

amendments are moved in Committee along these lines, I shall give them my support. The Bill provides that a percentage can be charged on top of the various license fees that now have to be paid. Let me take the ordinary seven-seater taxi running through the metropolitan area. The fees aggregate in the case of such a vehicle £36 a year. As the Bill stands now, with the deletion of the seating fee, the license will drop to £15, but there is a clause which permits the board to charge up to 10 per cent. more on the gross receipts, and if this 10 per cent. is added to the £15, it will represent a total of approximately £66 or £67 per annum.

Hon. G. W. Miles: You are surely out in your figures.

Hon. G. FRASER: I think not. The Government no doubt have a genuine desire to co-ordinate all the transport services in the metropolitan area, and do not intend that this Bill shall be a taxing measure. I hope when the Chief Secretary is replying to the debate, he will give some information on that point. Possibly there may be some misunderstandings as to the actual cost that will have to be paid when the full 10 per cent. extra is charged. It may be said that the board will not charge this much. It will only be necessary for a charge of 5 per cent to be made to bring up the fees to what they are to-day. Let me now take the buses. At present they pay approximately £130 a year, including the seating fee. The correct figure I believe is £129 15s. for a 30-seater bus. With the abolition of the seating fee it would bring the cost down to £40 for a vehicle license, but if the 10 per cent. is added the charge will run into £274. These buses are operating in certain parts of the metropolitan area which are not served by railways or trams. Some means of transport must be allowed to the people. I hope this phase of the matter will be taken into consideration. It does not appear to me that if the board retain the fees it will be necessary to charge such an extortionate rate to enable them to carry on. There must be fully 88 or 90 taxis and about the same number of buses operating in the metropolitan area. A tremendous revenue would be provided if the fees charged under the Bill were to be paid. I do not think it is desired that that revenue should be raised by the board. I believe the main idea of the Government in introducing the Bill is

to arrive at some settlement of the transport problem. In view of that fact I regard it as unnecessary that so high a charge as 10 per cent. should be imposed. In Committee it will be necessary, according to my view, to reduce the percentage. It may be said that probably the board will not charge the full 10 per cent.; but if the full percentage is not required, why give authority to charge it? As I said in opening, we hope to reach the Committee stage soon and to complete the Bill this week. Any further comments I have to offer I shall reserve for the Committee stage. Hon. members will, I hope, give consideration to the two or three points I have raised. I support the second reading of the Bill.

On motion by Hon. E. H. Gray. debate adjourned.

*House adjourned at 11.3 p.m.*

## Legislative Assembly.

*Tuesday, 12th December, 1933.*

	PAGE
Bills: Farmers' Debts Adjustment Act Amendment, report	2434
Lotteries (Control) Act Amendment (No. 2), Council's amendments	2435
Fire Brigades Act Amendment, Council's amendments	2437
Financial Emergency Act Amendment, 2nd Com. report	2440
Public Works Act Amendment, returned	2457
Government Railways Act Amendment, returned	2457
Health Act Amendment (No. 2), returned	2457

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

### BILL—FARMERS' DEBTS ADJUSTMENT ACT AMENDMENT.

Report of Committee adopted.

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

## *Council's amendments.*

Schedule of five amendments made by the Council now considered.

### *In Committee.*

Mr. Sleeman in the Chair; the Minister for Police in charge of the Bill.

No. 1. Clause 2.—Delete this clause.

The MINISTER FOR POLICE: I move—

That the amendment be agreed to.

It now appears that the Lotteries Commission have sufficient power already without this clause, and I therefore propose to agree to the amendment.

Mr. LATHAM: I am surprised to hear the remarks of the Minister. When we brought the matter up in this House he said it was necessary to have this clause. If a Bill is going to be altered, we might have the opportunity to make such alterations here.

The MINISTER FOR POLICE: The commission will not have the power that was originally sought for them, but will have sufficient power to do what is required.

Mr. LATHAM: The Minister told us that the commission had given £1,000 to the unemployment fund. I do not think any objection should be taken to that. I understand, however, that while the Bill has been going through, the commission have given another £500 to the unemployed.

The Premier: They gave £250 from two different lotteries.

Mr. LATHAM: I have no objection to that.

The Minister for Police: For future administrative purposes, this clause is not deemed necessary.

Mr. LATHAM: It seems that once another place puts up amendments, we are only too ready to accept them.

The Minister for Police: Not in every case.

Mr. Wise: The amendment I proposed, you fought strenuously.

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

No. 2. Clause 3.—Delete this clause.

The MINISTER FOR POLICE: I move—

That the amendment be agreed to.

This deals with the distribution of money for charitable purposes. The Council seem to have greater confidence in the commission than in the Government who appoint them. Evidently, in the eyes of another place, the commission have shown considerable administrative ability.

The Premier: This cuts out the provision for Ministerial control.

The MINISTER FOR POLICE: There is a disposition to rely entirely upon the commissioners in the distribution of this money for charitable purposes. In practice, the commission have always gone where they could get the necessary information, and have consulted both the Minister and the departments concerned.

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

No. 3. Clause 4.—Delete the word "thirty-six" in line three and substitute the word "thirty-four."

The MINISTER FOR POLICE: This amendment would, if agreed to, shorten the life of the Act by two years less than was proposed in this House. I move—

That the amendment be not agreed to.

The experimental stage of this business has now passed, and there is no reason why the commission should not be able to enjoy a continuity of policy for three years. This money is used to assist various departments which would ordinarily have to be assisted by the Government. The Health Department have requests for X-ray plant and hospital facilities, and if they are acceded to in the case of one district, another district will expect the same consideration. If the department know they can have a continuity of policy for three years, they will be able to arrange to satisfy these claims. It would certainly be advisable to extend the life of the commission until 1936. Formerly we had no conception as to how the funds would be distributed, but now we have had an actual demonstration. Apart from those who are opposed on principle to such legislation, no one can cavil at the success of the Commission with regard to raising money, nor can anyone have any

serious complaint regarding the way the money has been distributed. In conformity with the policy of the Leader of the Opposition, I shall not agree to the amendment made by the Council.

Mr. Wise: You did not say that before when I tried to secure an amendment.

The MINISTER FOR POLICE: A limitation of one year will interfere with the continuity of any policy the Commission may adopt.

Mr. SAMPSON: The Council's amendment should be agreed to. There is not the same principle embodied in it, as there was in the other two amendments we have dealt with.

The Minister for Health: Why bring this matter up for discussion every year? The old chaps have a habit of limiting legislation to one year.

Mr. SAMPSON: I thought the Minister intended to agree to limit the operations of the Act to one year.

The Minister for Police: Why do you say that?

Mr. SAMPSON: The Minister spoke in such a suave, bland way that I thought he had seen the light, although he would not agree to do so when I attempted to direct his thoughts. It would not be a serious matter if we required the legislation to be reviewed next year.

The Minister for Police: Do you desire to discuss this tinkering sort of legislation every year?

Mr. SAMPSON: The legislation was held up and stone-walled for quite a long time by members sitting on the Government side of the House.

Question put and passed; the Council's amendment not agreed to.

No. 4. New Clause.—After Clause 2, insert a new clause, to stand as Clause 3, as follows:—

3. Section three of the principal Act is hereby amended by the addition to paragraph (e) thereof of a proviso, as follows:—

Provided that the first appointed members of the Commission shall hold office until the thirty-first day of December, one thousand nine hundred and thirty-four.

The MINISTER FOR POLICE: I move—

That the amendment be not agreed to.

I definitely object to the Council's proposal. It would mean that members of the present commission would be appointed by Act of Parliament.

The Minister for Health: Not by Act of Parliament, but by a few old fogeys in the Legislative Council.

Mr. Latham: The Minister for Health should not talk in that way about members of another place.

The MINISTER FOR POLICE: I assume that members of the Opposition will not agree to the insertion of such a clause. I cannot visualise the Leader of the Opposition agreeing that any responsible Minister of the Crown should hand over a task that is essentially the prerogative of the Crown. If the new clause were agreed to, it would undermine Governmental authority. I cannot remember a precedent for such an amendment, and appointments of considerably greater moment have had to be made by Governments in the past. Governments have had to make appointments to the judiciary and magistracy, and have had to appoint men to such high offices as the Commissionership of Railways, and each Government have had to take the responsibility for their actions. They did not hand over the applications to Parliament and ask members to decide who should be appointed. I can hardly conceive that the Legislative Council were in earnest in agreeing to such an amendment, particularly in view of the difficulty that has arisen over some appointments. In fact, one appointment is still awaiting a legal decision. I do not know what the position of Parliament would be if they compelled the Government to continue an appointment that may yet prove to be ultra vires the Constitution. This is a vital matter, and in the circumstances, it will please the member for Swan to know that in no circumstances will the Government accept the Council's proposal.

Mr. SAMPSON: What has the member for Swan got to do with this matter? Surely the Minister can make a serious statement without endeavouring to bring in ill-conceived humour that is in bad taste. I agree with his contention, and can do so in one-tenth the number of words he used. The House can properly refuse to accept the amendment, but why the necessity for the pointless gibe at me? I cannot understand the Minister's idea. I am prepared to accept the views expressed by the Premier.

The Minister for Employment: If the Minister's remark was pointless, how did you take it?

Mr. SAMPSON: The Minister's remark seemed to me uncalled for. I was not disturbing him in his remarks.

The Minister for Police: You indicated before that I had not made my meaning clear, although I made it clear to everyone in the House except you.

Mr. SAMPSON. The Minister did not take the stand I had anticipated. If he had taken a stand on this amendment, he would have been quite safe. There was no necessity to make the remark he did, for it would call for a rejoinder.

The Minister for Police: It would not require any ability to get back on the rejoinder. I would be prepared to accept anything you said.

