

If it was intended that a formula had to be produced, I should say that the word "formula" would have been included in the paragraph. I feel certain that no court would uphold a prosecution for failure to produce a formula, seeing that there is no reference to it in the clause.

Hon. J. NICHOLSON: Mr. Fraser is taking a rather brighter view of the position than I would be inclined to take. A formula would apply more particularly to chemicals.

Hon. Sir William Lathlain: Also to sauces, perfumery, etc.

Hon. J. NICHOLSON: Yes. A formula that comes under the Health Act is safeguarded, but this is quite a different matter. A manufacturer might have papers of a more or less secret nature, and an inspector could demand their production. It is possible to go too far in investing inspectors with such powers.

The MINISTER FOR COUNTRY WATER SUPPLIES: I think that Mr. Franklin has read Clause 5, but that Mr. Nicholson has not. By regulation a standard will be set for certain articles, and when that is established, how will an inspector know that the articles comply with it unless he is able to see the documents?

Hon. J. Nicholson: By examining the articles.

The MINISTER FOR COUNTRY WATER SUPPLIES: Unless the words "letters and documents" are included, an inspector would have no power to ensure that the quality was what was claimed for the articles. Further, it would be quite impossible for inspectors to deal with unscrupulous traders.

The CHAIRMAN: If members read Clause 5, I think they will conclude that the insertion of the word "wholly" is as essential there as in the other clause. Notice has been given of a proposed new clause prohibiting an inspector from wrongfully disclosing any information acquired in the exercise of his duties. Instead of taking the form of a new clause, that provision should be inserted to stand as Subclause 2 of Clause 11, which deals with the powers of inspectors.

Hon. J. Nicholson: It would be better as a subclause to Clause 11.

The CHAIRMAN: In the circumstances, I suggest that progress be reported to enable the Minister to consider those matters.

Hon. E. H. GRAY: I am surprised that members of the Chamber of Manufactures have not busied themselves about this clause. Competition with the Eastern States must become keener in the manufacture of such goods as biscuits, cakes and confectionery. Experts are employed to devise new lines, and it would be a great saving if a competing firm could obtain from an inspector details of what rivals were doing. Knowledge of the ingredients of an article would not be necessary to determine whether it complied with the grade. We should not give an inspector authority to demand the production of any recipe or formula.

Progress reported.

House adjourned at 6.10 p.m.

Legislative Council,

Tuesday, 7th July, 1931.

| | PAGE |
|---|------|
| Questions: Caves House, rebuilding | 3670 |
| Traffic Regulations, bicycles | 3680 |
| Assistant Minister | 3680 |
| Bills: Hire Purchase Agreements, Select Committee, extension of time | 3680 |
| Workers' Compensation, 2A. | 3680 |
| State Manufactures Description, recon. | 3691 |
| Farmers' Debts Adjustment Act Amendment, Assembly's Message | 3694 |
| Motion: Budget economies | 3694 |

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

QUESTION—CAVES HOUSE, RE-BUILDING.

Hon. G. FRASER asked the Minister for Country Water Supplies: As the Government have received a sum of £2,176 insurance on Caves House, which sum has been placed to the credit of a trust account, and as they also have large reserves of timber at the State Saw Mills, will they commence rebuilding the Caves House immediately, in order to relieve unemployment among artisans?

The **MINISTER FOR COUNTRY WATER SUPPLIES** replied: It is considered that if additions are to be made they should not be of wood and iron, but of brick or stone, the estimated cost being between £22,000 and £23,000. Even though supplies to the value of £7,000 could be obtained from the State Trading Concerns, it is regretted that the total amount required cannot at present be provided by the Treasury for such a work as this.

QUESTION—TRAFFIC REGULATIONS, BICYCLES.

Hon. G. W. MILES asked the Minister for Country Water Supplies: In view of the accident to a policeman on the Perth-Fremantle Road on the 1st instant, will the Government immediately amend the Traffic Regulations so as to compel persons using bicycles after sundown to carry a suitable tail light or disc not less than three inches in diameter?

The **MINISTER FOR COUNTRY WATER SUPPLIES** replied: Inquiries are being made to ascertain whether a more effective tail light or reflector can be obtained. When this information is available the matter of amending the regulation will be considered.

QUESTION—ASSISTANT MINISTER.

Hon. Sir EDWARD WITTENOOM asked the Minister for Country Water Supplies: 1, Do the Government intend to comply with the request of this House to provide the Leader with an assistant Minister? 2, If so, when?

The **MINISTER FOR COUNTRY WATER SUPPLIES** replied: 1, The present arrangement satisfies the requirements of the Constitution, and has been followed for many years, including the period during which the hon. member was Leader of the House. It is not intended to make any change at present. 2, Answered by No. 1.

HIRE PURCHASE AGREEMENTS BILL—SELECT COMMITTEE.

Extension of time.

On motion by Hon. H. Seddon, the time for bringing up the report was extended for one week.

BILL—WORKERS' COMPENSATION.

Second Reading.

Debate resumed from the 2nd July.

HON. SIR CHARLES NATHAN (Metropolitan-Suburban) [4.35]: The general discussion that has taken place in the columns of the Press and in another place, as well as in this Chamber, has, I think, established certain facts and disclosed certain weaknesses in the Workers' Compensation Act and its administration. While hon. members are not entirely in agreement respecting many aspects of the Bill, there is certain points concerning which there is unanimity.

Hon. C. B. Williams: That applies to State ownership?

Hon. Sir CHARLES NATHAN: To clarify my thought and to enable members to understand, if not to appreciate, my attitude towards the Bill, I will set out categorically, those points on which we all agree, irrespective of political creeds. Despite what may be said to the contrary in the hurly-burly of political controversy, I believe that, without exception, members of this House will agree that the worker is entitled to compensation for injury sustained in the course of, or consequent upon, his occupation, and that the compensation should be the maximum industry can afford. I believe we are in agreement, too, that the workers should be adequately safeguarded against either the unprincipled employers who, by devious means, seek to evade their responsibilities, or against those who, through financial stress, cannot meet their obligations. It can also be said without fear of contradiction that, in any measure designed to give effect to Parliament's desire, adequate provision should be made to prevent exploitation by any person or section of the community, whether it be insurance companies, members of the medical profession, those who keep hospitals, employers or employees. There is unanimity of opinion that to ensure the maximum relief to the worker and the minimum load on industry, the cost of administration and operation should, consistent with efficiency, be kept down to the lowest point possible. Regarding the present Act, while there may be a wide divergence of opinion with respect to many phases that it seeks to cover there is a general consensus of opinion

that in its operation, grave difficulties and weaknesses have become manifest, necessitating a complete review of the position in the light of experience gained. It has been said by some hon. members that the Government should not introduce contentious legislation of this description at the present time. For my part, I contend the Government would be shirking their responsibility in the face of facts that are now common knowledge, had they made no attempt to at least rectify the abuses that have become so manifest. The Bill now before the House is a tribute to the Minister responsible for its creation and provides abundant evidence of many months of careful examination of existing data on the part of those associated with him in its compilation. Whatever may be its ultimate fate, I venture to say that the Bill will always be recognised as a valuable stepping stone towards the solution of this most difficult problem. I have no desire to traverse at length the excellent speech of the Leader of the House when submitting the Bill for the consideration of hon. members. Briefly, as I see them, the four main points the Government seek to make their objectives are these: (1) To effect a saving to industry of not less than £150,000 a year; (2) to prevent exploitation by the dishonest; (3) to ensure to the worker the most expert medical and surgical attention; (4) to render compulsory insurance more effective. The Government are of opinion that to achieve these admittedly valuable results, it is necessary to provide for State control, to establish an insurance fund, and to create a State monopoly. It has been claimed that if the Bill becomes law, with the inclusion of the provision for a State monopoly, there will be a saving of £150,000. It would have been more convincing had some details been given to us as to how that amount had been arrived at. That a substantial saving would be effected is evident, but the avoidance of any details leads to the assumption that the specific amount mentioned cannot be regarded as being other than roughly approximate. On the other hand, there is a definite offer from the insurance companies that, subject to the amendment of the Second Schedule, as proposed in the Bill, a reduction of the waiting period, and of medical expenses, too, they will reduce the present

premiums by 30 per cent. The amount collected annually in premiums has been estimated—I believe by the Minister—at £400,000. I understand that, roughly speaking, the amount has been arrived at as follows:—

| | |
|--|-----------------|
| Annual premiums collected by insurance companies | £ 235,000 |
| General insurances transacted by Government other than own employees and excluding mining diseases | 53,000 |
| Insurance, Government employees | 112,000 |
| Total | £400,000 |

As the Government estimate of saving is based on the assumption that a large percentage would be due to the proposed amendments to the Second Schedule, to arrive at a value of the insurance companies' counter proposal, the 30 per cent. reduction should be applied to all premiums collected. Thus, taking £400,000 as the figure, a 30 per cent. reduction is equivalent to a saving of £120,000. To this must be added an amount, which the Government will lose if the monopoly becomes effective, representing the $2\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. tax levied on premiums collected by insurance companies in lieu of company tax. That impost will represent, roughly, £6,000. These two amounts give a total of £26,000, so that, taking an estimate of saving, which it is hoped to make under the State monopoly, as against a figure that can be reasonably verified, there is a paper saving of £26,000. I ask hon. members not to misunderstand or misconstrue my arguments. The most I have attempted to demonstrate so far, by the figures I have quoted, is that the substantial saving it is hoped to make, whether on the Minister's figures or on my own, is not necessarily dependent on that portion of the Bill that seeks to create a State monopoly. During the controversy, reference was made to insurance companies being always unwilling to accept risks under the Third Schedule. Members, particularly those representing goldfields constituencies will not be misled by that argument. Sound insurance business can only be done on an actuarial basis and at the time the Minister in charge would not, or could not, furnish the essential data, and as there was an undoubted contingent liability, possibly of grave dimensions, due

to the pre-existence of silicosis, the extent of which was unknown, what sound business undertaking would be prepared to quote a firm premium against such an undefined risk?

Hon. C. B. Williams: They showed a profit on that risk.

Hon. Sir CHARLES NATHAN: Were the companies not justified in refusing to do so until the necessary data became available?

Hon. C. B. Williams: They showed a profit of £128,000 on the business.

Hon. Sir CHARLES NATHAN: The hon. member should go fishing somewhere else! In any case, provision for compensation for miners' diseases should be entirely removed from the Workers' Compensation Act. I agree with the opinions expressed by goldfields members that the establishment of a provident fund should be the combined responsibility of the industry and the community as a whole, and I trust that the time is not far distant when the Government will move in that direction. The sooner it is done, the better. I am in complete agreement with the principle underlying those clauses of the Bill that seek to create a medical board, realising that this will ensure to the worker the most efficient medical and surgical treatment and, to a certain extent, will minimise malingering. The principle of compulsory insurance is one to which, I believe, we all subscribe, but I agree with Mr. Seddon that, if the Bill reaches the Committee stage, an attempt should be made to tighten or at least strengthen the measure in this respect. Believing that every worker is entitled to protection, I cannot accept the principle laid down by Mr. Nicholson that insurance and compensation should be a matter between the individual employer and his employee. Having accepted the principle of compulsory insurance, it naturally follows that an insurance fund should be created for the protection of employees. This is necessary as a safeguard against either dishonest or unfinancial employers. But I fail to see why the whole of the insurance premiums should need to be accumulated in a common pool to provide the necessary protection. From data already in existence, it would not be difficult to calculate the possible annual liability for claims that might arise under this heading, and even if such a calculation were difficult, a generous provision might well be made in the shape of a percentage of the premiums collected, which

could be set aside as a reserve fund against this contingency. I have in mind the 2½ per cent. which the insurance companies are now contributing to Consolidated Revenue against the premiums being collected, and which, under the Bill, if it becomes law, will cease.

