but that if I found it was in their interests. I would have no hesitation in attending to the matter. As a matter of fact, I have under consideration an amendment of the Mines Regulation Act, and hope that it will be possible to introduce it this session. That amendment will have the effect of limiting the height of rises and this may do something in the direction desired. I have no objection to take to the criticism by hon. members and I thank them for their toleration and kindliness towards me and my Estimates.

Item, Assistant Petrologist, £276:

Mr. LATHAM: While there is provision for an assistant petrologist, there is no money provided for the petrologist. Have we a petrologist?

The MINISTER FOR MINES: Dr. Larcombe, of the School of Mines, Kalgoorlie, is the petrologist and he is paid from that vote.

Item, Director Eastern Goldfields Mining School, £402:

Mr. LAMBERT: While there is provision for the director of the School of Mines at Kalgoorlie, this officer is also director of the Technical School, for which he draws another £402. I do not know what led to this position, but I think it is wrong. We have an assistant director of the Technical School who draws £636 per annum. It shows how closely these activities are co-ordinated. Some time ago I complained that a beautiful model of a three-head battery had been disposed of and the battery case had been sent to the State Implement Works to be smashed up. At that time the School of Mines were purchasing a miserable old three-head battery for their experimental plant at Kalgoorlie. I drew the attention of Mr. Shaw, of the Implement Works, to the fact that the battery case was too good to be smashed up. This may have been an oversight and I do not wish to complain about it, but it does seem peculiar that such an incident should occur. I do not know whether this was an oversight, but it is an inefficient way of carrying on the School of Mines at Kalgoorlie and the Technical School in Perth. That is only one of the instances that have come under my notice in respect of the control of both those institutions. I deeply regret that a beautiful little plant like that referred to should have been thrown out and scrapped while an obsolete plant was erected in its place, although so unsuitable that no wheel in it has since been turned. I do hope the position in regard to the control of those two institutions will be considered. It is entirely unsatisfactory and should be abolished.

Vote put and passed.

Progress reported.

House adjourned at 10.15 p.m.

Legislative Council,

Tuesday, 3rd November, 1925.

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

QUESTION—AGRICULTURAL COLLEGE.

Hon. A. J. H. SAW asked the Chief Secretary: 1, When will the Agricultural College at Muresk be open to receive students? 2, Did an advisory committee, appointed last July to assist the Public Service Commissioner in the selection of a candidate from amongst those applying for the position of principal of the Agricultural College, make a unanimous recommendation? 3, Has the Cabinet selected anyone for the position? 4, If not, why not?

The CHIEF SECRETARY replied: 1, February, 1926, if the necessary buildings are completed. 2, Yes. 3, An appointment has been made. 4, Answered by No. 3.

QUESTION—FEDERAL ROAD GRANT.

Hon. H. STEWART asked the Chief Secretary: Will he lay on the Table of the House all files dealing with the allocation of the Federal road grant of £48,000 for main roads?

The CHIEF SECRETARY replied: If the hon. member will move in the usual way for the provision of the papers, they will be forthcoming.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

On motion by Hon. J. Nicholson, leave of absence for six consecutive sittings granted to Hon. G. W. Miles (North) on the ground of ill-health.

MOTION—ABATTOIRS ACT.

To disallow Regulations.

Debate resumed from the 20th October on the following motion by Hon. J. Nicholson:—

That the regulations promulgated under the Abattoirs Act, 1909, published in the "Government Gazette" on the 7th August, 1925, and now laid upon the Table, be and are hereby disallowed.

HON. A. LOVEKIN (Metropolitan) [4.36]: Since the Leader of the House discussed this question, some of us have had time to make inquiries. The inquiries I have been able to make have brought forth information which has been reduced as far as possible to a tabloid form, although I am sorry to say it is rather a big tabloid. This information the House ought to have before it and ought to consider. It has been supplied by those in the trade, largely in reply to what the Chief Secretary has told us. The Minister admitted that there was a heavy increase in the slaughtering charges to be made at the metropolitan abattoirs. He attempted to justify the increases as being necessarily involved to provide interest and sinking fund and depreciation on a capital outlay of £42,000 incurred by the partial demolition and rebuilding of the abattoir facilities at Midland Junction. He also pointed out that it was necessary to guard against losses made by operating under the old regulations and by additional rent that had to be paid by the Government to the Westralian Meat Export Company at Fremantle, a sum in excess of the amount previously paid for the rental of other abattoirs at that point. But I will endeavour to show that during the last six years the revenue and expenditure account at the metropolitan saleyards, lumped together as one department and administered by the same controller and staff, has shown a very substantial profit to the department for five out of the six years. The Chief Secretary based his comments largely on the figures of one year, which those engaged in the trade assert was an abnormal year. The figures I will submit embrace six years, so that a fair judgment may be formed. These figures are taken from official sources and are as follows:—

REVENUE AND EXPENDITURE OF METROPOLITAN ABATTOIRS AND SALEYARDS.

From 1st July to 30th June in each year.

Year.	Revenue.	Expenditure.	Profit.
	£	£	£
1919–20 ...	20,313	10,860	9,453
1920–21 ...	23,200	13,797	9,403
1921–22 ...	23,837	15,693	8,144
1922–23 ...	23,331	15,144	8,187
1923–24 ...	22,108	15,094	7,014
1924–25 ...	15,182	14,915	267

The trade contend, therefore, that it is entirely unfair to base any future calculations, either in respect of revenue or livestock to be slaughtered, on the figures available for any one year. A fair average of the last six years would be a more equitable basis of calculations and, in order that there may be no misapprehension as to the number of cattle, sheep, and lambs and pigs slaughtered at the abattoirs for the same period, I recapitulate them as follow:—

Year.	Cattle.	Sheep and Lambs.	Pigs.
1919–20 ...	19,416	359,313	7,844
1920–21 ...	23,516	367,079	8,758
1921–22 ...	23,545	362,132	8,154
1922–23 ...	23,444	345,784	11,107
1923–24 ...	27,057	278,592	11,015
1924–25 ...	23,274	204,266	9,221

These figures will show an average annual slaughtering of 23,375 bullocks, 319,527 sheep and lambs, and 9,349 pigs during that period. So it will be seen how unfair the Minister's calculations are when based on the figures for the year ending 30th June, 1925, which are the lowest for that period and were the result of various conditions beyond the control of any individual. During

the same period, from inquiries I have made, I have ascertained that the following live-stock passed through these saleyards:—

Year.	Cattle.	Sheep and Lambs.	Pigs.
1919–20 ...	23,250	529,034	32,073
1920–21 ...	29,315	510,180	27,349
1921–22 ...	27,269	475,970	26,515
1922–23 ...	25,006	549,291	35,294
1923–24 ...	31,094	420,444	33,404
1924–25 ...	34,039	491,695	35,603

The yard dues are collected by the Department of Agriculture from the selling agents using the saleyard facilities, and during the last six years an average of over £4,200 per annum has been derived by the department from this source. A comparison based on the average killings for the last six years as above mentioned, if slaughtered under the old rates, under Scale "A" and under Scale "B," would reveal the following position:—

CATTLE:

23,375	At old rate of 3s. 6d. per head. £4,090 12s. 6d.	Under Scale "A" at 7s. per head. £8,181 5s. 0d.	Under Scale "B" at 12s. per head. £14,025 0s. 0d.

SHEEP:

319,527	At old rate of 6d. per head. £7,988 3s. 6d.	Under Scale "A" at 1s. per head. £15,976 7s. 0d.	Under Scale "B" at 2s. per head. £31,952 14s. 0d.

PIGS, up to 100lbs., dressed weight:

9,349	At old rate of 1s. per head. £467 0s. 0d.	Under Scale "A" at 2s. per head. £934 18s. 0d.	Under Scale "B" at 3s. per head. £1,402 7s. 0d.

This brings us to the following comparative summary of increased charges:—

	Under old Rate.	Under Scale "A."	Under Scale "B."
	£ s. d.	£ s. d.	£ s. d.
CATTLE: 23,375	4,090 12 6	8,181 5 0	14,025 0 0
SHEEP: 219,527	7,988 3 6	15,976 7 0	31,952 14 0
PIGS: 9,349	467 9 0	934 18 0	1,402 7 0
	12,546 5 0	25,092 10 0	47,380 1 0

Therefore, killing under Scale "B" an increase as follows is apparent:—

	£ s. d.
As compared with old Rate ...	34,833 16 0
As compared with Scale "A"	22,287 11 0