Mr. SAMPSON: I am not too sure that the Minister would. There was no justification for his remark. He spoke quietly, blandly and apologetically, apparently expressed his agreement with the Legislative Council, and then, on this amendment, said he intended to oppose it. I am with him in this instance.

Mr. LATHAM: A principle is at stake, and this House could not agree to the Council's amendment. It would mean that, irrespective of what the qualifications or financial position of a member of the Commission might be, even if he should violate the law, he would still have to remain a member of the Lotteries Commission. I agree with the Minister that the House could not possibly agree to the Council's amendment. The Government have to accept responsibility in matters of much greater importance than the appointment of commissioners to conduct lotteries.

Question put and passed; the Council's amendment not agreed to.

No. 5. New Clause.—After Clause 3, insert a new clause, to stand as Clause 4, as follows:—

*Amendment of Section 15.*

4. Section fifteen of the principal Act is hereby amended by the addition thereto of a paragraph, as follows:—

(f) A copy of every account furnished by the Commission to the Minister under paragraph (d), together with a copy of the certificate of the

auditor in regard thereto, shall be laid before each House of Parliament within thirty days after the receipt of such account and certificate by the Minister, if Parliament is in session, and, if not, then within thirty days after the commencement of the next session of Parliament.

The MINISTER FOR POLICE: I move—

That the amendment be not agreed to.

The Act provides that a return shall be presented to the Minister, with an audited statement, certified by an auditor, after each sweep has been run. I have already given the House an assurance that at the end of the financial year, a properly certified balance sheet shall be compiled and published. The Council's proposal is, in my opinion, quite unnecessary.

Question put and passed; the Council's amendment not agreed to.

Resolutions reported and the report adopted.

A Committee consisting of the Minister for Railways, Mr. Latham and Minister for Police drew up reasons for disagreeing to certain amendments. Reasons adopted, and a message accordingly returned to the Council.

## **BILL—FIRE BRIGADES ACT AMENDMENT.**

### *Council's Amendments.*

Schedule of eight amendments made by the Council now considered.

### *In Committee.*

Mr. Sleeman in the Chair; the Minister for Police in charge of the Bill.

No. 1. Clause 2.—Insert a new paragraph to stand as paragraph (c), as follows:—

(c) by adding an additional proviso at the end thereof, as follows:—

Provided, also, that notwithstanding the amendment of the Second Schedule to the Fire Brigades Act, 1916, as enacted by the Fire Brigades Act Amendment Act, 1933, the constitution of the Board shall continue under the provisions of the Second Schedule as enacted by the principal Act until the 31st day of December, 1934.

**THE MINISTER FOR POLICE:** This deals with the re-allocation of districts; it is necessary, and I propose to accept it. The Second Schedule has been altered, and this proviso is required in order that those actually representing various districts shall continue their representation. This amendment means that the existing representation shall be valid, even though the Second Schedule has been altered in another place. I move—

That the amendment be agreed to.

**MR. CROSS:** This amendment is really essential. In actual practice the Second Schedule no longer exists. It was necessary to amend it, for it was creating a ridiculous position, and might have been the cause of some local authority holding up the work of the board at any time. The schedule has been amended in another place, and without the amendment before us there might have to be an election of all the board members elected by local authorities.

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

No. 2. Clause 3.—Delete paragraph (a).

**THE MINISTER FOR POLICE:** If this paragraph and also the next one be deleted, the power to appoint to the board a member of the Fire Brigades Union will no longer be in the Bill. When the Bill was introduced I explained that we considered it would be a decided improvement to the personnel of the board to have on the board a member of the Fire Brigades Union, for the board would have the advantage of his practical experience. The volunteer firemen were represented for the same reason, but the fire-fighting is now mainly done by the permanent men, and so it was proposed to enlarge the principle of giving representation to the volunteers by appointing also one from amongst the permanent men. As I say, this amendment, with the following one, would prevent that, and so I move—

That the amendment be not agreed to.

Question put and passed; the Council's amendment not agreed to.

No. 3. Clause 3.—Delete paragraph (e).

**THE MINISTER FOR POLICE:** For the reasons already given I move—

That the amendment be not agreed to.

**MR. CROSS:** I hope the Committee will not agree to this amendment. From time

to time we hear the opinion, particularly from the employing section of the community, that we ought to promote peace in industry, and concord between the employer and employee. This is a genuine attempt to give representation on the governing body to the workers in the industry. It cannot be denied that the advice of a practical fire fighter would be invaluable to the board. The need for amending the schedule was first mentioned by a practical fireman. Such an appointment would contribute to the efficiency and contentment of the service. Members of another place contended that matters of a confidential nature might be divulged to the union. I consider that such a statement was an insult to the intelligence of members here. People who speak in that way are not aware of the friendly relations existing between the board and the firemen.

**MR. LATHAM:** Why has the Minister specially singled out the workers in the coastal districts for representation on the board? Do they represent all the paid firemen?

The Minister for Police: Yes.

**MR. LATHAM:** I opposed the paragraph when the Bill was before us. This is the first time an attempt has been made to give effect by Act of Parliament to the principle of the representation of workers on a governing board.

**MR. RAPHAEL:** We live and learn.

**MR. LATHAM:** The hon. member has a lot of nasty ideas. A little while ago we gave a decision that involved a similar principle. So far as I know, there has been no friction between the board and the union, though disagreements may occur at times.

The Minister for Police: Volunteer firemen are represented on the board.

**MR. LATHAM:** But they are giving voluntary service and need representation to ensure that they get a fair deal. The other firemen are paid servants. I did not suggest that a representative of the firemen on the board would carry yarns back to the union.

**MR. HAWKE:** The member for Canning said that was mentioned in another place.

**MR. LATHAM:** Then he should not have mentioned it here.

Question put and passed; the Council's amendment not agreed to.

No. 4. Clause 3.—Delete paragraph (f).

The MINISTER FOR POLICE: The paragraph contains a proviso that any person who ceases to be a member of a local authority shall not continue to be a member of the board. This has been requested by the local authorities to ensure that they will be directly represented. Those who contribute to the upkeep of the fire brigades are the Government, the local authorities and the insurance companies, and each of those parties is entitled to direct representation. The proviso was inserted to ensure that there should be no departure from that principle. I move—

That the amendment be not agreed to.

Mr. LATHAM: The representative of a local authority could be on the board for only two years and he would then have to face re-election.

Hon. W. D. Johnson: During that period he might cease to be a member of the council.

Mr. LATHAM: Yet he might know more about fire brigade work than would a new man. He would be a representative of all the boards and not merely of the board who appointed him. The fact of his ceasing to be a member of the local authority would not make him less efficient as a representative on the board.

Mr. CROSS: If the proviso were deleted, a representative might cease to be a member of the local authority a couple of weeks after his appointment and he might do things detrimental to the local authority and in the interests of the underwriters. He should not be a representative of the local authority if he ceased to be a member of the council.

Question put and passed; the Council's amendment not agreed to.

No. 5. Clause 6.—Delete this clause.

The MINISTER FOR POLICE: This amendment also deals with the appointment of a permanent fireman to the board in that it proposes to increase the amount which members of the board may receive from £250 to £275 per annum. I move—

That the amendment be not agreed to.

Question put and passed; the Council's amendment not agreed to.

No. 6. New Clause.—After Clause 7 insert a new clause, to stand as Clause 8, as follows:—

8. The Second Schedule of the principal Act as enacted by section four of the principal Act is repealed, and the following substituted:—

#### *Second Schedule.*

##### *Part I.*

Municipal District—The City of Perth.

Road District—Perth.

##### *Part II.*

Municipal Districts—Claremont, Cottesloe, East Fremantle, City of Fremantle, Guildford, Midland Junction, North Fremantle, Subiaco.

Road Districts—Bassendean, Bayswater, Buckland Hill, Canning, Greenmount, Melville, Nedlands, Peppermint Grove, Perth, South Perth, Swan.

##### *Part III.*

Municipal Districts—Boulder, Kalgoorlie.

Road Districts—Coolgardie, Cue, Kalgoorlie, Leonora, Meekatharra, Yilgarn.

##### *Part IV.*

Municipal Districts—Albany, Bunnbury, Busselton, Collie, Geraldton, Narrogin, Northam, Wagin, York.

Road Districts—Beverley, Brookton, Katanning, Kellerberrin, Meckering, Morredin, Northam, Toodyay.

Each district under Parts II., III., and IV. to be named the (name of municipal or road district) fire district. The letters (R.B.) to follow the names of the Perth and Kalgoorlie road districts.

The MINISTER FOR POLICE: The proposed new schedule has been referred to the departmental officers who consider it necessary. I move—

That the amendment be agreed to.

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

No. 7. Title.—Delete the word "twelve" in the first line.

The MINISTER FOR POLICE: To amend the Title in this way would limit the scope of the Bill and prevent the inclusion of a permanent fireman on the board. I move—

That the amendment be not agreed to.

Question put and passed; the Council's amendment not agreed to.

No. 8. Title.—Insert the words “and the second schedule” after the word “forty-two” in the second line.

The MINISTER FOR POLICE: The amendment is necessary to cover the alteration to the second schedule. I move—

That the amendment be agreed to.

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

Resolutions reported and the report adopted. A committee consisting of Messrs. Cross, Latham and Millington drew up reasons for disagreeing to five amendments. Reasons adopted and a message accordingly returned to the Council.

## BILL—FINANCIAL EMERGENCY ACT AMENDMENT.

### *Second Reading.*

Debate resumed from the 7th December.

