

retired on one case that might take them many hours to deliberate upon, the court could not proceed with any other case listed until such time as the 12 jurymen, who were dealing with the first case, returned their verdict and joined up with the full panel. That is not what is done in actual practice. So that the court can proceed with the cases listed, after the first jury of 12 has retired, there are still the names of 28 jurors left in the box. Consequently a second jury is drawn from the 28 names remaining in the box. Strictly speaking, that is not, or may not be, in conformity with the requirements of Section 23 of the Act. There is some doubt on the point. In order to remove that doubt so that there will be no possibility in consequence of the existing practice of appealing with a view to disturbing a verdict, this measure is being introduced; so that after the first jury is drawn from the 40 who were empanelled, it will be strictly within the provisions that are being put into the chief Act to draw a subsequent jury from the 28 who remain. I move —

That the Bill be now read a second time.

On motion by Mr. McDonald, debate adjourned.

*House adjourned at 8.21 p.m.*

## Legislative Council,

*Tuesday, 31st August, 1937.*

	PAGE
Question: Unionists, preference .....	340
Leave of absence .....	340
Address-in-reply, tenth day .....	340

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

### QUESTION—UNIONISTS, PREFERENCE.

Hon. J. CORNELL asked the Chief Secretary: 1, Has the Commissioner for Main Roads been instructed to give effect to Cabinet decision, viz., to apply the principle of prefer-

ence to unionists to all expenditure in connection with future road construction and maintenance, in the following terms:—(a) Preference shall be given to financial members of recognised unions; and (b) If other than financial members of recognised unions are engaged, such persons shall make application to join the appropriate union within 14 days of commencing work, and shall complete such application? 2, Was the full text of the foregoing Cabinet decision conveyed to members of the Government Tender Board with an instruction that it be incorporated in all tender forms subsequently issued by that Board?

The CHIEF SECRETARY replied: 1, The decision of Cabinet did not apply to all expenditure under the Commissioner of Main Roads. Cabinet decided to apply the principle of preference to unionists in all Public Works contracts in the following terms: (a) Preference shall be given to financial members of recognised unions. (b) If other than financial members of recognised unions are engaged, such persons shall make application to join the appropriate union within fourteen days of commencing work, and complete such application. 2, The decision reached the secretary of the Tender Board through the usual channels.

### LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

On motion by Hon. H. S. W. PARKER, leave of absence granted to Hon. A. Clydesdale (Metropolitan-Suburban) for six consecutive sittings of the House on the ground of ill-health.

### ADDRESS-IN-REPLY.

*Tenth Day.*

Debate resumed from the 26th August.

**HON. H. TUCKEY** (South-West) [4.38]:

I do not say that the Address-in-reply debate is a waste of time, but I feel sure that the attitude of both Houses will be appreciated insofar as it serves to curtail the debate and save time. The Lieut.-Governor's Speech disclosed a deficit of £371,205, and a pessimistic note was struck on the financial outlook for the current year. We were also reminded that there must be no relaxation of close supervision of all public expenditure. I hope that the need for continued economy will not mean that urgent public works that

have been already authorised will have to be delayed much longer. Some of those works, I notice, are farther down the list of urgent public works than they were two years ago. This would indicate that the financial position is growing worse, in spite of what has been said to the contrary. The Education Department seems to be in the worst plight of all because, in many districts, school conditions are, to say the least, in a deplorable state. The improved conditions brought about by the bountiful rains and good prices should make matters very much better for the Government next year, and I hope there will not be such a dearth of funds to carry on works so urgently needed for the benefit of the State to-day. I was pleased to see that the Government had made a very satisfactory agreement with the Federal Government respecting Federal aid roads. The new one is of greater advantage to the State than was the old one, for the term is for a period of ten years, and I understand that in other ways it is 20 per cent. more in our favour. The Commissioner of Main Roads has done excellent work, and this new and very satisfactory agreement will enable the Commissioner to plan ahead in dealing with many of our main roads. In my view, the Traffic Act should be amended in order to prevent so many serious accidents. I have said before that the best way to bring this about would be to make it obligatory to affix governors to all motor vehicles. In this way speed could be definitely limited and I am sure this would go a long way towards solving the problem. I think, too, that insurance companies should not be free from liability to pay accident claims because a driver has not had his license renewed, but only when a driver is disqualified from holding a license should such exemption apply. Probably few people are aware that to-day it is an offence against the traffic regulations to pass a tram on the near side outside the city block.

Hon. J. CORNELL: One passed me an hour ago; it was going at 30 miles an hour.