Regarding Scale "A" and Scale "B," I am glad that the Chief Secretary has dealt rather exhaustively with the position as it appeals to him in respect of the butchers killing under these two different scales. Just in passing I would like to inform members that on the morning of the 7th September last, the date upon which the butchers were notified that the altered scale of charges would come into operation, 16 master butchers, who had been killing at those abattoirs, attended with their slaughtering staffs and found that the gates of all livestock races leading to the abattoir slaughtering floors, were closed and locked against them. The Controller of Abattoirs insisted that before any killing was done each individual butcher should sign a declaration to the effect that he would elect to kill his stock either under Scale "A" or Scale "B." The butchers unanimously decided that they would kill under Scale "B" and thus retain their own offal, but intimated to the Controller that they would require boiling down facilities, which had been available to them at those abattoirs for the last ten years at a moderate charge. They also intimated to the Controller that they would pay the charges under Scale "B" under protest, as they considered they were unduly high. In the meantime they had ascertained by telephone conversation that the butchers at the Meat Export Company's Works at Fremantle had been allowed to commence without signing any declaration, and it was only upon the Controller being acquainted with this fact that he agreed to unlock the gates and allow the killing to proceed at Midland Junction. The butchers, however, then decided that it would be advisable to endeavour to arrange for an immediate deputation to the Minister for Agriculture to finalise the points in dispute with a view to an amicable settlement and a continuance of trade operations. The deputation met the controlling Minister at five o'clock the same afternoon in his office when that gentleman, after considerable discussion and a very frank interchange of opinions all round, is reported to have said, "I will discuss the question of offal with Mr. Johnson. (It may be noted here that Mr. W. D. Johnson, M.L.A., introduced the deputation.) We will review the charges in one month's time. You will kill under Regulation "B" and leave the matter of by-products in abeyance for a week." It was on this understanding that slaughtering recommenced at Midland Junction the following morning. Much has been said by the Chief Secretary as to the advantages of the butchers killing under Scale "A" and allowing the Government to take the whole of the inedible offal (particulars of which are set out in the regulations now under consideration), as compared with the disadvantages

they are likely to incur by killing under Scale "B." The trade take the following points of view:—(1) The Government or any other body or individual have no right to commandeer their property by the fixing of a price arbitrarily as has been done by the Controller of Abattoirs under Scale "A." (2) That the fixing of a set price per head for the inedible offal of sheep, cattle, or pigs is inequitable, in that the man who buys good qua'ity stock gets no more for the offal from that beast than does the man who purchases medium or plain conditioned stock, and that the man who buys the very cheapest and poorest quality stock, either in the market or elsewhere, and slaughters it in the metropolitan abattoirs, is on an equal footing in this respect with the man who buys the very primest animals. (3) The butchers are unanimous in that they consider Scale "A" should never have been framed; they should not have been asked to sign it and it is quite unnecessary. (4) The butchers claim that if there is any benefit to be derived from the marketing of inedible offal and by-products therefrom, they as purchasers and owners of the stock so treated should be entitled to the full market value of it, and claim the right in the law of equity and fairness to be entitled to market it and deal with it as seems to them most desirable. Turning now to Scale "B," the butchers quite realise that extra chilling accommodation has been provided, and they agree that no abattoirs should be erected without chilling facilities, and that they have never been unfavourable to the payment of a moderate increase for the facilities provided, but when the charges for these extra facilities have been raised as they have been under Scale "B" from 3s. 6d. per bullock, under the old arrangement, to 12s. per bullock; from 6d. per head for sheep and lambs to 2s.; and from 1s. to 3s. per head for pigs dressing up to 100 lbs. weight, they complain with considerable justification that the added impost is out of all reason. To say the abattoirs have no facilities for treating the inedible offal the property of individuals is absurd. This has been done at a moderate cost, for ten years and the trade can see no reason whatever to prevent their continuing doing so. As a matter of fact it is being done to-day, but the butchers are pooling their offal, simply to suit the convenience of the Controller until the matter can be adjusted on a more satisfactory basis. The Chief Secretary has set up a whole heap of figures to prove to his own satisfaction that the butchers are losing £60 per week by killing under Scale "B." I say that the Minister's argument is founded on entirely wrong premises. I have endeavoured all along to show that a reasonable basis of calculation is on the average killings for the last six years, which I think you will agree is quite a reasonable and sound basis to commence with. Let us now refer again to the summary of increased charges shown under Scale "A" and under Scale "B," to which I have referred earlier. The trade are of the opinion that inedible offal and casings are worth, on the average, the following prices:—

Cattle	...	5s. 6d. per head
Sheep and Lambs	...	1s. ,,
Pigs	...	4d. ,,

Therefore, the average yearly killings on the basis I have previously outlined, would show the value of this commodity as below:

	£	s.	d.
23,375 Cattle at 5s. 6d. per head = ...	6,428	2	0
319,527 Sheep and Lambs at 1s. per head = ...	15,906	7	0
9,349 Pigs at 4d. per head	155	16	4
Total average annual value of inedible offal and casings	22,560	5	10
It will be observed here that the value of this offal would go to the Government Abattoirs under Scale "A" to which must be added killing charges levied under Scale "A" on the above mentioned stock equal to	25,092	10	0
Making a total of	£47,652	15	10

which the Abattoirs Department would receive. They would also have the opportunity of any enhanced value that might accrue as the result of an appreciating market for such by-products as are marketable, and the butchers claim, and I think rightly so, that they (the butchers) are entitled to the market value of such when they elect to market it. On the basis of killing charges levied under Scale "B," I have already shown that on the same average figures for killing, the return to the Abattoirs Department would be £47,380 1s., thus showing a saving to the trade of £272 14s. 10d. for an average year's killing, as compared with Scale "A" as shown above and I think entirely refuting the Minister's argument. The Chief Secretary has referred to the costs per pound of carcases of beef, mutton and pork. It will be found that under scale "B" 12s. is charged for floor space and chilling accommodation for bullocks, which is equivalent to a shade over ¼d. per pound for this service alone, for a 550lb. bullock. A 40lb. sheep at 2s. for this service is equivalent to three-fifths of a penny per pound; a 24lb. lamb at 2s. is equal to 1d. per pound,

and a 60lb. pig at 3s. is equal to three-fifths of a penny per pound. In addition to this cost has to be added slaughtermen's wages for killing and dressing, transport and distribution charges, as well as the incidental costs and overhead charges which are inseparable from an ordinary business undertaking. The Chief Secretary refers to a change of policy with the exit of the Seaddan Government. I wish to point out that towards the close of the Seaddan Government's tenure of office the then Controller of Abattoirs arranged for the department to kill all the stock for the butchers, who received back the carcases with all the by-products. The charge for this service was about 8s. per bullock. This is correct, but the position became so impossible and such chaotic conditions prevailed that the Controller was subsequently very glad indeed to re-introduce the old system of allowing each individual trader to arrange his own killing facilities. It has been said in another place that the sum of £72,975 represents the capital cost of the whole of the abattoirs. It has also been said that these figures include the North Fremantle Abattoirs, which have now been demolished. It has also been said there that the depreciation to be allowed is £5,888, interest £4,774, health fees £2,180, running expenses to £20,000, making a total charge of £32,911 against an estimated value of £35,000 based on the calculations of last year's figures. Let us analyse these figures and see what they convey: £72,975 represents to-day the capital cost of the whole of the abattoirs and saleyards. Allow 6 per cent. per annum interest on this sum, 6 per cent. per annum sinking fund, and 3 per cent per annum maintenance, and we have a total of 15 per cent. per annum to be provided for. This, I have no doubt, members will agree with me, is a very generous sinking fund and maintenance allowance and the ruling rate of interest for Government loan moneys. This sinking fund will provide that the facilities will pay for themselves in 17 years and be well maintained in the interim—

15 per cent. on £72,975	£10 946
Health Fees (which have to be paid to the Health Department)	2,180
Rental of Fremantle Abattoirs to the W.A. Meat Exports Company	7,000
Running expenses at Midland Junction, say	10,000
Total	£30,126

I would point out that the £7,000 of rental paid by the Abattoirs Department to the W.A. Meat Exports Company per annum will enable that company to pay interest at 4 per cent. per annum on the amount of their indebtedness to the Government, which at the moment is slightly over £100,000. Therefore, of the £7,000 rent that the Meat Exports Company receives it has to part with £4,000 for Government interest. This leaves them with £3,000, and for this payment they have to provide the building, the whole of the plant, all the power and the whole of the running staff with the exception of clerical labour, which would necessitate most the employment of two or three tally clerks to check the incoming live stock and outgoing carcases. If the W.A. Meat Exports Company is able to provide this service to the Abattoirs Department for £3,000 and handle half the killing in the metropolitan area, it is perfectly obvious that a provision of £10,000 for running expenses at Midland Junction is an extremely generous allowance. I have already shown you that under scale "B" the average killings per annum, based on an average of the last six years' figures, should return the department £47,380, which together with saleyard dues, averaging £4,200 per annum, should bring the revenue from those two sources alone up to £51,580, which should show a clear profit of over £20,000 per annum, without taking into consideration such incidentals as are collected from the butchers at Midland Junction by way of rental of stock pens and feed lockers, office rents from butchers and agents, refreshment booth rental, and various other incidentals. If it costs an additional £20,000 to administer the department and sustain the loss that the Chief Secretary estimates it will do, then it is time some alteration was made in the administrative methods adopted. It will be observed that the regulations which are the subject of this discussion were gazetted in the "Government Gazette" on the 7th August, 1925. The Midland Junction butchers returned from the Meat Exports Company's abattoirs at Fremantle and resumed operations at Midland Junction on the 17th August: the chilling facilities were then installed and the Chief Secretary has made considerable capital out of the fact that the butchers used these facilities for three weeks without additional charge, but he forgot to tell members that as soon as that section of the trade, who had been in the habit of killing at Midland Junction,

left Fremantle and went back there, the rest of the butchers at the Meat Exports Company's abattoirs were instructed to kill at the Union Abattoirs, South Fremantle, in order that alterations might be effected to the Meat Exports Company's works to enable the Fremantle section of the trade to ultimately resume there under something approaching reasonable slaughtering conditions. These alterations took some three weeks to carry out and it would obviously have been unfair to the Midland Junction section of the trade to have brought scale "A" or scale "B" into force with them at Midland Junction and allow the Fremantle traders to carry on under the old rate of charges. On the 31st August a letter was addressed by the Director of Agriculture to all the butchers utilising the metropolitan abattoirs as follows:—

"For your information I have to advise that the New Regulations under the Abattoirs Act, 1909, which were published in the "Government Gazette," on the 7th August, will take effect as from Monday next, the 7th September."