MR. LATHAM (York) [5.40]: I disagree with a remark made by the Deputy Leader of the Government when introducing the Bill. The hon. gentleman asserted that the Premiers' Plan had not done anything near what it was expected to do. I contend that the Plan saved Australia from bankruptcy, and I propose to quote some figures which, I believe, will convince the House that that is so. The Plan was adopted in May, 1931, and came into operation here in August. The Plan was accepted by the Commonwealth Government and the six State Governments, four of which at the time were Labour. The Prime Minister was leading a Labour Government; and in Victoria, New South Wales, and South Australia Labour Governments were in power. The Plan was endorsed by all the Governments of the day.

Mr. Cross: Including Mr. Lang's Government?

Mr. LATHAM: Mr. Lang agreed to the Plan.

The Minister for Works: He signed it.

Mr. LATHAM: Mr. Lang agreed to it, though we know what happened subsequently. At the time the emergency legislation was enacted, Australia was drifting to leeward at the rate of £40,000,000 a year. The deficits of all the Australian Governments ran into nearly that figure. The year in which the emergency legislation was

passed, it was anticipated that the aggregate of Australian deficits would be £40,000,000.

Mr. Cross: That was mostly for interest though.

Mr. LATHAM: It was shown that Australia could not pay its way.

Mr. Cross: Australia could not pay its interest.

Mr. LATHAM: The reason was that Australia's national income had fallen by £200,000,000 per annum, a stupendous drop. The fall in the national income was chiefly caused by the fall in the prices of our export commodities, and by the difficulty in securing markets. Wheat, wool, and timber had no markets; and when markets were obtained, the prices were very low. Secondly, Governments experienced difficulty in finding sufficient money in London to meet oversea commitments, and thus were compelled to discourage, and almost prohibit, the importation of goods into Australia. That again caused a falling-off in the national income. The two main facts to be borne in mind are that the national income of the Australian people had fallen by £200,000,000, and that Australia was facing an aggregate annual deficit of about £40,000,000. For the financial year ended 30th June, 1931, just before the introduction of the financial emergency legislation into this Chamber, the aggregate Australian deficit amounted to £31,150,000, a colossal sum. The House should remember that those factors caused the getting-together of the Prime Minister and the Premiers. The object was to stop that tremendous drift. Had we continued as we were going then, there would have been no alternative to bankruptcy. We were producing goods, but could not find markets for them. Therefore we had to resort to other means. The only other means available was to reduce expenditure. Hon. members know how that task was set about. The experts advising the Prime Minister and the Treasurers of the day pointed out what could be done to reduce expenditure by about £20,000,000, and what could be done, through increased taxation, to make up some of the leeway. The Premiers' Plan has achieved what it was intended to do. Some of us disagree, as the Minister for Works disagrees, with the methods employed. The Minister disagreed extensively last year.

The Minister for Works: I know I did.

Mr. LATHAM: Much more than he does this year.

The Minister for Works: No fear!

Mr. LATHAM: I will tell the Minister what he said. I will remind him that he threw out a challenge, indirectly, to us to look up "Hansard" and see what he said on this subject previously. But for that implied challenge, no one on this side would ever have thought of looking the matter up.

Ministerial Members: Oh!

Mr. LATHAM: I had no idea that there was likely to be any alteration in the Act. I will tell the House why I thought there would be no alteration. The reason is that in connection with the very first Bill introduced by him into this Chamber the Treasurer said he wanted more money. There was very little opposition to that Bill because it was realised the Treasury did want money.

The Minister for Works: Which Bill?

Mr. LATHAM: The Financial Emergency Tax Bill.

The Minister for Works: He only asked for the same amount of money.

Mr. LATHAM: But he wanted it to continue for the whole 12 months if it was possible. Last year we had only seven-twelfths of it and this year the Premier will have not less than nine-twelfths. The Premier at that time told us it was necessary to have that money, and I knew it was necessary, but it does come as a surprise to find that it is proposed to give away a certain amount of revenue that was wanted two months after the House met. It is indeed a surprise to find this Bill introduced now with the amendments it contains.

Mr. Raphael: Do you oppose the idea that certain refunds should be made to the Civil Service?

Mr. LATHAM: I do not intend to answer any of the hon. member's interjections. On the 30th June, 1931, Australia's deficit amounted to £31,150,000, and I think we can claim that the Act has done what was intended, because last year Australia's deficit totalled £8,608,000. So it will be seen that a considerable leeway was made up. It would have been a wonderful thing to have checked it, but as it is, we have brought it back to a controllable amount of money.

Mr. Ferguson: And with lower prices for commodities.

Mr. LATHAM: There is food for reflection in Australia's position to-day. On the 4th June, 1931, Australian 5 per cent. stocks were down to £63 10s.; to-day they are at a premium.

Mr. Raphael: That is because J. T. Lang has been put underneath.

Mr. LATHAM: To-day the price is between £103 and £105. That shows that confidence in Australia is being restored. This has been done by the getting together of all the Premiers and carrying out what is referred to as the Plan legislation. That legislation has done what it was intended it should do. Getting back to the finances of this State, in 1930-31 we went to leeward to the extent of £1,420,000, and in 1931-32 our deficit was £1,557,000. I do not propose to offer any excuses for those huge deficits, but in passing I might mention that there were a number of people out of employment and that alone was costing the State £643,000 and on account of the difficulty of getting money at Home we had to pay exchange at the rate of 30 per cent., which meant another £620,000. Thus it will be realised that Western Australia was going to the bad to the extent of a million and a half a year, and that therefore something had to be done. A reflection of the Plan legislation was a reduction of the deficit of £864,000 in the last year of the previous Government. If we look at the price of Western Australian stocks to-day we will find that some of them are quoted up to £110. That shows that confidence overseas, which it is so necessary for us to have, is being restored. The Minister for Employment told us that in September, 1931, there were 19,000 people depending on the State, that 17,000 were on sustenance and 2,000 were engaged on relief work, and that in September of this year there were only 5,300 on sustenance and 8,700 on relief work. The Minister further said, and I believe his figures are accurate, that 5,000 men had been absorbed in private employment. That looks as if the Plan legislation had done something; that it had assisted to take off the Government's hands that number of men. We can claim that the Plan legislation saved Australia from bankruptcy and restored confidence. That was what it was intended to do in spite of what the Minister for Works said the other night when he introduced this Bill. When the



legislation was introduced, it was intended that the finances should be balanced this year. The present Government, however, have been let off balancing their budget this year. The proposal now submitted to the House is not going to improve the Government's position; it will aggravate it. I do not know whether consideration was given to the matter by the Minister for Works, but I am afraid he did not consult the Minister for Employment, and indeed I do not know whether he consulted the Treasurer. If he did, I am surprised at his bringing down the Bill. I know that the Minister for Works is in the habit of doing a lot of wild things on his own, and before I sit down I shall quote one or two of them, just to show how much out of step he is with his party at times. "Hansard," which is a good record, will help me. When the legislation was introduced, things were so desperate that those who were in employment in the Government service, and those in employment outside, were asked to make a sacrifice.

The Minister for Employment: In this State only.

Mr. LATHAM: Everywhere. In every State in Australia there was a cut in wages in the Government service.

The Minister for Employment: No other Government introduced legislation like ours.

Mr. LATHAM: I have gone to a good deal of trouble to ascertain the position. In Queensland by an Order in Council there was a reduction in wages and salaries. In the other States it was done by legislative enactment.

The Minister for Works: Not a single law in Australia reduced wages.

Mr. LATHAM: I can assure the Minister for Works that the Arbitration Courts in South Australia and New South Wales made substantial reductions.

The Minister for Works: You were talking about Parliamentary enactments.

Mr. LATHAM: Authority must be given to do that. The Minister knows well what was done. After the basic wage was fixed by the Federal Arbitration Court, there was a 10 per cent. reduction, and the Minister knows well that wages in South Australia, Victoria, Queensland and Tasmania were considerably lower than the wages in this State. If reductions had not been made many people would have been thrown out of work. We asked the people in this

State to join up in making the sacrifice, and they agreed to do so. There was more noise and fuss in this House on the subject than there was in any other part of the State. There was comparatively little noise outside, because people were willing to do their part. They saw what was happening, and they saw that many people were out of employment for the first time in their lives. As I have said, the sacrifice was accepted cheerfully by the people, and we have no right now to ask them to make a second sacrifice. I am afraid that we are getting into a worse financial position than we were in before. The trouble is that members talk too much in the House and later on, when a change comes about, they wish they could obliterate some of the things they said.

The Minister for Employment: Then the hon. member had better be brief.

Mr. LATHAM: I am much briefer than the hon. gentleman. Certainly I shall never enter into a Marathon with him. The Minister for Works ought to be sure of his facts before he makes statements in this House. I notice that the Prime Minister had occasion to pull him up. When the Minister was speaking I doubted one of the statements that he made, and if he looks up the records he will see that I interjected, "You have no right to give that information, even if it is authentic." I never for one moment thought that the Federal Government had done anything of the kind attributed to them by the Minister. I know that in our own State some assessment notices are often delayed.

The Minister for Works: I know of one instance where a cheque for £2,000 was ready for payment to the Commonwealth, and the drawers of it were told to hold it back until after the financial year had closed.

Mr. LATHAM: The Minister is aware that the Commonwealth gives two months in which to pay taxation. Under the State law the period is one month and I should not like to approach our own Commissioner and ask him for an extension of time in which to pay taxation.

The Minister for Works: You frequently get it.

Mr. LATHAM: I do not know about that. If it is so, I am glad that somebody is able to get an extension. But really the Minister should be more guarded in the statements he makes.

The Minister for Works: What I said is absolutely correct.

Mr. LATHAM: Anyway, the Prime Minister has said that it is incorrect.

The Minister for Works: He made a very lame explanation.

Mr. LATHAM: The Prime Minister said that he was surprised at a responsible Minister making such a statement.

The Minister for Works: What causes him surprise does not concern me in the least.

Mr. Marshall: I would rather accept the Minister's statement than that of the Prime Minister who is only a political acrobat.

