

we were allowed to advertise, say, in Colombo or some of the other States, we might persuade many visitors to come to our towns. This would be of benefit not only to us but to the State in general.

Hon. J. Nicholson: Cannot the money be provided from the 3 per cents?

Hon. C. H. WITTENOOM: What then would be left for entertainment purposes? It might be difficult to get a mayor then. I represent a very large province and the people settled within it live mostly by the growing of wheat, wool and fruit. There never has been a time when the men on the land required so much assistance. They do not want assistance to get the basic wage, or anything of the kind. They want help so that they may remain on the land until either the price of their products has improved or the cost of producing them has decreased. Already there are signs of a decrease in the cost of producing wheat and wool, and I hope it will not be long before there is a definite reduction in the cost. I am pleased that the Government recognise the fact that they must not waste money in these times, and in this respect I was glad to notice a little while back that the work that has been going on in the vicinity of the Causeway, where a lot of machinery was in use, has been stopped. The object of the work was merely to beautify that locality. We cannot afford to carry on that kind of undertaking just now. A considerable sum of money has already been spent there, but of course the construction of the work was authorised at a time when money was plentiful. I am not in favour of the suggestion that money should be spent in the direction of carrying out improvements on Mount's Bay Road at the present stage. I noticed a reference in a newspaper the other day to the supposed urgency of this work. The paper advocated the construction of a retaining wall and the carrying out of a certain amount of reclamation. The road as it is has been good enough for all purposes for a considerable time past and a work of that character can be allowed to remain in abeyance. One other matter to which I wish to refer is the question of the reduction of the salaries of members of Parliament. I am certainly in favour of a reduction and I am glad that other members have alluded to the subject. I did not intend to mention it because I am one of the fortunate members who do not have to depend on their salary. I feel that I could never agree to

a reduction all round in salaries and wages unless we in Parliament set the example by first reducing our own. If it is the intention of the Government to submit a Bill having for its object a reduction of members' salaries, it will receive my support. I support the motion for the adoption of the Address-in-Reply.

On motion by Hon. W. T. Glasheen, debate adjourned.

*House adjourned at 5.4 p.m.*

## Legislative Assembly,

*Thursday, 28th August, 1930.*

	PAGE
Questions: Unemployed; picking-up methods ...	104
Insurance Coy.'s deposit ...	105
Government employees, retirement ...	105
Federal roads grant ...	105
Address-in-reply, fourth day ...	105

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

### QUESTION—UNEMPLOYMENT.

#### *Picking-up Methods.*

Mr. SLEEMAN asked the Minister for Industry: 1, What is the policy of the Government for picking up men for work in the country? 2, Are men to be picked up through the bureau, on the job, or around the streets? 3, How many men have been despatched to Denmark in the last few days? 4, Where were they picked up?

The MINISTER FOR INDUSTRY replied: 1, The policy of the previous Government has not been materially changed, except that preference to unionists does not prevail. 2, Answered by No. 1. 3, 25 men. 4, These men were selected by the supervisor in charge of the Nornalup Land Settlement Scheme from unemployed married men resident in the metropolitan area, to undertake preliminary work.

### QUESTION—INSURANCE COMPANY'S DEPOSIT.

Mr. NORTH (for Mr. J. MacCallum Smith) asked the Premier: As the Treasury holds £5,000 belonging to the Community General Assurance Company, Ltd., now some months in liquidation, what do the Government intend to do to satisfy claims of Western Australian policy holders?

The PREMIER replied: A local liquidator has not been appointed. The official liquidator in Sydney advises that he is applying to the court for direction, and will advertise for claims thereafter. In the meantime, the deposit of £5,000 is being retained.

### QUESTION—GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES, RETIREMENT.

Mr. HEGNEY asked the Premier: 1, Is it the policy of the Government to retire all salaried and wages employees over 65? 2, If so, why have the Government departed from this policy in making a recent appointment to the Licensing Bench? 3, If not, why have so many wage earners, who were giving full value for their wages, been retired?

The PREMIER replied: 1, No. 2, Answered by No. 1. 3, Matters of this nature are decided by the Commissioner of Railways, under authority from Parliament only.

### QUESTION—FEDERAL AID ROADS GRANT.

Mr. HEGNEY asked the Minister for Works: 1, What amount has been received from the Federal Government, under the Federal Aid Roads Act, since the 1st July, 1930? 2, How much has been spent? 3, Where has it been spent? 4, Are the Federal Government insisting on adherence to the conditions of the Federal Act and the schedules? 5, What agreement has been arrived at between the Federal and State authorities to amend the provisions of the Federal and State Acts, so that the grant may be spent at the discretion of the State Parliament and the Minister?

The MINISTER FOR WORKS replied. 1, £103,810 7s. 4d. (being recoups for expenditure incurred during June and July). 2, £151,544 0s. 1d. 3, Mainly on the following roads: Perth-Albany, Midland Junction-

Meekatharra, Midland Junction-Merredin, Bunbury-Collie-Wagin, Fremantle-Armadale, Northam-Goomalling-Mullewa, Moora-Geraldton, Armadale-Pemberton, Northam-York-Cranbrook, Busselton-Nannup, Busselton-Augusta, Coolgardie-Esperance, Albany-Denmark, Donnybrook-Boyup Brook, and several developmental roads throughout the State. 4, In some respects, yes; in others, no. 5, Variation of the original agreement, whereby the obligation of the State to contribute 15s. to the Commonwealth's 20s., is waived, has been executed by the Rt. Hon. the Prime Minister and the Hon. Premier. The discretion of the State Parliament is not provided for in either the original or amended agreement; the State Main Roads Act provides for the expenditure of the grant.

### ADDRESS-IN-REPLY.

#### *Fourth Day.*

Debate resumed from the previous day. **MR. MCCALLUM** (South Fremantle) [4.35]: If my task were limited to replying to the matter in the Governor's Speech and to the speech of the Premier delivered last night, it would indeed be an easy one. For barrenness and emptiness there has never been a Speech from the Governor to the Parliament to compare with the one submitted this session. It is comparable only with the speech delivered by the Premier last night. One would have thought that the condition of the State being what it is, with so many thousands of men out of work, with so many thousands more on broken time, with so much poverty in so many homes—very few homes, if any, in the metropolitan area have not someone out of work—with the trying times confronting the State and the crisis of which the Premier has warned the people, the Governor's Speech or the Premier's speech would have contained something that would have given some lead to the people or held out some hope to them or given them some encouragement for the future. If we are to survive the crisis, it is important that there should be a good morale throughout the community. It is important that there should be a fine spirit amongst the people. Naturally they looked to the Governor's Speech and to the Premier's speech for some hope, some guidance, some little comfort. But where is there, either in the Governor's Speech or in

the speech delivered by the Premier last night, any hope at all for the people of this country? What has he given them to look forward to? If the morale of the people of this State is undermined, if their spirits are crushed, then the task of surmounting our difficulties is going to be all the more serious. To have a good morale, a good spirit amongst the community, means everything. But in the Governor's Speech and in the Premier's speech there was barrenness and emptiness, no hope at all being held out to the people. This I consider a most unfortunate and regrettable state of affairs, but after all I do not suppose we could have expected very much more. The difference between the sentiments expressed in the Governor's Speech and those expressed by the Premier on the hustings is most marked. When on the hustings, according to the Premier, there was nothing right with the State. Much as the Leader of the Opposition endeavoured to impress upon the people that the condition of Western Australia was sound, the Premier ridiculed it, denied it, gave it no credence at all. Yet no fewer than four times in the Governor's Speech he mentions that the condition of the State is sound. Which is right? Which are we to believe, what he said on the hustings before the election or what he tells the Parliament now? Which does he himself believe? Which is the real Sir James Mitchell—the man who told the people on the hustings that everything was wrong, nothing was right, everything was upside down, and that the State's future was black, or the man who really spoke through the Governor's Speech? What are the people to believe? What are they to accept as the facts? Such a contradiction coming from the same man in the course of a few months is most extraordinary. Of course one can understand that with the responsibility of office upon him the Premier has to be a little more careful, in fact, much more careful of what he says than he had when on the hustings. Presently I shall make a few comparisons between what he said on the hustings and what he says to-day. As the Leader of the Opposition pointed out the other night, two or three of the paragraphs in the Governor's Speech are practically verbatim with what Mr. Collier said during the election campaign, which the Premier at that time denied and ridiculed and said were not to be believed. Yet now he puts the same sentiments into the mouth of the

Governor. The other night the Premier spoke about playing cricket. He said we should play the game and be fair. Is that what he calls playing the game? Within a few months he swallows his own words and contradicts the attitude he adopted previously. That is his idea of being fair and playing cricket. Apart from the hon. gentleman's speech, the statement he read on Tuesday evening outlining the decisions of the Premier's Conference contained nothing new. The statement of the conference proceedings gave us no information that was not known to every member as far back as last Christmas. There was not a solitary scrap of additional information in it. The Acting Prime Minister, Mr. Fenton, is reported in this morning's newspaper as stating that the decisions reached at the conference were arrived at a long time before and were gradually put into shape. Every one of us was acquainted with the whole of the information at least at the beginning of this year. Yet the Premier argues that it contained additional information, though, as I have said, to any who had studied the position of the State, it contained nothing new. The Premier and those associated with him are warning the people of the sacrifices they must make and of the hard times they must pass through during the next year or two, but not a shadow of hope is held out to them. How the trouble is to be overcome and the crisis passed and what their ultimate position will be, there is dead silence. Are we to take it that the Government have no idea how the morale or spirits of the people are to be maintained, that they have no idea what to do, no programme to meet the situation? If that is the position, it will be most regrettable for the State? What has become of the policy enunciated in the speech which the Premier delivered in Northam? What has become of the policy in the speech delivered by the then Leader of the Country Party in Katanning? Where are all those great schemes that the hon. gentleman, then Leader of the Opposition, outlined when he delivered his policy speech in Northam? What has become of all these promises, of this great developmental programme? And where is the promised forward movement of the Country Party announced by its leader during the election campaign? Where are those things? Not a line about them in the Governor's Speech,

or in the Premier's speech. Have both the policy speeches been jettisoned? Are the people of the country deserted? Is there anything to be done? Have hon. members opposite thrown overboard their programmes? Bright hopes were held out to the people in those policy speeches; but when it comes to putting words in the mouth of the Governor to be addressed to this Parliament and through Parliament to the people, when the leader of the Government addresses Parliament on what he proposes to do, there is a dead silence as to every phase of either programme. That is another awakening to the people as to how they were misled at the general election. The Premier carried on a campaign of reckless promises. "Return me to power, and there will be work for all." The words quoted by the Leader of the Opposition two days ago will need to be repeated fairly often during the next few months. In his policy speech at Northam the Premier, referring to the unemployed, said there would be work for all those people when the first part of his programme was put into operation, and that that would happen soon after he was returned to power. Soon after! Four months have passed now. It was asked, the then Leader of the Opposition and present Premier said, where he would get the money, but the answer was that the Treasury was receiving sufficient money to provide work for everyone in the State. The hon. gentleman said the Treasury was getting it. He also declared that what he had done before he could do again, that it was all a question of proper management. That was the declaration made by the present Premier.

The Premier: Do not you agree with that?

Mr. McCALLUM: That declaration having been made by the present Premier, there went up from his followers a chorus of "Work for all! He did it before, and he can do it again." That was re-echoed throughout the country by all the candidates supporting the Premier. What a sorry figure the hon. gentleman is cutting to-day! Where to-day is his promise of work for all? Of course he did not do it before.

Mr. Marshall: And he will never do it again.

Mr. McCALLUM: There was no qualification, no "if" or "but" about it. The Pre-

mier said, "Work for all. What I have done before, I can do again."

Mr. Marshall: Mount up deficits.