Hon. J. Nicholson: That would answer for the default of some employers.

Hon. Sir CHARLES NATHAN: Exactly. Might not the 2½ per cent. or, if necessary, an increased percentage, be levied, thus creating an insurance fund to provide the necessary reserve for compensating uninsured employees? As an interesting alternative, could not the insurance companies' existing organisations be used to collect insurance business and keep the necessary records, in a manner somewhat similar to that adopted by the acquiring firms when we had a compulsory wheat pool? The point I desire to make is this: It is not necessary to create a State monopoly to provide for this contingency.

Hon. C. B. Williams: As a matter of fact, we are opposed to State trading concerns on principle.

Hon. Sir CHARLES NATHAN: Is the hon. member opposed to them?

Hon. Sir William Lathlain: I am glad to hear the hon. member say that.

Hon. G. W. Miles: That is why he intends to vote against the Bill.

Hon. C. B. Williams: I believe in State trading concerns, but the hon. member does not.

Hon. Sir CHARLES NATHAN: I am in complete agreement with those who believe that a commission, charged with the duty of safeguarding and administering legislation such as this, is absolutely necessary. Under this Bill, however, the commission who would be responsible for the policing of the measure would be actively engaged in the industry and would have a monopoly of the business, whereas their sole responsibility should be to protect the interests of all parties concerned, including the fixing or approving of insurance rates. In other words, the commission should stand in relation to workers' compensation in a somewhat similar position to that of the Interstate Commission of America in relation to privately-owned transport systems.

Hon. C. B. Williams: No matter what the cost to the individual insurer might be.

Hon. Sir CHARLES NATHAN: Finally I come to the proposal to establish a State

insurance department, thus adding still another to the many State enterprises already existing. Reviewing the position of Australia to-day, is not a great deal of the financial stress in which Governments find themselves due to the enormous civil service we have created?

Hon. C. B. Williams: This will be a paying department.

Hon. Sir CHARLES NATHAN: Is not the reduction of the service one of the most serious problems that confront us? In this State, apart from the administrative departments, such as Public Works, Lands, Railways, Mines, etc., we have civil servants engaged in commercial enterprises, manufacturing bricks, milling timber, running hotels, and so on. I have no criticism to offer of the manner in which the internal affairs of State enterprises are conducted. I recognise that men controlling some of those departments are fit to control similar enterprises privately owned and make a financial success of them. But I do say that under the conditions existing, it is impossible for those men to do justice to their departments. While admitting that a State insurance department does not come exactly in the same category as the existing trading concerns, inasmuch as its funds would not find their way into Consolidated Revenue and the department would not be designed to show a profit on its transactions, it does seek to establish the principle of the State socialisation of insurance, and there is no more justification for the creation of a department of State insurance than there would be to provide for the production and distribution by the State of our daily bread.

Hon. C. B. Williams: There is just as much justification.

Hon. Sir CHARLES NATHAN: The only difference is that workers' compensation is a necessity created by statute; the other is a necessity created by the laws of nature. The principle involved, however, is just the same. Holding the views I do as to the pernicious result of Governments entering the field of private enterprise, I am not prepared to sink my principles to the extent that my support of this Bill would demand. Consequently, much as I desire to assist the Government—and I believe I have always supported them in the past, recognising that they are responsible for the administration—I am not prepared to sink my principles to assist the passage of this measure.

Hon. C. B. Williams: You supported the measure to enable the Government to sell State enterprises.

Hon. Sir CHARLES NATHAN: At the same time I regret the necessity for having to oppose the second reading of the Bill.

HON. C. H. WITTENOOM (South-East) [4.55]: I greatly regret that time and circumstances have caused the Government to bring down such a measure. The Minister in another place said it was a workers' Bill. I must say that that is my opinion of it.

Hon. C. B. Williams: If this is a workers' Bill, I am opposed to it.

Hon. C. H. WITTENOOM: It embraces some of the chief beliefs of the Labour Party.

Hon. C. B. Williams: Name one of them.

Hon. C. H. WITTENOOM: One of the chief planks of the Labour Party is that favouring State enterprise in workers' compensation or in any other direction. When the existing Act was passed, workers' described it as the finest measure of its kind in the world.

Hon. C. B. Williams: But this Bill seeks to amend it.

Hon. C. H. WITTENOOM: Does the existing Act make compensation insurance a State monopoly? What are Labour members complaining about?

Hon. C. B. Williams: That is the only good feature of the Bill.

Hon. C. H. WITTENOOM: What is Labour's objection to the Bill?

Hon. G. Fraser: We shall tell you shortly.

Hon. C. H. WITTENOOM: Surely the Bill would improve the Act from the point of view of the Labour Party.

Hon. C. B. Williams: I disagree. That is why the Bill was fought for days and nights in another place.

Hon. C. H. WITTENOOM: I have discussed this Bill with all sorts of people—some who favour it, some who are absolutely opposed to it. I have attended various meetings held to consider it, and there is no doubt that the opposition to the measure has been very strongly organised. I think the organisation has come chiefly from the insurance companies. If the Bill becomes law, the insurance companies will lose much of their business, and, a thing we should all regret, some of their employees would lose their billets.

Hon. C. B. Williams: I thought they were losing money on compensation insurance.

Hon. C. H. WITTENOOM: This is not an experimental scheme; it is operating in many parts of the world. Many of the States of Canada and of the United States have made compensation insurance a State monopoly and that principle has also been established in parts of Australia, more particularly Queensland. The Minister has utilised facilities to ascertain the position in countries that have adopted State insurance, and has put before us a very strong case indeed. He pointed out that in Queensland, which has about 800,000 people as compared with 400,000 in Western Australia, the premiums paid are much the same as those paid here. That appears to be a very strong argument. The position in Western Australia is serious and an alteration is imperative.

Hon. C. B. Williams: I thought you did not believe in State ownership.

Hon. C. H. WITTENOOM: During the last week or so a return has been circulated, by the Government I understand, showing the premiums paid in Western Australia as compared with the other States, covering 50 trades. The return indicates that the premiums paid in this State are the highest, in some instances being two or three times as much. I wish to quote some instances affecting the farming community, in which I am particularly interested. The first I am going to quote deals with clearing. In Western Australia the premium is 250s. per cent. That means to say that if we put on a man to clear 100 acres at £1 an acre, we have to pay for that work actually £112 10s. It is dreadful to think that so much has to be added to the cost of the work. In Queensland the rate is 63s. Then take well-sinking. In Western Australia the rate is 300s. per cent. and again, if it costs £100 to sink a well we have to add to that cost another £15. In Queensland the rate is 72s. When the Bill was first introduced in another place the companies reduced their rates by something like 30 per cent., but they reduced the rates conditionally. That, of course, was a move in the right direction, but the companies do not take all risks. For instance, they do not accept risks in connection with miners' diseases. The position is that in respect of 15 different trades the rates in Western Australia are double

the rates charged in Queensland. I represent a very large province and throughout it there is a demand for an alteration in workers' compensation rates. As a matter of fact, the demand is just as keen as it has been in connection with hire purchase agreements. The Bill itself is a good one and it has been well thought out, except for the fact that we are asked to forego a strong principle, a principle that many of us cannot be expected to abandon. I am opposed to monopolies and always have been against State trading. In this case I have tried to convince myself—and successfully I must say—that this is not State trading. State trading means buying and selling, but in the business we are discussing at the present time, employers are compelled to donate to a fund. There is no profit or loss associated with it. If there is to be a profit it will go, not into revenue, but to a reserve fund. I have been in favour of the disposal of the State trading concerns, and it is a matter for regret that no attempt has been made to sell the costly encumbrances. I do not think any really genuine attempt has been made to get rid of them; they have not been advertised, but I am aware that the Minister has taken steps to bring about their disposal. In my opinion, however, he has not tried hard enough. When the enterprises were started, the country was in a flourishing condition, but even then there was no call for them any more than there is now. At that time there was work for everybody and there was healthy rivalry in all the businesses in which the State embarked. In spite of the fact that everything was done to bolster up those concerns—there were no rents to pay and no rates or taxes—

Hon. Sir William Lathlain: Not even municipal rates.

Hon. C. H. WITTENOOM: Exactly, and in spite of all this, they failed. We do not want to see anything more established in the shape of trading concerns. Whether what we are now debating is or is not a trading concern, it is a monopoly, and I am opposed to monopolies. At the same time, it is a principle that one might consider foregoing on account of the high and excessive rates we have had to pay for insurance. What we have paid is beyond all reason and higher than any of the other States in Australia. For that reason I tried to forego my principle, but I cannot do it.

Hon. J. Nicholson: Is not the rate paid measured by the risk? Have you compared the risks in Queensland with those here?

Hon. C. H. WITTENOOM: Yes, I have compared Western Australia with Queensland and the other States as well. I find that Queensland is the nearest, in respect of rates, to Western Australia. But the services given in the way of medical and hospital attention in Queensland are less than those given here.

Hon. J. Nicholson: You are aware that in Queensland medical expenses are deducted from the compensation.

Hon. C. H. WITTENOOM: I am aware of that.

Hon. J. Nicholson: And are you also aware—

The DEPUTY PRESIDENT: Order! I should like to remind Mr. Nicholson that he is interjecting a lot and that the Chair is aware that he has already spoken on the second reading.

Hon. J. Nicholson: I was merely asking the hon. member for information, because he was departing from his assertion that he had a difficulty in reconciling his conscience—

The DEPUTY PRESIDENT: Order! I shall accept the hon. member's explanation, but I would remind him and other hon. members that interjections are disorderly.

Hon. C. H. WITTENOOM: I am convinced that if the Bill does become law, the premiums we will have to pay will be considerably less than those being paid now, and I am inclined to think that they will be in the vicinity of the rates suggested by the Minister in another place—perhaps half. But like all other trading concerns which started well, this, likewise, may also start well, but we do not know what will happen afterwards. Governments change and opinions, as well as the methods of working, differ. I cannot bring myself to support the monopoly clauses in the Bill. Experience has taught us that once we start these things we never know where we are going to finish. I trust that the clauses will be cut out or that the Government will accept some of the amendments it is intended to move. I should like to see the Bill go through in amended form because we do not want to be saddled with the existing Act any longer. It is killing development in the State. If some of the proposed amendments are carried, I hope the Government

insurance office will remain open. The question has been asked why it is that all insurance has not gone to the State office, because of the fact that the rates are so much cheaper. The only reason I can give is that very few people seem to know that there is a State Insurance Office.

Hon. Sir Edward Wittenoom: Oh yes, they do.

Hon. C. H. WITTENOOM: Then why do they not insure there? There are features of the Bill with which I agree, for instance, that part dealing with medical men and the waiting period. We all are of the opinion that if a man is injured, the compensation that is paid cannot be too big. We can give him all that we can afford, but if the State cannot afford it, then it cannot give. It is like asking a company which has been paying dividends in good times, to continue to pay those dividends when times are bad. Regarding the personnel of the commission, as a layman I have very little fault to find with it. I was surprised to note that the only legal member of this Chamber allowed that part of the Bill to pass without comment.

Hon. J. Nicholson: I think I dealt with it.