Accompanying that letter was a copy of the regulations and a copy of the declaration for the butchers to sign, declaring whether they would operate under scale "A" or scale "B." I have already outlined to members what took place on the 7th September at Midland Junction and they have already been told what was the reply of the Minister for Agriculture to the deputation which waited on him that day. In case they require to refresh their memories I will repeat that the Minister concluded his remarks with these words:—"I will discuss the question of offal with Mr. Johnson and also review the charges in one month's time. You will kill under regulation "B" and leave the matter of by-products over for a week." On the following day, the 8th September, these regulations were laid on the Table of this House and in another place also. What was the object that the Minister controlling that Department had in view when, less than twenty-four hours after making certain promises to the butchers, he arranged for this to be done? If the Minister was sincere in his promises to review the regulations, what necessity was there to put them on the tables of the Houses of Parliament? Was it done deliberately to strengthen his hands so that he could force the trade into a position which would give them no redress? If his promised review was to be effected, and he was desirous of making the charges reasonable and equitable, could he not have held the regulations in suspense? Is it any wonder that when the butchers discovered the advantage the Minister had taken they felt that they had been hoodwinked. They approached the member for Guildford (Hon. W. D. Johnson), who during the earlier years of his parliamentary career was Minister for Agriculture, and who should have been well qualified to sum up the position quickly and accurately. The butchers laid all their cards on the table, and Mr. Johnson was apparently so thoroughly satisfied that they had a strong case, that he led the deputation of the traders to the Minister on the 7th September, and made on that deputation a very effective speech in favour of the revision of the charges. Moreover, he promised the trade that he would investigate the matter further himself, and if necessary move in another place that the regulations be disallowed. As no communication was forthcoming from Mr. Johnson the butchers were getting restless as time was short. Their representative interviewed this gentleman again, who told him that he had seen the Minister who had assured him that he would review the regulations, and that there was no necessity for the butchers to do anything further in the matter. He also told their representative that the regulations would not be tabled in the Legislative Council so that there would be no opportunity to oppose it in this House. The reason for Mr. Johnson's complete somersault are probably best known to himself. Meantime, the butchers had taken other steps, the result of which was that Mr. Nicholson moved the motion now before this House. No harm whatever can be done by disallowing the regulations concerning which, to put it very mildly, there is a large measure of controversy. The Minister promised to reconsider the regulations in a month's time. That month has elapsed, and it is time that the Minister made some declaration as to whether he proposes that the regulations shall continue, or whether amended regulations are to take their place. It seems to me that the proper thing for this House to do is to disallow the regulations. If we do so, the Minister will be able to-morrow or next day, if he thinks fit, to put up a new set or even the old ones if he likes. Then, if whatever he lays on the Table should not be disallowed, it will become law and will operate. Any delay that might be involved by disallowing the present regulations will do no harm to the

Government. As a matter of fact, a lot of good should accrue to the butchers and to the public who have to pay for the meat and who are also paying the added charges involved as a result of the high rates imposed. I intend to support the motion.

HON. H. A. STEPHENSON (Metropolitan-Suburban) [5.5]: I agree with what Mr. Lovekin has said regarding the regulations, and I express surprise that the Leader of the House should have based his figures on the one particular year which we all know was a very lean year, due to drought conditions. At that time, there was very little stock in the State and meat had to be brought from Wyndham, South Australia and Queensland. The figures that have been supplied to us are authentic and show that for the past six years a handsome profit has been made at the abattoirs on the old rates. It seems to me that the new charges are altogether out of all reason. The abattoirs were not erected for the purpose of making big profits; the intention was to meet the trade and to conduct it in a reasonable way and to show a fair margin of profit. The matter does not require to be debated at any great length, more especially as the Minister for Agriculture promised to revise the rates within a certain period. We know, of course, that up to date he has not done so. I intend to support the motion.

HON. J. M. MACFARLANE (Metropolitan) [5.8]: I do not know whether it is intended to conclude the debate this afternoon. We have listened to the case that has been put up by Mr. Lovekin, but I feel sure that members have not been able to arrive at a definite conclusion on the evidence he placed before the House. It might therefore be wise for members to see the matter in print before they arrive at a decision. I have very little to add to the debate, except to say that the management of the abattoirs seem to have taken a high-handed stand in respect of the charges. The butchers to-day are almost in revolt not only because of the treatment they are receiving, but also on account of the exorbitant rates that are imposed. Some of the butchers have refrained from paying until Parliament has decided the question. Others who have paid say now that they intend to pay only a portion of the charges, realising that there may be a possibility of not getting a refund if they pay in full. These people have been told that if they do not pay up, a firm stand will be taken against them and that their business will be disarranged. I do not know whether the Minister has any cognisance of this attitude on the part of the manager of the abattoirs. Certainly the butchers resent that conduct very strongly. The facts that have been related to me are a corroboration of what Mr. Lovekin has told the House, but being anxious to ascertain what the charges were at Homebush, in New South Wales, I sent a telegram to inquire and received the following reply from the secretary of the Meat Board:—

> Slaughtering charges, including inspection fees for cattle, 4s. 6d.; calves 1s. 6d., pigs 1s. 9d., suckers 9d., sheep 3¼d. Fees include 12 hours use of chilling chamber. Board take inedible offal and pays for fat heads and feet. Tail tips at current market rates. Letter following.

Hon. members may have a copy of these figures, which are official. That telegram fairly well illustrates the position in New South Wales. In comparison with those figures, ours are, to say the least, very excessive. If lambs can be slaughtered at Homebush for 3¼d., why should we charge 2s.? Their charge for pigs is 1s. 9d. against our 3s. for pigs up to 70lbs. and higher according to weight. The Minister is at liberty to place the contents of this telegram before the Minister for Agriculture, if he has no other evidence of the charges at Homebush.

HON. J. NICHOLSON (Metropolitan—in reply) [5.12]: First I should like to express my thanks to the Chief Secretary for agreeing to the various adjournments in regard to the debate on the motion. I think he will realise with me that my object was only to get to the root of the matter and to secure the information everyone desired to have in order to enable a deliberative vote to be cast. I also congratulate the Chief Secretary on the fine speech he made against the motion. He made out a good fighting case, which members must acknowledge was calculated to shake their confidence in the motion that I submitted. However, after the Chief Secretary has digested—may I use this as a trade expression—the statement made by Mr. Lovekin, he will realise that there was good ground for the motion. The Chief Secretary will also excuse me if I make

the remark that I formed the impression after he had concluded his speech, that he felt he had made what one might term—again to use another trade expression—mincemeat of my argument. I am hoping that after the Minister's digestion has attained a satisfactory state, he will realise that a palatable dish can be made out of the mincemeat, and that he will find it acceptable to the extent that he will support the motion that I have moved for the disallowance of the regulations. The debate having extended over several days, it is possible that the memories of members may have become obscured regarding the main points, and I shall endeavour to refresh their memories slightly. The whole point at issue is this: New regulations have been introduced under the Abattoirs Act prescribing two scales of charges, A and B. Under scale A the Government make a smaller charge for slaughtering and retain all the inedible offal. Under scale B the Government make a higher charge to the butchers and allow them to retain the inedible offal. Under the old rates which expired prior to the introduction of the new regulations, there was a uniform charge of 3s. 6d. per head for cattle, 6d. per head for sheep and lambs, and 1s. per head for pigs up to 100lbs. weight. A comparison between the two rates is that, as against the 3s. 6d. formerly charged, the fee has been raised to 7s. per head for cattle under scale A, and up to as high as 12s. for cattle under scale B, and correspondingly higher charges have been imposed for sheep and pigs. That is an enormous increase and it will need a mighty lot of explaining. That is a point I wish to impress upon members. The Chief Secretary, in dealing with the motion, admitted that if the increases amounted to the sum of £37,000 as I had alleged, it was certainly an enormous figure, and he stated that few members would disagree on that point. The Minister questioned that figure; he said it was doubtful whether the sum had existence in reality, and then he added that it was very wide of the mark. In order that there may be no misunderstanding as to how I arrived at my estimate of £37,000, I shall refer to the notes from which I quoted on the previous occasion, notes based on the estimates of a week's killing from the 14th to the 19th September, 1925. Taking the number of bullocks, sheep, pigs and calves killed during that week, the total charges under the old rates amounted to £258 5s. 6d., but under scale B the total charges for the same number represented £974 14s., the difference being £716 8s. 6d. To take one week by itself is not fair, nor is it any more fair to take, as the Minister did, one year by itself, and that year a lean year. The difference for the one week I have quoted amounted to £718 8s. 6d., and multiplying that by 52 weeks for the year, the total increase is found to be £37,232. I used round figures and put the total increase down at £37,000. Therefore I gave quite a fair estimate. In view of the statement by Mr. Lovekin, however, I am willing to admit that the fairest way to determine this matter is to take not one week or one year but a spread of years, and average them out. On that basis it will be found that the increase on the average of six years approximates very closely the figure I gave; probably it would be £2,000 or £3,000 less. The Minister agreed that on the number of stock slaughtered last year, the increase amounted to the very substantial sum of £26,133, but he explained that that amount was more than absorbed by certain items. He quoted interest and depreciation on cost of extensions and additions, £5,040; extra wages, electric light, power, chemicals, insurance and maintenance, £5,000; the amount necessary to avoid a recurrence of the loss last year under the old system, £5,000; the loss of revenue through not collecting the new charges until after the 7th September, the works having been in operation from the 17th August, £6,000. The Minister said those items totalled £26,524, but I make the total only £21,040, a difference of £5,093. It is possible that the Minister omitted one item, and if he did I am prepared to make allowance for it. The Minister pointed out that between the admitted increase of £26,133 and the total of £26,542 was a difference of £392, representing a loss to the Government. If no items were omitted by the Minister in arriving at his total, instead of there being a loss of £392, there would be a profit of over £4,000, because of the £5,093 for which the Minister has not accounted. I ask members to examine the items for themselves and to bear in mind that the capital outlay on the works is £42,000. There is an enormous increase of over £30,000 between the old and the new rates, and that being so there can be no hesitation on the part of members to support the motion to disallow the regulations. This is a question that affects not so much

the butchers as the general public. Mr. Lovekin has referred to that. When it is made manifest that the charges imposed represent an unfair addition to the cost of meat to the consumer, it is our duty to refuse to approve of the regulations. Members have often objected to legislation by regulation. This is an instance of regulations having been passed to impose new charges, and the new charges will be collected until the regulations are disallowed. It makes one wonder whether the determining of fees by regulations is a fair procedure or whether the fees should not be fixed by statute. Mr. Lovekin has shown that the present charges are unjustified, and I have no doubt that when members have an opportunity to read his statement, they will agree with him. If members compare the rates obtaining here with those obtaining in the other States, particularly the figures from Homebush quoted by Mr. Macfarlane, they can come to only one conclusion, namely, that our charges are excessive.