Mr. McCALLUM: Not a qualification, not a restriction about the statement; but an unqualified declaration that this could be done. When it was pointed out to the hon. gentleman that the unemployed problem was world-wide, not restricted to this country, his reply, given a few days before the general election, was, "If returned to power I promise to find work for everybody in the State. This is no extravagant statement." He declared that it was no extravagant statement that he would find work for everybody in the State. Coming from anyone else, it would be considered a most extravagant statement. He declared, "What I have undertaken to do, I can do." Out spake brave Horatius, the hero of old, "What I have undertaken to do, I can do. I will find work for everybody in the State." That, the hon. gentleman declared, was no extravagant statement. Thus we find him without equivocation, without any qualification whatever, declaring himself a modern Moses from Northam who will lead the stricken people of this State into the promised land. He was going to conduct them where there would be work for all, where there would be no more unemployment. It only remained for him to be returned to power and the whole problem of unemployment would be solved. I am not overstating the position at all when I say that since the hon. gentleman has been in office the number of unemployed has increased at least fourfold. In addition, many men have been put on broken time. In this country to-day there are few homes not suffering privation. Against that fact, put the hon. gentleman's cry, his one election cry, "What I have said I can do, I can do." And then there is his declaration that it was no extravagant statement to say that he would find work for everybody in the State. Confronted now with his declaration made at the time of the general election, the hon. gentleman cuts a poor figure indeed. Now he says that he relied on statement made by others; that he did not know the position of the finances or the Treasury. Speaking here the other evening he said that had he known the financial position of the State he would

never have made that declaration. That excuse merely amounts to casting a reflection on the intelligence of the people. Certainly it is no compliment to the hon. gentleman himself. Let us see whether he did not know the financial position. Let us see what he had to say on that subject during the last session. When the Loan Estimates were before this Chamber the then Premier, Mr. Collier, warned the House as to the financial outlook, kept repeating to the House what the financial outlook was. He repeatedly told hon. members how tight the money market was, and what the financial position in the future would be; how he would have to scrape in order to carry on. "Hansard" of the 29th October last, on page 1193, reports the ex-Premier as saying—

I am afraid that with the reduced amount that will be available this year we shall be forced to go right up to the limit of the amount forthcoming for the estimated expenditure this year.

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: If you can get the money.

The Premier: That is, of course, quite uncertain.

The present Premier says he did not know whether there was any shortage then. Why cast a doubt at all on the possibility of securing the money? Later Mr. Collier said—

If the position should not improve, especially on the London money market, we shall find very great difficulty in obtaining sufficient money to carry on the programme of works we have in hand . . . . .

The then Premier warned the House that he expected to find it extremely difficult to keep works going that he then had in hand. He told the present Premier that. What did the then Leader of the Opposition say? This is as far back as the 29th October of last year. The hon. gentleman now says he did not know that the funds of the Treasury had been exhausted. He knew well enough that we had not been on the loan market as a State since April of 1928. Here are his own words, referring to the ex-Premier—

He has had a comparatively tight time during the last 12 months in consequence of the difficulty experienced in borrowing in London. His difficulties for the ensuing 12 months will, I fancy, be greater than those he experienced during the last financial year. He has exhausted all sorts of funds that were at his disposal in his endeavour to meet his loan expenditure, and those funds considerably eased the position.

That is recorded in "Hansard." Now the hon. gentleman gets up here and says he did not know the position. Three months after making those remarks he goes to the people and promises them the construction of 370 miles of new railway in addition to numerous other new items. That was in the face of his admission that the ex-Premier would have a hard job to carry on, and in the face of the ex-Premier's declaration that he would find difficulty to keep even works in hand going. And now the Premier has the audacity to say that he did not know the position. That is too thin to go down with the community. There is not much likelihood of such a statement being accepted by members of this Chamber. That disposes of the hon. gentleman's statement that he did not know. Here we have his declaration, made in October last, that he did know that the late Premier had exhausted funds of all kinds to keep going. Nevertheless, the present Premier during the election campaign promised work for all and said, "What I have done before, I can do again." If he was returned to power things were going to boom, and industry was going to thrive. Why, the bottom seems to have fallen out of everything since the present Government came into office! Everything is at a standstill. And what is the policy of the present Government for coping with the situation? If only there were some declaration from the Premier showing that he had some idea of how to deal with the unemployed problem! What do the Government propose to do? Hundreds and hundreds are being added to the unemployed roll each week, and the Premier has to admit that the decisions which were arrived at in Melbourne last week, and which he has reported to the House, will increase the number of unemployed. But there is no declaration of the Government's policy for dealing with the problem of unemployment. How are they going to provide work for all? Where is that "work for all" which they promised? The Government's only achievement since taking office has been to establish the Blackboy Hill concentration camp comprising about a thousand men. Is that the limit of the Government's policy for dealing with the unemployed—putting a thousand men to make eight miles of road and the work not nearly finished after four months? I repeat does that represent the Government's policy for coping with unem-

ployment? Apart from that, the Government have thrown a great deal of their own responsibility on the shoulders of the local authorities. That is a most unfair attitude. The Government have cast on the local authorities a responsibility which the present Ministers, when on the hustings, undertook to bear. They guaranteed to the people that they would do it themselves, but now they have put it on the local authorities. From a promise of work for all, they have developed into an attitude which has led to the establishment of distress committees in every village and hamlet throughout the country. That is the position to which the Government have brought the country. Is it the limit of the Government's policy to organise odd jobs, to collect old clothes, and to ladle out soup? The way the people are being reduced with part-time working and rationing of work, half the community is being brought down to the soup-kitchen level. And the Government remain silent. The Premier is silent. The Governor's Speech is silent. No hope whatever is held out to the people. The Minister for Works, in connection with the Greenmount deviation, has put forward a proposition that the men employed should earn their sustenance and half their rents. How does that job comply with the Premier's recent declaration that every pound of Government funds that is expended must go into reproductive work, go towards the creation of new wealth? What wealth is the Greenmount deviation going to create? Between £20,000 and £30,000 is involved in that job. No new wealth will be produced as a result. The only thing the deviation of the road at Greenmount will create will be a more difficult position for the railways. It will make it easier for motor traction to carry bigger loads in competition with the railways. And on that work the arrangement was that the men were to be employed merely for rations and half their rent! That is the Premier's application of his pledge of work for all! "I did it before and I can do it again" was his cry! That is how his policy is being carried out! The community are being reduced to the soup-kitchen level! If some alteration is not made by the Government, it will be a poor look-out for the community as a whole. The only indication the Government have given of how they propose to proceed with their policy to balance the ledger, which they say they must balance,

is to practice economy, and the only sign of that is an attack on the wages and working conditions of their own employees. That is what the Government have set out to do—to reduce wages and break down industrial conditions. Let us see how that squares with what the Premier told the people on the hustings. In the "West Australian" of the 29th March of this year the Premier was reported as follows:—

A statement is being sedulously circulated by some supporters of Labour that if the National Party is returned to power it will reduce wages. This is a pure invention for electioneering purposes.

What is the Premier doing to-day? He is citing all the unions before the Arbitration Court to take away industrial conditions they have enjoyed for 35 years.

Mr. H. W. Mann: But with no reduction in wages.

Mr. Panton: The oracle has spoken!

Mr. McCALLUM: Surely the member for Perth (Mr. H. W. Mann) does not realise what he has said. What is a district allowance? Will not its discontinuance mean less money for the employee? I have no doubt that the lead now being given by the Government is really a gesture to private employers to follow suit. The Government have cited the unions before the Arbitration Court to take away district allowances and the 44-hour week. The district allowances have been in force since 1895, so that for 35 years the men have enjoyed that extra money. It has been the accepted custom and practice throughout the Government service during the whole of that period.

Mr. Marshall: And only right and proper, too.

Mr. McCALLUM: The district allowance was granted as an encouragement to men to live in the back country. The present Government are supposed to encourage settlement in the country. The Premier, more often than anyone else, has voiced the view that men should settle with their families in the country areas. He wanted men who went into the country, to remain there and establish homes for their families. The policy involved in the granting of district allowances meant that some recompense should be made to men in the country areas on account of the disadvantages under which they and their families laboured as compared with men who worked in the city. It was not a question of mere hard statistics or arithmetic concerning the cost of living,

but it was on account of the disabilities involved in living outside the city, of the different climatic conditions, of the educational facilities largely lacking in the country, as compared with those available in the city, and of the fewer opportunities of finding employment for children, that the district allowances were granted. It was because of the disabilities I have mentioned, as well as other disadvantages that accompany life in the country, that such a policy was adopted.

Mr. H. W. Mann: Is it more expensive to live in Merredin than in Northam?

Mr. McCALLUM: The question of expense does not enter into the matter.

Mr. H. W. Mann: Of course it does.

Mr. McCALLUM: Does the hon. member suggest it is a question of expense? Are there no other disadvantages? The hon. member must realise that a man in the city can get employment for his children. What hope is there for a man to do that in Merredin? If a railway man lives in Merredin, what opportunities are there for him to secure employment there for his boys? The railway workers very often are forced to break up their homes in order that their children may have reasonable opportunities in life. Either the mother has to go to the city with the family, or she has to be separated from her children. Is there to be no recompense for that? Is it to be a matter merely of cold calculated costs? Is that to be the position? Are we not to take into account other disabilities? I presume, then, isolation is not to be reckoned as among the disabilities suffered by men who live in the outer parts and carry out the essential services of State. Nothing of that description is to be taken into account! I realise that farmers have outlets on their farms for their families. They are never without work—if they want work.

Hon. P. Collier: They may be without money, but there is plenty of work.

Mr. McCALLUM: With the men in the Government services, the position is different. The present Government propose to take money away from them, to reduce wages and to rob them of an allowance that has been available for over 35 years. Yet the present Government are not satisfied with reducing wages; they have included in the application to

the court a provision that will require the men to work longer hours. The general belief is, apparently, that the 44-hour week originated in an administrative act by the Collier Government. The Minister for Works indicated that the other evening. There is nothing further from the truth. The facts regarding the inauguration of the 44-hour working week are that in April, 1919, the Arbitration Court, presided over by Mr. Justice Rooth, issued a declaration which provided 44 hours for girls in the printing trade. That was the first declaration by the Arbitration Court for a 44-hour week. That decision was arrived at after the whole of the circumstances had been investigated, after evidence had been tendered by both sides, and after the court had listened to arguments both for and against. In December, 1919, the master printers entered into a voluntary agreement with their employees for a 44-hour week.

Mr. Sampson: That was an alternative. The 48-hour week was not struck out. They could have which they liked.

Mr. McCALLUM: There was no reduction for the 44-hour week.

Mr. Sampson: Yes, there was.

Mr. McCALLUM: The same rate was provided in each instance.

Mr. Sampson: Yes, the same rate per hour.

Mr. McCALLUM: No, the hon. member is wrong; there was no reduction. In the same month the railway employees went to the Arbitration Court to secure a declaration for a 44-hour week to apply to the workshops and the Ways and Works branch of the Railway Department. At that time, the present Premier was also head of the Government.

The Premier: That is so.

Mr. McCALLUM: After the court had given its favourable decision, the Government of the day, of their own accord, extended the 44-hour week to the boiler-makers, engineers, engine drivers and firemen, carpenters and joiners, coastal dock, river and harbour employees, coastal shipwrights and boat builders, moulders, plumbers, painters and paper hangers, water supply, sewerage and drainage employees, and to the A.W.U.

Hon. P. Collier: A bigger list than the court included.

Mr. McCALLUM: Practically the same list as the list of those to whom we extended the 44-hour week. Yet it is held the Labour Government were those who, by an administrative act, were responsible for initiating the 44-hour week. I have outlined the history of that movement. It did not originate with a Labour Government; it originated when the present Premier was in power. In May, 1922, the Commissioner of Railways challenged the award and applied to have the 48-hour week restored. Exhaustive evidence was tendered by the Railway Department regarding the output per machine and per man per hour. The whole position was examined carefully, and Mr. Justice Draper, in giving the decision of the court, said that the case presented by the Commissioner had broken down and he decided to continue the 44-hour week. Following upon that decision, we, as a Labour Party, appealed to the people in favour of a 44-hour week, together with long-service leave for wages men. The people endorsed our policy, which was made part of the speech delivered by the Leader of the Opposition at Boulder when opening Labour's campaign. Every Labour candidate referred to the policy, and the people returned the Labour Party with a majority. As a result, we put our policy into force with the consent of the people. The present Government have no mandate or decision of the people to repeal the 44-hour week. The Premier did not mention it in his policy speech, nor did the Leader of the Country Party either. There was no request by members on the Government side of the House that the people should declare their opinion on the question. The people represent the highest tribunal in this State and, surely, seeing that they approved of the policy that led to the Labour Government giving fuller effect to the 44-hour week, it is only right that the people themselves should be asked to give a further decision before the policy was challenged. The people should have been consulted and asked to issue a declaration on the point. Behind the backs of the people, and having kept silence on the hustings in regard to the 44-hours question, the Premier, now he is in power, is proceeding to break all the promises he made and has even attacked the industrial standards of the community. See what attitude the Premier adopted during the campaign! Again I

repeat what the Premier said through the medium of the "West Australian"—

A statement is being sedulously circulated by some supporters of Labour that if the National Party is returned to power it will reduce wages. This is a pure invention for electioneering purposes.