Hon. H. TUCKEY: The traffic officials do not object, but that is not the point. If motorists adhered to the traffic regulations and passed all trams on the off-side after crossing the boundaries of the city block, I am sure that many more accidents would occur. This clause of the regulations should be amended to make all vehicles pass on one or the other side, either the right or the left,

right through the city. For if you are travelling along Hay-street, there is really no difference between passing a tram between Pier-street and King-street as against between King-street and Milligan-street. When I come to think of it, my illustration is faulty, because there is only one-way traffic in that section of Hay-street; however, the same thing would apply in Barrack-street. In passing Wellington-street going north, one should pass trams on the off-side. But people do not do so; they pass on the near side, which is an offence against the regulations. I am altogether in favour of third-party insurance. Far too many accidents occur in which there is no redress for those people who suffer damage or injury. I should like to say a word about the proposed Collie power scheme. In my view, a great mistake has been made in not erecting a large power plant at Collie to supply the city and the South-West with current. I am not an expert, but I do not see any great difficulty in the way. It should be possible to transmit 30,000 or 40,000 volt current from Collie to Perth, and break it down in the city to suit requirements. At present alternating current is transmitted from Yalourn to Melbourne, of 32,000 volts, the distance being 87 miles. If such transmission can be effected there, one would think current could be transmitted a few more miles from Collie to Perth. This would be a great advantage to the industries of the South-West, and would do more than anything else, except local superphosphate works, to develop that part of the State. It would be of special assistance to the dairying industry there. Thousands of pounds are being sent overseas for the purchase of machinery and fuel for the supply of current. The cost of current in the South-West is prohibitive. Some of the towns charge 1s. a unit for lighting purposes and 8d. for power. Such prices are prohibitive if the current is used on a large scale. I feel strongly on the point. It is a pity such matters should be allowed to drag so long. Had a power scheme been established at Collie some years ago, hundreds of thousands of pounds would have been saved to the South-West and the metropolitan area. I congratulate the Government on the manner in which they have looked after water supplies in the South-West. We appreciate very much all that has been done in the matter of water conservation. I would draw attention to the

urgent need for further storage in the Harvey area. The farmers there are already short of water for irrigation, and cannot go on developing whilst the present uncertainty prevails. Recently an influential deputation waited on the Minister and all the details were discussed. I hope when the Government go into the question of water supplies generally that the Harvey proposal will receive consideration. I am glad the Government have recognised the good work being done by the members of the Fish and Game Society, by making a grant of £150 towards the stocking of some of the fresh water streams with trout. Although the amount is small, it will be helpful. The gift is very much appreciated. The Government might go further and endeavour to improve the fishing industry generally. That would be of great advantage to the tourist trade, and would be the means of protecting one of the State's most valuable industries. For years Governments have taken what they could get out of the industry, which certainly has not been a losing proposition. I understand that for about 30 years there has been a surplus of receipts over expenditure. Gradually, however, the industry has worn down, and there is not now much left of it. I hope something will be done to protect our fishing grounds and improve the present state of affairs. We are told that the industry is controlled by foreigners, and that only foreigners catch fish and deal in them. That is a great mistake. In Mandurah there are 80 licensed fishermen, all Australians married men with families. In June last they despatched to the central markets in Perth 1,700 boxes of fish. This shows that in one centre at any rate, Australians are catching considerable quantities of fish. There is trouble at Mandurah over the closing of the sea bar. I think it will be closed again during the coming summer. That is a great drawback to the fishing industry. I hope, as the financial position improves, the Government will do something to make the opening in the bar permanent. Engineers have recommended an expenditure of £3,000, and I understand the Government have approved of it, but unfortunately the Treasurer cannot find the money. The sooner arrangements can be made to keep the bar open permanently, the better will it be for Mandurah and the fishing industry. At one time Augusta, in the Lower Blackwood, was

famous for its fishing, but it is not so to-day. There is no supervision over the fishing there. That is a pity, for at one time many people went there who now go elsewhere. Some years ago the Government paid a bonus on the destruction of shags because they were so harmful to the fishing industry. In those days fish were more plentiful than they are to-day. The bonus was paid for a few years and was then cancelled. Some people doubt whether shags eat fish. I was surprised to see that it took an expert nearly 12 months to decide the question. I have known shags to take 100 dozen mullet out of the nets before sunrise. If the fishermen do not start taking in their nets before daylight, they get very few fish. At times they carry guns with them so that if they are late they can shoot the shags until they get within 20 yards of the end of the net. Shags will follow the nets until the fishermen have practically completed their work. To shoot shags on the upper reaches of the Swan is not a means of finding out what their diet is. Shags will eat the fish that are nearest to them. In October, when thousands of cobblers are found in the rivers, shags will live upon them. Undoubtedly these birds have a serious effect on the fishing industry for thousands are found in the rivers and estuaries. When funds are available it would be a wise thing to reintroduce the bonus. Usually at this time of the year we hear references to the ill-treated North and the spoon-fed South. If members representing the North-West would put up a concrete proposition for dealing with local problems, I feel sure they would get the full support of the House. I do not think an annual outburst, such as we sometimes hear, is the right way to achieve results. The time has arrived when something should be done for that part of the State. We can see what is going on from year to year. We have almost reached the stage when we may admit that we are suffering from a peaceful penetration at the hands of a foreign power. At any rate, efforts will soon be made in that direction if we do not take steps to do something with that part of the continent. I agree with members who say it would be a good thing if the Federal Government took over that part of Australia. It is no use coming here and talking about it unless we follow it up. A committee could be appointed to go into the question in the hope of arriving at

