

NOMS.

Mr. Clothier	Mr. Raphael
Mr. Coverley	Mr. F. C. L. Smith
Mr. Cunningham	Mr. Tonkin
Mr. Lambert	Mr. Wise
Mr. Moloney	Mr. Hegney
Mr. Needham	(Teller.)

Amendment thus passed.

The MINISTER FOR RAILWAYS: I find that the word "principally" has a tremendously wide application and the use of "solely" would make the position more clear and prevent litigation. I move an amendment—

That in line 1 of paragraph (3) "principally" be struck out and the word "solely" inserted in lieu.

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

Schedule 2:

THE MINISTER FOR RAILWAYS: I have an amendment on the Notice Paper to substitute a new Part I which will, while containing practically the same words, set out what is desired more clearly. I move an amendment—

That Part I be struck out and the following inserted in lieu:—

PART I.

Rules for ascertaining power to load weight of commercial goods vehicles (not including trailers or semi-trailers) for the purposes of this Schedule.

1. The power weight (P.W.) of a commercial goods vehicle, which is a motor vehicle, is ascertained by adding the weight thereof expressed in hundredweights (cwt.) (complete and ready for use, including the tools, oils, spare parts, tyres, and other accessories usually carried) to the horse-power calculated on the Dendy Marshall formula.

2. The power load weight of a commercial goods vehicle, which is a motor vehicle, is ascertained by adding to the power weight of the vehicle the carrying capacity (expressed in hundredweights) as verified by statutory declaration when application is made for a license.

3. The horse-power (H.P.) of a commercial goods vehicle, which is a motor vehicle, is ascertained according to the Dendy Marshall formula by multiplying the square of the diameter of the cylinders (expressed in inches) by the number of cylinders and the length of stroke (expressed in inches) and dividing the result by 12.

4. The power load weight of any other commercial goods vehicle which moves under its own power shall be ascertained in the prescribed manner.

Provisos relating to increased fee where commercial goods vehicle fitted with other than pneumatic tyres.

Provided that all commercial goods vehicles:—

- (a) fitted with solid rubber tyres may be charged an additional 40 per cent. on the fee so assessed;
- (b) fitted with cushion tyres, neither solid nor pneumatic, may be charged an additional 10 per cent. of the fee so assessed;
- (c) fitted with metal tyres, shall be charged an additional 80 per cent. of the fee so assessed.

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

Progress reported.

House adjourned 11.29 p.m.

Legislative Council,

Wednesday, 29th November, 1933.

	Page
Bills: Mine Workers' Relief Act Amendment, 3r. ...	2148
Health Act Amendment, 1r. ...	2152
Fremantle City Council Lands Act Amendment, 3r., passed ...	2152
Permanent Reserve (A.A.1162), 2r., Com. report ...	2152
Angusta Allotments, Com. report ...	2158
Reserves, Com. report ...	2159
Lotteries (Control) Act Amendment (No. 2), 2r. ...	2159
Employment Brokers' Act Amendment, 2r. ...	2166
Adjournment, special ...	2175

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

BILL—MINE WORKERS' RELIEF ACT AMENDMENT.

Third Reading.

THE HONORARY MINISTER (Hon. W. H. Kitson—West) [4.36] in moving the third reading said: I take this opportunity to supply information which on the second reading I promised I would secure before

the Bill passed the third reading. Mr. Holmes asked that certain figures be supplied in regard to the costs of the Mine Workers' Relief Act and the Miners' Phthisis Act. I have been supplied with the following information:—The total compensation paid to prohibited miners and their dependants since the proclamation of the Miners' Phthisis Act on the 7th September, 1925 to the 1st February, 1933, the date of proclamation of the Mine Workers' Relief Act, is £323,144, and the outstanding liabilities are estimated at approximately £350,000. Payments for the year ended the 30th June, 1933, total £69,043. The number of beneficiaries still eligible for compensation is as follows:—Prohibited miners 305, wives 186, widows 137, children 258, mothers 4. Compensation under the Miners' Phthisis Act is paid out of Consolidated Revenue. In regard to the 15 men reported to be suffering from tuberculosis under the Miners' Phthisis Act but who were permitted to continue at work on the surface of the mines: while those men are employed on the mines their wages will be paid by the mining company, but in the event of their ceasing work at the mines or becoming incapacitated for work, they would be entitled to compensation under the Miners' Phthisis Act. The liability in respect of those men is estimated at £16,000, but this amount is included in the total outstanding liabilities of £350,000 referred to above. The amount of the Government's contributions to the Workers' Relief Fund to the 18th September, 1933, was £4,939. I move—

That the Bill be now read a third time.

HON. C. B. WILLIAMS (South) [4.40]: Unfortunately I was not able to be here when finally the Bill went through Committee, for I was in attendance at the count of my selection ballot. So I want to enter my protest against the passing of the third reading. I have already drawn attention to the reduction the beneficiaries will suffer under the Act, notwithstanding that when the Minister for Mines met some of the goldfields members, I understand he was unable to see any method by which he could improve this for the workers in the industry. Prior to the second reading of the Bill, any man turned down under the Act since last February was receiving half wages, and provided his circumstances were such as to warrant the

Mine Workers' Relief Board regarding him as being indigent, the board could make up the difference between his half wages and £3 17s. 6d. per week. But if he were on the basic wage and getting only £4 6s. per week, he could only receive £2 3s. per week under the Act. In other words, under the Act under which he contributes 9d. per week, he can get 25s. per week for his wife, and he can get the invalid pension, which will practically bring him up to £2 per week. With all the insurances to be met, some 10s. per week per man has to be paid. Yet under the Act a man will receive only £2 3s. or 3s. more than under the old fund plus the invalid pension. As a representative of the men, I am not going to sit down and take that. One section, we know, wrongfully states that any workers can have his money made up to the amount he was drawing when taken out of the industry. I agree that that was never intended. But in every case up to the passing of the Act the board will pay up to £3 17s. 6d. per week to all those men. They are doing it now. Surely I am not asked to accept this measure, which will suit only two or three individuals who have been put out of the industry on a technicality. If they were to amend the Act to make the compensation greater for the worker, the man in the mining industry would not object to paying more by way of contributions.

Hon. E. H. Harris: The board have power to do that now.

Hon. C. B. WILLIAMS: The hon. member may be right, but the old board had not that power, except by taking a referendum on the contributions. I believe they would be only too pleased to have the amount increased. The amount of £2 3s. per week is not enough to keep a man and his wife. I am surprised that the Minister could not see his way to alter the Act. Some men receive £4 6s. a week. All the men who have fallen out since February last will receive £3 17s. 6d. a week, but the others from then onwards will receive only half wages. If they are indigent they can get the amount made up to £3 17s. 6d. provided their obligations entitle them to more than £3 10s. per week.

Hon. J. J. Holmes: Cannot those men get other employment?

Hon. C. B. WILLIAMS: No. They are receiving compensation. If a man is well enough to work in another industry he would not get compensation. Over 5,000 wages men are paying approximately £2,500 a week for insurances in the mining industry.

Hon. J. Cornell: For all risks?

Hon. C. B. WILLIAMS: Yes, the third schedule and other risks under the Workers' Compensation Act. There are over 3,000 men in Kalgoorlie, about a thousand in Wiluna, and 400 in Gwalia without counting the miners in other parts of the State. I have previously drawn attention to the Southern Cross miners. I understand they have had a conference with the Minister, but have not done any good for themselves. These men are entitled to some compensation, but no provision has been made for them. They were taken out of the mines by the Government of the day, and were to a certain extent looked after when they were placed upon the land. They were from 60 per cent. to 70 per cent. dusted at the time and were entitled to compensation. A man can work one day in a year on wages and is then entitled to sue his employer for compensation. The only benefit the amended Act affords is to the man who is dusted and desires to leave the industry, and continues to pay his ninepence a week. If in eight or ten years his state of health reaches a certain stage he can receive compensation. The man whose wages are £4 6s. a week, can only get £2 3s. by way of compensation, for six months and should he want a lump sum, he has the right to draw £750 after six months. It will then take him another six years before he can get a penny from the relief fund, and he would have to continue contributing ninepence a week throughout that period. Of course the man would not live as long as that. What would his wife do in the meantime? I am astonished that such a magnificent Act as was put on the Statute book six years ago should have been allowed to go by the board. There has been too much selfishness in this matter. The trouble is that the proposed amendments were not brought forward by someone else. Because some of us in this House had the courage of our convictions we have not been allowed to go any further. I am disgusted over the whole thing, and in no circumstances will I vote for the third reading.

HON. J. CORNELL (South) [4.30]: I desire to stress once more the importance of this legislation to a vast section of the community, and the profound ignorance of the people in general in regard to the whole affair. I must thank the Honorary Minister for the figures he gave. It appears that the sum of £323,000 has been paid out of consolidated revenue to beneficiaries under the Miners' Phthisis Act, and that the estimated liability accruing from February last is £335,000. This means that the amount which has been paid, and it is estimated will be paid, under the Miners' Phthisis Act represents three quarters of a million.

Hon. J. J. Holmes: All out of consolidated revenue.

Hon. C. B. Williams: Some has come out of the State Insurance Office.

Hon. J. CORNELL: And the public know nothing about it. We are told that we are liable for 890 beneficiaries under the Miners' Phthisis Act. Of these 305 are miners. Under the new scheme at least three years will pass before the 305 men come into it. The amount of money paid to beneficiaries under the prior law is infinitely greater than the amount that will be paid to beneficiaries under the new law. In South Africa the beneficiaries under the new law received greater consideration than those who came under the old law. In this State the position is reversed. In February last there were 890 beneficiaries coming under the prior law, and the anticipated liability against consolidated revenue is £350,000. Before these men can come on to the fund they have to exhaust £750 of workers' compensation. The industrial diseases section of the Workers' Compensation Act has been woven into the Mine Workers' Relief Act. We have heard a lot about the nigger in the wood pile.

Hon. C. B. Williams: There is a good one here.

Hon. J. CORNELL: No one has yet referred to that in association with the Mine Workers' Relief Act.

Hon. G. W. Miles: Is there one there?

Hon. J. CORNELL: There are many. The nigger in the wood pile is the £750 which each beneficiary is entitled to draw, but it can only be drawn from the State Insurance Office. When the Miners' Phthisis Act was first proclaimed the insurance companies refused to take the

risk, and the State Insurance Office was created for the purpose. Legislative sanction was sought but refused. The position to-day is that the miner who comes under the Mine Workers' Relief Act, and is declared to be eligible by the bureau in Kalgoorlie, receives £750 from an unlawful institution.

Hon. G. W. Miles: Quite right!

Hon. J. CORNELL: That is what we have to face. If there were a violent change of Government, and it was decided to abolish the State Insurance Office, what would become of the beneficiaries? The obligations toward them would have to be made a charge upon consolidated revenue. Parliament gave its sanction to a scheme based on an unlawful institution. The only alternative would be to induce the insurance companies to take the risk.

