

Minister for Railways who administers the Bunbury Harbour Board Act, he pointed out that there were only two amendments, the first being the repeal of Section 12 which covers the maximum remuneration received by members, and the second being the granting to the Bunbury Harbour Board the power to make regulations in regard to the fees payable to the chairman and the members.

I take this opportunity of pointing out that the Bunbury Harbour Board has been in existence since 1909. When the Act was proclaimed Section 12, which has not been amended since, read—

The fees payable to the Chairman shall not in any one year exceed One hundred pounds, and those payable to any member other than the Chairman shall not in any one year exceed Fifty pounds.

Conditions have changed considerably since that time. For many years the Bunbury Harbour Board has endeavoured to effect an alteration to the fees payable to the chairman and board members. According to the report of the board of last year, I notice that it met on 51 occasions, and therefore for those 51 meetings the members received the sum of £50 each while the chairman received £100.

During his second reading speech the Minister made a slight error when he indicated that the increased fees requested by the board were from £3 3s. to £4 4s. in respect of the chairman, and from £2 2s. to £3 3s. in respect of the members. That is not correct. In fact, at times the members do not receive on the average £1 per meeting. The board has submitted a regulation in which an endeavour is being made to increase the fee payable to the chairman to £4 4s. per meeting with a maximum of £200 per year, and to the board members to £3 3s. per meeting or a maximum of £150 per year, thus bringing the fees into line with those payable by the Albany Harbour Board.

I trust that the Minister who introduced the Bill and who is not in his seat, will give consideration to granting the increased fees payable to the chairman and the board members retrospectively to the 1st March last, because the regulation has been in the hands of the department for some time. I have pleasure in supporting the second reading.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee, etc.

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

Bill read a third time and transmitted to the Council.

House adjourned at 12.3 a.m. (Friday).

Legislative Council

Tuesday, 19th November, 1957.

CONTENTS.

	Page
Assent to Bills	3154
Questions : Speech therapy, treatment for Goldfields children	3154
Wubin water supply, plans and expectations	3155
Boring in Mendels-Wongoondy area, drilling plan, commencement of work, etc.	3155
Motions : Municipal Corporations Act, to disallow uniform general building by-laws, order discharged	3194
Municipal Corporations Act, to disallow uniform general building (car port) by-law, order discharged	3195
Bills : Nurses Registration Act Amendment (No. 2), as to recom., 3r.	3155
Acts Amendment (Superannuation and Pensions), reports	3155
Constitution Acts Amendment (No. 1), 2r.	3155
Long Service Leave, 2r.	3156
Midland Junction-Welshpool Railway, 1r.	3181
Bunbury Harbour Board Act Amendment, 1r.	3181
Metropolitan (Perth) Passenger Transport Trust, 1r.	3181
Education Act Amendment, 1r.	3181
State Transport Co-ordination Act Amendment (No. 3), 1r.	3181
Electoral Act Amendment (No. 3), 2r.	3181
Juries, Assembly's further message	3194
Traffic Act Amendment (No. 1), Assembly's message....	3194

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

ASSENT TO BILLS.

Message from the Governor received and read notifying assent to the following Bills:—

1. Betting Control Act Continuance.
2. Government Railways Act Amendment.
3. Chiropodists.

QUESTIONS.

SPEECH THERAPY.

Treatment for Goldfields Children.

Hon. J. M. A. CUNNINGHAM asked the Chief Secretary:

In view of the report of speech therapist Miss Adams, from the Children's Hospital, Perth, on her visit to Kalgoorlie-Boulder last July, that 150 children in that district

were suffering some defect, and her expressed view that something would have to be done to provide treatment, will he advise—

- (1) Is anything being done to provide regular speech therapy treatment for children with speech defects in the Kalgoorlie-Boulder district?
- (2) If so, what?
- (3) Is Miss Adams and her team to visit the Goldfields again early in the new year to complete the previous survey?

The CHIEF SECRETARY replied:

Speech therapy in school children has been under consideration by the Public Health and Education Departments for a considerable time. It is anticipated that with the collaboration of the newly established University department of child health, and the Princess Margaret Hospital, an accurate assessment of the problems associated with speech defects on a State-wide basis will be made early in 1958. Appropriate advice will then be given to the Government concerning what action is necessary.

WUBIN WATER SUPPLY.

Plans and Expectations.

Hon. L. A. LOGAN asked the Chief Secretary:

- (1) To what stage has the plan for a water supply for Wubin been developed?
- (2) When is it expected that this urgent work will be completed?

The CHIEF SECRETARY replied:

- (1) Plans for a dam and standpipe supply are complete.
- (2) The work will be listed for consideration on the 1958-59 draft Loan Estimates.

BORING IN MENDELS-WONGOONDY AREA.

Drilling Plan, Commencement of Work, etc.

Hon. C. H. SIMPSON asked the Minister for the North-West:

- (1) Will he inform the House of the present position in regard to the setting-up of a hydrological section and the procurement of drills and necessary staff to do exploratory boring in the Mendels-Wongoondy area?

(2) Is a drilling plan prepared covering intended operations?

(3) In what areas in the vicinity of the Wongan and Midland railway lines would operations be undertaken at a reasonably early date?

(4) How soon is projected work likely to commence?

(5) In what order of priority in regard to areas is work to be undertaken?

The MINISTER replied:

(1) Two Ruston Bucyrus well drills are expected to arrive in Fremantle at the end of this month, and field-work should commence early in the new year. Some staff is already available and further will be obtained as required.

(2) and (3) A number of requests have already been received from farmers for assistance to locate water supplies. These have been listed, and priority of operations will be decided later. Should the hon. member desire to lodge any requests affecting Wongan and Midland railway areas, these will receive consideration.

(4) See No. (1).

(5) See Nos. (2) and (3).

BILL—NURSES REGISTRATION ACT AMENDMENT (No. 2).

As to Recommittal.

Hon. J. G. HISLOP: I move—

That the Bill be recommitted for the further consideration of Clause 2.

The PRESIDENT: Has the hon. member an amendment to move?

Hon. J. G. HISLOP: No. The purpose in moving for recommittal is that a meeting of the Nurses Registration Board has been held. I understand that notes have been sent to the Government, and I would like to know whether the Government is prepared to consider them or not.

The PRESIDENT: I am afraid that under Standing Order 204a. I must rule the motion out of order. The Standing Order reads as follows:—

No amendment shall be made in, and no new clauses shall be added to, any Bill recommitted on the third reading, unless notice thereof has been previously given.

Hon. J. G. Hislop: Thank you.

Third Reading.

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

BILL—ACTS AMENDMENT (SUPERANNUATION AND PENSIONS).

Reports of Committee adopted.

BILL—CONSTITUTION ACTS AMENDMENT (No. 1).

Second Reading.

HON. G. E. JEFFERY (Suburban) [4.41] in moving the second reading said: This Bill proposes two principal amendments to the Act. The first is to change the qualifications needed for membership of either House of Parliament, and the other is to widen the franchise for the Legislative Council, to include qualified ex-service personnel and people who have

resided for five years in their present dwellings and who have been on the Legislative Assembly roll for all of that period.

It is the intention of this Bill to provide uniform qualifications for members of both the Legislative Council and the Assembly. Section 7 of the Constitution Acts Amendment Act sets out the qualification for membership of the Legislative Council as follows:—

Subject as hereinafter provided, any person who has resided in Western Australia for two years shall be qualified to be elected a member of the Legislative Council, if such person is of full age of 30 years, and not subject to any legal incapacity, and is a natural born subject of Her Majesty the Queen, or if not a natural born subject of the Queen, shall have been naturalised for five years previously to such election, and have resided in Western Australia during that period.

While it is admitted that this has not caused any dissatisfaction in the past, I think that members must agree that it does not cover the position adequately. The wording as it stands does not specify the two years of his life in which the member has resided in Western Australia, and to my mind, this in itself is unsatisfactory. It can be summarised that a man who has left this State when two years old could return 50 years later, provided he had retained his citizenship, and immediately be elected as a member of the Legislative Council, while being still ineligible to vote himself.

Section 20 of the Act deals with the qualification of members of the Legislative Assembly and states—

Subject as hereinafter provided, any person who has resided in Western Australia for twelve months shall be qualified to be elected a member of the Legislative Assembly, if such person is of the full age of 21 years and not subject to any legal incapacity and is a natural born subject of Her Majesty the Queen, or if not a natural born subject of the Queen shall have been naturalised for five years and shall have resided in Western Australia for two years previously to such election.

Here, it will be noted, is the essential difference between the qualification for either House—the Assembly requiring a 12-month residential period, while the Council provision requires a two-year residential period. To make the qualification for both Houses uniform, this Bill proposes that a two-year residential period shall apply in each case.

This Bill further proposes that the minimum age for members of the Legislative Council shall be reduced to 21 years, which is the minimum age applicable to members of the Legislative Assembly. Members

might argue that this is too young for election to a House of review. But I think the safeguard as to the suitability of the particular individual would be found in the party selection of the candidate; but more important still, he would have to stand the fierce scrutiny of, and be accepted or rejected by the electors.

I need hardly remind members that the younger Pitt was Prime Minister of England at the age of 21 years; and while the franchise under which he was elected was dissimilar to ours, history shows, and the enemies of England of that day admitted, that he was an illustrious occupier of the Prime Ministership.

The second amendment is to widen the franchise for the Legislative Council and seeks recognition of ex-servicemen. The States of South Australia and Tasmania have already accepted this provision and my information is that these provisions were placed on the statute books of those States soon after the Great War of 1914-1918. The provision envisaged in this Bill is similar to that in the South Australian Act, the franchise conditions of that State being nearest to those of our own State.

The fact that people have resided for five years in the one place and have had their names on the appropriate Assembly roll for that period is sufficient justification for their being entitled to a Legislative Council vote and a further amendment provides for that. The period of their residence would allow these people an intimate knowledge of the district and its affairs, and would enable them to cast a deliberative vote. I commend the measure to the House and move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

On motion by Hon. C. H. Simpson, debate adjourned.

BILL—LONG SERVICE LEAVE.

Second Reading.

Debate resumed from the 14th November.

HON. H. K. WATSON (Metropolitan) [4.45]: I was reading this Bill through last Sunday evening and at the same time was enjoying a bit of homespun philosophy from Mr. Larry Adler, on the Guest of Honour session of the A.B.C. At one stage during his address, as though he were looking over my shoulder at the Bill I was reading, he quoted these words from Confucius, "The superior man knows what is right. The inferior man knows what will sell." I thought those remarks were not altogether inapt to the authors of this Bill.

The Chief Secretary: I wonder which class you place yourself in.

HON. H. K. WATSON: When I have finished what I have to say the Chief Secretary will be able to form his own opinion on the question. As a reward or recognition

of long, faithful, and loyal service, long-service leave has much to commend it; but perhaps I should have said, as an "extra" reward for long and loyal service, because employment today is not without many concessions, benefits, and rewards.

For a week's work of only 40 hours, employees receive a pretty handsome wage, and they also get annual leave of two or three weeks per year, plus 13 public holidays and seven days' sick pay; and in addition to all those benefits many of them receive superannuation or retiring allowances or pensions upon retirement. In the result we find that Australia has more paid leisure time than any other country in the world, while on the other hand it is probably the least competitive country in the markets of the world.

Many businessmen, and particularly small businessmen, do not enjoy the privileges I have mentioned, and neither does the widow who is battling to keep a family on either a small pension or the income from a few thousand pounds that her husband may have left her, or perhaps even a small struggling business that has been left to her. However, in a word, I suppose it can be said that long-service leave, like breakfast in bed, is a grand institution; but, like breakfast in bed, it can only be enjoyed so long as you have someone to give it to you.

I am satisfied that if this Bill were passed in its present form, many employees and many employers would get long-service leave all right! I think some of them would get long-service leave from which there would be no return and for which there would be no pay. In its present form the Bill, too, would cripple many businesses, particularly small ones. As for large businesses, even if the burden on them were not unbearable, it certainly would be onerous; and would inevitably involve severe dislocation in attempting to carry on profitably and efficiently.

The last time I was in Sydney I had a spare Sunday afternoon and I visited the Domain. On one of the rostrums on that occasion there was rather an irrepressible and irresponsible humourist who was giving an oration which went something like this—

Put me into Parliament and I will give you the perfect life. I subscribe to the principle of a basic wage of £50 a week for all male workers; £45 a week for all female workers; £100 a week for workers of no sex at all; three months' long-service leave every ten years; rent-free homes and free transport.

This Bill provides for long-service leave of 13 weeks after 10 years, calculated from 1951, and pro rata leave for a lesser period of service. A survey has been made of the probable effect of the Bill on many businesses in this State, and in many cases the results have been extremely startling. I will not burden the House with a lot of

detail, but I can give a few illustrations which will indicate very definitely and clearly the serious effect this Bill would have on industry if it were passed in its present form.

I have learned that one company would have 70 employees out of a total of 200 who would become entitled to long-service leave in 1961 at an immediate cost of £17,000. In regard to large concerns, I imagine that the Minister could perhaps give us a good illustration if he informed us what the cost of this Bill will be to Chamberlain Industries. So far as another large engineering firm is concerned, I would mention that while speaking at the annual general meeting of Tomlinson Steel Ltd. on the 23rd October last, the chairman of that company, Mr. Ernest Tomlinson, said this—

Local industry was not being given a sporting chance with the burdens it was forced to carry when competing in world markets.

If the company had to absorb 13 weeks' long-service leave every 10 years of service, it would be equal to an extra 53 hours per year per employee on top of the present 80 hours annual leave, 80 hours holiday pay and 48 hours of sick pay. It would make in all 261 hours from the total of 2,080 hours a year.

These factors reduced productivity drastically, but industry must live on the efficiency or productivity of its plants.

Local manufacturers also paid more for electric power than in any other State. The average cost per unit in 1955-56 was 3.23d. in Western Australia compared with 2.14d. in Victoria, 2.56d. in New South Wales, 2.58d. in South Australia and 2.61d. in Queensland.

The State's long-service leave proposals would tax local industries' ability to keep absorbing additional costs.

That is a statement from the chairman of one of our large companies in Western Australia which employs many men, but which is not necessarily making large profits. If my recollection serves me right, the profit for the year before last was extremely meagre, if it were a profit at all.

Hon. A. R. Jones: It was a loss, wasn't it?

Hon. H. K. WATSON: I think it was.

The Minister for Railways: It still pays payroll tax?

Hon. H. K. WATSON: Yes. I have also heard of a case of a small hardware store which has seven employees. Needless to say, that is a very small business. However, all of them would be entitled to long-service leave in 1961 at an immediate cost to the employer of £1,500.

In another case of a small ironware store which employs three individuals, two of those would be entitled to long-service leave in 1961 at a cost of £960. A comparatively small firm of engineers with 12 employees would have the whole 12 eligible for long-service leave in 1961 at an immediate cost in that year of £3,000. Apart from the cost which, as I have indicated, is fairly burdensome, it is not difficult to imagine the complete disorganisation which would take place in those businesses, whether large or small, by such a large proportion of the staff becoming entitled to take long-service leave in 1961.

The position is the same in regard to the rural industries. It will be found that the average farmer, pastoralist, or any other primary producer employing labour is in a different category from the city businessman; because, as often as not, he provides accommodation for his employee or employees. Although the average farmer or primary producer finds it fairly difficult to take three months' long-service leave at various intervals, presumably he would witness the spectacle of his employee having three months' loaf on his property at his expense.

Taking industry as a whole, it has been calculated—and I think competently calculated by a person whose opinion I respect—that the cost to private industry of long-service leave under this Bill, as at June, 1961, is conservatively estimated to be between £15,000,000 and £17,000,000. I am convinced that the scheme in the Bill is not practicable either from the point of view of the ability of private industry to bear the cost, or the impact on production and the disruption of industry. As a real and true long-service plan as distinct from something for nothing under the guise of a long-service scheme, I consider that the scheme in this Bill is not merited.

It is significant that even among the work force itself there has been no cheering over the introduction of this Bill. To me it seems utterly unreal that a worker may become entitled to long-service leave at the age of 28 years, and all the more so when up to half of the 10 years of qualifying service may have been spent merely as an apprentice learning the trade.

The principal argument of the Minister in favour of the scheme proposed in the Bill—that is, 13 weeks' leave for every 10 years of service—is that all Government wages employees in Western Australia already enjoy this benefit. That is a fact; but the community has been heavily taxed to pay for that benefit. There is the vicious land tax; there is the Bill to increase the stamp duty on cheques; there is the increase in water rates, etc.

It will also be found that almost every Government enterprise, from Cave House to the railways, is being run at a loss. It would be very interesting to know how

much of the annual railway deficit results from the granting of long-service leave. The Minister has asked us to treat them as comparable cases. Then the argument of the Minister runs along these lines: Surely it is not illogical for the Government to submit that it is right and proper for the balance of workers in industry in Western Australia to be given the same treatment. In other words, is it not right and proper that private industry should be given the treatment that has been given to the railways and other State enterprises?

Heaven forbid that private industry should ever be given the treatment that has been meted out to the railways and other State enterprises? If private industry were accorded that treatment, it would be found that the railways would not be the only industry to close down branch-line services; we would find private industry following the railways and closing down many sections also.

Hon. R. F. Hutchison: No such thing!

Hon. H. K. WATSON: If it is a question of placing the whole State on a comparable basis, then if the railways and the other State industries cannot be conducted at a profit, we may seriously consider whether or not the long-service leave provisions, which are operating in this State, should be brought on to a more realistic basis.

Last week Sir Alexander Fitzgerald, chairman of the Grants Commission, delivered an address to the Economic Society of Western Australia, and the following is a report of what he said:

Sir Alexander warned that a public enterprise which did not operate at a profit had no accumulation to cushion possible future losses, nothing to provide for expansion, and nothing with which to replace losses. If public enterprises were not allowed to make profits they would be run down.

The truth of that statement is self-evident. It applies not only to public enterprise, but with equal force to private enterprise. It applies to industry, commerce and trade as a whole. Those are the principles which have to be observed when considering a proposal such as the one contained in the Bill.

Further on the Minister became whimsical and suggested that because the Bruce Rock Road Board either last week or last month adopted a long-service leave scheme of three months for every 10 years of service in respect of its employees, the whole of private industry should follow that example. Because the Bruce Rock Road Board has done that, the Minister suggests that the Bruce Rock garage owner, baker, butcher and farmer should grant their employees three months' leave for every 10 years of service. I must confess that I cannot see the force of that argument.

There is another strange feature in the Bill. Although long-service leave is simply incidental to all industrial problems and incidental to employer-employee relations, all of which matters are invariably handled by the Arbitration Court, it is proposed in the Bill that the Secretary for Labour shall be the administrator and the arbiter of long-service leave and of all questions relating thereto. To my mind that is unthinkable. If there is to be long-service leave, then just as in the case of all other types of leave, the existing organisation—that is, the Arbitration Court—should deal with the matter. I suggest that that court, and not the Secretary for Labour, is the proper authority to administer this Bill.

A further provision in the Bill is inconclusive. It provides long-service leave of the nature that I mentioned, but it also gives liberty to the worker or the union to apply to the Arbitration Court for better long-service leave provisions if it is thought there was a sporting chance of success. In other words, that provision could generate a contest between Parliament and the Arbitration Court as to which can grant the best long-service leave provisions.

Hon. R. F. HUTCHISON: That is so much nonsense, and you know it!

Hon. H. K. WATSON: If long-service leave is to be taken out of the hands of the Arbitration Court, and if the Arbitration Court is not to be permitted to decide what long-service leave is to be granted under industrial awards, then Parliament, and Parliament only, should have the say as to the amount of that leave. It should be one way or the other. Either the Arbitration Court deals with the matter and that is to be the end, or else the Arbitration Court is to be divorced from it—apart from administration—in which case Parliament, by statute, should lay down the long-service leave provisions. We cannot have it both ways.

There are some incidental provisions in the Bill. In one, long service is deemed to include even the period when a worker is on strike, so long as he returns to work in accordance with the terms of settlement. I draw the attention of the House to another provision which could bring about a serious injustice. The tenure of service is calculated as being with the business or industry, regardless of whether or not the business has changed hands.

