of the Opposition who, I believe, appreciates that the Bill merely places everyone on a fair competitive basis, with injury to no one. I want to emphasise the fact that every Sunday bakers are working. The baker never enjoys a Sunday from work, and he gets no extra pay for working on Sunday. He is forced to take his day off on Saturday. Some members are under the impression that because the Minister has made provision regarding baking on Friday, the baking for the week will conclude on that day and no more will be done until Monday. That is not so. The only day that is excluded under this Bill is Saturday, and for years practically throughout the world baking has been done on Sunday. In New South Wales legislation was introduced to exclude Sunday baking, but the Minister here has not gone to that extent. He has simply adopted the trade custom that has been operating in Western Australia for many years, and employees will still be called upon to work every Sunday in the year. Therefore I trust members will take into consideration the special circumstances attending this industry and grant this legislation for which the employees of Western Australia have been asking for over 25 years, which is not opposed by the employers of labour and which, if passed, will do no injury to the non-employers of labour.

MR. SAMPSON (Swan) [82]: I was surprised to hear the member for Guildford (Hon. W. D. Johnson) mention that there are women engaged in the baking industry, but surely they are limited in number.

Hon. W. D. Johnson: I do not say it is a general practice, but there are women and children employed in the industry in the metropolitan area and in country districts.

Mr. SAMPSON: Odd cases. I suppose the same thing might be said of every industry.

Hon. W. D. Johnson: I think it prevails to a greater extent in this industry than in any other.

Mr. SAMPSON: I believe there are some virtues in the Bill, but nevertheless there are some evils, and the virtues could be attained by other means. It is claimed by the Minister that this is the first occasion on which Parliament has been asked to deal with legislation arising out of the establishment of peace. It is said that promises were made to the workers, and that one of them was on the lines of prohibiting certain work during the hours of night.

Hon. W. D. Johnson: It has been honoured in Germany, and there is all day baking in France.

Mr. SAMPSON: It is said that an attempt was made under the Versailles Treaty to give effect to what is claimed to be one of the promises made during the war. Special emphasis was laid on the fact that night work meant an absence of humane conditions, and it was definitely asserted that night work was inhumane. A few days ago there was circulated a draft setting out certain particulars of the different principles aimed at by the International Treaty. I regret that No. 21, dealing with night baking, was not contained in the chart, but the Minister gave us some particulars of the wishes of conference that were very interesting. It was stated, too, that the progress of international labour legislation was dependent on the strength and enlightenment of public opinion in the different countries, and I cannot help thinking that too much stress has been laid upon this question. Why should we take this one particular class of night work only, and remain silent in respect of all other night work?

Hon. W. D. Johnson: This is particularly unhealthy.

Mr. SAMPSON: It is not more unhealthy by night than by day.

Hon. W. D. Johnson: Yes, it is.

Mr. SAMPSON: I do not wish it to be thought that I am opposed to the carrying out of bread-baking during the day, but I am opposed to the clause that would preclude employers from exercising the right to do as they wish in conducting their own business. Any man who endeavours to establish a business has a very difficult task indeed, and if he is limited in respect to the hours he is to work, he may find it impossible to win through, unless he is very fortunately placed in regard to finance. No

reference was made by the Minister to the general custom throughout the world of producing the principal newspapers at night time, though the member for Katanning referred to it. Newspapers are not limited to any particular section of the community. There are Tory, Conservative and even Labour dailies, and I have never heard any objection raised to their production at night. If it is inhuman, why not limit ourselves to evening papers? I cannot conceive of any member advocating that, and there is certainly something inconsistent in the attitude adopted.

Mr. Lutey: Would you support the abolition of morning papers?

Mr. SAMPSON: No.

Mr. Lutey: Are you putting in a special plea for the printers?

Mr. SAMPSON: No; everyone wants a morning newspaper.

Mr. Panton: What about abolishing newspapers till after the 14th November?

Mr. Hughes: Would not the "Leader" suffice?

Mr. SAMPSON: The hon. member would doubtless continue to read the "Leader." The working of the railways would be almost impossible if night duty were not permitted and the costs would be excessive.

Mr. A. Wansbrough: Night work on the railways is reduced to a minimum now.

Mr. SAMPSON: Since night work is unhealthy, why not abolish it entirely except where it is absolutely imperative? The great aim of the Minister and of every well wisher of the human race should be to secure for the people good food, and I am strongly of opinion that the bread which is frequently served to the people is not good food. We have not far to go to ascertain the quality of the bread. It is often either under-baked or immature. I am not sufficiently conversant with the technicalities of the baking trade to say what is the reason, but the spongy and rubber-like commodity so often sold as bread is, I am advised, very unhealthy indeed. The health of the people should be our first consideration. A remedy can perhaps be found for this, and I suggest that a clause be added making it illegal to supply bread within, say, 12 hours of the baking. I do not know whether that will appeal to the Minister.

Mr. Teesdale: It does not appear to upset him much.

The Minister for Works: Did you see me turn pale?

Mr. SAMPSON: The Minister took pains to assure us of the consideration being given to the humane aspect of the question, and since food is the basis of good health and bread not properly baked is unhealthy, surely we are justified in bringing this matter forward. I regret that the Minister remains silent. It is quite as important that the people should be supplied with good bread as that night work should be abolished. I have some printed matter dealing with the bread industry. The writer says that white bread is not a food. That is certainly a very extravagant statement. It is claimed that white bread is a sham and a source of physical degeneration, ill-health and disease. If that is true of white bread, how much more so is it true of white bread insufficiently cooked!

The Minister for Lands: Cannot it be baked as well in the day as in the night?

Mr. SAMPSON: It should be well worth considering whether we should not make the delivering of bread illegal until 12 hours after the baking. The same authority says that many of the wasting diseases are traced to the eating of white bread; in ignorance of what they do, people not only eat white bread but they eat it new and sodden. That is a vigorous denunciation of this particular class of bread, but no one will deny that in many instances it is true. The right class of bread is beyond dispute. The first matter of importance, however, is that the bread should be properly cooked. I regret that we have not the full report on item No. 21 dealing with night work in bakeries, but it was claimed in the portion of the article read by the Minister that the making of bread, pastry, or other flour confectionery during the night time is forbidden.

The Minister for Works: I have the full report.

Mr. SAMPSON: It was questioned whether the making of small goods or fancy lines was mentioned. If the one is not permitted at night time, I do not see why any other class of baking should be permitted at night. I submit that we are emphasising the difficulties beyond the justification. The inhumane aspect has been exaggerated, and the aspect of the public, so far as properly prepared bread is concerned, has not been dealt with. I understand that the International Labour Conference is an offshoot of the League of Nations.

Hon. S. W. Munsie: It is part and parcel of the League of Nations.