Hon. C. B. Williams: They would not take over the liability.

Hon. J. CORNELL: Over a period of eight years we have run into a liability of three quarters of a million for less than 3,000 miners. What have we to square up to in the next eight years with 6,000 miners? As I said in committee the Bill is of paramount importance, and the whole question of miners compensation for industrial diseases requires to be thoroughly overhauled and investigated. When in 1921 I first brought up this matter in the House, I could foresee what would happen. I said to the Minister for Mines (Mr. Scaddan), on my return from South Africa, when he asked for my impressions, that either South Africa ought to be indicted for criminal expenditure, or this State ought to be indicted for criminal negligence.

Hon. G. W. Miles: I remember your saying that.

Hon. J. CORNELL: The liability of three quarters of a million bears out the fact that South Africa need not be indicted for criminal expenditure, but that we should be indicted for criminal negligence. The future is more insecure than ever. A thorough investigation is required in order that the whole matter may be put upon a proper basis. We cannot throw overboard the liability that we have contracted in respect of the 890 beneficiaries, but it is due to us to give the new beneficiaries as great a degree of security as that given to the

old beneficiaries. The whole thing hinges on the State Insurance Office.

Hon. J. Nicholson: Does that office get the 10s. per week per man?

Hon. J. CORNELL: The mining companies pay the premiums in connection with all insurance to the State Insurance Office; that is, the industrial risk as well as the accident risk.

Hon. J. Nicholson: The State Insurance Office receives the full premium?

Hon. J. CORNELL: And there is no Parliamentary sanction for the existence of that institution. We are all interested in this and particularly those members in whose provinces these men are employed, Mr. Williams, Mr. Hall, Mr. Drew, you Sir, and myself. I do not accuse the present Government of lack of sympathy towards the miners. The contrary is the case, but the whole position is due for a drastic overhaul so that it may be put beyond all doubt as far as the beneficiaries are concerned. I suggest that a committee be appointed and that the chairman of it should be Mr. Bennett, who is an actuary, and that the other members might be Mr. D'Arcy, who has been secretary of the board since its inception, Mr. Woolf, the Crown Solicitor, who is a competent draftsman, a representative of the mining companies and a representative of the Miners' Union. This committee could thoroughly overhaul the position and we could get as a result of its labours what we have not had up to the present time, and that is an actuarial estimate of the potential liability. The matter is turning out as I expected when I had two or three rows with Mr. Scaddan and his colleagues. I pointed out that he, as Minister for Mines, could not hope to overcome one of the most difficult questions in the State, without doing what South Africa did, namely, making a thorough inquiry with a supreme court judge as chairman of the board of investigation. South Africa has done this on two occasions. In this State the position is such that public policy alone justifies a thorough investigation. I apologise to the House for having spoken at such length on the third reading, and I shall conclude by expressing my gratitude to the Honorary Minister for supplying to Mr. Holmes the figures that the hon. gentleman asked for.

HON. E. H. H. HALL (Central) [5.4]: I am going to ask the indulgence of the House to be permitted to follow up the serious remarks addressed to us by Mr. Cornell. Long before I entered the Chamber I recognised that Mr. Cornell was an authority on this subject. Some years ago he was sent to South Africa to investigate it, and, as briefly as possible, I should like to say that, having listened to him this afternoon, I certainly think that it is his duty, knowing what he does, to move for the appointment of a select committee or a Royal Commission, either of this House or of both Houses, to inquire into this very serious matter. That is all I wish to say. I could not remain silent and wonder why the hon. member, with his knowledge of the subject, has not seen fit to move in the direction I suggest.

HON. J. J. HOLMES (North) [5.5]: I thank the Honorary Minister for having this afternoon supplied the information I have been seeking for a long time. Although I anticipated that the liability was considerable, I never thought it would be anything like the figure it has actually reached. My contention is, and has been for years past, that this is a responsibility that should be placed on the mines and not on the general taxpayers of the State. The men are employed by the mines and until they become unfit for work—

Hon. J. Cornell: The liability is on the mines now up to £750 per man.

Hon. J. J. HOLMES: —the State has to continue to pay. My point is that the health of these men, by reason of their occupation, is destroyed. Then for them to be turned out and the State to be asked to pay part of the compensation is neither equity nor justice, and I do not think it should be tolerated any longer. The health of the men having been destroyed by reason of their occupation, it is the duty of the mining companies, and not that of the taxpayers, to provide the compensation. As for the lack of Parliamentary authority in respect of the State Insurance Office, to which Mr. Cornell has referred, I take no responsibility, and I do not think Mr. Miles and several other members will do so, either. We fought that matter out for two or three sessions. We threw out the Bill to legalise State insurance, but in defiance of that the Government

have carried on the business of insurance. I do not think that the minority of this House who did their best should be asked to accept the responsibility. I simply rose merely to thank the Minister for letting us have the information that he has supplied.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a third time, and returned to the Assembly with amendments.

BILL—HEALTH ACT AMENDMENT (No. 2).

Received from the Assembly and read a first time.

BILL—FREMANTLE CITY COUNCIL LANDS ACT AMENDMENT.

Read a third time, and *passed*.

BILL—PERMANENT RESERVE (A†1162.)

Second Reading.

Debate resumed from the previous day.

HON. J. T. FRANKLIN (Metropolitan) [5.13]: I secured the adjournment of the debate yesterday so that I might supply members with information regarding what the City Council has done in the past. Some members tried to belittle the work of the Perth City Council. First and foremost, the City Council are at all times alive to the interests and advancement of this glorious city of ours. They have widened and extended various streets, and have purchased property for the purpose of carrying out these undertakings. I shall give a short resume of what has been done.

Hon. Sir Edward Wittenoom: All with borrowed money.

Hon. J. T. FRANKLIN: No; much work is paid for out of the rates collected yearly. Some of the works have been financed with borrowed money carrying a reasonable rate of interest and with sinking fund provisions. The ratepayers of Perth are indeed fortunate in the policy adopted by the City Council. Sir Edward Wittenoom might be interested to know that every distinguished visitor who comes to this State praises the city and its streets. The city is a credit to the ratepayers, who are to be complimented on having returned to the

council men who look after their interests so well.

Hon. Sir Edward Wittenoom: They do not pay the rates, do they?

Hon. J. T. FRANKLIN: I cannot fathom the meaning of the hon. member's interjection. The ratepayers certainly pay their rates, and are satisfied with the rates imposed by the City Council. The rates imposed by the city of Perth compare more than favourably with those of other cities of even less importance than is Perth. The works undertaken by the City Council for street improvement include the following:—

Arthur-street, widening; Bulwer-street and Good-street, widening and setting back of fence of Perth Oval.

The latter work gives a straight run from the city to the suburbs.

Cambridge-street, extension; Forrest-place, land purchased and road constructed; Adelaide-terrace and St. George's-terrace corner; George-street, widening; Hay-street and Thomas-street, surface; Jewell-street to Plain-street, new road.

The last named opens up a main artery from Guildford across the Causeway, and obviates the necessity for much of the traffic to pass through the city and thus cause congestion.

King's Park Circus:

Let me inform Mr. Williams that there will be no need to approach the authorities for any land belonging to the Observatory. We have as much land as we require there. During the visit of the Duke and Duchess of York, the Government gave us some land there, and it will be utilised for the benefit of the ratepayers.

King's Park-road, construction; Mount's Bay-road, widening.

The Perth City Council have been accused of not doing all they might have done for the benefit of the city. Some years ago, when the Labour Party were in power, the present Minister for Works had an interview with me and with some of the councillors regarding the widening of Mount's Bay-road. At that time the Minister was willing to share the cost of the widening on a fifty-fifty basis. Then the depression came and, when we approached the Government again, they could not see their way to assist us. Consequently, the Perth City Council undertook the work and the public I believe, are quite satisfied with what has been done.

Mount's Bay-road is a highway to the city of which everyone might be proud, and I am glad that we had councillors possessed of sufficient courage to undertake that work.

Nile-street, filling in and grading; Pier-street, extension; Railway-parade, widening; Thomas-street to Havelock-street; Sutherland-street, extension, land purchase.

Years ago the City Council were twitted about permitting Chinese gardens in various parts of the city. We resumed all the Chinese gardens in the Sutherland-street area and constructed the street through to Cambridge-street.

Stirling-street, extension.

This was another important work. At one time Stirling-street came to a dead end at Brisbane-street and we had to purchase property in order to carry Stirling-street through.

Wollington-street widening near markets; Endowment Lands, City Beach, the Boulevard and subsidiary roads; Lake Monger, reclamation; River reclamation, Causeway,

I wish to commend the Government for their policy of river reclamation. When the Labour Party were previously in power, they undertook the reclamation work at the Causeway, and on their taking control of the administration again last April they resumed the work.

Hon. Sir Edward Wittenoom: What did Wembley cost?

Hon. J. T. FRANKLIN: I will deal with that presently. Other works include—

Removal of sanitary site from Mt. Lawley; William-street, extension; Aberdeen-street, eastwards; Bourke-street, Leederville to North Perth; Vincent-street, extension, via south bank of Lake Monger, to Grantham-street and the ocean.

Some members have tried to belittle the City Council and their work, and I consider I would be remiss in my duty if I allowed their remarks to pass unchallenged.

Hon. C. F. Baxter: Quite right, too.

Hon. J. T. FRANKLIN: We have been accused of not looking ahead, and of having failed to purchase land to provide lung spaces for the people. I deny that accusation. In this respect we are doing our duty and, indeed, more than our duty. I claim that the City Council do look ahead, and I hope this House will do likewise when any question of the kind is presented for its consideration. During the

past 20 years the City Council have purchased for lung spaces over 300 acres of land. In addition they purchased 1,290 acres in the Lime Kilns estate. This is what Sir Edward Wittenoom alluded to when he asked the cost of Wembley. We purchased the Lime Kilns estate with a view to providing a main road from the city to the beach. Had not we purchased the estate, it would have been necessary to carry the road through private property, which would have enhanced the value of that property without the city reaping any benefit from it. On that estate we intend to earmark 1,000 acres for a national park. That is a lung space with which the ratepayers should be well pleased. The City Beach will be made one of the most up-to-date and popular resorts in the vicinity of Perth. In this respect I maintain we are carrying out a policy that should be the aim of all important cities. During the past 25 years the council have rounded off hundreds of street corners on the principle of safety first. The rounding of the corners makes for the safety of the public and of the traffic generally. That work redounds to the credit of the council and of the ratepayers. Let me read the opinion of one of the best known town planners in the world, Mr L. W. Mawson, Director of Town Planning in New Zealand.

Hon. C. F. Baxter: Not Mr. Davidson?

Hon. J. T. FRANKLIN: No, but I believe Mr. Davidson was a pupil of Mr. Mawson. When passing through Perth Mr. Mawson was reported as follows:—

“I do not think there is another city in the Empire which has done more in the provision of parks and recreation grounds than Perth.” Judging from what he saw and the statistics supplied to him, he had no hesitation in saying that the civic administration of Perth would bear comparison with that of any city he had visited.