For example, a farmer may have sold his business 12 months ago, and with that transaction one of his employees is taken over by the purchaser. That new purchaser should not be expected to assume liabilities except those that actually exist at the time of the sale. However, under this provision, he will find that in 1961 he will have to grant that employee long-service leave, including the period of service with the previous owner of that farm.

However irksome this provision may be, it will at least enable the people concerned to know what will be the position in the future, so that the purchaser can make an adjustment in the purchase price. It does seem, however, unfair with respect to the past sale of business—primary, industrial or commercial—that the buyer should be penalised to the extent that I have outlined.

Long-service leave as a condition in industrial awards has not been unknown in the State. The Minister gave various examples, and I can give the House another. In the milling industry, as a condition of the award, long-service leave has been granted since 1950. That provision in the award was granted by the conciliation commissioner under the Federal Arbitration Court; it is three months' leave after 25 years of service. That provision has some merit; even so it took quite a lot of absorption when it was introduced. It is one thing absorbing a scheme like the one I have mentioned, but it is another matter to absorb a scheme like the one in the Bill.

One feature in the Bill which I regard as extraordinary, seeing that it profoundly affects employee-employer relationship, is that the employers and their organisations were not consulted by the Government before the Bill was introduced.

Hon. L. A. LOGAN: That is in Western Australia.

Hon. H. K. WATSON: That is so. It is a pretty fair assumption that Mr. Chamberlain, the secretary of the A.L.P., and his colleagues were given a full hearing as to the contents of the Bill. One would have thought that with such a far-reaching provision the employers would have been consulted. I understand that was not the case. That to my mind is doubly curious and regrettable, because some months ago the various employers' federations throughout Australia and the A.C.T.U. began, jointly, to hammer out a long-service leave code for adoption on an Australia-wide basis. This code has now been agreed upon and ratified by the A.C.T.U. congress at its recent meeting in Melbourne.

The Minister for Railways: No; it has not.

Hon. H. K. WATSON: I have read the code, and I may mention that there was a Western Australian delegate to the congress. The code covers in detail every aspect, and it has been agreed upon paragraph by paragraph.

The Minister for Railways: No; not finally agreed upon.

Hon. H. K. WATSON: The Minister says, "No"; but I can best illustrate the position by citing what occurs within the precincts of this House when there is a conference of managers between the Legislative Council and the Legislative Assembly on a Bill

which is in dispute. The managers go into the conference room and at the end of the day they agree upon points A to E.

Hon. R. F. HUTCHISON: They generally have to do what they are told.

The PRESIDENT: Order!

Hon. H. K. WATSON: They agree upon the points and say, "We all agree; call in the Parliamentary Draftsman and let him put our views and agreements into legal phraseology." That is precisely the position that has been reached regarding this code.

The Minister for Railways: Not quite.

Hon. H. K. WATSON: It has been agreed upon.

The Minister for Railways: No.

Hon. H. K. WATSON: The conference between the drafting committee and the legal advisers of both sides was due to be held on the 13th of this month—a few days ago—but on account of unavoidable circumstances that meeting was postponed. But the stage has been reached where nothing remains but for the lawyers of both sides to make the position clear or—this may be a matter of opinion—to confuse the issue.

The Minister for Railways: That is not the case as far as the A.C.T.U. is concerned.

Hon. H. K. WATSON: It is.

The Minister for Railways: As far as the employers are concerned but not the A.C.T.U.

Hon. H. K. WATSON: As far as the A.C.T.U. is concerned; and the agreement is between it and the employers' federations.

The Minister for Railways: A basis for discussion.

Hon. H. K. WATSON: The scheme has been agreed upon. Just how it is going to be effected—whether through the metal trades award as was the original intention, or by other means—has still to be determined. But at the joint drafting committee, representative of the employers and the A.C.T.U., on the 31st October last, it appears that Mr. Deverell, who was a representative of the A.C.T.U. executive, said that as he saw the position the following methods were open to attain the objective:—

- (1) Uniform State legislation.
- (2) Private agreements which would be exempted under the provisions of State Acts.
- (3) Amendments to the Act on the lines of the South Australian position which would give automatic exemption to agreements or awards.
- (4) Agreements certified by the commission.
- (5) By award. But the parties must be clearly delineated.

They were the expressions of the A.C.T.U. representative at this conference as to how best to give effect to what had been agreed upon. Members will notice that the first in the list of five is uniform State legislation.

The basis of the national code is 13 weeks' leave after 20 years' service. That, by the way, is also the basis of the long-service leave legislation enacted by Queensland, New South Wales, Victoria and Tasmania. The Minister has talked of being logical, and I suggest that the only logical thing for Western Australia to do is to adopt the principle which has been approved by the A.C.T.U. and the employers throughout Australia, and which is virtually in force in the four States I have just mentioned.

The Minister for Railways: It has not been approved by the A.C.T.U.

Hon. H. K. WATSON: The adoption of that scheme in this State will not be without burdens and problems relating to production. I know of one company—not a particularly profitable or financial one—which will have to find about £10,000 immediately to look after long-service leave for 36 employees with more than 20 years' service. The company will have to find this sum in addition to about £4,000 a year which it is already contributing to its employees' superannuation scheme. But although the national scheme will be costly to industry in Western Australia and will have a severe impact upon production, it ought not to create the complete chaos which would follow the enforcement of the scheme envisaged in the Bill.

Therefore, to sum up my criticism of the measure I would say that it is open to three serious objections. Firstly, it should be in accordance and not in conflict with the national code; secondly it should be administered by the Industrial Arbitration Court in the ordinary course of its dealings with industrial matters; and thirdly, the Act should be supreme. It should lay down what the long-service leave shall be and it ought not to be within the province of the Industrial Arbitration Court, or anyone else, to vary the terms and conditions relating to long-service leave. With these reservations, I support the second reading of the Bill.

HON. A. R. JONES (Midland) [5.23]: The Bill is one to which we must give earnest consideration if we are to determine just how we, as a State, are going to fare as against the Eastern States when it comes to production, both secondary and primary. For the past 12 months a drive, sponsored by the Government, has been made to get all of us to put our best foot forward to produce what we can locally of those things that are absorbed locally and which also may be exported overseas. When we export overseas we have to compete with countries

that have developed their secondary industries to the stage of mass production; and our primary products have to compete with the products of countries that are nearer to the world markets than we are.

It is evident that we must at all times consider the costs of production, and if we are going to further the interests of the State and build up our industries, we will all have to give away something; or at least we will all have to put our shoulder to the wheel and bear an equal proportion of the responsibility.

Hon. R. F. Hutchison: You mean you want some people to put their shoulder to the wheel?

Hon. A. R. JONES: Each and every one of us has to put Western Australia before anything else in this matter, just as we should put Western Australia before anything else in any other matter. Ours is a large State with a small population, but with a great potentiality for primary industries. The primary industries can be followed, in my opinion, by secondary industries as the markets to absorb the production of those secondary industries become available. It is folly to have to subsidise any industry, other than primary, because I believe we must develop our industries before we can successfully develop our secondary ones.

I do not believe in subsidising any industry if it has no chance of success; but if an industry has a chance of succeeding, I believe that each and every Government, irrespective of its colour, should lend its weight to that industry, at least to the extent of seeing it get on its feet. I say that the Government should do this provided the industry has a future.

We are all vitally concerned with the future of Western Australia. The present Government, let me remind members, is making an all-out effort to get the public to put the right foot forward and consider Western Australia first and foremost for the sake of the people; but when it introduces a Bill of this nature, I feel it is not ringing true. Industry must have the ability to pay whatever is put upon it; and while we are with our backs to the wall fighting against the industries in the Eastern States and overseas for a place in the market, we should not have to consider legislation which will place a burden upon our local producers. This legislation, if it were enacted as proposed, would do that to every industry in the State.

Hon. R. F. Hutchison: Their balance sheets are not too bad.

The PRESIDENT: Order! I ask the hon. member to resume his seat. I refer Mrs. Hutchison to Standing Order No. 413. The hon. member may resume.

Hon. A. R. JONES: I am not going to touch on secondary industry or the business side of the community, because I do not know their position as well as it is known

by other members who will speak to the Bill. But I will illustrate what is likely to happen in the agricultural areas if the legislation is passed in its present form, because I claim to know the agricultural industries from start to finish.

The farmer or pastoralist is totally different from a person employed in the Government service, or in secondary industry, or in a business in Perth. In the first place as was pointed out by Mr. Watson, the Minister said the Government had been giving its employees this concession for a number of years; but, as Mr. Watson remarked, it was paid for by the taxpayer and the Government was going further and further into the mire all the time. So that is not, in my opinion, a good example.

But even if these Government instrumentalities were on a profitable basis and were paying their way, I would still say there is no comparison, because a man in a Government position works to an award. As he passes examinations or serves so many years in the service, he is entitled to a further amount of pay; and as someone goes out of his particular department, he steps up and is entitled to an increase. But at no time does he receive bonuses, a share in profits, or anything like that, as happens in secondary industries and private business; and most certainly in the agricultural industry.

When a farmer or a pastoralist employs a person, and that person is with him for three or four years—or maybe longer—he becomes so attached to the place, and to his boss, that he is virtually accepted as one of the family. I would venture to suggest that long before that time he would have been receiving top wages and good conditions of living; otherwise he would not have stayed on the farm. Usually he enjoys some sort of bonus or profit-sharing for the work he does. He is given an incentive to work; and I could name a dozen ways in which he benefits, and in which the farmer or the pastoralist gives him some remuneration over and above the good wages that he receives.

If this Bill becomes law in its present form, such an employee will be receiving long-service leave as well as all the other benefits I have outlined. I am not against the principle of long-service leave, provided we can work out a system whereby the cost of it can be absorbed, and so that we can all play our part and industry will not be saddled with a cost that it cannot bear.

Employees will have to play their part; and in organisations where large numbers of people are employed, those who are working while perhaps two or three others are away on long-service leave will have to do a little bit extra to make up for the absentees. I say that because we could not expect any organisation to employ extra personnel to take the place of those who are on long-service leave.

We could not expect an establishment to be able to employ somebody to take over a job while a man who had been doing that work for 10 years, went on his long-service leave. Such a person would not be conversant with the work, and so it would be necessary for those already employed to take over and do a little extra while the others were on long-service leave.

Everybody will have to make a sacrifice if we want this long-service leave plan to work, whether the period be for 10 years or 20 years—and I say that the period should be at least 20 years before long-service leave is granted. So far as the farmers and pastoralists are concerned, it would be most unfair to ask them to accept the provisions contained in this measure, and pay for long-service leave at the end of a 10-year period. Things are so elastic in the agricultural industry that it would not be possible to tie down an employer, and make the conditions and rules so rigid that he would not be able to meet them.

If the whole thing is sewn up, as is proposed in the Bill, the give-and-take attitude which exists at present will go by the board. The agricultural worker will have his wages pegged to those laid down in the award; the same will apply to his hours and other conditions of service. In other words, the agricultural worker will be tied down to the bare conditions laid down in the award; that will have to be so if the provisions in this Bill are agreed to. And we do not want that position to arise.

If we could make a moderate request to industry, and lay down, for instance, a 20-year term, I would have no hesitation—and I am sure I speak for other members on this side—in supporting a reasonable proposition. As I said before, after an employee has been with a farmer for a few years, he is accepted as one of the family, and if he remained with the one man for 20 years, I venture to suggest that if the farmer left the property that employee would become a share farmer, or a manager, or he would be left responsible for the property in some way or other. I believe that that is sufficient remuneration for the man.

I would like to quote the case of two young chaps I employed after the war. They immediately went on to a programme and received benefits according to the work they did; they were very happy to receive something like from £20 to £22 per week. For a young lad learning farming that is not too bad. When I knew that I would have to leave the property—about four or five years ago—they carried on as share farmers, and today they are both prosperous young men. That is only one instance of what is happening on many farms throughout Western Australia.

If this Bill, in its present form, becomes law and farmers are bound to abide by its provisions, they will have to pay for long-service leave at the end of 10 years, or they will have to pay the proportion due while an employee is with them. In such cases the conditions of those employees would not be nearly so liberal as they are at present.

I have been trying to discover the Government's purpose in introducing the Bill, especially when, as Mr. Watson pointed out, this matter has been receiving urgent and close attention in the Eastern States for many months. We are on the eve of agreement being reached by all parties on a basis of 20 years. In view of that, why did this Government introduce a Bill cutting that 20-year period in half, and giving employees so many other conditions which would make it impossible for industry to carry on? I would be justified in thinking, in view of the Government's attitude, that it is not playing the game by introducing this legislation.

The Government, I think, is putting up something which it knows will not be acceptable—because industry cannot afford to pay for it—simply because, if the Bill is amended in any way, the Government will be able to go to the people and say, "We were prepared to give you so much but the Houses of Parliament chopped it in half." It seems rather strange that the Government should introduce legislation such as this when at the same time the Government and the Premier are making appeals to the people to pull their weight and make Western Australia great. I can only come to the conclusion that the Government is flying a kite so that it will be able to say, "We were prepared to give you so much but the Opposition ruled us out." Whether that is right or wrong I do not know.

The Minister for Railways: That means you do not favour the Bill.

Hon. A. R. JONES: I do not favour the Bill in its present form; but I am quite prepared to accept a reasonable measure. I am prepared to vote for the second reading and to support some of the amendments on the notice paper hoping that they will be agreed to. If I thought that none of those amendments would be taken into consideration, I would not agree to the second reading, because I think that in its present form the Bill will provide for something which industry cannot afford, and therefore I would not entertain it at this juncture.

The Minister for Railways: What parts of it do you consider are unreasonable?

Hon. A. R. JONES: I consider that the period should be 20 years instead of 10 years. I also believe that we should take cognisance of what Mr. Watson had to say about the Secretary for Labour having control over the implementation of

the Act, if it becomes one. I believe that control should be placed in the proper hands—those of the Arbitration Court. I think all Mr. Watson's suggestions were quite reasonable. If they were agreed to I think that the State and the people would be able to afford this scheme. But if we place too great a burden on industry, and we fall upon bad times, what will happen?

It is of no use having legislation on the statute book if it cannot be implemented; and who is to say, after what we have seen in the Eastern States over the last 12 months, that it will not be Western Australia's turn to have a drought within the next few years? God forbid that we have another year like 1914! But we could have a lean time, such as those in the Eastern States have had; and if this legislation were agreed to the State would be more than struggling. Industry would have no chance of meeting the obligations imposed upon it by this Bill.

With certain reservations I endorse the policy of long-service leave. I believe that the plan should be one which Western Australia and Western Australians can pay for both now and in the future. If the Bill is passed at the second reading stage, we will have every opportunity in Committee of amending it to bring it into a reasonable form. But I shall certainly reserve the right, if it is not amended in a proper way, to vote against the third reading. I support the Bill at this stage.

HON. R. F. HUTCHISON (Suburban) [5.42]: I support the Bill. This afternoon we have heard some of the age-old arguments that we always hear when any progressive reform is introduced by a Labour Government. As we all know, in this State we have a Labour Party and a Labour Government; but there is not a Labour Government in power. It is not in power because of the Legislative Council where there is always a majority against us. As a result we have never been able to introduce any worth-while measures, or do any of the things we would like to do, if we were in power.

Hon. J. M. A. Cunningham: It is just as you say, age-old piffle!

Hon. R. F. HUTCHISON: Any change is anathema to the Opposition. This Bill does nothing more than bring this State into conformity with world trends—that workers of the world are something more these days than machines to use up in order to provide profits for those who own the land, and then be cast aside and be allowed to sink or swim as best they can. That is not my opinion of what humanity should do, and it is not my opinion of what our social position should be.

Mr. Jones asked, "What is the purpose of the Bill?" I will tell him. It is to give a fair deal to all workers in this land—a fair deal to those who make the profits for

those who own the land to enjoy. At the end of their service, be it 10 years or 20 years, all they have left is their health and strength to go on and give further service.

Regarding farmers, it was pleasant news to me to hear Mr. Jones say that the farm labourers of today are treated so well, because the farmers must have had a terribly good lesson during the war. Prior to the war farm labourers and domestic servants were all in the same category; and they were the people who had the worst pay and the worst conditions in the community. Nobody can deny that. There may have been the odd farmer who did what Mr. Jones suggested, but I do not think that that was so in the aggregate. They used to work on 27s. 6d. a week and starve. The purpose of this Bill is a fair deal for all men. Labour Governments in all lands and at all times have stood for that principle; and we, as a Labour organisation, do the same here.

I do not think that the provisions in the Bill will have the repercussions that members might think, because the measure contains certain safeguards such as a financial pool, and it is clear that everything will be all right. We have heard members opposite when speaking to this measure, likening it to the State railways and State enterprises. I have often wondered whether the Opposition members in this Chamber realise that other people can think logically and intelligently, because very often they do not.

Nobody can compare the set-up under the State railways, or that relating to any other State utility, and the conditions that apply there, with those that pertain to private enterprise. In this case the Government proposes to do something for the common good; all enjoy it. So, to compare those state enterprises with private enterprise is just so much nonsense. To use a word which I have often used before, it is merely camouflage.

We have heard remarks made by members opposite concerning the Premier advocating that people buy goods manufactured in Western Australia, and that they support local industries. That aspect of our public life has, up till now, been converted into a political football in this House; and the Premier's advocacy of this angle will prove to be one of the finest things that has happened to this State, particularly if everybody decides to do his bit. Mr. Watson raises his hands in horror and says that this measure will have a crippling effect on private enterprise.

The same thing was said when a move was made to introduce an eight-hour working day, and later when steps were taken to introduce a 48-hour working week. The same stand was also taken when an endeavour was made to reduce the hours of work to 44 a week; and when we sought to make it a 40-hour working week, we were told that we were going completely off the

ralls. I think I can say with every confidence that it will not be long before the 40-hour week is attacked in order to bring science into line with the conditions of the work force of the nation.

It is no wonder that we live in the horse and buggy days when we find that in this Chamber, which is the highest legislative chamber in the land, there are not men with sufficient vision or sufficient realism to approach this matter in its true perspective. I am shocked at the attitude they adopt, and I am certain that for the most part they speak with their tongues in their cheeks.

The PRESIDENT: Order! The hon. member must not reflect on other members in this House.

Hon. R. F. HUTCHISON: Why can't they tell the truth!

The PRESIDENT: Order! The hon. member will apologise for that remark.

Hon. R. F. HUTCHISON: I apologise, Mr. President. I was elected here by the people of my constituency, and they must have put me here for some purpose.

The PRESIDENT: Whether the hon. member was elected or not, she will abide by Standing Orders while I am in the Chair. I would ask the hon. member to observe them.

Hon. A. R. Jones: She wouldn't know them.

Hon. R. F. HUTCHISON: I would ask the hon. member to withdraw that remark.

The PRESIDENT: I did not hear the interjection. Did Mr. Jones make an interjection?

Hon. A. R. Jones: I merely said that she wouldn't know them.

Hon. R. F. HUTCHISON: This Bill is a step along the path of progress, and I think we should support it sincerely. I know that all legislation that is brought forward by a Labour Government for the benefit of the workers is invariably challenged as a matter of principle on a time-honoured basis. It is only by fighting this opposition step by step, and by working laboriously year after year that we are able to break it down bit by bit with a view to securing some benefit for the worker. The proof of the pudding is in the eating of it. When social legislation is eventually placed on the statute book nobody is game to challenge it, either in the national Parliament or in the State Parliament.

I have no doubt at all that industry could quite easily absorb all the financial implications of long-service leave. I do not agree that private industry could not carry the financial outlay that would be involved as a result of men being granted long-service leave; nor do I think that industry should be allowed to charge whatever price it likes for its goods and make whatever profit it chooses while at the

same time denying these benefits to workers who have given 10 years' faithful service. That is something which should be taken into consideration.

For instance, if a farmer has a man who has been working faithfully for 10 years, that farmer must be in a pretty good way; and he should be in a position to reward that man for the years of faithful service he has given. If the farmer or the businessman is successful, he is in a position to enjoy better conditions; and naturally, as a result of the efforts of the working man, has plenty of money to spend and with which to enjoy life.