Mr. SAMPSON: It is an offshoot of the League of Nations. In connection with that congress there was a good deal of what might be termed tinkering with comparatively small matters. This, I submit, is one of them. Nevertheless if the liberty and the rights of those who are endeavouring to establish a business can be conserved, I would not oppose these clauses which would render night baking in other cases illegal. Even then there is a difficulty in respect of country districts. Owing to the scattered nature of these districts, a comparatively small number of loaves is baked in any one centre. One baker has to do, perhaps, a variety of work, including not only the making of the dough but the baking of the bread and the delivery afterwards. I am hopeful that consideration will be extended to those who have this difficult position to face, the men who are endeavouring to establish a business for themselves and those in the country who are endeavouring to provide bread for the people. If it is made mandatory that the work can be carried out only during certain hours, it will be extremely difficult for people in the country to secure bread. There will, in the case of country districts, be an increase in the cost of bread. That statement was made earlier, but was questioned by members by interjection. Where a baker is engaged in a small country centre he is necessarily called upon to carry out more than one part of the operation of making bread. I venture the opinion, with all diffidence, that the International Labour Conference would have been wise if, instead of endeavouring to tinker with a number of small matters, it had dealt with first causes. If it had turned its attention to matters such as removing trade barriers, something better would have come of it. I am hopeful that when the second draft reaches us there will be found in it such information that it will be possible to prove that in the general opinion of those who took part in the conference all these propositions aimed at are in the public interest. In the one before me I notice remarkable unanimity in respect to the decisions arrived at in Argentina. In every case throughout the 17 items a recommendation has been carried. When we come to Bulgaria I find that every one, with the exception of No. 7, has been registered. I do not dispute the fact that many of these items

are in the public interest, and I will support them to the utmost of my power, but to compare night work for men with such questions as childbirth, night work for women, minimum age, working in white lead factories, etc., seems to me to be rather beside the mark. If in Committee the Minister will agree to give consideration to those who are endeavouring to establish a baking business as a result of their own efforts, and are not employing other labour, I shall support the measure.

The Minister for Lands: I thought you were supporting it.

Mr. SAMPSON: No. To do that would possibly result in depriving some of those, who are at present endeavouring to make a living in this industry, of their means of existence.

The Minister for Lands: You said that bread should not be sold until it is 12 hours old.

Mr. SAMPSON: That would provide a remedy. If the Minister would introduce a clause to make it illegal to sell bread until it had arrived at a proper stage of maturity, until it had reached the stage when to partake of it would not be to court sickness, I would gladly support the measure. Let this be done by day labour.

The Minister for Lands: How can they bake bread and deliver it on the same day?

Mr. SAMPSON: They can deliver it later, so long as it is not sold within the period during which its consumption would affect the health of the people. I am convinced that bread as it is sold to-day is in many cases injurious to health.

MR. BROWN (Pingelly) [8.21]: When I first read the Bill through I was under the impression that it would meet the wishes of all the people engaged in the baking industry. I thought that if day baking could be made universal and would suit the consumers, there would be no harm in the Bill. I find that that is not the case. The reason why I find it not fair to all parties is this: There may be a baker who is employing a considerable number of men, paying union wages, and complying with union conditions. I thought it only fair that other men who were working long hours and not complying with these conditions should be prevented from undercutting the others. I now discover that this is not the position. The price of bread is fixed by a commission. Therefore, the man who works either long or short

hours can only charge the same price as the others.

The Minister for Works: Where did you ascertain that?

Mr. BROWN: I understood that was the case, and that the price of bread was the same in the city as in the country.

The Minister for Works: There is no commission to fix the price.

Mr. BROWN: Who fixes the price?

Mr. Heron: The master bakers.

Mr. Panton: That is so.

Mr. BROWN: Then the price of bread is fixed. The price in Perth is the same as it is in Pingelly, 150 miles away.

Mr. Chesson: It is 8d. a loaf up our way.

Mr. BROWN: That is in the North-West.

The Minister for Railways: It is also dearer in Geraldton.

Mr. BROWN: It appears that this Bill was not introduced for the purpose of lessening hours, or making the occupation more healthy. It is all a question of money. It appears that the master bakers are under the impression that the small man is undercutting them. The conditions are different in the country. In a country town a baker has probably been a journeyman and wants to strike out for himself. He goes to a small town, takes a house, and erects a bakery. He has to do his own baking and his own delivery. Such a man must work at night in order to supply his customers.

Mr. J. MacCallum Smith: When does he sleep?

Mr. BROWN: He gets some sleep. The output is such that it would be impossible for him to employ labour. If he did he would have to pay his man about £6 a week. That would make it impossible for him to carry on. It is very hard that a man in the country should come under the same conditions as those that appertain to a man in the city. I fail to see why we should not make this law uniform throughout the metropolitan area. I do not know how long it takes to make the dough or bake the bread.

Mr. Panton: About eight hours.

Mr. BROWN: I have baked many dampers, but have done this after a hard day's work. If the member for Wagin (Mr. Stubbs) moves an amendment to exempt country towns where there is only one man doing his own baking I will support him. I was surprised to hear the member for Guildford (Hon. W. D. Johnson) speak about the curse of competition. Competition

is the life of trade. But for that where would the world be? Let any member walk down the streets of Perth on a Saturday morning, and he will find probably one butcher who is selling his meat below that of another. He will see hundreds of people rushing into the shop. It is impossible to be served there because of the competition. The line that is thus being cut is largely availed of by the wives of the workers. They are as keen over competition as anyone else. We do not find any generous Government introducing a measure to provide that the wives of farmers shall work only a certain number of hours.

The Minister for Lands: Do you want extra wives now?

The Ministers for Works: What about the wives of members of Parliament? Why limit it to farmers' wives.

Mr. BROWN: It is the member of Parliament who works late hours, and not his wife.

Mr. Panton: The farmer should keep fewer cows.

Mr. BROWN: Very often after the children have gone to bed the farmer's wife will sit up till midnight sewing their clothes or possibly the old man's pants. There is no legislation brought down to shorten farmers' hours. The member for Guildford grows wheat. I am sure he is only too eager to get as keen competition for it as he can. He is not patriotic enough to sell his wheat to those who are working only eight hours a day or who belong to a union, but if he can get 6d. a bushel more for it, he will do so. He will naturally want the best price he can get for it.

The Minister for Lands: Did he not put it into the pool?

Mr. BROWN: Yes.

The Minister for Lands: Therefore he did not sell it to the highest bidder.

Mr. BROWN: He thought he would get a greater price by doing that.

The Minister for Lands: No.

Mr. BROWN: Otherwise he would not have put it into the pool. He was under the impression that by doing so he would cut out the middleman, who had been getting all the profit. But things do not always turn out as anticipated. Competition has a very strong effect. As regards the quality of bread baked in the day time, against that of bread baked at night, I have noticed very little difference. In the towns day baking

conditions can, of course, be complied with; but people struggling in the country should receive some consideration. So long as they are not under-cutting men working under union conditions, they should be given consideration. I hope the Minister will accept an amendment covering country towns and the country districts.

THE MINISTER FOR WORKS (Hon. A. McCallum—South Fremantle—in reply) [8.32]: I am disappointed once again at the very slight importance members opposite seem to attach to the decisions of the Geneva Conference. One might think that that was purely a Labour Conference, composed solely of representatives of workers of the world. But every nation represented at Geneva had two out of its three representatives anti-Labour. The Government appointed one representative, and the employers one, and the workers one, each of the latter two representatives having to be approved by the Government. I know of no country in the world to-day whose national Government is a Labour Government. We had such a national Government in Australia at one time, but that is not the position now. The only Australian representative who voiced the opinions of Labour was the direct Labour representative.

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: You have no right to say that. We are not anti-workers.

THE MINISTER FOR WORKS: Members opposite are anti-Labour, and most pronouncedly so.

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: In politics.