Now where is the Premier's electioneering propaganda? His Government are attacking the wages, working conditions and standards of living of the employees without the authority of the people to do so. In face of his declaration to the people that he would not do it, the Premier is doing it! Some Government members made declarations on the point. The Minister for Mines, when questioned on the hustings, said he would not be a party to interfering with industrial conditions. How does he stand in Cabinet today? Is he a party to this move? The member for Perth (Mr. H. W. Mann) said he would not be a party to any such move. The member for Katanning (Mr. Piesse) gave a definite assurance to the railway men at Katanning that he would not be a party to any interference with their industrial conditions. Other members gave the same assurance. How different is their attitude once they have secured control of the Treasury bench! The only policy the present Government have announced is this of attacking the wages and working conditions of the wages men. Are not we entitled to ask the Premier why has he drawn a distinction between wages men and salaried men? Why is he not moving to take away the district allowances of the salaried men? Why is he making this class distinction? Why is he directing all his energies to the levelling-down of the wages men? When he was previously in office, there operated the system of long-service leave for salaried men but not for wages men. Later we broke down that distinction and gave long-service leave to wages men. But now the hon. gentleman is going to attack the wages men again by removing their district allowances; or else he is using them as a stalking-horse with a view to extending his attack later when a clamour arises. If so, why has he not the courage to stand up to his convictions and say by regulation that the district allowances shall be taken from the salaried men also? Does he want to shoulder on to the Arbitration Court all the responsibility that practically belongs to him, or is he standing for class distinction between wages men and salaried men? If the wages man is to have

the district allowance taken from him, is there any good reason why the salaried man should be permitted to continue in enjoyment of his district allowance? That was the viewpoint we took in respect of the long-service leave. I will defy anybody to put up a logical reason why these privileges should be given to one section of the public service or Government men and not to another. We tried to get away from this class distinction and treat all Government employees on an equitable footing, but the policy now is to reintroduce the old order and set up the class distinction once more. The Government, as I say, and their friends every morning are hammering away with the cry that it is essential in the interests of the country during the present crisis for our standards to be broken down, our wages to be reduced. The "West Australian," which has adopted the Premier as a petted darling, is hammering away every morning on the theme that wages must come down. That journal has even the audacity to tell us, Sir, you and I, that we have to reduce our own wages. Did you ever know a country to prosper, any nation to become a great nation, which was a low-wage country? In the history of the world has there even been a country that became great on low wages? Has any nation that paid low wages and adopted a low standard for its community ever been able to hold up its head in competition with other nations? Such a nation may have prospered for a little while, but certainly it was not able to maintain its prosperity for long. The "West Australian" in its leading column and elsewhere is thundering out each morning that wages must come down. The journal seems to forget the fact that recently there was a decision by the Arbitration Court on the basic wage, and that the basic wage for this year has been arrived at by a different formula, on a different basis from that on which previous decisions were come to. Previous decisions were given on an entirely different basis from the decision given this year. Had the decision this year been given on the same formula as that underlying previous decisions, the present basic wage would have been £4 8s. 6d. instead of £4 6s. I am not at the moment criticising the decision of the court. But there is the fact, and the result has been that the wage-earners of this country have had to suffer a wage cut of half a million for the year. They have £500,000 less to

spend this year, owing to that decision. And some of the advocates of low wages have used the phrase "Industry has been relieved to the extent of that amount." That reduction has already taken place. Professor Giblin, whom the "West Australian" is so fond of quoting, has stated in one of his publications that if all incomes in the Commonwealth could be reduced by 5 per cent., Australia's financial difficulties would be gone. The wage-earners of this country have suffered just on 3 per cent. by that basic wage decision of the Arbitration Court. So they have gone more than half way along this gospel the "West Australian" preaches and gives out every morning to this community as one which they should adopt as coming from Professor Giblin. I repeat that the workers of this country have lost just on 3 per cent. of their wages this year. Are they not now entitled to ask what the other fellow is going to lose? What about the rack-renters and the money lenders with their extortionate rates of interest? Is it not time that they should be asked to go at any rate as far as the workers of this country have already gone? When the cost of living was rising, when prices were increasing, wages were chasing them and were a good way behind all the while. The workers before they could get a rise in wages had to go to the Arbitration Court and prove by evidence that the costs had been inflicted on them. Frequently it was not only months, but years, before they could get an increase. Now, on the other hand, wages are to be forced down. And the Government are not satisfied with that half million, but they want to take away from the workers more money by abolishing district allowances and by making the men work longer hours in addition.

The Premier: Do you think the Court made a mistake of half-a-crown in the basic wage?

Mr. McCALLUM: No, it was fully explained by the members of the court. They had their own views as to the method of calculation and they showed why the basis had been altered. But there is the position. Had their decision been arrived at on the same basis as in previous years the basic wage would have been half-a-crown more. It is for members of the court to fix the basic wage on any formula they like, and this year they discarded the formula previously observed.

The Premier: The law was not altered in the meantime.

Mr. McCALLUM: No, that is so. However, there is the fact: half-a-crown a week has been lost to every wage earner. Although the "West Australian" thunders out each morning for reductions in wages, I notice that the company controlling that paper showed a declared profit of £86,000 last year, together with a dividend of 15 per cent. I say "declared profit" because it is quite obvious that there was almost a similar amount hidden up. But they declared a profit of £86,000 and a dividend of 15 per cent. Still, their charges remain at the very peak. They are not only at war rates, but they are even higher than they were during the war. Their advertising rates now are higher than they were at any time during the war period. And they buy their newsprint to-day at less than one-quarter the price they paid for it during the war. The merchants of this city have approached that newspaper company and asked them to reduce their advertising rates, but the company have declined any reduction at all. During the last few years those rates have been increased. Is not that a tax on industry? Is not that keeping up the cost of living? Every merchant with advertisements in that paper at the existing exorbitant rates necessary to make such exorbitant profits, passes the cost of those advertisements on to his customers. The workers of this country have to pay for all the advertisements. But while the "West Australian" will preach to the workers of this country "You have to take lower rates of wages," the paper itself will not accept lower rates, and has denied them to the merchants of the city. In addition, 2d. per copy is still being charged for that paper, a 100 per cent. rise on what the price used to be. The Government are not satisfied even with attacking wages and working conditions, but are now attacking the organisations of the departments. Everything that was set up for the protection of the working man, for industrial safety, all industrial standards are the first to be attacked. The Government have abolished the "Industrial Gazette," a most useful journal, and the only concise source of information that employers and workers have had. It was printed in succinct form and could be used by advocates in the Arbitration Court. To both unions and employers

having dealings with the Arbitration Court that journal has been the same as the Law Reports are to barristers and solicitors.

The Premier: We have reconsidered that matter.

Mr. McCALLUM: Well, I am very pleased to hear it, because that journal has served a distinctly useful purpose. Might I suggest to the Premier that if he inquires at the department he will learn of the service that journal has been overseas. We should not overlook that fact, for if we in a country with a high standard of living are to make headway in future we require to help other countries less fortunately situated. We are trying to do that through Geneva. That journal is broadcast throughout the world, and during my time in office numberless inquiries were received from other nations asking for further particulars. So that journal has not only served a good purpose here, but also a very useful purpose abroad.

The Premier: Gazettal of the various proceedings is not necessary.

Mr. McCALLUM: No, I agree. But there is the concise form of the journal and altogether it has proved a very useful document. There is, I understand, a long free list that might be curtailed somewhat.

The Premier: I believe that publication in the "Government Gazette" might be obviated if the journal were continued. Duplication would not be required.

Mr. McCALLUM: No, I do not think so. But the whole cost, speaking from memory, is only about £600 or £700.

The Premier: Yes, £700.

Mr. McCALLUM: Certainly it was a most useful document, serving not only the union side, but the employer's side as well. There has been an alteration under the Scaffolding Act. I know the building trade is very slack just now and that there would not be work for the number of inspectors that were there before. But the administration of that Act has always shown a profit, as I told the House previously when I moved to reduce the fees.

The Minister for Works: The fees were not reduced.

Mr. McCALLUM: I brought in a Bill to reduce the fees, but the Upper House threw it out. We could not get it through the Legislative Council because they insisted upon the inclusion in the Bill of other matters to which I would not be a party.

The declaration of the Government when the Bill was introduced was that so long as the fees met the cost of administration we would be satisfied. We did not want to make a profit on them. There was no question of using the measure as a tax on industry. I realise that there is not sufficient work at present to occupy the number of inspectors we had when the building trade was busy, but I disagree entirely with the transfer of the administration of the Act to the Principal Architect. He is engaged with the contractors of the State in the general business of building, and occasionally is himself a large employer of labour. To hand over to an employer of labour the administration of labour conditions that affect the men in his employ is most illogical. The men working on scaffolding for the Government have a right to know that their lives and limbs will be safeguarded just as much as when they are employed by private contractors. To place the administration in the hands of the Principal Architect is not only unreasonable, but will put him in a most invidious position. When the scaffolding legislation was passed I considered the Principal Architect and refrained from putting him in an unfair position. The right thing was to give the administration to men who have made a study of industrial conditions and who deal with factories, shops, buildings, the timber industry and other matters affecting industrial life. I cannot see any argument in favour of giving the administration to the Principal Architect, and so long as it remains with him, workers employed on Government buildings will not feel very safe. I believe that in the timber industry one of the inspectors has been dismissed.

The Minister for Works: Correct.

Mr. McCALLUM: And there is talk of transferring the administration to the Forests Department.

The Minister for Works: It has already been transferred.

Mr. McCALLUM: Fancy giving the administration of industrial conditions covering the machinery in timber mills to the head of the Forests Department! What has he to do with industrial conditions? What is the object behind it? What do the Government expect to achieve by it? He has never been concerned with industrial conditions. He is a university man, a scien-

tist, and to ask him to become mixed up with the hurly-burly of industrial life and drag him into arguments with employers in the industry is quite wrong. I do not know whether there is any ground for the rumour being circulated amongst the unions that the administration of the Factories and Shops Act is to be broken up. The whole of the attack is focussed on the industrial side. The Government are attacking wages, they are attacking industrial conditions, and they are attacking the administration of industrial law.

Mr. Panton: The workmen's inspectors on the mines, too.

Mr. McCALLUM: Yes. Wherever it is possible to deal with labour conditions the Government are applying the axe and putting the workers back into a position they occupied decades ago. The most regrettable feature of all is that this will cause industrial unrest amongst the rank and file of the workers. The Premier has appealed through the newspaper for a good feeling in industry. He asks the employers and the workers to cultivate friendly relations and yet, as may be seen from the items I have enumerated, he is attacking their wages and conditions and breaking down the administration of laws designed to ensure justice for them. Wherever possible he is attacking them. Is that going to create good feeling and contentment amongst the industrialists? If the Premier had designed to create illfeeling and chaos, he could not have done it more effectively. The Government, in their four short months of office, seem to have applied themselves thoroughly to this work. I repeat that the people of this State gave us a mandate to introduce the 44-hour week. The highest tribunal—the democracy of the State—gave us that authority, and the Government have no right to challenge it or to abolish it without the authority of the people. The right and fair thing to do is to consult the people before continuing the present action. But the case has been cited before the court, and the court is asked to deprive the employees of those conditions. If that happens one outcome is inevitable, namely, grave dissatisfaction throughout the Government service. The unions are convinced that the Government are taking this action to give a lead to private employers, so that wherever similar conditions operate with private

firms, the Government plea of poverty, their propaganda and pressure will be utilised to take them away. The result must be to produce chaos in our industrial life. For the past six years we have been able to boast that in this State there has existed a better feeling between employer and worker than in any other part of the Commonwealth. No other State has enjoyed such industrial peace, nor have all sections of industry elsewhere exhibited a finer feeling or engaged in such open discussions and exchanges of ideas as they have here. The moment the new Government got into office, however, they set about breaking down those friendly relations and creating suspicion and ill-feeling. The Government cannot expect the unions to do other than resist their action, and the unions would be less than human if they did not fight with all the means at their disposal. Though I complain that there has been no declaration of policy either in the Governor's Speech or in the Premier's speech, let me point out that almost daily we have been treated in the columns of the "West Australian" to a series of bed-time stories by the Premier. I should be sorry to think that the Premier himself was responsible for them.

The Premier: I am, for every one of them.

Mr. McCALLUM: They appeared under his name, but they are merely dished up for political infants. They are the laughing stock of the community. Some of them contain the greatest piffle I have ever listened to.

The Premier: Have you never listened to yourself in your life?