Accordingly I cannot see the justice in one class of people being given all the benefits, while another class is denied those same benefits. I think it is well-known that a worker struggles all his life; and if at the end of his time he has a home to live in, he is extremely lucky. There are not too many of them who enjoy that privilege. The purpose of this Bill is to provide some recompense for a man who has given faithful service for 10 years. In our age of advancing science, and with the progress made in atomic research, we find that men will only be able to work for a certain period, and that after that it will be necessary for them to obtain long-service leave to enable them to recuperate. I have watched men working machines, and it was quite apparent that they were not making their own pace; they were following a pace set by a machine. When the parts of a machine wear out they can be replaced, but that is not always possible in the case of a worker who may have had his health broken as a result of his work. The benefits in this measure should be given to a worker to enable him to enjoy his years of retirement.

I am sorry that it is always necessary for me to get up here and say that I do not think the workers are being justly treated. The members on the opposite side should have given more thought to this matter, and they should have been more generous than their foreshadowed amendments would indicate. Mr. Watson said he would like this matter decided by arbitration.

I notice that whenever there is a sticky question to be resolved, or whenever members opposite are in a spot, they turn to arbitration to help them get out of their difficulties. I would like to point out to members that the unions themselves are not completely satisfied with everything that is done in the Arbitration Court. When the principle was first introduced we thought it was the perfect answer, but then we found that we still had to fight against capitalism and the conditions it imposes. That is a weak link. It means nothing to me when members opposite request that such matters be referred to the Arbitration Court; to my mind it is

only passing the buck, because there is no merit at all in the suggestion made by members opposite.

The principle of long-service leave is not new. It has been in force for many years; and since we have a work force, we should see that it receives all the benefits possible. After all is said and done, this work force is one that is established for the national good. Members opposite have no objection at all to Governments paying long-service leave; but when private industry is asked to do so, they raise their hands in horror and tell us that everybody will go broke. We know of course, that nothing of the kind will happen, because the impact will be absorbed and its effect will not be even as great as a ripple on the water.

This will be similar to every other reform that has been brought forward, and we will have nothing to worry about at all. It is not possible for the Labour Party to bring any measure of a political nature to this House with any confidence; or introduce certain reforms which it thinks just and honourable, because once legislation reaches this Chamber it is necessary for the Government to accept what members here are prepared to hand out. Even if the measure goes to a conference of managers the same thing applies.

Uniform States' legislation is another matter which Mr. Watson touched on, and which of course he knows is quite impracticable—he knows it can never be achieved. He also said that it was logical that Western Australia should adopt the decision of the A.C.T.U. Members know that in every State in Australia the unions and the work force are fighting the same battle, and they have to fight it in an ambit within which they can move; and that ambit differs from State to State. That is why we must fight the battle on our own ground and do the best we can for the people for whom we are fighting.

It is about time that we all got together and decided that the workers of the country and the nation's work force are something more than just steel and hammers. They are a human force and should be raised to a dignity commensurate with the age in which we live—an age of great progress in scientific knowledge. If we do not do that we will not go forwards but backwards, because we cannot stand still. In life one either goes forwards or backwards. If members are so backward in their thinking on this type of legislation that is brought down then we will make no progress at all. I can go back to the time when I came to this Chamber, and I have argued along those lines ever since; and it is quite true. I support the second reading and trust that some commonsense, some charity, and some good thinking will be put forward before we are finished with this Bill.

HON. SIR CHARLES LATHAM (Central) [6.1]: I do not intend to say very much; but I must state that I have just listened to a speech which I think is not likely to help this legislation to pass this Chamber.

Hon. R. F. Hutchison: You are not deaf, anyway.

Hon. Sir CHARLES LATHAM: The people who are opposing this legislation are intelligent enough not to oppose legislation for the sake of opposing it. When the hon. member has had some of the experience I have had, she will probably get a better outlook on life.

Hon. R. F. Hutchison: I hope I never have your outlook.

Hon. Sir CHARLES LATHAM: The hon. member must realise that there are other people who have given consideration to the working classes. I think that, by her speech, she does the working people a grave injustice. On the statute book of the State we have some wonderful legislation, and, for a long time, Western Australia led with industrial legislation.

The Chief Secretary: We have slipped back in recent years.

Hon. Sir CHARLES LATHAM: Because of the additional Labour members in this Chamber. I am referring to the time—and the hon. member knows—when there were only seven members of the Labour Party in this House and we introduced and passed the best Arbitration Act ever passed in Australia up to that stage.

The Chief Secretary: They were more generous members in those days.

Hon. Sir CHARLES LATHAM: We did not have to listen to the sordid kind of speech to which I have had to listen in recent years. We also passed the best Workers' Compensation Act ever passed in Australia.

Hon. R. F. Hutchison: It is not extra good now.

Hon. Sir CHARLES LATHAM: We have not had the conservative minds since then, but being conservative does not mean we cannot dissect legislation and have not the knowledge of what industry can do. I keep repeating this: that Western Australia is dependent on a very narrow margin of prosperity from the goods which are exported; and, by the time this year has passed, we are not going to have the amount of finance available that we have had during the last few years. I am certain of that.

Maybe long-service leave is a right which people should have; but we can only give them what industry can pay for, especially when it has to compete with the rest of the world. How much of our goods can we export at a profit in competition with other countries that are sending goods into Australia?

The Minister for Railways: You will not let us export iron ore.

Hon. Sir CHARLES LATHAM: That is not manufactured.

The Minister for Railways: It is worth a lot of money.

Hon. Sir CHARLES LATHAM: We are not able to manufacture goods here for which there is a market available overseas.

The Minister for Railways: You can do both.

Hon. Sir CHARLES LATHAM: New Zealand provides quite a useful market for manufactured steel; but how much can be exported? Even a big concern like B.H.P. is unable to export.

The Minister for Railways: They only made £12,000,000 profit.

Hon. Sir CHARLES LATHAM: You never hear of strikes in B.H.P. as it is a well-managed firm; and there are very few strikes in Western Australia.

Hon. G. Bennetts: Does B.H.P. give its employees long-service leave?

Hon. Sir CHARLES LATHAM: I am not able to say "Yes" or "No," but I do not think it does.

The Minister for Railways: It has a 10-year long-service leave scheme.

Hon. Sir CHARLES LATHAM: I will accept the Minister's word for it, but I have never heard of it.

The Minister for Railways: At Yampi.

Hon. Sir CHARLES LATHAM: I would say those people were entitled to long-service leave. I would like long-service leave if I were at that isolated place, and so would the Minister; but he has enough sense not to go there.

The PRESIDENT: Order!

Hon. Sir CHARLES LATHAM: There must be some attraction to get people to stay at a place like Yampi. We have no objection to those people having long-service leave; but, every time industry is landed with extra costs, they have to be met from somewhere. It is no good members saying that the worker is down-trodden in this State; he is not. Conditions here are equal to those in any part of the world. The concessions and privileges that operate in Australia are equal to any, and Western Australia enjoys part of them. I object to speeches made by Mrs. Hutchison. I think, perhaps, that I am very tolerant in listening to her. The workers in this State are well off. In Western Australia £9,000,000 has been spent on beer alone.

Hon. R. F. Hutchison: The workers do not spend it all.

Hon. Sir CHARLES LATHAM: They have plenty of money for gambling on Saturday and other days of the week.

The Minister for Railways: Not only the workers.

Hon. Sir CHARLES LATHAM: No; but the hon. member says the workers are badly off. I know who frequents these places.

The Minister for Railways: The workers drink beer; but who drinks champagne?

Hon. Sir CHARLES LATHAM: Very few people in Western Australia drink champagne. I know what the main drink is, although I do not drink it; it is beer, whether among the superior classes or the inferior classes.

The Minister for Railways: I only asked what drink—

The PRESIDENT: Order! I think the hon. member had better not be side-tracked.

Hon. Sir CHARLES LATHAM: We have had some good addresses during this debate and there have been very few interjections. I wish to make it clear that we can only give these privileges to people if industry can afford to pay.

Hon. R. F. Hutchison: It can.

Hon. Sir CHARLES LATHAM: The hon. member is only a kindergarten student in politics. All the hon. member knows about is—

Hon. R. F. Hutchison: You haven't a monopoly of all the brains.

Hon. Sir CHARLES LATHAM: There are two kinds of politics. One we have had in Western Australia for many years; and the other kind I do not want to see ever come here—that is communism. If we are going to listen to what the hon. member says, we will have communism. If the Governor's assent to this Bill is obtained, how many people will be entitled to immediately apply for and obtain long-service leave? The Premier of this State tells us that he cannot get enough money to maintain employment, and I am sure that this House will agree there are very few avenues on which taxation can be imposed on us now. We are taxed by the Federal Government and also taxed highly by the State Government.

The Minister for Railways: We are told to tax you more.

Hon. Sir CHARLES LATHAM: Gambling moneys are taxed; drinking money is taxed; and we go to the public and say, "Please give us some money to build an infant health centre," or, as was the case recently, a machine for—

Hon. L. A. Logan: A linear accelerator.

Hon. Sir CHARLES LATHAM: —assisting to cure cancer. Take the Royal Perth Hospital building. That has come out of a voluntary form of taxation.

The Minister for Railways: No.

Hon. Sir CHARLES LATHAM: Yes, from the Lotteries Commission. I do not know how we get this money circulating, but it seems to circulate. It is possible to kill industry in this State; and I venture to say that if there is more of this kind of legislation introduced we will not have many people attracted to this country in order to invest their money. If I were a young man with money I would not come here.

Hon. R. F. Hutchison: You could change your mind.

Hon. Sir CHARLES LATHAM: The worker is not badly off in this State; he gets three weeks' or a fortnight's annual leave. However, it was not ever thus. I do not know of anybody who has died from hard work.

The Minister for Railways: Some have.

Hon. Sir CHARLES LATHAM: The Minister did not work as hard as I did at the age of nine years. This country was built up by the hard work of men and women; not working seven or eight hours a day for six days a week, or five days a week; they worked seven days a week. Our wool and wheat industries were built up by hard work of the men and women on the land.

The Minister for Railways: And a lot of native labour.

Hon. L. A. Logan: They don't get three months' long-service leave.

Hon. Sir CHARLES LATHAM: They do not get any long-service leave.

The Minister for Railways: The natives always go walk-about.

Hon. Sir CHARLES LATHAM: The hon. member knows—

The Minister for Railways: The natives built the pastoral industry.

Hon. Sir CHARLES LATHAM: There are none in the wheatbelt. I have had more experience there than the Minister; and I do not know of any cases where niggers—I will withdraw that word and say "natives"—have been employed in the wheatbelt except in looking for sheep. They would not clear or pick up after a fire had gone through.

The Minister for Railways: They were only paid flour and tobacco.

The PRESIDENT: Order!

Hon. Sir CHARLES LATHAM: They get paid for the work they do, but they will not stay. When they are employed in shearing they get the ruling rate of wages; but in the middle they go away for a week before the work is finished. Will the natives get long-service leave?

The Minister for Railways: They are never employed long enough.

Hon. Sir CHARLES LATHAM: I must oppose this Bill because we are getting to the stage in Western Australia when

there is not very much spare cash about; and if this legislation is inflicted on industry a good deal of investment for developing vacant lands and searching for new minerals will not be encouraged to come here. I would remind the hon. member that working conditions in this State have been built up by—

Hon. R. F. Hutchison: By the workers.

Hon. Sir CHARLES LATHAM: —other Governments than Labour Governments. Since I have been in this House—since 1921—I think for 11 years out of 36 there was a Liberal Party Government; and for the rest of that period Labour Governments have been in office. However, they did not see the need to introduce legislation of this kind.

Hon. R. F. Hutchison: Because we have a Legislative Council.

Hon. Sir CHARLES LATHAM: Leaders of the Labour movement knew what they could do and what they could not do; and they knew this country could not afford legislation of this kind. This State has been most generous to its workers and there is no justification for blaming employers in this State.

Hon. R. F. Hutchison: They would prevent this.

Hon. Sir CHARLES LATHAM: Not prevent it. The position is that industry cannot pay for it.

Sitting suspended from 6.15 to 7.30 p.m.

HON. J. M. A. CUNNINGHAM (South-East) [7.30]: The principle of reward for long and loyal service to an employer or an organisation is one to which every fair-minded man subscribes. It is obvious to anyone that an employee who is so unsettled and unhappy in his job that he keeps changing employment every two or three years, not giving himself a chance at any time to acquire skills in speed, efficiency, safety and conservation of his own energy, cannot by a stretch of imagination be as valuable a unit in any organisation as the man who, through pride of job, applies himself to the task in such a way that he becomes an efficient, safe and very valuable piece of machinery in what is probably a very large organisation. That man is rewarded in his pay envelope, the contents of which have a portion of reward for the virtues I have mentioned: skill at the job, actual purchase of his time—whether it be six hours or eight hours a day—efficiency and reliability. All these things are rewarded in his weekly pay envelope.

However, there are other conditions that are recognised today as being necessary to the well-being of the employer, the employee, and the profit and progress of the industry—such as compensation, annual leave, holidays, and sick pay. These are all rewarded separately. But there is

another concession that is not generally granted and that we want to see awarded; and that is a reward for long service.

Long service can only be built up by service over a long period. It cannot be contributed to by extra skill, or speed, or any other virtue. It can only be built up over a long period of days running into weeks, months, and years of continuous, loyal work. If we are to recognise long service we can do so only if there has been a long period of years of service which are worth something to the employer. Short service does not come into it. It is to reward long and continued service in the one job that this Bill has been submitted to the House.

There are arguments for and against on the point as to just where long service should begin to be recognised as such as distinct from short service. We know that in Government circles for a long time a period of 10 years has been recognised as long service. But what we have to do is to consider whether the granting of long-service leave under such conditions is likely to be of benefit and joy to the recipients. From the few inquiries I have made quite recently, I fear that the granting of long-service leave would not be such a benefit to the worker as would appear. I feel that the anticipation in this matter will prove to be of far greater attraction than the realisation. I am not saying this in opposition; I sincerely and genuinely suggest—I even prophesy—

The Chief Secretary: Oh!

Hon. J. M. A. CUNNINGHAM: I do. I prophesy; and I hope to have the opportunity in years to come of reminding the Chief Secretary that he chortled when I said it.

The Chief Secretary: I am of the opinion that it is dangerous to prophesy at any time.

Hon. J. M. A. CUNNINGHAM: It may be a danger; but I will risk that and will say that at some future time—it may be in two or three years—some effort will have to be made to make this benefit what we want it to be.

Let me give a specific instance in my own home town. There is a very well-known and highly respected man in the Government service who is now taking long-service leave. Circumstances prevented his doing so previously, so he has to take more than normally would be the case. I think he has about five months. There is no unhappier man on the Goldfields than he; and he has been in a good job on good wages.

The Minister for Railways: Doesn't he want it?

Hon. J. M. A. CUNNINGHAM: It is of no benefit to him. He has not been able to get extra money to take full advantage of this leave. He has merely received wages covering the period that he will

not be at work. He has a young family going to school, so he cannot go on vacation. He has not the money to do so. He could not pay the fares and find the extra money involved in taking a holiday. So he has no alternative but to walk the streets of Boulder and Kalgoorlie, a miserable and unhappy man. I am not exaggerating; there are members in this House who know the man. And his is not an isolated case. He has been in a good well-paid job, but he cannot reap the full reward he is entitled to after his long service with the Government. I do not suggest that I have the answer to this problem, but there are many men in this Parliament who doubtless could find it. Let us suppose this Bill goes through in its present form and next week 1,000 men have to take long-service leave immediately.

The Minister for Railways: Not if this Bill goes through.

Hon. J. M. A. CUNNINGHAM: Suppose the position was that 1,000 men were entitled to it.

Hon. L. A. Logan: Not till 1961.

Hon. J. M. A. CUNNINGHAM: That is in three or four years' time. But suppose it happened next year; or, if members like, let us say in four years' time. Suppose that then 1,000 men had to go on long-service leave. They would have four years to try to provide for the contingency to which I have made reference; and it would be impossible for them to do so. We would have a work force supposedly about to take a rest after a long period of continuous service with only a few intervening holidays. I venture to say that there would not be one-tenth of that number who would actually be able to obtain the full benefit of that holiday.

Hon. F. R. H. Lavery: What about all the others who are on long-service leave at the moment?

Hon. J. J. Garrigan: What particular industry are you referring to?

Hon. J. M. A. CUNNINGHAM: I am not referring to any particular industry. I realise that the query can be raised concerning those who have had long-service leave after 10 years with the Government. Let us take the railway employees—they are connected with perhaps the largest Government department in the State. It is a very different proposition for those men; because immediately a railway employee is entitled to leave, he can get free rail travel to almost any part of the Commonwealth. If the same concession could be given to every employee in private industry, possibly long-service leave would be the joy we want it to be.

Hon. J. J. Garrigan: Miners get a concession once a year.

Hon. J. M. A. CUNNINGHAM: I am talking about men being off for three months continuously with no money except their three months' pay.

The Minister for Railways: You don't think they should be?

Hon. J. M. A. CUNNINGHAM: I did not say that.

The Minister for Railways: What is your point?

Hon. J. M. A. CUNNINGHAM: I am asking how such men would get the full benefit.

The Minister for Railways: That is their business.

Hon. J. M. A. CUNNINGHAM: That is their trouble?

The Minister for Railways: Yes.

Hon. J. M. A. CUNNINGHAM: I hate to hear the Minister say it is their problem.

The Minister for Railways: Of course it is!

Hon. J. M. A. CUNNINGHAM: That is not what we want to do. If we are going to confer such a benefit as this, we must give men the opportunity to make the greatest use of that benefit. At present they have not that opportunity.

The Minister for Railways: Private industry could pay their train fare to Timbuktu if it liked.

Hon. J. M. A. CUNNINGHAM: That is the whole point. We hear so much about what private industry can do.

The Minister for Railways: We know what it wants.

Hon. J. M. A. CUNNINGHAM: We all pay for the concessions granted by the Government. Whatever Government department is concerned, it is losing, without a single exception. How is it possible for private industry to grant the concessions that are given by Government departments without making a loss? It is impossible; it cannot be done.

The Minister for Railways: Who pays the hand-outs to private industry?

Hon. J. M. A. CUNNINGHAM: What hand-outs is the Minister referring to?

The Minister for Railways: You know of several.

Hon. J. M. A. CUNNINGHAM: Which specifically?

The Minister for Railways: You know there are the coalmining companies, for instance.

Hon. J. M. A. CUNNINGHAM: I cannot think of any. It is regrettable that the Government has felt the need to introduce this legislation in almost indecent haste. It knew—because the matter was widely publicised—that representatives of employers and employees got together, in the

light of sweet reason, around a table; discussed this matter; and forged a proposition that should be acceptable to the whole of the Commonwealth. The Government knew that this proposition was quite likely to be accepted almost without opposition. But to forestall that, it introduced this measure. I would hate to do the Government an injustice, but it would appear it did that to provide ammunition that would not be forthcoming from the other proposition.

The Minister for Railways: This is giving effect to an election promise made two years ago, long before we heard of any code.

Hon. J. M. A. CUNNINGHAM: Yet it has only just come to light. The Government mentioned it two years ago. It was not mentioned last year, and it is only coming to light now with indecent haste, just prior to a Commonwealth-wide agreement thrashed out by men eminently suited to decide and to agree upon the matter.

The Minister for Railways: They have not agreed.

Hon. J. M. A. CUNNINGHAM: That is a contentious point.

The Minister for Railways: It is a fact.

Hon. J. M. A. CUNNINGHAM: The fact remains that the Government has not even waited to see if there was an agreement. The Government brought this measure before us for our consideration, knowing full well that there is another measure, if not before Parliament, at least on the books, which has been arrived at up to its present stage by representatives of the workers—

The Minister for Railways: It has not been agreed to.