Mr. SPEAKER: The Leader of the Opposition must address the Chair.

Mr. LATHAM: The position of the State has not improved sufficiently to enable the Minister to give anything away. If he examines the revenue and expenditure for this year, he will find that with the extra taxation he is collecting that was not collectable last year, plus the £300,000 that the Government are getting from the Commonwealth, the State will still be a long way behind. A considerable amount of money is coming in monthly to the Treasurer from the financial emergency tax. In addition, he is getting £200,000 more this year from the Federal Government than was given last year, that is, £100,000 for the reduction of the deficit last year, and £100,000 towards a reduction in the deficit this year. I can understand the Minister feels he is under an obligation to introduce this Bill. It does not, however, represent the promise he made to the people nor the promise made by other occupants of the front bench, or the promises made by members occupying some of the cross benches. I am sorry that the Labour Government were not in power for the last three years. We would then have seen what they were able to do, and to what extent they were able to improve on what we could do. I know the Government are quite ready to do the right thing irrespective of whether they think those things represent their political views or not. We had an instance of that the other day when the Minister for Employment had to do the right thing, though possibly he did not want to do it. I am sorry the Minister for Works has not profited by the experience everyone has been through during the last three years. He has not done so because he did not have

the responsibility of office. In order to show that considerably more than this was promised to the people I should like to quote from a speech made by the Premier on the 3rd March last at the Perth Town Hall. He said—

The provisions of the Financial Emergency Act, which had the effect of lowering salaries and wages, would not be re-enacted if Labour were returned to office, but those which provided for a reduction in interest would be re-enacted.

The Minister for Works: He was wrongly reported.

Mr. LATHAM: Surely the Minister will not put up that argument. It was a statement which influenced thousands of votes, many more than the placarded stuff at Trades Hall and on the trams.

The Minister for Employment: Did that annoy you?

Mr. LATHAM: No. I am only sorry that the public believed that sort of trash. I will now quote from "Hansard" of the 17th November, 1932, to show what the Minister for Works had to say on the subject:—

We have denounced this Bill ever since it was placed on the statute-book, and I give the Minister in charge an undertaking now that if at the next election we are returned to the Treasury benches, he will never be able to charge us with not denouncing the measure before we got into office, and repealing it when we did get into office; because one of the first things we will do when we get into power after the next general election will be to repeal this legislation. There is no doubt about that.

I can imagine the emphasis that was placed on the words "No doubt about that."

The Minister for Employment: And now you complain that we are going too far.

Mr. LATHAM: Not at all. Why does not the Minister do what he promised? What are the Government giving away under this Bill?

The Minister for Works: You said I was giving away more than I could afford.

Mr. Hawke: Poor bow-yangs!

Mr. LATHAM: The man on the basic wage will not get a penny under this Bill. He will require to draw 9s. above the basic wage before he receives any assistance whatever. The man with a margin of 10s. for skill will get an extra 8d. per week; the man with a margin of 12s. 6d. will get 2s. 2d.;

and the man with 15s. will get 2s. 8d. The more money a man gets the more relief will he get. A man on 17s. 6d. will get 3s. 2d.; a man on 20s. will get 3s. 8d.; a man on 22s. 6d. will get 4s. 2d.; and the man on 25s. will get 4s. 8d. above the basic wage. That is most unfair to the man who is out of work. These figures show up the position in a very bad light from the point of view of the unemployed. These additional amounts that are to be landed over on the ground of margin for skill represent a sum of money that would find a great deal of work for other people, and tend to ease the lot of a great many.

The Minister for Employment: It will do that.

Mr. LATHAM: The Minister knows, as do the people, that goods are always bought at the cheapest possible place, even if they have to be imported from the Eastern States.

The Minister for Works: Are you referring to the margin for skill?

Mr. LATHAM: Yes. I do not know whether my figures are completely up to date, because I have had to depend upon the records we could get in the House.

The Minister for Works: What was the figure you quoted?

Mr. LATHAM: The man on the 10s. margin for skill will get 8d. a week.

The Minister for Works: That is right.

Mr. LATHAM: And on 2s. he will get 2s. 2d.

The Minister for Works: That is on the latest basic wage, not when the Act was brought in?

Mr. LATHAM: Yes.

The Minister for Works: That is right.

Mr. LATHAM: The Minister has more up-to-date information than I have, but I am glad to know my figures are correct.

The Minister for Works: It would be largely a question of the date. Are you including the cuts?

Mr. LATHAM: We took the last "Industrial Gazette" and the present basic wage. The man who gets the basic wage with a 25s. margin for skill will receive 4s. 8d. Talk about greasing the fatted pig!

The Minister for Employment: You took more off him, when you made your cuts.

Mr. LATHAM: He can afford to give a little to the Government who help in keeping employment going.

Mr. Hegney: He is giving it.

Mr. LATHAM: Not at all. The arguments that we put up hold good to-day.

The Minister for Works: It means so little to him that he should not object.

Mr. LATHAM: It means so much to the man who is out of employment.

The Minister for Works: Your argument has been proved to be fallacious.

Mr. LATHAM: The Minister will certainly get into trouble over this. The man on the basic wage will get no relief, but immediately his margin of skill brings him above it he will get relief.

The Minister for Employment: But he will not have his wages cut down 10s. as you promised.

Mr. LATHAM: I made no such statement. When the Minister put up that flap-doodle to the people of East Perth it is a wonder he did not feel sick. He made some wonderful promises. If we were to outdo each other with promises it would be a very bad outlook for Western Australia, and the public would have to pay.

The Minister for Employment: They did not accept your promises.

Mr. LATHAM: I will now deal with the salaried staff. The Minister has brought down an amendment relating to the police, but I do not understand the import of it. Salaried officers who are at present receiving between £205 and £240 are the only ones who will derive any benefit. No one who is receiving less than £205 will get anything. Members of the civil service are not likely to derive any great satisfaction from this measure.

The Minister for Works: To what district are you referring?

Mr. LATHAM: To the City of Perth, where most of the money is spent.

The Minister for Works: There are other districts too. If you confine yourself to the city it will be all right.

Mr. LATHAM: I am doing so. The officer who was on £300 a year at the 30th June, 1930, is now drawing £240. Under the Bill, because he has come down £2 below the amount of the automatic range, he will receive a benefit of £2 a year.

The Minister for Justice: That is something.

Mr. LATHAM: Is it worth while disorganising the whole of the service for £2?

The Minister for Justice: But that is not so.

Mr. LATHAM: It seems as if it is so. It is causing a good deal of discontent, and

is not carrying out the promise of the Government.

The Minister for Justice: What did the Government promise?

Mr. LATHAM: I have already told the House what the Premier and the Minister for Works said. The officer who was drawing £288 on 30th June, 1930, is now drawing £230. Under the Bill he will receive £242, a rise of £12 a year, which is the maximum.

The Minister for Works: That is in the city.

Mr. LATHAM: The less a man actually gets the less will he receive. The officer on £276, now drawing £221 will go to £230, a rise of £9; the man on £264, and now on £211, will go to £218, a rise of £7; the man on £252, now on £205, will have the magnificent rise of £1 a year. Below £205 the officer gets nothing. If there is anyone who is entitled to help it is the man on the small salary.

Mr. Cross: You did not say that before the elections.

Mr. LATHAM: Of course I did. Only 322 officers are likely to get any benefit.

The Minister for Works: Are you talking of the metropolis still?

Mr. LATHAM: I think there are very few civil servants outside the city.

Mr. Tonkin: Have you ever heard of the teachers?

The Minister for Justice: Is it not a good thing to confer benefits upon people?

Mr. LATHAM: Yes, at the expense of other people. The Government by this measure will be depriving of work those who badly need it.

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

Mr. LATHAM: As I have already said, there are about 322 who, it is estimated, will receive benefits from the introduction of this legislation, and those benefits will not be enjoyed by anyone receiving less than £205. One of the disadvantages of the legislation is that it will benefit men who are already in receipt of a fairly good wage compared with what others are earning. I consider it to be the duty of the Government instead of helping those who are already receiving a fairly high margin for skill, to assist those who are out of employment, those who are on relief work or on part-time employment. It should be our object to place them in full-

time employment as soon as possible. This legislation will not assist in that respect. There are still many sad cases. In your own electorate, Mr. Speaker, there are some such cases and individuals concerned have come to me occasionally and pointed out that they and their grown-up families are living in one room. It is the responsibility of the Government to endeavour to put that sort of thing right.

Mr. Moloney: You did not tell them that when you took this tax from them.

Mr. LATHAM: The member for Subiaco knows very little about it, or he would not talk like that.

Mr. Moloney: I know a good deal about it.

Mr. LATHAM: If he did, he would not make such a statement.

Mr. F. C. L. Smith: You imposed a tax on sustenance workers.

Mr. LATHAM: I asked the Minister for Works where he was going to get this money, and the Minister replied that it had nothing to do with us, but the responsibility was on the Premier. I tell the Minister definitely that members, irrespective of the side of the House on which they sit, represent the taxpayers as well as the non-taxpayers, and the Minister had no right to reply in such a way. It is the responsibility of every member to know whence the money is to come. We may agree or disagree as to whether we are justified in adopting certain courses, but it has to be recognised that the Premier has to submit his proposals to the House when he asks for money. Every member has a right to express his views when such a request is made. I am of the opinion that the Minister for Works has not given any consideration as to what this relief will cost or where the money is to come from. As a matter of fact, I do not think the Minister knows how many will be affected by the legislation or how much hardship it will impose upon those who are in employment. If he did I believe he would have told the House more than he did. I have given the House more information than the Minister did when he introduced the Bill. The expenditure for the first five months of the present financial year has been £103,202 more than for the same period of last year, and the cost of the relief covered by the Bill must be added to that. I admit that the deficit this year is £53,181

less than it was last year at the corresponding period, but the Premier has had the benefit of the additional money derived from the financial emergency tax, which was not collected this time last year. I do not know whether he is drawing additional money from the Commonwealth Government from the grant of £100,000 that was to be spread over the year. Presumably he receives one-twelfth of that amount each month.