something that will be acceptable to both Houses. We might then get the Federal Government to meet us in the matter. Members of this House could act with members of another place, and by that means evolve something that would bear fruit. I hope the question will not be allowed to drag on indefinitely, and that all concerned will do their best to achieve some satisfactory results. I would draw the attention of the Agricultural Department to the existence of foot rot in the South-West. That is a very serious menace to the sheep industry. There are many saleyards in the South-West, where farmers go to buy their sheep. If a yard is affected, the germs can be carried from one place to another. The yards should all be inspected and an endeavour made to keep them clean. I do not know what is done in the metropolitan area in that respect, but I know inspectors are employed to supervise the saleyards there. That is something we do not have in the South-West. Many thousands of sheep pass through the saleyards in that part of the State. Once a man gets foot rot on his property, it takes him a year or two to stamp it out. He can only do it then by getting rid of his sheep. If the disease becomes well established in a man's flock he cannot get rid of it without getting rid of his sheep. One man I know had to go out of sheep for two years. During that time he bought a large number of pigs. Strange to say, after a little while, the pigs contracted swine fever, and he had to get rid of them too. He thus lost money over both ventures. This was due in the first place to the introduction of foot rot on his farm.

Hon. J. Nicholson: Had the foot rot anything to do with the swine fever?

Hon. H. TUCKEY: No. A good deal could be done to minimise the danger if the Agricultural Department took the matter up.

Hon. L. Craig: It is already an offence to sell in a yard sheep suffering from foot rot.

Hon. H. TUCKEY: Yes, but who is to say that they have foot rot when there is no inspection? The absence of inspection applies to meat generally. Thousands of cattle and sheep are killed in the South-West, though people seem to suffer no ill-effects therefrom.

Hon. L. Craig: The meat is inspected at my place.

Hon. W. J. Mann: In all the towns there are meat inspectors.

Hon. H. TUCKEY: But not in the small places. There should be more control over

this business. No doubt the disease will spread if it is not checked at the saleyards, which is where the matter should first be dealt with. People can take sheep into a country saleyard when they have not been dipped. If there is no inspector on the spot, people take no notice, and the sheep, if transferred to another farm, may carry a lot of vermin with them. The State Gardens Board is doing good work. I should like to see that body take charge of the Cave House at Yallingup. Something should be done to remedy the existing condition of affairs there. The best way to do that is to hand the establishment over to the State Gardens Board. It has been a disgrace to past Governments. Not only has the accommodation been far below requirements, but the surroundings, such as the septic tank half way to the beach, have at times been in a filthy condition. These matters ought to be looked into. If the State Gardens Board were to take control, it would be a step in the right direction. It is about the only place that I know of that is not under that control, and I feel sure if the board were to look after it more would be done.

Hon. J. Cornell: That is a poor recommendation for the management of the State Hotels.

Hon. H. TUCKEY: I do not know that it is a complaint against that management. Those people have to put up with the conditions laid down by the department, and if insufficient money is made available, they have to make the best of the position. Much fault has been found with the Government for not providing full-time employment for the sustenance workers and the unemployed generally. I do not know that either the present or any future Government could afford to do that, although it is unfortunate that anyone is compelled to work part-time. I have had a good deal of experience in local government matters. Years ago the State was not without its unemployment trouble. Fifteen or 20 years ago, the then Minister for Works, the late Hon. W. J. George, asked my board to accept £1,000, and to provide work for some of the Perth unemployed on the Pinjarra-Mandurah road. At that time we were getting road metal supplies by contract at 1s. 6d. per yard. When the men came down from Perth they wanted day work. I did my best to arrange a contract price with them, because that system saved the expense of supervision

and we knew what work would be done. The men would not accept those conditions, and went on strike, although we offered 4s. where it had formerly cost us 1s. 6d. Still the men continued on strike, and Mr. George telegraphed down to say that we would have to allow the men day-work conditions, or else they would have to be sent back to Perth. The fact is that we have always had a certain proportion of unemployment in our midst. If we were to insist upon the Government finding sufficient money to enable them to employ everyone in Western Australia, I am afraid the State would carry a lot of drones, and others who would not work.

Hon. J. Cornell: I think the percentage of unemployment in 1915 was as great as it is to-day.