Hon. C. H. WITTENOOM: The chairman of the commission is to be the actuary, but in my opinion the chairman should be a man with legal training. The actuary or chairman may or may not have legal knowledge, but in the State Arbitration Court and the Federal Arbitration Court the presidents are legal experts, whilst our local courts are presided over by men with legal training. Surely, therefore, to decide whether an injury arises out of, or in the course of his employment, legal training is necessary. I should say that legal knowledge was more essential than actuarial knowledge.

Hon. E. H. Harris: There is the Crown Solicitor to refer to.

Hon. C. H. WITTENOOM: Many legal points are bound to arise, and it appears to me that those could be dealt with only by one possessing a legal training.

Hon. J. Nicholson: The commission would not determine that; it would be decided by the court.

Hon. C. H. WITTENOOM: The claims have to come in to the commission, and so I am inclined to think that in the chairman legal knowledge is more important than actuarial knowledge. The legal points that

may arise may be very intricate and conflicting, and because of that also I think it would be a good thing to have a legal man as chairman of the commission. I intend to vote for the second reading.

HON. C. B. WILLIAMS (South) [5.16]: I have but little to say. I have only to sympathise with members who voted for the sale of the State trading concerns and who will now be constrained to vote for the second reading of the Bill. Also I wish to congratulate the last speaker on his very decent wriggle as to how he is going to vote for the Bill since it does not square with the motion he voted for on a previous occasion. I will await with interest the voting on the second reading by members who were enthusiastic for the sale of the State trading concerns. I have but an indifferent memory for division lists, but I do recall that we were very few in number who crossed the floor and voted against that motion. If the Labour Party has cast iron rules in caucus, at all events the Nationalist Party and the Country Party must have even more rigid rules for the constraining of their votes on this measure. It is a triumph for the Government when they can bring to heel to vote for this measure those other members who voted for the sale of the State trading concerns. As I say, I await with pleasurable feelings the vote of Sir William Lathlain and other members on the second reading of this Bill. Members have said they would vote against the retention of the State Insurance Office, but would vote for the principles of the Bill in relation to the worker. What they are going to do when the division bells ring I cannot imagine, unless indeed they find themselves conveniently recalled by urgent telegrams to their constituencies. Failing that, they all will have to vote, and so disclose their attitude towards the Bill. I myself am in favour of the retention of the State Insurance Office, but am not altogether in favour of certain provisions in the Bill. Mr. Wittenoom said the Bill was something to which the Labour Party had given their blessing. I am afraid he has not studied even that phase of the question, else he would find that the Labour Party in another place fought this measure for weeks on end. However, the Government had the numbers and so gained the

victory. Also the Government have the numbers here, and are likely to win again. When first I came to the House I thought it was a non-party Chamber, but I soon realised my mistake. According to Mr. Wittenoom, it suits the Labour Party to have the compensation for the loss of a leg just above the knee reduced from £562 to £475, and to reduce the compensation for the loss of a leg below the knee from £562 to £450. Does he really believe that any member of the Labour Party would support this reduction in the compensation to be paid? A man who loses his leg is thrown on the industrial scrapheap for life. Just now we are discussing the worker, who is the lifeblood of the country, and we are told that it is worth to him only £475 if he loses his leg just above the knee. Talk about the depression! We see 1,500 able-bodied men in full possession of their limbs, unable to get work. How, then, is a worker who has lost a leg or an arm to compete with them? Yet it is proposed to reduce that man's compensation from £562 to £475.

Hon. E. H. Harris: That will be for the commission to say.

Hon. C. B. WILLIAMS: And it is for me to vent my disgust that any Government should say to any man who has lost his leg, "We will take from you the difference between £562 and £475, for we say you are just as good a man with the loss of a leg, plus £475." Why, that amount is not a decent wage for one year for a married man with a family. The Government say that in the needs of industry they will amend the workers' compensation so as to reduce the premiums payable. Even the Arabs, and other races that white people look upon as low, treat their cripples better than the white races treat theirs. A one-armed man or a one-legged man is finished industrially, and cannot get work in a State where young men have never been in a job and cannot get any work.

Hon. J. Nicholson: Have you discovered what the Arabs pay by way of workers' compensation?

Hon. C. B. WILLIAMS: I believe the Arabs have lawyers and solicitors in their ranks, and so I think the hon. member could get that information much quicker and better than I could. I merely said the Arabs and the blacks looked after their

cripples better than do the people of the white races. I did not say they paid workers' compensation.

Hon. J. Nicholson: I merely wanted to compare the two scales of compensation.

Hon. C. B. WILLIAMS: Even if I could give the hon. member the information I would not do so, for I am not concerned with any comparison with another country, except from the charitable point of view. It is useless for any hon. member to point to what is done in America or even in South Australia. It does not interest me.

Hon. W. J. Mann: Or New South Wales?

Hon. C. B. WILLIAMS: No, nor New South Wales. I am not a bit concerned. I live here, and I hope to die in Western Australia. That being so, I want Western Australia to set the standard, so that other countries may refer to Western Australia's workers' compensation, not that we should have to refer to what is done in America or Europe. We in this Chamber are here to-day, but next year may be among the unemployed.

Hon. V. Hamersley: There is no more borrowed money available.

Hon. C. B. WILLIAMS: I am not worrying about that. No industry can carry on without a few employees, and if it is not in a financial position to employ anyone at a decent wage, then the sooner it goes out of existence the better for all. I like Mr. Hamersley, who is a member of one of the original Western Australian families whom we can respect because they had to battle in the old days. They battled along, and made this country fit for t'other-siders who came after them. I have every respect for them, but I must confess that Mr. Hamersley is more of a Conservative than I am a Radical.

Hon. G. W. Miles: Impossible!

Hon. C. B. WILLIAMS: I rarely like to give in, even when beaten, but on this occasion I must deny what Mr. Miles has said. Still, I do not take so very much notice of him, because I am for the workers, all for the workers, just as he is all for the men in his own line. I represent a constituency that is half farming. I look upon the farmer as one of the hardest working men in the State, even a harder worker than the miner, from whose ranks I sprang; for the miner works eight hours per day, whereas the farmer works 24 hours if he can get sufficient light. And at the end of 12 months all that he has are his bills. Probably he has to employ some hands, the

harvest being at least too great for him to handle without assistance. He has to insure those hands under the Workers' Compensation Act. Then the cry is raised that he cannot afford this cost. But if the wheat is not worth growing, why put it in? You do not get any trade unionist in Western Australia working for less than the basic wage, because of the Arbitration Court, which fixes the rates of pay. But the farmer very often gets nothing. He is not in a union: he is only an individual, probably having left a trade union and a labouring job to grow wheat. Should he not be just as good a trade unionist in farming as in any industrial life? Should he not say, "I am not going to grow wheat unless it pays"? The farmer gets no fixed price for his wheat, and if he is not able to pay the insurance rates under the Bill, if wheat is not worth growing, the sooner he gets back to a labouring job or gets on to the dole, the better for the State.

Hon. V. Hamersley: But the wheat must be brought in just the same.

Hon. C. B. WILLIAMS: Then it should be worth growing. Some of the electors in my province are endeavouring to farm 60 or 70 miles from a railway. I am not going to tell them that things will come right soon. I would tell them they would be better amongst the unemployed in Perth than growing wheat at the present price and carting it for 70 miles.

Hon. J. Nicholson: What if the State be bankrupt?

Hon. C. B. WILLIAMS: Has it not been a great worry to us all? I expect the State is on the road to bankruptcy; hence this Bill. If we were on that road, how would this Bill prevent it? In what way would it help against such a condition?

Hon. J. Nicholson: Will not this Bill help the farmer?

Hon. C. B. WILLIAMS: How will it help him merely to pay the difference in the premiums on £562 10s. against £475? Would that saving buy him two loaves of bread a month?

Hon. J. Nicholson: It makes a difference of £150,000 a year.

Hon. C. B. WILLIAMS: If an employee lost a limb and had to be compensated for it, the difference between what the farmer has to pay under the present Act and what he would have to pay under this Bill would not buy him two loaves of bread a month. People are not prepared to discuss this Bill

from the point of view of industry, which is the object for which it was brought down. The Government have said, "We will spread the risk of industry over industry." What risk does a member of Parliament run, except that he may swallow a fishbone when at lunch? The risk he runs is very small, except at election times. The risk is to be spread over the whole State, the mining and timber industries, over the wharf lumpers and the coal miners, as well as over the clerks and the shop hands.

Hon. J. Nicholson: It is over a section of the people, not over the whole State.

Hon. C. B. WILLIAMS: It does take in the whole State.

Hon. J. Nicholson: But the insurance comes through the employer.

Hon. C. B. WILLIAMS: I never try to split straws with the hon. member, and will leave to him the interpretation of the words contained in the Bill. The fact is that this measure was brought down with the object of lightening the load of workers' compensation on all our industries. The State Insurance Office has taken certain risks, the roughest of the risk, and has been able to show a profit. The greatest of these risks was in connection with the mining industry. The private companies quoted a rate of insurance for that industry which would have closed it down.

Hon. J. Nicholson: They asked for some data.

Hon. G. W. Miles: Did they give a quote?

Hon. C. B. WILLIAMS: Of course they did.

Hon. J. Nicholson: I do not think they reached the quotation stage.

Hon. C. B. WILLIAMS: It is no use telling me they did not quote, nor that they had not all the data they required. These companies have all the data for all the risks throughout Australia, if not throughout the world. That is their business. They employ an army of people to get it together. They know all the risks they undertake. They knew better than the State Insurance Office what the risks were, and yet the officers of that department, who were drawn from the Public Service and knew nothing about that class of business, were able to make a success of their job. They took on the work from scratch and they quoted a rate that paid the mining industry.

Hon. E. H. Harris: Who quoted a rate?

Hon. C. B. WILLIAMS: The State Insurance Office. It was far below any pre-

mium offered by the private companies, who did not want the business at all.

Hon. E. H. Harris: The ex-Minister for Works said they had refused to quote. Do you deny that?

Hon. C. B. WILLIAMS: I am not here to deny anything in that line. The companies would not take the risk. That means there was nothing they could quote that would compensate them for taking it. The State Insurance Office took over the business and showed a profit of £128,000 on Third Schedule risks. Are members prepared, after carrying a resolution to do away with the State Insurance Office, to sit down for six or eight months and see it continue in operation, and take no steps to have it closed? Why should that office be obliged to cater only for the great risks attendant upon the mining industry, or the wharf lumper or the timber worker. Why should it not be allowed to take the good with the bad? If that were so, the risks charged to the timber industry, the mining industry, in the case of wharf lumpers, and so on, would all come down because the assets of the country would be pooled in one great insurance scheme. I can commend the Government for having thought of this.

Hon. G. W. Miles: You are opposing that.

Hon. C. B. WILLIAMS: A man's leg is worth more than it was two years ago, because he cannot get work to-day. It is no use flogging a dead horse. I now wish to refer to the medical profession. If an accident occurs in the mining industry in Kalgoorlie, no charge is made to the State Insurance Office for medical attention. Should a worker have to be sent to a Perth specialist, a charge is, of course, made, but if a man breaks an arm or a leg no medical expenses are charged against the State Insurance Office. If the doctors in Kalgoorlie, despite the provision of £100 for medical attention, can treat these cases free, why should not medical officers elsewhere treat their patients on a better basis than they do to-day? The Minister should give the medical men in Kalgoorlie a pat on the back for the work they do. They have made no attempt to take anything from the mines by way of extortionate charges.