Hon. J. M. A. CUNNINGHAM: It is doubly regrettable when we realise that this sort of sweet-reason agreement between employer and employee is just beginning to be seen in the Commonwealth. We, in this House, had a Bill before us a few days ago and its principles had been thrashed out between employer and employee representatives. I refer to the shearers' accommodation measure which was hammered out around a conference table by men who respected each other. That Bill was agreed to by all and was placed before Parliament simply for ratification. Admittedly there was debate on the measure; but the representatives of both sides were quite happy about it.

There is far less contentious debate on such measures than on Bills like this, where the Government has not consulted the representatives of all concerned. Only Uncle Joe, apparently, was brought into consultation on this measure.

The Minister for Railways: Who is "Uncle Joe"? Bob Menzies certainly was not consulted.

Hon. J. M. A. CUNNINGHAM: No. I mean uncle Joe Chamberlain. From the interjections it was obviously only Uncle Joe. I wish now to refer briefly to some of the remarks of a previous speaker in regard to progressive legislation which is so often opposed in Parliament after having been brought down by the Government of the day—and obviously she referred to Labour Governments. Several of these pieces of legislation were mentioned and I am amazed that the hon. member either thinks that we know no better or herself knows no better. Who and what Government have the workers to thank for the invalid pension, for instance? Not a Labour Government! Who have they to thank for age pensions, maternity allowances and so on?

The Chief Secretary: Those concessions were not granted by the State Parliament.

Hon. J. M. A. CUNNINGHAM: We were talking about progressive legislation for the workers and the inference apparently was that all such legislation emanated from Labour Governments, but such is not the case. We could continue and mention child endowment, the Arbitration Court, workers' compensation and even the 40-hour week. We know that all those questions were advocated by Labour when in opposition, but were not implemented by Labour Governments when they were in power. Of course Labour, when in opposition, exercised great pressure to have such legislation passed, and that is why we say that Labour makes a great Opposition.

The Chief Secretary: When was your attitude on industrial matters so different from what it is now?

The PRESIDENT: Order! The hon. member must address the Chair.

Hon. J. M. A. CUNNINGHAM: It was alleged that the cost of this legislation to the employer would be such as not even to ruffle the surface of the economy of the State; but that was a strange allegation in view of the fact that the Government funk'd the issue when faced with the staggering cost of the proposal. It funk'd the issue of providing for long-service leave on the scale originally intended, when faced with the shocking cost—

The Chief Secretary: You are contradicting yourself. You said this was rush legislation.

Hon. J. M. A. CUNNINGHAM: It is, because the whole issue has come up within the last couple of months.

The Minister for Railways: But when did all this happen—last year?

Hon. J. M. A. CUNNINGHAM: No, only a few months ago. About £10,000,000 was mentioned as the pool that would have to be provided to meet the cost of this legislation and the Government immediately decided to thrust the cost on to private enterprise. Other figures have been given in this House of anything up to £17,000,000

as the likely cost of this legislation. However, the Government says it will not cost that much and that private enterprise can easily carry the burden.

I maintain that in some small family businesses which have probably only one employee, who may have worked in that little shop for well over 10 or 20 years, the business will have to be given to the employees concerned if the Bill is passed. I believe there are accountants in this House who could quote cases, and I know of one instance where what I have suggested will literally be the case. That is not the long shot that the Minister seems to think, but I do not believe that alone is a reason for opposing long-service leave. One can go to countries such as America today and in the comparatively small towns one will not find a single small one-man or two-man business such as we have here. They have all gone—

The Minister for Railways: Where is that?

Hon. J. M. A. CUNNINGHAM: In America.

The Minister for Railways: But we are talking about Western Australia.

Hon. J. M. A. CUNNINGHAM: Yes, but that is how these things can finish up. However, I repeat that that is no reason why we should not agree to beneficial legislation such as this is.

The Minister for Railways: Have they long-service leave in America?

Hon. J. M. A. CUNNINGHAM: I do not know.

The Minister for Railways: Do you know that they have not?

Hon. J. M. A. CUNNINGHAM: I do not know whether they have it or not.

The Chief Secretary: You are floundering around a lot.

Hon. J. M. A. CUNNINGHAM: It is a pretty good flounder. Some members may think, from my remarks, that I am opposing long-service leave, but I am not.

The Chief Secretary: That is this week's funny story.

Hon. J. M. A. CUNNINGHAM: I commenced by saying that every fair-minded man must accept the just principle of long-service leave or reward for long-service and I completely accept it.

The Chief Secretary: You are only opposing the Bill.

Hon. J. M. A. CUNNINGHAM: I am referring to long service over a period that that has been accepted as genuine long service—20 years, as is accepted in most of the other States. Over that period a worker, knowing that if he is in the employment of one firm or industry for that time he will receive three months' leave, could easily, by putting aside a small sum each week, fortnight or month, accrue at

the end of that period a handsome sum of money which would make it possible for him to obtain the full benefit of the leave that he knows he will get after reaching the end of the qualifying period. If the leave is granted after 10 years it is debatable whether a working man, under today's conditions, could put aside enough to pay for a decent trip or holiday for three months.

The Minister for Railways: Many of them could not, on the wages they get.

Hon. J. M. A. CUNNINGHAM: Is there any indication that the wages will jump so greatly that it would not be a burden on the average worker to put aside sufficient in 10 years? I believe, however, that even on a small wage or salary a man, either married or single, could put aside a small sum each week so as to provide a good holiday when his long-service leave was due.

Hon. F. R. H. Lavery: What about giving them the opportunity and see if they can do it?

Hon. J. M. A. CUNNINGHAM: I believe most of us have discussed this question with friends and I think most of us have been asked "What's going to happen about long-service leave?" If asked to what leave proposal they are referring, half the people do not know—

The Minister for Railways: The Press does not give the matter much publicity.

Hon. J. M. A. CUNNINGHAM: The Press publicises both sides, but people only think of the principle of long-service leave and the average working man does not care whether it comes in 10 or 20 years.

The Chief Secretary: Don't give us that!

Hon. J. M. A. CUNNINGHAM: I am a working man and have been one all my life. I think I have worked harder and on more labouring jobs than the Minister has. I have worked on the railways as a fletcher and underground in the stink and wet and mud of the mines.

The Chief Secretary: But your mates tell us the railway men do not work.

Hon. J. M. A. CUNNINGHAM: I worked all my life until I came here and this is the best job I ever had. I know what I am talking about when I mention bad mines where the air is foul and stinking, but there are many members here who do not know. I am proud that I know what I am talking about and I know that during the lunch hour underground men, some knowledgeable and some not knowledgeable, talk of many things. I know that the average working man will be happy to get long-service leave because he will not realise how unhappy he may be when he gets it. If he is glad to get it after 10 years instead of after 20 years, who is to blame him? If this legislation gives him long-service leave after 10 years he will be happy, just as he would be if the basic

wage was bumped up by 5s. or perhaps £1 a week. The average working man only wants what is fair. Will the Minister deny that?

The Chief Secretary: That is what we are trying to tell you all the time.

Hon. J. M. A. CUNNINGHAM: Irrespective of his job the working man only wants what is fair and will not demand what is unfair. But if it is given to him, he will accept it; and we cannot blame him for that. I have no difficulty in deciding what I must do on a measure such as this, because there is a simple rule, of four parts. One must apply the test of asking firstly, is it fair? Secondly, is it just? And, thirdly, will it build better relations? And if all those points are answered in the affirmative one can support the measure.

Hon. F. R. H. Lavery: You mentioned four points, but you have given us only three.

Hon. J. M. A. CUNNINGHAM: If that test is answered in the affirmative the people who benefit by the legislation will be happy. If it is fair and just—

The Chief Secretary: Where is this Bill unfair or unjust? Answer that!

Hon. J. M. A. CUNNINGHAM: I will answer it in good time. Those are the reasons why I believe the agreement between the workers' representatives and the employers in Canberra is a fairer and more reasonable proposition.

The Chief Secretary: Why?

Hon. J. M. A. CUNNINGHAM: Because it answers the four points I mentioned.

The Chief Secretary: You are a wonderful representative of the workers.

Hon. J. M. A. CUNNINGHAM: Is it fair? Is it just? Is it—

The PRESIDENT: The hon. member must address the Chair.

Hon. J. M. A. CUNNINGHAM: Is this measure fair to all? In the Federal proposition both sides were brought into the discussion, but in this State issue only one side was consulted and the other was completely ignored and so it is not fair or just to all. Will this measure build better relations? No, because one side has been completely ignored and so it cannot build better relations between men and managements. If representatives of both sides had been given the full story and had reached agreement, the measure would have built better relations; but under the present circumstances it will not. I will listen to other speakers to the debate—

The Minister for Railways: Are you going to agree to the amendments on the notice paper?

Hon. J. M. A. CUNNINGHAM: I have not seen them all. I do not profess to understand certain complicated issues. But there are others in this Chamber who do, and I will pay attention to what they have to say and then decide my approach to this Bill.

The Chief Secretary: And I bet I know how you will vote!

The PRESIDENT: Members know that betting is not allowed in this Chamber.

Hon. J. M. A. CUNNINGHAM: I was not going to go as far as that, Mr. President. I was going to say that I resent the Chief Secretary anticipating any attitude I might adopt in this Chamber. However, I believe that, whether this Bill passes or not, ultimately legislation will be brought forward on a much wider basis which will be acceptable to both parties, and when that is done I feel that nothing but good will result.

HON. G. BENNETTS (South-East) [8.1]. I do not profess to be an accountant or a man who is competent to juggle with any figures which might be involved in this Bill; but I wish to enlighten Mr. Cunningham that prior to the introduction of a similar Bill some two years ago, the Government saw fit to bring an expert to this State, by the name of Mr. Gawler, to inquire into the pros and cons of granting long-service leave to all the workers in Western Australia. However, at that time it was considered that the proposal, which embraced every worker in this State, was too ambitious; and that was the reason why legislation to implement long-service leave was not introduced during the last session of Parliament.

Mr. Cunningham also said that only one side of industry has been considered in the framing of this Bill. However, at the moment, of a total of 118,000 employees, 50,000 are already enjoying long-service leave benefits in this State. That number covers Commonwealth and State civil servants, railway employees and workers who are employed by local government bodies. Long-service leave legislation was introduced in New South Wales in 1951; in Queensland in 1952; in Victoria in 1953; in Tasmania in 1956; and I understand that in South Australia it has only recently been introduced.

In Western Australia the employees of 19 out of a total of 21 municipalities are already enjoying the benefits of long-service leave, and the employees of 114 road boards, out of a total of 126, are also enjoying this privilege. I notice, too, that the men employed at Yampi Sound have only just been granted long-service leave.

As I have already said, I am not an accountant and therefore I am not in a very good position to judge whether all forms of industry will be able to afford the granting of long-service leave to the various workers. But from the figures

available, and what the Minister told us when introducing the Bill, it seems certain that this proposal can be put into effect. I consider that the money which will be paid into the proposed pool by representatives of industry will be sufficient to meet the commitments involved.

It has been said by some members that many employees who are granted long-service leave live miserable lives. I was one of those employed by the Commonwealth railways who was granted long-service leave.

Hon. F. D. Willmott: And you have been miserable ever since.

Hon. G. BENNETTS: At the time I was granted long-service leave I was feeling rather run down and keyed up over my work, and I must admit that I was glad to obtain such leave. Being an employee of the Commonwealth railways I was granted a free pass to travel over any Commonwealth line in Australia and was also granted a privilege ticket to travel on any State railway should I desire to do so.

Those employed by the Western Australian Government railways are granted free rail passes to travel over any railway line in the State railway system and a privilege ticket to travel on the Commonwealth railways, on the condition that they pay the full amount for meals and for sleeping berths. Those employed in other Government positions do not enjoy the concession of being granted privilege railway tickets.

In addition to my long-service leave, I had other leave granted to me in consideration for work that I had performed on Sundays; and this built up my total leave to a considerable extent. However, in taking out the full period of leave, I was paid only on a flat rate basis. Nevertheless, I thoroughly enjoyed my holiday because there is no doubt that a worker after working for very many years in one job gets very keyed up. Apart from that one is able to carry out certain little tasks around the house which one is not able to do when continuously employed. Another advantage in being granted long-service leave is that a worker can take his family away for a holiday and enjoy complete relaxation from his job.

All workers, especially miners, are extremely keen to have long-service leave granted to them. I do not know what arrangements the mining companies have made for the payment of their commitments into the proposed pool. However, I support this measure because it is the desire of the Labour Party for all employees in this State to be granted long-service leave. I do not want to speak unnecessarily on the provisions in the Bill because I do not know a great deal about them, and I can only speak on the information that has been made available to me and from that disclosed by the Minister when introducing the Bill.

HON. G. C. MacKINNON (South-West) [8.8]: It is interesting to hear how often the word "industry" crops up in a debate of this nature, and how often a picture is formed, in the minds of some members who have debated this measure, of industry or capitalism being something that is anxious to grind the faces of the workers into the ground. If that is not the thought that is expressed by some members then it is some other catchcry of a similar nature concerning industry and capital.

Such members apparently consider industry as being comprised of large organisations and nothing else. It does not seem to be impressed on anybody's mind that by far the biggest percentage of capital is tied up in small businesses such as the grocer's shop, the small hardware store, and so on. Therefore, when we have to consider proposals such as the one contained in this Bill, it is as well to remember the people who are conducting those small businesses.

If a big corporation is properly conducted and has achieved a fair measure of success, no doubt it has built up some type of reserve fund designed to absorb any shocks to its economy which it may encounter in times of stress. However, the small man is in a very fortunate position indeed if he can establish such a fund designed for the same purpose. Indeed, such a small businessman would be extremely rare. Without question, he is the man who should receive the greatest consideration in the discussions of a Bill of this nature.

Strangely enough, however, he is the man who least requires this type of legislation. I think we are all prepared to admit that when a man works for an impersonal employer such as the Government, he loses certain advantages enjoyed by a man who is working under the direct supervision of his boss. It is much more difficult for such a worker to say to his employer, "I have a little job to do. Do you mind if I take an hour off to do it?" and to have his requested granted.

Over the years there has developed a tendency for men in Government employ to be granted long-service leave. This tendency has also developed between employer and employee in large private organisations. The Minister for Railways would probably be the first to admit that in large organisations union membership is much easier to organise and to discipline than it is in small concerns that have only a few men in their employ. Where an employer has only 10 men employed, for example, he works alongside them and it is not as easy to recruit those men as union members as it would be in a shop such as that conducted by, say, the Broken Hill Pty. Ltd. The relationship between employer and employee is more personal in a small organisation.

In a small business, if a worker has performed good work and he has a good boss, he is given some recognition for his faithful service in the way of a bonus at the end of the year. Yet the thought uppermost in the minds of most members who have spoken to this Bill is that industry represents, in the main, large industrial concerns employing hundreds of people in each. The greater percentage of the cost of granting long-service leave to all employees, however, will be carried by the majority of small businessmen who employ two, ten or 15 employees. Ultimately, of course, the taxpayers as a whole will meet this expense at greatly increased cost.

We now come to the question of the investment of capital. Throughout this session—and the last—very often we heard references to the need in this State for the investment of capital for development. However, the majority of worth-while enterprises which have prospered and developed in this young State have grown from small beginnings. Inevitably, there must be a period of transition between the time when a man is first an employee and later when he reaches the stage of becoming an employer.

All businesses do not start from a group of men getting together to issue a prospectus, and calling for capital to float a big concern. The majority of industrial concerns or of any other large organisations, have started in a small way. The pattern generally follows that of a boy becoming an apprentice, then a tradesman, and eventually starting out on his own and progressing to the stage where he commences employing either one or several men.

One of the disadvantages of this type of legislation is that it will make it increasingly difficult for a wages man to make a move to get himself out of the rut and so become a self-employed man. So long as a man works for another he enjoys his annual leave and his public holidays; and when this Bill becomes law in some form or other, he will be granted long-service leave. However, when he starts working for himself he enjoys none of those benefits.

Hon. A. F. Griffith: He does not cease to become a worker because of that.

Hon. G. C. MacKINNON: That is a point well taken.

Hon. H. K. Watson: He has the privilege of working from 9 a.m. to 9 p.m.

Hon. G. C. MacKINNON: Yes; and very often he also has the privilege of doing his own book-keeping because he cannot afford to pay an accountant to keep his books for him. Compared with what happened previously, that employer now faces the prospect of working much longer hours, with all the worry that goes with the running of the business. There is also the threat hanging over his head that if he makes a profit the Government will tax him

accordingly in the various forms over and above the ordinary taxation that is imposed on the employee.

Whilst we are all agreed that long-service leave will in some form or another take effect this year or the next, it seems inevitable from the various speeches that greater consideration will have to be given to its effects. Firstly, we must bear in mind that a majority of capital invested in this country is in respect of small businesses which have not been able to establish reserve funds for the payment of long-service leave.

Secondly, we should not make the way difficult for a person with ambition, energy and drive to move from the status of employee to employer, for it is through the latter that the progress, development and expansion of this State will come about. Unless the small enterprises are soundly established by men of energy and drive, then all the rest of our enterprises will only be built on moving sand. The amendments foreshadowed by Mr. Watson tend to bring the provisions in the Bill more into line with the views I have put forward. I support the second reading with a view to supporting the amendments.

HON. J. D. TEAHAN (North-East) [8.17]: All reforms meet with opposition. There was a time when the working man did not get the odd holidays during the year like Christmas Day, Boxing Day, or Easter Monday; or if he got them as holidays he was not paid. We need not turn our minds back very far to when that was the position; we have to turn our minds back to more recent times when annual leave for the working man did not prevail. Such a condition of employment was said to be too far distant and one which industry could not stand. Yet now, those days are paid holidays; and sick leave is provided as is annual leave. Those conditions are accepted as the set-up in industry and in our way of life. It cannot be claimed that factories or industries have closed down as a result of the granting of sick or annual leave.

It is 15 years since the Boulder Municipality, of which I was a member, introduced long-service leave. Various arguments were advanced against its introduction, similar to the ones that have been advocated during the second reading of this measure. Despite that antagonism, long-service leave was introduced in that local authority, and today it prevails in the great majority of the 143 local authorities in this State. I am not aware that its introduction has caused any local authority to go out of existence.

Hon. H. K. Watson: They just increased the rates.

Hon. J. D. TEAHAN: They might have done that; but the people accepted the imposition. To me the added costs incurred by the introduction of annual and

sick leave have been balanced by the greater volume of work which resulted from mechanisation, that is by replacing the pick and shovel with the grader and loader. There always seems to be a method of overtaking any leeway that results from the introduction of reforms. By the introduction of mechanisation, the local authorities attracted a better type of employee, and those with greater amenities and working conditions attracted the best types.

The better the quality of labour the less is their need for supervision. In the short time that I employed men, it was my experience that a good employee could save the employer much expenditure. If an employer had a good truck-driver who was happy in his work, he could save much more in repairs to vehicles than would be expended in the provision of long-service leave.

It has always struck me as an anomaly that of two young men starting off in life, one in private service and the other in Government employment—the latter should be eligible for long-service leave after 10 years' service while the other was not entitled to such leave. If long-service leave is granted in Government employment, private industry should follow suit; because, after all, it is the public that pays for the benefit.

I know of a few men working in this State who are near the age of retirement. They went into private employment after the first world war and they have been almost burnt up in rendering service to their employers. They have not received any long-service leave and their retiring allowances will be small. That condition of employment should be remedied; and if this Bill is passed it will help in a small measure to rectify the unequal distribution of amenities among the employees of this State.

Any person who has inspected an up-to-date factory cannot have failed to notice the tempo at which the work is carried on and the need for the operator to keep pace with the machine. The job is monotonous. The work is turned out in greater volume than in the days when many of the processes were done by hand. I am certain that as a result of the increased tempo the worker suffers a greater degree of fatigue. Long-service leave is one of the rewards for the speed of work which the machines demand.

Even among the machines used in the office, such as accounting machines, it is necessary for the operator to be smart to keep up to the pace. Thus, that work in the office requires more concentration and speed, and the operator will require more rest. Taking all these factors into consideration, with the introduction of automation and of mechanisation, not only the employer and his organisation should share in the reward but also the workers

who contribute to the increased production. One of the methods of evenly spreading the benefits over the whole of the people is by the granting of greater leisure and long-service leave. I support the second reading.