Hon. H. TUCKEY: It is a big question, and while I sympathise with those who are not on full-time work, I can quite appreciate the position of the Government. It is a matter of utter impossibility for the Government to accede to the wishes of those who require them to place all workers on full-time employment. Some of the sustenance men could do better if they tried to shift for themselves. For instance, I offered to assist two men whom I know quite well. I told them where they could get permanent work, but it meant they would have to shift their homes for a distance of 17 miles. They said they would not do that, and preferred to carry on as they were. They said they were getting enough to enable them to keep going, and they certainly did not want to remove their homes to another place. That sort of thing should not be tolerated in a big State like Western Australia. Men should go where work was available, so long as the conditions were reasonably decent. Again at Donnybrook on one occasion a dairy farmer named Sear had three months' work to undertake and offered 10s. a day and keep for the men he required. Although sustenance men were working in the district, he could not get any to accept the work he offered. It was certainly not permanent, but the job was a decent one. Nevertheless, Mr. Sear had to do without the labour that he required. Some comment has been indulged in regarding the new bridges at Fremantle and Canning Bridge. I do not care to say too much about the Fremantle bridge, because ob-

viously one should know something about the position before indulging in criticism. If it is the intention of the Government to allow the new structures to remain for any length of time, I agree that it would be better to put up cement or steel structures that would be permanent. If they are to be temporary structures only, probably cheap wooden bridges represent the better proposition for the time being. If they are to be in the nature of permanent structures that will have to remain there for many years, I think at least cement piles should be used if steel super-structures cannot be provided. Most certainly the piles should be made to last and should be sheathed in cement. We all know how destructive the teredo is in Fremantle waters. Wood will not last for any length of time. Years ago we had no trouble with the teredo. At Mandurah 30 years ago we did not have any, but recently this sea worm has made its appearance there, and any timber that has been placed in the water becomes riddled in the course of a few years. We know that the pest is plentiful in the Swan River. If the bridge at Fremantle is intended to be a permanent structure, I believe the Government would be very unwise to put in wooden piles. A lot of money has been lost in maintaining the existing bridge over the past few years, and if wooden piles are to be used again, that type of expense will continue. Public works of this description should be made to last and to avoid heavy maintenance costs. I passed over the old Canning Bridge to-day, and I noticed that wooden piles are being used for the new structure there. They do not seem to be reinforced, nor are they sheathed with muntz metal or copper. If the teredo is as bad there as in other parts of the Swan River, those piles will not last for long. I would remind the Government that Muntz's metal sheathing is not a protection against sea worms. It does not last for more than a short time in water, and is costly to put on. If the piles were to be reinforced so as to be immune from the depredations of the teredo, they should be put down in cement. A peculiar feature about the teredo is that it is not present all along our coast. For instance, there are none at Shark Bay, whereas at Carnarvon they are very destructive. A length of oregon, 3 inches by 3 inches, was taken out of the water at Shark Bay after hav-

ing been submerged for 35 years, and was found to be as sound as when it was placed in position. Had that timber been used in Fremantle or Carnarvon waters, it would not have lasted for more than two years at the outside. Furthermore, boats at Shark Bay are not troubled with the growth of barnacles or weeds. These matters are hard to understand, and I cannot enlighten members as to the explanation. The fact remains that in the Swan River the pests do exist, and we should build bridges that they will not interfere with. I had intended dealing with group settlement matters, but I shall not proceed much longer. I regret that Mr. Wittenoom is not present to-day because I had intended asking him why he had not told the whole story when he referred to the Denmark settler who had 11 cows from which only four gallons of milk were produced. I do not know if the hon. member's statement was to be regarded as a criticism of the land or of the management. My concern is that too often we hear things said that are really detrimental to the reputation of the land in Western Australia, and there is no good reason for that type of criticism. In Western Australia we have land quite as capable of production as that to be found anywhere else in the Commonwealth. Although the Group Settlement Scheme has failed to a certain extent, that result was not because the land was poor or because the settlers were inefficient. The greatest crime of the latter is that they were supposed to do what they were told. In other words, they were farm hands and not farmers. After they had been instructed by the representatives of Governments over a period of years during which they were required to do certain things, and then their properties failed, we can hardly blame the group settlers for that result. It is a pity that the settlers always seem to get the blame. We know that many of the settlers should never have been placed on the land, but that does not affect the position of the good farmers who have not been responsible for the mistakes they have made. Some of them have tried to alter their methods, but they have been prevented from doing so by those in the control of their districts. It is a great pity that that has been the position, but there is still hope for some of the areas concerned. I trust that when blocks are taken up by other settlers, the type of control that I have referred to will

not be insisted upon. If a man has been on his block for seven years and is not capable of running it as a farm, he should not be there at all. He should not have to be told whether he should clear the land in the valley or that on the hillside, nor should he be told whether he should grow wheat or oats. He should be in a position to decide for himself, and men in that position should be allowed to carry on under conditions that suit themselves and their properties.

Hon. J. Cornell: Very often they are instructed by men who have failed themselves.