Hon. G. W. Miles: I suppose that was after you had entertained him.

Member: No wonder you are mayor all the time!

Hon. J. T. FRANKLIN: The ratepayers are satisfied to keep me there.

Speaking from memory, he considered that Perth had a higher ratio of open spaces to gross land area and population than any city in the Empire. The parks and playgrounds were so distributed as to serve the maximum utility in relation both to present and future populations. Moreover, there were wonderful

open spaces in the form of river and ocean beaches which provided magnificent recreational facilities. What amazed him was that so much had been done for so small an expenditure of money. He thought he was justified in saying that the civic administration of Perth was the best example of enterprise and foresight, coupled with sound economy, within his experience. He would venture the opinion that if the same care and foresight were exercised in the future in the guidance and control of buildings, land utilisation and the character of the buildings themselves, Perth would become the queen city of the British Empire.

Hon. Sir Edward Wittenoom: How long was Mr. Mawson here?

Hon. J. T. FRANKLIN: Quite long enough to enable him to form that opinion.

Hon. J. J. Holmes: Are you opposing the Bill?

Hon. J. T. FRANKLIN: No, I am supporting it, but I must refute certain statements made by other members. The City Council have been twitted about not fulfilling their obligations to resume land along the Hay-street frontage for the widening of that thoroughfare. I agree with the remarks of Mr. Cornell and Mr. Baxter. A few years ago the City Council considered the question of resuming land to widen Hay-street, but unfortunately the members were not unanimous and the Municipal Corporations Act precluded us from undertaking expensive work involving the borrowing of money without first obtaining the consent of the ratepayers. That is why the scheme for widening Hay-street was not proceeded with. When the matter was under discussion, Foy and Gibson's were having alterations made to the Hay-street frontage of their building, and the principals wired to the architect to design the improvements in such a way that if Hay-street were widened, there would be no need to disturb the main building. The main pillars were kept far enough back from the alignment to permit of the widening being undertaken. A strip of land along the northern boundary of Parliament House grounds was given to the City Council to permit of the widening of Hay-street. That represented a good deal for the Government because, instead of having an obsolete and ramshackle fence along that boundary, there is an up-to-date concrete wall with concrete pillars. Land purchased for the widening of Hay-street cost £13,636 and the portion purchased but not required for widening purposes, on being sold, realised

£19,054. Thus on the land deal the City Council showed a surplus of £5,418. I think the City Council should be congratulated on the success of that deal. They fulfilled their obligations to Parliament and to the rate-payers. Members who have long occupied seats in Parliament will recollect that years ago they had to traverse a street with a very rough surface in order to reach the House, but the City Council made it one of the best streets in the city. That cost the Perth City Council £3,780 7s. 11d., and the construction of the retaining wall near Parliament House grounds cost £857 12s., making a total of £4,637 19s. 11d. As regards the land from Parliament House to Malcolm-street, the idea of the City Council is not to make a bottle-neck of it, as some members have suggested. It is already a bottle-neck. The City Council's idea is to widen the road from the curve on the south side to the line of the old Barracks, and to make the balance of the ground a footpath.

Hon. Sir Edward Wittenoom: Have any accidents occurred there?

Hon. J. T. FRANKLIN: No, but we never know when there will be an accident. The street is narrow, and it is better to obviate the risk of accidents. The City Council are prepared to erect a post and tubular fence or, if the Joint House Committee prefer it, a post and chain fence. They will batter the ground back, and at the rear of the fence plant such ornamental trees as the Conservator of Forests may desire. The Perth City Council will assuredly carry out their obligation. I again draw attention to the fact that if the area is granted to the City Council, that sharp and dangerous corner at Harvest-terrace and Malcolm-street will be rounded off. I have great pleasure in supporting the second reading, and on behalf of the citizens of Perth I offer thanks to the Joint House Committee for recommending the Bill to Parliament.

HON. J. NICHOLSON (Metropolitan) [5.34]: A thought which has just passed through my mind must, I am sure, have passed through the minds of some other hon. members—that it is a great pity this particular Bill was not presented a week or ten days ago, when it would have served to ventilate, in connection with the annual municipal elections, the excellent work which the Perth City Council have done

and are doing. The City of Perth has a record of which it may well be proud. What Mr. Franklin has said serves only to confirm and emphasise the fact. Some adverse criticism, as has already been mentioned, was directed against the measure by an hon. member yesterday; but that adverse criticism only serves to show his gross ignorance of the circumstances of the case and of the work which the City Council are doing. That fact was exemplified strongly by the remarks which were made by Mr. Cornell, who followed that particular member. It is a great pity that an hon. member who seeks to deal with a measure of some importance, like this one, should not at least make himself well acquainted with the facts. I wish to remind the Chamber that the Bill comes before us with the approval of the Joint House Committee; and that is the main fact so far as we are concerned. The approval of the committee is, of course, essential to the alienation of any of the lands in question. It is an assurance that whatever we do will be only giving support to what the committee have thought it wise and proper to recommend. We would be wrong indeed were we to express an opinion adverse to the decision of the committee who had the opportunity of going into the matter. That being the case, I do not think it necessary to add much to the remarks which have been made. The Bill merely adds a further good work to the many good works already accomplished by the City of Perth. I may instance the work done in Mount's Bay-road, which was carried out in co-operation with the Government and the King's Park Board. The City of Perth has at all times shown a desire to assist the work of governing bodies and to advance the interests of the State. Nor do the City Council confine their efforts to their own particular boundaries; they are glad to give the benefit of their experience to others who may desire it. The particular piece of land to be resumed under the Bill is a piece which it has been said should have been resumed many years ago. I well remember discussions taking place with regard to this matter when I was in the City Council, and that is a good few years ago. It is only now about to be consummated. I consider that the House Committee are to be commended for giving their approval to the handing-over of this

piece of land from the particular reserve on which our Parliamentary buildings are erected, and to the widening of a thoroughfare which is now one of our main thoroughfares and will become still more important, connecting up with various other parts of the city and the outlying districts. I heartily support the second reading.

HON. E. H. GRAY (West) [5.40]: I support the Bill, and as a member of the Joint House Committee concur in the clear explanation given by Mr. Cornell yesterday. I take this opportunity to ventilate my opinions regarding the work required from the State Government in order to keep pace with the splendid work already done by the Perth City Council. The Lord Mayor of Perth is to be congratulated on his statement. He certainly put up a splendid case for the City Council, and a case which we can all endorse. I hope the suggested improvement in front of Parliament House will be continued, if not by the Perth City Council, then by either the Joint House Committee or the Government. Moreover, the time has come when the Government should seriously consider the completion of Parliament House buildings. Great works are being carried out all over the world, not only to provide employment, but to beautify the various cities; and it is necessary to put forward the best side of Perth. It is not considered advisable for men who travel the country selling the wares of their firms to be badly dressed. On the contrary, it is known to be conducive to good business to have a good appearance. In my opinion Perth should, in the interests of Western Australia, be beautified in every possible way. Certainly we can make Parliament House and its grounds a splendid advertisement for the State if we complete the work according to the original design and in accordance with the progressive policy of the Perth City Council. I urge the Government to consider seriously the demolition of the Public Works offices. I have no sentimental regard for buildings of that character. Many people look upon the Public Works offices as a historic relic, but in my opinion the time has arrived for it to be taken down. One of the greatest mistakes of past Governments was to consent to the erection of the Water Supply and Sewerage offices without even consulting the Joint House Committee. Future generations will be sorry for that

mistake. Now is the time to initiate big improvement schemes. Not being the Treasurer or a member of the Government, I do not feel the depletion of the Treasury so much. Still, we should have courage. If we went the right way about it, we could raise money for extensive improvements.

Hon. H. Seddon: Did you ever hear of the Adelaide railway station?

Hon. E. H. GRAY: It has been a surprise to me that the advocates of Separation have not pushed forward their case by advocating improvements on those lines. Personally I consider that a strong effort should be made to improve conditions as regards our public offices. At present many highly paid Government servants are housed in what are little better than rabbit warrens. This has a depressing effect on their working capacity. Again, the Public Works offices—

The PRESIDENT: I hope the hon. member will not stray too far from Parliament House grounds.

Hon. E. H. GRAY: The Public Works offices adjoin this building, and I think the time opportune for drawing attention to them. I would like these improvements to be carried out and I am certain that, in keeping with the policy of the Government to beautify the Swan River and other parts of the city, any money spent in the direction suggested will be repaid a thousand fold from the standpoint of advertisement and in the appreciation of those who may visit Western Australia.

HON. C. H. WITTENOOM (South-East) [5.46]: I, too, desire to offer my congratulations to the ratepayers of Perth, through Mr. Franklin, on the excellent work that has been carried out in the city during the past few years. I support the Bill because Parliament should assist the Perth City Council in every way to improve the entrances to, and exits from, the City of Perth. It is a good idea that a narrow strip along the southern side of Parliament House grounds should be transferred to the City Council in order to effect the improvement to Malcolm-street. Mr. Franklin, who is Lord Mayor of Perth, told me this afternoon that the improvements could be effected without interfering with the Barracks. I was surprised to hear that because I was under the impression that Malcolm-street between the Barracks and the house at the

corner is narrower than it is half way up the hill. Mr. Franklin tells me that that is not so. Nevertheless I do not see how the work can be carried out quite successfully without portion of the old Barracks being removed. I regret very much that so many of the old historic buildings and sites are being obliterated but in this instance the work is of such importance I think it can well be undertaken. If the Barracks are to go, I trust the archway will be left as a relic of the past. There are many people who regret the disappearance of these old landmarks but with their removal, the old associations are soon forgotten. For instance, some of the old residents regretted exceedingly that the rifle butts on the top of Mount Eliza were removed, but now they have gone and the locality has been so improved, even those old people are satisfied with the alteration. I support the Bill.

HON. J. M. MACFARLANE (Metropolitan-Suburban) [5.49]: I feel I should voice my commendation of the work carried out by the Perth City Council particularly on the Hay-street and Harvest-terrace frontages of Parliament House grounds. I am glad the House Committee have recommended the elimination of part of the grounds so that the Malcolm-street frontage can be dealt with in a similar manner. I believe a very effective alteration will be carried out but what I am concerned about is that some of the work will be left unfinished. Mr. Cornell told us yesterday that one reason in favour of the proposal was that the trees along Malcolm-street were reaching their age limit and would die in a little while. It seems a pity, therefore, that the remaining portion of the Harvest-terrace frontage between the House and Malcolm-street will be left untouched.

Hon. Sir Edward Wittenoom: Those trees are not affected the same way.

Hon. J. Cornell: They are a different type of pine altogether.

Hon. J. MACFARLANE: I hope that a uniform fence will be constructed to encircle the grounds of Parliament House.

Hon. J. J. Holmes: It should be a type of fence that cannot be pushed over.