HON. L. A. LOGAN (Midland) [8.26]: I daresay every member of this House is in favour of the principle of long-service leave. The only matter on which members seem to be at variance is the qualifying service—that is whether it should be 10, 15 or 20 years. When Mr. Watson made reference to the national code, the Minister for Railways interjected on several occasions that that member was not speaking on facts. I do not know if the Minister will dispute these facts: A conference of representatives of the employers and unions was held on the 14th and 15th August, and again on the 5th and 6th September, 1957. If he denies that then he might deny that the draft code has been submitted. It is a fact that those meetings were held.

The Minister for Railways: No one is disputing that.

Hon. L. A. LOGAN: Both the unions and the employers have discussed long-service leave.

The Minister for Railways: And arrived at a basis for discussion.

Hon. L. A. LOGAN: This draft code was submitted to the joint drafting committee to rectify errors and other little points. The code was sent back to the principals of both parties. It is stated: "Clauses in the code agreed at conference between representatives of the employers and the unions for submission to principals of both parties." Therefore it is logical to conclude that agreement has been reached and that this code was sent back to the respective parties for ratification.

The Minister for Railways: As a basis for discussion.

Hon. L. A. LOGAN: The parties came to agreement that this code would be the basic platform.

The Minister for Railways: No, only as a basis for discussion.

Hon. L. A. LOGAN: It cannot be otherwise.

Hon. F. R. H. Lavery: Not if you want to think that way.

Hon. L. A. LOGAN: It is the basic code agreed to between the unions and the employers.

The Minister for Railways: As a basis for discussion only.

Hon. L. A. LOGAN: The basis is there. That basis was discussed at the meeting, and the representatives had come to agreement.

The Minister for Railways: I agree; but as a basis for discussion.

Hon. L. A. LOGAN: They reached agreement. The code was then sent back to the principals for ratification.

The Minister for Railways: Where has it got from there?

Hon. L. A. LOGAN: It has still to be discussed by the A.C.T.U. on the 27th November.

The Minister for Railways: That is what I say.

Hon. L. A. LOGAN: But it is only a matter of ratification. Do not tell me that on the 27th November the A.C.T.U. is going to alter the period to 10 years.

The Minister for Railways: I do not know.

Hon. H. K. Watson: It is only left to the lawyers.

Hon. L. A. LOGAN: To say it has not been settled, is just too silly.

The Minister for Railways: Be fair about it.

Hon. L. A. LOGAN: I am fair.

The Minister for Railways: You are not.

Hon. L. A. LOGAN: The questions that were discussed by the representatives of the employees and the employers were entitlement to leave, period of leave, calculation of continuous service, time of taking leave and so on. These were the bases of discussion between the representatives of the two parties, and were agreed to clause by clause and sent back as submissions to the principals of both parties.

The Minister for Railways: That is right.

Hon. L. A. LOGAN: They have agreed on this.

The Minister for Railways: As a basis for discussion.

Hon. L. A. LOGAN: Otherwise they would not have sent it back for ratification.

Hon. A. F. Griffith: Who was the A.L.P. representative?

Hon. L. A. LOGAN: It is wrong to try to judge the issue. The period of time does not merely rest on the question whether an industry can pay, despite the fact that no figures have been given to us as to the likely cost. I have previously criticised the Government for introducing legislation without giving the relative information and figures, and I do not remember any figures as to cost being given to us on this measure. We are entitled to that information. The Government is in a position to find out what the cost will be, but we have not the information at our disposal. In order that we may give a fair and clear judgment we should be supplied with the information.

Looking at the effect of this proposition I believe that the granting of long-service leave after 10 years will do an injustice to many employees. I say this advisedly because I am in accord with what Mr. Cunningham said in respect of those fellows who are not able to take advantage of it. Only yesterday I was talking to an executive officer, who is in his 40's. I asked him what the cost to his company would be, and he said, "I cannot tell you; but it will be considerable." He went on to say, "It is no good to me. I cannot afford to go on long-service leave."

If an executive in his 40's cannot afford to go on long-service leave, how can a young fellow between the ages of 26 and 32, when he is still paying hire-purchase instalments on his washing machine and refrigerator and meeting the payments on his home, as well as rearing a family, afford it? The worker cannot accumulate his leave but has to take it within 12 months. According to the Bill, immediately he takes outside work the disqualifications for long-service leave become effective.

It is all very well for Mr. Bennetts to say he can take his wife out for a run and get a load of wood. I venture to say that after the first week the husband will get itchy feet and will want to move around somewhere. What does he do?

The Minister for Railways: What do you do in your spare time?

Hon. L. A. LOGAN: As most members know, leisure time is much more costly than time spent at work.

Hon. R. F. Hutchison: That is a poor old argument against it.

Hon. L. A. LOGAN: It is a very good one, because it is a fact. If the hon. member had any experience of it she would realise what leisure time costs.

Hon. G. Bennetts: He would want to be a teetotaler.

Hon. L. A. LOGAN: He would want to be a lot of other things too. This will be an injustice to many workers. According to the Bill, a worker cannot accumulate his leave but has to take it within 12 months of its becoming due. If members asked the majority of workers whether they could afford to take long-service leave and make the best use of it, they would find the answer would be "No."

But let us get back to the principle of long-service leave. I always thought it was given to enable the worker to recuperate from his work. But we find that that policy is being disregarded; because if a fellow does nine years' work for one employer and then leaves, he has to be paid so much in lieu. So, long-service leave becomes a cash award and thus the principle is being departed from.

Mr. MacKinnon mentioned that workers in the smaller firms were in the majority of those who had long-service leave due. It

is estimated—I believe based on fact—that small firms, with less than 12 employees, are in the majority of those involved. Some 75 per cent. of the employees of these firms remain with them for 20 years or longer.

The Minister for Railways: Where did you get those figures?

Hon. L. A. LOGAN: They were given by someone.

The Minister for Railways: Can we check them?

Hon. L. A. LOGAN: They were given by the people who worked out the national code. They do not apply only to Western Australia but to the whole of Australia. I hope the Minister will check them; because if they are wrong, we want to know.

The Minister for Railways: Tell me where I can get them.

Hon. L. A. LOGAN: From the representatives of the employers who worked out this national code.

The Minister for Railways: The Employers' Federation?

Hon. L. A. LOGAN: I use them for what they are worth. No doubt, as has been said, the cost will be absorbed by industry; but what will the cost be? Already we have with the Eastern States an unfavourable trade balance to the extent of £55,000,000 or £60,000,000. The Eastern States, particularly the ones with which we have an unfavourable trade balance, will have long-service leave based on 20 years.

The Minister for Railways: We will have a favourable trade balance with them after this year.

Hon. L. A. LOGAN: The Minister need not be too sure about that. Our goods will not all go over there but overseas. The Minister and his Government should make sure that not all our exports go to the Eastern States, but that we maintain our overseas markets.

The Minister for Railways: You know the State Government can't stop it.

Hon. L. A. LOGAN: The Government can always help.

The Minister for Railways: It can't stop it.

Hon. L. A. LOGAN: It can help the Farmers' Union. In fact, it should be the first to make a move.

The Minister for Railways: Only the farmers, the men who own the stuff, can do that.

Hon. L. A. LOGAN: They are doing their best; but they want the support of the Government.

The Minister for Railways: Tell us what the price will be. Will it be the overseas price or the home-consumption price?

Hon. L. A. LOGAN: I think the long-service leave scheme would be much better if it were worked out on the original basis of 20 years. Then after the employees who already had 20 years' service had taken their leave, it could be brought down to 15 years; and after those who qualified at 15 years had cleared their leave, it could be brought down to 10 years. If that were done, I think industry and everyone else would be much better off. If the Bill applies, long-service leave will start in 1961, so that a fellow who started work in 1951 will be eligible for long-service leave in 1961. But at that stage there will also be men—and a few women—who have had 30 years' service. So we put the fellow with 10 years' service on the same plane as the man with 30 years' service.

That is why it would be better to start with a 20-year period. There would not be so many making an impact on industry at the one time. If the principle of commencing at 20 years and gradually reducing to 10 were accepted, it would be all right. I am certain that that is the intention of the national code. If the initial period is 20 years, the unions will then make an application to bring it down, and their application will be granted because they eventually get everything they want.

The Minister for Railways: Why delay it?

Hon. L. A. LOGAN: Because of the impact that will result through the number that will become due for long-service leave at the one time. Is that not a fair and logical argument? Of course it is not in the eyes of the Minister; but it is in mine. I can go to a lot of workers and put this proposition to them, and they will be on my side.

Because of the cost to industry, the liability that it has at the present time, with our unfavourable trade balance with the Eastern States and the inability of many workers to make use of long-service leave, after 10 years, I am opposed to the 10-year period, and suggest we should start off with a period of 20 years. When that initial period is overcome, I am quite prepared to come down. I am the only member prepared to do that.

The Minister for Railways: You know that will be a long way away.

The Chief Secretary: It would not be in your day.

Hon. L. A. LOGAN: Of course it would.

The Chief Secretary: Not if you are here.

Hon. L. A. LOGAN: Yes, it would. I have already given my word on that.

The Chief Secretary: But words change.

Hon. L. A. LOGAN: No, they do not. I will stand up to anything I have to say.

The Minister for Railways: You can't have it both ways. It is one thing or the other.

Hon. L. A. LOGAN: I have said what I wanted to say. I have suggested that the period be 20 years then 15 and then 10; and that is the basis on which we should accept this proposition.

HON. F. R. H. LAVERY (West) [8.45]: I feel something like the owner of that great racehorse, Tulloch.

Hon. J. J. Garrigan: There is no betting allowed!

Hon. F. R. H. LAVERY: I wish to make it quite clear from the outset, the same as the owner of that great horse did, where I stand on the matter; and I want to put the public at ease as to how I shall vote. I certainly support the Bill and, to be quite honest, I feel like taking out my handkerchief and crying after hearing members ask how the poor old worker will be able to fill in the time while he is on long-service leave. I have never heard so much piffle in my life.

I have with me a journal known as "Rydge's." This is a financial journal, recognised by the business fraternity throughout Australia, and I wish to quote portion of it. Mr. Jones, when speaking to the second reading, as he usually does when he speaks on these matters, poured cold water on the future prosperity of this grand country of ours. Surely there are some Australians who are game to get up and say that this country is not going backwards; that trade is not falling off and that we are not going broke!

Surely men who belong to the farming community study these things; they must know that this great Commonwealth of ours can only go forwards and not backwards! After I have read this article I hope that Mr. Jones, when the Bill reaches the Committee stage, will try to answer the points I put forward. I wish to quote an editorial written by Norman Bede Rydge on page 859 of the September issue of "Rydge's." The editorial is headed "1957-58—Will It be a Good Year?" It states—

Forecasting the level of business tempo in the future, even in the near future, can be very hazardous. This is so because significant, but unforeseeable and therefore unpredictable, factors may suddenly emerge with the effect of changing the picture overnight.

Hon. F. D. Willmott: Like long-service leave every ten years!

Hon. F. R. H. LAVERY: It goes on—

Some such factors, which come immediately into one's mind, are the dreadful possibility of a war, or a sudden down-turn in wool prices, etc.

However, at the moment the weight of evidence available supports the view that the Australian economy, and

therefore the majority of the nation's businesses, can look forward to a basically stable and favourable business climate in 1957-58. Certainly the Budget is yet to be brought down, but as the present Government will again have to face the electorate, political considerations should preclude this having any dampening effects—indeed most observers believe that it may bring to business some concessions.

With this thought in mind let us review the facts now available. By far the most potent influence upon the Australian economy is the trend of our external trade and the level of our overseas reserves, which are simply the amount of money that we can fall back on if necessary. Naturally, the higher our reserves the greater is the country's security from temporary setbacks.

1956-57 saw a favourable visible overseas trading balance of £276 million (as against the previous year's deficit of £39 million), and an increase of Australian overseas reserves to £565 million. This was an extremely satisfactory result, and goes a long way towards laying a sound basis for the current financial period. With the increased number of sheep to be shorn this season (up to 150 million) and the sound prospects of a satisfactory market, it can reasonably be argued that the 1957-58 export return may even top last year's record inflow of £995 million.

Hon. L. A. Logan: It won't if the price of wool drops.

Hon. F. R. H. LAVERY: To continue—

Certainly imports will be up this year, but even so another substantial favourable trade balance can be anticipated. With this thought in mind the President of The Rural Bank has recently said:

In short, a further increase in our overseas reserves can be confidently anticipated, and it would not be surprising if they reach the (very high) vicinity of £650 million by June, 1958.

This is certainly a most encouraging opinion and gives ground for confidence regarding the current financial year.

Leaving the field of external transactions, it is interesting to note the current buoyancy of several internal indicators. New motor vehicle registrations for May, June and July, 1957, have all been above the corresponding 1956 figures; new houses and flats, both commenced and under construction, during the quarter ended June this year have been higher than last year's figures; and the share market, usually both a sensitive and prophetic barometer, has recently been strongly optimistic.

All in all, the major economic indicators are now set for a prosperous 1957-58. Certainly there may be some degree of patchiness, but I am sure that when this year's financial accounts are finally ruled up they will not disappoint any enterprising, well-managed concern.

I read that some weeks ago and it has been on my mind ever since.

Hon. A. R. Jones: When was it published?

The Chief Secretary: In September of this year; he told you that.

Hon. F. R. H. LAVERY: On the 1st September, 1957, and it is to be found on page 859 of "Rydge's." I feel, the same as Mr. Teahan, that whenever there is an attempt at reform, or to give some concessions to the workers, members opposite are against it. However, I must agree with Mr. MacKinnon that there are a number of people whom this legislation will not benefit at present; and I also agree with Mr. Logan that in the future they could be brought under its provisions—I refer to the small business people.

I now want to give a straight-out answer—that is if members will believe me—to those who argued with the Minister tonight about the fact that the A.C.T.U. has agreed to the code at the conference recently held. As the Minister said by way of interjection, only part of that was a fact. I have the complete story through a telephone message received from Mr. Souter, the secretary of the A.C.T.U. Only a few days ago he put forward four points as follows:—

The code will only be a minimum; and it looks like applying only to Federal awards.

I think that can be answered because, in this morning's Press, there was a statement that in a judgment given in the Eastern States it was stated that the code applied to other than Federal awards. I have read the first and second points. Mr. Souter's third and fourth points were—

That the matter is not yet finalised or accepted by all. There is a meeting of the A.C.T.U. on the 25th November, 1957, at which the matter will be further considered.

The negotiations at this stage agree only to certain principles in the code.

That is information I have received from the secretary of the A.C.T.U., a gentleman I have never seen in my life.

Hon. A. F. Griffith: Why do you think they accepted the basis of 20 years for discussion?

Hon. F. R. H. LAVERY: What I have given you are the actual facts. There is another aspect which should be given consideration. Mr. Cunningham delivered a tirade this evening, and said that he was the only person who knew anything about

this proposition, or who had studied it. He asked, "How would the worker be able to spend his three months' leave?" The point is that this legislation was not rushed in over the last few weeks. We in the Labour movement have been battling with our Government for several years, long before I became a member of Parliament, and I have been here for 5½ years. We were battling with various Labour Governments, and also another Government when it was in office.

Hon. A. F. Griffith: What do you mean when you say you were battling?

Hon. F. R. H. LAVERY: We were trying to get long-service leave for the workers in this State.

Hon. A. F. Griffith: Wouldn't they have any part of it?

The Chief Secretary: No, because there was a Liberal Government in power.

Hon. F. R. H. LAVERY: There is no need for Mr. Griffith to try to bait me, because he does not know that I have been on 37 conferences in regard to this matter.

Hon. A. F. Griffith: I don't care whether you have been on 137 conferences; I just asked you a question.

Hon. F. R. H. LAVERY: The hon. member is trying to be facetious. The Trade Union Council in this State has been planning and working over the years for long-service leave for workers. It has put up several schemes to the powers-that-be to try to get long-service leave for private employees in this State. Twelve to 18 months ago it looked as though we would be successful; but the plan that was then proposed would have placed too big a financial burden on the economy of the State. The plan envisaged by this Bill is one much in advance of that originally proposed.

So Mr. Cunningham, or any other member who thinks that this question has been bulldozed through because there has been talk of the code over the last few months, is entirely wrong. I can take any interested member to the Trades Hall in Perth and show him the files on this matter. Those files date back some years.

When I was working in the oil industry, Sir Stafford Cripps found that the Anglo-Iranian Oil Company was holding in reserve a sum of £9,000,000. This was for a provident fund, and when he asked about it he was told that this £9,000,000 had come from members who had not complied with the terms of their employment; and they had surrendered that amount to the fund. A man had to be in the company's employment for 10 years or more before he received any benefit from the provident fund. Sir Stafford Cripps advised the company that the money belonged to the company's employees, and the company acted on his

advice and now has a pensions scheme—the £9,000,000 formed the nucleus of that pension fund.

Hon. H. K. Watson: Sir Stafford Cripps didn't give them Boxing Day or New Year's Day as holidays.

Hon. F. R. H. LAVERY: The Arbitration Court granted those holidays. The English system is slightly different from ours.

Hon. H. K. Watson: But they still don't get those holidays in England.

Hon. F. R. H. LAVERY: The position I am very concerned about is whether these people who advocate long-service leave after 20 years mean that this principle should apply to all those Government employees who are at present enjoying long-service leave on a 10-year and 7-year basis. This is definitely a Committee Bill and I will make my further remarks at that stage.

I have always tried to be fair with regard to this matter, because I know that wherever we have big business we have big employment as is the case, for example, with General Motors Holden in Adelaide where there are 5,800 employees. But I am satisfied that in this period of post-war prosperity there has been a levelling of economies in the Commonwealth, and I think the time has come when something of this nature can be attempted with safety to the economy of the Commonwealth.

HON. R. C. MATTISKE (Metropolitan) [9.11]: I agree with most of the members in this Chamber who have said that the principle of long-service leave is generally accepted, but I do feel that the Government's handling of this matter leaves very much to be desired. The Government has handled it very poorly indeed; and as a result, this Chamber must now spend hours over a long list of amendments in an endeavour to put into shape a piece of legislation which should have been presented to us in a more reasonable form.

Prior to Sir Thomas Playford introducing similar legislation in South Australia, he conferred with all parties who would be affected by it—and when I say all parties, I mean not merely with all the employers' organisations or with all the employees' organisations, but with everyone concerned. He then sifted all the facts, after which he was able to submit to Parliament a scheme which he knew would be workable, and which would be within the bounds of industry to pay.

But in this case the Government did not see fit to confer with employers' organisations, with the result that its first scheme which was given much publicity went overboard before it was presented to Parliament; and now we have what I consider a half-baked Bill before us. But I hope we can put it into proper working

order, and that from the amendments on the notice paper we will be able to prepare a worth-while piece of legislation.

The Minister for Railways: What point in it don't you like?

Hon. R. C. MATTISKE: Practically all of it.

The Minister for Railways: Tell us one.

Hon. R. C. MATTISKE: The Minister can read the amendments and will have some idea of what I mean. If he will listen to what I have to say, it should convey my meaning to him.

The Minister for Railways: You agree with all the amendments.

Hon. R. C. MATTISKE: The question of the ability of industry to pay is one that has been touched on by practically every speaker; but unfortunately most of them have spoken very loosely on the subject, of which I venture to say they have inadequate knowledge. It is all very well for us to say, "Money will come from somewhere; look at the big profits industry is making" and so on. But let us have a look at the facts relating to industry. And when I say that, I do not mean the industry of Australia as a whole, where the conditions vary so much from State to State; and as commented on by Mr. Rydge in the article quoted by Mr. Lavery. But let us look at the facts applying to industry in this State, because if long-service leave is granted it will have to be paid by industry in this State.

It is generally accepted that the building industry is the barometer of prosperity. I think we all realise that in the post-war period there has been a considerable boom in the building industry because of the pent-up demand for housing, and other building, and that boom has been reflected through other industries, with the result that great improvements in working conditions and wage conditions, etc., have taken place. Looking at the actual figures, we find that so far as housing is concerned in the year 1955 we reached a peak when 8,772 houses of a total value of £25,072,000 were constructed in this State.