Hon. H. TUCKEY: I am sorry to say that that is true. I do not desire to be too critical. I could say quite a lot, but I do not think it would get us anywhere. We all desire to assist the Government or anyone else charged with the responsibility of carrying out these operations. Unfortunately many of these men knew what was wrong. Many of us knew what was wrong, but we could not step in and give contrary advice. Finally, I wish to refer to the Peel Estate settlement. When that project was first spoken of, we were told what wonderful things were to be done on that area. We who knew the Peel Estate were simply astounded at what we read and heard. I remember perusing a long article in the "West Australian" after a Ministerial visit had been paid to the Peel Estate. The writer described in glowing terms the characteristics of the beautiful country south of Fremantle. I do not know whether that writer was more to be blamed than the Government of the day, but the two together made a very sorry picture.

Hon. J. Cornell: The honorary Royal Commission did not blow up the Peel Estate!

Hon. H. TUCKEY: It is unfortunate that so much money was lost there. Many of us who knew the country appreciated what would happen, but we were powerless to step in and stop that wilful waste of money. Had that money been expended in other parts, greater development would have followed. The idea of the money advanced being interest free over a certain number of years did not enter into the picture, because any money so utilised must be taken into account in the long run. I am afraid I have spoken rather longer than I anticipated, and so I shall not take up any more time of the House beyond saying that I have much pleasure in supporting the motion.

**HON. W. J. MANN** (South-West) [5.15]: I had intended prefacing my remarks with an extended reference to what may be described as the example that I think ought to be set by the State in connection with trading activities, making special reference to the Tender Board contracts about which we have heard so much in the last few days. However, the Premier's recent statement has materially altered the position and for that reason I will curtail my remarks, at any rate, until we hear the actual result of the reviewed position. Mr. Nicholson, in speaking to this motion, dealt with the need on the part of the Government for exercising the greatest care in all transactions. I desire to point out to the Government that a charge, in my opinion at any rate, might have been levelled against them, had they permitted the Tender Board contract conditions to remain. I recollect some years ago when in the United States, hearing quite a lot about a notorious thing called racketeering. Men and women in all kinds of business spoke of it with bitterness and considerable hatred, and on three occasions the query was put to me as to whether we had such a thing as racketeering in Australia. To such an extent had it grown in America that it became a source whereby a certain class secured a lazy and lucrative way of living. I was assured that quite a large number of people in the big cities of America did nothing more than worry their fellow citizens and extract from them money under the guise of "protection." I have forgotten the American interpretation of racketeering, but so far as my memory serves me, this is what it means. It was a form of unlawful compulsion to contribute financially to some person or organisation under penalty, upon refusal, of serious interference with the peaceful and proper conduct of business. I have too much respect for members of the Government to charge them with racketeering, but I think one has a right to point out and protest against what he believes amounted to an attempt, perhaps unwittingly, to introduce this very vicious thing. In the ultimate issue the effect of the proposed regulations—providing that preference be given to financial unionists—if it is not a form of racketeering then I contend it is very close to it. That is, in its ultimate result. The conditions of contract intimated to the tenderer, that to share in Government business he must employ only

unionists who had paid all union dues. Such a condition, however, would have no authority in law, and would be in defiance of both Parliament and the Arbitration Court. Whoever introduced the innovation into the contract undoubtedly knew that at least a percentage of union dues found their way into party funds, the party represented by the Government. This I contend in the ultimate effect is a distinct form of racketeering and it differs only from that in America in that it demands payment from the worker whereas in America payment is extracted from the employers. That is about all I wish to say on that question, but I do repeat that the Government have laid themselves open to a grave charge and I am glad that the Premier has recognised it and that he is having the position reviewed. Another matter about which I desire some information is with regard to the Workers' Compensation Act. The "Government Gazette" of the 13th of this month contains seven pages of regulations under that Act and from the introductory paragraph it is clear that all previous regulations under the Workers' Compensation Act are revoked. The seven pages of new regulations appearing in the "Gazette" are intended to take the place of the others and cover a wide range. For instance, No. 6 has reference to employers effecting insurance under the Act and makes it incumbent on the insurer desiring to do business to first obtain the approval of the Minister in control of the Act. That is the effect of it. Apparently the framers of the regulations held the belief that all insurers are domiciled in the city and are easy of access to Government departments. I am concerned about people in the country districts and to give effect to that particular clause of the regulations would entail considerable trouble and involve delay and perhaps some loss as well. Perhaps I had better read it—

Every employer desirous of effecting insurance with an incorporated insurance office in compliance with Subsection 1 of Section 10 of the Act, must first obtain from the Minister in writing his approval of the incorporated insurance office as an incorporated insurance office with which such insurance may be effected.

There are other following regulations that have a bearing on that one.

**Hon. J. Cornell:** When did those regulations come into force?

Hon. W. J. MANN: I am trying to find out whether they are in force.

Hon. J. J. Holmes: They have not been laid on the Table of the House.