Hon. J. M. Macfarlane: Especially as theirs include inspection fees.

Hon. J. NICHOLSON: Yes. At Homebush the charge for cattle is 4s. 6d. as against our B rate of 12s. The difference between those figures is so enormous as to call for explanation. The same applies to the charges for other stock quoted by Mr. Macfarlane. I ask members to say whether it is fair to take one year for purposes of comparison, or whether it would not be wiser to take the six years, as was done by Mr. Lovekin. If we take the average figures for the six years, we can arrive at much more accurate results. The average number of stock killed during the six years from 1919 to 1925 was 23,375 cattle. 319,527 sheep and lambs, and 9,349 pigs. Under the old rate the total cost of slaughtering those cattle, sheep and pigs would have been £12,546 5s.: under scale "A" it would have been exactly double that amount, but the "B" rate is the one operating here and under that rate the amount is £47,380 1s. The excess under the "B" rate over the old rate is, therefore, £34,833 16s.—an enormous increase, approximating to the amount of £37,000 which I estimated when I first spoke. It is not necessary for me to add more to convince members that there is every justification for supporting the motion.

Question put and passed.

BILLS (2)—COMMITTEE REPORTS.

1, Land Act Amendment.

2, Newcastle Suburban Lot 88.

Adopted.

BILL—INDUSTRIAL ARBITRATION ACT AMENDMENT.

In Committee.

Resumed from the 29th October: Hon. J. W. Kirwan in the Chair, the Chief Secretary in charge of the Bill.

Clause 2—Amendment of Section 4 of principal Act (partly considered):

Hon. A. LOVEKIN: I desire to prevent domestic servants becoming members of unions and being brought under this measure. Therefore I move an amendment—

That in Subclause (6) the words "By omitting the words 'but shall not include any person engaged in domestic service,' in the interpretation of 'Worker,'" be struck out, with a view to the insertion of other words.

The words which I propose to insert are, "By inserting after the word 'service' in the interpretation of 'Worker' the words 'except such persons as are employed as domestics or nurses in public or private hospitals, boardinghouses, hotels, restaurants, and public institutions.'"

THE CHIEF SECRETARY: I hope the amendment will not be carried. On the second reading I pointed out that the provision for inclusion of domestic servants did not mean intrusion upon the privacy of the home. Such a criticism arises from a misunderstanding of the Bill. The right of entry is only under the Factories and Shops Act, and does not extend to private premises used as a dwelling or to any dwelling appropriated to the use of a household.

Hon. J. Nicholson: What about Clause 67 of the Bill?

The CHIEF SECRETARY: Under Clause 67 the secretary of a union has merely the power of an inspector under the Factories and Shops Act and therefore cannot enter a private dwelling, although he has full power to enter a factory. Under that clause he can call at a place and ask for an inspection of the books, but no more. The next point is whether domestic servants are entitled to fair wages and decent conditions. We contend that in this respect they are just as much

entitled to protection as the carpenter, the blacksmith, the railway employee, or the miner. I do not wish to make another second reading speech on this clause.

Hon. J. NICHOLSON: Unfortunately I cannot see the matter in the same light as the Chief Secretary. The proposal in this clause, taken in conjunction with Clause 67, clearly means that the secretary of a union shall, for the purpose of ascertaining whether the terms of an industrial agreement or award are duly observed——

Hon. J. Cornell: I do not know how you can work that reasoning in on this clause.

Hon. J. NICHOLSON: If a class of persons is included within the scope of the Bill, those persons would be subject to any industrial award or agreement which might be made; and in order to ascertain whether the award or agreement is being duly observed, the secretary, or any person authorised by the president or secretary of a union, would under Clause 67 have the powers of an inspector under the Factories and Shops Act, and would be entitled to enter a private house. A private house stands in a totally different category from a factory. I support Mr. Lovekin's amendment.

Hon. A. J. H. SAW: I sympathise with Mr. Lovekin's object, but the words which he proposes to insert do not appear to me well chosen. I do not think nurses are employed in boarding-houses or hotels. I am in favour of striking out the words which Mr. Lovekin proposes to strike out. I have an objection to inspectors entering private houses, and I have yet to learn that domestic servants want to come under the arbitration laws. So far as I know, there is no union of domestic servants, and I do not know that domestic servants want to form a union. I think they want protection from certain people of whom they and we have had some experience during the last six months in Perth. I do not think they want to come under the provisions of the Arbitration Act nor do they desire to form a union. They are pretty well off to-day and they know it. There is a shortage in the supply of domestic servants.

Hon. T. Moore: Then the work is not popular!

Hon. A. J. H. SAW: These girls know that they are well treated and if there is any grievance, it is not on the part of the servants.

Hon. J. R. BROWN: I hope the subclause will be retained in the Bill. This question was debated last session. To-day inspectors are able to go into business premises without any inconvenience or trouble resulting, and the right under the Bill regarding inspection refers to houses, for instance, where there may be only one or two servants. However, it is not desired that the inspectors shall enter houses. Mr. Nicholson seems to fear bleary-eyed Bolsheviks chasing cooks round the yard!

Hon. J. Nicholson: I do not paint any picture like that at all.

Hon. J. R. BROWN: I am telling you what your picture was like. The hon. member seemed to fear this bleary-eyed Bolshevik chasing the cook round the yard for the union fees, while the dinner frizzled on the fire. At the same time, Mr. Nicholson seemed to fear that at the front door would be a Communist who had come to see the parlour maid who, perhaps, was trying on the mistress's new hat. There is nothing of that sort to be feared. We merely desire domestics to be included under the Bill because they are downtrodden. How many fathers in working class homes will allow their girls to take up domestic service? They will make them waitresses, dressmakers, milliners, barmaids or typistes, but they will not allow them to become domestic servants. If they are very plain and ugly and are not fitted for any other occupation, only then will the girls take on domestic service.

Hon. J. Nicholson: In which case the inspectors would not come round to see them.

Hon. J. R. BROWN: Servants are expected to sit up all hours during the night merely because the mistress has visitors in the parlour. There is no limit to her hours. It will be a shame if the provision regarding domestics is deleted from the Bill. Dr. Saw said that there was no desire on the part of domestic servants to be brought within the scope of the Arbitration Act. There was no desire on the part of the nurses! Girls are working under conditions of domestic slavery, and the Committee will be doing a grievous wrong to them if we do not agree to their inclusion.

Hon. J. CORNELL: The issue is clear. The subclause will rectify an anomaly which exists under the Act which excludes insurance canvassers and domestics. Mr. Lovekin desires to exclude domestics, but is willing to include certain classes of insurance canvassers. I have always supported the inclusion of domestics and all people who work for wages, under the pro-

visions of the Arbitration Act. I cannot see what justice there is in the contention that one class of worker may come within the provisions of that Act, while another is debarred from doing so.

Hon. J. M. Macfarlane: The domestics may not value the provision.

Hon. J. CORNELL: If a law is not availed of, it becomes a dead letter. On the other hand, the right should be given to domestic servants so that they may avail themselves of it should they so desire.

Hon. W. H. KITSON: I support the subclause, which will bring domestic servants within the scope of the Bill. Dr. Saw was correct when he said that the supply was not equal to the demand for domestic servants. That being so, it behoves us to inquire why such a position arises. It has not always been so. The real reason is that the conditions under which many of the domestic servants have to work are not what the girls are entitled to. They have to accept the wages that the mistress likes to pay, work the hours she directs to be worked and observe the conditions, whatever they may be. Hundreds of cases have been brought before the industrial organisations indicating that domestic servants have been asked to work under conditions that no human being should be asked to do.

Hon. J. Duffell: If the domestic servant does not get as good food as her mistress, she will walk out.

Hon. C. F. Baxter: She sees to it that she gets some of the best of whatever is going.

Hon. W. H. KITSON: And in some instances that would be quite justifiable. A servant is entitled to the same justice as any other girl.

Hon. A. Lovekin: What will these girls do if they will not become domestic servants?

Hon. W. H. KITSON: They become waitresses or shop girls or something else more congenial.

Hon. J. Nicholson: If the demand is great and the supply small, the girls should have splendid opportunities for choosing their positions.

The CHAIRMAN: Each member of the Committee has an opportunity to speak as often as he may wish. In the circumstances, therefore, an hon. member addressing the Chamber might be allowed to proceed without interruption.

Hon. W. H. KITSON: I do not object to interruptions.

Hon. J. R. Brown: But they are disorderly.

The CHAIRMAN: Order!