Hon. J. M. MACFARLANE: Irrespective of what type of fence is constructed, vandalism will continue.

Member: Why have a fence at all?

Hon. J. M. MACFARLANE: The fence that has been constructed is of a description that hardly gives the impression of a fence at all. It is suited to the surroundings.

HON. H. V. PIESSE (South-East) [6.51]: I congratulate the House Committee on their business acumen in inviting the City Council to carry out this work. The old trees along the Malcolm-street frontage would have to be grubbed up at an early date and possibly a new fence erected. Although I can remember running about the old Barracks as a boy, I believe that the building could easily be done away with. It is a very old landmark and Western Australians are proud of it. As Mr. Wittenoom suggested, if the archway were retained as a memento, it should be sufficient. The City Council are to be congratulated on the excellent work that has been carried out on the north side of Parliament House grounds, and I believe that they will make an excellent job of the Malcolm-street extension.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Hon. V. Hamersley in the Chair; the Chief Secretary in charge of the Bill.

Clause 1—agreed to.

Clause 2—Power to excise portion of Reserve A†1162.

Hon. SIR EDWARD WITTENOOM: I congratulate Mr. Franklin on once more being returned as Lord Mayor of Perth. He has carried out excellent work.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! What has that to do with Clause 2?

Hon. SIR EDWARD WITTENOOM: I think it has something to do with it. I have criticised the work of the Perth City Council, because they have spent too much of the ratepayers' money in the city, although they may have beautified its surroundings. We cannot afford to compete against Sydney and Melbourne in that class of work. I am a large ratepayer and I know that the rates are very high. Work of the description under discussion and like that undertaken at the entrance to King's Park when

the Duke of York visited Perth, must mean an increase in rates.

The CHAIRMAN: I hope the hon. member will connect his remarks with the widening of Malcolm-street.

Hon. SIR EDWARD WITTENOOM: I am trying to explain that this means the expenditure of more money, and that means higher rates.

Hon. E. H. Gray: Your rates are much lower than those at Fremantle.

Hon. SIR EDWARD WITTENOOM: That is no argument. I am in accord with the Bill. I am a member of the House Committee and I agree that the proposal is quite right.

Clause put and passed.

Schedule, Title—agreed to.

Bill reported without amendment and the report adopted.

BILL—AUGUSTA ALLOTMENTS.

In Committee.

Hon. V. Hamersley in the Chair; the Chief Secretary in charge of the Bill.

Clauses 1 and 2—agreed to.

Clause 3—Certain persons may apply for grant in fee simple of allotments occupied by them:

The CHIEF SECRETARY: On the second reading Mr. Nicholson wished to know why the period of five years was inserted in Clause 3. As a matter of fact, it was the result of an amendment in another place that the words "for a period of not less than five years" were inserted. The Bill as originally submitted made no provision at all in that respect.

Hon. J. J. Holmes: It is the better for the amendment.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: The object of the amendment was, I think, to reduce the number of claims. There are only ten lots in all. At the same time, there might be a descendant of the old settlers who desired to lodge a claim, in which case I do not think he should be debarred because he has not occupied the land during the past five years.

Hon. J. NICHOLSON: I thank the Chief Secretary for his explanation. A difficulty might arise where a man has not completed by himself the full five years of occupation, although he might have done so in

conjunction with some other person who preceded him on the land. One man might have held the land for a certain period preceding the last five years, and he might have assigned or conveyed all his right, title and interest in the land to some other person, who might have been in possession for only three years prior to the commencement of the Act; but by the combined occupation of those two people, there might have been 25 years' possession of the land. Why, then, should we not allow the period of possession of the predecessor to count with the possession by the second man? I suggest that it would be wise to cover such a case, which could be done by recommitment.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: I do not think any cases of hardship are likely to arise, for investigations have been going on for many years past, and in only one case has a claim been substantiated. Some of the lots have been jumped, but I do not think that has extended over the five years. That was why the five-year period was inserted in the Bill. Occupiers must present a reasonable claim before they will be recognised. Some years ago the local road board sold several of the lots for arrears of rates. It may be that some of the claimants have been holding blocks purchased at public auction held at the instance of the road board, but have never bothered about getting a title. Those people may now come forward with their claims.

Hon. W. J. MANN: I had hoped to be able to present the Committee with particulars of each of these lots, but unfortunately the local authority, to whom I wrote, have not replied. From my own knowledge, only some of the blocks are occupied. There was a fairly large number of these blocks, but some of them were sold by the road board in 1916 for arrears of rates, while others were resumed for railway purposes. If the term in the clause were extended even to 12 years, I do not think it would mean any additional claims, for the claimants are all representatives of very old families. I understand that those interested are satisfied with the five years prescribed.

Hon. J. J. HOLMES: I gather that anybody requiring one of these blocks, requires it for sentimental reasons. The Minister said that originally there was in the Bill no limit of occupation. I think five

years is an improvement on that, but also I think five years quite sufficient. Without a time limit we might have a man, knowing that the Bill had been passed, hopping in and taking possession.

The Chief Secretary: He would have to satisfy the Minister.

Sitting suspended from 6.15 to 7.30 p.m.

Hon. G. FRASER: In South Fremantle a man acquired some land in 1877, and three years ago transferred his rights to his son. If the five-year period mentioned in this clause remains, it is possible that some hardship may be caused in this as well as in other similar instances.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: It is unnecessary to adopt Mr. Nicholson's suggestion. If a man has held land for longer than 12 years, he can claim a title to it under the statute of limitations.

Hon. G. FRASER: In the case to which I have referred, the father transferred his rights to his son, but the latter has not held the land for more than three years, consequently he could not obtain a title if this clause were to be put into operation against him.

Clause put and passed.

Clauses 4 to 7, Schedules, Title, Preamble—agreed to.

Bill reported without amendment and the report adopted.

BILL—RESERVES.

In Committee.

Bill passed through Committee without debate, reported without amendment and the report adopted.

BILL—LOTTERIES (CONTROL) ACT AMENDMENT (No. 2.)

Second Reading.

THE HONORARY MINISTER (Hon. W. H. Kitson—West) [7.40] in moving the second reading said: The provisions of this Bill are the same as those which were contained in another Bill that came before the Chamber a little while ago, and for constitutional reasons could not be proceeded with. On that occasion the clauses of the measure

were debated at length. I do not propose, therefore, to cover the whole ground now. The Act would ordinarily expire at the end of this year, but, owing to the success which has followed the efforts of the Lotteries Commission, it is desired to continue this legislation for a period of three years. There is also provided an amendment to the Act, which places in the category of charitable objects, any body which has for its object the relief of unemployed persons in the State. If this is passed the Commissioners may devote some of the money raised to that purpose. There was considerable opposition to this clause on a previous occasion. I have now received a communication from the Boys' Employment League, and I daresay other members have also received one. This organisation has very successfully been engaged in finding employment for youths who are out of work. I understand the organisation is now short of funds. The communication in question winds up by saying that "if the present line of discussion in Parliament be followed, it is inevitable that the Boys' Employment League will fall between two stools, being overlooked by the Government, and excluded from participation in the Lotteries Commission allocations."

Hon. L. B. Bolton: Who signed the letter?

The HONORARY MINISTER: It is signed by Fred T. Cross.

Hon. L. B. Bolton: It should never have been sent.

The HONORARY MINISTER: But it has been sent.

Hon. L. B. Bolton: I am a member of the committee of that organisation.

The HONORARY MINISTER: Then the hon. member should know something about it. Certain particulars accompany the communication, showing what has been accomplished by the organisation.

Hon. J. Cornell: Was the Act passed for this kind of thing? Surely it was passed for the assistance of charitable institutions. The object of securing employment is not a charitable one.

The HONORARY MINISTER: It all depends on how the hon. member interprets the words "charitable purpose." It is a tragic thing that there should be hundreds and possibly thousands of young men who have never been placed in employment, and find it extremely difficult to secure any.

Hon. E. H. Harris: Is it for Parliament to decide how the money shall be allocated?

The HONORARY MINISTER: Only to the extent of determining to what purposes the funds shall be allocated.

Hon. J. J. Holmes: Do you think it wise that the boys should be assisted into positions by this means?

Hon. L. B. Bolton: I think it is scandalous.

The HONORARY MINISTER: It is one of the directions in which the proceeds from the lotteries could be used with advantage.

Hon. E. H. Harris: You want the House to decide, do you?

The HONORARY MINISTER: I want members to agree to that particular clause.

Hon. J. Cornell: What about helping those who lost their seats in Parliament at the last elections?

The HONORARY MINISTER: I am simply advancing another point to substantiate our claim in support of the clause in question. I have on many occasions in this House elaborated on the necessity for money being made available to do more than it is possible to do with sustenance funds provided by the Government. It is highly desirable that there should be more money made available for the assistance of those people who have been unemployed for an extended period and for whom not enough money can be provided from Government funds. If the clause be agreed to, it will be left to the Lotteries Commission to say whether they are prepared to allocate in this direction any of the money raised for this particular purpose. The other amendment in the Bill provides that before any distribution of money is made for any charitable purpose, the Minister shall give his approval in writing to that distribution and that the sums of money and the bodies to receive it shall be specified. That amendment speaks for itself. It means that before the Lotteries Commission can distribute money that they have allocated for different purposes, that allocation shall be approved by the Minister.

Hon. J. J. Holmes: That means that the Minister will make the allocation.

The HONORARY MINISTER: If the hon. member will be fair he will agree that the clause simply provides that after the

commissioners have determined how the money shall be allocated, the Minister must approve of it.

Hon. J. Cornell: Why should he?

The HONORARY MINISTER: It is highly desirable that he should. The hon. member knows that this provision is contained in many Acts of Parliament. The usual procedure is for a particular authority to submit their ideas to the Minister for his approval. If the Minister does not give his consent, he puts forward suggestions which, in his opinion, will meet with approval. But I can hardly imagine the Minister turning down the recommendation of a commission or a board which is justifiable on the facts of the case. On a previous occasion I dealt with all these amendments and therefore I do not propose to say anything further. I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

HON. E. H. GRAY (West) [7.49]: I should like members to realise the importance of passing the clause relating to unemployed persons.

Hon. L. B. Bolton: We do not understand it.

Hon. E. H. GRAY: There is no charitable organisation in Western Australia big enough to provide for the unemployed or to carry out the necessary investigations with regard to particular cases.

Hon. L. B. Bolton: The Government provide funds for the unemployed from other sources.