THE MINISTER FOR WORKS: Yes, and I am talking politics. We are here to talk politics. When it comes to anything vital, the national Governments of the world stand and vote as one. Yet by an overwhelming majority the Geneva Conference, composed as I have described and representing all the peoples admitted to the League of Nations, carried a resolution in favour of the abolition of night baking. Surely such a resolution should carry weight here. I do not say that we should adhere to the strict letter of the resolution. But in a country like this, boasting that it leads the world in social reform, the workers have a right to expect at least the standard of the resolutions carried by the Geneva Conference. Certainly they cannot be expected to accept anything less. It has been stated by some members that this was

merely a recommendation. I wish to point out that there is a distinct difference between a recommendation and a convention; and this is a convention. It is a convention adopted by an overwhelming majority, and its first article reads—

Subject to exceptions hereinafter provided, the making of bread, pastry, and other flour confectionery during the night time is prohibited.

In the Bill I have not included flour confectionery. The article proceeds—

This prohibition applies to the work of all persons, including proprietors as well as workers, engaged in the making of such products; but it does not apply to work which is done by members of the same family for their own consumption.

No doubt members have seen the recent cablegram from Paris stating that as a result of the law passed by the French Parliament in this connection the master bakers of Paris had held a stop-work meeting of two hours to protest against the inclusion in that law of the master baker whether he employs labour or not. That was the result of France having had the experience of a law abolishing night baking only for those who employed labour, while non-employers were permitted to work any hours. Thus an impossible position was created. However, day baking is now the law of France. I regret that the graph setting out the decisions of the various nations on this matter has not yet reached me, though I have received a later graph, copies of which were distributed when this Bill was introduced. The period of 18 months within which the nations are expected to pass legislation on this subject has not yet expired. I cannot for the life of me understand the argument of members opposite that this Bill will prevent men getting out of the rut and will militate against men striving to set up businesses of their own. How can the difference between baking in the day and baking at night have any such effect? Men can only work a certain number of hours; they cannot work the whole round of the clock: they must sleep sometimes. This Bill merely declares that the baking of bread shall be done in the daytime. How will that stop men from striking out on their own account? I fail to see it. As mentioned by the member for Guildford (Hon. W. D. Johnson), on the aspect of competition it is not a matter of being afraid to compete with the other man whether under

day baking or under night baking conditions. But it is a question of equitable conditions. When one man sells hot bread, which a percentage of the public prefer, and another man sells bread which is staler, the competition is unfair.

Mr. Pantou: And duplication of delivery is caused.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: Yes. All medical testimony is against the idea that hot bread is good for health. The object of the Bill is to prevent the penalisation of bakers who are doing a fair thing by their employees. The reason for the inclusion of rolls and the exclusion of pastry is that no one can argue that pastry is a substitute for bread, while everyone must admit that rolls can be used as a substitute for bread. Rolls are a direct competitor with bread, and therefore the omission of rolls from the Bill would be most unfair if bread is to be controlled.

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: What about fancy bread?

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: Every kind of bread will be covered by this Bill. As to the hours, the Geneva Convention leaves a wide range. I have fixed hours under the Bill, but I shall be interested to hear arguments on the point. If it can be shown to me that an alteration of the hours stated in the Bill will be of advantage to the trade generally and will not involve any great hardship on the men, I shall be prepared to agree to such alteration. I am not wedded to the particular hours set. Especially do I say that with regard to the summer months. I shall be quite prepared to listen to arguments from members representing the goldfields and the Far North. On the other hand, there cannot be very much difference between Perth and the districts mentioned by the member for Katanning (Mr. Thomson). There can be no argument whatever about Albany as against Perth. I have not gone the full length of the Geneva convention, nor have I gone so far as some of the legislation of the Eastern States. I have gone as far as I think reasonable for a start. To get the principle established, I was prepared to modify the original suggestion. But I cannot follow the line of reasoning when I am told that I have departed from the principle, that I should have introduced a Bill for the abolition of all night work. Those who talk like that are anything but logical.

Mr. Teesdale: Is it not a bit illogical to work the doughmaker at night?

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: Some men must work at night.

Mr. Teesdale: You use the word "equitable" pretty freely. Is it equitable that the dough-maker should be crucified?

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: The dough-maker's work is done more easily at night, and there is only one dough-maker to perhaps 10 or 12 bakers. It is a question of the greatest good for the greatest number. I have not heard anyone argue that it is possible to abolish all night work. In our present state of society it is essential that some work should be performed at night. In this instance, however, night work can be abolished right away, to the benefit of those engaged in the industry and to the benefit of the general public.

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: You claim that this is not your idea, but that it has come from Geneva.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: The Opposition Leader knows quite well that I advocated day baking for years before the Geneva Conference was established.

Mr. Teesdale: I hope you will be just as enthusiastic when some Geneva convention comes along that you do not agree with. I shall tell you about it then.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: I do not doubt that I shall be reminded of it. As I have said, the workers of this country are entitled to at least the standard set up by the Geneva Conference. If there is one means by which the workers of the world can hope to get anything out of the war, it is the means represented by the International Labour Bureau at Geneva.

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: Those who fought won a great deal of honour.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: If we wipe out the International Labour Bureau, and say that its decisions carry no weight with us, and that the workers are not entitled to at least the standard set up by the Geneva Conference, then the workers of this country have gained nothing for all the sacrifices they made in the war. I hope this Parliament will live up to the decisions that were arrived at at Geneva and to the many promises that have been made. I hope that we will give a lead to the other Parliaments of Australia. So far as I can ascertain, this Parliament is the first that has been asked to pass this legislation. I understand that the other States will deal with similar legis-

lation this year, but this Parliament is the first in Australia to actually deal with any of it. I hope it will not be said of Australia as the leading democratic State of the world, that at the first time of asking, one of her Parliaments turned the proposition down and was not prepared to go to the length that the nations agreed to at Geneva.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

BILL—LAND DRAINAGE.

Second Reading.

Debate resumed from the 29th September.

HON. SIR JAMES MITCHELL (Northam) [848]: I am very sorry that the Honorary Minister who introduced the Bill is not able to attend here this evening. I presume no endeavour will be made to take the Bill into Committee to-night. It is a big Bill dealing with a big and important question.

The Minister for Lands: And a very urgent one, too.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: It is a very urgent question that has received attention for a long time. Much has been attempted regarding drainage matters at various times during the history of the State without, in most cases, any pronounced success. A great deal of money has been spent in some instances, but the people concerned have not benefited. That was not altogether due to the engineers, because we have attempted to do too much with too little money.

The Minister for Lands: I want to do something under the migration agreement and I want the Bill to help me.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: But drainage can be done without the assistance of the Bill, and the Minister knows it.

Hon. S. W. Munsie: Yes, if the Government do the work, take all the risk, and pay all the cost without securing any rates in return.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: You call on the people concerned to take all the risks.

Hon. S. W. Munsie: Yes, if all of them benefit.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: That is the point and that illustrates why the Government of to-day is a danger to the community. It is the whole community that will

benefit. Cannot we have some vision? Can we not realise that the only hope for Western Australia is to get people to come here to develop the land?

The Minister for Lands: I heard you interject the other night when another Bill was under consideration, "If you want water, you must pay for it?"

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: I think you heard me say that if the Minister had his way, water would be dearer than beer!

Hon. S. W. Munsie: Then people would drink more water.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: Are we not to face this question, not because we shall benefit a few individuals, but because it is a national work? We settle people on the land hoping that they will benefit individually, but primarily because we know that by settling the land, the State as a whole will benefit. Most decidedly this is a national work. Some people may say that we are putting settlers on the land with public funds. What they really mean is that we use public funds to put men on the land, that we help them with public funds, and that it is altogether for their own good and not for the benefit of all the people! As a matter of fact, it is, on the contrary, a national work.