Hon. W. J. MANN: It has been said and is being said that it is the intention of the Government to create a State monopoly in the class of business referred to—workers' compensation insurance. Under Section 36 of the Interpretation Act it is provided—

When by any Act it is provided that regulations may or shall be made, and—(i) it is provided that such regulations may or shall be made by the Governor; or (ii) it is not provided by whom such regulations may or shall be made; any regulation made under, or by virtue of, such provision—(a) shall be made by the Governor; (b) shall be published in the "Gazette"; (c) shall, subject to Subsection 2 hereof take effect and have the force of law from the date of such publication, or from a later date fixed by the order making such regulation; (d) shall be laid before both Houses of Parliament within 14 days of such publication, if Parliament is in session, and if not then within 14 days after the commencement of the next session of Parliament.

Hon. J. J. Holmes: That has not been done.

Hon. W. J. MANN: I had a look through the papers on the Table of the House but was unable to find a copy of the regulations. Already 14 days have passed since those regulations were gazetted. To my knowledge they have not been produced in this House. I wish to ask the Leader of the House whether these regulations which were published in the "Gazette" on the 13th of this present month are being put into effect seeing that the procedure laid down by the Interpretation Act has not been complied with. Perhaps I should also read the introduction to the regulations as it appears in the "Gazette"—

Whereas under the provisions of the Workers' Compensation Act, 1912-1934, the Governor may make such regulations as may be necessary or convenient for carrying out or giving effect to the provisions of the said Act: Now therefore, His Excellency, the Lieutenant-Governor, acting with the advice and consent of the Executive Council and in exercise of the powers conferred by the said Act, doth hereby revoke all the regulations heretofore made and in force under and for the purposes of the said Act and in lieu thereof doth hereby make the new regulations as set out in the Schedule hereto:—

This notification, I take it, revokes all previous regulations regarding the Workers' Compensation Act. I contend that as they have not been laid on the Table of the

House, the substituted regulations published in the "Gazette" have no force in law. We have apparently reached the stage where there are no lawful regulations in force under the Workers' Compensation Act. That is the way it appears to me, and I am submitting my point of view so that the Chief Secretary, when he replies, may clear up the position.

The Chief Secretary: You say there are no regulations.

Hon. W. J. MANN: I repeat, that the preamble to the regulations appearing in the "Gazette" revokes all previous regulations. There is nothing in the Interpretation Act referring to the Preamble having to be laid on the Table of the House, but the regulations themselves must be tabled. The notice in the "Gazette" revokes the previous regulations. That is the way it appears to me.

Hon. J. Nicholson: There is no provision in the Act that the revocation must be gazetted, but the regulations have to be gazetted and laid on the Table of the House.

Hon. W. J. MANN: The notice which precedes the regulations revokes the regulations in existence. I want to know whether this is another instance of someone having blundered or misinterpreted instructions, and whether it is the intention of the Government to revise the revised regulations, and table them in the usual way.

Hon. J. Cornell: Last session the Minister laid regulations on the table one day too late.

Hon. W. J. MANN: The Speech made reference to the agricultural industry. As a result of the better season and the bountiful rains that have recently fallen, the industry shows improvement, and the outlook is brighter than it has been for some years. This is very gratifying, and we can only hope that the wish expressed in the Speech for a bumper harvest will come to fruition. Reference was also made to the operations of the Agricultural Bank. I do not wish to speak upon this subject extensively, but no reference has been made to one operation of the Bank, namely, the failure materially to improve the disastrous position created by the eviction policy of the Bank and the Government in relation to group settlement. The powers that be, having succeeded in forcing hundreds of good men and their families to forsake the country and seek sus-



tenance, chiefly in the city, the Bank found itself in the position of being quite unable to re-people the vacated blocks. For years some of us have been warning the Government and the Agricultural Bank what was going to happen. We have pointed out that it was easy enough to force people off the blocks but that it would be quite another matter to get others to take them up again, because newcomers would lose faith in the Government and would not know but that the same conditions which had forced the previous occupants off the blocks would operate against them also. So the Agricultural Bank has done just what we anticipated. Now the Commissioners are looking to private enterprise to get them out of the difficulty. I do not wish to criticise the arrangements made with the firm of Goldsbrough, Mort & Co. Ltd., because I believe they are putting a lot of energy into their work. I have been authoritatively informed that they have undertaken to sell on an average one farm per day for about two years, and that they are making satisfactory progress. That is a fairly big order, and if the firm can stand up to it, they will deserve well of the country and will deserve any profit they receive for their work. The position as I understand it is that about 1,700 properties in the agricultural districts covering the whole State have been handed to the firm. The Bank Commissioners have had to admit that they are practically helpless to dispose of properties, and have called in outside help. I have no wish to make more reference to group settlement than is necessary; it has been discussed from various angles on many occasions, but recently I heard within the precincts of this Chamber some rather seathing remarks about group settlers as a whole, and I do not propose to let those remarks pass without entering a protest. Some people seem to think that because they have visited one group area and spoken with perhaps half-a-dozen men, they can speak for all the group settlers in the State. I know of places in group settlements where the men are just as rough and brusque in manner as it is possible for men to be, and a stranger might easily come to the conclusion, "I do not think much of that lot." Yet they are the warmest-hearted men one could meet and, in addition, they are great workers and excellent settlers, but they are men who have been accustomed to open-air life and to the back country, and they use expressions that perhaps would not be tolerated in some