The Premier: No.

Mr. LATHAM: Is that payable at the end of the year?

The Premier: Yes.

Mr. LATHAM: At any rate, there is that additional money that he will have at his disposal. There was no mention in the Estimates of money for the purposes of the relief covered by the Bill. Is it proposed to submit supplementary Estimates to deal with this expenditure? Will the amount be large enough to justify the submission of supplementary Estimates.

The Premier: No.

Mr. LATHAM: We have not been given any idea of what it will cost and members have a right to that information. I have looked carefully through the Estimates and so have other members of the Opposition. We can see no provision made anywhere for this additional expenditure. If there is any such provision, I do not know where it is to be found. The Premier did not say in his speech that he anticipated any such additional expenditure. I have looked through the whole of his speech, but I can find no such reference. Perhaps this legislation represents a last minute thought on the part of the Minister for Works. There is not the justification this year that there was in the past to interfere with trust funds. In years gone by, all Governments used trust funds in anticipation of being able to recoup them from loan funds. In these days, we know to the last penny just what loan funds will be available, and, in consequence, we are not justified in interfering with trust funds at all. Certainly the tax Bill that we dealt with earlier afforded relief to the lower paid men, and I credit the Government with that action. The Government have also restored the 44-hour week to the workers, and now they propose to grant some relief to the better paid wages men. It seems most extraordinary that the first Bill we dealt with imposed taxation and the last Bill seeks to return to some workers the cut that was

made under the financial emergency legislation.

The Premier: Which was the first Bill that imposed taxation?

Mr. LATHAM: The Financial Emergency Tax Bill.

The Premier: That merely continued the tax you imposed.

Mr. LATHAM: I will not agree to that at all. It was not identical by any means.

The Premier: It was a better one.

Mr. LATHAM: No doubt it was, from the Premier's point of view. Perhaps we will find that the additional money required under the Bill before the House is to be derived from that tax. I have not been able to find out exactly what money is being derived from that tax.

The Premier: It was not a new tax.

Mr. LATHAM: It was double the former tax.

The Minister for Works: It gives the same amount.

The Premier: Yes, it returns the same total amount.

Mr. LATHAM: We will check the statement when we get the returns. In 1930-31 there were 57,219 taxpayers, but last year there were only 30,735, so that if the Premier anticipates getting increased taxation with which to grant this additional relief to the Civil Service, he will have to impose the taxation on a fewer number of taxpayers than were available in 1930-31.

The Premier: We have not imposed any taxation beyond what you did.

Mr. LATHAM: Previously I pointed out that the revenue of the State does not justify this relief in the slightest degree. There is still a falling off in revenue every year and there would have been a falling off last year but for the additional taxation and the money received from the Commonwealth Government. There will be a fall this year unless the revenue is more innocent than I anticipate. There is certainly more money from the railways, but whether that will continue, I do not know. I have my doubts about it, and certainly wheat freights will be less than they were last year. I do not think the Government would do it, but it would be strange if they were to go to the Commonwealth Government for assistance, not to balance the Budget but to decrease the deficit, and at the same time, grant the relief projected under the Bill, relief that is not at all justified. That relief is to be given to those who are

in receipt of fairly good wages; it will render assistance to that section of the wages men and very little relief will be given to men in the Civil Service. I want the Minister for Employment to note that the repeal of Part V. of the Act will adversely affect the position of those he is striving to assist. It is unfair to allow persons to enter into contracts and then force new conditions upon them. Contracts have been entered into for the supply of timber overseas and now we are to force the people concerned to pay higher wages, if this legislation be agreed to, after the 1st January next year. I do not know how those people will get on seeing that they have arranged their contracts on the conditions that prevailed prior to this legislation.

The Minister for Employment: Does that not occur in every walk of life?

Mr. LATHAM: I do not know, but they must have cut their prices very fine to get the business. The days have gone when there were huge profits to be derived.

The Minister for Employment: Will the hon. member say what became of the profits they derived when the men's wages were reduced and the employers had current contracts that continued?

Mr. LATHAM: There were no contracts. I wish there had been.

The Minister for Works: Weren't there?

The Minister for Employment: Of course there were.

Mr. LATHAM: There was no export trade then, or very little of it.

The Minister for Works: I will give you some information under that heading.

Mr. LATHAM: I want the Minister to give the House considerably more information than he has done so far. He spoke all round the Bill and very little about it. If I achieve nothing else beyond inducing the Minister to give some information to the House, I shall have done something. It is easy for the Minister to talk in the way he has. We know that business was stagnant in the days I refer to. There was no export of timber, but there is some export going on to-day. The Minister boasted of additional activity in the timber trade, but if we are to permit employers to fix contracts and then introduce legislation that will force them to pay higher wages to their employees the effect will be harmful. In

the timber trade, practically the whole of the workers receive the margin for skill.

Miss Holman: Hardly any of them receive it. More than 50 per cent. of the employees in the timber industry are paid the basic wage.

Mr. LATHAM: What proportion?

Miss Holman: Most of them are in that position.

Mr. LATHAM: I say that nearly all of them are paid additional money on the basis of margin for skill.

Miss Holman: Statistics show—

Mr. LATHAM: I gleaned my information from the statistics.

Miss Holman: You have not read the statistics that were placed before the board.

Mr. LATHAM: I have, and I found that most of the men in the timber trade are on the margin of skill.

Miss Holman: That is wrong.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. LATHAM: I will not argue with a lady.

The Minister for Employment: If the contracts extended over 12 months—

Mr. LATHAM: I am not referring to old contracts, but to new contracts. There is the supply of sleepers for the trans-Australian railway. I presume the contractors did not consider it necessary to insert a clause providing that if there were an increase in wages, the price would increase correspondingly. The Minister for Employment knows it is perfectly true when I say that nearly all the furniture sold in Kalgoorlie to-day is imported from the Eastern States. It is not a question of railway freights; the furniture can be bought more cheaply there. I do not know how the Minister for Employment can sit in Cabinet with the Minister for Works when the latter legislates adversely for the people whom the Minister for Employment is desirous of placing back at work.

The Minister for Employment: It will be extremely difficult to sit with him.

Mr. LATHAM: I will tell the Minister what will happen in the soft goods trade. Supplies can be procured more cheaply in the Eastern States and they will be made up there. That is what will happen. Instead of the raw material being sent here and being made up locally, the goods will be imported and work will be lost to our people.

The Minister for Employment: That was the argument you used before the elections. to bring down wages to the level of those in the Eastern States.

Mr. LATHAM: I am not suggesting that now, and I have never argued that way. The Minister for Employment has become so used to the parrot-like utterances of his that he actually believes them.

The Minister for Employment: I have it in black and white.

Mr. LATHAM: I have never said anything of the sort.

The Premier: You ask your defeated Nationalist friends.

Mr. LATHAM: I will read what the Premier said.

Mr. Thorn: They had to blame someone.

Mr. LATHAM: Of course, and they abused someone who got support. If it is a question of making promises, I can assure the Minister that I can make rash promises too.

The Minister for Employment: I know that.

Mr. LATHAM: But we have not been in the habit of doing so. I hope I shall never have to, for it is time we told the people who has to pay. In the printing trade, the hon. gentleman recently went down and started a new tricolour machine going. On that occasion complaints were raised about work being done in the East. The very people members opposite are supposed to represent, the workers, will buy the cheapest possible goods—and I do not blame them. The only thing we have to look to is to see that we do not force them to buy goods in the Eastern States.

The Minister for Employment: You mean we should keep them on low wages, and give them no spending power.

Mr. LATHAM: What does the spending power of the people mean? It means a lot less goods if we are going to put up the cost of the goods. Will that be of any benefit to them? Of course not. This is what Mr. Theodore said just prior to leaving the Treasury—

Those who say that salaries and wages must not come down are living in a world of illusion.

That statement was broadcast, for he used it on several occasions.

The Premier: Wages did come down, following on that statement.

Mr. LATHAM: I previously pointed out that the people on the basic wage are not affected by the legislation which has been introduced. What I am concerned about is that the men working in factories on a margin of skill are going to have additional wages paid to them, which will serve to make goods dearer and force employment out of this State to the Eastern States. So we shall get back to that beastly old method we had three years ago. I am not going to oppose this legislation, for I want to see us rid of the whole of this class of legislation as early as possible, but we should do it in a proper way.

The Premier: What is a proper way?

Mr. LATHAM: As I have already pointed out, the Minister for Works gave us an exposition of the proper way when he said as follows:—

We have denounced this Bill ever since it was placed on the statute-book, and I give the Minister in charge an undertaking now that if at the next election we are returned to the Treasury benches he will never be able to charge us with not denouncing the measure before we got into office, and repealing it when we did get into office because one of the first things we will do when we get into power after the next election is to repeal this legislation. There is no doubt about that.

We can imagine the Minister wiping the perspiration off his brow when saying that.

The Premier: Your complaint is that he is doing too much for you.

Mr. LATHAM: No, I say he is doing it piecemeal. Why does he not carry out the pledge he gave? Indeed, why does not the Premier carry out the pledge he made in the Perth Town Hall on the 3rd March last, when he said he was going to repeal the measure. This is what the Premier said on that occasion—

The provisions of the Financial Emergency Act which had the effect of lowering salaries and wages would not be re-enacted if Labour were returned to office, but those which provided for a reduction in interest would be re-enacted.

The Minister for Justice: Do you support that?