The Minister for Lands: Some of it.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: If it were not so, public funds would not be used as they are. It is because of this, that we face the drainage problem in order to bring into production land that cannot produce now.

The Minister for Justice: All public utilities come under the same heading.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: I am talking about advances to settlers.

The Minister for Justice: Drainage is a public utility.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: If the Minister constructs a railway, he charges for the services rendered.

The Minister for Justice: And when you drain a man's land, you render him a distinct service.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: Yes, to him and to the State as well. If that is done, we produce a tax-paying machine, someone who creates wealth and makes it possible for trade and industry and employment to proceed.

The Minister for Justice: He creates some wealth for himself and some for the State.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: He creates all for the State. If by setting a man on the land, he produces results that return £1,000 a year, the State is £1,000 better off. Every grain of wheat produced is of benefit to the State. By this means, we create real cash that is put into circulation, a good deal of it for all time. So it is that by engaging in this national work we return profit to the Treasury, although the Treasurer may very often have to pay interest on a considerable sum of money. This is what I want hon. members to understand. I hope the Government will realise that even if a few will make more profit than before because of this national work, it is still in the interests of the State as a whole. I have heard an hon. member ask where Western Australia would be were it not for the discovery of gold.

Hon. S. W. Munsie: Hear, hear, and I say it again.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: I have not heard the Honorary Minister make that remark once. I was referring to the member for Cue (Mr. Chesson).

Mr. Chesson: I plead guilty.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: As a matter of fact the statement has been made by us all. We realise the development at great cost to this country—

Hon. S. W. Munsie: When the State constructed the goldfields water scheme, did the Government charge nothing for the water.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: The Government did better than that.

Hon. S. W. Munsie: No, they charged for the water, which was a reasonable thing to do.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: But the Government did many other things as well. The Government could not charge for many of them, because a good deal of the national expenditure was to the decided advantage of the whole State. As a matter of fact, the discovery of gold here was our jumping-off point. It attracted people to the State, created new life, produced new ideas, and contributed to the general revenue of the country. Not only was this done by means of freight on goods carried over our railways and by means of charges for other services, but by means of a much greater amount contributed indirectly to the Treasury. Western Australia would not be the country it is to-day, were it not for the fact that much national work was done and a great deal spent by the country in that

direction. I hope to convince the Government that drainage is really a national work.

The Minister for Lands: I agree with you, to an extent.

The Minister for Justice: We have brought you round at last.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: When it comes to the consideration of a proposal to help the goldfields, no man on the Opposition side of the House does not support the proposal. A little time ago we reduced the price of water to a very considerable extent and would gladly do something more for the industry. When it comes to a question of encouraging other industries, we do not get quite the support we might reasonably hope for from the Government. There is urgent need for the drainage of a considerable part of Western Australia and we can thank the Almighty that that is so. We have our wheat lands and our pastoral lands. The next land we have to deal with is in the South-West. In fact, drainage in the South-West and perhaps irrigation, certainly irrigation in the North-West, will be the next chapter written in the history of the development of this State.

Mr. Chesson: The sooner the better.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: I agree. We want it at once.

The Minister for Lands: If you hand that part of the State over to the Commonwealth they will do it, and we will pay.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: So far as I am concerned it will never be handed over to the Commonwealth.

Hon. S. W. Munsie: Hear, hear!

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: We can take the land from the Moore River round the coast almost to Hopetoun and it will be found that we must have drainage and so make possible the settlement of many thousands of people who will become successful farmers there. There is a heavy rainfall in those parts, and where drainage is required, it is, fortunately, foothill land which is subject all the year round to seepage from the hills. This makes possible a good deal of production along the foot of the Darling Ranges. We are fortunate in having this drainage to do, because we have land that can produce the foodstuffs we require and also land that can carry great numbers of stock. We want the land in the South-West to produce butter, bacon, vegetables and tobacco and, in fact, everything we need except cereals. However, it is not necessary to have such a Bill in order to do the necessary drainage work. Drainage work has

been carried out without the necessity for such legislation.

The Minister for Lands: But very little.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: Not a very little at all. The better way to do it is to acquire large tracts of land, drain them and settle them under the supervision and direction of the Government in such a way that the drainage will be of immediate practical use and bring in returns.

The Minister for Justice: Then the man pays for it on the capital value of the land.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: He may pay something that way and if he does, he has something he can convert into money straight away. People settled on land in the way I suggest have furnished the State with returns almost at once.

The Minister for Justice: What difference does it make if in the one instance he has to pay in the capital value and in the other by way of drainage?

The Minister for Lands: If I have a block of land I might have to pay for draining another man's block.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: The Minister for Lands will never pay for the draining of land because he will never leave the city. He wants to be near the flesh-pots, the theatres, and have all the pleasure where life is pleasant and rosy, and where there is change every day. The land is never paid for because it has always to carry taxation. The Minister would have us believe that the roads are not maintained by the landowners of the country. Of course they are. We have passed a number of measures this session imposing taxation on the land in one shape and another, and of course the land does contribute by way of taxation, through income tax and in other ways. The land never ceases to contribute to the revenue of the country. It can be generally accepted that the great bulk of the revenue that flows into the Treasury comes from primary production. So we are faced with drainage as a national work. When I was interrupted by the Minister for Justice I was pointing out that the best way is to acquire large areas of land, drain it thoroughly and provide roads, and thus make for orderly settlement. The only time we have an opportunity to direct and encourage production from settlement is when it is done in this way. At the Peel Estate there are many houses, many fields and wonderful English pastures, due to drainage. The Minister is putting stock on to the Peel

Estate now, and one may see production on that 80,000 acres where previously there was no production.

Mr. Teesdale: In spite of the stinking fish report.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: That is orderly production directed by Mr. McLarty, Mr. Sutton and other officials. They are directing the work of those settlers along lines to produce the commodities we require.

The Minister for Lands: Now that the drains are made, who should keep them in order?

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: The people of course.

The Minister for Lands: That is why we want the Bill.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: If the Minister would refrain from interrupting so much, I would give him some information and advice. At Peel Estate there is orderly settlement directed towards the production of butter, bacon, and cheese, the foodstuffs most needed and now costing hundreds of thousands of pounds a year to purchase from the Eastern States. In the other States this produce is raised on land no better than our land but certainly very much dearer, because their land costs £100 per acre against £10 an acre here. The Minister is engaged in breaking down these importations. That is why this great work of settlement is going on. It will save cash to the people of this State to carry on industry and further develop the country. Since the goldfields were discovered I suppose we have sent 30 million sovereigns out of the country for food that might have been produced between Perth and Bunbury. Is it not a scandalous thing to have done that? It is right that we should now be engaged in breaking down all those importations, and one of the means to do it is by drainage. It is better to acquire the land and direct the work of development. A prominent visitor to this State, an experienced and capable man, visited the Peel Estate the other day. He had been told that the scheme of settlement there was bad and costly, and that the individuals were doing no good. After his visit he said, "I have seen the area, which is limited, but there are very many houses in sight of each other; there are contented women and children and satisfied men, wonderful pastures, good stock, a good drainage scheme and everything going well, a proper method of settlement, the best I have seen

anywhere." That gentleman had travelled widely.