Hon. E. H. Gray: Doctors have refused to treat patients in the hospitals here.

Hon. C. B. WILLIAMS: They treat them in the hospitals in Kalgoorlie with every attention, all for their 9s. a quarter.

Hon. E. H. Harris: Is that not because the men pay into a fund?

Hon. C. B. WILLIAMS: Let us say what a good class of men we have in Kalgoorlie, seeing that they continue to pay into the fund despite the provision of £100 for medical expenses.

Hon. E. H. Harris: It is a condition of their employment.

Hon. C. B. WILLIAMS: Only so long as the men like it to be. They are evidently just as kindly disposed towards the fund as the doctors and the mine owners are.

Hon. E. H. H. Hall: Might not we educate the rest of the workers in the State to follow the same principle?

Hon. C. B. WILLIAMS: If the hon. member can get the farmers in his Province to work up to the same stage I have got the workers in Kalgoorlie up to, he will be doing something worth while.

Hon. E. H. H. Hall: We have workers in Geraldton beside farmers.

Hon. C. B. WILLIAMS: I now wish to refer to the increase in the earnings, which define a worker, from £400 to £500.

Hon. G. W. Miles: That is done so that members of Parliament may be brought under it.

Hon. C. B. WILLIAMS: If we are a lot of mugs, we shall come down to that. I am not going to vote to have my salary reduced, for I consider I earn every farthing of it. In season and out of season members of this Chamber have said that the workers should be contractors, or piece workers, that they should not be given 15s. a day so that they may sneak around the corner and smoke for half an hour. Let them earn as much as they like so long as they are piece workers.

Hon. G. W. Miles: That is what your friends in Russia are finding out.

Hon. C. B. WILLIAMS: I am not worrying about my friends in Russia except that I wish the workers there well. I believe they are much better off to-day than they were under other conditions 10 years ago. Let us hope they will continue to be more blessed than our unemployed in this State are to-day. We have nothing on Russia, nor on the worst country in the world.

Hon. E. H. H. Hall: Nonsense!

Hon. C. B. WILLIAMS: We have 12,000 people out of work. Where, in proportion to population, is there a similar number? As to the £500 and the man on

piecework, many hon. members say piecework is the only game. I do not agree with them. However, the majority of members of this Chamber say piecework should exist. They say, let a man earn to the utmost of his capacity, earn as much as ever he can for himself and his employer. If a man earning 16s. 6d. per day on wages can earn as much by piecework, should he not be covered by this Bill?

Hon. H. Stewart: Let him cover himself.

Hon. C. B. WILLIAMS: With a blanket? How much does a member get out of his £600 a year? And how much does the working man on £500 a year get if he has a wife and a couple of children?

Hon. H. Stewart: If he is a decent citizen, he should be able to pay an insurance premium.

Hon. C. B. WILLIAMS: There we have the farmers coming along! No wonder the farmers are down where they are when such as that is their mentality! The worker I am quoting is a man who lives and who keeps the State going. He does not hoard his money; he puts it into circulation, thereby keeping the State going. Unfortunately he got into that groove early in life.

Hon. Sir Edward Wittenoom: How much has he in the savings bank?

Hon. C. B. WILLIAMS: I have 9s. Only a very small percentage of working men have money in the savings bank. Piecework is demanded, and a man's best is demanded. I will describe the natural corollary of piecework in the mining industry. A young man, fit and able, can probably earn £2 a day by piecework. But there comes a time when he is relegated to the scrapheap, no longer being able to compete with the young fellows. Then he is back on the 14s. a day. It will be said that he should save his money; but under those conditions the State would be at a standstill, and we would not be able to buy a pair of trousers because there would be no money in circulation.

Hon. Sir Edward Wittenoom: What do the banks do with their money? Surely they use it for something.

Hon. C. B. WILLIAMS: I never had much of it, and I will not now go into the theory of banking. Even if one gets money from the banks, one has to pay the piper in the way of interest. Next week this House

will be faced with a Bill for the compulsory reduction of interest. The banks have not volunteered to do anything of that sort. They have been useful to Australia, but now they have crippled Australia, as the money lenders in general have crippled the world. That is proved by the President of the United States of America saying to the other countries, "We will let you go for 12 months." The reason is that at present the other nations cannot buy wheat. If the worker is good enough to work hard and give the best that is in him and thus earn £500 a year, he should come under this measure. If he does earn £100 more than another man, why should he be placed outside the scope of workers' compensation? Next year he may not earn two shillings. It is a ridiculous proposal to exclude him.

Hon. G. W. Miles: But he is within the scope of the Bill.

Hon. C. B. WILLIAMS: Yes, and I hope the hon. member interjecting and Sir Edward Wittenoom will vote for the retention of that feature. There are members of this Chamber who have sheep. How many shearers earn more than £500 in a year?

Hon. G. W. Miles: You will not give us a chance to vote.

Hon. C. B. WILLIAMS: I will give hon. members every possible opportunity when I see all the twisting and wriggling that occur when the time for dividing comes, twisting and wriggling as to which side to vote on. Another place has been referred to by Mr. Seddon, with whom I quite agree that miners' complaint should not be an accident within the meaning of this measure. In lieu of better provision, it has to be there. If the Bill reaches the Committee stage, I shall move an amendment to dispose of what I have always termed a blot on the Third Schedule to the Workers' Compensation Act. The policy that allows any insurance office, State or private, to send a man who has been dusted in the mines to the Medical Board to say that his compensation shall be 20 per cent. or 30 per cent., according to the amount of dusting he has suffered, is utterly wrong. The result is that when a man applies for compensation on account of dust, he is absolutely finished, and within two or three years will be dead. The Medical Board may say the applicant has a bad heart. In such a case the probabilities are that he has been working for years with a badly dusted lung, so

that the heart has been compelled to work overtime, so to speak, and thus has become bad. Despite the fact that a man is stifling, can hardly breathe, the Medical Board will say that he is only 30 per cent. dusted, and that 70 per cent. of his trouble is due to heart.

Hon. H. Seddon: They even use that excuse to give the man nothing.

Hon. C. B. WILLIAMS: Yes. Apart from one case, that of a man named Davis, who, so far as I know, did not get anything, all the applicants for compensation on account of dust got their money. I shall take up that phase if the Bill gets into Committee. In the event of dust cases not being taken out of the measure altogether, I shall move an amendment to the effect that a man dusted in the mines is to receive his compensation. The present situation is that dusted men, instead of receiving compensation under the Third Schedule, go on working when they ought not to do so. The eventual result is that they become heavily dusted. On applying for compensation, they receive 20, 30, or 40 per cent. The miner who is dusted says to himself, "Why should I accept 40 per cent. compensation?" And he goes on until he has phthisis, thus shortening his life by years. If he were properly cared for under the Workers' Compensation Act he would probably live 10 or 15 years longer. But he knows that it is useless to apply for compensation under the Third Schedule until he is absolutely at death's door. Under the Miners' Phthisis Act the wife, after the death of her husband, gets £2 a week for life and 7s. 6d. for each child under 16 years of age.

Hon. G. W. Miles: Have the State Insurance Office provided for that in connection with their £100,000 profit?

Hon. C. B. WILLIAMS: The reason why the State Insurance Office shows so much profit is that the dusted men have not been taken from the mines. If the doctors said a man was dusted, they would have to declare he was unfit for further work. If he applied for compensation the doctors would say he had 30 per cent. dust. Then he would get only 30 per cent. of £750. He might be a married man with a family, and he would stay in the mines with the certain knowledge that in 12 months' time the laboratory would say he had tuberculosis, and then he would get half wages, and his wife would get £1 a week, and there would be 7s. 6d. for each

child under 16 years of age up to a total of £4 7s. 6d. a week. Finally, if he died, his wife would get £2 a week for life.

Hon. G. W. Miles: That proves that the State has not provided for the risk.

Hon. C. B. WILLIAMS: Private insurance companies would be no better than the State Insurance Office in those circumstances. But the Parliament of this country, and the Government of this country, irrespective of brand of politics, should see that the present system is discontinued in the interests of the health of miners.

Hon. G. W. Miles: That is quite right.

Hon. C. B. WILLIAMS: For the reason I have indicated, very few cases indeed are now brought under the Third Schedule to the Act. As things are, a dusted miner says to himself, "I am done, I am gone." As soon as he receives the notification that he is dusted, he says, "I will do the best I can. I will stop in the mine until I get tuberculosis, and then the wife will benefit." Or he may get £750 less the four per cent. cash by remaining in the mine. It is the duty of the Government to see that that position does not continue. They should adopt a system of insurance on the lines suggested by Mr. Seddon.

Hon. J. Nicholson: Have a separate fund?

Hon. C. B. WILLIAMS: Yes; group the lot. That has been my greatest grievance against both the present Government and the Collier Government. They said that they did not interfere with the operations of the State Insurance Office.

Hon. J. Nicholson: It would have been better to introduce legislation to deal with that phase than to submit the present Bill.

Hon. C. B. WILLIAMS: It would have been much better from the miners' point of view, and probably from that of the State as well. Already the Government are carrying the burden of the men who are diseased as a result of their work in the mining industry, not the State Insurance Office. I have advised many men to seek their compensation and yet they will not follow that course. They prefer to wait until they are passed out of the industry as sufferers from tuberculosis. If those men were to claim compensation they would probably live for six or eight years, yet they prefer to hang on and die in the course of a year or two, simply because they know that their wives and children will get a better deal. I hope that those hon. members who have advocated

piece work will adhere to their principles and say that the man who works so as to earn as much as he can, shall be as much entitled to come under the provisions of the Act as the man who loafs, or at best earns 16s. a day.

Hon. E. H. Harris: Up to what limit?

Hon. C. B. WILLIAMS: There should be no limit. We should not hamper the good worker to that extent. If that worker is able to earn £12 a week, he must be a better man than the individual alongside him who can earn £4 6s. a week only. Why give the latter cover up to £750 and provide the man who can earn £12 a week with no cover at all? That is merely a premium on laziness. The inferior worker is brought within the scope of the Act, whereas the superior man is outside it. There is no logic in that attitude.

Hon. F. W. Allsop: What about the man in an office?

Hon. C. B. WILLIAMS: If it is necessary to safeguard men in that position, it should be easy to do it. I oppose the Bill, and I hope that on this occasion I will be with the majority.

On motion by Hon. H. J. Yelland, debate adjourned.

BILL—STATE MANUFACTURES DESCRIPTION.

Recommendation.

Resumed from the previous sitting. Hon. J. Cornell in the Chair; the Minister for Country Water Supplies in charge of the Bill.

Clause 11—Powers of inspectors:

The CHAIRMAN: Progress was reported on Clause 11 to which the Minister had moved the following amendment:—

That in line 5 of paragraph (d) the word "and," inserted at a previous sitting, be struck out and "letters and documents" inserted in lieu.

Amendment put and passed.

The MINISTER FOR COUNTRY WATER SUPPLIES: I move an amendment—

That a new subclause, to stand as Subclause 2, be inserted as follows:—" (2) No inspector or interpreter shall disclose to any person, other than in the course of his duties under this Act, any information which he acquires in the exercise of his duties."

Several hon. members suggested that the inspectors might gain knowledge that they might be tempted to use outside the scope of their official duties. The amendment will safeguard that position.

Hon. J. T. FRANKLIN: I understand that the Minister claims that under the amendment, formulæ may not be demanded by the inspectors except in compliance with the provisions of the Health Act.