Mr. LATHAM: Yes, I told the Minister the other night I would support it.

The Premier: I thought you were opposing it because it was not going far enough.

Mr. LATHAM: No, I was giving to the House information which the Minister did not give. The Minister talked all around

the Bill, but did not give us any information, and when asked for information he practically told us in a polite manner to mind our own business.

The Minister for Works: What information did you give?

Mr. LATHAM: I told you how many people below the £205 mark were going to benefit. None. And how many of those above the £240 mark were going to benefit. None.

The Premier: Are you not going to oppose the Bill?

Mr. LATHAM: No.

The Premier: Yet you say it will ruin so many. You are going to help ruin them!

Mr. LATHAM: I say we have to continue the operation of the Act, but the Government say the finances are so good that they can afford to give relief. However, I know their figures do not show that, and that is what I am telling the House. Some wages men will get some benefit, but not the least paid wages men, only those on a margin for skill. I think I must have disappointed the Minister when I gave those figures.

The Minister for Works: You do not discriminate between dates and districts and figures.

Mr. LATHAM: There are only four districts. Already some relief has been given on the goldfields, and I am not against that.

The Premier: You are supporting everything in the Bill, even though it is going to ruin the private traders?

Mr. LATHAM: It will not ruin private traders. It will throw many men out of employment, but the traders will import ready-made goods from the Eastern States. I am not supporting every clause in the Bill; I have to support the second reading in order to get the Bill into decent shape in Committee, where I expect a good deal of support from the Government side. If the people can get their goods cheaper, they are going to get them cheaper.

Mr. Sleeman: The factory workers in the East are not under the financial emergency legislation.

Mr. LATHAM: Does that matter? They are paid 7s. per unit less in the factories over there. Whereas we get the raw material and manufacture it here to-day, we are going to have it sent over here as manufactured articles. That is what I am concerned about.

The Premier: Well, surely you will not vote for the Bill.

Mr. LATHAM: I have to vote for its continuance. In Committee we shall see what we can do with that clause. But there is a much more important clause, namely that which the Premier voted against last session. There was no division on the second reading, but when it came to the vital clause, the continuation clause, the whole of the Labour Party voted against it. This year they are not going to vote against it.

The Premier: It is a different Bill.

Mr. LATHAM: It is a different side of the House.

The Minister for Employment: And the then Government would not divide the measure, either.

Mr. LATHAM: No, we were not justified in doing so. Even to-day, from my knowledge of the finances, the present Government are not justified in this Bill.

The Minister for Employment: We say we are justified, and that it is going through.

Mr. LATHAM: Well, I do not mind, and the Treasurer does not care.

The Premier: I am going to find the money.

Mr. LATHAM: Are you going to bring down supplementary Estimates?

The Premier: No.

Mr. LATHAM: Have you any idea what it is going to cost? Perhaps the Premier will tell us that, and where he is going to get the money. The only thing the Minister for Works spoke about the other night was that there was no justification. He roamed all around the Bill without actually dealing with it. I do hope we shall yet be given some further information about it.

HON. N. KEENAN (Nedlands) [7.55]: I should like the Minister to consent to an adjournment, for we have had no opportunity to read his speech until to-day. I move—

That the debate be adjourned.

Motion put and negatived.

THE MINISTER FOR WORKS (Hon. A. McCallum—South Fremantle—in reply) [7.56]: It is difficult to follow the Leader of the Opposition for, although he is opposed to the Bill, he is going to vote for it. He said we were giving away too much, and then he said we could not afford to give away anything. It is hard to see where he



stands in the matter. He says he opposes the Bill, opposes any alteration; he says the State finances cannot afford it, and then he turns round and says we are giving away nothing, after which he declares we are giving away more than we can afford.

Mr. Doney: He explained that to amend the Bill in Committee it was necessary to support the *second reading*.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: I am not discussing that; I am discussing only his criticism of what is in the Bill. He said we were not giving the service anything, and then he said we were giving away more than we could afford. He said the Bill is going to be ruinous, but that he will vote for it. He started off by declaring that the Premiers' Plan had achieved its objective, that it had come up to expectations. We have not opposed the whole of the provisions of the Premiers' Plan, for we supported the conversion of our internal debt and the reduction of interest and quite a number of other phases of the Plan. But the reduction of salaries and wages we opposed from the start. When the hon. member claims that so much has been achieved as a result of the Premiers' Plan, I remind him that the results he pointed to have been achieved at the cost of the great bulk of the wage-earners, and to the benefit of the financial institutions, who have built up enormous bank balances at the expense of the mass of the people.

Mr. Latham: Who are they who have built up the bank balances?

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: Those people who were able to contribute £10,000,000 to the loan in 24 hours, a week or two ago.

Mr. Latham: You mean the banks.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: Not so much the banks as the big financial institutions. To-day a section of this community have more money than they can find investment for, more money than the banks will take over from them.

Mr. Patrick: Your income tax returns do not show it.

Mr. Latham: Simply because they cannot send their money away and pay the 25 per cent exchange.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: What is the use of talking like that? It is easy enough to get money away to America to-day, or at all events it is not so costly as it was a little time ago.

Mr. Latham: But it means 25 per cent. exchange when sending it to America to-day.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: The exchange is against us because the money has to go to London first, but there was a time when it was costing 60 per cent. to send money to America.

The Minister for Employment: And whilst they were making increased profits, they did not hesitate to reduce the wages of their employees.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: It is not money of that description which is available. The money is there in millions.

Mr. Latham: Ten millions would amount to only about 30s. per head of the population.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: Yes, and the public were not given an opportunity to subscribe to the last loan.

Mr. Latham: The public subscribed through the banks.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: There was no campaign to get the money. We were advised that it would be unwise to go on the market for a loan of £15,000,000, whereas it is quite obvious that with a campaign, £20,000,000 could have been obtained.

Mr. Latham: Because the banks were holding the money.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: The money was subscribed quickly by the big financial institutions. The hon. member pointed out that wages had fallen in the Eastern States as well as in this State. I do not think he said it directly, but he certainly inferred that wages had fallen there for the same reason as they had fallen here. I repeat, and I defy contradiction, that this is the only Parliament in Australia that passed a law to cut wages. No other Parliament attempted to do it. It was altogether outside the Premiers' Plan. Wages in the Eastern States have come down as a result of applications made to the Arbitration Court, where the employers had to prove their case in support of a cut. That is what will happen if this Bill be passed. If the employers have a case and are entitled to a reduction of wages, they have to go to the court and substantiate their claim. They will not be able to impose upon Parliament the duty of reducing wages. Let us consider where the hon. member's argument would lead. He said that in every State wages had been reduced. In every other

State the reduction has been made by order of an industrial tribunal. The Commonwealth Arbitration Court made a cut of 10 per cent. and other courts largely followed the lead, but the cuts have been imposed by industrial tribunals. Though cuts have been made in that way elsewhere, the hon. member maintains that Parliament should make the cuts here. That would set up Parliament as a court to review the decisions of our Arbitration Court.

Mr. Latham: Exactly what you will be doing under this Bill.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: Exactly what we propose to repeal under this Bill.

Mr. Latham: You are not dealing with the salaried staff.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: Their salaries are not fixed by the Arbitration Court.

Mr. Latham: I am quite aware of that.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: Every wage-earner whose wages are fixed by the Arbitration Court, if the Bill becomes law, will be freed from the cut by Parliament. There is no suggestion that the court should be interfered with. The hon. member's argument is that if an industrial tribunal reduces wages in the East, this Parliament should impose a reduction here. If employers cannot prove their case and substantiate their claim on oath, the hon. member would have us make the cut over the head of the court. If we are going to set up Parliament as a court to review the decisions of the Arbitration Court, we cannot operate in one way only. The time will come when we shall have to grant increases over the head of the court. If the hon. member advocates that principle for a downward trend of wages, he cannot deny it for an upward trend.

Mr. Latham: The only reason we did it was that the money was insufficient to go around.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: I will deal with that phase, which is quite fallacious. After the hon. member's experience of the last three years, I did not think such a fallacious, empty argument as that the cutting of wages would keep more men in employment would be repeated at this stage. The hon. member cannot name a single individual who has obtained employment owing to a reduction in the wages of other men.

Mr. Marshall: I will wager that way.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: I suggest there is not an individual in this city who is in work to-day because someone else has had his wages reduced. Let the hon. member speak to the business men. When the previous legislation was before Parliament, I quoted the experience of a Fremantle business man. There had been a debate between the member for Nedlands and me on the floor of the House, and a certain business man pulled me up a week afterwards and said he had read the report of the discussion and had totally disagreed with the views I had expressed. Then he added, "If you will look at my book, I can draw a line right across showing that the moment wages were cut my takings fell, and I had to reduce my staff because there was not the trade to be done." He also said that every business man was in the same position. Instead of the cut leading to an increase of employment, it reduced employment. Every business man could tell us the same thing. The main emporiums in this city did not take advantage of the cut.

Mr. Marshall: That is so.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: They did not reduce their staffs, because it was demonstrated to them what that would mean. They would not take advantage of the cut because they knew they would merely be hitting their own pockets. I never expected the hon. member to repeat that argument at this stage.

Mr. Latham: You know the prices wheat and wool were bringing and that the low prices caused it.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: Yes, but there were other ways of getting around it. If the hon. member had read "Hansard" more fully, he would have found statements much stronger than the one he quoted. We would have tackled the problem in some other way. I repeat to-night what I said when the legislation was first introduced. I was challenged to say what I would have done had I occupied a seat on the Treasury benches at that time, and I then said, and I repeat it now, that sooner than be a party to putting a law like that on the statute-book, I would sweep the gutters of Perth. This is the first opportunity we have had to clear that legislation off the statute-book.