Hon. E. H. GRAY: Thousands of pounds have been collected during the past three years to supplement the relief granted by the Government. The position is now worse than ever it was, even though unemployment on bare sustenance has dropped from 12,000 to 3,000 odd. There is no money in the coffers of the State to supplement the relief being granted. I am speaking now particularly for the married men and the families in the metropolitan area who are to be looked after. We cannot get funds, and the position is that 25 committees in the metropolitan area are without money. The "West Australian" newspaper has been good enough to launch a Christmas appeal. I do not think that journal would have done so unless it had known the facts of the case and was satisfied with the justice of making the appeal. It is impossible for a man with a wife and children to exist on the relief

that is granted by the Government. A man can feed himself to a limited extent and pay something towards the rent, but he cannot get anything to provide clothing and all the food that is required. The Lotteries Commission during the past 12 months have made substantial grants to the unemployed, and seeing that those allotments have been questioned by the Audit Department, members should fully realise the position. I am speaking now for the unemployed themselves; I know they require assistance and I hope the clause in the Bill that affects them will be agreed to. If members support it, they will always be glad that they took this action. I support the other provisions of the Bill and the clause relating to the Minister's approval I consider a good one. The record of the commission does not need to be extolled by me. The lotteries have been well managed. I support the second reading.

HON. H. J. YELLAND (East) [7.53]: When the question of establishing lotteries for the purpose of raising funds for charities came before the Legislature several years ago—and it was defeated at that time—it was considered to be unwise to bring lotteries into our public life. But when we found the position becoming acute, as it has been in the last few years, re-consideration was given to the proposal to use lotteries for charitable purposes and the Act passed last year was the result. A few years ago when it was suggested that we should have lotteries, the intention was that the use of the lotteries funds was to be restricted to the support of hospitals. Last year when we were discussing similar legislation we had most prominently before us the needs of the various hospitals of the State, and it was suggested that it was only charitable institutions that needed public support which they were not then getting because of the unfortunate position in which the community generally found themselves. Now, if we are to open up any further avenues for distribution, I want to know where hospitals and charitable institutions will come in. According to Clause 2 of the Bill, the Lotteries Commission will be allocating money towards an object, the support of which, properly speaking, should be met from public funds. It is the duty of the Government either to provide employment or to assist those out of employment, and I

believe they are doing it to the best of their ability to-day. As a result of the efforts of the community and the work that is being provided by the Government, it is almost impossible for the primary producers to get people to assist them to take off their crops.

The Honorary Minister: That statement requires qualification.

Hon. H. J. YELLAND: It may, but it is what the primary producers are up against. There is considerable employment in the country awaiting those who are prepared to take it, but the farmers are not able to obtain the services of the men they require. The position is that the farmers are held down to a certain wage. They cannot therefore pay more than they are permitted to pay by those who are in control of the situation. The position as it exists to-day is an indication of the parlous state of the industry as a whole.

Hon. J. Cornell: The average farmer will pay good money to a good man.

Hon. H. J. YELLAND: He certainly will if the industry will permit him to do so. The higher wages one pays, the better results he gets, and the cheaper will it be for him in the long run. It is impossible to get good men to do the work and it is stated that the reason is that those who are out on sustenance work do not wish to go into the country. I know a farmer who was prepared to engage a man at 25s. or 30s. a week with his keep and the position would have been permanent, but he could not get any man. Then he was prepared to pay £2 a week during harvest time and the fare there and back. If we are going to permit the raising of funds in this manner for our charitable institutions, when we know that it is the duty of the Government to supply it out of the public purse, then we are going too far. I shall oppose any such proposal. Clause 3 proposes that the distribution of the proceeds of the lotteries shall be submitted to the Minister for his approval. That is quite unnecessary. When the Commission were appointed it was intended that they should be free from Ministerial control. Yet the clause will bring them under Ministerial control, a position we sought to avoid when considering the original measure. The amendment represents a direct contravention of the intention of the legislature when the measure of last year was passed.

Hon. J. Cornell: If the distribution is to be subject to Ministerial control, let it be a State lottery.

Hon. H. J. YELLAND: Yes, it would be better to have a State lottery straight out and let the Minister control it. Then we could do away with the Commission. Section 11 of the Act provides that in regard to every lottery for which a permit is granted, certain things must be done. A permit may be granted to any institution to run a lottery, and those responsible may distribute the proceeds without reference to the Minister. If this clause be passed they will still be able to do that, but the Commission who grant the permits will be compelled to get the Minister's permission for the distribution of the proceeds of their lotteries. That cannot be considered fair. I shall oppose that clause. I have an objection also to Clause 4, which proposes to continue the Act for three years. We have recently passed an amendment of the Constitution Acts and have given that amendment a duration only until the end of 1934. If we are to have the present members of the Lotteries Commission acting—and I see no reason why they should not be permitted to continue in view of the remarkably good work they have done—it would be unwise to extend this legislation to 1936 and restrict the other measure to 1934. Both should run parallel. Therefore I suggest that the duration of this measure be extended to 1934. As it is necessary to continue the Act, I shall be compelled to vote for the second reading, but in Committee I shall strongly oppose the inclusion of Clauses 2 and 3.

HON. C. H. WITTENOOM (South-East) [8.3]: I support the second reading, though I shall not support all the clauses in Committee. In view of the excellent work done by the Commission, we cannot do other than grant an extension for the next three years. I see no reason why such an important question as that of deciding how the proceeds shall be allocated should be taken out of the hands of the Commission and vested in the Minister. I cannot see what is to be gained by it. The success of the Commission has been due to the fact that they have been able to operate free from Ministerial control, and I entirely oppose any alteration in the direction suggested. The public generally have

been so satisfied that it would be a most unpopular alteration for this House to endorse.

HON. G. FRASER (West) [8.4]: I support the second reading. I would not have risen to speak, seeing that I spoke on the original Bill, but for the remarks of Mr. Yelland. After listening to him one is forced to the conclusion that he does not know much about the unemployment position. If he did, he would be aware that the people benefiting from the money distributed by the Lotteries Commission through unemployed relief committees are those who draw ration tickets. The policy of the Government is that every man who can work is given relief work. The only men exempt from that condition are those who produce a doctor's certificate. The money provided by the Lotteries Commission for unemployment relief committees is distributed, not to men on Government relief work but to men who cannot undertake relief work—men who have to seek light jobs around the metropolitan area. Such men could not undertake work on a farm. Owing to the unfortunate times, they are cut out of employment that would be available to them in normal times. Consequently they receive only a ration ticket.

Hon. H. J. Yelland: But you propose to encroach upon the proceeds of the lotteries for their benefit.

Hon. G. FRASER: I know of no other way of assisting them.

Hon. H. J. YELLAND: I say it is the duty of the Government to assist them.

Hon. G. FRASER: The Government are providing them with a certain amount of food—up to 7s. per unit per week. Beyond that the Government cannot go. The payment has to be supplemented. Since the passing of the Act, committees for the relief of unemployment cannot conduct lotteries in order to raise funds to assist such people.

Hon. C. B. Williams: Why not?

Hon. G. FRASER: Because under the law they are not permitted to do so.

Hon. C. B. Williams: This is the only place where they cannot do so.

Hon. H. J. Yelland: It is the duty of the Government to provide for those people.

Hon. C. B. Williams: There are more sweeps now than ever there were.

Hon. G. FRASER: If the Government expended the amount of money necessary to house and clothe as well as feed the unemployed, the figure would be so high that we would never hear the end of it.

Hon. J. Cornell: Take all the proceeds of the lotteries and give nothing out!

Hon. G. FRASER: Those persons receiving Government relief must be granted something extra.

Hon. H. J. Yelland: The Lotteries Act was passed for a certain purpose, and you are trying to undermine it.

Hon. G. FRASER: It was passed to assist charitable objects. If the hon. member had in mind that it was intended to assist hospitals only, that was merely his own impression.

Hon. V. Hamersley: It is stated in the Act.

Hon. G. FRASER: Not that the proceeds were to benefit hospitals only. I remember the amendments moved to the Bill of last session, some of which were accepted, and some of which were rejected.

Hon. J. J. Holmes: You moved that the Bill be read a second time that day six months.

Hon. G. FRASER: Yes, because the measure reached us on the last day of the session.

Hon. H. J. Yelland: If the people to whom you refer are sick and indigent, they are already provided for under Section 2 (g) of the Act.

Hon. G. FRASER: Yes, the Commission can grant up to £250.

Hon. L. B. Bolton: Is not that sufficient?

Hon. E. H. Gray: No.

Hon. G. FRASER: How far would £250 go amongst 3,000 or 4,000 people?

Hon. J. Cornell: You would have to take all the money from each lottery to benefit that number.

Hon. G. FRASER: Not necessarily. All we ask is that the Commission be authorised to grant a little extra assistance for those people. If the law were altered as suggested by the amendment, it could be left to the good sense of the Commission to give to unemployment relief committees what was considered a fair thing. I have sufficient confidence in the Commission to know that they would not neglect any charitable institution that stood in need of help. I have sufficient confidence in them to know

that the whole proceeds of the lotteries would not be devoted to the relief of unemployment. Under existing legislation, the powers of the Commission are too limited.

Hon. L. B. Bolton: Leave them alone while they are doing good work.

Hon. G. FRASER: I recognise that they are doing good work.

Hon. L. B. Bolton: Then leave them alone.

Hon. G. FRASER: If the amendment be passed the Commission will not be compelled to grant additional assistance.

Hon. H. J. Yelland: I suggest that those people would be included in the definition of charitable purpose contained in the Act, but the clause in the Bill goes much further than that.

Hon. G. FRASER: All the clause proposes is to give the Commission power, if they think fit, to grant more for the relief of unemployment than may be granted at present. Members have praised the Commission for the good work they have done.

Hon. L. B. Bolton: You no sooner get a body of men doing good work than you want to spoil it by Government interference.

Hon. C. B. Williams: Hear, hear!

Hon. G. FRASER: I am dealing with Clause 2 which provides for the relief of unemployment.

Hon. J. Cornell: You should leave the details until we reach the Committee stage.

The PRESIDENT: I think that instead of this conversational discussion, it would be better to deal with the details in Committee. We are discussing the second reading of the Bill.

Hon. G. FRASER: The interjections have drawn me into making special reference to the details of the clause.

Hon. L. B. Bolton: Well, do not take any notice of the interjections.

Hon. G. FRASER: I was remarking that the Commission are empowered to grant up to £250 for the relief of unemployment. It is desired that those people who are unfortunately placed should receive a little extra at this season of the year. A sum of £250 distributed amongst those who are in need of a little extra assistance would not go very far. There are about 27 unemployment relief committees operating in the metropolitan area, most of whom have anything up to 100 unemployed on their books. To distribute £250 amongst the large body of people represented by

those committees would not provide much benefit to anyone. I am prepared to accept the amendment proposed in the Bill and leave to the good sense of the Commission how much extra they will provide. It will not be mandatory for the Commission to give the whole proceeds of a lottery or any portion of them. It will still be left to the discretion of the Commission to grant whatever sum they consider fit. Hon. members must recollect—Mr Yelland touched on this point—that the Government have to carry the responsibility. They cannot, however, carry any greater responsibility than they are carrying to-day. They are providing up to 7s. per unit per week. That amount, however, is only sufficient for food. Something additional must be provided in order that these people may obtain clothing.

Hon. E. H. Harris: Where does the extra money come from?