The Minister for Country Water Supplies: Yes.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! Throughout the discussion on the Bill there has seemed to be a misconception. The Bill relates to the manufacture and production of goods in Western Australia as the place of origin, not to their constituent parts.

Hon. J. NICHOLSON: Mr. Franklin seems to be under the impression the Minister said that by agreeing to the new subclause, no demand will be made by an inspector to peruse formulæ.

The CHAIRMAN: That could not be, under the provisions of the Bill.

Hon. J. NICHOLSON: Respecting goods manufactured here, there may be some secret used in the production of the articles, which may necessitate the use of special ingredients. Under the Bill, even with the inclusion of the proposed subclause, the secret method or formula could be inspected. The amendment will amount to nothing more than a pledge of secrecy, but even that is qualified because in the event of the inspector giving evidence in court, he might be called upon to state what he knew and then the secret would be made public. That is wrong in principle, and nothing that the Minister has proposed will safeguard the position.

Hon. E. H. Gray: Why not move an amendment to exempt formulæ from inspection?

Hon. J. NICHOLSON: That might be all right. Why should an inspector have the right of inspecting letters or documents? It is too inquisitorial altogether.

The CHAIRMAN: How could the local manufacture of an article be proved or disproved unless provision were made for access?

Hon. J. NICHOLSON: I do not object to access to the factory, but to the perusal of documents.

Sitting suspended from 6.15 to 7.30 p.m.

Hon. J. NICHOLSON: Any promise by a Minister or any word used in debate has no effect on a court when interpreting an Act.

The Minister for Country Water Supplies: I gave no promise.

Hon. J. NICHOLSON: Then that releases Mr. Franklin. No promise having been given, it is obvious that Mr. Franklin was under a misapprehension.

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

Clause 13:

The MINISTER FOR COUNTRY WATER SUPPLIES: I move an amendment—

That in paragraph (b) the word "and" be struck out and after "vouchers" the words "letters or documents" be inserted.

The amendment would restore the original wording of the paragraph.

Hon. J. NICHOLSON: I oppose the amendment. Mr. Franklin was under the impression that a formula would be accepted. If an inspector found a formula, it would be a document. Where secrecy is required an inspector should not be empowered to see such a document. Otherwise the whole value of a formula would be lost. Inspectors should not be given inquisitorial power that is neither required nor desirable.

The MINISTER FOR COUNTRY WATER SUPPLIES: Evidently several members did not previously understand the purport of the words in question. How could an inspector ascertain the quality of the goods unless he had access to letters and documents?

Hon. J. Nicholson: By going to the factory and seeing.

The MINISTER FOR COUNTRY WATER SUPPLIES: He might be dealing with previous consignments. Any assurance given to Mr. Franklin had no relation to this amendment. Clause 5, providing for a warranty on the sale of marked goods, stipulates goods conforming to the description or definition prescribed in respect of the particular grade mark. Australia has fallen behind because of the quality of goods exported. When a standard of quality is defined, an inspector must have means to ascertain that it is maintained. Under the Health Act wider power is given, and the

formula of a patent medicine would be much more valuable. Has any manufacturer complained of information being disclosed by the Health Department? I urge members to support the amendment because it is one of the most important parts of the Bill.

Hon. H. STEWART: The subclause just inserted practically authorises an inspector or interpreter to give information, and that is the objection to which Mr. Nicholson should pay attention. That amendment will make the measure drastic, and put considerable power in the hands of inspectors. The position would be safeguarded somewhat if the words "other than in the course of his duties under this Act" were deleted from the previous amendment.

The CHAIRMAN: I suggest that the proper way to clear up the matter would be by adding the words "nor be empowered to demand the formula from any person."

Hon. J. NICHOLSON: Once we admit the words "letters or documents" we are undoubtedly giving certain power to the inspector. The formula, of itself, is necessarily a document and it is possible that a formula may be contained in a letter. By leaving out the words "letters and documents" we shall be accomplishing all that is necessary.

The Minister for Country Water Supplies: You will destroy the Bill.

Hon. J. NICHOLSON: Not at all. The Minister overlooks the important fact that an inspector going into a factory does not look at letters or documents to ascertain whether certain goods are being manufactured there.

Hon. E. H. H. HALL: Notwithstanding what the Minister has said, I feel inclined again to vote as I did the other night. We are all jealous of the good name of Western Australian manufacturers and we are anxious to do what we can to preserve it, and to prevent the sale of anything shoddy as an article of local manufacture. At the same time we should be very careful not to give too much power to the officers of the department. Inspectors under the Act are not what may be looked upon as real members of the Public Service, since any man can be appointed an inspector if he happens to suit the Government in power at the time.

Hon. C. B. Williams: Have you any fault to find with that?

Hon. E. H. H. HALL: I have. Such a man is a different type from the officer who has spent the best part of his life in the service and has grown up with it. He has rights and privileges which the recent appointee has not. These officers might become possessed of valuable information which they might be tempted to make use of should they leave the service for some reason or other.

Hon. J. Nicholson: And there might be something very confidential in the letters or documents.

Hon. J. T. FRANKLIN: At the previous sitting the Minister told us that he would submit a clause that would satisfy the Committee that the production of a formula would not be demanded. If the owner of a formula has to divulge its contents, what is the use of his trying to develop the business in which he is engaged? A formula should always be treated secretly. If the Minister does not intend to introduce a clause to meet the situation, I shall vote against the re-insertion of the words.

Hon. J. M. DREW: "Letters and documents" do not necessarily cover "formula." I remember once having seen a formula for the manufacture of pig melon jam written on the end of a kerosene case. I have also seen formulae written on whitewashed walls.

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

| | | | | |
|------|----|----|----|----|
| Ayes | .. | .. | .. | 9 |
| Noes | .. | .. | .. | 11 |

Majority against .. 2

AYES.

| | |
|-------------------|---------------------|
| Hon. C. F. Baxter | Hon. G. A. Kempton |
| Hon. J. M. Drew | Hon. W. J. Mann |
| Hon. G. Fraser | Hon. E. Rose |
| Hon. V. Hamersley | Hon. C. B. Williams |
| Hon. E. H. Harris | (Teller.) |

NOES.

| | |
|----------------------|-----------------------|
| Hon. F. W. Allsop | Hon. H. Seddon |
| Hon. J. T. Franklin | Hon. H. Stewart |
| Hon. E. H. H. Hall | Hon. Sir E. Wittenoom |
| Hon. Sir W. Lathlain | Hon. C. H. Wittenoom |
| Hon. G. W. Miles | Hon. H. J. Yelland |
| Hon. J. Nicholson | (Teller.) |

Amendment thus negatived.

Clause, as previously amended, agreed to.

Bill again reported with further amendments.

BILL—FARMERS' DEBTS ADJUSTMENT ACT AMENDMENT.

Message from the Assembly received and read notifying that it had agreed to the amendment made by the Council.

MOTION—BUDGET ECONOMIES.

Debate resumed from the 1st July on the following motion by Hon. Sir Edward Wittenoom:—

That in the opinion of this House steps should be taken to suggest to the Treasurer economies that may be made to assist in balancing the Budget for 1931-32.

HON. J. M. DREW (Central) [8.5]: Sir Edward Wittenoom, in his anxiety to balance the Budget, would suspend all expenditure on State secondary schools, would stop the grant to the University, would abolish the Arbitration Court and the Agency-General, and would get rid of the State trading concerns, even if he had to give them away. The Leader of the House has delivered a crushing reply to Sir Edward, and I would not have decided to enter the fray were it not that, having had ministerial control of the Education Department for some years, I feel I should not remain silent in respect of the efforts of Sir Edward to prevent the continuance of the good work done by the secondary schools for many years past. Sir Edward's attitude towards the cost of education in this State does not come as a surprise to anyone here. We have been accustomed to it off and on during a long period of time. On previous occasions the hon. member's remarks were not regarded too seriously by the House. There was no one, not even outside the House, who came into the open to endorse the hon. member's views. It is different now. The State and Commonwealth are in the throes of a financial depression, and with that spirit of magnanimity peculiar to human nature, each one is striving to transfer his share of the burden to somebody else's shoulders. There are some, not in this House, who in the name of economy but with the sole object of easing themselves of taxation, applaud the action taken by the hon. member. It should be patent to anyone with a deep-thinking mind that both the State secondary schools and the University are doing valuable work for the country, work which will be reflected

in the higher intellectual standard of our citizens of the future, and in the more scientific building up of the superstructure of the State. This is a democratic country and will remain so as long as the Commonwealth Constitution survives. If it does remain so, it is of the first importance that it should be an educated democracy, capable of intelligent thinking and endowed with a superior judgment so that the people may be able to guide the State and Commonwealth along a bright and prosperous path. I have said that we require an educated democracy. That assertion should be self-evident. An ignorant democracy, armed with the franchise, the most powerful weapon a man or woman can wield, is certainly a menace to orderly government. Disraeli, in the House of Commons in 1874, expressed himself in these words:—

Upon the education of the people of this country, the fate of this country depends. There is no period in the history of the world in which I believe it has been more important that the disposition of the minds of the people should be considered by the State than at present.

At the time he delivered those words, Disraeli was Minister for Education as well as the Prime Minister of Great Britain, and he felt the responsibility of giving voice to those views. If we wish to prevent anarchy, if we wish to preserve freedom and justice, we must train the intellect of those who in the years to come will be entrusted with the liberties and destinies of our people. I will give further extracts from eminent men in support of my contention. President Garfield wrote in a book he published—

Next in importance to freedom and justice is popular education, without which neither freedom nor justice can be permanently maintained.

Edward Everett, a great American orator, in an address to English literary societies in 1835, spoke in this strain—

Beneath a free Government there is nothing but the intelligence of the people to keep the public peace. Order must be preserved, not by a military police nor by regiments of horse-guards, but by the spontaneous concert of a well-informed population resolved that their rights which have been rescued from despotism shall not be subverted by anarchy.

All civilised countries in the world now view education as an imperishable asset to the nation. Every country has come to the conclusion that money spent in education is well expended. Great Britain, the United

States of America, France, Germany, Italy and Japan are all making wide extensions in their systems of secondary education. Like ourselves, the Mother country is suffering from acute depression. She is economising in many ways, but not in education.

Hon. H. J. Yelland: She is increasing her education expenditure.

Hon. J. M. DREW: Yes, she is spending freely on education. England looks far ahead and she sees the danger which would arise from great masses of the people entrusted with the franchise without sufficient mental equipment to enable them to use it wisely and well. In her Budget last year for the purposes of education in England and Wales alone the vote was increased by no less a sum than £3,809,759, while she has increased the vote since 1914, including the period of the war, from £14,660,311 to £45,476,000 in 1930, an enormous increase. Are we here in Western Australia, because of a setback which has no sufficient local origin, which is related to a universal financial disaster and collapse, and which may end as unexpectedly as it began, are we in Western Australia in a moment of panic to deal a blow at the foundation of our future greatness? The object of the establishment of State secondary schools was to provide equality of opportunity for the children of parents with limited means, of parents who were unable to pay the fees charged by private secondary schools.

Hon. H. Seddon: I suppose that is why the children attending the technical schools cannot qualify for the junior examination; they cannot get the necessary subjects.