Mr. McCALLUM: I took up the "West Australian" one morning and found dotted over its columns a lot of funny little men, accompanied by a statement under the name of the Premier. I thought it must be an advertisement for some cinema show. I thought the two comedians who have provided so much amusement for the children, Mutt and Jeff, had been revived. Boiled down, the article consisted of telling the reader that if he spent £1 and got back 18s., he would lose 2s. Had you not read the article, Mr. Speaker, you would not have known that. It shows how profound is the Premier's thought. Of course there is too much Scottish blood in my veins for me not to know that if I got only 18s. for £1, I would lose 2s. That is the kind of stuff the Premier has been dishing up in his bed-time

stories to the community. In all these articles he tells the other fellow what to do, but does not say what he is going to do. I am not going to conjecture how many icepacks were necessary to enable the Premier to reach the profound conclusion that if one got only 18s. for £1, the loss would be 2s. I can imagine the worried brow and the cold compress needed to reach that conclusion. What I object to is that all the time he is telling other people what they should do, but there is nothing in his bed-time stories as to what he himself proposes to do to surmount the difficulties confronting us. I do not subscribe to the statement that all our troubles arise from a too heavy borrowing for developmental works. Excepting group settlement and possibly soldier settlement, if all our public works were offered for sale, I think they would realise sufficient to cover the liability. Of course the group settlements are the outstanding financial calamity of the State. If they were auctioned, I do not suppose they would realise one-half of what we have lost on them.

Mr. Withers: You would lose your 2s. in the pound there.

Mr. McCALLUM: We have not indulged in lavish expenditure on public buildings, and on the whole I think we have fair value for the public money invested. Many of our railways were constructed cheaply; the cost of some of the lines would not buy an equivalent mileage of rails to-day. I admit that all the loan money has not been expended on reproductive work.

The Minister for Railways: In making your estimate, have you allowed for 2½ per cent. sales tax on the price?

Mr. McCALLUM: I am not anticipating that the Minister is in the auctioneering business.

The Minister for Railways: The sales tax has to be considered.

Mr. McCALLUM: On the whole there is not much room for complaint regarding the expenditure of public money in this State.

The Premier: The works cover the cost.

Mr. McCALLUM: Much has been said about the financial position. The Labour Government was blamed for excessive borrowing. The Premier has offered the excuse that before taking office he did not know that the financial position was as he found it. I would remind the Premier of something else he said on the hustings on another occasion. He was asked where he was going

to get the money with which to carry out his promises. He replied, "My friend, Sir Hal Colebatch, through influential circles in London, will be able to get all the money I want." Where is his friend Sir Hal Colebatch to-day? Fancy a man in a responsible position in this Parliament, after helping to pass through the Financial Agreement, making a statement like that!

The Premier: I did not do that.

Mr. McCALLUM: The House passed the Agreement and the Premier spoke upon it. No man in the House knew its contents better than he did. He cannot deny that he knew what was in the Financial Agreement. He knew that no State could borrow overseas on its own initiative, and yet he tells the people that if returned to power his friend, Sir Hal Colebatch, will get him all the money he wants.

The Premier: Oh no, I did not say that. We can go overseas, and I will get a Bill brought down that will give us permission to do so when the time comes.

Mr. McCALLUM: The Premier can go overseas with the consent of the Loan Council. If the Council gives him permission he can go.

The Premier: No.

Mr. McCALLUM: He told the people that he could get all the money he wanted. He has admitted that money is tight but he told them that Sir Hal Colebatch could get it for him.

The Premier: You are quite wrong.

Mr. McCALLUM: Is that playing cricket?

The Premier: You are wrong.

Mr. McCALLUM: I have read the Premier's statement. I had it put to me at my own meetings.

The Premier: Public bodies are going overseas for money, and we will bring down a Bill to give us the right to go overseas.

Mr. McCALLUM: I will not argue about the contents of that Bill. I am merely relating what was the position when the Premier made that statement.

The Premier: You are wrong.

Mr. McCALLUM: The Premier is wrong, and he knows it. If the money had been obtainable in London, would not the Leader of the Opposition have got it? It was another example of the type of cricket the Premier was playing.

The Premier: You are not playing it now.

Mr. McCALLUM: He would not stand up to the batting. He ran away from the bowling. He would not admit that what the

Leader of the Opposition had told the people was right, but he said he could get the money through Sir Hal Colebatch, although he knew the laws of the country prohibited him from doing so.

The Premier: No; we have to amend the law.

Mr. McCALLUM: The Premier's statement in the Press, and his admissions since Parliament assembled, show that the case put up by the Leader of the Opposition is a correct one.

The Premier: It is not.

Mr. McCALLUM: It was the case then and it is the case now. At that time the Premier ridiculed it, but now he admits that the money market in London is closed. He stated the other day that it would be closed for another year at least. That is what the Leader of the Opposition said on the hustings. The Premier is now face to face with the facts, and his humbug has been exposed. The Premier is welcome to all the satisfaction he can get from securing his own advancement by making false promises to hungry men and women. He rode into power on the promises he made to a most unfortunate section of the community. I would not like to have the Premier's conscience. I wonder what he feels like when he meets the people to whom he promised work! If the position of the Premier, and the place and pay he has obtained through making these reckless promises and false statements on the hustings, are bringing him satisfaction, he is entitled to it. Not a member on this side of the House would have his position in such circumstances for all the gold on the Golden Mile. The hon. gentleman can take all the credit to himself. He has now told us in his bedtime stories that we must right the balance of trade in our State. Whilst I believe that is a desirable thing, I think there is a lot of humbug talked about it. One would think from articles in the Press that the whole of the financial crisis we are facing is the result of the adverse trade balance in Australia, that this is what has brought about the chaos. I do not suppose it would have occurred in Australia had it not occurred similarly in other countries. To say that if we balance our trade everything will come right is sheer humbug. I have examined the position of some of the most important countries in the world. In these figures, I give the countries concerned

the advantage of their imports and exports of gold and silver in order that I may state the position as correctly as possible. I am unable to secure the figures showing what is termed the invisible trade. Such figures are never included when the ordinary trade returns of the country are quoted. I find that the United States has a favourable trade balance of £175,000,000; Italy, an adverse trade balance of £72,000,000; Great Britain an adverse trade balance of £267,000,000; Germany an adverse trade balance of £136,000,000; and France an adverse trade balance of £67,000,000. What has Sir Otto Niemeyer got to say about England? Do we understand him to say that all we have to do is to balance our trade and our difficulties will disappear? Why does he not tell England that?

The Premier: It does balance.

Mr. McCALLUM: England has a balance of trade against her of £267,000,000, including gold and silver.

The Premier: She has not. What about her invisible trade?

Mr. McCALLUM: No one can give us that definitely. Neither the State nor the Commonwealth Statisticians can give it to me; they can only estimate the shipping and other business. No one has been able to secure reliable figures.

The Premier: They know pretty well.

Mr. McCALLUM: We have a certain amount of invisible trade in this country. England has a greater invisible trade than any other country, but in merchandise, gold and silver, she is £267,000,000 behind. I do not question Sir Otto's ability. I know the good service he has rendered the British Government. He was financial adviser to the Treasury and has attended various conferences. There is no question about his knowledge of finance. But of what use is it that he says if once we balance our trade we are right, when his own country is £267,000,000 behind.

Mr. H. W. Mann: One is an exporting country and the other is an importing country.

Mr. McCALLUM: What difference does that make?

Mr. H. W. Mann: It makes all the difference.

The Minister for Railways: The difference is that one is a lending country and the other is a borrowing country.

Mr. McCALLUM: The Minister for Railways is now dealing with invisible trade. If it is not invisible trade it is counted in with the gold and silver. People say that unemployment and the position of the labour market in Australia are due to adverse trade. The United States has a favourable trade balance of £175,000,000, and yet it has over 4,000,000 unemployed. France has an adverse trade balance of £67,000,000, but we are told it is the only country in the world without unemployed. There can be no logical room for argument there. There must be something more than the mere balancing of trade.

The Minister for Railways: You are making a serious attack upon the Federal Government.

Mr. McCALLUM: I do not deprecate the idea of balancing trade, but I maintain the mere balancing of trade will not get us through the crisis. It will not right all our ills, as these figures show. The United States has a favourable trade balance of £175,000,000 and yet has 4,000,000 people out of work.

The Premier: That is only a little over £1 a head.

Mr. McCALLUM: It cannot be argued that the position is any different here from what it is overseas. One of the main causes of our trouble is that the two big exporting industries, wheat and wool, cannot be carried on at a profit. These commodities cannot be produced at present market prices. It is safe to say that unless there is an increase in the price of these products during next year, at least 75 per cent. of our farmers will be bankrupt.

The Minister for Railways: That is your ray of hope, is it?

Mr. McCALLUM: That is staring us in the face. An obligation is cast upon the Government to say now what they are going to do about it.

The Minister for Railways: Put up the price the other side of the world.

Mr. McCALLUM: Is that all the Minister can do, point to some impossible thing? He has done little else since he has been in office but criticise what others did. What is he going to do about it? Our wheat and wool cannot be produced at the present market figure. Ministers criticise the Commonwealth Government. The Federal authori-

ties did put up a proposition to guarantee 4s. a bushel for wheat, and the farmers of the country would have been able to carry on with that guarantee. The Mitchell Government, however, have put forward no policy. Is it proposed to let all our farmers go to the wall? What is to happen? Let Ministers find fault as they like. Let us admit their case against the Commonwealth's proposition up to the hilt. Let us say it would have cost the Government up to half a million of money if the guarantee had gone through. If that scheme had been adopted instead, perhaps next year, of the wheat-growers of the State having to bear that loss entirely, the whole community would be bearing it. Let the Government make a declaration on the point. Where are the members of the Country Party?

Mr. Marshall: The spring onion fellows.

Mr. McCALLUM: We know what they were going to do if they were returned to Parliament. They now sit silent. Let the Government declare their policy. No questions asked, no word of criticism, not a suggestion put forward! Yet, according to today's paper, wheat is down to 3s. 2d. per bushel, and sheep are being sold for 5s., 6s., and 7s. each.

Hon. P. Collier: And there is not a corresponding reduction in the price of bread or mutton. Compare the price of flour today with the price of bread.

Mr. McCALLUM: There is no correspondence between the prices. Neither has the price of clothing come down comparably with the price of wool. The prices which the community have had to pay are still being paid. Only two suggestions, if suggestions they can be called, have been put forward by the Government. The Premier, with a blare of trumpets, advanced some new scheme about assisting the farmers to do additional clearing. There was a suggestion that wages should be paid by means of loans.

Mr. H. W. Mann: There is a considerable reduction in the price of meat.

Mr. McCALLUM: There is no reduction in the price of meat as regards the Fremantle district.

Hon. P. Collier: If there is a reduction, is it equivalent to the fall in the price of sheep and lambs?

Mr. H. W. Mann: I cannot say. However, there is a considerable reduction.

Hon. P. Collier: What about the price of bread?

Mr. H. W. Mann: It may come down.

Hon. P. Collier: Why is there no agitation in the public mind and in the public Press about those things? The agitation is all about wages.

Mr. McCALLUM: We on this side offered a policy, and hon. members on the other side opposed it. What are they going to do about these things? It must be admitted that the community is being dealt with unfairly, that neither the producer nor the consumer is getting a fair deal. Our friends the primary producers, instead of joining us in the effort to secure a fair deal for both producer and consumer, seem to link up with the market manipulators and middlemen. Meantime, the people they are supposed to represent will go under in the struggle. The Premier is advising the man on the land to go in for mixed farming, to adopt side lines, to produce pigs and poultry, sheep and lambs.

Mr. H. W. Mann: Do you oppose that?

Mr. McCALLUM: No. But what is the use of it under existing conditions? What are the Government doing about the egg market? What is the use of producing eggs at the present price? Are the Government doing anything to facilitate export of our commodities?

The Premier: What did you do last year?

Mr. McCALLUM: Was the market last year anything like it is now?

The Premier: Just the same.

McCALLUM: At this time last year the market price of eggs was over 1s. per dozen.

The Minister for Lands: Eggs were exported last year.

Hon. W. D. Johnson: A limited number.

Mr. McCALLUM: This year has seen a huge increase in the production of eggs. The Government who advise the people to go in for that line of production, and declare themselves to be the only friends of the primary producers, should have some policy in regard to marketing.

Hon. W. D. Johnson: What about fat lambs?

Mr. McCALLUM: Yes. What is going to happen about fat lambs?

The Minister for Agriculture: Your butchers will not let us kill the lambs when we do produce them.

Mr. McCALLUM: Was that difficulty as to killing insurmountable?