Hon. G. FRASER: They are not getting any extra money now. What they did get came from the various relief committees. For several reasons that money is not now available. It must be found somewhere. To me it seems remarkable that these people have been able to go on so long as they have, in some cases for two or three years, without employment. Their greatest problem is to keep a roof over their heads, although it must be admitted that many landlords in the metropolitan area have shown themselves exceptionally considerate. Besides the question of housing, there is the problem of clothing for the men and their families. The Government are doing much good by providing relief work, thereby greatly lessening the responsibilities of the relief committees. The present position is that those assisted by the relief committees are men unable to work on Government relief schemes, men who in normal times could obtain sufficient work to keep themselves and their families, but who to-day, by reason of the tightness of money, find their occupation gone. The relief committees are now absolutely unable to provide extra comforts for these people, as was done in the past. The Bill does not instruct the Lotteries Commission to give the money, but empowers them, if they desire to do so, to make funds available. The matter may well be left to the good sense of the Lotteries Commission, who will decide how much shall be given. Certainly they will

not give much more than they are giving to-day. If they give £500, it will tend materially to reduce the distress amongst unemployed in the metropolitan area. I hope hon. members will view the provision favourably. Mr. Yelland evidently takes the stand that because a large number of unemployed will not go to the farming areas, he must vote against the Bill.

Hon. H. J. Yelland: No. I said that at the present time the unemployed were being used on sustenance work and therefore were not available for the farmers.

The PRESIDENT: Order! The hon. member has already spoken on the Bill.

Hon. G. FRASER: I am thankful for the hon. member's assistance.

The PRESIDENT: The hon. member should not encourage interjections.

Hon. G. FRASER: One reason why the farmers cannot obtain labour is that the conditions under which men are asked to work are not suitable, either from a food point of view or generally. If the farm workers were given the same conditions as the farmers, there would be no shortage of labour in the country districts.

Hon. L. B. Bolton: What you say applies to only a small proportion of the farmers.

Hon. G. FRASER: Residents of my province seem to have struck that small proportion consistently. However, some of the men have been quite satisfied with conditions in the country. Others are afraid to go into the bush because they do not know where they are going and what the conditions will be. In many instances men have gone to work in the country only to be told eventually that if they were prepared to wait until the next harvest their wages would be available. Can one wonder at men being tardy to venture into the bush for work under such conditions? I do not say that that is the general experience, but it has been sufficiently frequent to make many men afraid to accept work in the country. Most of the families to-day receiving assistance from relief committees are the families of men who are unable to take country work.

Hon. L. B. Bolton: Then why waste the time of the House with—

The PRESIDENT: Order! I must ask hon. members to cease interjecting.

Hon. G. FRASER: The hon. member advanced as one of the reasons for opposing the Bill that these people would get extra

assistance if the measure passed, whereas they should be working for the farmers.

Hon. H. J. Yelland: That is quite inconsistent.

THE PRESIDENT: Order!

Hon. G. FRASER: I hope that those hon. members who do not know conditions in the metropolitan area will endeavour to ascertain them. If so, they will discover that everything stated by other members on that subject is entirely correct. We are pleading for extra assistance because we know of actual cases of acute distress. We are amongst these people daily. We know the conditions under which they live. We wish hon. members to allow the Lotteries Commission to grant extra assistance wherever they possibly can. I hope hon. members will support the appeals made by those who go amongst these people every day in the week. There are genuine cases which make one feel sorry, for once in one's life, not to be a rich man, because of the good one could do with one's wealth. Here is an opportunity to make some funds available, and I hope hon. members will support the appeals which have been addressed to them.

HON. J. J. HOLMES (North) [8.26]: I did not intend to speak on the Bill to-night, but after what has been put over this House I feel that in justice to those whom I represent something must be said in reply to Mr. Fraser. That hon. member either is unknowingly misleading the House or does not know anything about the subject. He says that there are men about Perth who cannot get employment, and that the reason why they do not go to the country is that they do not know what conditions they will meet there and whether they will get their wages or not. I am a large employer of labour.

Hon. G. Fraser: But you are a good employer.

Hon. J. J. HOLMES: I venture to suggest that from one end of this country to the other I am known not only as a man who pays well but as a man who feeds well. Within the last month I received an urgent wire asking me to engage two men. I went to a bureau which does not charge men anything for finding employment. I pay the fee, and I pay the fare as well. That bureau took three days to get one man, and another four days to get the other. On the first occasion only two men applied. I would have engaged both,

but one, a young man, would not go to the country. To put over such stuff as has been done this evening is to mislead the House and the public as to the real position. The harvest is plenty, but the labourers are few; that is, the labourers who are prepared to work. Under the Bill everything is to be sacrificed to the unemployed. We have provided loan money for the unemployed. We have provided revenue for the unemployed. We have provided special grants for the unemployed. We have passed emergency legislation for the benefit of the unemployed. We have also imposed a hospital tax. The hospitals, however, have not received the proceeds of the tax.

Hon. E. H. Gray: It was never intended that they should.

Hon. J. J. HOLMES: Yes, it was. I will give the reason why the hospitals should get the money, and why the people who paid the hospital tax were under the impression that they would get relief at the hospitals. The Act says that if one resides in Western Australia one pays the tax on one's income, but that if one resides outside the State and draws income from the State, one shall not pay any hospital tax at all, the inference being that residents of this State who pay the hospital tax shall get treatment at the hospitals. They have never got it.

Hon. E. H. Gray: That ought to be rectified.

Hon. J. J. HOLMES: In view of the fact that all this money is being provided for the unemployed, it is beyond my comprehension how an hon. member can put up a plea that money should be taken away from charitable institutions to be given to the unemployed. Mr. Fraser stressed the effect of Clause 2, but he missed the point. He said it was intended to assist unemployed who were sick and indigent. But the clause is much wider than that. It includes any body which has for its object the relief of unemployment in this State. There are many worthy institutions in Perth and throughout Western Australia, that are at their wits' end to find ordinary sustenance for indigent patients. I would cite the Home of Peace, one of the best institutions ever heard of. Those in control of the home are up against it all the time. Fortunately, some charitably disposed people have in their wills made some provision for the institution, other-

wise it could not carry on. Despite that, the little assistance that such organisations may derive from the lotteries run by the commission are to be diminished because it is proposed the unemployed shall have a dip into the lucky bag, so to speak, knowing full well that the more they take out the less will remain for worthy charities throughout the State. Mr. Fraser dodged Clause 3 altogether, so I presume he will assist in defeating that proposal, which refers to the Minister taking control of the distribution of funds.

Hon. G. Fraser: I dealt with that matter previously.

Hon. J. J. HOLMES: Mr. Fraser said that the distribution of funds should be left to the good sense of the Lotteries Commission, and repeated that statement at least three times. If, in face of that, he can vote in favour of Clause 3, which places the distribution of funds in the hands of the Minister, he is incapable of looking at two sides of the question. As regards the unemployed, he certainly has looked at one side alone. However, he should know, as the result of what I have said, what he did not appreciate before. We have been told that the employers are being held down by the financial institutions with regard to wages. To my mind, the great bulk of the employers to-day are so far involved with the banks that the financial institutions have to hold them up, rather than hold them down. I refuse to believe that any financial institution in such circumstances would refuse to supply money with which to pay the wages of men required to garner the harvest that is now ripe. Mr. Seddon has given notice of his intention to move an amendment with regard to the audit, but I think he should go a bit further. I believe the auditing should be done by the Auditor General because he and his staff are accustomed to handling accounts from the Government standpoint, which is altogether different from the experience of other auditors.

The Honorary Minister: You do not want the Government to have anything to do with the money.

Hon. J. J. HOLMES: I want Parliament to know where the money is going. We want the Auditor General to tell Parliament, not the Minister, what is happening.

The Honorary Minister: If you gave more attention to the amendment, you would know that that is what it means.

Hon. J. J. HOLMES: There is another point regarding the distribution of funds, which the Minister says will be made by the commission, subject to the Minister's approval. I can read one thing only into that. It means that the distribution will be by the Minister. Irrespective of what the commission may submit, unless the Minister approves, there will be no distribution. The only way by which a distribution of the money will then be secured will be for the commission to bow to the decision of the Minister and accept dictation at his hands. That should not be allowed.

Hon. G. Fraser: The position is more likely to be the other way round.

Hon. J. J. HOLMES: I think the House could do well by striking out all the Bill except the last clause and then we should alter that to "1934" from "1936." If we did that we would make a good job of the Bill. I oppose the second reading.

On motion by the Honorary Minister, debate adjourned.

BILL—EMPLOYMENT BROKERS ACT AMENDMENT.

Second Reading.

THE HONORARY MINISTER (Hon. W. H. Kitson—West) [8.35] in moving the second reading said: The securing of employment for those who are unemployed is a matter of great importance that has been stressed on many occasions by almost every member of this Chamber. Owing to the depression that has existed for some considerable time, that importance has greatly increased and, naturally, competition for any work that is offering has become much keener. As a result of that, many of the employment agencies have reaped a somewhat rich harvest. The Bill deals with one or two phases of the operations of employment agencies that, I submit, have been due for attention for some considerable period. Irrespective of the merits of the Bill, most members will agree that the present law is not as satisfactory as it might be, even from the standpoint of the employers. Notwithstanding any opposite opinion that may be held by members, I hope they will agree with

me when I say the time has arrived when we should consider our varying points of view in the hope that we may be able to place on the statute-book a law that will be workable and just to all parties concerned. I do not propose to spend much time in presenting details concerning what has been done in other countries with reference to the laws governing the employment of labour, principally because I believe every member of this Chamber has a good knowledge of what has been done in that direction. They are at least aware that every constituent nation of the League of Nations has amended their legislation in one respect or another. Some have gone much farther than others, but in Western Australia, I regret to say, we have done nothing at all. The present Act was passed in 1909, when the population of the State was much smaller than it is to-day, and when the existing conditions could not be compared with those that have obtained during the last 10 years. One or two efforts have been made to amend the Act, but without success. Conditions locally furnish sufficient justification for the introduction of the Bill. Recently a woman was engaged as housekeeper for a pastoral property. She was to be paid £2 a week on arrival at the station, subject to the employee paying the railway fare on the understanding that it would be refunded by the employer after the woman had been six months in his employment. A paltry trick was played on the woman, for she was employed for the period of the mustering season, which lasted three months only. It was well known by the employer when he made the engagement that that was the position. The woman could not secure a refund of the railway fare and, as a result, the comparatively small wage she received was not remunerative for the time she spent on the station.

Hon. C. H. Wittenoom: Did she sign an agreement to stay for six months?

The HONORARY MINISTER: No; the agreement she had was that she would secure the refund of her railway fare at the end of six months.

Hon. J. Nicholson: If she had been prepared to stay, she had the right to recover that money if her services were determined by the employer.