Hon. J. M. DREW: That is a matter for reform. Amongst the children of the poor, just as amongst those of the rich, there are talented boys and girls. A State secondary school opens the way to their further natural mental endowment. Be it remembered only bright children can gain admission to these schools. The candidates are submitted to severe tests, either through winning scholarships or by means of examinations of the most searching type. Many children of poor parents have passed successfully the ordeal of these tests and have gone on to the University where they have further distinguished themselves. It will therefore be seen that the State secondary schools are filling a place in the community, supplementary to the private secondary schools. Under the nom de plume of "Old Modernian," a con-

tribution appeared in the "West Australian" of recent date. The matter is ably written and the writer furnishes facts that must prove of interest to members. Referring to the Modern School he says—

There are no statistics, but from personal knowledge I can supply information about a group of 37 men who went through the Perth Modern School with me and left nine years ago after a course of either four or five years at that or other State high schools. Eleven of them have since attended the University of Western Australia and four have attended other universities. One died soon after leaving school and the whereabouts of four I do not know. The remaining 32, whose average age is 26 years, are now disposed as follows: Engineers (University degrees) 5, doctors 3, dentists 2, teachers 5, journalists 2, farmers 6 (five in their own interests), commerce 7, law students 2. Of the engineers, four are now working in this State, and the fifth (a Rhodes scholar) who is now engaged in Scotland, is eager to return when opportunity offers. Two of the doctors are in this State, and one who is taking a post graduate course in London will return later. Of the farmers one holds a degree of B.Sc. in agriculture, and one had technical college training in wool. The five teachers are in State schools. Of the seven grouped under commerce, at least two in this State and one in Victoria hold responsible positions. Three or four of the number owing to various causes (such as a breakdown in health), have had changes in circumstances which have affected their work and which, in a strict study, should eliminate them from any calculation. From my personal knowledge I doubt whether any except perhaps three out of the 32, would have been able to enjoy secondary education for five years at a private school charging fees.

Hon. Sir Edward Wittenoom: I did not question the quality of the education.

Hon. J. M. DREW: The hon. member questioned the cost. He said the State could not afford it, and I say the State cannot afford to be without it.

Hon. Sir Edward Wittenoom: We all know that sort of thing. That is by the way. Where is the money coming from?

Hon. J. M. DREW: That is an old story.

Hon. Sir Edward Wittenoom: They are all old stories.

Hon. J. M. DREW: Similar arguments could be used in support of the University, which is also free to the children of the people. This was established through the advocacy of that far-seeing gentleman, the late Sir Winthrop Hackett. Sir Winthrop did not confine himself merely to lip or pen support. In the first place, he made a gift of £18,000 to found a chair of agriculture at the University, and secondly he left a

legacy which proved to be worth something like £420,000. It was the intention of the testator that the money should be devoted to the erection of buildings, and also to assist in the maintenance of deserving students with small means. That was his wish and it has been carried out. These words deserve to be repeated many times, "assistance towards the maintenance of deserving students with small means." They should appeal to every member. Sir Winthrop Hackett did not think the University would be achieving its full measure of usefulness unless, in addition to being free, there was a fund to help students of small means. The University has been opened for 18 years, and there are in that institution the best brains from the State and private secondary schools being further trained. The result is that many who could never have hoped to rise in life have become members of various professions and are a credit to the institution responsible for their elevation. Sir Edward Wittenoom would withdraw the grant to the University and compel it to charge fees. In other words he would bring about its destruction. It would not be possible, as anyone must realise, for the University to carry on with a revenue from the students such as could be received from that source. In one act the hon. member would close the doors of the University in which the student is taught science and its application to our industries, its application to almost every form of human endeavour. The student goes from the University to disseminate the knowledge he has gained, to disseminate it for the benefit of the State, and for the stimulation of its progress and the prosperity of its people. We have to go back to the Crown Colony days to find a parallel for the attitude of Sir Edward Wittenoom on education. Like Mr. Williams, I have a great admiration for the old pioneers who laid the foundations of this State. They endured trials and tribulations which would daunt the stoutest heart, but after investigation I certainly have no admiration at all for their attitude towards education. Let me state a few facts. The Education Department in 1875 was controlled by the Central Board of Education. In their annual report for that year, this paragraph, which is a plea for an increase in the salaries of the teachers, appeared—

Looking at the increased rate of wages that new obtains in the colony and the rising

prices of the necessities of life, we conceive that the teachers—

Thirty pounds a year was what some of the lowest paid teachers received.

—with even the abilities required for such small schools will not readily be found on such terms. The slight increase asked for will, we hope, enable the teachers to exist on their earnings.

Hon. J. Nicholson: It reminds one of Oliver Goldsmith.

Hon. J. M. DREW: Yes, very much. At that time there were 21 Government school teachers in the State receiving under £50 a year and some as low as £30. Despite this starvation wage there was one prominent legislator who raised objections to the proposed increase. This is what he said—

There was a tendency on the part of some people to educate our children to death.

At that time the children in the small schools were only taught the three R's, with grammar and geography optional.

Hon. Sir Edward Wittenoom: When was that?

Hon. J. M. DREW: In 1875; no reflection on the hon. member.

Hon. Sir Edward Wittenoom: I was at a Government school in 1866, and a great deal more than that was taught.

Hon. J. M. DREW: I was referring to small schools. This is all taken from the records.

Hon. Sir Edward Wittenoom: They may not be right.

Hon. J. M. DREW: This prominent legislator went on to say—

The vote was assuming alarming proportions.

The grant was not to exceed £3 10s. per annum for every child who attended 180 days out of 217. A teacher was not paid until the child had attended 180 days out of 217 and unless he passed the examination, and then the teacher received £3 10s. This legislator continued—

And what was the result? Did it tend to give the colony the class of labour it stood in need of? He would guarantee that if the Government advertised for 50 labourers, not loafers, to-morrow, they would not get a dozen applications.

It will be realised that the children were being educated in laziness under this system whereby teachers were receiving £30 a year.

Hon. E. H. H. Hall: What was the school-leaving age then?

Hon. J. M. DREW: It was 14, the same as now. At that time when some of the teachers were receiving £30 a year, and the colony was accused of educating its children to death, an amount was placed on the Estimates making provision for black trackers for the Police Department, and £30 was set aside for the cost of each black tracker. He was placed on the same level as the teacher of children. I am stating facts.

Hon. Sir Edward Wittenoom: What has that to do with my suggestions?

Hon. J. M. DREW: I am endeavouring to show that some of the old spirit still survives. In those days the population of Western Australia was small, about 27,000; but there was a greater percentage of rich men than there is now. The public debt was only £164,000; and the balance of trade was substantially in our favour, and had been for a number of years. That was long before Sir Edward Wittenoom entered Parliament.

Hon. Sir William Lathlain: You do not blame him for the loss of trade, do you?

Hon. J. M. DREW: No. In justice to the hon. gentleman, when responsibility was cast upon his shoulders as Minister for Education, he took the first great step in the advancement of education here. He brought to Western Australia in 1896 Mr. Cyril Jackson, afterwards Sir Cyril Jackson, and placed him in charge of the Education Department. Sir Cyril was one of the ablest men ever in charge of the department. There had, of course, been no one like him previously. He was a new man, and effected many desirable reforms which raised the standard of education. In that work he was encouraged by Sir Edward Wittenoom, though we can scarcely realise that fact to-night. Sir Edward's opposition, however, is not to primary education. He attacks secondary education, and I trust that his attack will fail.

Hon. Sir Edward Wittenoom: My opposition is on the ground of want of money.

Hon. J. M. DREW: I shall vote against the motion, and I trust every other hon. member will adopt a similar attitude, thus preserving education in Western Australia on the same lines as now exist.

HON. F. W. ALLSOP (North-East) [8.33]: I shall vote against the motion. We goldfields members are particularly proud of our goldfields high school, which has done a wonderful amount of good. Mr. Drew has

given some facts about the Modern School, and I would like to quote a few observations regarding the Eastern Goldfields High School—

(1) The Kalgoorlie-Boulder district is the second largest centre of population in the State. This district is roughly 100 miles from the metropolitan area, and is isolated. The Labour Government established this school in 1914 to provide facilities for secondary education similar to the facilities provided in the metropolitan area by the Perth Modern School. Students have attended from places as far removed as Laverton in the east, Southern Cross in the west, and Esperance in the south. But the great majority of the students come from the Kalgoorlie-Boulder district. The success of the school was assured from the beginning. The sacrifices which parents make in order to give their children an opportunity of receiving a secondary education are the best indication of the value of education, and the parents on the basic are prepared to make this sacrifice. (2) The scholastic record of the G.H.S. show that suitable material for secondary education exists on the goldfields. If the school record is a guide, the mentality of the goldfields people is much above the average. Since 1917 the school has won 19 Government University exhibitions. Two of the exhibitors became Rhodes Scholars for Western Australia. Three science teachers scholarships have been won by students of the school. These scholars are trained at the University to become science teachers in the State schools. Approximately 200 students have gained the leaving certificate of the Western Australian University, after completing the five-years secondary course. A great number of these students have become trained teachers in the Education Department. Approximately 500 students have gained the junior public certificate of the Western Australian University after completing the first three years of the secondary school course. Students who have passed through the school are now occupying positions of distinction:—The school has produced two Rhodes Scholars. One is at present at Oxford. Two exhibitors after completing their University course at the Western Australian University went to Cambridge University. Our first exhibitor, Miss Lavater, was a distinguished mathematical student of Cambridge. The other exhibitor, Mr. J. Cairns, B.Sc., is at present doing research work under Sir John Rutherford. He will be the first ex-student to receive the Cambridge degree of Ph.D. Mr. Cairns has contributed some papers to science societies in England and in the U.S.A. Two ex-students are engaged in chemical research work on behalf of the Federal Government. Ex-students are now doctors, civil engineers, and journalists. All the banking institutions on the goldfields have received a great number of their junior staff from the school. Ex-students are in the Commonwealth Railway Department. One ex-student became a senior lecturer at Duntroon Military College, and

another a paymaster lieutenant in the Royal Australian Navy. A great number of ex-students are now teachers in the Education Department of the State. One occupied the position of Senior Lecturer at the Teachers' College. Professor Ross has frequently mentioned at public functions in Kalgoorlie that the U.S. has produced some of his best students in mathematics and physics. The school has a State-wide reputation for its record of achievement at the University examinations.

Those are some of the achievements of our high school on the goldfields, and they make us regard the institution as worth fighting for. Many years ago, in Johannesburg, I was one of the foundation members of the Chemical and Metallurgical Society there; and a few years later I became a vice-president of the corresponding institution in Victoria. It is recognised that a man entering upon a science course is wasting his time unless he has acquired a fairly good secondary education. The Hon. T. Walker, Minister for Education in 1914, at the official opening of the Eastern Goldfields High School took as his text for a brilliant speech, "Let there be light." He was not one who thought that what was good enough for past generations was good enough for the present. Running back along those lines, we rapidly get to a period when there was no Education Act, when the conditions of life for the great mass of the people were a disgrace to the governing class. However, secondary and other education has done a great deal to remove that reproach. Our high schools now take children from 13 to 18 years of age. They fill in the gap between the primary school and the University. Without this provision there would be no goldfields or other high schools, and many children now going through the secondary schools would be running about the streets, and many of the boys would become larrikins. The Ballarat School of Mines was perhaps the only school of mines in Australia 40 years ago; and when the Broken Hill mines were discovered, young men from all over Australia came to that school for tuition. The chemists and metallurgists required at Broken Hill were largely imported from other parts of the world; but the Ballarat School of Mines and other institutions of the kind which came later, have rectified that position. Australia now supplies some of the best chemists and metallurgists in the world. Wonderful progress has been achieved. As I stated in a speech I made some time ago, the successful flotation

of the Wiluna mines is due to scientific men, and we could not have had scientific men in the absence of sound secondary education. That is why I battle for the Eastern Goldfields High School. Germany is the first great example of recognition of the value of education. After her crushing defeat by Napoleon at Jena in 1806, she commenced the series of reforms which led to her future greatness. She educated her people. The second great instance is the United States of America. America has poured out her wealth in building schools and training her citizens. In fact, all the great modern States regard education—not primary, but secondary, technical and University—as one of the most important of their duties. In Kalgoorlie we have endeavoured to get our young fellows to take the secondary course even before going to the school of mines. The secondary course tides them over the difficulty of lack of sufficient education. A scientific course, following a course in secondary education, has enabled many of our young fellows to secure appointments in the metallurgical and chemical branches of the mines. Thus we keep our young men in the State, and increase the wealth of Western Australia.