The Minister for Lands: He has not had so much trouble as I have had.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: The Minister would not be paid if he did not have trouble. The visitor then asked to be shown settlement that had been carried out under the other method. He was taken outside the Peel Estate, not nearer to Fremantle where settlement is close, production is great, and the land is in the hands of the most capable agriculturists, but he was shown an area where there was a house here and another a mile away and the next perhaps two miles further on, settlement that meant very little. His comment was that he entirely approved of the form of settlement at the Peel Estate. If we could acquire at Bunbury, as I intended to do and as I hope the present Minister will do, a large area of land which needs draining and is really of little use except for the running of stock until it is drained, and put in a drainage scheme it could be settled in a most satisfactory way. It would provide opportunities for a great many people not possessed of much capital. That generally is the better way to do the work, and I hope the Minister will agree with me on that. I thought we might drain a great section from Bunbury to Harvey and another section from Harvey to Pinjarra, provided of course that people retaining land contributed towards the cost, but securing as much as possible for subdivision in our own way and in order that we might direct settlement and production in our own way. I should like to see the area near Fremantle to the Peel Estate drained. On that area a good many people could be settled, and production would be near to the best market in the State, namely the metropolitan area. People there could do well on very small areas. I should like to see that land acquired and settled under group conditions.

The Minister for Lands: Do not you think we shall be able to acquire land more reasonably when we have the Bill?

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: This Bill will not help the Minister to acquire land. If the idea is to fix the tax so high as to force people to surrender their land, I cannot agree with the Minister. I do not think he wishes to do that. The people who have land have done their best with it.

The Minister for Lands: Some of them have.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: But it has been impossible for them to carry out the necessary drainage or do the necessary work of development. Drainage and road making are essential, and a good deal of expenditure must be incurred in the subdivision and proper development of the lands of the South-West. From Albany round to Fremantle, drainage is wanted. In the hands of the Crown there are thousands of acres between Albany and Pemberton that need drainage and drainage only, because much of it is treeless country, and the drainage required is not extensive.

The Minister for Justice: There is one block of 3,000 acres of swamp land.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: That is purely swamp, but some drainage is necessary in the heavy rainfall country, apart from the swamp. I am referring to Crown land where the drainage could be carried out before the land was sold. This Bill is not really necessary to permit of the Government doing that. The Minister was with me at Young's Siding, where we saw a system of drainage that was not very expensive and where an experimental plot had been put in after the cutting of the drain. I understand the results there have been satisfactory. If the drainage was satisfactory, it means that a great deal of land that cannot be used until the water is taken off it can be made available for settlement at a low cost. I intend to support the second reading of the Bill because the Minister has said the Government will not undertake drainage unless they have the Bill, but I shall deal with many of the clauses in Committee, particularly the one relating to taxation. Although the Works Department is responsible for the Bill, it is the Minister for Lands who wants it, and I am wondering whether it is in his mind to acquire land in the way I have suggested, and to drain Crown lands in the area between Perth and Albany that are still awaiting settlement. The production per acre from this land will be considerable. In addition to drainage, railways and roads will be necessary. The one without the other would be useless, but we do want drainage if the railways are to pay. We know the value of drained swamp land. There is still a good deal of land available in the world to-day. We are told that a large area of agricultural land is still available in America, but it is largely

land that has to be drained. An enormous area of land is required to provide for the increase of population. To my mind the producers of foodstuffs will be on a very good wicket because I cannot see how the enormous increase in population year by year will be fed. The world has to be fed and if, by the time we get our drainage work well in hand, we are still buying our butter, cheese and bacon from other countries we shall have to pay a good price for them. On the other hand, when we come to the time for exporting all these things, as we shall do, we shall get a good price for them. The world's population is rapidly increasing, and has more than doubled during the last 100 years. The rate of increase now is such that it is expected it will more than double again in the next 100 years. It is believed that the world will not be easily fed in another 25 years. It is said that our country is patchy and that only a percentage of it can be worked. I do not think that 40 per cent. of the earth's surface can be cultivated. I am sure that 40 per cent. would be a big percentage in any country. A good deal of the world is too steep to cultivate and too rocky, and there is a good deal of it that is absolutely rainless, though other parts can be irrigated. The area, however, is very limited. It takes about $2\frac{1}{2}$ acres of cultivated land to feed each person in the world. We can see how valuable the world's acres that can be cultivated will be in the comparatively near future. Our duty, possessing as we do a third of the continent, is to get ready for the time when there will be a greater demand for foodstuffs. It is our duty as part of the Empire to see that the food requirements of the Empire are provided within it. I suppose we shall find the British people looking for foodstuffs and probably giving us some preference in the matter before long. There is evidence of their desire to do it now. This Bill will help the work of settlement, which is very near to my heart, and which I know is supported keenly by the Minister for Lands. There are many streams in the South-West that must receive attention ordinarily as a national work. I do not refer to drains necessary to carry water from the land that is held, nor do I say that these should not be cut by the landowners, but there is a great deal of work that ought to be regarded as national work. There are natural water-courses which ought to be straightened and

snagged, and in some cases deepened and made more effective. That is a national work. There are main channels that will have to be cut, and that is a national work. The opportunity for a landowner to drain his land at his own cost ought to be supplied in this way.

Mr. A. Wansbrough: We ought to be able to get a good deal of that done under this agreement.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: It does not matter how we do it. It is a national work. I do not say the Minister for Lands agrees with me, but we have talked these things over very often on the spot, and I hope he does see as I see in this respect. The exchequer will benefit and the people will benefit. Unless the work is done there will be loss of revenue to the Treasury. It can easily be shown that the indirect return to the Treasury for all moneys loaned to individual farmers is greater than the interest on all money borrowed for agricultural development, and we get our interest from the farmers in addition. It may be that £1,000,000 will be spent. This will cost £50,000 a year. If the million is wisely spent the contribution to the Treasury, apart from interest, will probably be twice £50,000 a year. In a country like this, where the people own the railways, the harbours, and the other public facilities, this is the work to do.

The Minister for Lands: You know that they do not pay any export dues, and that in the case of the railways they have to pay the cost of transport.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: The Minister knows that there is a contribution towards the harbours.

The Minister for Lands: There is none.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: If we set up an army of producers there is something that comes in through the harbours.

The Minister for Lands: These people down there maintain themselves.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: Where does the Government get its harbour revenue from if not from the people? Every farmer contributes to the dues of the Fremantle harbour. It does not matter if he does not contribute to the outward wharfage, he still contributes to the revenue of the harbour. The contributions from the Treasury that go towards development and production from the land are greater than the amount of interest on the money that we

loan to the farmers. I do not know that Shylock would want any better return than that. We can do things as a national work without doing them at the expense of the general taxpayer.

The Minister for Lands: If that was a fact the finances would be in a much better position.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: They could not be in a better position. The improvement in our railways, due to the lending of large sums of money to soldiers and others, has been greater than the interest on the money we borrowed. During the five years that we were in office we lent between £8,000,000 and £9,000,000 to men on the land, including soldiers, and the improvement in our railways due to increased activity in all directions resulted in a profit last year of £190,000, after providing for all interest and a profit of £62,000 for the year after providing interest and sinking fund, as against a loss of £540,000 four years ago, including interest and sinking fund. That is due to production, and to the fact that the Government have acted as bankers for those who are developing the country. It is a good investment. Without it there would be unemployment, and we would gradually go back in the Treasury balance, because our expenditure on education and in a hundred ways is increasing day by day. Unless we create new avenues from which to produce wealth, and from that produce taxation and contributions to the Treasury, we must go backwards. The only thing for the country is to do work of this nature, and get the land settled. The member for Albany (Mr. A. Wansbrough) says that this can be done under the new migration agreement.