Hon. W. H. KITSON: The only argument advanced against the inclusion of domestic servants was that referred to by Mr. Nicholson regarding the right of inspection. The only right conferred upon an inspector appointed by the secretary or a union is that conferred upon inspectors under the Factories and Shops Act, 1920. Under that Act dwelling-houses are expressly excluded. If domestics were included under the Bill, they would be able to form a union and register their organisation, take proceedings before the Arbitration Court and secure an award. In that award the court would define the right of inspection. Surely hon. members would not contend that the court would do something that would be oppressive to the employers. There has been agitation on the part of women in domestic service for many years in the hope that this right would be conceded. Many girls leave domestic service after a little while, because the wages are not commensurate with their requirements. If it can be shown that it will work a hardship upon the employers or the employees, I will be prepared to agree that there is something to be said for the abolition of domestics from the Bill. Nothing, however, has been said to indicate that there is any danger from either point of view. Servants are the least fitted of all to look after their own interests and the subclause will provide them with an opportunity to have their wages and working conditions fixed by an impartial tribunal.

Hon. H. STEWART: From my experience, I would not be inclined to speak strongly either in favour of, or in opposition to, the inclusion of domestic servants. When we were discussing the Industrial Arbitration Act Amendment Bill last session, Mr. Kitson admitted that the results of arbitration had not been satisfactory and that the conditions of the workers and their standard of comfort had not improved very favourably compared with what they had been in 1911. There may be a good deal in what Mr. Kitson said regarding the hardships experienced by some girls in domestic service, but that may apply in the more congested areas. It may be that hardships arise from instances where it is necessary to have help in the house on account of the health of the wife, although the husband can ill afford the expense. Of course it is

easy to pick out cases of hardship but, at all events in the outer districts, the girl rendering domestic help is treated as one of the family; indeed that is an essential condition if the family would secure that help. The sanctity of the home is a thing to be preserved in all its sacredness. It must not be threatened by any industrial experiments. Members, I think, are not prepared to risk the weakening of home control by experimental legislation. Only in that aspect do I hold any strong feelings on the question before us.

Hon. W. H. Kitson: How would be affect the sanctity of the home?

Hon. H. STEWART: Under this provision something might happen comparable with what happened during the caterers' strike. On no condition should the province of the court be extended to domestic servants, unless it were prescribed that before the union took action a compulsory secret ballot should be conducted by the Chief Electoral Officer of the State.

Hon. J. DUFFELL: Mr. Kitson is an artist in inducing people to realise that they have grievances. He now wants the Committee to realise that domestic servants are downtrodden, hard-worked and ill-paid.

Hon. W. H. Kitson: In many cases that is so.

Hon. J. DUFFELL: In many cases it is not so. Domestic servants in the metropolitan area are earning up to 30s. a week and getting the very best of living and of working conditions. The reason why there is difficulty in finding domestic servants is that they cannot get off every night as the girls in restaurants, offices and warehouses do. If this provision be allowed to remain in the Bill, we shall have Mr. Kitson organising the domestic servants into a union, and then they will demand the 44-hour week and will be holding stop-work meetings when they should be getting on with their domestic duties. I see no reason why this provision should be included.

Hon. A. LOVEKIN: If the Bill passes as it stands, the first thing that can happen is that domestic servants may form themselves into a union and go to the court for an award. When they have an award, the secretary of the union, or any person authorised by the president or the secretary, will have all the powers of entry and inspection of an inspector under the Factories and Shops Act. Mr. Kitson was wrong in saying that under that Act a private house was exempt. There is nothing in the Bill to exempt a private house. The person appointed for the purpose by the union will have power to require the mistress of the house in which a member of his union is employed to answer almost any question he cares to put to her, and even to sign a statutory declaration as to the truth of the matter respecting which she is questioned. Can we imagine the sanctity of the home being invaded to this extent? A union secretary shall be appointed to go to one's house and ask the mistress any question regarding the conditions of employment, and even to require a formal statutory declaration. It would be absolutely intolerable. Yet that is exactly what the Bill means. Mr. Stewart referred to what happened in the so-called caterers' strike. I agree that what happened in a public house might as well happen in a private house, if we give the facilities proposed in the Bill.

Sitting suspended from 6.15 to 7.30 p.m.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: One might conclude from the speeches this evening that the agitation for an improvement in the industrial conditions of domestic servants had been initiated in Perth. That is not so. This is a question of world-wide concern, and many public men are interesting themselves in it. A recent International Labour Office publication contains the reports of resolutions bearing on the industrial questions adopted by the first international sociological conference held in Rome in 1924. It was resolved, in effect, that the dignity of persons engaged in domestic service should be raised, that domestic science be developed, and that the class of old-fashioned domestic servants should be superseded. It is practically impossible to raise the level of domestic servants until they are given the same protection as other workers. Mr. Lovekin says that the secretary of a union would have power to invade the sanctity of the home. That is not so. He would have only the power of a factory inspector who, under the Factories and Shops Act, could not invade the private home.

Hon. A. Lovekin: The Act does not say that.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: A factory inspector cannot inspect any building that is appropriated to the use of the household, and the union secretary could not do so

either. Domestic servants would have to form a union; otherwise, under this Bill, they could not approach the court.

Hon. A. J. H. Saw: They are not prohibited from forming a union.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: Under the law at present they could not register as a union, and it would not be worth their while forming a union unless they were enabled afterwards to approach the court. It is desired to give them an opportunity of forming a real union, registering it, and getting an award from the court so that their industrial conditions might be improved.

Hon. A. LOVEKIN: I cannot follow the reasoning of the Chief Secretary. The powers given under the Bill must apply to the private home, and the officials would at once come under Section 11 of the Factories and Shops Act. These powers would be given, not to an impartial officer such as an inspector of factories, but to the secretary of a union or his appointee. Surely members would not tolerate that.

Hon. A. J. H. SAW: The powers conferred on a factory inspector enable him to inspect factories and dwelling houses. It would thus be for the Arbitration Court to interpret what is meant by this clause.

Hon. E. H. Gray: Can you not trust the court?

Hon. A. J. H. SAW: It would be reasonable for the court to say that inasmuch as a factory inspector can make those inspections, an inspector under this Act would have the same power, and would be enabled to enter those establishments where servants were employed.

The HONORARY MINISTER: The only objection that can stand against this clause is the objection to a union secretary having the power to enter a private dwelling. A bogey has been raised. No one who has had anything to do with industrial matters can point to instances where union officials have overstepped the mark. These officials are carefully chosen to uphold the ideals of the Labour movement. I know of no instance where the responsibilities of check inspectors of mines have been abused. The same thing would apply to other union officials who may be clothed with the powers of inspectors under the Act. One of the strongest arguments in favour of retaining the clause has been put up by Dr. Saw, who says that the occupation of domestic servants is not sufficiently attractive to induce people to take it up. I venture to say that no union secretary would abuse the privileges that were given to him.

Hon. E. H. HARRIS: It might be thought that the secretary of a union was the only person who would be vested with these powers. Under the Bill, however, hundreds of other persons might be vested with them. If it were confined to the secretary or president there would not half the objection that there is now. Another matter that has not been stressed is that a factory inspector is empowered to call to his aid a member of the police force. If provision were made for an official of the union to make the visit, with power to see that the award was carried out, there would not be half the trouble.

Hon. J. NICHOLSON: A reasonable interpretation must be given to the clause, and when one looks at the fact that under certain parts of the Bill, power is given to a secretary, or a person appointed by a secretary, to enter any place for the purpose of seeing whether an award is being observed or not, there must be an interpretation given to that, and that interpretation can only be that to which Dr. Saw has drawn attention. The Minister will remember that in all the conferences it was pointed out that the various countries would apply the recommendations according to the conditions. Our conditions are wholly different from those crowded places where the recommendations have been applied. Therefore the only way to deal with the matter is to support the amendment.

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

Ayes	12
Noes	7
Majority for ...	5

AYES.

Hon. C. F. Baxter	Hon. A. J. H. Saw
Hon. A. Burvill	Hon. H. A. Stephenson
Hon. V. Hamersley	Hon. H. Stewart
Hon. A. Lovekin	Hon. F. E. S. Willmott
Hon. J. Nicholson	Hon. H. J. Yelland
Hon. E. Rose	Hon. J. M. Macfarlane (*Teller.*)

NOES.

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

Pairs.

Ayes.	Noes.
Hon. J. Duffell	Hon. J. E. Dodd
Hon. J. J. Holmes	Hon. J. Cornell

Amendment thus passed .

Hon. H. A. STEPHENSON: I move an amendment—

That the following additional words be struck out of Subclause (6):—"And by adding to the interpretation of 'worker' the following words:—'The term includes any other employee (including insurance canvassers) under a contract or whose duties imply a contract for service remunerated wholly or partly by commission or similar reward.'"

The CHIEF SECRETARY: There has been a request for the inclusion of insurance canvassers. Recently the Minister for Works received a letter from the secretary of the Federal organisation of insurance agents urging that the Government should take action to bring insurance agents within the provisions of the Arbitration Act. It is not desired that the hours of labour should be fixed. That would be impracticable. What is sought is a revision of the rates of commission. It is contended that the rates in some instances are ridiculously low. This is not a matter that is agitating insurance canvassers of Western Australia only. The same condition of affairs obtains in New South Wales. In "Smith's Weekly" of the 26th September there is a long article dealing with the question. For the information of members I will read the headlines and a couple of paragraphs which will indicate the tenor of the article. The headlines are "Appalling Conditions make Industrial Insurance Men unite," "Even wealthy A.M.P. grows rich by sweated labour," "Calling that invites dishonesty." The article contains these paragraphs—

Canvassers for insurance companies writing industrial policies are in some repects the worst treated workers in the community. There earnings are so microscopic that the wonder is that they hand themselves over body and soul, as they do, to their employers for an average reward far below the labourer's living wage. It is appalling to think that a really smart industrial canvasser would hardly earn £3 a week with constant effort; and there are many who earn almost nothing at all over a term of weeks, after deductions have been made for lapses of policies written by their predecessors.