The Minister for Agriculture: Will you help us to surmount it?

Hon. P. Collier: The butchers would not sacrifice the lambs at the price!

Mr. McCALLUM: There must be some explanation, if that is the only difficulty. Trade unionists have always been and will continue to be helpful, but they are not going to be imposed upon. They refuse to be told that when an emergency arises they are the only ones who should make sacrifices, that everything should be taken from them while no one else concedes anything. I do not know what is the position of the matter to which the Minister for Agriculture has referred. This is the first I have heard of it. I have had many difficulties to overcome in trade union negotiations, and I have never found one that I was not able to get over. It is always possible to come to an agreement.

Mr. Latham: Even if you have to give way?

Mr. McCALLUM: Someone has to give way. Are hon. members opposite utterly helpless? Do they tell us that because a little difficulty arises nothing can be done?

Mr. Latham: We want your help.

Mr. McCALLUM: But hon. members opposite have not solicited it.

Mr. Latham: We have done so now.

Mr. McCALLUM: If it is just a little question of arranging the conditions under which killing is to be done, that is not an argument against an export trade. Compared with the larger issues confronting us, such things are mere trifles. I do not for one moment believe that our existing financial position is wholly accounted for by the stoppage of borrowing for reproductive works or by the adverse balance of trade. We are told there is a shortage of money. But there is as much money in Australia to-day as there was two years ago. The people have not eaten the money.

The Minister for Lands: Twenty-five millions were sent away, you know.

Mr. McCALLUM: The money has not been burnt, nor has it been taken out to sea and dumped. The money is in this continent now.

The Minister for Lands: Twenty-five millions sterling were sent to England.

Mr. McCALLUM: Yes; and the Australian people have produced twenty-five millions since.

The Minister for Lands: No.

Mr. McCALLUM: Yes. Wealth is produced every day. The money is here. The real issue is as to the control of national credit being in the hands of private individuals, who can manipulate it as they like, who can do with the nation as they like. I do not say that the Western Australian Government can handle that trouble. I am doubtful whether even an Australia-wide Administration could handle it successfully. Twelve months ago the banks and other financial institutions in Australia were pressing credit on their clients, asking them to take money and go on with work. Then, all of a sudden, the people are told by the banks, "We have no money." Has that money disappeared into the atmosphere?

The Minister for Mines: When did that happen all at once?

Mr. McCALLUM: It happened within the last six months, since Christmas. The stoppage of local credits resulting in this crisis has happened this year. That is the problem with which Governments have to grapple. It is more than a State problem, and even more than a national problem. Really it is an international problem. It should be dealt with internationally. The subject is too intricate to be discussed fully in a debate of this kind. However, I am indeed glad to know that the British Prime Minister has indicated his intention of bringing the question before the Imperial Conference, which Mr. Scullin is now on his way to attend. I hope it will be possible to arrive at a decision, at least within the British Empire if not internationally, as to what shall be done to guard against the wonderful power private individuals now exercise over nations, halting progress and restricting development. On this point I wish to quote from the "Financial Times" of the 17th July last a statement by Mr. Ramsay MacDonald, who outlined some of the matters he intended to bring before the Imperial Conference. The British Prime Minister said—

After the Government took office there was a great financial crisis not in this country at all, and as a result the British unemployment figures began to go up.

Mr. MacDonald continued—

It is a curious thing that the two great crises which preceded that one came from financial collapses, and we must face the problem of why men not engaged in industry, either as masters or men, not concerned in production, but who by gambling, manipulation, and self-seeking and the way in which they manipulate credit by operations on stock exchanges, can create conditions not only in one country but in the whole world which mean that scores of thousands of men and women are turned out of work. The power of finance will have to be regulated and controlled.

That is the declaration made by the British Prime Minister in stating that he proposes to put up to the Imperial Conference the question of regulating and controlling finance. In that respect I believe the Imperial Conference will be able to help us to surmount the present crisis. In my opinion, assistance should be sought from the conference.

The Premier: I hope there will be good results from it.

Mr. McCALLUM: I hope that my remarks will not be misunderstood. I for my part will not stand for anything other than the tightening of the bonds between Australia and the Old Country. No one would regret it more than I if Australia adopted any other attitude. I make that statement lest I should be misunderstood in what I am about to say as to what should be done in regard to the position of credit, and in regard to the assistance I consider the Imperial Government can render Australia during the present crisis. I consider we have been most harshly dealt with in having our credit cut off, in being debarred from the London money market, so suddenly. Australia should have been given notice, so that she would have had time to adjust her affairs. This has not happened in the case of any other country. The least that should have been done was to notify Australia that she would need to make other arrangements. Then we would have had time to adjust ourselves to the change, and the situation could have been gradually righted. But to do it at one fell swoop, as in the case of Australia, is to do something that is unfair to a country which at all times has fully met its obligations.

Hon. P. Collier: Especially to do it at a time when there is a great fall of national income.

Mr. McCALLUM: Yes; it is most unfair that the opportunity selected for doing this

should be when Australia's main export commodities are severely affected by falling prices.

The Premier: That is one of the main reasons why I urged that Mr. Scullin should attend the conference.

Mr. McCALLUM: I am glad to hear the Premier say that, and I hope Mr. Scullin will be able to effect something in that respect while in London.

*Sitting suspended from 6.15 to 7.30 p.m.*

Mr. McCALLUM: At this juncture I think it would be well if I had something to say about a report that appeared in this morning's "West Australian" under the headings: "Labour Extremism. Financial Repudiation. New South Wales Demands. Ultimatum to Federal Members." The report indicates decisions arrived at by a committee, and they have been broadcasted and given great prominence both here and abroad. They have created much discussion in London. First of all, I would like to explain just what is the Labour Party organisation. I believe it is well known to members of this House, but it is just as well that it should be understood by the community at large. That will enable the people to give the report and statements embodied in it, their true value as affecting the Labour movement in Australia. The Australian Labour Party in its Federal sphere is governed by a triennial conference, comprised of six delegates from each State. Every three years that conference lays down the Federal policy of the Labour Party for the ensuing three years. The delegates are elected by the Labour Party in each of the States. In Western Australia we have one organisation; the industrial and the political sides are included in the one body. We select our six delegates here. In the Eastern States the industrial and political sections of the Labour movement are separate. In Sydney, where these resolutions emanate, the Trades and Labour Council have no association at all with the Australian Labour Party. The latter is an organisation entirely separate and apart from the Trades and Labour Council. The Australian Labour Parties in the different States elect their six delegates to attend the triennial interstate conference. The agenda paper is issued months ahead and distributed

amongst the various organisations. The various proposals are discussed and expressions of opinion are made available to the elected delegates. The decisions arrived at as a result of the deliberations at the triennial congress, are those to which the Labour movement of Australia will adhere for the succeeding three years. During the interregnum between conferences, an executive comprising delegates from each of the States watches the operations of the conference decisions. At the moment, the member for East Perth (Mr. Kennocally) is the president of that executive, which watches and acts in an administrative capacity regarding the decisions of conference. Apart from that executive, no body has any authority in this continent to speak for the Australian Labour Party in its Federal sphere. Should any other section attempt to speak for the party, they speak only for themselves and not for the Australian Labour Party.

The Minister for Railways: These people are not speaking; they propose to kick!

Mr. Withers: Kick themselves!

Mr. McCALLUM: According to the report in the "West Australian," there is a committee—I know no more about it than appears in the report—said to represent the State Labour Party and the Sydney Trades Hall. That committee will have to report back to the bodies that appointed them, and those bodies will deal with the recommendations. Neither body that appointed the committee has any authority to speak for the Australian Labour Party in its Federal sphere. I do not know what may happen to the committee's report, and the decisions arrived at. They may be accepted or rejected by either body.

The Premier: But that will not include Australia?

Mr. McCALLUM: It will not affect the Federal Labour Party at all. It is a great pity that such Press reports should be published and cabled abroad. It is a pity that they should be allowed to do such untold damage, create a wrong atmosphere, and give a false impression to the community as to the exact position. Then the report states—

..... if the recommendations are agreed to by the Australian Council of Trade Unions, all Federal Labour members will be concerned  
..... New South Wales Labour Ministers are bound by the decisions.

There is a body designated the Australasian Council of Trade Unions, but it has nothing whatever to do with the Australian Labour Party, and this State is not represented on the council at all. We have never been associated with it, and have nothing whatever to do with it. The council may express the opinions of the people it represents, but cannot talk on behalf of the Australian Labour Party. If that fact were appreciated in this community, such statements as those published in the "West Australian" would do far less damage in Australia than they are likely to do abroad. It is a great pity for the interests of Australia that such reports should get abroad. The report says that New South Wales Ministers will be bound by the decisions of the Australasian Council of Trade Unions. There is no truth whatever in that statement. No one can bind Federal Ministers or members of the Australian Labour Party in the Federal Houses of Parliament except the triennial conference of the Australian Labour Party, at which all the States are represented and at which the Federal policy is laid down. No one else can speak for our party. For these people in Sydney to say that they will issue ultimatums, talk expulsion, and so forth, is for them to deal with matters over which they have no jurisdiction whatever.

The Minister for Railways: They did it before.

Mr. McCALLUM: It is strange that always on the eve of an election, this element comes before the public and issues reports somewhat similar to that which appeared in this morning's "West Australian." An election is pending in New South Wales, and here we have the same old element making an appearance again, placing resolutions of the description I have indicated before the public, and trying to embarrass the Labour Party. During the last elections we had this same element against us. That element is always against us at elections and does everything possible to prejudice the people against us. The committee is attempting to fasten a policy of repudiation on to the Australian Labour Party. I have not doubt that I speak for the party in this country when I say we will not have anything to do with repudiation.

Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. McCALLUM: Least of all can the Labour Party have anything to do with re-

pudiation. How many of our own people during the war period, put their hard-earned savings into war loans? The trade unions put tens of thousands of pounds into those loans. When I was general secretary of the A.L.P. during war time, thousands and thousands of pounds were put in by trade unions.

Hon. P. Collier: As unions, not as individuals.

Mr. McCALLUM: Yes, the trade unions themselves invested in the war loans. Their money is still invested, and would they think for a moment of repudiating their own investments?

The Minister for Railways: They would not be influenced by self-interest!

Mr. McCALLUM: The thing is too ridiculous to be taken at all seriously. The fact remains that this element is always very active just before election time. At all times, it endeavours to cause disturbances, disruption and splits in the ranks of the Labour Party. It tries to cause chaos for the purpose of bringing about the downfall of the Australian Labour Party so that it may rear up in its place something more in keeping with other ideas.

Hon. P. Collier: To raise up Moscow.

Mr. McCALLUM: The latest publication is merely another instance of this. I need not inform hon. members that the Prime Minister (Mr. Scullin) has more than once stated clearly that he regards the honour of Australia in meeting its obligations equally as much as he regards his personal honour in meeting his own obligations. When the Attorney-General (Mr. Brennan) and, more recently, the Minister for Markets and Transport (Mr. Parker Moloney) passed through Perth, each dissociated himself clearly from any policy of repudiation.

The Premier: I hope your statements will be cabled abroad.

Mr. McCALLUM: There will be no question about this State and as to where we stand. These people in Sydney have no authority whatever to speak for the Australian Labour Party. If those responsible attempt to broach the subject at the triennial conference of the Australian Labour Party, they will quickly be told to go about their own business, for we will not be parties to anything of this description.

Mr. Angelo: It is good to hear you speak like that.

Mr. McCALLUM: I now wish to refer to the part Australia played in the Great War and the help extended by her to England. I have made the explanation regarding the Sydney episode first so that the public of this State interested in the point of view of the Labour Party and the attitude we are likely to take, will not misunderstand anything I say.

The Premier: And I hope that your remarks will be cabled Home.

Mr. McCALLUM: I consider that during the present crisis, the British Government should come to the help of Australia by establishing credits in London in order to help us out of our difficulties. In view of the help Australia rendered England we are entitled to ask for that consideration. We expect it, and we should not have to ask for it. Most decidedly that assistance should come our way. I say that because Australia stands out as having done more to help England during the war than any other part of the British Dominions. If we take the performance of Australia as compared with Canada, we find that up to the 30th April, 1919, the war expenditure in Canada represented £37 per head of the population. In Australia that expenditure rose to £60 per head, nearly twice as much per head as in Canada. Since then our expenditure has been going up at a greater rate because our pension payments are much heavier than those of Canada. The capitalised cost of war pensions in Canada is £88,000,000, whereas in Australia it is £100,000,000, in New Zealand £12,000,000, in South Africa £2,250,000, and in Newfoundland £3,000,000. The total war debt still continuing is 37 per cent. of the aggregate public debt of Australia, both Commonwealth and State. Canada has nearly double the population that Australia has, and yet she did not go to the assistance of Great Britain nearly to the extent that Australia did. Excepting Canada, Australia did more than the rest of the British Dominions put together. Yet we find that Canada can get all the credit she wants in London, can get loan moneys and can get finance, while Australia is denied it.