HON. E. H. H. HALL (Central) [8.42]:

The thanks of the House are, in my opinion, due to Sir Edward Wittenoom for moving this motion, which is not what the remarks of the two previous speakers might lead one to believe. In order to get back to what the motion really is, I will, with your permission, Sir, read it:—

That in the opinion of this House steps should be taken to suggest to the Treasurer economies that may be made to assist in balancing the Budget for 1931-32.

Certainly Sir Edward Wittenoom devoted most of his time to a criticism of our present system of education, and there is not the slightest doubt that the remedies suggested by him are drastic. I repeat, however, that our thanks are due to the hon. member, if for no other reason than that for once at least Professor Murdoch has been induced to adopt a serious vein. Still, I wonder whether the professor was really serious in that "Bright Idea" article he contributed to the "West Australian." Many of us have enjoyed week by week in the Saturday issues of that journal the Scottish humour and satire with which the professor is so amply en-

dowed. It is only fitting that Mr. Drew, who has for so many years been the Ministerial head of our Education Department, should make the speech he did in defending the department. Sir Edward undoubtedly is fully able to express his meaning, and he did not leave the House in any doubt. I do not profess to be able to interpret the feelings of the city—I do not say this in any narrow-minded way—but all these advantages are in the city's way. There is the Modern School, for instance. Country people who wish to take advantage of that institution have to pay for the board of their children while attending the school. The same thing applies to their children attending the University. It need not be thought that I particularly want to cut down the Education Vote, but the feeling that is uppermost in people's minds to-day is, I think, that we should take steps definitely to ascertain whether we are getting value for the money we spend on education.

Hon. H. Seddon: Now you are getting to the point.

Hon. E. H. H. HALL: For raising this phase, we are indebted to Sir Edward Wittenoom.

Hon. H. J. Yelland: How would you measure the value of education?

Hon. H. Stewart: By the ethics of the community.

Hon. E. H. H. HALL: I will endeavour to give members some indication of what I mean. I will not go back to the days of Disraeli, nor will I go to Johannesburg, or even to the School of Mines at Kalgoorlie. Incidentally, people say, and rightly so, "What does this fellow Hall know about education?" Mr. Deputy President, he knows nothing about it.

Hon. G. Fraser: Then they would not be far wrong.

Hon. E. H. H. HALL: I left school when I was 11 years of age. Had I had more go in me, I could have done a jolly sight better for myself.

Hon. E. H. Harris: Do you intend getting down to the motion?

Hon. E. H. H. HALL: I shall quote the opinions of some of the leading educationists of the State. Here is a report that

appeared in the "West Australian" of the 11th December, 1929:—

Australian Culture.

A Professor Wonders.

Speaking at the annual graduation ceremony of the Kindergarten Union of Western Australia yesterday, Professor A. C. Fox questioned what results in general culture in Australia had been attained by education. Had the thousands of students turned out from universities had any effect on the standards of the community? Addressing the graduates, the professor reminded them that even though they had completed three years at the college their education had only just begun. Those who had given time to training them could not do very much for them, for education could only help persons to help themselves. When the low standard of taste of the people of Australia in general was considered, when it was seen how little they seemed to care about the important things of life, it was to be questioned what return the education of youth was bringing. For many years past universities in Australia had been turning out thousands of graduates. Sydney University was 70 years old; Melbourne was nearly as old, and Adelaide was only a score of years behind; while the University of Western Australia was opened in 1912. It seemed that, in view of the fact that universities had been pouring out during those years such a large number of presumably educated people, those people should have made a far greater impact on the general community than they appeared to have done. He often wondered whether their failure to do so was due to the fact that they did not continue their education after graduation and whether they still read the type of book which, as students, they were compelled to read. Apparently a good many of them did not. Having had their fill they thought they might rest on their oars. Those who had charge of the training of students must sometimes wonder whether they had not failed in their task if they had not created a more permanent taste for culture and education. They might comfort themselves, however, with the reflection that no teacher could do more than help students to help themselves.

That is the opinion of one of the professors at the University of Western Australia, and he is wondering whether we are getting value for the money we spend on education.

Member: What is he a professor of?

Hon. H. Stewart: Psychology.

Hon. E. H. H. HALL: Here is another report that appeared in the "West Australian" on the 19th December, 1929:—

Children and Reading.

University Lecturer's Criticism.

"It was with interest that I noted in 'The West Australian,' the coincidence of the re-

marks of the Director of Education and of Miss Walton, on schoolgirls' studies," said Dr. M. A. Clarke, M.A. (Lecturer-in-Charge of French and German at the University) yesterday. "Not only did they coincide with one another, but with the impression conveyed to me in a month's recent contact with schools. The Principal of the Methodist Ladies' College spoke of a decline in reading, and the Director of Education of a decline in tenacity. I have to note the uniformly low level of attention in reading, which points to both these things. Seldom are boys and girls able to exert enough attention to comprehend a page of print which they have to read and upon which they are to be questioned. They seem to be under the impression that accurate understanding is not important, that attention can be dispensed with, that the effort to understand is far too great to demand of them. It is this most important faculty of attention, quite essential to effectiveness of any kind, that is everywhere in abeyance. Where a confusion can be made or a point missed, they miss the point, they make the confusion. And if five years' book and subject study cannot develop attention what can it do, and what is it setting out to do? Attention is not an easy thing. It would be one of the claims to usefulness of our education if it could be said to have developed it. Reading is not an easy thing—so much so that the greatest minds have generally found it hard exercise. Our young people seem to be under the false impression that it is easy, and that it can be done without the brain. If they continue like this, they will provide the State with a generation of citizens incapable of thinking accurately and disinclined to think at all—with a generation of sheep at the mercy of any opinion or impression. The prospect is not cheerful. Their sublime ignorance of the world and lack of imagination about it are equally striking. Current facts that everyone must know if he is to live the life of an intelligent being on the earth are beyond their ken. General knowledge is no aim in itself, but some general knowledge, besides being necessary to life, would have resulted from a decent amount of reading for the Leaving Certificate. This sort of learning up of just enough facts to reply to examination papers in precisely the number of subjects necessary to acquire a certificate—this sterilising of curiosity—will not only fail in its avowed object, but will ruin the intelligence for life."

Perhaps one of the most severe critics has been Professor Murdoch himself. Amongst the educationists of the State, Professor Murdoch has been in hot water because of his outspoken references to examinations. Those who have read the professor's articles in the "West Australian" know that he has no time for the system of examinations adopted in this State. My knowledge of boys in connection with the business with which I have been associated, has not been

very extensive, but half-a-dozen of them have passed through my hands immediately upon their leaving school. I must confess that I have been much surprised at what appeared to me to be the outcome of our much vaunted education system. Certainly they were boys educated in a country school, and not in a city school. Recently, just prior to the inspection by the Premier, I was passing along James-street and could not help being proud when I saw at the Perth Boys' School such a fine body of lads, naked to the waist, who were going through their physical exercises. In common with others, I thought how fine it was that their bodies were being looked after as well as their minds. However, Mr. Deputy President, as I walked further along I saw the future mothers of our race huddled up in corners eating pies and other sweetmeats. It occurred to me that if it were necessary for us to put our boys through physical exercises such as I had seen, was it not equally necessary for our girls to be put through their exercises as well?

Hon. J. M. Drew: They are.

Hon. E. H. H. HALL: Certainly the girls were not being put through their exercises that morning, and we have not read of our girls entering into competitions for shields like our boys. Then, again, are those exercises confined to the boys at Perth Boys' School?

Hon. J. M. Drew: They are not.

Hon. E. H. H. HALL: I have seen the boys at the Geraldton school being put through their exercises, but I doubt whether the practice is carried on to the same extent in the country schools as in the city.

Hon. J. M. Drew: It is done in most places.

Hon. E. H. H. HALL: I will accept the hon. member's word because he was formerly a Minister for Education. At the same time I have not read much about it in the Press. Regarding the grant to the University of Western Australia, while conditions are as they are in the country, the position should be reviewed. I will not ask the House to take my word for it but I will quote the opinion of Professor Cameron, who is the Professor of Education. In an article he said—

Educational authorities tended more and more to supply necessary materials for teaching. There was a bad tradition in the schools which maintained that teachers should themselves make all their teaching aids. How

futile this would be in the case either of a carpenter or a surgeon. Teachers sometimes spent hours in making teaching aids which could be bought for a few pence and which reached a higher standard of production. "In the supervision of schools," added the lecturer, "the older type of inspector is gradually disappearing. No longer is it the function of an inspector to dictate methods of teaching."

I will quote Professor Fox again—

Despite the general appearance of this article, I do not believe that no person in Australia is thinking about them, but the number of thinkers is relatively small, they need more courage in expressing their views, and those who have nominal charge of our public affairs should pay more heed to those who care for the things of the spirit. The development of a robust spiritual life is the only ideal that will lead us to national greatness.

Dealing with that phase of the question, I say with a great degree of thankfulness that the present Director of Education, Mr. Wallace Clubb, has assured me on more than one occasion that his instruction to the teachers throughout the State is that character building shall be placed first. We are indeed fortunate in having a man of the calibre of Mr. Clubb in charge of our education system.

Hon. Sir Edward Wittenoom: He is a very good man.

Hon. E. H. H. HALL: Ever since the days of Mr. Cyril Jackson we have been fortunate in the Directors of Education in this State. Despite that fact, the question whether the State schools are giving value for the money spent is one regarding which I have grave doubts. From the evidence that has come before me, I am forced to view the position with suspicion. Coming back to my references to what I saw at the Perth Boys' School, I met a gentleman who is at the head of one of the large State departments. I remarked to him what a fine sight it was, and we commenced talking about education. I can assure the House that it was with no feelings of pleasure that that officer told me, without any promptings on my part, the education that the children were receiving had not been disclosed in those who had sat for examinations under him. The officer concerned—naturally I shall not mention his name—has to conduct examinations of candidates for certain branches of the Public Service. Of ordinary simple tests he said they made a frightful job. Many of us are asking the

same question that the professor has asked. After all this expenditure on education, is the life of the community any better for it? When Mr. Drew was speaking, Mr. Williams asked, by way of interjection, at what age children had to go to school in the times to which he was referring. The hon. member comes from Victoria.

Hon. C. B. Williams: Not a bad place.

Hon. E. H. H. HALL: I was about to say that. It would have come much better from me, being a Groper. I have always regarded Victorians as being well educated people. In those days, and in my day, we could leave school whenever we liked.

Hon. E. H. Gray: You do not suggest that that is a good thing.