The HONORARY MINISTER: But there was no breach of the Act. There are scores of such cases on the records of the

department, many of which I have on a file with me. I will deal with one or two of them before I conclude my remarks. There is another form of imposition that is practised by some employers. The instance I will cite concerns the engagement of barmaids for a country hotel. During a period of 12 months, no fewer than 13 barmaids were engaged for this hotel, 12 of them through the agency of one broker, who charged both the employer and the employee £1 12s. 6d. for each engagement. That number of engagements in one year meant that that particular broker received fees amounting to £39. I suggest that in those circumstances the agency was far more lucrative than many others that hon. members may have in mind. The evidence in that particular case goes to show that there was collusion between two of the parties. That is one instance only and there are many of a similar character. Then, again, there is another practice frequently adopted by astute employers. It is to discharge their employees, who have been engaged through one or other of these agencies, just a short time before the period expires when the employees are entitled to a refund of the railway fares they have paid. I have already quoted the instance of the woman who was engaged as a housekeeper on an understanding that her fare would be paid if she remained for six months, and she was engaged for three months only. There are a large number of cases where the employees were dismissed just a short period before the time expired when they would become entitled to a refund of the fares one way or the other, or, in some instances, both ways. More often than not, the excuse that is made is that owing to slackness of trade it is not possible to keep the employee any longer. Yet a couple of weeks afterwards another employee is engaged to take the place of the one dismissed. Some time ago an employee was engaged as waitress and assistant housemaid at a country hotel at 32s. 6d. per week and keep, and it was provided that there should be 48 hours notice given on either side. The fare was to be paid by the employer after three months service. But after two months the girl received notice of dismissal. There was no complaint against her and, as invariably happens in such a case, the employer refused to pay the fare,

although he was requested to do so, both by the employee and by the broker who had sent the girl to the position. The girl had no redress. Sometimes the employer writes to various agencies for an employee. Not long ago a case of this kind came under the notice of the Chief Inspector of Factories, when three girls would have been sent a considerable distance from Perth to the one job had he not intervened. The prospective employer was a farmer living in a distant part of the State. He wanted a domestic to perform housework and do the washing and cooking for 15s. per week. Three separate agencies were instructed by a representative of the employer to obtain a servant, to be subject to the approval of the representative. The three girls would have proceeded by the same train to the one job. One broker wired to the employer and secured his authority to complete the engagement. The second broker fulfilled the terms of the representative of the employer, interviewed the girl and selected her for the position. But the girl selected by the third broker happened to hear that there was something amiss, and she challenged the correctness of the engagement made with her by the third broker. Hearing of this, the Chief Inspector of Factories acted promptly, with the result that one of the brokers sent along a girl to fill the position, the second cancelled the engagement, and the third girl, who had challenged the arrangements made, verified her suspicions and refused to proceed to the job. That girl was rather unfortunate in that she had already paid the broker's fee, which he refused to refund, offering to secure another engagement for her. She declined the offer, and eventually was placed in another position by the first broker, who had sent a girl to fill the original position. That sort of thing is most unfair to persons out of employment and prepared to undertake long journeys into the country in order to take employment, at the magnificent wage of 15s. per week, doing the housework and cooking and washing for a large family. There are many variations of these cases, and I could give innumerable instances; but I think I have said enough to claim the consideration of members for the proposals in the Bill. On previous occasions when a measure of this kind has been before the House, members have refused to agree to it, but this time I

hope the proposals in the Bill will meet with the support of a majority of members; and if the House cannot agree to the whole of the proposals, I hope they will agree to some amendments of the present Act which unquestionably are essential. Let me relate the more important amendments contained in the Bill. The first one deals with the transfer, from the licensing court to the police or resident magistrate sitting in courts of petty session, of the functions of hearing applications for licenses and the granting of certificates for the issue of licenses to employment brokers. At present it is for the licensing court to deal with these matters, but it will make for the easier working of the Act if we remove it to the resident magistrate. Also we are inserting a definition of "inspector." This is necessary in view of later amendments which confer certain powers on inspectors. In the existing Act there is no definition of "inspector." The first part of Clause 4 is really consequential, but the second part enables an inspector to refer applications to the court if he be of opinion that the proposed place of business is unsuitable for the operations of an employment agency. While there may not be cause for complaint respecting premises used at present, there has been just cause for complaint in the past, and it may occur again in the future unless we have power to prevent it. Clause 8 enables objections to be made to the issue of a license on additional grounds; first that the applicant has suffered previous forfeiture or cancellation of any license. Then it is provided that if the reasonable requirements of the district do not warrant the granting of a license, the court shall be empowered not to grant it. Recently there was brought to the notice of the department an instance where the licensed broker was carrying on a matrimonial agency in conjunction with his employment broker's agency, both in the one room or office. I do not propose to read advertisements inserted by this agent under the heading of "matrimonial," but I can assure members that after due inquiry it became clearly apparent that there was cause for complaint in the carrying on of those two agencies in the one room.

Hon. J. Nicholson: Could not that be dealt with when it came to the renewal of the license?

The HONORARY MINISTER: Not at present. We propose to give the court

power to refuse to grant a license for any reason deemed by the court sufficient. Clause 8 empowers a road board in addition to a municipality to object to the granting of a license in the district. There are at present 15 licenses, of which 14 are within the boundaries of municipalities, while the 15th is at Wiluna, and the Wiluna Road Board is precluded from objecting to the issue of the license. The Bill will correct that. Clause 13 repeals Section 15 of the Act in its entirety. Also it prohibits the broker from receiving any deposit, fee or reward from the employee, and it prohibits the broker from charging or receiving any fee from the employer other than those prescribed by regulations, together with the out-of-pocket expenses actually incurred in respect of telegrams and long distance telephone calls. It requires, as at present, that the prescribed scale of fees shall be posted in a conspicuous place in the broker's office, and provides also for the recovery of any fee illegally charged by the broker. In addition it provides a penalty of £20. As an instance in support of that clause: An employee reported that a job had been advertised in the country. Upon making application for it, he was advised by the broker that all applicants were required to register and deposit an amount ranging from 10s. to £1. In this case it appears that the applicants tossed up for the job, and that the successful man paid an additional fee over and above the 10s. The broker retained the other deposits until he could find jobs for those who had put up their money. When inquiries were made into the case it was found that the broker had eventually returned the deposits, but in the meantime probably the applicants were in want of the few shillings they had lodged with the broker. The retention of the deposits was not an offence under the Act, but the clause to which I have just referred deals with that subject. During a recent investigation by the inspector of factories it was found that a Perth employment broker kept a special register, on the card index system, being a classification of various jobs. On these cards he registered the names of the persons who wanted one of those jobs, and the person so registered paid a special fee ranging from 5s. to £1. In return for that they were supposed to be informed when a suitable job was available, and to be given the refusal of the job before

it was advertised in the press. It is stated that when an engagement is effected, the servant is credited with the amount he has lodged, and only has to pay the difference between that and the fee the broker charges for securing the employment. This means that the broker is assisted by the workers who can ill afford to part with their money, to finance his own business, without paying any interest, and before any engagement is obtained. In some instances a considerable sum in the aggregate is obtained by brokers by this means. The amendment to which I have referred also deals with this phase of the subject, which is certainly one requiring attention. Clause 15 is a new provision. It provides a statutory obligation on the part of an employer, who effects the engagement of a servant through an agency, first of all to pay the fare of the servant from the place of engagement to the place of employment, and in the event of the employer dispensing with the services of the servant for any reason other than the wilful misconduct or incompetence of the servant, the employer shall pay the fare of the servant back to the place where the engagement was made.

Hon. C. H. Wittenoom: Regardless of the length of time he may stay? Suppose a servant remains for only one week.

The HONORARY MINISTER: If a servant leaves the job of his own accord, or is dismissed for incompetence, misconduct, dishonesty, immorality, intemperance, or insubordination, he would not be entitled to his return fare.

Hon. J. Nicholson: I do not see anything about the servant leaving the job.

The HONORARY MINISTER: That is the position.

Hon. J. J. Holmes: Is there a definition of wilful misconduct?

The HONORARY MINISTER: I have shown what it includes.

Hon. J. M. Macfarlane: Or of incompetence?

Hon. C. H. Wittenoom: That is very hard to prove.

The HONORARY MINISTER: It would not be difficult for some members to satisfy themselves on that point. There is a proviso designed to protect the employer and relieve him of liability for the payment of fares either way, if the servant is dismissed for misconduct or incompetence, or if on arrival at the job it is found that the servant obtained the engagement by means of a false

statement as to his capabilities, experience, or fitness. The employer will be relieved of the responsibility for the repayment of the fare either way in that event.

Hon. J. J. Holmes: The employer would have already paid.

Hon. J. Nicholson: The only remedy he has is to sue for the money.

The HONORARY MINISTER: I am quite prepared to consider any amendments members may move to improve this legislation.

Hon. J. J. Holmes: It does require to be tightened up.

The HONORARY MINISTER: Yes. The custom to-day is that the person pays the fare from the place of engagement to the place of employment. If the fare is advanced by the employer or the broker the servant repays it out of moneys due to him. I understand the contract of engagement in these cases usually contains a clause providing for the refund of the fare by the employer within a stated period. Upon the termination of the employment the servant must pay his own fare to whatever place he desires to reach.

Hon. E. H. Harris: None of these conditions would appertain to the State Labour Bureau.

The HONORARY MINISTER: No. In that case the employee is not asked to pay any fee whatever.

Hon. E. H. Harris: Does the bureau advance the fare on every occasion?

The HONORARY MINISTER: In almost every case where the employee can prove that he has a paid job to go to. If a man accepts a job through the bureau the fare is advanced on the conditions I have stated.

Hon. H. Seddon: Provided the fare is guaranteed.

The HONORARY MINISTER: An order is given on the employer. If there is any doubt as to the veracity of the employee the bureau takes steps to protect the interests of the department by securing a guarantee from some competent person.

Hon. E. H. Harris: Could not the same sort of guarantee be taken by employment brokers?

The HONORARY MINISTER: They would accept the same guarantee. On a previous occasion when the labour bureau came under my jurisdiction, every effort was made to secure the necessary guarantee from some individual known to the department. I usually found some way to overcome that

difficulty, provided I knew the job was there for the man to go to, and that he was going to take it.

Hon. J. J. Holmes: I think you also used the police for the collection of the money.

The HONORARY MINISTER: They have been used for that purpose. Clause 16 provides that where an employer engages one or more brokers to secure an employee he shall notify each broker of the fact, and state the names of the other brokers so engaged, and no engagement shall be completed until the employer has notified all the brokers engaged that he has secured an employee.

Hon. J. Nicholson: And the penalty is £20.

The HONORARY MINISTER: That will eliminate the possibility of more than one person being sent to one job and the risk of one or more employees being left stranded. There are several cases in the records of the department where more than one employee has been sent to one job, and some unlucky individual has been stranded. There have been cases where the Government have had to go to the assistance of individuals, particularly of girls, so that they might not suffer from their ill fortune. Three brokers were called upon to engage a girl, and three girls were on the eve of being sent but for the intervention of the chief inspector of factories.