Mr. Angelo: What is her indebtedness per head, as against ours?

Mr. McCALLUM: I cannot say at the moment; I am dealing only with war figures.

Mr. Angelo: It may have a bearing upon your figures.

Mr. McCALLUM: No, because you have to take the assets, and in Canada the great bulk of the railways are privately-owned. Britain loaned to the Allies during the war £1,465,000,000 and to the Dominions £218,000,000. Australia was the only Dominion that paid the wages of her troops, maintained them, and found them in ammunition while they were fighting at the front. From the time the Canadian troops were put aboard a troop-ship, all the charges of those troops were on Great Britain. And while Australia maintained her own troops in France, France charged Australia rent for the trenches in which her troops were fighting.

The Attorney General: She charged England too.

Mr. McCALLUM: Yes. And, further, she charged England rent for the country upon which England constructed and equipped railways to take food supplies up to the French troops. Then again, Australia had to buy, in a country she was assisting, land in which to bury her own dead. When travelling through France I was most amazed to find that only one graveyard had been presented. Certainly Australia had to buy the land in which to bury her dead soldiers. No other Dominion was as badly treated as we were. On the other hand, we treated Great Britain better than did any other British dominion. We sold her our wool, wheat and gold, all at a flat rate. She traded them, and it is estimated that she made on them a profit of £300,000,000 sterling, nearly equal to the war debt of this continent. Yet Canada traded her wheat to England and got the full market value, whereas it may be said that we presented £300,000,000 to England in our wheat, wool and gold. Australia's annual war bill of charges is now over £30,000,000 per annum. That is what it is costing this continent to-day to meet war charges, all non-productive. Then again, we sacrificed the youth of this country, who would all have been wealth producers now. England has written off foreign war loans to the extent of no less than £1,000,000,000 sterling. She wrote off six-sevenths of the Italian war debt and five-sixths of the French war debt, and to-day she is lending huge sums of money to for-

eign countries. But we are called upon to meet our full war obligations, and have done it, despite which we have been told we cannot get credit. We are called upon to repay our war loans to Great Britain over 35 years at 5 per cent. Great Britain has been given by America 60 years in which to repay her obligations at 3 per cent. and 3½ per cent. So in that regard we are treated more harshly by England than England has been treated by a foreign nation. Up to 1926 France repudiated not only her war debt, but even the interest on it. Every Government in France that suggested increased taxation to meet war obligations was turned out by the people, who would not listen to any such suggestion. The result was that ultimately Great Britain had to write off five-sixths of the French war debt. In other words France repudiated her war debt to England to that extent, while Italy repudiated her war debt to England to the extent of six-sevenths. In view of all that, it is mighty strange after all Australia has done for Great Britain that we should be told we cannot get credit. We cannot get credit in London to allow us to go on with developmental work so that we might repay England in full. The British Government entered into an agreement with the Commonwealth and State Governments to allow us to provide cheap money for development. They wanted us to push on with the development of the Dominion, and said they would help us with cheap money so that we might assist the migration movement. But the moment we attempted to take advantage of that we were told we were overborrowing, that we had had too much money and that no further credit was available to us. It is not so much the borrowing we have done to develop this country that has caused the existing position; it is that the war has bled this country white; it is the enormous war debt this community is called upon to bear that we are suffering from now. During the war we were told by members opposite that Germany would bear the cost, that the Kaiser would pay our war debt; but we have since found that we ourselves have to pay it. It is Australia that is called upon to make the sacrifice and pay up. We are in a position to-day to pay England with our wheat, our wool, our timber, our meat, our butter and our fruit, but she is demand-

ing our gold. And the unfortunate part of it is that a great percentage of that gold will find its way into foreign countries in order to buy goods similar to our own. I will not in any way support repudiation. The Labour Party cannot afford to stand for repudiation, but I do not think England should repudiate us after all we have done for her. I do not forget, either, that it was a Labour Prime Minister who declared that Australia would go to the last man and the last shilling in the war. But it would appear that we have spent more than our last shilling. I regret the situation that has arisen, particularly those decisions that blazoned forth from Sydney this morning; but I warn members opposite that it is just such a policy as they are following, breaking down industrial conditions and using the whole of their efforts to further press upon the bottom dog and destroy his standard of living—it is that action on the part of members opposite that gives rise to those views and sentiments we had from Sydney this morning. Members opposite require to be careful of that.

The Minister for Railways: You said just now they had made much the same noise when you were in office.

Mr. McCALLUM: Yes, whether we were in office or out of office. I am not so anxious about the few making the noise, as I am about the support they are likely to rally to them.

The Minister for Lands: You are anxious to ally yourselves with them now and subsequently make out a case against the Government.

Mr. McCALLUM: Just now I took the responsibility of disowning them. I do not want the hon. member to force any of the workers of this country over to them. I want him to be careful in his actions, and not to continue carrying on as he is doing. I have shown what Australia has done for England, that she has done more for England than did any other part of the British dominions, and that in return she has not received even as favourable treatment as that meted out to foreigners. I think the least the British Government should do is to see that we are tided over the critical stage, to arrange credits for us in London until we can adjust our own affairs. I throw that out as a suggestion. I think it should have been discussed at the Premiers' Conference. I do not know whether

Mr. Scullin has it in mind to suggest any such thing when he reaches London. But we hear nothing from Ministers opposite as to what they have in mind. Nothing is said as to how they propose to meet the situation. At the elections they cried, "Work for all. I did it before and I will do it again." But now we have the unemployed increased by at least four times the number they were at election time. There is poverty and distress everywhere, yet we have no indication from the Government as to what they propose to do about it. The last time the Premier was in office he boasted that he had settled the then unemployment problem. Of course he did not do anything of the sort. The policy he adopted then was to drive men out of the country. It was one of the very few occasions in the history of this country when there were more people leaving the State than were coming into it. And now again, the hon. gentleman has been in office only four months and statistics show that during the last two months more people have left Western Australia than have come into it. In June there was an excess of 163 departures over arrivals, and in July the excess was 132. There is the Premier's policy of settling the unemployed—he is driving them out of the country.

The Minister for Lands: Those who have left were some of the foreigners you talked so much about when in office.

Mr. McCALLUM: That cannot be, for the hon. member has a very warm corner in his heart for foreigners. He objected strongly when we proposed to take action regarding those foreigners.

The Minister for Lands: That is an unfair and untrue statement.

Mr. McCALLUM: Nonsense! These figures are the official statistics. The State Statistician issued them, and they were published in the "West Australian" only the other morning. So what is the use of trying to deny them?

Hon. P. Collier: You protested against the embargo we laid on the Agricultural Bank's assistance to foreigners.

The Minister for Lands: Nothing of the sort.

Hon. P. Collier: Yes, you did.

Mr. McCALLUM: While, generally speaking, I do not propose to lose any opportunity to unmask the Premier and his idle promises and false statements made during the election, to expose him to the public in

his true light, to reveal the hypocrisy he used on the hustings and to show how he misled the most unfortunate section of the community—who believed him because they were right hard up against it and were fearful of losing their employment. They took his promises at their face value. I shall lose no opportunity of exposing him to the public for his hypocrisy and false promises and statements.

The Minister for Railways: I can see him fading away.

Mr. McCALLUM: It is not likely to affect him physically, but politically we shall do what we can to let the public know his true value. At the same time I wish to say that, in view of the position of the State, if we can agree with the Government on broad principles to help the State in its crisis, that help will be forthcoming.

The Attorney General interjected.

Mr. McCALLUM: I am not going to give the hon. gentleman any peace at all—

The Attorney General: Of course not.

Mr. McCALLUM: —so far as his promises are concerned.

The Minister for Lands: Nor help either.

Mr. McCALLUM: No. I am going to make members opposite stand up to everything they said on the hustings, so far as lies in my power to do so. I am going to expose them to the people for their hypocrisy, show what false statements they made, and how they deceived the electors. No opportunity will be lost by me to put the true facts to the people.

The Attorney General: You have started.

Mr. McCALLUM: Yes, and will continue. The hon. member will not be disappointed. There will be no let-up during the next three years. I will show the public how much reliance is to be placed upon any statement made by members opposite. To-night I have exposed the Premier by quoting "Hansard" and by means of facts and figures. That I shall continue to do during the next three years, so that when election time comes round again, the electors will know what value to attach to the promises made on the hustings by members opposite.

**THE MINISTER FOR WORKS** (Hon. J. Lindsay—Mt. Marshall) [8.2]: With the Premier and the Leader of the Opposition I wish to express my regret at the absence of some familiar faces from this House, even though they were my political oppo-

ents. During the six years I have been in this House, I have found that although we were opponents on the floor of the House, we could be personal friends outside. That is a very fine spirit which pervades members generally, and I hope it will continue. I congratulate the member for South Fremantle (Mr. McCallum) on his elevation to the position of Deputy Leader of the Opposition. I wish to congratulate the Leader of the Opposition on his very able speech and the moderation of its tone. Being the man he is, he realises that this is a time when the Opposition should be mild in their criticism and should help the Government to overcome the very serious difficulty with which the State is confronted. I am pleased that the Deputy Leader of the Opposition has followed somewhat in the footsteps of his Leader, because he appeared to me to be a little milder than is usual for him. The Leader of the Opposition said the time had come when there could be no increase in taxation, and the Government would have to square the ledger. I believe that is recognised by most people in the State, and the Government intend to do it if possible. Yet immediately we start to do something in the direction of squaring the ledger, we are attacked by the Deputy Leader of the Opposition. The hon. member has taken us to task for dealing with matters that he says affect only the working men. Two of the matters he mentioned, the scaffolding and timber regulations, are covered by Acts that are under my administration. It has been my duty as Minister for Works to reduce expenditure. In the scaffolding department we had three paid officers, and to-day there is only one. The member for South Fremantle said he introduced a Bill to reduce the scaffolding fees, and the fees would have been reduced if the Upper House had agreed to the Bill. The hon. member, when in power, introduced many Bills which included other matters to which members could not agree, and because another place rejected those measures on account of the inclusion of provisions to which they objected, he says he was not permitted to do what he considered right. I have already given notice of my intention to introduce a Bill for an Act to amend the Scaffolding Act. It is my desire to reduce the scaffolding fees, because I consider those fees have been a tax on the people, and wherever possible we

ought to reduce taxation. Under the timber regulations we have had one permanent and two workmen's inspectors paid by the State. The member for South Fremantle knows that the officer in charge of the timber regulations has been consistently writing to say that the department was overmanned and that the staff should be reduced. I have reduced the staff. The hon. member says we should not have handed the administration of the regulations to the Forests Department. That has not been done. I have handed the regulations over to the Minister for Forests because I believe they can be administered more economically in that way than by creating a separate department. The Leader of the Opposition accused us of attacking an award during the currency of the award. We are not doing that at all. Awards are issued by the Arbitration Court for a specified period, and it is provided that after 12 months either party may apply for leave to amend an award. The member for South Fremantle has criticised the Government for approaching the Arbitration Court.

Mr. Sleeman: You admit that the Government have done so.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: I do, and I take the full responsibility for it. I do not attempt to dodge my responsibility at any time.

Mr. Sleeman: The other night you said it was the Commissioner of Railways.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: As Minister for Labour, I take the responsibility for it. In 1922, when the then Government took some action with regard to unionists, the member for South Fremantle was one of a deputation who waited upon the Government. The report published in the "West Australian" on the 30th June, 1922, stated that the deputation waited upon the Acting Premier, Mr. Colebatch. This is what the member for South Fremantle said—

In his experience of industrial matters, if one side wished altered hours or wages and the other side disagreed, it had been the aggressive side's responsibility to use the law and to approach the Arbitration Court for the desired alteration.

Because we are doing what the member for South Fremantle in 1922 said was the right thing to do, he criticises us. On that occasion the hon. member also said that were it not for the fact that Section 103 of the Arbitration Act exempted the Government, the proposed alterations could not be enforced

without the court's consent. At that time Section 103 did exempt the Government.