Mr. A. Wansbrough: I think so, too.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: Of course. If that were not so, the work would still have to be done. Mr. Bruce has made it possible under the new agreement, which the Minister has accepted, for us to borrow money at 1 per cent. The best I was able to do was to get money at 2 per cent. for five years. The new agreement means cheap money for ten years, the cheapest money this State has ever known. It is twice as good as my agreement, and is twice the advantage to the State that my agreement was. My agreement was the first that was made.

Mr. A. Wansbrough: That is so

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: No one in this State had ever suggested we should ask for anything.

The Minister for Lands: Don't discuss the new agreement now.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: I must do so. I have not said very much about it, but it affects the Bill now before us. I am very pleased the new agreement has been made. If we could have got better terms I would have been still more pleased, as it would have enabled us to do the work more quickly. If the Minister can get this money from the fund, he will pay only 1 per cent. on it.

The Minister for Lands: I have here a list of works which will mean bringing into the country, in order to get the advantage of this money, 91,000 migrants.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: It is no use merely having the idea. Let us do the work. Let us bring them in. We cannot stand still.

The Minister for Lands: I could not get to work until I had the agreement signed.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: No. We have been waiting for 18 months.

The Minister for Lands: That is not land settlement. It is apart from that.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: If we are going to use the money for public works and not for land settlement the money will be a scourge and not a blessing. We cannot starve land settlement and use this money for public works.

The Minister for Lands: It is pretty safe whilst this Government are in office. They will not borrow more than they can repay. With some Governments this agreement might have proved very dangerous.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: Does the Minister suggest that it would be dangerous if I were sitting over there?

The Minister for Lands: I do not say that.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: If it is suggested that I would want to use the money, would want to settle people on the land, would want to keep going at the highest speed possible for our Government departments, I plead guilty. We have been afraid and have hesitated too long. Therefore, to-day we are faced with this Drainage Bill, which probably should have been faced years ago. I do not admit that the Bill is necessary. We can do the work of drainage without it. It is only a question of borrowing the money.

The Minister for Lands: The trouble is to repay it.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: That is the trouble. I have been endeavouring to show the House that money borrowed and wisely spent can be borrowed. If the Minister is going to wait until the people, without Government assistance, convert these acres that are to be drained into useful acres, he will wait a long time. One of the soap works in the Old Country has borrowed more than the Government of Western Australia ever borrowed. I suppose there is no country that can show a better asset for the money borrowed than Western Australia. Borrowed money carried its own rate of interest last year. In 1911 borrowed money had paid for itself, and last year it did so. If that had not been the case there would have been no balance in the ledger.

The Minister for Lands: You know that money has been borrowed in order to pay interest on borrowed money.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: The invested money paid its own interest last year. We did not borrow money last year to any extent to pay interest. If we did, it was necessary because we used our revenue to meet the expenditure on loan works. Certainly we have set aside borrowed money to pay interest in London, but who would pay exchange both ways? It was a matter of convenience to the Treasury. This country will never develop unless we do borrow. We have this agreement signed. To-morrow is the time to start. We ought to have had it months ago. I will not delay the passage of this Bill, if it be necessary to galvanise this Government into life and to carry out the work of South-West settlement.

Mr. Teesdale: The agreement will have to be approved of elsewhere.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: In the main it is a very good Bill. The great blot on it is the shirking of responsibility for any work on the part of the Government. It throws a charge upon a few people for everything that is done for the people. The people are taxed in order that the work may be done for them. Under the Bill the Government have a right to declare drainage areas, whether the people want them or not, to set aside areas, to set up drainage boards, to declare areas, to tax areas and to have the work done. In the past a petition, signed by the people, had always to

be presented before drainage was undertaken.

The Minister for Lands: Do not forget that this Bill was drafted by your Government.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: It was not drafted by me.

The Minister for Lands: It is one of the legacies left by your Government to the present Government.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: It was not drafted by me, and I never saw it.

The Minister for Lands: I did not say it was drafted by you. I said it was drafted by your Government.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: Anyhow, I shall oppose what is wrong in it, and I shall support what is right in it. No Government with which I was connected ever shirked its duty. Let me point out that the Grassmere drainage scheme could be included under this Bill.

Mr. A. Wansbrough: Quite right, too.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: The hon. member had better not say that at Albany.

Mr. A. Wansbrough: I shall say it there too.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: There has been emphatic protest against the damage done by the Grassmere drainage scheme.

Mr. A. Wansbrough: You surely do not call the Grassmere scheme drainage? That drainage scheme settled the district.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: Of course it did, and it was put in by a previous Labour Government. However, it was not the Government's fault: the trouble was that a good deal of the land was under sea level.

Mr. A. Wansbrough: The engineers were at fault.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: The truth is that some of the country was below sea level, and that consequently the water could not be got off it. I never blame a Government for trying: I only blame Ministers when they will not try. The Grassmere failure was not the fault of the Government that undertook the scheme. There is no right, however, to charge the cost of that failure up to the present holders of land in the district. Surely the member for Albany does not agree with such a proposal. The cost may be £15,000 or £20,000.

Mr. A. Wansbrough: But what about the people 40, 50, and 60 miles away?

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: The water had to get away to somewhere.

Mr. A. Wansbrough: A blind man could have seen that the scheme was no good when it was put in.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: But a blind man was not got to see it. It is no use to get a blind man to see it now. Now is too late. Those people must not be charged up with the cost of work that was done by various Governments and resulted in but very little advantage to the people, sometimes in actual disadvantage. We cannot graft the past on to this Bill in any considerable degree. Where the work is still of benefit, the position is different.

Mr. Sleeman: You passed the cost of past works on to the Peel estate.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: The cost can be passed where the drainage is satisfactory. Under this Bill the Minister for Lands will not be responsible for the man, but only for the land and the drainage. If the man does not make good, either because he will not work or for any other reason, that is not the Minister's fault. But let us open up the country and give working men a chance. If there is one failure, some hon. member will come to this House and tell of it, forgetting the 999 successes. The one man who failed was probably a failure before he was born.

Mr. Sleeman: How is it that there are so many vacant blocks on the Peel estate?

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: Because the hon. member interjecting is in Parliament. I am satisfied that the Minister for Lands will do justice to the people generally, but I do not like the idea of the Bill. I do not agree with the provision that the Government shall be relieved of the responsibility for all watercourses, or the provision that all work connected with rivers is to be handed over to the proposed board. The board, while covering only a limited area, would be responsible in respect of floods. Many watercourses run through private land, which will have to be rated in this connection; and the same will be the case with much Government land, but this latter will only contribute when it is settled and there is somebody to pay the rates. The Government ought not to escape their responsibility for natural watercourses, nor, in my opinion, for main drainage. Still, those matters can be discussed in Committee. We have dealt with some wild and weird taxation proposals on the farmer during the last few weeks, and this Bill adds another to the list. Last week we proposed a tax of 2s. in the pound on the capital value of land, with a maximum

of 1s. That is an inequitable proposal. Land worth £4 an acre and land worth £10 an acre would pay exactly the same taxation. Under this Bill there is a proposal to impose a tax of 2s. in the pound on the capital value.

The Minister for Lands: The unimproved capital value.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: Unimproved, of course, but capital value, and 2s. in the pound, with a maximum of 5s. The board, of course, will impose the tax. The principle is very unscientific. With a rate of 2s. in the pound and a limit of 5s., land worth £2 10s. per acre would pay 5s., and land worth £5 per acre would pay 5s. Osborne Park land, worth £100 per acre, would pay only 5s. Surely the House will not agree that that is right.

Mr. Sleeman: Do you think the graduation does not go far enough?