drawing-rooms. But because they happen to be a bit uncouth in manner and lack the advantage of high school education is no reason why they should be branded as malingerers or worse, as I heard them, or why all group settlers should be judged by that standard. Looking back over the years since the inception of the scheme, one is more than confirmed in the opinion that after the glamour and excitement of the first two or three years the group settlers never had a real chance to become prosperous farmers. In saying that I am recapitulating what I have said in this Chamber over the last five or six years.

Hon. T. Moore: You do not blame the Government for that, do you?

Hon. W. J. MANN: Not entirely, though in part I do. I am not blaming the present Government any more than previous Governments.

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

Hon. W. J. MANN: I candidly admit that in a big scheme there will always be found a percentage of men who are impossible, men from whom we could not expect success, men who, notwithstanding what was done for them, would prove failures. There was a percentage of such men amongst group settlers, but the greater proportion were undoubtedly men of a better class. Huge sums of money were debited against group settlement for which the settlers received absolutely no value. Members are well aware of that fact. The group holdings, in consequence of the methods adopted, were capitalised beyond all hope of success.

Hon. C. B. Williams: Do you say that £24 a year is too much to ask a group settler to pay?

Hon. W. J. MANN: I am not speaking of £24 a year.

Hon. C. B. Williams: That is what some of them are being asked to pay.

Hon. W. J. MANN: A chance of paying such an amount would be received with open arms by 99 per cent. of the group settlers, but some of them have been asked to pay nearer £124.

Hon. C. B. Williams: Forty pounds is a large amount.

Hon. W. J. MANN: That is not the position. The holdings were over-capitalised and, following on that, the settlers encountered a period of lean years, during which even the best farmers of the State found it impossible to make ends meet. Again, the group settlers were tied down with Bank

mortgages. They had no prospect of finding work elsewhere, and they were practically forced into the position of becoming indigent and humble proteges of the Bank, which institution, more often than not, irritated rather than assisted them. We know also that those settlers have been very largely directed by theoretical farmers, book farmers, men who were always quoting the latest book on clover or something else, irrespective of whether such fodder would be satisfactory in the district concerned. Their advice might have applied in some instances, but it did not apply in all.

The Honorary Minister: Were not they practical advisers?

Hon. W. J. MANN: In many instances, the settlers were not permitted to follow the advice of men who had made good in the industry, and, in addition, there was always the uncertainty of a regulation issued to-day being cancelled to-morrow. Regulations were sent out one day telling people what they had to do, and in the next few days they received instructions to the contrary. Finally, while the settlers were told they were good fellows and might make good, they were never allowed to forget that the interests of the Bank were paramount. The wonder to me is that so many of the settlers have struggled on so long. The men and women still on the groups, I think, are deserving of great credit and assistance.

Hon. T. Moore: Do you think all the good ones are left on the blocks?

Hon. W. J. MANN: I consider that a great many of those still on their blocks are estimable people, and some of them are doing very well. If the hon. member made inquiries, he would find that since prices have improved those people are doing exactly as they promised to do during the time of the depression. At that time they said, "Give us a reasonable price and a reasonable chance, and we will meet the Bank's demands as far as possible." That is being done. I suggest that the hon. member should peruse the records of the Agricultural Bank, which will prove the accuracy of my statement. I wish to warn the Bank against grinding those settlers down to paying the last penny. It would be wrong to wring the last penny out of them. In most instances, the original plant and machinery put on the groups are worn out. The horses have grown old, and there has been no money available to provide new

plant and machinery, and no money with which to purchase new horses. These necessities will have to be renewed. In my opinion, the assets of the Bank would actually be enhanced, for the next couple of years at any rate, if they offered a rebate of 2½ per cent. on the interest payments of group settlers to enable them to purchase plant and machinery and necessary horses. The assets of the Bank would thereby be improved, and the group settler assisted to carry on. The group settler has a complex very much the same as I imagine the miner-settlers at Southern Cross have. All he asks is for a reasonable chance, and to be freed, as far as possible, from red tape and from office domination.

Hon. J. J. Holmes: Is not there an attempt to nationalise the agricultural and dairying industries?

Hon. W. J. MANN: I do not recollect efforts to nationalise the agricultural industry. In fact, this is the first I have heard of it. My point is that the miner-settlers at Southern Cross rejected offers of transfer to other localities, in preference to being freed from the control of the Agricultural Bank and permitted to continue on their holdings to work out their destiny in their own way. I believe that in that way there will be more success.