Further along the article contains even stronger comments. There was opposition to the proposal regarding private houses and that came from the employers, which was only natural. Every extension of the scope of the Bill is likely to be opposed by those who desire perfect freedom to do exactly as they please. Regarding canvassers, there is no standard commission and there are few companies whose rates compare. Canvassers should have an opportunity, just as have other sections of the industrial community, to approach the court. The provision applies only to persons employed without wages and wholly on commission, and what is wrong with giving the Arbitration Court power to fix the rate of commission for insurance as well as the rate of wages in other callings? If one is done, the other should be done.

Hon. J. R. BROWN: I hope the words will be retained. An insurance canvasser has one of the hardest rows to hoe. He may tramp the town day after day and get no results, but his work of advertising a company may result in his successor reaping considerable benefit. No hardship will be inflicted upon employers if canvassers be included.

The CHAIRMAN: The purpose of Mr. Stephenson and Mr. Lovekin will best be served if the amendment is put in the form of striking out the second paragraph of Subclause 6. I shall put the question in that way.

Amendment put and a division called for.

Bells rung.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: I ask leave to withdraw my call for a division.

Call, by leave, withdrawn.

Amendment put and passed.

Hon. A. LOVEKIN: The words retained in the subclause read "by adding to the interpretation of 'worker' the following words." To make the paragraph read, I move an amendment—

That the following words be inserted:—"The term includes canvassers for industrial insurance whose services are remunerated wholly or partly by commission or percentage reward. For the purposes of this paragraph the word 'canvassers' means persons wholly and solely employed in the writing of industrial insurance business and/or in the collection of premiums at not longer intervals than one month in respect to such insurance, but does not include any person who directly or indirectly carries on or is concerned in the carrying on or conduct of any other business or occupation in conjunction or in association with that of industrial insurance."

It would be well to get this amendment on the Notice Paper. We had a meeting on Thursday night and the amendment is the outcome of the discussion. After I have briefly explained it, I think it would be well if the Leader of the House agreed to postpone further consideration until members have had an opportunity to study the amendment. I have tried to tighten up the position so that only industrial insurance agents will be concerned; that is, agents who collect 1s. a week in respect of small insurances. Last year we had a similar clause before us and the Committee voted it out. I was in favour of deleting it. Mr. Kitson, however, has put up a case that I thought we should investigate before giving judgment again. Believing that the House would adjourn at the tea hour on Thursday last, I asked two managers of insurance companies to be good enough to come up here and have a chat with us and the insurance canvassers concerned. Four or five of us met those gentlemen. I had been impressed largely by one of the points put by Mr. Kitson, and the fact was practically admitted on both sides. Mr. Kitson informed us, and the managers and canvassers agreed, that when a canvasser had been given a district and had secured a certain number of insurers whose premiums he was entitled to collect from week to week, thus ensuring himself an income, some of the companies concluded that such a canvasser had too many clients; that is, he was making too much money. If he had in his book a number of clients whose business would give him, say, £30 a week to collect, the company would step in and say, "We desire to divide the area you have. You will have only £20 a week to collect and you will have to give the other £10 of your business to Mr. Brown whom we are putting on to make another district. For a number of weeks you will practically have to stand good for the premiums payable, in some cases for 13 weeks, to the new man." The result is that the original canvasser, who has worked hard to build up his book, is from time to time set back, and has to begin again to lift his book from £20 to £30 before he can obtain the same amount of weekly emolument that he was getting before. Such a man was obviously being deprived of the fruits of his labour, whether he be called a commission agent or a contractor. It was not fair. If I undertook to canvass for business in a given district, I should be entitled to the full fruits of my labour in that district, and I should be permitted to build up to £40 or £50 if I was able to do so. One of the best canvassers was getting £6 a week. That man had rather a large district around Applecross, and to cover his ground he told us he had to keep a pony and trap out of the £6 a week. According to his statement, when he got much beyond that amount, his district would be divided as others had been divided in the past, and he would have to get more clients within a smaller area. That is not right. We were told by the manager of one of the companies that the average earnings of these canvassers were £4 3s. per week. We asked the men what they were earning, and from what they told us we concluded that £4 3s. per week was considerably above what they actually netted. That is not fair to the man; nor is it fair to societies such as the A.M.P. There is not a word of complaint against the A.M.P. Society who are doing this industrial work. It would be a good thing for such societies as the A.M.P. and the National Mutual—the latter do not touch industrial business—that this particular class of canvasser should be able to come under the Act and take advantage of one of the boards to be appointed if the Bill becomes law. Given such a board, the parties could sit around a table and get at some sort of an agreement that would be fair and square to both sides. It may be argued that this could be done now, but there is no obligation on the parties to do it, and matters are going on in a very unsatisfactory way. There is no tribunal that can step in and say to both sides, "You shall sit down and make an equitable agreement, or, if you cannot agree, you shall go to the court and the court will decide what is fair." The canvassers could not go to the court because the question is too complex for a court to consider. It would have to be dealt with by a board. I think the court would refer it to a board for consideration, and would itself decide only the points on which no agreement could be reached. We could not have an arbitration rate for life insurance canvassers. These people, however, are really employees paid not by a weekly wage but by a percentage. This, being a non-party House, we should try to do justice by all sections of the community. Perhaps the consideration of the clause will be postponed in order that members may see my amendment in the Minutes.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: I move—

That the further consideration of Clause 2 be postponed.

Motion passed.

Clause 3—Amendment of Section 6:

Hon. J. CORNELL: I move an amendment—

That the following be struck out:—"the words 'associated for the purpose of protecting or furthering the interests of employers or workers in or in connection with any specified industry, or (in the case and subject to the conditions hereinafter set out) in or in connection with divers industries in the State.'"

This is on all fours with an amendment to which the Chamber agreed last session. The clause aims at upsetting what has been the established practice since the inception of industrial arbitration, to confine each union to a specified industry. With one exception every union in the State has so modelled its rules as to conform with the practice which has obtained since 1902. The A.W.U., however, to a major extent will not or cannot so model its rules as to procure registration under the Act as it stands. Despite those difficulties, three or four integral parts of the A.W.U. have secured registration under the existing Act. Unionism of to-day is based on customs which have given practically universal satisfaction since the passing of the original Act, 23 years ago. A change from the existing state of affairs to that contemplated by the clause would mean the destruction of well-defined forms of organisation and registration, and would give registration to the A.W.U.; which hitherto failed to get in under the law. If the clause is carried, the A.W.U. will not have to conform to cardinal principles recognised since 1902. I said last session, and I say now, that I doubt very much whether the organised unions really favour the proposed change. I have heard of no joint petition from them on behalf of the A.W.U. The carrying of my amendment will leave the Act as it has been for 23 years. If my amendment is carried, I propose to move a further amendment fixing the same number of membership for an employers' union and for an employees' union.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: The object of the clause is, amongst other things, to enable the A.W.U. to register. It is essential for the purpose of industrial peace that such a large union should be given every opportunity to approach the Arbitration Court for adjustment of wages and working conditions. The intention of the A.W.U. is to cover all men, not being tradesmen, who are casually employed, and who may in the course of a year be engaged in such different occupations as road construction, railway construction, water supply, or tramway construction. The one union ticket would enable a member of the union to follow casual work in any or all of these industries. The other unions, which some members wish to safeguard, will take adequate steps at the proper time to protect their interests, should it be necessary. To obtain registration in the Federal Arbitration Court the A.W.U. gave satisfactory undertakings to the other unions, and it is prepared to do so in this State.

Hon. A. LOVEKIN: We all know that however worthy a union the A.W.U. may be, it is a polyglot union, and composed of innumerable trades—in many instances trades which already have their own unions. It may be right to have one big union, but people must know where they are. A carpenter may be to-day a member of the A.W.U. and to-morrow a member of the Carpenters' Union; and so the public would never know where they were. We should keep each trade and occupation by itself in the matter of unionism, so that when a union comes before the court, the court can deal with the occupation and make an award. If we are to have the A.W.U. before the court with hundreds of trades and vocations, I do not know where the court will be, nor do I know where the public will wind up. For many years the A.W.U. has been specially excluded from registration for the very reason that each of the trades of which it is composed can register separately, which is better for the public. We must consider the people as well as the unions. Therefore, I support the amendment.

The HONORARY MINISTER: I have heard it said by many members in this Chamber that it is their ambition to bring about industrial peace. I have subscribed to that policy. Here we have a large organisation making just one more attempt to secure registration in the interests of industrial peace. That effort is being made out of loyalty to the members of the organisation who have on many occasions voted for arbitration as the policy of the union throughout Australia. The A.W.U. have made many attempts and the former Premier, Sir James

Mitchell, told the organisation that he was sure it could be registered. He promised, however, that if it were found that the A.W.U. could not be registered, he would introduce legislation to enable it to be registered. The Bill will enable the A.W.U. to secure registration. The Government have made that provision because they are keen on assisting those who stand for industrial peace and for arbitration. Mr. Cornell and Mr. Lovekin stated that the A.W.U. had the opportunity to go to court. That is entirely wrong. The mining and pastoral sections of the union have been registered. The registration of the pastoral section, however, is worth nothing. One provision of the Arbitration Act stipulates that a ballot of members has to be taken under certain circumstances. It is impossible for the members of the A.W.U. to effectively comply with that requirement, and recently the organisation was thrown out of court because that technicality had not been complied with. The only result from that action was to put both sides to added expense. The organisation complied with the requirements of the Act, and is to-day before the court. If members are serious in their desire for industrial peace, and to have every organisation registered under the provisions of the Industrial Arbitration Act, they will agree to this provision. It has been suggested that the A.W.U. should be cut up into small organisations. We had experience of such small organisations in the early days on the goldfields when every mining centre had its separate miners' union. That involved considerable expense that is obviated to-day. In view of past experiences, surely hon. members will realise that this provision is in the interests of industrial peace. It is the policy of the A.W.U. not to accept into its ranks any members of an organisation unless by a vote of the union concerned being in favour of linking up with the A.W.U.