Then in 1956 the figure dropped from 8,772 to 6,047 which was a very appreciable drop. In the first quarter of 1957 the total number of houses produced was only 1,021. Allowing for the fact that the first quarter is normally one where the quantity of building is down because of the fact that industry closes down at Christmas time, and also because of the impact of Easter, the figures for the first quarter of 1957 indicate a very rapid falling off in housing construction.

On the other side, for other new buildings we see that in 1955 there was a peak of £11,563,000 worth of buildings erected. That fell in 1956 to £9,982,000—again a very appreciable drop. Then in the first quarter of 1957 it was down to the comparatively low figure of £2,183,000. Those

figures are factual; they are prepared by the Government Statistician and published in his Quarterly Statistical Abstract, and must be accepted as authentic.

The figures I have quoted indicate that the building industry is definitely suffering a recession at the present time, and to impose an additional burden such as long-service leave at a time like this would require very careful handling; otherwise we will accelerate that recession, which in turn will be reflected in other industries, and we will find large unemployment in this State. Accordingly the problem must be approached very cautiously and with full cognisance of the facts. The provision of retrospectivity included in the Bill is extremely unfair on industry, to say the least of it; and is, in effect, a penalty on those who have given employment to so many people during the last decade. If we are simply to say that those who have given this employment regularly to people during the past decade will have to pay a levy for giving that employment, then, to say the least, it is most unfair, and I feel that in many cases it could have a crippling effect on certain industries.

Mr. Logan asked why the Minister did not submit figures regarding the cost of this legislation and in what manner it would affect industry. In fairness to the Minister I must say that that would be a curly one, because it would be only by going to the various groups of employers in industry and getting from them an overall picture as to how it would affect them in its present form that we could get a true indication of the cost to this State. That is the only way we could do it. It would not be possible to get a proper picture from the information prepared by the Government Statistician.

The impact of long service leave is one which must be studied very carefully. We must see what the possible repercussions would be. Last year, when land tax was imposed, it was stated—just as loosely as it has been stated tonight—that industry could bear the burden of it. But I know two cases where clients of mine had to retrench staff because of the burden of land tax. Therefore it is not those employers that have paid the land tax who have suffered but the employees who have been retrenched. If long-service leave is to be granted on a wholesale basis without proper consideration of the effects on industry then it could result in wholesale unemployment.

Again, there is the effect on industry from another angle. Supposing the Bill in its present form were passed, it would mean that from 1961 onwards persons would be entitled to long-service leave. What would be the effect on skilled labour in certain industries? We know there are many industries where skilled labour is in short supply, and if a large proportion of

that skilled labour is made idle for three months at a time, what will be the effect on industry? Can it from some other source produce other quantities of skilled labour to take their place? That is an aspect which requires consideration.

Again, it has been stated freely that there are many who would not be able to afford to take long-service leave. Despite the jocular approach to that by Mr. Lavery, I feel in all seriousness that it is quite a problem which will affect not only that particular individual who is taking his leave, and has not money to go away somewhere to enjoy it; and bearing in mind that the principle of long-service leave is to fit a person out for a further period of service it behoves him to do something of that nature; otherwise he is only rusting away somewhere or other, and will come back at the end of the leave period in a far worse condition than he went away.

There is a further and worse effect; and it is this: That many of those persons who are not able to go away during that period of leave will do the obvious thing; they will get employment elsewhere. I can cite many cases—and no doubt every member here can—where persons at present enjoying long-service under different awards cannot afford to take leave, and seek other employment during that leave period. If that is going on to some extent at the present time, with the comparatively limited amount of long-service leave available—

The Minister for Railways: It is irregular.

Hon. R. C. MATTISKE: Unfortunately it goes on.

The Minister for Railways: They can be found out.

Hon. R. C. MATTISKE: It is difficult to police. What effect is this going to have when a far greater number of persons will be enjoying long-service leave, and when money is even tighter than at the present moment? The Minister said just now that it is irregular for that to be done. However, if he will cast his mind back to the conditions in the building industry during the last decade, he will not deny that many skilled and unskilled persons in this industry were working self-employed every week-end. They were working on houses being constructed by self-helpers; and, looking at it from the position of the economy as a whole, it was a good thing, because it did provide an invisible source of labour at a time when we were hard put for labour in the building industry. However, looking at it from the angle of Arbitration Court awards, it was a bad thing, and union secretaries made no attempt to police it.

The Minister for Railways: Eventually they did.

Hon. R. C. MATTISKE: They did when the cream was cut off. However, these persons were turning up to work on Monday morning and, on Mondays and Tuesdays, they were of little use to their normal genuine employer, because they were simply fagged out. They were going all out on the week-ends working for themselves and earning £5 or £6 per day, and absolutely tired themselves out. Therefore, I feel that that aspect is also one which must be given very careful consideration in connection with this present measure.

The Minister for Railways: It has nothing to do with long-service leave.

Hon. R. C. MATTISKE: We would all like to see every employee given more money. But what is going to happen then? Costs go up and up, and the employee has to pay. He is no better off within his own economy. When he considers the conditions of his own particular economy in relation to world markets, he will surely realise he is worse off. Let us, by all means, do what we can to improve working conditions. Anything of that nature will be received most wholeheartedly by everyone here, I am sure. But where the money wages are concerned, I feel we must approach the problem very carefully. Otherwise we may, thinking we are doing good, do a grave injustice to the employee.

I will support the second reading of this Bill and hope that the amendment at present on the notice paper, and a few others to come forward, will enable us to get a workable piece of legislation which will benefit the employees in the State, and which will be within the ability of industry to pay.

On motion by the Minister for Railways, debate adjourned.

BILLS (5)—FIRST READING.

- 1, Midland Junction-Welshpool Railway.
- 2, Bunbury Harbour Board Act Amendment.
- 3, Metropolitan (Perth) Passenger Transport Trust.
- 4, Education Act Amendment.
- 5, State Transport Co-ordination Act Amendment (No. 3).

Received from the Assembly.

BILL—ELECTORAL ACT AMENDMENT (No. 3).

Second Reading.

Debate resumed from the 14th November.

HON. C. H. SIMPSON (Midland) [9.26]: This Bill is one which seeks to introduce universal adult suffrage. Strange as it may seem, I find there is one clause in the Bill which I can support. That Clause is No. 14 and the effect of it is that Section 60 of the principal Act is amended

by deleting the words "fifty-eight" in line three. Turning to Section 60 I find that it reads:—

Upon receipt of the lists referred to in section fifty-six, subsection (a) and sections fifty-seven, fifty-eight, and fifty-nine—

I need go no further.

I then turned to Section 58 and find it is repealed by No. 58 of 1951, Section 6. I can support that particular clause in the Bill, but I am very much afraid I cannot support any single remaining clause. The object of the Bill, from start to finish, is to introduce adult suffrage in this House—

Hon. R. F. Hutchison: What is wrong with that?

Hon. C. H. SIMPSON: —and destroy the system which has grown up over the years of having a different franchise for this House, which many of us think is not only necessary, but desirable. All of the different clauses, of which there are many, are really linked together. Some refer to the Legislative Assembly and others indirectly to the Legislative Council; but still they have that one object in view, so it is quite unnecessary for me to go through the Bill in detail to tell the House what it is about.

In introducing the Bill the Minister ridiculed the present system. He said it was reminiscent of the practice in totalitarian countries where a minority ruled the people. He also said that the minority in this House ruled the people in a statutory way. I think these claims are not correct. Without going into elaborate detail, because I think members know this particular measure—its pros and cons have been debated many times over the years—I think the framers of the Constitution, having the experience of other countries to go on, decided on the bicameral system, and then considered that in order to get an efficient House of review there would be first of all a different qualification regarding members who actually sat in the House.

Having regard to the necessity for experience, they decreed in their wisdom—and I think they were quite right—that those who sought to sit in this House must be 30 years of age, whereas people could enter another place at the age of 21. Then they decided that there would be different qualifications for those who voted for their representatives in this Chamber. They decided that they would be elected at a different time and they gave them really a threefold qualification; and it was all voluntary.

The first qualification was to fulfil the conditions laid down in Section 15, which state that one must be possessed of some property or similar interest. If one fulfils that qualification, there is a civic but not a statutory obligation to actually enrol; it is a voluntary action. The third obligation—but again no compulsion about it—is to exercise the right to vote on polling day.

Whatever criticism may be levelled at the Chamber, that system has worked remarkably well over the years. In the Council the members are elected for a term different from that of members of the Assembly. They are elected for six years as against three in another place, and the times of election are different. There is provision for continuity of representation in the different electorates by reason of the fact that three represent the same electorate and one of the three retires each two years; and that is an advantage. But the big advantage of this Chamber, which has worked very successfully over the years, is that it does fulfil the functions of a house of review.

The Chief Secretary: Don't make me laugh!

Hon. C. H. SIMPSON: In spite of the criticism from time to time, the number of Bills actually rejected is a remarkably small proportion of the total. That is not to say that many of them are not amended. After all, that is our function—to rectify mistakes or supply omissions, and then to ask another House to accept our amendments and eventually to arrive at a compromise.

It sometimes happens—and this is very important—that after a measure is considered in another place and passes that House, it is discovered by those whom the Bill affects that there is a serious defect. There may be an omission, or a mistake. Not infrequently, those affected come along and say, "We know what was intended when the Bill was passed. But, as framed, it does more than was intended."

Sometimes it not only does not do effectively what was intended but it does other things that were not thought of when the Bill was first considered. A breathing space is allowed in the time between the passing of the Bill in one House and the opportunity of discussing it in another and rectifying the defects. In many instances people who put the Bill through in the first place are quite happy to have mistakes pointed out and those mistakes are rectified.

Many of the measures we receive are machinery Bills concerned with the processes of Government; and it is only right that we should examine them and accept them if we are satisfied with them, or discuss and possibly amend them. That is our right and duty.

On the whole, I think that the process of legislation coming from one House to this place and then being returned works out very well. In any event, the present system, whatever faults individuals may think it has, does work. I strongly oppose the suggestion that it should be altered, and for that reason cannot support the second reading.

HON. A. F. GRIFFITH (Suburban) [9.36]: It strikes me as strange that a Bill of this nature should be introduced in the Legislative Council particularly as it does not appear that it is going to be accompanied by the usual constitutional Bill which is necessary if this Bill is to have any effect.

The Chief Secretary: It could be.

Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: Of course, we know that the Government in another place has a brutal majority which it exercises when it pleases itself.

The Chief Secretary: Like the brutal majority in this place.

Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: And anything can happen in another place.

The Chief Secretary: Like it does here.

Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: This Bill is to amend the Upper House franchise. It is one of the hardy annuals. We have had it in Parliament every year since I have been here.

Hon. R. F. Hutchison: It may not be so hardy after next year.

The PRESIDENT: Order, please!

Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: I know that an interjection such as the one—

The Chief Secretary: You shouldn't take any notice of interjections.

Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: —that came from Mrs. Hutchison speaks the truth. I know from listening to her in this House just how bitter she can get on the question of legislation brought down here.

The Chief Secretary: What clause is that in?

Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: I know just how much she would like to see the Legislative Council abolished so that we would have one Chamber in Western Australia.

Hon. R. F. Hutchison: That is very true.

Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: And so that the party that is in power could play ducks and drakes and do just what it liked with the people of this State and the legislation it brought down.

Hon. L. C. Diver: That is still true.

Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: But I do not think that view is shared by all members of the Labour Party. If we were all to examine our consciences—

Hon. R. F. Hutchison: Wishful thinking on your part.

Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: —and tell the truth about how we feel on this matter, we would not like to see this Chamber abolished at all.

The Chief Secretary: Say "I," not "we."

Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: I would not, and I doubt very much whether the Chief Secretary would, either.

The Chief Secretary: I can always speak for myself.

Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: I doubt it very much indeed. It is rather interesting to have a look at the situation in Western Australia. Let us go back to the days of 1933 to 1947 when we had 14 continuous years of Labour Government. There were about seven members of the Labour Party in this House and 22 or 23 members of the Liberal and Country Party. There was not over those years the incessant howl we hear now for the abolition of the Legislative Council.

Hon. R. F. Hutchison: It has always been on our platform.

Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: A little while ago the hon. member made a speech. Nobody interjected. As a result, the length of the speech was about four times shorter than usual. Now I counsel her to let me make this speech four times as short as it will be if I start on her in a minute.

We did not hear this howl about the abolition of the Legislative Council in those days. The Government in Western Australia went along nicely with Bills passing both Houses of Parliament; and it was not until we saw an increase in the number of Government members in the Legislative Council that greater lip service began to be given to the claim that the Legislative Council should be abolished, and that part and parcel of the scheme to do it should be adult franchise for the Legislative Council.

Hon. R. F. Hutchison interjected.

The PRESIDENT: Order, please!

Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: For goodness' sake keep quiet! On every Bill touching on the Electoral Act, we hear the mind of some member of the Labour Party. Others remain very quiet on this point. But I think it would be very interesting from a public point of view to have a look at how desperate is the control of the Legislative Council in this State; to examine what has happened to Bills presented to both Houses since this Government has been in power. I think that even Mrs. Hutchison would be surprised if she had a look at the situation. I have taken the trouble to get out a few figures.

Hon. L. A. Logan: So have I.

Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: Has the hon. member dealt with them?

Hon. L. A. Logan: Not yet.

Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: Then he will not mind if I do? In the year 1952, when there was a non-Labour Government in office, 75 Bills were presented to Parliament, 66 of which were passed, six of which were lost in the Council, and two of which were lost in the Assembly, the other one being withdrawn.

In 1953 there were 107 Bills of which 91 were passed, 12 were lost in the Council, three were lost in the Assembly and one

was lost as a result of non-agreement at a conference. In 1954 there were 85 Bills presented. Of these, six were lost in the Council, three in the Assembly, and one as the result of a conference.

Hon. R. C. Mattiske: And two more should have been lost.

Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: In 1955 there were 75 Bills, of which seven were lost in this Chamber and two in the Assembly. Last year 89 were passed out of a total of 103.

Hon. R. F. Hutchison: You don't say how the others were amended.

Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: Twelve were lost in the Council and two in the Assembly. This session we have already had 80 Bills on the notice paper and we have received a number of messages which will build the number up to 85 or 90. Not counting those, in the last four or five years, 445 Bills have been introduced and all have been passed except 43 that were lost in the Council and 12 that were defeated in the Assembly.

The Chief Secretary: These figures do not mean a thing.

Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: Figures mean nothing to the Chief Secretary unless they suit him and then he is the first to use them, as we well know. In this case the figures do not lie.

The Chief Secretary: Figures can prove anything.

Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: If the Minister checks up he will find that the figures I have quoted are correct and that they were obtained for me, on request, by the clerks. The political bogey that is supposed to exist in the Legislative Council is so much humbug. We know it is essential for the Government to dish up to Parliament its hardy annuals for political reasons. There is, for instance, the Constitution measure, which we will not see on this occasion—

The Chief Secretary: Do not be too sure of that.

Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: I cannot say so here, but the Chief Secretary knows why we will not see it, and until it is here the measure before us is completely useless, whether passed or not, as the Minister knows, because it cannot be given effect to. There were other Bills that we used to see, such as the price control legislation, but the Government does not introduce that one any more.

Hon. R. F. Hutchison: No, because the Commonwealth settled it.

Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: I would like to introduce a Bill to abolish the hon. member and I am sure it would be passed by this Chamber and that many members apart from myself would vote for it. As I say, these measures are dished up so that at election time the Government can get out its pamphlets and say, "These are

the men who defeated such-and-such a Bill." The hon. member knows all about it, because she used those tactics in the election in which she was successful, and will use them again. The Government will be flat out next year to gain control of this Chamber. The Government would like to do it by means of adult franchise; and if they are successful in beating me, as one who comes up for election next year, I am doubtful whether even then Mrs. Hutchison will rest peacefully in her bed, because I am sure she will then have her claws into someone else.

The PRESIDENT: Order! The hon. member must not be personal.

Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: I do not wish to be personal; but I have sat here and have listened to this side of the House being abused. I have heard it said that we have a Tory outlook, and that we will not do anything for the working man. It is absolute impudence on the part of those who say that; and I would like the House and the public to know that I have as much feeling in my heart for the working man, and as much genuine desire to do whatever I can to improve his lot in life and see that he gets a fair go, as has any member in this Chamber. In this State we are all workers. There are very few of us indeed who do not qualify under the definition of "workers."

The whole of our country is typical of the fact that we are all workers. Just because a man happens to work with his hands, he is, to my mind, no different from him who works with his pen or in some other way. We are all engaged in making our living; and as long as we do it in a decent and upright manner, we are qualified as workers; and I am sure that the propaganda that is put over will have no effect on people who think.

This State has received the benefits of the bicameral system of Government for nearly 70 years, and I hope that system will continue. I hope this Legislative Council will always be here to take a second look at the legislation that is brought down; because we have seen tonight, in the long debate that has taken place on long-service leave, that were it not for the more intelligent and balanced approach of this Chamber to legislation, the State would have already reached a stage where recovery would be hopeless.

At present we need only examine the financial statement of this State to discover that as the years go by we are getting further and further into a financial mess, until this year we anticipate being about £2,500,000 in the red. How far is this process going to go before someone somewhere calls a halt? The policy simply seems to be to stir the pot again and add another tax to the burden already on the shoulders of the taxpayers, in order to keep going.

I hope this Bill will not receive a second reading; and, whether or not I am here to take part in the debates next year, I hope it will be a long time before this Chamber changes its political complexion, or the treatment that it accords to the Bills received here. We all know that measures dealt with in this House receive full consideration and thought, as is shown by the evidence I have given the House tonight in regard to the number of Bills dealt with. Obviously this measure is a political football, because the necessary amendment to the Constitution Act does not accompany it. I oppose the second reading.

HON. R. F. HUTCHISON (Suburban) [9.52]: As members would expect, I support this Bill wholeheartedly. We have heard tonight the same old arguments that we have heard over the years with regard to the restricted franchise of the Legislative Council, and I am surprised that members still put forward arguments that were worn out long ago. I would refer first to the remark of Mr. Griffith, that he hoped this House would continue for a long time; but it remains to be seen for how long it will continue. I would remind him that New Zealand, under a Nationalist Government, abolished its Legislative Council, and there seems to have been no outcry for its reinstatement.

I have no first-hand information about New Zealand, but will know more about it after I have been there later this year. I would point out to the hon. member, also, that we do not see anyone rushing in to re-establish the second Chamber in Queensland, even under the present Government.

Hon. A. F. Griffith: You will!

Hon. R. F. HUTCHISON: The franchise for this Chamber is an insult to the people of Western Australia. Members say that this is a House of review. Yet only last year Mr. Simpson accepted an increase in salary which was granted to the Leader of the Opposition in this Legislative Council. That actually happened, so to say that this is a House of review is nothing but an excuse.

At present we have the situation that everyone in this State over 21 years of age is bound by law to vote at Legislative Assembly elections; but unless those same people own property of a certain value or qualify in other ways under our restricted franchise, they cannot vote at Legislative Council elections for the members who must pass every piece of legislation before it becomes law in this State. Do members think that is fair and honest or just? I say it is a dishonest franchise and that it should be altered.

The people will see, in time, that it is altered, because the rolls of the Suburban Province have risen from 10,000 in 1949-50 to over 33,000 at the present. That

proves that the people are becoming interested in the question and are determined to have a voice in what will happen to the Upper House. It is no use putting up smokescreens, as Mr. Griffith did, with regard to the number of Bills passed by this Chamber. We all know that those measures are passed as amended by the Opposition, and that we accept them for the little good that is allowed to remain in them.

Since 1890 or in fact since the Government of this State was first implemented, this House has progressed slowly; and now, in 1957, we have still this restricted franchise. Under that franchise I say that the money spent on this Chamber of 30 members could better be spent on hospitals and other necessities; and if I had my way, I would abolish this House tomorrow. Must we continue to have to tell the people that they have to vote for the Lower House but they cannot vote for this Chamber by which all the legislation of the Government must be passed? It is an insult to the women of the State to tell them that.