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: I regard the amount proposed to be collected as ample, indeed as far more than will ever be needed. However, the board will have to fix the amount needed. The allocation of contributions does not seem logical or right. However, we have adopted it as regards the goldfields main. After all, this is largely a Committee Bill. The clauses relieving the Government of all responsibility and placing that responsibility on the board, and imposing taxation and various disabilities, should receive the earnest consideration of members. Drainage is of the utmost importance to Western Australia, and we should do everything humanly possible to see that it is brought about with no unnecessary delay. A good deal of drainage has been done, and a great deal more must be done. The Minister who introduced the Bill is not here to-night, but I hope that when he returns we shall discuss the matter and decide it, not as we have decided most matters this session—with a minority sitting on this side of the House and graciously permitted by members opposite to voice their opinions, but never by any chance permitted to alter the proposals contained in the measures submitted. Drainage is really a national question, and ought not to be treated in a party spirit. I trust members will see that this is made a good working measure.

Mr. A. Wansbrough: I have heard no complaint about it.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: The hon. member should not wait for complaints. He is not a delegate, but a member of Parlia-

ment. He ought to know better than anybody else what is good and what is bad in this measure. We do not wait for complaints to be made by our constituents. We endeavour to see that proper and advantageous measures are enacted. On this question the Government are giving nothing except the Bill. There is no contribution at all from the Government. They claim the right to dictate to the House how the measure shall be shaped and to the landowners what shall be done. They say, "This drainage shall be done, and shall be done at the expense of the people in the area." They take all, and give nothing except this Bill. The Minister for Lands, by interjection, showed sympathy with our idea that this is a national work. He has shown that he is sympathetic. The Bill, however, does not say so, nor does the Honorary Minister in charge of Water Supplies. I am glad that the Bill is before the House and I hope that land settlement will follow the work that will be done in accordance with its provisions. I trust that the Government will show, before we finally pass the measure, that they intend to do their part in connection with the land that can be acquired and with Crown lands in the South-West as well. There should be no hesitation and the Government should move forward with a definite firm policy of land settlement from the Moore River to Albany, working section by section until we bring the whole area under cultivation.

Mr. A. Wansbrough: The croakers will be out after this to-morrow.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: This should be done in order that the State shall progress and that our people, whether they be in the city or in the country, may become prosperous. Only through work of this description will that prosperity be gained. This is almost the first occasion this session that we have had an opportunity of considering some constructive work. We have done much towards curtailing the freedom of the people and effecting other changes, but this Bill gives us an opportunity to do something that is truly constructive. I have longed for the opportunity to take part in some really constructive work this session and if the Honorary Minister in charge of water supplies were here this evening, I would tell him that his Bill provides us with an opportunity to mould something that will be of real advantage to the State. With the assistance of the enthusiasm of the Minister for Lands, we shall do something towards

providing for the drainage of the South-West.

THE MINISTER FOR LANDS (Hon. W. C. Angwin—North-East Fremantle) [9.48]: I have listened attentively to the speech delivered by the Leader of the Opposition. I attended a social function the other night and a speaker there complained that there was no optimism in Western Australia. He urged his audience to push into members of Parliament and the people generally some feelings of optimism.

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: And you made a remark that you should apologise for now.

The MINISTER FOR LANDS: I said there was a good deal of optimism in Western Australia. As a matter of fact, if there is one thing that Western Australia has suffered from more than another, it is too much optimism.

Mr. Teesdale: They want some in another place all right.

The MINISTER FOR LANDS: Western Australia has been so full of optimism in the past that huge developmental works carried out by so small a population have imposed enormous commitments on the people generally. I was rather pleased to hear the concluding portion of the hon. member's speech. I do not know if that change was brought about because I interjected that the Bill was one of the legacies left by a previous Government.

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: I did not see the Bill. I believe it was drafted when you were in office before.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: It was one of the first Bills to which my attention was drawn by the Minister for Works after we had taken office.

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: I assure you that I never saw it.

The MINISTER FOR LANDS: It was printed ready to be introduced, but, for some reason or other, the Government did not have the courage to bring it forward.

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: No, we lacked courage!

The MINISTER FOR LANDS: Yes, in that respect. The Leader of the Opposition is right when he says that drainage work is a national matter. The Government realise that fact, but it is necessary that some of the drainage should be done by private land owners, apart from the Government work.

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: That is quite right.

The MINISTER FOR LANDS: That is what we have to contend with. Drainage at the Peel Estate, for instance, has benefited not only land owned by the Crown, but land held by private people. In some instances, the people who own the land have appealed to the State for compensation. We consider it better to buy the land than to pay compensation.

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: Of course.

The MINISTER FOR LANDS: I mention that phase to emphasise the necessity for the Bill. In the Busselton area we have to spend approximately £150,000 for additional drainage work. Some time ago the Mitchell Government spent about £50,000. The amount I mention will be necessary not to drain group areas alone, but private holdings that will increase in value considerably owing to the drainage works to be carried out. Yet even in that district we are threatened with legal action for compensation on account of drains that were constructed by the Mitchell Government!

Mr. Teesdale: I suppose it was the earth you removed that was so valuable.

The MINISTER FOR LANDS: I do not know what it is; it is difficult to understand. Yesterday I was asked to undertake works in the Busselton area that will mean the drainage of one group to enable the settlers to put in their pastures, and the cost of that work will be £50,000. That work will be of advantage not alone to land owned by the Government, or in the group.

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: Of course the engineers want to carry out big works.

The MINISTER FOR LANDS: It is not the engineers who are responsible for it; it is a case of doing the work or closing down the groups. The work to be undertaken there includes the straightening of a river and that is essentially a national work. That is included in the total cost of £150,000.

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: Dealing with a river is national work.

The MINISTER FOR LANDS: I admit that, but at the same time the Government must be protected and we must see that the benefits of the drainage schemes do not go into the pockets of private people.

Mr. Teesdale: Hear, hear!

The MINISTER FOR LANDS: I am in accord with the Leader of the Opposition when he says that the State must do its share and see that the land is drained for the purposes of cultivation. On the other hand, the State must protect the people who have

to find the money and not allow certain individuals only to reap all the benefits.

Mr. Teesdale: Undoubtedly that is so.

The MINISTER FOR LANDS: There is another reason why a Bill of this description is necessary. Although a Bill was drafted and printed before we took office, such legislation is more urgently necessary now than when the Mitchell Government were in office. Drains have been cut and we have no power to prohibit a person through whose land a drain passes from doing that and risking the flooding of other settlers. Such cutting of the drains has been done in several instances at the Peel Estate and we have had several complaints. We have no power to prevent it being done. I want to remind the Leader of the Opposition of his statement that if this work were done by the State, all the benefit will come to the State and that it will mean a distinct gain to the Treasury. I will give another instance. The Mitchell Government drained Herdsman's Lake. We know what that cost.

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: You know the estimate; you finished it.

The MINISTER FOR LANDS: I do not desire to refer to the cost or to the estimate, but to point out that we may find it necessary to get out of it and get land elsewhere. It has been found necessary to purchase land adjoining the lake in order to provide high ground that is necessary for the settlers. Owing to the drainage that has been carried out, the owners of the high land are asking £80 an acre for it.

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: For the lake land?

The Premier: No, for the high land.

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: The lake land will bring £200 an acre.

The MINISTER FOR LANDS: No, more like £100.

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: That will pay for the drainage.