Hon. J. M. Macfarlane: By an agent or by an employer?

The HONORARY MINISTER: By the employer and his representative.

Hon. J. M. Macfarlane: And they tangled up the business between them.

The HONORARY MINISTER: That may be so. The employer asked his representative in the city to engage a girl. The representative went to three agencies, each of which secured a girl. The representative made a condition that he should interview the selected girl before she was sent up. One of the brokers thought he would get in first, and telegraphed to the employer setting out the kind of girl he had available, and he obtained permission to engage her. The second broker engaged a girl and submitted her credentials to the representative, who was satisfied and was prepared to accept her. The third girl heard of the circumstances and refused to proceed. Eventually, through the intervention of the chief inspector of factories only one girl was sent to the

job. The girl who refused to accept the job in the circumstances, paid a deposit to the broker, in the belief that she was securing the position. The broker refused to refund the money, but offered to find a position for her. She was subsequently placed in a position by the broker who was successful in filling the first position.

Hon. J. M. Macfarlane: I suppose you do not know whether this was deliberate or accidental?

The HONORARY MINISTER: The chief inspector made all the inquiries he could. The job was only worth 5s. a week and was in an outback part of the State.

Hon. J. M. Macfarlane: If this was done deliberately, it is bad, but if it was accidental it was a different matter.

The HONORARY MINISTER: If it was accidental compensation should have been provided for those who suffered. It is not an offence under the present Act, but the provision we are now inserting will give us an opportunity of dealing with the matter. Clause 18 repeals Section 25 in its entirety, and it provides for a maximum penalty of £50 or imprisonment not exceeding six months, where a broker induces a person to enter into an engagement by false representation—there have been quite a number of cases of this kind—where a broker knowingly makes a false statement of the facts to a worker for the purpose of inducing anyone to accept an engagement or to seek to obtain an engagement which in fact is not available or open. One can spend a lot of time giving instances of this kind. The clause speaks for itself and I believe will probably meet with the approval of members. Subclause 2 of Clause 18 renders any person who sends or delivers to a broker any written false statement for the purpose of being used to induce a servant to enter the service of an employer or to seek to obtain employment or position which is not in fact open or available is liable to a penalty of £50 or six months imprisonment. It is obvious that for his own protection a broker shall make available all correspondence. An inspector is bound to see it and he is liable to a penalty of £25 if he discloses any private matter that may be contained in that correspondence.

Hon. J. J. Holmes: I do not think you will get that.

Hon. C. H. Wittenoom: That is one of the worst points in the whole Bill.

The HONORARY MINISTER: Sufficient evidence can be induced to show the desirability of inserting a clause of that nature. Clause 21 deals with the fees which may be charged by employment brokers. They are to be fixed definitely by regulation. I have a comparative statement showing the provisions of legislation in the other States of the Commonwealth dealing with that particular point, and an official publication recently received from New Zealand. The last-named indicates that the maximum fees chargeable by licensees under the Servants Registry Offices Act in that Dominion are also fixed by regulation.

Hon. J. J. Holmes: If you fixed the maximum fees, it would wipe out all the brokers.

The HONORARY MINISTER: No one would apply.

Hon. E. H. Harris: You might fix the fee at 1s., and close up all employment brokers.

The HONORARY MINISTER: There is one case to which I would like to refer and it has to do with one or two points to which I have alluded. On the 23rd of last month a broker was proceeded against in the Perth police court on three charges for offences against the Employment Brokers Act, 1909. The following are the particulars:—

1. Charging a higher fee than the rate specified in the scale of charges deposited at the office of the Minister in respect to the engagement of a servant, contrary to Section 16 of the Act. In this case the broker arranged for the payment by a relation of the servant's of a premium of £25 to secure the employment of such servant as an apprentice to the hairdressing trade at a commencing wage of 11s. 2d. per week, and charged a fee of £2 10s. for his services. The scale of charges deposited at this office indicates half a week's wages as the maximum fee to be charged to employer and employee. The fee payable should therefore have been 5s. 7d. The defendant was fined £1 and costs.

2. Charging a fee in respect of the employment of a servant which he did not equally charge to the employer, contrary to Section 15 of the Employment Brokers Act. The broker charged the servant £2 10s. but made no charge on the employer and was fined £1 and costs on this charge.

3. Failing to keep the engagement book in the form prescribed in the Fifth Schedule of the Employment Brokers Act contrary to Section 19 of the Act. In this case the engagement book had not been written up for some time. Copies of the transcripts of contracts of engagement containing particulars which are required to be recorded in the engagement

book were kept and were available for inspection, but in some instances the transcripts did not contain all the particulars required to be entered in the book and all contained additional particulars not required to be entered. A conviction was recorded and defendant was cautioned and ordered to pay the costs of the case.

If the Bill is agreed to, as I hope it will be, it will be necessary and highly desirable that a broker shall at least keep an accurate record of these matters. At the present time, brokers can charge what they like. No limit is fixed, and all they are asked to do is to keep a scale in their offices and supply a copy to the Minister. These charges are mostly a half week's wages payable by both employer and employee. One broker's notice indicates a quarter of the first week's wages, another a maximum of half and a minimum of a quarter. Only one broker makes no charge to the employee, but charges the employer £1 for each engagement. Then with regard to contract work, there is considerable variation. One broker charges $2\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. on the value of the contract payable by a contractor, whilst another requires 3d. in the £1. I have already given an indication that employment broking, if carried on at all extensively, is a very lucrative business. This will be realised from the inquiries made by the department at various times. Of course there is extreme difficulty in getting anything like absolute accuracy in this respect. What I am about to inform the House relates to one particular broker who carried on a successful business. The advertisements which he inserted were selected at random over a period of one week during the current month. They were examined and dissected, and it was found that if each position advertised had been filled by the broker, and the fees to which he would have been legally entitled collected, namely half a week's wages from both worker and employer, his income for the week would have amounted to £140 15s. It is doubted also whether the total cost of conducting this office would have exceeded £10 per week, as only the broker and one assistant were employed in the business. I am not suggesting for one moment that the amount I stated was received, but if the claim of these brokers put forward from time to time that they can fill these positions is correct, and if they make the charges they are entitled

to make from the employer and the employee, there is no doubt about it that the business is lucrative.

Hon. J. Nicholson: I think you should have seen the Income Tax Commissioner.

The HONORARY MINISTER: The hon. member knows that we have not that power, but we have evidence that in many cases, while the employee is charged the full legal fee, the employer gets off scot free. That is a phase of the business to which members can give consideration. Nobody objects to an employment broker or any other individual getting a fair reward for his labour. The Bill provides that instead of an employee being called upon to pay for the services of the broker, he shall be able to secure engagements free of charge. I am reminded that Mr. Yelland earlier in the evening, speaking on another measure, referred to the difficulty of securing workers for the harvest. I should like to suggest that the conditions under which persons are obtaining employment for some of these posts are the conditions which compel men, and in some cases women, to absolutely refuse to have anything to do with the positions. Let me put it this way: A broker advertises for a cook for the house, or perhaps for any other worker. The position is vacant for the period of the harvest and it may last for three or four weeks only, and in some cases perhaps a little longer. In many instances, the wages are low because of the inability of the farmer to pay more, but the employee, who is prepared to accept the position under existing conditions, finds that he has to pay half his wages to secure that position. Then he discovers also that he has to pay his railway fare, and the post may be 250 or 300 miles away. If the job is only for three weeks or a month, the fare back will have to be paid by the employee, and his desire may be to return to Perth where there will be a chance of securing another position. So that he will have worked for three, four or five weeks, and having had to meet all these charges, out of the remuneration which is altogether too small, the acceptance of the position has become an unprofitable proposition. In this respect we should have a little more regard for the point of view of the individual who says he cannot take such a job. In many instances no reasonable objection can be raised to the conditions, but

the instances I have given supplies one reason why quite a number of people would not accept positions offered to them in recent weeks. I think I have said sufficient to ensure that members will at least agree to the second reading of the Bill. I have pointed out that I am prepared to consider amendments that may be proposed in Committee. I contend that a measure that was passed in 1909, and that has not been amended since—

Hon. J. J. Holmes: It was amended in 1912 and in 1918.

The HONORARY MINISTER: What were the amendments?

Hon. J. Nicholson: There was a consolidation in 1912.

The HONORARY MINISTER: What were the amendments?

Hon. J. Nicholson: In 1918 we provided for an equal distribution of the fee between employer and employee.

The HONORARY MINISTER: That was the only amendment made?

Hon. J. Nicholson: In 1912 other amendments were made and then the Act was consolidated.

Hon. J. Cornell: The year 1912 is a long way back.

The HONORARY MINISTER: That does not vitiate the point I was making. So many years have elapsed since the Act was amended, and the conditions have altered so greatly meanwhile, that it is, to adopt the words of Mr. Holmes, necessary that the law should be tightened up in some respects.

Hon. E. H. Harris: That is what the Minister for Works said when he introduced amendments in 1925 and 1927.

The HONORARY MINISTER: I am speaking of the existing position. If members do not approve of all the clauses—I should consider myself fortunate if they did approve of all the clauses—they will be at liberty to submit proposals as to what should be done and, so far as possible, I will be prepared to meet them.

Hon. J. Cornell: I think those people should be under the police.

The HONORARY MINISTER: The hon. member may be able to justify that statement, but I have not suggested anything of the kind. I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

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

ADJOURNMENT—SPECIAL

THE CHIEF SECRETARY (licn. J. M. Drew—Central) [9.33]: I move—

That the House at its rising adjourn till Tuesday, the 5th December.

Question put and passed.

House adjourned at 9.34 p.m.

Legislative Assembly,

Wednesday, 29th November, 1933.

	PAGE
Questions: Employment conditions—1, Canning Weir camp; 2, Yanchep workers ...	2173-4
Bills: Loan, £3,940,000, 1R. ...	2174
Farmers' Debts Adjustment Act Amendment, 1R.	2174
Health Act Amendment (No. 2), 3R. ...	2174
Public Works Act Amendment, 2R., Com. report	2174
Government Railways Act Amendment, 2R., Com. report ...	2176
State Transport Co-ordination, Standing Orders suspension, Com., recom., reports ...	2176
Mine Workers' Relief Act Amendment, returned	2198
Fremantle City Council Lands Act Amendment, returned ...	2198

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

QUESTIONS (2)—EMPLOYMENT CONDITIONS.

Canning Weir Camp.

Mr. RAPHAEL asked the Minister for Works: 1, Is he aware that no facilities for bathing are provided at Canning Weir for the wives and children of men engaged on the job, there being a large number of women and children in the camp? 2, Would it be possible for the Government to subsidise a doctor to visit the camp? 3, Do the Government intend to provide a school at the camp? 4, Is he aware of the sanitary arrangements at the Canning Weir married people's camp?

The MINISTER FOR WORKS replied: 1, Material is on order for erection of the