Mr. McCallum: It did not; the Government backed down.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: When the hon. member was Minister for Labour in 1925, he introduced an amendment of the Arbitration Act and that exemption was removed. This House agreed to the removal of the exemption. Members who were here at that time will recollect the interest that the amending Bill aroused. It was sent to another place where I believe some 80 amendments were moved. Later there was a conference of managers, and it took 18 hours to decide the points in dispute between the two Houses.

Hon. P. Collier: And weary hours they were, too.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: Yes, for those who were awaiting the result of the conference. The amendments became law, and the then Minister for Labour made a public statement to the effect that the legislation as amended was the finest Arbitration Act in the world. All that the Government are asking to-day is that that finest Arbitration Act in the world be allowed to operate.

Mr. Sleeman: Operate your own way.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: We have gone to the court and asked for a review of the working conditions. We have asked that the 48-hour week be restored and that the district allowances be reviewed.

Mr. McCallum: You have asked for an abolition of the district allowances, not a review.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: At one stage I interjected that the 44-hour week had been granted by administrative act. I was told that was wrong. Let me give the facts. In December, 1919, Mr. Justice Rooth granted certain workers in the Railway Department, principally workshops employees, the 44-hour week. The number of employees who benefited was 4,293. A point that the member for South Fremantle left severely alone is that in September, 1923, after a lengthy hearing and the submission of extensive evidence, the court granted the Government's application for a 48-hour week. The application was made on behalf of the Government and applied to all Public Works employees numbering 3,000. The term of that award was three years, subject to review after 12 months. That award became the law, and both Government and employees had

to observe it. But what happened? In April, 1924, there was a change of Government, and notwithstanding that the award should have continued in operation at least until the following September, the new Government granted the 44-hour week to every one of the 3,000 employees. A political act!

The Minister for Railways: On a minority vote.

Hon. P. Collier: It was not.

The Minister for Railways: Look at the figures.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: Anyhow, nine months after the award had been granted the Collier Government overrode the decision of the Arbitration Court—their own body—and gave workers to the number of 3,000 the 44-hour week. I believe that the Government should obey the law just the same as anyone else has to do, and I believe it is the duty of the Arbitration Court, and not of Ministers, to determine wages and hours. In saying this I am not adopting any new attitude. When the member for South Fremantle introduced a Bill for the 44-hour week, I opposed it. I said—

It should not be the function of the Government to decide wages and working conditions. It is the function of the court that is appointed by Parliament and paid for by the taxpayers of the State.

That is all we are asking on this occasion—for the court to do the work. In April 1924 a large number of other Government employees were by administrative decision granted the 44-hour week. On the 30th June, 1929, the number of Government employees was as follows:—Departmental other than railways and tramways, 7,161; railways and tramways, 8,534, a total of 15,695. Of that number 13,198 were working 44 hours, and of the remainder some were working under and some over that number. By administrative decision a small section of the community was given the 44-hour week. The number of wages employees in the Government service at 30th June last was 16,134, and 13,434 were working 44 hours. The only decision the court has ever given in that connection was in December, 1919, when it granted 44 hours to 4,293 employees. The number of wage and salary earners employed by the

Government on the 30th June last was 21,139. The number of wage and salary earners in Western Australia altogether was then 131,800. When special privileges were given to Government employees the cost must be paid by someone. A good many of these privileges have been paid for by the other 110,000 salary and wage earners in Western Australia. People say we are doing something to reduce the pay of the workers. The Government are doing nothing except to ask the court to function. If a Government gives a small section of the community certain privileges, which other sections cannot get, the cost must come out of the pockets of the others. The present Government have not been getting money out of the pockets of others. I would tell the House of other sections who are not working 44 hours. The police work 112 hours a fortnight of 14 days in shifts of eight hours, with one day off a week.

The Minister for Railways: They were not popular.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: The employees of State farms, the rabbit-proof fence employees, and those of the agricultural college work 48 hours a week. Why did not the Government finish the job, and by administrative act give to others what they had given to a certain section?

Hon. M. F. Troy: We complain you are doing what you promised at the elections not to do.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: I promised nothing. I wish to refer to the debate on the 44-hour week Bill. How many on this side of the House voted for it? I do not think one did so. I expressed my views then as I am doing now.

Hon. M. F. Troy: The Premier said he would not interfere with the position.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: The Public Works awards of 1923 were issued in September of that year. The 44-hour week was given to this section of the community by the Government in July, 1924, three months before the expiration of the 12 months allowed by law before any alteration could be made.

Mr. Panton: There is nothing in the law to prevent anyone giving less than the maximum hours nor more than the minimum wage.

**The MINISTER FOR WORKS:** No, but why add the cost to other salary and wage earners?

**Mr. Panton:** You said the Government had broken the law.

**The MINISTER FOR WORKS:** No Government should do something for the benefit of one section of the community only. It is their duty to administer the affairs of State for the whole of the people.

**Mr. Panton:** You were quoting the law just now.

**The MINISTER FOR WORKS:** The agreement could not be registered because the court could not allow that. It could not be registered until after September. The agreement was made, but did not become a legal document until some time later. We have been twitted by the Leader of the Opposition because we attempted to get an amendment made to an award before it had expired. I agree that the award is for three years, but it distinctly states that amendments can be asked for after the first 12 months. What happened with the other unions? The Government gave them the 44-hour week. As soon as September arrived the unions entered into negotiations with Ministers, who granted them many conditions which had not been granted by the court. In September, 1924, the unions submitted a list of the variations they were seeking. These matters were dealt with, and some were agreed to. Certain small clauses in the award, even that Ministry could not agree to. An arbitrator, I believe Mr. Walsh, was appointed, and eventually in 1926 the agreement became law. The elections were held in April and the award does not expire until September. I will indicate the attitude of the previous Ministry in this matter. The Minister for Labour wrote a letter as follows.—

I should be glad if you would prepare an industrial agreement between the Government and each of the trade unions who previously enjoyed the 44-hour week and lost it owing to the recent decision of the court of arbitration.

How dare the court do such a thing? These men lost the 44-hour week because of the law. This would include the Australian Workers' Union, which did not go to the court.

**Mr. Panton:** It was not allowed to go to the court.

**The MINISTER FOR WORKS:** I said it did not go to the court.

**Mr. Panton:** The inference was that they would not go.

**The MINISTER FOR WORKS:** I agree that they could not go to the court. The agreement was to set out that the 44-hour week should be worked in 5½ days, and so it goes on.

**The Minister for Railways:** Who said that?

**Mr. McCallum:** I did, the Government did.

**The MINISTER FOR WORKS:** The agreement was further to provide that when the date arrived for the review of the existing award this year, both parties would agree to the settlement of issues, to the continuance of the 44 hours at the existing rate. Here is the legal aspect of the position as given by the Solicitor General. In a letter addressed to Mr. Munt, Mr. Sayer said—

As you are aware, the court has no power to vary the terms of an award until after the expiration of the first 12 months, and by Section 126 (which is expressly incorporated with Part 3), an agreement to vary the terms of an award cannot be legally enforced. However, as the substitution of a 44-hour week in place of the 48-hour week is mutually agreed to, the provisions of the proposed agreement are not likely to be called into question.

I believe the Arbitration Court is the proper place to decide wages and working conditions. The Government think so too. All we have asked is that the court shall function. The court did so recently, and gave the 48 hours in at least two awards. One happens to be the saw-milling award.

**Mr. McCallum:** That lends you a little encouragement.

**The MINISTER FOR WORKS:** Probably; the 48 hours was worked by the saw-mill employees prior to 1920. The 44-hour week was granted by the Federal award in November, 1920. The 48-hour week was embodied in the Federal award of 1922 on the evidence of decreased production. In August, 1925, the 44-hour week was reverted to by Government direction. Again we have the Government interfering with the decision of the Court and appointing themselves an arbitrator. In 1930 the 48 hours was given by State award. Here is another illustration. Let me take the Old Men's Home. This is something that was done lately. In 1925 the union claimed 44 hours. The Chief Secretary disputed the claim. By Award No. 5 of 1926, the court left the hours at 48.

In delivering the judgment of the court Mr. President Dwyer said—

The court has to consider the evidence and weigh the advantages or disadvantages of the arguments put before it, and then acting conscientiously has to arrive at what it thinks is in the best interests of the industry, the worker, and the community in general.

It is the duty of the court to consider the interests, not only of the worker, but of the community as a whole. That is why we think the court should be the tribunal to decide this question, and not the Government. I refuse to place myself in the position of arbitrator. The member for Leederville (Mr. Panton) knows that. He has tried on many occasions to get me to sign an agreement with his union. It is not my duty to do that while the court exists.

Mr. Panton: We cannot go to the court.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: I know. I will sign the agreement after the court has given its decision. I do not think any Minister can decide such a matter because he is not in a position to hear the evidence. The court is paid to function and do its job. That is all the Government ask of it.

Mr. Willcock: The court settles disputes. If you can come to an agreement, you do not need to go to the court.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: When the conference was held, the unions said that provided we withdrew the question of district allowances, and the question of hours in regard to those employees who had the 44 hours before 1920, they would not object to the application for leave, but would oppose the 48 hours for the whole of the workers.

Mr. Panton: I do not blame them.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: That was not a reasonable proposal. It was the same thing we started with, and I could not agree to it.

Hon. P. Collier: You are very hard.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: I have learned that it is necessary to be hard in these times. I have learned how to say no, a thing I was not able to do until a few months ago. There is a paragraph in the Industrial Arbitration Act, which says—

What is fair and right in relation to any industrial matter, having regard to the interests of the persons immediately concerned and the community as a whole.

It is the duty of the court to consider that. When I ask the court to decide on the district allowances, it will decide upon that issue. Is it not a fair and reasonable way to decide it?

Mr. Willcock: No.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: The court will decide the matter on the evidence.

Mr. Willcock: It has no power to decide it on proper evidence.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: It has more power than I have to give justice. How can I as Minister decide these issues?

Mr. Willcock: It has been possible for Ministers to do so for the last 30 years.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: No Minister has decided district allowances.

Mr. Willcock: They have.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: I have here the whole history of district allowances. The first allowances given were in connection with the Kalgoorlie water supply scheme. The men were given a district allowance owing to disabilities, cost of living, and the isolation of those days.

Mr. Sleeman: Who decided the matter?

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: It cannot be said that the same disabilities exist at Merredin to-day that existed for the men engaged on this water scheme.

Mr. Withers: Men who never saw the start of the water scheme were then getting district allowances in the railways.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: After all, there is the question of the State district allowances. Certain things have been laid down by the Arbitration Court, and the court has to decide these questions on a similar basis. As regards the district allowance in the Commonwealth railways, Sir John Quick, in delivering his judgment in December, 1926, said—

The next question to consider is the claim for what are known as district allowances granted to employees on the Commonwealth railways additional to the basic wage in consideration of such elements and factors as isolation, time lost in travelling to and from a place, the consequent increased cost of living, and the increased discomfort owing to the lack of social and domestic facilities.

At the instance of the present Leader of the Opposition the following motion was carried on the 4th December, 1923:—

That in the opinion of this House the practice that has hitherto prevailed of making a monetary allowance in addition to wages to

railwaymen and other employees living on the goldfields and remote from the capital as compensation for climatic conditions, risks of industry, and the general living conditions incidental to working in those parts of the State, is just and equitable and should be continued and extended to all workers employed in such industries.

Hon. P. Collier: That motion was carried unanimously.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: Public Service Regulation No. 75 provides that district allowances may be paid in localities where the climatic conditions are severe, or where, owing to the situation, the cost of living is exceptionally high. That is the position as regards the Arbitration Court. The court has the duty of deciding the question. When it comes before the court, it will be decided by the court. Section 121 of the Industrial Arbitration Act as amended in 1925, during the regime of the late Labour Government, provides—

(1) Before the 14th day of June in every year the court, of its own motion, shall determine and declare—(a) a basic wage to be paid to male and female workers, and (b) wherever or whenever necessary, differential basic rates to be paid in special or defined areas of the State. (2) The expression "basic wage" means a sum sufficient to enable the average worker to whom it applies to live in reasonable comfort, having regard to any domestic obligation to which such average worker would be ordinarily subject.