Hon. E. H. Harris: It is on record that the A.W.U. tried to take one lot by force.

The HONORARY MINISTER: I have been continuously a member of the A.W.U. from my early days and I know something about its ramifications. It is not a body-snatching organisation and its record will stand investigation by any section of industrialists or of the community in general. One objection raised was that the organisation was largely governed by executive authority. That contention was wrong, but if it were correct, I claim that no organisation has been governed with better judgment. References have been made to some industrial troubles. In those instances the rank and file bolted, but when the executive was able to take control a better situation arose. The last shearing upheaval was entirely against the advice of the executive officers, who were not responsible for it. I trust that members who are not personally acquainted with all the details regarding the industrial position will be guided by those who have made a study of it. I feel I am acting in the interests of industrial peace in urging members to accept the subclause. If we do not adopt that course, we may throw our industrialists into the hands of Walsh and his crowd. If we continue to hamper the desires of the A.W.U. it may result in the teachings of Walsh being studied more closely and in such circumstances we will have to accept responsibility for actions that may be taken in accordance with the teachings of Walsh and his satellites.

Hon. E. H. HARRIS: The object of the proposal is to establish one big union in Western Australia.

Hon. J. R. Brown: What is wrong with that?

Hon. E. H. HARRIS: I take strong exception to the proposal.

Hon. E. H. Gray: Naturally.

Hon. E. H. HARRIS: The constitution of the A.W.U. shows that it includes such workers as those engaged in the sugar industry, cane cutting, milling and refining, fish trawling, manufacturing of copper bars and a hundred and one other things.

Hon. W. H. Kitson: What is wrong with that?

Hon. E. H. HARRIS: These are industries that do not exist in Western Australia to-day! This means that the organisation is looking ahead and asking Parliament to confer powers upon it now, that will enable it to have a monopoly of those engaged in these industries years hence.

Hon. J. R. Brown: They would not do that.

Hon. E. H. HARRIS: That the hon. member says so is no guarantee. If we confer this power upon the A.W.U., it will be used in any direction desired.

Hon. W. H. Kitson: Of course it will.

Hon. E. H. HARRIS: The Honorary Minister has pointed out his desire for industrial peace. The A.W.U. is registered under the Federal Act and has Federal awards, while sections of the organisation

are also registered under the State Act. It is the obvious desire on the part of the organisation to secure awards from the State as well as from the Commonwealth, thus causing overlapping. It will also result in overlapping in the membership of organisations in various vocations. The latest return in the "Government Gazette" shows that the A.W.U. had mining branches in Cue and Geraldton, but I believe those registrations have been allowed to lapse. If the A.W.U. is desirous of securing the enrolment of members, why does it not form branches of the various organisations?

Hon. J. R. Brown: There are not enough of them.

Hon. E. H. HARRIS: What is there to prevent the A.W.U. having an organisation with 20 branches so that a member can be transferred from one branch to another if he changes from one class of work to another?

The Honorary Minister: What is the object of that?

Hon. E. H. HARRIS: The Honorary Minister knows that organisations do that. The A.W.U. uses this bogey in order to further the plea for registration.

Hon. J. R. Brown: It is no bogey.

Hon. E. H. HARRIS: Registration will give the A.W.U. a monopoly enabling it to cover many different vocations.

The Honorary Minister: You cannot be enrolled unless you desire it.

Hon. E. H. HARRIS: But if there is only one organisation of this description, it can successfully object to the registration of a union covering other forms of employment. The parent Act provides for objection being taken to the registration of a union if it can be shown that there exists already an organisation to which the people employed in the vocation concerned can conveniently belong. The A.W.U., in such circumstances, could successfully resist any number of applications for registration in the future. That is not in the interests of the unions.

Hon. J. Nicholson: Would the other unions then in existence practically cease to exist?

Hon. E. H. HARRIS: It is not so much a matter of those in existence ceasing, as that no others could come into existence. By the constitution of the A.W.U. it is provided that when any new industry shall arise in Western Australia, the A.W.U. shall be entitled to claim as its members those in that new industry, and to object to their registering as a separate union. In an industrial union that would be bad enough, but when the sphere of influence is extended over a much greater area it is not just to the unions still to come amongst us. The provision means goodbye to any further organisation in Western Australia. The main object set out in the preamble to the A.W.U. is one big union, while its objective clearly embraces the taking and holding of means of production, distribution and exchange. Consider what that would mean were the leaders of the union of very different calibre from those at its head to-day. The proposal is not in the interests either of the unions or of industrial peace. The last time the union applied for registration the president of the court practically said that they could get what they wanted, but not in the way they asked for it.

Hon. W. H. KITSON: Mr. Harris has a very good working knowledge of the A.W.U., but I think some of the statements he made were made with the object of misleading members of the House as to the actual constitution of that union. The A.W.U. has members in all the industries enumerated by Mr. Harris.

Hon. E. H. Harris: What about cane-cutting in Western Australia?

Hon. W. H. KITSON: There is none at present, but if there be any in the future the cane-cutters will be members of the A.W.U.

Hon. E. H. Harris: Because they will not be allowed to join any other union or form a union of their own.

Hon. W. H. KITSON: The A.W.U. is the largest organisation in Australia. Mr. Harris suggests that the union can get all it wants from the court. I thought Mr. Harris was an advocate of industrial peace, but apparently he is the reverse of that. He must be aware that before the A.W.U. can approach the Federal court it is necessary to have an industrial dispute in more than one State. If its members want an award from the State court and there is no dispute in the State, what are the members to do? Being desirous of following constitutional action, they have tried to secure the right to approach, not only the Federal court, but the State court if necessary. As things are, if they desire a variation of their conditions, there is only one of two ways by which it can be done: either by direct agreement with the employers or by direct action. On more than one occasion the

officials of the Arbitration Court have had to act as adjudicators in disputes between the A.W.U. and the employers. The object of the Bill is merely to give the A.W.U. the right to go to the court instead of being dependent on outside arbitrators. If we desire to see that our primary industries are not held up by industrial troubles, the best thing to do is to give to the employees in those industries the right this clause proposes to give them. Mr. Harris suggests that every section of the A.W.U. should be registered, that the A.W.U. in this State should be divided into a large number of small unions, each of which must necessarily keep its own set of books, appoint its own officers and make its own returns annually to the court. It would be impossible. Mr. Harris would say to a man working on road construction in the metropolitan area, "You belong to a union registered for the metropolitan area, but if you go to Katanning on road work to-morrow, you must transfer from this union to another union to be formed in that district?"

Hon. E. H. Harris: Are not the railway men doing that to-day?

Hon. W. H. KITSON: A member of the A.W.U. working on a road to-day may be working on a railway job to-morrow and a month later on a shearing job. All the time he is constantly changing, not only his occupation, but his residence.

Hon. E. H. Harris: You used to transfer.

Hon. W. H. KITSON: It has never been done by the A.W.U. except in respect of sections in the mining industry, where men were employed in the one industry and were residents for years in the one district. The system of to-day has been proved to be the best for all concerned, including the employer. To-day an award in the mining industry obtains throughout that industry. The Leader of the Opposition has said on more than one occasion that the A.W.U. should be registered.

Hon. J. Cornell: I thought he was a banker, not a navvy.

Hon. W. H. KITSON: Mr. Harris knows that the A.W.U. on the goldfields is a large organisation, that complies with the Arbitration Act, and does its work in a constitutional manner.

Hon. E. H. Harris: No one disputes that.

Hon. W. H. KITSON: The question is whether members of that union are going to improve their conditions by constitutional means, or whether they are practically to be told to adopt direct action. If members take up that attitude they cannot complain if the union remembers it.

Hon. J. M. MACFARLANE: It is suggested that if we permitted the registration of the A.W.U. this would lead to greater peace. Positions have arisen that cause me to disagree with that view. Some two years ago certain works were going on in Victoria and the employees were either members of the A.W.U. or some other organised body. There was a difference of opinion between these two bodies as to which should dominate, the desire on the part of the A.W.U. being that they should dominate. The same trouble arose at other works in Victoria. It was suggested by the Melbourne Trades Hall that a plebiscite should be taken as to which body the employees should belong, but the A.W.U. advised their members to take no part in it as they intended to dominate the position. Secretaries of unions in this State have said that the same thing is going on here. It seems to me that in time the A.W.U. would absorb all craft unions, and would then dominate the position throughout Australia. I hold that before members of a union are embroiled in a strike a secret ballot should be taken. Every union should be able to get at its members quickly so that a decision may be reached through them rather than through the executive.

The HONORARY MINISTER: I know of numerous instances in which the executive of a union has been the means of preventing serious industrial trouble. Before the registration of the miners as a branch of the A.W.U. there was trouble at Meekatharra and the men decided to strike. As a result of what was done through the executive, the men held their hands until the machinery of the country was put into motion. The A.W.U. embraces amongst others, cement workers, Hume pipe workers, soap factory workers, wheat lumpers, employees in sandalwood yards, workers on contract work, etc. It would be practically impossible to follow these men into their various occupations and draft them into separate organisations. I am sure Mr. Macfarlane has been misinformed, for no organisation would allow anything such as he has suggested to occur. If members persist in refusing to allow this organisation to be registered the responsibility must be theirs.