We have already seen one reform take place in regard to the service of women on juries, and that was allowed to be accomplished only because of the pressure of public opinion which the Opposition in this Chamber was afraid to flout any longer. The position regarding our franchise is the same, and the time is not far distant when we will see democracy in action in this State for the first time.

Before concluding I wish to express my abhorrence of the fact that I and others of my party have to go out and tramp the streets to enlighten people concerning things that are not even mentioned in the daily Press. Until we had people who would do that, while the Legislative Council was not mentioned in the Press, no one was aware of why legislation that should have been passed and failed.

I have witnessed the crocodile tears that have been shed by various members of this House for wives and widows; but every piece of legislation that has been brought forward in this House to enlarge the franchise for the Legislative Council is whittled down to the bare minimum; or, alternatively, it is thrown out altogether. It is no wonder that those in another place talk about the brutal majority in this House.

I am pleased to support this measure. It would be too much to hope at the moment, and too great a shock to my constitution, to think that this Bill will be agreed to; but I am certain that other legislation containing similar provisions will pass through this House eventually. The people of this State should know that it is costing them over £100,000 a year to keep 30 members in this House in operation. I support the second reading of this Bill with all the vigour I have at my command.

HON. L. A. LOGAN (Midland) [10.2]: Quite a few speeches have been made by Mrs. Hutchison in this House on the question of adult franchise for the Legislative Council. In my opinion every one of those speeches would have been made in their correct atmosphere had they been given from a soapbox on the Esplanade or on the Sydney Domain. It is that type of speech which the communists in this country thrive upon. They are the people who are trying to upset the parliamentary system of Australia, and the hon. member is playing right into their hands by making such speeches.

Hon. E. M. Davies: What a lot of rot!

Hon. L. A. LOGAN: It is not a lot of rot at all! It is the plain truth! Let us review what the true position is. On many occasions we have been told about the restrictive franchise for the Legislative Council and the attitude adopted by members of this House on any legislation that is brought before it. We have also heard about the brutal majority—I want members to remember those two words and also the word “camouflage.” In 1950, however—and I hope the Press uses these figures just to prove to the people of this State that Mrs. Hutchison has travelled around and told people what we do not do—there were 43 divisions taken in this House and everyone of them showed mixed voting. They were not held on Party lines..

Hon. R. F. Hutchison: Not according to constitution!

The PRESIDENT: Order, please! I ask Mr. Logan to resume his seat and I appeal to the Chief Secretary as Leader of the House to appeal, in turn, to Mrs. Hutchison to adopt some measure of control over her interjections otherwise she will be suspended from the House.

Hon. L. A. LOGAN: Of those 43 divisions—

The PRESIDENT: Order! I ask the hon. member not to try to bait Mrs. Hutchison.

Hon. L. A. LOGAN: I am quoting only those figures and only those comments that have been taken from Hansard. Of those 43 divisions the members of the Labour Party divided amongst themselves on only 13 occasions. In 1951 there were 52 divisions held in this House.

The Minister for Railways: Did the members of the Country Party ever divide?

Hon. L. A. LOGAN: Not much! I will give the Minister a few figures directly.

The Minister for Railways: That is what we want to know.

Hon. L. A. LOGAN: I will give those figures to the Minister in a moment.

The Minister for Railways: I can recall the hon. member voting against his own Minister.

Hon. L. A. LOGAN: Of course I have! That is democracy! That is why the present franchise was granted to this House, namely, to give someone with a little independent thought the power to vote as he wished and so that we can have reasonable legislation on the statute book. Of the 52 divisions held in this House in 1951, 48 of them were mixed and on that occasion there were nine divisions during which the members of the Labour Party divided amongst themselves. In 1952, 42 divisions were held, 34 of which were mixed and 10 showed that the members of the Labour Party divided amongst themselves.

It must be remembered that on all the occasions I have mentioned, members of the Country Party divided amongst themselves on the issues that were put to the vote. Therefore, the figures show that the members of that party were not told how to vote. On those issues that were put to the vote they showed that they had independent minds and were putting democracy into practice as it should be. In 1953, 89 divisions were held in this House, of which 69 were mixed and of which nine show a mixed Labour vote. This was the year during which the Labour Party Government took office.

These figures, therefore, indicate that this is definitely a House of review. Where is the camouflage, according to these figures, that Mrs. Hutchison so often refers to? In 1954 there were 91 divisions held in this House, of which 52 were mixed and 11 of which showed that the members of the Labour Party were divided in their votes. I do not know what went wrong in 1955, but only 27 divisions were held, and yet 15, or more than half of those showed a mixed vote.

Hon. Sir Charles Latham: That was the last session before the general election.

Hon. L. A. LOGAN: In that year there was a mixed Labour vote with only one division. I have more comprehensive figures for the last two years. In 1956 136 divisions were held, of which 104 were mixed. Do those figures show a tendency towards undemocratic principles being followed in this House? Also, in that year, only seven divisions showed a mixed Labour vote. The main point to be considered, however, is that during 104 divisions we, on this side of the House, have crossed the floor and voted for the Government.

The Minister for Railways: It all depends on the question under consideration.

Hon. L. A. LOGAN: Members of the Labour Party talk about us on this side as being undemocratic. However, they, with Mrs. Hutchison should apologise because out of a total of 136 divisions only 29 of them were held purely on the basis of the Labour Party versus non-Labour Party.

The Minister for Railways: I bet they were on industrial matters!

Hon. L. A. LOGAN: Yet members on the other side of the House have the cheek to say that we are undemocratic and that we take advantage of our brutal majority. Will Mrs. Hutchison canvass those figures around her electorate for the information of the people? Also, I would point out that, in 1956, of the 136 divisions held during the year, in 78 of them the members of the Country Party split up; some voting for the Government and some voting against it. Does Mrs. Hutchison still insist that we are undemocratic?

The Minister for Railways: It all depends what the question is.

Hon. L. A. LOGAN: Those figures prove that we follow democratic principles and I would point out that those divisions were taken on extremely contentious matters.

Hon. R. F. Hutchison: You have a safeguard.

Hon. L. A. LOGAN: What safeguard?

Hon. R. F. Hutchison: A brutal majority.

Hon. L. A. LOGAN: I have already pointed out to the hon. member that of a total of 136 divisions taken in 1956, despite the fact that members of the Country Party split up on 78 of those divisions, the members of the Labour Party showed a mixed vote on only seven divisions. In 1957, during this session of Parliament to date, 76 divisions have been held, 43 of which have been mixed and 33 have been on the lines of the Labour Party versus non-Labour Party. During 28 divisions the members of the Country Party have joined forces with the Labour Party to help the Government carry its legislation through, but only during four divisions, of a total of 76, have members of a Labour Party split their forces.

Over a period of eight years there has been a grand total of 556 divisions held in this House, 408 of which have shown a mixed vote and on only 64 occasions have the members of the Labour Party split their forces. Yet we still have members of that party accusing us of being undemocratic and of using a brutal majority. However, on this occasion the figures I have just quoted will be printed for all to see; and I hope, therefore, we will not hear so much of these derogatory remarks in the future.

It has been stated that the franchise granted to this House is an insult. I wonder who the hon. member was insulting when she made that remark? This franchise was initiated by men with much greater ability than she has or ever will have. It was never intended by them that a person of 21 years of age should become a member of this House. I think we can claim that in Australia we have the highest standard of living of any country in the world. Has that been brought about by an undemocratic Legislative Council? It proves that the members of this House

are fully awake and realise that a good standard of living is necessary in this State of ours.

I hope, therefore, that from the point of view of members of the Country Party I have proved that all this talk of camouflage, undemocratic action and brutal majority is entirely without foundation. I am just about getting sick and tired of such talk; and if it continues I will, in future, vote against any measure the Government introduces.

Hon. E. M. Davies: Don't make threats like that!

Hon. L. A. LOGAN: We try to do a good job, and that is all the thanks we get for our efforts. If the Minister cares to have a look at our industrial legislation he will realise what support the members of the Country Party have given the Government.

The Minister for Railways: I will have a look.

Hon. L. A. LOGAN: Therefore, on the basis of the figures I have quoted to the House, I intend to oppose any Bill which seeks to alter the franchise for this House.

HON. J. M. A. CUNNINGHAM (South-East) [10.14]: Although this Bill represents a hardy annual and differs very little from year to year, there is, of course, not much that can be offered to this House of a progressive nature towards the alteration or amendment of the franchise for the Legislative Council. Therefore, I think most members will agree that the sensible thing to do would be to ignore such legislation. As has been said, this House is very fair-minded. Most members as a general rule support the second reading of a Bill, even if they are against the principle. They permit the story to be told and listen to the various speakers before judging it on its merits.

The Minister for Railways: I have a long memory on that point.

Hon. J. M. A. CUNNINGHAM: The Minister will not be unfair enough to expect that every measure introduced in this House will go through without being questioned or amended. When a measure is admitted from another place, particularly one that is contentious, it is only natural that the debate should become heated and statements are made on the spur of the moment by members who regret doing so afterwards. Feelings are stirred up, but in a short time members regret making those statements. This House is a cooling off House.

Hon. E. M. Davies: It is a "cooler."

Hon. J. M. A. CUNNINGHAM: It seems unfortunate that members of this House should boast on the one hand that they have been elected as representatives of their district to do a job, and on the other hand say that their sole purpose is to work for the abolition of this House. That is a poor attitude to adopt. After

all, the House is trying to fulfil and is fulfilling the functions for which it was established. It was not intended that the franchise of this House should be a reflection of the franchise of another place.

I agree that voting on adult franchise for election to another place serves a useful purpose. It gives a totally different outlook of the people in this State. If the members of this House were to be elected on the same franchise, then members advocating for its abolition would have the best possible argument to justify the abolition, because the House would be merely a pale reflection of another place, as most Upper Houses in Australia are selected. The members are selected with one specific purpose in view; that is, to make the Upper House a rubber stamp, a shadow, or a reflecting surface of the lower House wherein the power lies.

I have here a newspaper report of the statement of a very honest person whom Western Australians can admire. The report reads as follows:—

A newly-elected MLC. devoted his maiden speech last night to trying to talk himself out of a job.

He is Australian Workers' Union general secretary Dougherty. He held the NSW Legislative Council spell-bound for 40 minutes while he advocated immediate abolition of the House.

Other members in this House have said pretty well the same thing, but they have not been as courageous as Mr. Dougherty.

The Chief Secretary: You abuse the member in this House for making that remark, yet you are praising Mr. Dougherty for making the same statement. You can't have it both ways.

Hon. J. M. A. CUNNINGHAM: If the member in this House is sincere and holds the same sentiments as Mr. Dougherty I shall do everything I can to help her carry out her proposal. The report went on to say—

Dougherty, who was elected only two months ago, said he had become a Member simply to bring about its destruction, and if the NSW Parliament did not abolish the Chamber, he would not complete his term of office.

If the hon. member here who advocated the same course will adopt the same attitude, I shall help her.

The Chief Secretary: There is a great difference.

Hon. J. M. A. CUNNINGHAM: There is; and that is why I admire Mr. Dougherty. He described that House in the following terms:—

He described the Council as undemocratic, the worst Chamber in the world and the most select club in Australia said he was a crusader sent there to bring about its destruction.

There would never be democracy while the House remained. The Council was dead wood and rottenness cluttering up democracy.

Members were like children playing a game of Parliament. Bills from the Lower House passed through like sausages in a machine.

The members of that House are selected by the members in another place where there has been a majority of Labour members for a great number of years, resulting in a majority of Labour members in the Upper House who, according to Mr. Dougherty's words, contributed to this council of deadwood and rottenness, cluttering up democracy.

Where the Council is selected on party lines, not on the worth of its members, it simply endorses whatever legislation is passed in the Lower House. In this State we have a Legislative Council of which we can be proud. So far as I know it is the only Upper House that is fully elective. No member can be elected to this House without having been elected by the people. Despite the small percentage of population that may vote, there are members in this Parliament who are elected by a far smaller number of electors.

I agree that generally speaking people should exercise their vote in respect of a worthy subject, although members opposite say that anything which is worth while voting for should be based on adult franchise.

Hon. E. M. Davies: What do you mean by the opposite side of the House?

Hon. J. M. A. CUNNINGHAM: What the hon. member understands it to mean. There are some members of Parliament in this State who hold a seat by a mere few hundred votes, not as a result of adult franchise but by union ballot, which is a very restrictive franchise. If any member advocates that adult franchise should apply to union ballots in respect of prospective members of Parliament, he will have my whole support. I would like to see what would happen if I went to the A.L.P. when there was a selection ballot taking place and asked to cast my vote under adult franchise. I am afraid I would be refused permission, perhaps courteously, because they would treat it as a joke. Already the franchise for the Legislative Council is as wide as possible. Any person with a standing or with a sense of responsibility can get on to the roll.

Hon. F. R. H. Lavery: That is not correct. What about bachelors living on their own in boarding-houses?

Hon. J. M. A. CUNNINGHAM: If the hon. member will cease making a speech while I am interjecting I shall do my best to put over my thoughts. There are very few people who remain bachelors all their lives. On the other hand the greatest number achieve the heights of being

householders, simply by occupying a house of a rental of 7s. a week. The qualification of a householder is one who within the province occupies any dwelling house of £17 clear annual value; that is, not paying a rental of £17. Although a person may not pay any rent he can still get on the roll, as in the case of people occupying mine houses, or parsons living in houses attached to rectories. How much wider is it desired to make the franchise for the Legislative Council?

If a person living in a bough shed claims the annual value to be £17, his card will be accepted unless he is challenged on the issue. I would like any member to disprove that statement. A prospector living in a humpy can claim a vote but if someone contends that the humpy is not worth £17 annual rental a year he can say "Build me a house and I would like to know how much you would charge."

The Minister for Railways: Tell us about the occupants of Lawson Flats.

Hon. J. M. A. CUNNINGHAM: We have to be very careful about people who occupy flats. Some occupants of flats at present cannot get a vote, but no one can claim that the occupants of Lawson Flats are penalising the Labour Party in being deprived of a vote.

The Minister for Railways: We agree that they should have a vote.

Hon. Sir Charles Latham: You would not support the proposal when we tried to include it in the legislation.

Hon. J. M. A. CUNNINGHAM: If that provision is agreed to it will become possible for the occupants of large blocks of flats, as in New South Wales of 100 flats in a block, to obtain a vote. That can become a weapon to be abused, and that is why this House has not agreed to that provision. Members opposite would agree—

The Minister for Railways: I think you have convinced yourself.

Hon. J. M. A. CUNNINGHAM: —on the point that for every 1,000 people who are on the Legislative Council roll, there are probably another 1,000 who are entitled to be on the roll but are not. Or am I underestimating it?

The Minister for Railways: Not in the North Province, anyway.

Hon. J. M. A. CUNNINGHAM: If it is only half that number, why widen it when the people who are already entitled to be on the roll do not want to get on it? Those who are already on it have a greater range of choice than have the people who are on the Assembly roll because those who are on that roll must vote. It is compulsory for them to do so in our free and democratic country on pain of punishment. Yet ours is a country where there is free speech and free everything except free unionism, free enrolment and some other things.

An elector for the Legislative Assembly must vote although he may not have any time for either of the candidates offering. He must vote or do the unintelligent thing and scribble on the ballot paper. In Council elections he has that third choice by which he can show his estimate of the type of people being put up to him to elect to Parliament. That is just as definite a decision as to his wish as if he put a mark in front of one or other of the candidates.

Hon. G. E. Jeffery: Washing his hands of the affair.

Hon. J. M. A. CUNNINGHAM: Not at all. He is indicating that he will not have anything to do with the material that he is asked to support. This often happens. The hon. member must know that from time to time people who are not good candidates put up for elections and that, out of loyalty to party or for other reasons, he casts a vote in favour of one or another of them.

Hon. E. M. Heenan: Why will you not agree to a simplification of the qualifications?

Hon. J. M. A. CUNNINGHAM: I do not believe there is any difficulty in them.

Hon. E. M. Heenan: What is your description of an equitable freeholder?

Hon. J. M. A. CUNNINGHAM: Is it not fairly clear? It is anyone owning a part of any property. As a matter of fact the freeholder qualification has always, to me, been the safest one. If a man owns a piece of land of £50 clear value, he is there until he disposes of the property.

Hon. E. M. Heenan: If you ask people like that, they do not know the number of the location.

Hon. Sir Charles Latham: Such a person has no right to have a vote.

The PRESIDENT: Order!

Hon. J. M. A. CUNNINGHAM: The card can be filled out to that point and when it gets to the Electoral Office it is gone through with a fine tooth comb and the information is made available.

Hon. E. M. Heenan: Why not make it simple?

Hon. J. M. A. CUNNINGHAM: That is pretty simple. It is reasonable, wide, honest, elective, and not selective. We have the result that after 70 years of life with, in the main, a different form of Government in the Lower House, the legislation has gone through year after year even when the Government has had a small majority in the other place and a brutal majority here. The legislation has gone through and the percentage of the actual rejections of legitimate, administrative and useful Bills has been small.

The figures of rejected Bills mentioned appear to fluctuate. One year there is a great number and another year there

is a drop. That is understandable; because as we come to an election year we get the regular hoary giants coming up, and a number of others that the Government has no hope of having passed, and does not intend that they shall pass. They are there to give members an opportunity to create a little propaganda to be used as ammunition at the forthcoming election, and also to be able to say that this House is one of frustration and that it prevents legislation from going through.

If we exclude Bills dealing with administration and industry, very few are prevented by the Legislative Council from passing. But Bills dealing with price control, electoral franchise, and such things that are brought down for a purpose, swell the numbers of those that are rejected.

They are unimportant. The House is still doing a valuable function and is fulfilling the original concept of a House of review. So long as the House continues as it is, and is elected on its present franchise, we, in Western Australia, will still have the best Parliament in the Commonwealth. I oppose the measure.

THE MINISTER FOR RAILWAYS (Hon. H. C. Strickland—North) [10.36]: I assure the hon. member and the House that this Government does not bring the proposition here as a hardy annual for election propaganda.

Hon. J. M. A. Cunningham: It is used that way.

THE MINISTER FOR RAILWAYS: It is brought here as an honest endeavour to give the people of Western Australia adult franchise. The intention is to give everyone who is entitled to vote for the Government of the State, a vote for this Chamber. It is the Labour Party policy. We believe in true democracy.

Hon. J. M. A. Cunningham: What, compulsory voting?

THE MINISTER FOR RAILWAYS: The hon. member believes in that himself, but he has never brought a proposition here to alter it.

Hon. J. M. A. Cunningham: Would we have much chance?

THE MINISTER FOR RAILWAYS: I do not know; but the hon. member has the majority. A democratic Government is elected on adult franchise, and it is responsible to the people for three years. The policy on which the people elected it can be absolutely refused by this Chamber.

Hon. J. M. A. Cunningham: It seldom is.

THE MINISTER FOR RAILWAYS: This Chamber is not responsible to the people. The Chamber can never face the people as a whole, because one-third of its members go before one-third of the people. It

is estimated that one-third of the electors for the Legislative Assembly are eligible to vote for this House; that is, one-third of those who have a vote for the election of the Government, or those who vote for the Government of the Commonwealth or the Senate, can vote in respect to this Chamber.

It is the policy of the Government and the Labour Party to endeavour to alter that situation and allow the electors of Western Australia to elect a truly democratic Government. We want this to be achieved, whether it be by abolition of this House or by adult franchise for this Chamber, so that it is put on the same footing as the Senate. It would then need to face the electors as a whole as the Senate faces the electors as a whole. There have been double dissolutions.

Hon. A. F. Griffith: Only when there are double dissolutions.

THE MINISTER FOR RAILWAYS: This House can never have a double dissolution because members can sit back and say, "in six years' time the electors will forget about what I do." I have seen members count up and say, "I can afford to vote for this."

Hon. J. M. A. Cunningham: I have seen it, too.