Mr. Latham: This is not the first act.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: No, it is the first opportunity we have had to attack that legislation—

Mr. Latham: The last one.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: —and we are attacking it. When it was originally introduced, we all disagreed with it; the whole Labour movement disagreed with the scheme of cutting wages. If wages had to be reduced, we contended, there was a tribunal clothed with the necessary authority to make the reduction. The hon. member said I had made rash statements, but he did not go so far as to quote any of them or say that I could not prove anything I had said in moving the second reading of the Bill. He did say that I had made statements that the Prime Minister had had to correct. I think the figures published in this morning's paper show that everything I said in moving the second reading of the Bill was correct. The Prime Minister can make all the excuses he likes, but he cannot escape the fact that he collected in revenue £7,500,000 more than he estimated to get. He budgeted for a surplus of £12,469 and, if he had kept within the expenditure for which he budgeted, his surplus would have been well over £7,500,000.

Mr. Latham: He got most of it from Customs revenue.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: I am aware of that, but the fact remains that he got the money. He indulged in all sorts of extraordinary expenditure to cover up the surplus. Income tax assessments are only now being issued for money that should have been collected before the end of June last. That is well known to everyone.

Mr. Patrick: The State's assessments are being issued along with them.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: For a year later.

Mr. Patrick: No, for the same year.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: The same officials operate for State and Federal authorities.

Mr. Patrick: Exactly.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: I was given an instance in this city. A certain taxpayer, whose income tax exceeded £2,000, made out his cheque, and it was suggested to him that he should hold it back until after the close of the financial year. Every State Premier at the last meeting of the Loan Council had that point in mind.

Mr. Patrick: The department did not suggest that to me.

Mr. Latham: If the Commissioner is doing that with State revenue, it is about time you rapped him on the knuckles.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: We have no control over the Commissioner of Taxation. We actually offered to pay the staff overtime in order to expedite the collection of revenue, and our offer was refused. We have no control over the Commissioner of Taxation. The hon. member spoke of contracts that are current now. I admit that the difficulty exists, but was there not a difficulty when the original legislation was introduced?

Mr. Latham: Unfortunately there were no contracts current at that time.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: If the hon. member will read my speech, he will find that I mentioned more than one.

Mr. Latham: Whose contracts?

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: Did not I cite the contract for the building of the Commonwealth Bank? Does not the hon. member remember that? The tender was put in when prices were high.

Mr. Latham: Nearly the whole of it represented material.

The Minister for Railways: All of which came down in price.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: Because a bricklayer, working for the City Council on constructing manholes, had his wages reduced under special application to the court, every bricklayer in the building trade was reduced. Although the contractor for the Commonwealth Bank put in his tender when prices were high and things were booming, he got the advantage of the 20 per cent. cut in wages and in prices of all material. Every line of material fell in price and the profit went into the contractor's pocket. There was no suggestion that he should share the profit with the men he employed. The cut was made to apply all round. The hon. member knows that I cited companies who had paid dividends of not less than 16 per cent. and who got the advantage of the cut. They reduced the wages of all their men.

Mr. Hegney: And did not reduce the prices of their goods, either.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: No, they put up the prices. Other companies making huge profits that were sent out of the country did not even have to take their cases to the court; on account of the common rule, they applied the cut. As I stated at the

time, it was the most iniquitous piece of legislation ever put on the statute-book and we are altering it at the first opportunity. The hon. member tried to emphasise that the men on the basic wage would receive no benefit under this legislation. Why is that?

Mr. Hawke: Do not press the question.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: Because the measure will not affect them.

Mr. Latham: I said it would not.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: The hon. member would lead the public to believe that the reason those men will not obtain any benefit is due to a defect in the Bill.

Mr. Latham: Many of them think your Bill will do a lot for them and I want them clearly to understand that it will not.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: The hon. member wishes to create the impression that we are doing nothing for the men on the basic wage. He should get it into his mind, and the public also should know, that the only way in which we can meet the position of the basic wage earner is to abolish the principle that the hon. member supported in the offensive legislation introduced by his Government, and not by asking Parliament to override the decisions of the Arbitration Court. The basic wage in operation here to-day and all the margins up to 9s. are as fixed by the Arbitration Court. The hon. member says we are doing nothing for that section. The only way we can do anything for that section is to override the Arbitration Court and put Parliament in the position of a wage-fixing machine. Let me remind the hon. member that under his Government's measure, no matter how the cost of living rose, the worker received no compensating benefit. He was reduced when the cost of living fell, but he could get no increase when it rose.

Mr. Latham: You know what the intention of that legislation was.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: The hon. member knows we asked at the time that if the cost of living went up those workers should receive a corresponding advantage. However, that was refused. We say now that once a man is outside the Act, he shall get the benefit of any rise in the cost of living, and not be brought back under the Act. The hon. member has said he is afraid I brought down this Bill on my own.

Mr. Latham: I am not afraid of it.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: Perhaps the hon. member is delighted about it.

Mr. Latham: You know exactly what we think.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: I do not know what were the habits of the last Government. I know it was frequently hinted, and there was a general impression that it was a one-man Government. If that was the case with hon. members opposite, it is not so with us.

Mr. Latham: But it seems like it. Who was the one man who ran the last Government?

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: We had exhibitions of what was the fact. The hon. member has frequently twitted us, inside and outside Parliament, with not being able to move unless we have a decision of caucus, by which we are bound.

Mr. Latham: No; a decision of the Trades Hall.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: The hon. member says we cannot act on our own. Now he asserts that an important measure such as this was brought down to the House by me without even the Premier being consulted.

Mr. Latham: No. I am speaking of the Trades Hall.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: Then I suppose I received instructions from the Trades Hall, and am over-riding the rest of the Cabinet.

Mr. Latham: You do not mind as long as you have the Trades Hall behind you.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: That is too ridiculous to be taken seriously. Like all other measures, this has the approval of the full Cabinet. There is no question on that score. This, I think, about covers all the points raised by the hon. member.

Mr. Latham: Tell us what the Bill is going to cost.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: The hon. member is most anxious to know what the cost will be. He should not be so much concerned about that aspect.

Mr. Latham: Why not?

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: Let him deal with the Treasurer on that point. During the last three years there was a great deal done by the hon. member's Government on which we got no information.

Mr. Latham: We gave every bit of information.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: If the hon. member's speech of to-night is to be

taken as meaning anything, the Bill is not going to cost much. He says we are giving nothing, or rather that we are giving a very little to the reasonably paid men. Then the whole thing is not worth troubling about.

Mr. Latham: I said nothing of the sort.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: Then why should we go to the bother of getting out information? The whole proposition has been thoroughly canvassed. No decision has been reached hurriedly. The question has been examined, and carefully thrashed out and argued for weeks. We know where we are.

Mr. Latham: Will you tell us what is the cost involved, and the number of people affected?

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: The Government have to face that.

Mr. Latham: That is a curious reply. Surely to goodness this House is entitled to the information!

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: The hon. member could not tell us what his Government's Bill meant when it was brought down.

Mr. Latham: We told you what it would save, and everything else about it.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: We have found out what it saves, and all the rest. The responsibility of carrying out the provisions of this Bill rests upon the Government.

Mr. Doney: What is your objection to telling the amount involved? Is it that you do not know?

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: Hon. members opposite question everything we say. They have even questioned the rates that I quoted here last week.

Mr. Latham: What rates?

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: The hon. member quoted figures which were a kind of challenge to my figures.

Mr. Latham: You quoted no figures at all.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: Did I not? Because I did not quote the figures the hon. member wants, he says I did not quote any.

Mr. Latham: I want the figures showing the cost involved in the measure.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: I was not sufficiently obliging to give the figures the hon. member wants. The Bill will go through this Chamber all right. When we were sitting opposite, we told the hon. member that such a Bill as this would be passed.

Mr. Latham: No. You said you would repeal the legislation.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: We are repealing the legislation.

Mr. Latham: No, you are not.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: We are, as far as we possibly can, getting out of the load the hon. member left us. His Government left us with this infant. At least, it is not much of an infant now.

Mr. Latham: We left you an infant and now you are making a monster of it.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: The hon. member created a monster, which we are trying to trim a little. The argument that the Bill would create unemployment is the old cry that has been heard back over the ages, a cry which has been repeated again and again. It has been heard in the Arbitration Court over and over again. The argument has been disproved right through the years that it has been examined, and now it has been disproved here once more. The industries mentioned by the Leader of the Opposition have used that argument many, many times in the Arbitration Court. There is a tribunal properly qualified to take evidence and sift the whole situation. Parliament is absolutely unfitted for this task. We must not continue this bad principle one hour longer on our statute-book than can be avoided.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

### *In Committee.*

Mr. Sleeman in the Chair; the Minister for Works in charge of the Bill.

Clause 1—agreed to.

Clause 2—Amendment of Section 7:

Mr. LATHAM: I desire to move an amendment that in proposed Subsection 4, paragraph (a), the words "did not exceed £293 per annum" be struck out. The clause as it stands does not apply to the whole of the Public Service. Why should a few be picked out to the disadvantage of the many?

The CHAIRMAN: I am afraid the hon. member is not in order in moving the amendment, as it will increase the burden on the people.

Mr. LATHAM: While I shall not move to disagree with your ruling, Mr. Chairman, I fail to see how the amendment can pos-

sibly have that effect. Its effect is to give relief. It does not seek to impose a burden.

The CHAIRMAN: The Bill proposes to give relief.

Mr. LATHAM: Yes, and the amendment proposes to give a little more relief.

The CHAIRMAN: The amendment would interfere with the finances.

Mr. Doney: But not to the extent of adding to the Treasurer's burden. It eases the Treasurer's burden.