Hon. J. CORNELL: I have not a word to say against the A.W.U. I am only act-

uated by the principle of whether or not we are going to break down the system of organisation as we have had it for the past 23 years. I joined the A.W.U. in New South Wales 34 years ago. If we take into consideration the power it wields and the force it controls we must agree that its industrial records compare more than favourably with that of any other organisation in Australia. The granting of the proposal set out in the clause will not be of any use to the A.W.U. unless the parent Act is amended to do away with the ballot as to whether or not unions shall go to the court. I am satisfied that the A.W.U. will not resort to direct action. It is no use saying that if they do not secure registration as they want it, they will turn the country upside down. I am of the opinion that one of the reasons why the A.W.U. have been so successful in preventing disputes and bringing about a set of conditions that have been beneficial to its members, is because they are not a registered organisation. Were they registered to-morrow it would necessarily mean that they would either have to go to the court for an award, or split up citations into many sections, and that would bring discord in the ranks. My advice to the A.W.U. is to stay as they are and to apply reason before they resort to law and possibly strikes.

Hon. W. H. KITSON: Regarding the A.W.U. it is not a question of executive control. There is no organisation in the Commonwealth which is governed less by its executive than the A.W.U. It is so organised that any section of it can deal with its local troubles provided it carries out very simple rules. I do not know of any other organisation that gives its rank and file so much latitude in that direction.

Hon. J. R. BROWN: I hope the A.W.U. will be allowed to register. Many members here are not aware of the ramifications of the A.W.U. and they are consequently influenced by the remarks of Mr. Cornell and Mr. Harris. If we do not register the A.W.U., we may possibly create industrial unrest. The constitution of the A.W.U. will allow them to take anyone in. Where there are 15 members of any union, the A.W.U. will not step in and take away those members. Some hon. members do not know anything about the emblem of unionism. As long as I can remember it was a bundle of sticks tied together, and the thicker the bundle the stronger the unionism. I hope members will not be influenced by any of the side issues that have been advanced.

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

Ayes	..	..	13
Noes	..	..	6
Majority for		..	7

AYES.

Hon. C. F. Baxter	Hon. J. Nicholson
Hon. A. Burvill	Hon. A. J. H. Saw
Hon. J. Cornell	Hon. H. A. Stephenson
Hon. V. Hamersley	Hon. H. Stewart
Hon. E. H. Harris	Hon. H. J. Yelland
Hon. A. Lovekin	Hon. E. Rose
Hon. J. M. Macfarlane	(*Teller.*)

NOES.

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

Amendment thus passed.

Hon. J. CORNELL: I move an amendment—

That the following be inserted:—"By omitting the word 'fifty,' in paragraph (a), and substituting the word 'fifteen.'"

The CHIEF SECRETARY: I have no objection to the amendment.

Amendment put and passed.

Hon. J. CORNELL: I move—

That in lines 6 and 7 the words "and by omitting Subsections (3), (4), and (5)" be struck out.

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

Clause 4—Amendment of Section 10:

Hon. J. CORNELL: I hope the Committee will negative the clause because it is really consequential on the amendment just carried.

Clause put and negatived.

Clause 5—Amendment of Section 14:

Hon. E. H. HARRIS: I hope the Committee will show their consistency by voting against this clause. We have debated at length the amendment of a clause which would have permitted registration being effected, and this is a second shot if the other failed. When an application was before the court for registration the union indicated that they relied on Section 14, and if they failed in that, they would fall back on Section. 6. His Honour pointed out that they were not a union that could come within the

meaning of the Act for registration as a trade union. It had been argued, according to the "Industrial Gazette" of November, 1922, that because they were registered as a trade union in New South Wales, the court should register them here. If this clause were passed, it would permit of the union securing registration, of which members by their vote of a few minutes ago indicated that they did not approve.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: It is not advisable to waste any time over this amendment as we have already taken a vote on the principle.

Clause put and negatived.

Clause 6—Amendment of Section 19:

Hon. E. H. HARRIS: This is the third shot to effect the same purpose. The object of the clause is to strike out the word "may" and insert "shall," thus making it mandatory for the registrar to register the A.W.U. Having secured that, they could successfully object to the registration of any other organisation on the ground that a union existed to which members could conveniently belong.

Clause put and negatived.

Clause 7—Variation of agreement to conform with common rule:

Hon. A. LOVEKIN: I think the draftsman might have shown in the marginal note, somewhat better than he has done, what is contemplated by this clause. Section 85 of the principal Act provides that no award or order shall impair the validity or prevent the operation of any previously existing award or industrial agreement during the term of such award or agreement, and no amendment shall during the term of an award be made therein which is inconsistent with the true intent and meaning of the award originally made by the court. That is a fair section. An award may be made in the building trade specifying certain rates and conditions, and a man may take a contract basing his estimates upon those terms. Yet this clause would permit of an agreement being varied so far as it was inconsistent with an award or industrial agreement in operation as a common rule. Awards are often obtained in different districts, and then an application is made for a common rule. If a builder had entered into a contract and that were done, he would be left lamenting. I complain that we are not told in the marginal note that by Clause 35 of the Bill, the equitable Section 85 of the Act is to be repealed. Thus the fair provision to protect a man who has entered into a contract under an award would simply be wiped out, and this clause would be substituted providing that any change may be made during the currency of a contract. I ask the Committee to negative the clause.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: I regret that the amendment does not appear on the notice paper in order that I might have had an opportunity to study it. It is quite unfair that such an amendment should be sprung upon me without notice.

Hon. A. LOVEKIN: This is an amendment I had marked on my copy of the Bill, and I suggested it before, but for reasons which I shall state to the Minister, it does not appear on the notice paper. I am sorry for that, because I would be the last to wish to spring anything upon the Minister, who is always very courteous to us. If the Minister wishes, I am quite agreeable to the clause being postponed.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: I move—

That the further consideration of Clause 7 be postponed.

Motion passed; clause postponed.

Clause 8—Amendment of Section 42, Members of the court:

Hon. J. NICHOLSON: This is an important clause, affecting the court. The question was argued at length on last session's Bill. We then debated whether the court should consist of a president and a deputy, or, as at present, of a president and two lay members. It would be much better to leave the court constituted as it is now, and I hope the clause will be deleted. I cannot agree that the president should be a man without legal qualifications.

Hon. J. R. Brown: Why?

Hon. J. NICHOLSON: Because many questions coming before the Arbitration Court require a legal interpretation.

Hon. J. R. Brown: At the expense of the workers!

Hon. J. NICHOLSON: No; for the benefit of the workers and everybody concerned.

Hon. J. R. Brown: If a legal interpretation was required, the Crown Solicitor's opinion could be obtained.

Hon. J. NICHOLSON: Would Mr. Brown suggest, then, that the Crown Solicitor should be requested to take a seat on

the bench of the Arbitration Court? The decisions of the court should be given by a man of legal training.

Hon. J. R. Brown: Do you think a layman would not do it as well as a judge?

Hon. J. NICHOLSON: It would be quite impossible for a layman to do it.

Hon. J. R. Brown: It is impossible for a judge to do it.

Hon. J. NICHOLSON: It might as well be argued that a layman could perform medical duties. Expert knowledge is essential in these cases. A judge should be on the Arbitration Court bench to decide legal questions. On questions affecting industry the representatives of the workers and of the employers are there to advise.

Progress reported.

House adjourned at 9.51 p.m.

Legislative Assembly,

Tuesday, 3rd November, 1925.

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

QUESTION—DAIRY STOCK PURCHASES.

Mr. BROWN asked the Minister for Lands: 1, What number of dairy stock has been purchased in the Eastern States? 2, What are the respective numbers of the different breeds? 3, What is the average cost per head f.o.b.? 4, What is the average cost per head landed at Fremantle? 5, How many dairy stock have been purchased in this State? 6, What is the average cost per head?

The PREMIER (for the Minister for Lands) replied: 1, 1,264, excluding bulls. 2, Milking Shorthorn grades about 90 per cent., Jersey grades about 5 per cent., Guernsey grades about 3 per cent., Ayrshire grades about 2 per cent. 3, £6 10s. 3d. f.o.b. Sydney. 4, £11 17s. 7d. 5, 3,960, excluding bulls. 6, £12 7s. 2d.

QUESTION—BANKRUPTCY, A. J. WROTH.

Allegations against Government Official.

Mr. RICHARDSON asked the Premier: 1, Has his attention been called to the statements in the "Subiaco Weekly" of Saturday week dealing with the bankruptcy proceedings of one, A. J. Wroth, wherein serious charges are made against a Government official? 2, If so, will he consider the question of appointing a Royal Commission so that the charges against this official may be investigated?

The PREMIER replied: 1, Yes. 2, If sufficient justification is established, the matter will be considered.

QUESTION—SEAMEN'S DISPUTE.

Mr. RICHARDSON asked the Minister for Works: 1, Is it a fact that a number of British seamen, on strike, are employed on the Churchman's Brook reservoir construction work? 2, If so, will he give instructions that they be replaced by unemployed who are permanently resident in the State?

The MINISTER FOR WORKS replied: 1, No. 2, Answered by No. 1.

QUESTION—PETROL SUPPLY, NORTH-WEST.

Hon. G. TAYLOR (for Mr. Teesdale) asked the Honorary Minister: 1, Is he aware that under a new regulation petrol for North-West ports must be carried in drums? 2, As the extra cost is considerable will he arrange for the lowest possible freight on empty drums from northern ports?