THE MINISTER FOR RAILWAYS: I have noticed that when industrial measures have been before the Chamber that has occurred. No wonder we have had a lot of mixed divisions. At times the Labour Party has had a small number here, and there has been plenty of room for gerrymandering, mixing things up and being able to say, "I voted for your measure."

I only wanted to place the Government's viewpoint before the Chamber and let it be known that the Bill is not introduced for election propaganda purposes. If members continue to deny the people of Western Australia a democratic vote, that is their business. If the electors are told about it at election time, or if the Press tells them about it, that is their business again. It is public business and they should be told. After all, should a person who votes for the House of Representatives and the Senate be precluded from having a vote for this Chamber?

Hon. J. M. A. Cunningham: We do not want the same fiasco here as happens there.

THE MINISTER FOR RAILWAYS: What has this Chamber got which means that two-thirds of the people who elect the Commonwealth Parliament should be denied a vote here? The hon. member tells us how easy it is for a person to become enrolled. He quotes a person living in the bush, and paying no rent; but as long as the house is worth £17 per annum, he has the right to vote. I quoted Lawson flats where people might

be paying £17 a week—I would not know, but the rentals are high—but are denied a vote.

Hon. A. F. Griffith: No; they are not.

The MINISTER FOR RAILWAYS: Yes they are.

Hon. A. F. Griffith: That is not true, and you know it. What about the people in Wandana flats?

The MINISTER FOR RAILWAYS: I am quoting Lawson flats because I remember that we had a member living there, and an attempt was made to alter the franchise so that he could become enrolled.

Hon. G. Griffith: What about Wandana flats, Subiaco?

The MINISTER FOR RAILWAYS: I am talking about Lawson flats. I hope the hon. member will withdraw his accusation of a lie.

Hon. A. F. Griffith: I beg the Minister's pardon. I am of the opinion that there are people on the roll.

The MINISTER FOR RAILWAYS: I have asked the hon. member to withdraw his accusation of a lie.

Hon. A. F. Griffith: I cannot do any more than ask the Minister's pardon.

The PRESIDENT: The Minister has asked the hon. member to withdraw.

Hon. A. F. Griffith: I withdraw.

The MINISTER FOR RAILWAYS: It is a fact that while there may be people living in establishments, and not paying rent, who can become enrolled for this House, there are others living in the city and paying high rentals who are not allowed to vote for this Chamber. My opinion is that we should have adult franchise for the Legislative Council. The electors of Western Australia, I consider, have sufficient sense to know how to vote and they should be given the opportunity to exercise a vote for this Chamber the same as they exercise one for other parliamentary elections including election for the Federal Senate, the House of Representatives and the State Government.

HON. G. BENNETTS (South-East) [10.44]: I support the Bill. I am one who would vote for the abolition of the House. I would not be frightened of that. The amount of £100,000 that it costs the State to keep the Legislative Council going might pay off some of our railway debts, and we might then have reopened those lines that were discontinued. As the Minister for Railways said, one-third of the people have the right to override the full vote for another place. They are elected by adults, or people over the age of 21. It is a compulsory roll; and yet one-third of the people can override the majority and tell them what shall be done.

Just now Mr. Cunningham spoke about the person who has a bough shed in the bush. He said such a person could qualify for enrolment. But unless the annual rental value of that house is worth £17 he cannot obtain enrolment. It could be worth more than £1 a week to the person concerned; but if his name did not figure on a ratepayers' roll he would not be entitled to enrolment for the Legislative Council.

Hon. H. K. Watson: You are quite wrong there.

Hon. G. BENNETTS: A lot of people in my electorate have been scratched off the roll. I have been conducting a house-to-house canvass in different parts of my electorate, and it is true, as Mr. Heenan said, that half the people do not know the numbers of their allotments. I would say that only one in five would know. They do not know whether they have a freehold or a leasehold of their properties. Surely we should allow the wives to have a vote. They are looking after their families and they do a good job. Why should not a soldier, or a man who has been in the army, have a vote.

Some of my boys were away at the war and they did a good job. I think they are more entitled to be put on the roll than I am, even though I own the house. These lads who fight for their country should be entitled to have a vote in its affairs. It has been said that Mr. Dougherty mentioned in the Legislative Council in New South Wales that that Chamber should be abolished. He said that its only use was to put through legislation which had been passed in another Chamber. While there is a Labour Government in power in this State the Labour Party has not been in control in this Chamber, and it cannot pass Labour Government legislation. But when the Opposition Government was in power this Chamber passed legislation sent to it from another Chamber.

I heard one member talk about divisions; and how certain members voted with us on occasions. I am certain that those members made sure that the numbers were in favour of their own party before they voted with us. Let us be fair about this matter.

Hon. A. F. Griffith: Yes, let us be fair!

Hon. G. BENNETTS: Let us give the wives, who are rearing their little nippers, and doing justice to their husbands, keeping the home fires burning, a vote for this Chamber. Also, let us give the soldier boys an equal right to have votes for this Chamber. I feel sure that the Labour Government will be satisfied with that.

Hon. J. M. A. Cunningham: You're telling me it would be!

Point of Order.

Hon. A. F. Griffith: I rise on a point of explanation, Mr. President. A little while ago the Minister for the North-West requested that I withdraw a statement because he said that it was untrue.

The President: That Minister requested you to withdraw an implication that he was telling an untruth.

Hon. A. F. Griffith: That is correct. I now point out for the information of members the name of Robert Ross McDonald who resides at Lawson Flats, 6 Esplanade, Perth, barrister. He is on the roll for the Metropolitan Province.

The Chief Secretary: What is his qualification?

Hon. H. K. Watson: E.L.A.L.

Hon. A. F. Griffith: I am sorry about this. I was looking at the wrong place. He is on the roll as a freeholder for another property.

The Chief Secretary: That is so.

Hon. A. F. Griffith: I will still look.

Debate Resumed.

HON. E. M. HEENAN (North-East) [10.50]: As certain members have said, this Bill has come before the House on a number of occasions, and some facetiously refer to it as a hardy annual. But there are a great number of misconceptions about the position, as was exemplified by Mr. Griffith just now. There is no reason why 50 people who have flats, and who reside at Lawson Flats, should not be on the Legislative Council roll. No doubt Sir Ross McDonald owns property in various parts of Perth.

Hon. A. F. Griffith: The point was that the Minister said that he could not get on the roll in respect to Lawson Flats.

The Chief Secretary: He is not.

Hon. E. M. HEENAN: The Minister was quite right.

Hon. G. Bennetts: Have they separate entrances?

Hon. E. M. HEENAN: His address is Lawson Flats, and the qualification for being on the roll is not that he has a flat at Lawson Flats, but that he has a property elsewhere.

Hon. A. F. Griffith: There is no capital you can make out of that. I admitted it was a mistake.

Hon. E. M. HEENAN: I know, but the fact is that Lawson Flats are constructed in such a way that the flats have a common entrance by means of a lift; and under the legal interpretation of a flat they do not qualify.

Hon. H. K. Watson: For municipal purposes they are rated separately. Therefore, E.L.A.L.

Hon. E. M. HEENAN: As far as the Electoral Act is concerned those people who occupy the flats do not qualify as householders. That has been definitely established by a Crown Law Department ruling. Those people, although they occupy flats and pay perhaps £10 a week are not householders within the definition of the Act.

Hon. A. F. Griffith: What about Wandana Flats?

Hon. E. M. HEENAN: I am talking about Lawson Flats. The hon. member is side-tracking me. Wandana Flats were erected in a different way.

Hon. A. F. Griffith: But there are no separate entrances.

Hon. E. M. HEENAN: I am talking about something I know everything about. I say that without any exaggeration because over the years we have gone very carefully into this question, and it has been the subject of a Crown Law Department interpretation. I do not know anything about Wandana or any other flats.

The Chief Secretary: It was even the subject of legislation.

Hon. E. M. HEENAN: Yes. That is why I take issue with Mr. Cunningham and others; and it would be enlightening for Mr. Cunningham and possibly Mr. Griffith to know that a few years ago their own Government, in its policy speech, gave an undertaking that it would broaden the franchise for the Legislative Council. Mr. Hubert Parker, when he was Minister in charge of this House, introduced a Bill to carry out that policy. But, as enunciated by Mr. Bennetts and the Chief Secretary, members of his own party, in spite of the fact that their leaders had given that assurance in their policy speech, voted against their own Minister.

Hon. J. Murray: It is a non-party House.

Hon. E. M. HEENAN: When his Government kept faith with the undertaking it had given that it would broaden the franchise for the Legislative Council, and brought in a Bill to carry out that policy, members of his own party in this House defeated the measure.

Hon. J. M. A. Cunningham: That is regimentation, isn't it?

Hon. E. M. HEENAN: I think it could be called a worse name than that; when one makes a promise and breaks it.

Hon. J. M. A. Cunningham: Touche.

Hon. E. M. HEENAN: I think it could be given a worse name than that. The reason why we pursue this matter is that although the qualifications—and I agree with Mr. Cunningham, and anyone else who says that the qualifications are generous, up to a point—are generous, up to a point, if they were properly exploited more people could get on the rolls.

I do not have a card, or the Act in front of me at the moment, but I think there are about six or seven qualifications, and they are not simply or readily understood. I am sure that many business and professional men, who claim to know a good deal about most things, would not be able to fill in a card correctly for enrolment for the Legislative Council.

Hon. R. F. Hutchison: They are the worst of the lot.

Hon. E. M. HEENAN: As Mr. Bennetts said, one of the qualifications is a freeholder; and one has to quote the lot number and the number of the title deeds. How many people have them? The premises are usually mortgaged, and so the deeds are with a bank, or somewhere where they are not readily accessible.

Hon. A. R. Jones: Surely you remember them.

Hon. E. M. HEENAN: Surely!

Hon. A. R. Jones: Yes.

Hon. E. M. HEENAN: I wish the hon. member could tell me the Crown lease and lot numbers of his farm. I challenge him to do that!

Hon. A. R. Jones: I can write them down for you now and you can check them.

Hon. E. M. HEENAN: If that is so I admit defeat. I could not quote the number of the title deeds for my house.

Hon. J. M. A. Cunningham: I agree with that.

Hon. N. E. Baxter: I could.

Hon. E. M. HEENAN: These qualifications are too obtuse and too difficult. It simply means that intense canvassing has to be undertaken, and that incurs a lot of expense.

Hon. R. C. Mattiske: By the Electoral Department in specified areas.

Hon. E. M. HEENAN: And by candidates and party adherents. To me it seems so foolish and unwise. Why not say, "Let all adult people who occupy houses have votes." If we do not want to give complete adult franchise, limit it to all householders.

Take the case of Senator Vincent at Kalgoorlie. Everyone at Kalgoorlie over the age of 21 years can vote for or against Senator Vincent, and if we were to be engaged in some enormous undertaking—we might be engaged in a war—Senator Vincent would have a vote as to the part the Commonwealth would take in it. Yet here we have a grand and honourable gentleman like Mr. George Bennetts, and only one-third of the people on the Goldfields can vote for him.

Hon. G. E. Jeffery: Only one-third were eligible to vote.

Hon. E. M. HEENAN: Everyone on the Goldfields has a vote for or against Senator Vincent; but only about one-third of them have a vote for or against Mr. Cunningham or Mr. Bennetts.

Hon. H. L. Roche: Do you think the Senate has been a success?

Hon. E. M. HEENAN: It has been as much a success as this House has. I think they have done their best in the Senate as we have here. But I do think there is a strong case for a liberalisation of the franchise in this House; I do not think it would make a great deal of difference to the party position.

Hon. J. M. A. Cunningham: It probably would not.

Hon. E. M. HEENAN: It would not because the electorate is different, the system is different, the times of election are different, and it would save a lot of difficulty and misunderstanding; apart from which a lot of the prejudice against this House would be abolished, and I think a better set up would be established altogether. Strangely enough, that view was held some years ago by Hon. A. F. Watts as Leader of the Country Party, and I think the Leader of the L.C.L. at the time was Sir Ross McDonald. But it was published that that was their electoral policy and true to its word the Government brought a Bill down along these lines. It was introduced here by Mr. Hubert Parker. It was to liberalise the franchise by giving votes to householders and provided that any husband or wife who occupied a house was entitled to vote.

This small Bill extends that privilege to returned soldiers. That would not be going as far as we would like but I think it would be a worthwhile contribution. If any section is deserving of the vote it is the returned soldiers. It is possible, as Mr. Bennetts says, that a man and his wife could be living in a house and they are both entitled to a vote. But their adult son who went overseas and fought for his country may not own a house or he may not be married or occupying a house—he may be living at home—and surely we should extend the franchise to that type of person.

Hon. G. Bennetts: They have done it in South Australia.

Hon. E. M. HEENAN: That is so. A similar Bill has been before us on previous occasions, and on a few occasions a Bill for the liberalisation of the franchise was almost passed. I hope on this occasion we can do something about it. It would be a good thing because it would save the Electoral Department a lot of expense; it would save candidates the trouble they have to go through of enrolling and it would mean that more people would have votes. There is nothing wrong with that.

The more people that get on the rolls the more will it indicate how healthy is the outlook of this country. I hope that this small Bill will make some progress in that direction, and will receive the support of the House.

On motion by Hon. G. E. Jeffery, debate adjourned.

BILL—JURIES.

Assembly's Further Message.

Message from the Assembly received and read notifying that it no longer disagreed to the amendments insisted on by the Council and agreed to the original amendment No. 9 made by the Council.

BILL—TRAFFIC ACT AMENDMENT.

(No. 1).

Assembly's Message.

Message from the Assembly notifying that it had agreed to amendments Nos. 1 and 3 made by the Council, and had agreed to No. 2 subject to a further amendment now considered.

In Committee.

Hon. W. R. Hall in the Chair; Hon. F. D. Willmott in charge of the Bill.

No. 2.

Clause 2, page 2—Delete all words after the word "shall" in line 17 down to and including the word "fee" in line 18 and substitute the words "notwithstanding the provisions of this Act and the scale shown under Items 7 or 8 of this Schedule, be one-half of the prescribed fees for the tractor or of the fees prescribed for the licensing of both the trailer and the tractor."

The CHAIRMAN: The Assembly agrees to the Council's amendment subject to the Council making a further amendment to strike out the figure "8" in line 6 and insert the figure "10" in lieu.

Hon. F. D. WILLMOTT: I move—

That the Assembly's amendment be agreed to.

The necessity for it is simple. The two items in the Third Schedule of the Traffic Act which the Bills deals with are items No. 7 and 10, not items No. 7 and 8.

The MINISTER FOR RAILWAYS: In view of the explanation there is no objection.

Question put and passed; the Assembly's amendment to the Council's amendment agreed to.

Resolution reported, the report adopted and a message accordingly returned to the Assembly.

MOTION—MUNICIPAL CORPORATIONS ACT.

To Disallow Uniform General Building By-laws—Order Discharged.

Order of the day read for the resumption of the debate from the 6th August on the following motion by Hon. A. F. Griffith:—

That Uniform General Building By-laws Nos. 1 to 505 inclusive made under the Municipal Corporations Act, 1906-1956, as published in the "Government Gazette" on the 5th June, 1957, and laid on the Table of the House on the 9th July, 1957, be and are hereby disallowed.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: I move—

That the Order of the Day be discharged.

It is necessary to discharge this from the notice paper because the Municipal Corporations General Building by-laws have been disallowed in the Legislative Assembly.

Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: I oppose the motion. I cannot see why this should not be dealt with in the proper form.

The Chief Secretary: There is nothing. How can you oppose it?

Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: I want to make sure of the situation. While speaking to another Bill I mentioned that there was no accompanying Bill because certain things had happened. The Chief Secretary intimated that the Government might replace that particular legislation before the notice of the House. If we discharge this from the notice paper and the Legislative Assembly by motion of that House brings its motion back to the notice paper, and then the matter is dealt with, it will be off the notice paper here; it will have been dismissed in another place, and the regulation will become law. If the Chief Secretary wants to discharge this item from the notice paper, I suggest he take a vote on it.

The CHIEF SECRETARY (in reply): It is not a question of what I wish or do not wish. How can we decide to do something with relation to something that does not exist? So far as the Legislative Assembly is concerned, whether the Government does reinstitute these by-laws does not matter so far as the municipalities are concerned, because the motion dealing with road districts is still on the notice paper; and if it is disallowed, then even if the Government wanted to reintroduce the other motion it would be foolish to do so; what applies to one applies to the other.

Hon. A. F. Griffith: Why don't you take a straight-out vote?

The CHIEF SECRETARY: I have no objection. There is nothing to disallow.

Motion put and passed.

Order discharged.

MOTION—MUNICIPAL CORPORATIONS ACT.

*To Disallow Uniform General Building
(Car-Port) By-law—Order Discharged.*

Order of the Day read for the resumption of the debate from the 15th October on the following motion by Hon. A. F. Griffith:—

That Uniform General Building By-law No. 428A made under the Municipal Corporations Act, 1906-1956, as published in the "Government Gazette" on the 4th October, 1957, and laid on the Table of the House on the 9th October, 1957, be and is hereby disallowed.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: For the reason I gave previously, I move—

That the Order of the Day be discharged.

I can understand a person being firm but not obstinate; both could apply of course.

Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: I am not obstinate. I warn the House that this could be the situation if another place restores this particular motion to the notice paper. Will it not in actual fact become law if it is not disallowed? The House is not disallowing a motion to disallow; it is taking this from the notice paper.

Hon. Sir Charles Latham: It has been disallowed in another place.

Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: I realise it has been disallowed in another place; but if it is reinstated in another place it will go back on the notice paper in its original form. Another place, with a brutal majority, could do anything it wanted to do. That could take the form of a fresh debate and a vote to disallow the regulations being again taken, the result of which could be the reverse of what it was before, and the regulations would not be disallowed. This House has agreed to remove an order from the Notice Paper without disallowing the by-laws and I suggest they will become law as a result. Therefore I oppose the motion.

Hon. H. K. WATSON: I think there is a lot in what Mr. Griffith has said. After all, it is only a precaution. The item has been on the notice paper for two months; and what harm would there be if it remained for another week or a fortnight? It would not do any harm, but it might do a lot of good. If the resolution in another place is rescinded, automatically the by-laws would not have been disallowed. It would then be too late for us to disallow them here, and we would be the victims of circumstances. I feel we should give ourselves the

benefit of the doubt; keep the Chief Secretary honest for a fortnight and vote against the motion.

Hon. Sir CHARLES LATHAM: I think this is the first time that we have not accepted the Chief Secretary's word. If something has been disallowed in another place it does not exist.

Hon. J. Murray: This one does.

Hon. Sir CHARLES LATHAM: The Chief Secretary has informed us that both do not exist.

Hon. J. Murray: No.

Hon. Sir CHARLES LATHAM: The Chief Secretary must give an assurance one way or the other; but I do not want to feel that we cannot accept the word of the Leader of the House. We should not discount his word, and I for one am not going to do so.

The CHIEF SECRETARY (in reply): A few days ago I said there always seemed to be some suspicion about any action that is taken by the Government. It is not right that that should happen. How long would anybody last in public life if he came to Parliament and put "swifties" over? It is too ridiculous to countenance.

Hon. A. F. Griffith: I object to the Chief Secretary saying that I am trying to put "swifties" over and demand a withdrawal.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: There it goes again! I am being accused of something which I am not trying to do. The position is this: What I am moving now is only an amendment to the previous motion. If the previous motion has gone out, how can we have an amendment to it? That is the ridiculous position which we have reached. What is the hon. member worried about even if the Government did reinstate it in another place? This can be reinstated. The hon. member can immediately move the same motion here.

Hon. J. G. Hislop: We can restore it to the notice paper.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: Of course. The Government could not put anything over even if it wanted to.

Hon. L. A. Logan: We could use our brutal majority.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: A brutal majority would not have to be used to put it on the notice paper.

Hon. H. K. Watson: That is a new one.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: It is only necessary to give notice; there is no need for a brutal majority. This is only an amendment to the motions introduced in June. If the Government did reinstate this to the notice paper in another place, I repeat that the hon. member could again move his motion to disallow.

Motion put and passed.

Order discharged.

House adjourned at 11.22 p.m.