The MINISTER FOR LANDS: Not at all. As it is, in view of this development we are considering making a change. We may not require that land. I do not condemn the lake by any means, because I know it contains good soil. I merely mention this to show the position the Government are placed in because we have no Drainage Bill to deal with such a position.

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: You have some high land.

The MINISTER FOR LANDS: But not sufficient. I hope to make a change that will

provide us with sufficient high land without the necessity for purchasing such high priced areas. The Leader of the Opposition referred to a large area of land in the South-West. The member for Banbury (Mr. Withers) has drawn my attention to it as well. The suggestion was that that area should be drained. It will cost £320,000 to deal with that work.

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: I do not think so.

The MINISTER FOR LANDS: That is the estimate of the departmental officers. It has been pointed out by the officials that the proper way to deal with that area is by way of a complete scheme. That means that it will cost about £2 10s. an acre for drainage alone. Is it fair that the Government who can buy some of the land at prices ranging from £1 to £2 an acre, and place settlers on the land, should ask them to pay their proportion of the cost of drainage, while others, who possess land in that area reap the benefit from the drainage and contribute nothing towards the cost?

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: Certainly not.

The MINISTER FOR LANDS: Therefore I claim the Bill is urgently necessary.

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: We agree with the Bill.

The MINISTER FOR LANDS: There is no intention on the part of the Government to do anything that will have a tendency to evade carrying out work that is truly national. Take the Peel estate, for instance. The work that is being carried out there now is called drainage, but it really amounts to constructing a river. The water enters the Serpentine River, with the result that some areas may be flooded during the winter months. It was found necessary to straighten the Serpentine River. That could not be called anything but a national work. The main drain at the Peel Estate is likewise a national work, but the subsidiary drains running into it are not a national work.

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: I agree with you entirely. I have educated you well.

The MINISTER FOR LANDS: I point out those things to show the urgent necessity for the Bill.

The Premier: I can see we shall get this Bill through easily.

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: Do not be so optimistic; the Bill states the reverse.

The MINISTER FOR LANDS: There is no doubt that the southern portion of the State needs drainage. Yesterday I sent an

urgent minute to the Treasurer for £150,000 to start the work.

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: You should have started the work first of all.

The MINISTER FOR LANDS: I am not in charge of the Treasury. If a Minister wanted money when the hon. member was in office, he had to go to the hon. member for it.

Mr. Richardson: You should have started it when the Premier was in England.

The MINISTER FOR LANDS: At that time it cost too much to get the money out here. The rating mentioned in the Bill will be the maximum, and will vary in different districts. It will be imposed only where found necessary, and deductions will be made in respect of any drains which are purely national. We cannot expect people to pay the high rates that would be necessary to carry a river through an estate. The member for Albany and the Leader of the Opposition referred to the need for drainage in the Albany district. There is a large area at Owingup that requires to be drained, but to do that work it will be necessary to divert and open up the mouth of the river. That cannot be considered to be other than a national work, but the cost of draining the swamps will be charged to the settlers.

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: But the people will have something that they can use straight away.

The MINISTER FOR LANDS: Three days ago I supplied the Treasurer with information of urgent public works brought under my notice that will entail an outlay of between seven and eight millions of money, and the road making for group settlement included in that list is for the next two years only. Those are works which people are pressing the Government to undertake.

Mr. Richardson: We shall have to send the Premier Home again.

The MINISTER FOR LANDS: We can get every penny of that money at one per cent. conditionally on our bringing out migrants.

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: But you must settle the country or you will not be able to pay the one per cent. interest

The MINISTER FOR LANDS: That is so. In this State we have dry areas and we have wet areas. While we require water supplies in the agricultural areas, in the southern portion of the State we require

drains to take the water away. While we charge in the wheat areas rates for providing water, the people of the South-West are not charged rates for the drainage of water. The Leader of the Opposition spoke about having water rates here and some other rates elsewhere, but the water rates and the drainage rates will not apply to any one portion of the State, and so the burden, one might say, will be evenly distributed. I hope we shall be able to start the drainage of some portion of the South-West, and it must be started at once.

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: Hear, hear! Are you starting to-night?

The MINISTER FOR LANDS: That being so the owners of abutting land benefiting from the drainage should contribute towards the cost.

Mr. Teesdale: Yes, let them pay for it.

The MINISTER FOR LANDS: That is all we are asking under this Bill.

Mr. Teesdale: I am supporting that.

The MINISTER FOR LANDS: We want full power to protect the drains when they are made. The Leader of the Opposition dealt with land settlement in the South-West generally. To listen to some members of Parliament—I am pleased to say not in this House—one would conclude that very little more development work was possible in the south-western portion of the State.

Mr. Teesdale: They would stop everything if they had their way.

The MINISTER FOR LANDS: If one took notice of those who have been speaking on the Forests Act Amendment Bill, he would think there was no possibility of opening up land between Clackline and the southern part of the State. I take very little notice of that sort of talk.

Mr. Teesdale: That is their value, too.

The MINISTER FOR LANDS: I am pleased that the Leader of the Opposition is favouring the second reading, and I hope he will assist to get it passed. It is not a party Bill. So far as I am aware, no member of the party saw the Bill until it was introduced. The first time I saw it was a few weeks after taking office, when I found the draft as it was left on the file by the previous Minister.

The Premier: We took it up as it was and said it was all right.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

House adjourned at 10.5 p.m.

Legislative Council,

Tuesday, 13th October, 1925.

Questions: Arbitration Act, A.W.U. Registration ...	PAGE 124
International Labour Office ...	124
Bills: Auctioneers Act Amendment, 3r. ...	124
Forests Act Amendment, 3r. ...	124
Narragin Soldiers Memorial Institute, 3r. ...	124
Fremantle Municipal Tramways and Electric Lighting Act Amendment, 3r. ...	124
Entertainments Tax Assessment, Suspension of Standing Order, Com. ...	124
Labour Exchanges, 1r. ...	125
Entertainments Tax, Com. Report, 3r. ...	125
Western Australian Bank Act Amendment (Private), 2r., Com. Report ...	125
Goldfields Water Supply Act Amendment, 2r. ...	125
Industrial Arbitration Act Amendment, 2r. ...	125
Water Boards Act Amendment, 2r. ...	125
Jury Act Amendment, Com. ...	126
Entertainments Tax Assessment, Assembly's Message ...	126
Workers Compensation Act Amendment, 2r., Com. Report ...	126
Electoral Act Amendment, 2r. ...	126

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

QUESTION—ARBITRATION ACT, A.W.U. REGISTRATION.

Hon. E. H. HARRIS asked the Chief Secretary: 1, Have the Australian Workers' Union applied under the provisions of the Industrial Arbitration Act, 1912, to register as a composite union? 2, If so, on what date? 3, Did their application seek to cater for any trades or vocations already provided for by registered unions? 4, Did any registered union or association lodge objections to the proposed registration? 5, If so, what organisations? 6, What was the decision of the court? 7, Are there any branch unions of the A.W.U. registered under the Act, and, furthermore, are there any other of its branches eligible to be separately registered?

The CHIEF SECRETARY replied: 1, Yes. 2, On the 25th November, 1921. 3, Yes. Workers eligible to belong to the West Australian Government Railways Employees' Union, the West Australian Branch of the Australian Meat Industry Employees' Union, Amalgamated Society of Engineers, Metropolitan and South-West Engine-drivers and Firemen's Union, Australasian Society of Engineers. 4, Yes. 5, The unions of workers referred to above appeared in opposition to the application, and in addition the Master Builders and Contractors' Association Industrial Union of Employees and the Mas-