Mr. LATHAM: I do not think the clause will have any effect, really. The Minister refuses to say what is the amount involved. Probably it is infinitesimal. If the amount is small I shall say, Sir, that you have a right to accept my amendment. My amendment proposes to give relief. I object to the Minister bringing down legislation without stating all the facts in his possession. I do not know of such a thing happening previously. The Minister said the Government had thoroughly investigated the matter.

The Minister for Works: The amendment has been ruled out.

Mr. LATHAM: I am speaking on the clause now. The clause favours some officers, and leaves the others to stew in their own juice. We should be fair to all sections. The Minister ought to move the amendment himself. Why did not the Minister bring down a Bill on the lines of the Federal measure but excluding members of Parliament, whose exclusion would be justified because their increase of salary has been in far greater proportion than that of the public servants? Before the Bill passes the Committee stage, I want the Minister to tell us the number of public servants affected and the amount of money involved.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: I move an amendment—

That the following be inserted in paragraph (b) of the proposed new Subsection (4) after the word "than," in line 33, the words "an officer in the Police Force appointed by the Governor under Section 6 of the Police Act, 1892, and other than."

The idea is that relief shall be given to the non-commissioned members of the police force; the commissioned officers will not get any benefit. Some of the commissioned officers receive up to £600 a year and yet their salaries fluctuate with the basic wage. To give police officers receiving such a high salary as that the advantage set out in the

Bill and then refuse it to the railway officers and public servants, would be most inconsistent. As a matter of fact, it would create all sorts of anomalies within the police force itself. When the Bill was drafted, this point was overlooked. I submit the amendment.

Mr. LATHAM: I am tired of attempting to get information from the Minister, but will he tell us what is the maximum salary a police officer will receive before the Bill will cease to apply?

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: The wages of non-commissioned officers and ordinary rank and file of the police force are fixed by the Arbitration Court.

Mr. Stubbs: Up to sergeant rank?

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: Up to inspectorial rank. Their salaries or wages fluctuate with the basic wage alteration.

Mr. Stubbs: Ever since the Financial Emergency Act came in?

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: Always. The salaries of inspectors range from £480 to £600.

Mr. Stubbs: Would it not have been better to bring in a separate Bill for the police?

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: We want to place the police on exactly the same footing as other branches of the service. The amendment will overcome a difficulty, and will make the non-commissioned officers rank equally with those in the Civil Service and the railways.

Mr. LATHAM: The Minister took me to task because he said I was using Parliament to usurp the functions of the Arbitration Court. He is now usurping the functions of the Arbitration Court. The civil service salaries are fixed by the Public Service Commissioner and there is the right of appeal.

The Minister for Works: We cannot alter all your mistakes.

Mr. LATHAM: No, but you are attempting to make them worse by this measure. The Minister has not given us any information and I can only conclude he has not any to give.

Amendment put and passed.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: I move an amendment—

That in paragraph (b) of proposed new Section 4 the words "whose salary is paid per medium of wages pay sheets and," be struck out.

These words were queried when the Bill was first drafted. Some officers are paid on wages sheets and others on salary sheets, and if the clause is left as it is printed, it will mean a lot of confusion and wrangling. I am advised that if the words come out the clause will then be well understood.

Amendment put and passed.

Mr. LATHAM: We are dealing with the matter piecemeal. If it had been desired to do a fair thing by the service, the Minister might have followed the example set by the Commonwealth and restored the cut to the extent of five per cent. I mention this as my final protest against the Bill.

Clause as amended put, and a division taken with the following result:—

Ayes	..	..	..	27
Noes	..	..	..	17

Majority for .. .. 10

#### AYES.

Mr. Clothier	Mr. Munroe
Mr. Coverley	Mr. Needham
Mr. Cross	Mr. Nulsen
Mr. Cunningham	Mr. Raphael
Mr. Hawke	Mr. Rodoreda
Mr. Hegney	Mr. F. G. L. Smith
Miss Holman	Mr. Tonkin
Mr. Johnson	Mr. Troy
Mr. Kenneally	Mr. Wansbrough
Mr. Lambert	Mr. Willcock
Mr. McCallum	Mr. Wise
Mr. Marshall	Mr. Withers
Mr. Millington	Mr. Wilson
Mr. Moloney	(Teller.)

#### NOES.

Mr. Brockman	Mr. Seward
Mr. Ferguson	Mr. J. H. Smith
Mr. Latham	Mr. J. M. Smith
Mr. McDonald	Mr. Stubbs
Mr. McLarty	Mr. Thora
Mr. North	Mr. Warner
Mr. Patrick	Mr. Welsh
Mr. Piesse	Mr. Doney
Mr. Sampson	(Teller.)

#### PAIR.

AVE.	No.
Mr. Collier	Mr. Keenan

Clause, as amended, thus passed.

Clause 3—Amendment of Section 8:

Mr. HAWKE: In the proviso there are certain words the exact import of which I cannot grasp. I move an amendment—

That the words in lines 2, 3 and 4, "who had not attained the age of 60 years on the 30th day of June, 1931," be struck out.

I do that so that the meaning of the clause may be made clearer and so that the Minister may explain why the words were in-

cluded. In the previous clause there is a proviso somewhat similar to that of Clause 3, but without the words that I propose to strike out of the proviso of Clause 3. I see no reason for their inclusion. Of course if the Minister has a convincing explanation to make as to why they should be included, I shall consider the advisableness of withdrawing my amendment.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: I will not raise any objection to the words being struck out. The Crown Law Department tried to impress upon me that it was necessary for the words to be included, but I was not convinced.

Mr. LATHAM: Does not this mean that a person may have retired on the 30th June, 1931, on a salary lower than he would have had on account of the Financial Emergency cut? Perhaps the words were put there to afford him some protection?

The Minister for Works: The Crown Law Department asked that this should be done, although I remain unconvinced as to the necessity for it.

Mr. LATHAM: Is it not intended to provide that an officer, who retires after the date in question, may have done so on a lesser salary because of the financial emergency cut? Were not these words included to give him some protection?

The Minister for Works: If a person retires under the age of 60 he will not get a pension?

Mr. LATHAM: If he had not reached the age of 60 at that time, but reached it subsequently and then retired, he should not suffer because of the financial emergency cut. The Minister has taken power to deal with these cases on their merits. I desire to put in a word for those who were transferred under the Imperial Act, namely, the few civil servants who were taken over in the early days of constitutional Government. A High Court case was heard in South Australia when it was found that those who had contracts with the Imperial authorities had them taken over by the State. I hope the Minister will look into these cases and extend some consideration to them.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: We have taken power to deal with these borderline cases. I believe some of these people have been hard hit and are getting pensions of only a few shillings a week. I propose to

have each case examined, after which Cabinet will deal with each claim on its merits.

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

#### Clause 4—Repeal of Part V.:

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

Ayes	..	..	..	..	26
Noes	..	..	..	..	16

Majority for . . . 10

#### AYES.

Mr. Clothier	Mr. Munroe
Mr. Cross	Mr. Needham
Mr. Cunningham	Mr. Nulsen
Mr. Hawke	Mr. Raphael
Mr. Hegney	Mr. Rodoreda
Miss Holman	Mr. F. C. L. Smith
Mr. Johnson	Mr. Tonkin
Mr. Kenneally	Mr. Troy
Mr. Lambert	Mr. Wansbrough
Mr. McCallum	Mr. Willcock
Mr. Marshall	Mr. Wise
Mr. Millington	Mr. Withers
Mr. Moloney	Mr. Wilson

(Teller.)

#### NOES.

Mr. Brockman	Mr. Sampson
Mr. Ferguson	Mr. Seward
Mr. Latham	Mr. J. M. Smith
Mr. McDonald	Mr. Stubbs
Mr. McLarty	Mr. Thorn
Mr. North	Mr. Warner
Mr. Patrick	Mr. Welsh
Mr. Piesse	Mr. Doney

(Teller.)

#### PAIRS.

AYES.	NOES.
Mr. Collier	Mr. Keenan
Mr. Coverley	Mr. J. I. Mann

Clause thus passed.

Clauses 5, 6, Title—agreed to.

Bill reported with amendments.

#### BILLS (3)—RETURNED.

- 1, Public Works Act Amendment.
- 2, Government Railways Act Amendment. Without amendment.
- 3, Health Act Amendment (No. 2). With amendments.

House adjourned at 8.55 p.m.

## Legislative Council,

Wednesday, 13th December, 1933.

Question: Public Service, goldfields allowances	...	PAGE 2457
Bills: Lotteries (Control) Act Amendment (No. 2), Assembly's message	...	2457
Farmers' Debts Adjustment Act Amendment, 1R.	...	2469
Fire Brigades Act Amendment, Assembly's message	...	2469
State Transport Co-ordination, 2R.	...	2472

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

### QUESTION—PUBLIC SERVICE, GOLDFIELDS ALLOWANCES.

Hon. H. SEDDON asked the Chief Secretary: 1, Is it the intention of the Government to restore to goldfields civil servants and teachers the goldfields allowance for married men. 2, Will the Government consider the question of restoring the annual railway pass to goldfields teachers and civil servants?

The CHIEF SECRETARY replied: 1, These allowances are fixed pursuant to a decision of the Arbitration Court with regard to goldfields allowances generally, and it is not within the province of the Government to interfere with any such award of the Court. 2, The matter is already under consideration.

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

#### Assembly's Message.

A message having been received from the Assembly notifying that it had agreed to Nos. 1 and 2 of the Council's amendments made in the Bill and had disagreed to Nos. 3, 4, and 5, the message was now considered.

#### In Committee.

Hon. J. Cornell in the Chair; the Honorary Minister in charge of the message.

No. 3: Clause 4—Delete the words "thirty-six" in line 3, and substitute the words "thirty-four."

Assembly's reason for disagreeing to the Council's amendment:—The principle of the Bill has been agreed to by both Houses.