Mr. Panton: The court, when declaring the basic wage, takes no notice of any district allowance given by the regulations.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: In delivering the 1929 declaration, Mr. President Dwyer stated *inter alia*—

The Court has, as regards the Eastern and Murchison Goldfields Districts, decided to adhere to the former basic wage, as it is its intention to hold an inquiry at an early date into what should be the basic rate in these places, and in the meantime to maintain the status quo. This position is forced upon the Court owing to the wording of the Act. The Act states that it is the duty of the Court to declare (a) a basic wage to be paid to male and female workers, and (b) wherever and whenever necessary differential basic rates to be paid in special or defined areas of the State. In consequence of that, any declaration made by this Court, unless provision is made to the contrary, is bound to have general application all over the State from Wyndham to Albany. We know from our experience here that the only figures we get have reference to the metropolitan area. The only facts and circumstances put before us for consideration have reference to the metropolitan area, but notwithstanding the impossible task is imposed upon us of declaring a basic wage

which has a general application. It seems to me that so far as our Western Australian conditions are concerned, whatever may be the case in other places the common sense and practical method of dealing with this subject is to apply our mind to the metropolitan area, which I suppose embraces about 70 per cent. or 75 per cent. of the workers coming within the jurisdiction of the Court, and having ascertained the cost to supply reasonable comfort to a family residing in the metropolitan area, then to use that as the standard whereby to regulate wages in other places, either by adjusting existing agreements and awards or when agreements and awards come up for determination to apply the results obtained in Perth. In the present instance the figures, so far as they go, would apparently be very much against the goldfields, and it is therefore better as far as they are concerned to maintain the status quo until full inquiry is instituted up there to ascertain what would be a fair basic wage to apply in the circumstances and conditions as they exist there.

It was decided that in the following year the Arbitration Court should take evidence as to the basic wage outside the metropolitan area, and should fix a basic wage not only for the metropolitan area but also for the rest of the State.

Mr. Panton: Well, and what happened then?

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: I am coming to that. In 1929 the Arbitration Court bench, accompanied by employees' and employers' advocates, made an extensive tour through the goldfields areas, and inquired into conditions, cost of living, and so forth there. The 1930 declaration prescribed a basic wage of £4 5s. for males and £2 5s. 11d. for females throughout the State with the exception of the metropolitan area, in which the basic wage was fixed at £4 6s. and £2 6s. 5d., respectively. In other words, the Arbitration Court declared that the cost of living was 1s. per week less outside the metropolitan area than within it. That is the first time in the history of the Arbitration Court of Western Australia that such a declaration has been made.

Mr. Panton: Was any ruling given by the court as to the district allowance being granted?

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: In delivering the 1930 declaration the President of the Court made the following remarks:—

Hitherto our information as to the cost of living was confined to the metropolitan area, but on this occasion the Government Statistician through his officers had enabled us to obtain information relating to other portions

of the State, as will be seen from the figures given above. First of all as regards the gold-fields areas, it will be seen that cost of living in Kalgoorlie to meet the same scale as in Perth would amount to £4 3s. 10d. However, the type of house provided there is not as good as that provided in Perth, but on the other hand, the type of house in Perth which is necessarily taken as the rental basis includes many houses of a very expensive character to build, and consequently commanding more rent than the unskilled worker with whom we are dealing should or would be called upon to pay. Therefore, it seems to me, in the circumstances, that if we provide for the Kalgoorlie worker the sum of £4 5s. per week we will be making fair provision for him as a basic wage in Kalgoorlie and supplying him with the reasonable comfort requirements of the Act.

Mr. Pantou: The £4 3s. 10d. is on account of rents, of course.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: Rent, naturally, is taken into consideration.

Mr. Willcock: Is a man to live in a wretched house in Kalgoorlie and therefore get less money?

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: The Arbitration Court has decided what the basic wage shall be. Mr. President Dwyer continues—

I do not think that we would be dealing justly with the Kalgoorlie worker were we to give him an amount appreciably below his fellow-workers in Perth, even though the wages he receives could be made to go further.

In 1923, when the Public Works Department unions were before the Arbitration Court, the district allowances were discussed at considerable length, and in speaking at the discussion on the minutes Mr. Justice Draper, then President of the Court, stated—

I have no hesitation in saying that these district allowances of the Government are not very logical, and they will not be repeated again, so far as I am concerned.

Mr. Pantou: The judge did not bring them down, though.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: The court did give a district allowance to the Kalgoorlie miners, in 1923. Mr. Justice Northmore's judgment on that occasion contained the following passages:—

Now it cannot be disputed that if we take as a base the minimum rate of wage recently fixed by the Court for Perth, and apply to that the index figures supplied by the Commonwealth Statistician, neither the rate of 16s. claimed by the respondents, nor the rate

of 15s. fixed by the award, which is sought to be amended in these proceedings, can be justified. The respondents, however, claim that, to the figure so arrived at, there should be added an amount to compensate workers for the climatic and general living conditions obtaining in Kalgoorlie, and to cover risks in the mining industry, and it is contended that to withhold such allowance would be to depart from a well-established custom in the industry, and a long and continued practice in this Court. The respondents' claim and contention raised two questions, viz., (1) whether there is any justification for the making of any such additional allowance to the basic wage, and (2) whether in fact it has been the practice in the past for this court to make such an allowance. Dealing with the first question, it is obvious that the added risks to body and health are not common to all workers in the industry, and, therefore, do not supply a reason for increasing the basic wage, but rather should be, and no doubt have been, taken into consideration in fixing the margins above the minimum wage payable to the various classes of workers. Moreover, so far as the underground workers are concerned, the risk to health is recognised in the granting of a 44-hour week as against a 48-hour week for surface workers. As to the climate of Kalgoorlie, for a considerable portion of the year, it is excellent and superior to that of Perth. In the summer it is, no doubt, hot and dusty, but whilst in that respect it is probably little worse than other towns nearer the coast, it has many conveniences which such towns lack. In this connection also it should be borne in mind that the award provides for a fortnight's holiday to all workers in the industry, a provision which imposes a substantial burden on the industry, and which was described by more than one witness as a great boon to the workers. For these reasons, it seems to me that the respondents' claim for an allowance cannot be supported.

Mr. Pantou: The judge took half-a-crown off the amount fixed 12 months previously.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: In making the 1927 declaration, Mr. Justice Dwyer remarked—

The first award in the Arbitration Court which was made in the mining industry was in September, 1902, when the minimum wage was fixed at 10s. per shift. At the time the minimum wage in Perth was in the region of about 8s. per day. It is, however, a well-known fact that the cost of living on the goldfields at the time had reached a very high peak, and this is quite sufficient to account for the marginal difference.

The position is that district allowances have been granted over a long term of years. They have grown up somehow, no one knows exactly how.

Hon. P. Collier: Like Topsy, they "just grewed."

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: When the Leader of the Opposition was speaking, I asked him what was the difference as regards isolation and high cost of living between a man at Kellerberrin and one at Merredin. The man at Kellerberrin gets no allowances, whereas the man at Merredin gets 1s. 6d. per day. That seems an injustice to the Kellerberrin worker. Why should the man employed by the Goldfields Water Supply Department receive a district allowance of 3s. per week, while other workers employed under similar conditions receive no allowance whatever? Why should the Public Works Department employees at Kalgoorlie, Coolgardie and Southern Cross receive an allowance of 9s. per week, and the railway employee similarly situated 10s. 6d., while the miner receives nothing? The miner within a 5-mile radius of Kalgoorlie, Coolgardie and Southern Cross receives no allowance whatever. Within 5 miles of a railway south of Dundas and thence north-east to ten miles east of Karonie he receives 6s. In the case of a mine more than five miles from a railway, he receives 9s. Kalgoorlie men are not getting the district allowance. There are 130,000 wage and salary earners in the State, and only 20,000 public servants. I ask, who pays the district allowances of the public servants?

Hon. P. Collier: I thought the farmer paid for everything.

The Minister for Lands: He has no means to pay this year.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: In South Australia there are zone allowances of 1s. per day north of Hawker, of the same amount in the Port Lincoln Division, and of 6d. per day north-east of Paraoo. No district allowances are prescribed for South Australian railway and road construction workers. In New South Wales for men engaged on railway construction there are no district allowances, but a climatic allowance of 1s. per day is paid west of a line running from about 50 miles west of Albury through Dubbo to the north of the State. Under the New South Wales railway traffic award the climatic allowance in those areas is 6d. per day. The Main Roads Board foremen's award prescribes neither district nor climatic allowances. We are always told that conditions of employment under the Commonwealth

are far and away above those of employment under the States. Now, I think it will be agreed that employment on the trans-Australian railway involves isolation. It means living in the desert. For employees at and 12 miles from Port Augusta the allowance is 2s. 4d. per week, 50 to 257 miles 5s. 3d. per week, 258 miles to 436 miles 10s. 6d. per week, and beyond 437 miles 12s. 3d. per week. But when it comes to Kalgoorlie, the allowance is 5s. 3d. Therefore the Commonwealth railway employees are not as well treated as our men are. A most peculiar feature of the district allowances is their unevenness. They are unjust to some districts. The Railway Department give no district allowance as far as Lake Grace, but beyond Lake Grace to Newdegate—and it is no worse to live at Newdegate than at Lake Grace—there is an allowance of 5s. 3d. per week.

Mr. Willcock: Living might be dearer at Newdegate.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: Living dearer at Newdegate, only 25 miles further by train! Let me take the hon. member's own district. Within 20 miles of Geraldton the worker receives an allowance of 1s. 6d. Outside the 20 miles, he gets nothing. From Mundaring to Merredin the railway employees get nothing, whereas the Public Works Department employees get 3s. per week. Why should they? From Merredin to Goongarrie, the railway men receive 10s. 6d. per week and the Public Works employees 9s. When we come to Geraldton, we find that within twenty miles, the railway people draw 1s. 9d. per week and the Public Works men 1s. 6d., whereas 20 miles from Geraldton to Yuna, Ajana and Mullewa, the railway employees get 10s. 6d. per week and the Public Works employees get nothing. What an injustice to the Public Works employees!

Mr. Panton: Now is your chance to rectify it.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: From Marne to Mullewa the railway employees draw 10s. 6d. per week and the Public Works employees nothing; from east of Mullewa to Magnet, the railway men get 10s. 6d. and the Public Works employees 9s.; from Lake Grace eastward, the railway men draw 5s. 3d. and the Public Works men nothing. I believe I have said enough to show that the district allowances, to say the

least of it, are very uneven. I have also demonstrated the fact that the previous Government, by administrative action, gave to the wage-earners in the Government service something that the Arbitration Court refused to agree to. In other words the Government altered the decision of the court. That additional money could be given only by taking it out of the pockets of other workers and—

Hon. P. Collier: The farmers.

The MINISTERS FOR WORKS: The farmers are workers as well. I have already indicated that the 110,000 workers in private employment have to bear the expense of the concession to Government workers. The Opposition tell us they are the friends of the workers, but evidently the Labour Government were the friends of the Government employees. Every penny this State adds to the cost of Government services means taking so much out of the pockets of the rest of the people, and the time has come, not only in this State but elsewhere, to rectify the position.

Mr. Kenneally: You are making out a good case for a proper charge to be made for the carriage of superphosphates.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: If the member for East Perth (Mr. Kenneally) would only take home a bag of superphosphate, he might grow more intelligence, because super is good. We as a Government stand for the Arbitration Court. That court has never been allowed to function. We stand not only for the workers in the Government service, but we stand for justice for the whole of the people of Western Australia. Hence our action in this respect.

On motion by Mr. Griffiths, debate adjourned.

*House adjourned at 8.45 p.m.*

## Legislative Council.

*Tuesday, 2nd September, 1930.*

Address-in-reply, sixth day ... .. PAGE 133

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

### ADDRESS-IN-REPLY.

*Sixth Day.*

Debate resumed from the 28th August.

HON. SIE EDWARD WITTENOOM (North) [4.34]: Before proceeding to address myself to the motion before the House, I should like to say how pleased I am to be back in Western Australia, and incidentally amongst my fellow members in this House. From my experience of travelling I can honestly say there are few places in the world to equal Western Australia, especially for climate and health, and I always find each time I leave it that I am more than glad to come back again. Again, I should like to place on record my regret at what I understand is a serious illness in my old friend Mr. Bernard Parker, the Clerk of Parliaments. As you all know, Mr. Parker has been associated with this House for a great number of years. He was particularly closely associated with me during my short term as President, and I can say that he carried out his duties loyally and to the best of his ability. During his serious illness he has my sincere sympathy and, I am perfectly sure, the sincere sympathy of us all. A third matter I should like to mention has to do with the Standing Orders. Standing Order No. 381 prescribes that no member shall read his speech. I think that in the past that rule has been carried out rather in the breach than in the observance; indeed I might almost say that on various occasions we have had speeches read in this House. I think that Standing Order should be eliminated, for a well-written speech is infinitely better than a long viva voce harangue which, perhaps, has in it neither point nor grammar. So I think it would be advisable to have that Standing Order expunged. My reason for referring to it on this occasion is that through my increasing age my memory is not as good as it has been in the past.