Hon. E. H. H. HALL: Of course not. Though I did not enjoy the advantages of a good education, it will be my object to see that other people do. Education to-day is compulsory and free. In my day we had to take our twopence to school every Monday morning. Mr. Alfred Carson, of the "West Australian," was one of my teachers, and no doubt he used to curse the twopences. Notwithstanding the bad times now prevailing, many people could afford to contribute towards the great cost of education. If the people practised a little more self-help it might even be possible to increase the education facilities.

Hon. C. B. Williams: How much could the 12,000 unemployed put in?

Hon. E. H. H. HALL: A gentleman from Victoria said of our University that that which people get for nothing they seldom value. That may not be true. It has been said that students roll down to the University in their motor cars. That may not be true, either, but the advantages afforded to students at present make it incumbent that the people who can should contribute something towards the cost of those advantages.

Hon. C. B. Williams: If they cannot contribute, what then?

Hon. E. H. H. HALL: Those who desire advanced education should not be denied it.

Hon. C. B. Williams: You would make it a charity.

Hon. E. H. H. HALL: We have thrown open wide the doors of the University. The other day a farmer in my district told me that his wife was a graduate of the University. "Why on earth does she want to know about all the things she learnt there?"

he asked. "She is a good wife, and she can look after the fowls, but she did not require a University education to enable her to do that." I do not think he was quite serious in that statement. Education is good for anybody, whether a farmer's wife or anyone else. What I am concerned to ascertain is how have we benefited the national life of the country by this expenditure on education? We had an example in New South Wales not long ago when Mr. Lang said, "Vote for me and give me place and power, and I will give you 7s. 6d. a bushel for your wheat." Is that one of the results of our compulsory, free and much vaunted education system? The proof of the pudding is in the eating of it. At the picture shows it is often impossible to get a seat, and the minds of young people are being polluted by a lot of films that are screened there. It is time people seriously inquired where our much vaunted system of education is leading us. In the Old Country there may be some excuse for thousands of people assembling to watch a football match. Perhaps there are not sufficient grounds to enable all who would to play. In Australia, however, it is sport, sport all the time. I am no spoil-sport. I acknowledge that even Cecil Rhodes stipulated that, before a student could win one of his scholarships, he must excel in sport. But there is a medium in all things. The other day Lord Somers said that too much prominence was given to sport in Australia.

Hon. C. B. Williams: We do not want to take much notice of the average Englishman. We are ahead of him.

Hon. E. H. H. HALL: The hon. member is entitled to his opinion. The "West Australian" of the 12th June contained an article by "Dad" entitled "Youth Outlawed; Breeding a Race of Labourers," an article that every member should read. It stated—

As it stands, our educational system must be regarded as a partial failure. The country spends hundreds of pounds in educating each child, only to turn it adrift at school-leaving age to shift for itself. A boy with a scientist's brain may find a job in a fruiterer's, if he can. The finding of careers for our children at school-leaving age should be the nation's job, and a Royal Commission might investigate, with advantage to this country and future civilisation, the part that the Education Department should be empowered to play in determining the mental qualifications and penchants of children of school-leaving age, and in determining the careers

that those children should follow to best realise their assets to themselves and their country.

The DEPUTY PRESIDENT: From what is the hon. member quoting.

Hon. E. H. H. HALL: From a newspaper article.

The DEPUTY PRESIDENT: An article dealing with this question?

Hon. E. H. H. HALL: Yes.

The DEPUTY PRESIDENT: Standing Order 390 provides that no member shall read extracts from newspapers or other documents referring to debates in the Council in the same session.

Hon. E. H. H. HALL: Do you rule against my reading it?

The DEPUTY PRESIDENT: I hope the hon. member will be brief and use the article only by way of illustration.

Hon. C. B. Williams: Is the writer of the article an authority?

Hon. E. H. H. HALL: It does not matter whether he is or not. Mr. Drew considered the article good matter.

Hon. C. B. Williams: I am not taking any notice of Mr. Drew on this question.

Hon. E. H. H. HALL: That shows a want of commonsense. The article continued—

"Real national issues declare themselves and come out of that deep which we call public opinion," wrote Garfield. The Rights of the Young are becoming a national issue in this country, swelling up from the depths of many tortured parental hearts. As a twig is bent, the tree is inclined. To thinking men and women the spectacle of a whole generation of youth growing up unprovided for—in fact, it can be almost said with truth, "outlawed" by the industrial laws of the land—is a source of unrest. Decent men's conscience tells us that we ought to be up and doing. Yet so much that can be done lies first with the Legislature.

Another extract from the article stated—

In no time in West Australian history was the thoughtless selfishness of our labour laws more apparent than now. Our labour laws, revealed in all their cruelty in this depression, are driving terror into the hearts of parents, who cannot place their children in any trade or occupation, and who know that the passing of the months only makes the problem, in face of our "payment by age" and anti-junior craft awards, increasingly difficult. Nobody would seriously suggest that the trades union movement of this State is consciously depriving the workers of bread and the rising generation of opportunity. Yet, in fact, by its persistent opposition to part-time labour (the rationing of work) and its implacable objection to junior labour, thou-

sands of adult workers are to-day, in mental agony, living on sustenance, and thousands of boys and girls are advancing beyond the age when it will be profitable for employers to employ them.

It is some time since the Big Four visited Australia.

Hon. C. B. Williams: Give us something new. They are dead.

Hon. E. H. H. HALL: They did not speak of the education vote, but they spoke of the Arbitration Court, and the article I have quoted deals with both those subjects. I am pleased that Mr. Drew considered the article good matter. He was formerly Minister for Education, and is in a position to judge. My daughter, who is about 13 years of age, is studying for her leaving certificate. Some of the books she requires are—"Social Life," 3s. 9d.; "Modern World," 3s. 9d.; "Nature in Farming," 3s. 9d.; and "Gentlemen of France," 2s. 6d. Last year she required books costing £1 1s.; this year the cost of her books is £1 2s. 2d.

The DEPUTY PRESIDENT: The motion provides for suggested economies to the Treasurer.

Hon. E. H. H. HALL: The cost of books is very much to the point. The question has been ventilated in the Press from time to time, and something should be done. Not even our Nationalist friends, who are strongly opposed to State enterprises, have had anything to say about it.

Hon. Sir William Lathlain: What about the Country Party members?

Hon. E. H. H. HALL: Here is a Government concern that is operating against private enterprise, and Nationalist members have closed their eyes to it for years. I refer to the Government Printing Office.

Hon. C. B. Williams: And now we are going to have a State insurance office.

Hon. E. H. H. HALL: I suggest that an inquiry be made into the management of the Government Printing Office. If this were done, it might be possible to effect economies somewhat on the lines of those recently effected in the Railway Department.

Hon. E. H. H. Harris: What about the cost of "Hansard."

Hon. E. H. H. HALL: Sir Edward Wittenoom, in moving his motion, first dealt with education and then the Government grant to the University. While our people in the country are suffering we must call upon the people who are getting the advan-

tage of University education to help in this time of need. That will have to be done.

Hon. G. Fraser interjected.

Hon. E. H. H. HALL: The hon. member may indulge in as much sneering as he likes. He is a young man, but time will enable him to overcome that. Thirdly, Sir Edward spoke of the Arbitration Court. I do not know that I can go so far as the hon. member in saying that the Arbitration Court should be abolished. The president and his colleagues have frequently said they were there to carry out the Act as it stands. If those people, who are continually calling out for the abolition of the court want to do something useful, they can have the Act amended.

Hon. C. B. Williams: Do you suggest we should abolish the court?

Hon. E. H. H. HALL: Not without first trying to improve it. The position could be improved in many ways, and the Act could be made more in conformity with our present needs.

Hon. J. Nicholson: Would you suggest the suspension of the court?

Hon. E. H. H. HALL: I do not know that I would suggest that. With regard to compulsory voting, this House is of more importance to the people than another place because it represents those who have to pay. Those have to pay should have the say. Whilst I do not believe in compulsory voting, I think if people do not take sufficient notice of the affairs of their own country to put their representatives into Parliament, we are better off without them. Sir Edward Wittenoom has had first-hand knowledge of the Agent-Generalship. There again I do not know that I could agree to that post being abolished, but I am afraid if the duties of the office are handed over to a High Commissioner we might suffer.

Hon. C. B. Williams: We would be treated in the same way as we are being treated now by the Federal Parliament.

Hon. E. H. H. HALL: We have a big and undeveloped State, and we hope things will not always be as bad as they are now. We might endeavour to keep our Agent-General as long as possible, especially as just now there would not perhaps be as many tea parties as when Sir Edward Wittenoom held the position in London. One thing the hon. member did not refer to. I notice that last Easter when farmers were having a busy

time trying to get super., and the banks had to be approached, all these institutions were closed on the Tuesday, in addition to the previous Friday, Saturday, and Monday. That was altogether out of reason.

The DEPUTY PRESIDENT: Is the hon. member going to connect that line of thought with the motion?

Hon. E. H. H. HALL: Most certainly. The holidays which the banks enjoy hamper the operations of those people who are endeavouring to reduce the costs of production. The matter has been referred to in the metropolitan Press, and the Chamber of Commerce, because of the fact that there were bank holidays on four of the Mondays in last month, have drawn the attention of the Government to the matter, and asked them to take action. I hope the Leader of the House will not wait for that, but will see that it is the duty of the Government to reduce bank holidays in this State. I support Sir Edward Wittenoom in his desire to effect economies, but cannot adopt his drastic suggestions regarding education. At this time we want to be careful to see that the money spent on education returns its full value in every sense of the word. There is a danger that we are trying to cover too much ground in our State school curriculum, and have gone in for too many frills instead of trying to give the children a thorough grounding in those things which will fit them to play their part in life.

On the motion by Hon. H. J. Yelland, debate adjourned.

House adjourned at 9.21.

Legislative Assembly,

Tuesday, 7th July, 1931.

| | PAGE |
|---|------|
| Questions: Pig Industry | 3704 |
| Taxation, Fremantle Harbour Trust surcharge | 3704 |
| Petrol, Commonwealth Oil Refinery | 3705 |
| White City Garage | 3705 |
| Leave of absence | 3705 |
| Motions: Collic coal industry, Order discharged | 3705 |
| Gold bonus, reduction | 3710 |
| Bills: Debt Conversion Agreement, Com. | 3705 |
| Firearms and Guns, returned | 3710 |

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

QUESTION—PIG INDUSTRY.

Midland Junction Sale Yards.

Mr. THORN (for Mr. J. I. Mann) asked the Minister for Agriculture: In view of the rapid development of the pig industry, and the consequent congestion at the Midland Junction sale yards, will the Government make immediate provision for the erection of additional pens in order to cope with the ever-increasing demands of pig raisers?

The MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE replied: This matter is receiving earnest consideration at the present time.

QUESTION—TAXATION.

Fremantle Harbour Trust Surcharge.

Mr. SLEEMAN asked the Chief Secretary: 1, Is he correctly reported in the "Daily News" of 27th June, under the heading "Notable Speech by Mr. Norbert Keenan," as having stated at Merredin—(a) "The Federal tariff is the main factor. Its incidence has been the main cause of the cost of living reaching the dizzy heights of 1929, What then is to be done to achieve such a revision of the tariff?" (b) "I can see no ray of hope for Western Australia with the present Federal tariff blocking completely the road to safety and the path to reconstruction"? 2, In view of the amount, £193,000, paid into Consolidated Revenue last year from the operations of the Fremantle Harbour Trust, does he intend to continue using this utility as a taxing machine? 3, Has he made representations to