Hon. J. Cornell: Even without rain?

Hon. W. J. MANN: They have got rain this year. As they have had a series of bad years, let us hope that they will have a long series of good years. I regret that the Agricultural Bank have not made a special effort to keep settlers' sons on the land. For a number of years I have brought that matter up. I have urged that every inducement should be given to farm-trained lads to take up land. However, nothing has been done. Inaction of this nature deserves severe censure. The present generation of farmers is passing and there must be a continuity of trained men if our rural husbandry is to survive and prosper. In a recent publication I read the following passage, referring to the necessity for keeping farm-trained young people on the farms and preventing them from drifting to the cities—

The soil must be served; the soil is supreme. Empires have risen or fallen, according as they have served or neglected it. If a given piece of land yields better, not in exportable surplus, but in human contentment, when supporting three men, where once it supported only one, then that land, if again held by one, will

avenge itself, even though it may take generations to do it.

There is great need for action to be taken in that direction. The drift away from the land still continues, and it is useless to make endeavours to build up a thriving rural population if we do not look after the young men who are coming along and see that they are given encouragement to take up land. Another complaint I have is that the Agricultural Bank refuse to assist settlers desirous of linking their holdings with other vacant blocks adjoining, except on the same terms as are offered to newcomers. My complaint arises in this way: that now some of the settlers are beginning to get a little ready money and are in a position where they can expand, they find that their holdings are on the small side. Most of the group holdings are too small. Recently I approached the Agricultural Bank on behalf of a settler who had been on his holding for about 14 years and wished to buy a vacated holding next to him. He offered to accept the conditions available to new settlers; that is, payment of a certain amount down and payment of interest as prescribed in the form of agreement. This settler asked to be allowed to pay the deposit by instalments. I saw the Bank officials, and they said, "No; if he wants it, he will have to pay £63 down." That is not encouraging a man who has borne the heat and burden of the day. The Bank should show a kindly spirit to settlers who have done their bit all those years, and who have shown their bona fides by sticking to the scheme so long. I trust the Agricultural Bank authorities will not be slow to show their appreciation of the loyalty of those who have stuck to the scheme through great adversity, by extending to them every possible consideration in the future. One of the gratifying features of agricultural development in the South-West is the manner in which the farmers generally are raising the standard of their industry. The support given to herd-testing, improvement of stock and pasture, and the production of higher-grade cream in the dairies is most marked. The formation of junior farmers' clubs for youthful members and the encouragement of calf clubs, pig clubs, and other things of that description amongst the children are all indications of a determination to lift the status of the industry. Perhaps the natural corollary of these things is best

illustrated by the fact that during the past year the percentage of choice butter manufactured by Western Australian factories has shown a splendid increase. In addition to that, I think we can say that we are the only State of the Commonwealth that has shown any increase at all. Most of the other States are showing decreases in the production of choice butter. A suggestion has been made for the inauguration of a dairy science course for the South-West. Such a course should be instituted without the least avoidable delay. In Western Australia, as in all new countries, there is a great deal yet to be learnt about the land, the climate, and the various factors of production. The establishment of a dairy science course would be a move in the right direction, and would assist materially in the scientific study of the problems that the farmer is up against. One of the things causing some misgivings among dairy farmers, at any rate, is the sale of margarine. It is alleged that a permit to bring into this country 5 tons of margarine per week was obtained from the Minister for Agriculture some time ago. In fairness to the Minister I should mention that I am given to understand the permit was to some extent secured by misrepresentation. That misrepresentation referred to what was being done in other States. However, I am indeed sorry that the permit was granted at all, because the people who bring margarine into Western Australia have not much interest in our rural districts. Their chief interest is to get some profit by the sale of a lower-grade food, for which there is no necessity. Butter in this country is not expensive, not nearly as expensive as in some other countries, and it is a perfect food. The Government and everybody else should do all that is possible to promote the sale of good, wholesome butter made in our own State. Figures relating to the prices of butter in other countries show that we in Western Australia have not much to complain of. According to Mr. Walter Noakes, of Brunswick, one of the men doing good work for this State's dairying industry and a member of the Federal Dairy Products Equalisation Board, in to-day's "West Australian" quotes the following prices:—Western Australia, 13s. 9d. per cwt.; Denmark, 13s. 6d.; France, 16s.; Germany, 26s. 6d.; Holland, 20s.; Belgium, 18s.; United States of America, 18s.; Canada, 14s.

Hon. L. Craig: Those figures are on the basis of the Australian £1 note?

Hon. W. J. MANN: I presume so.

Hon. C. B. Williams: What about the price in England?

Hon. W. J. MANN: It would be about the same as Denmark.

Hon. C. B. Williams: Are you guessing?

Hon. W. J. MANN: More or less, for I have not the latest figure for England. It might be a few shillings above the price in Denmark. At all events, of the eight countries referred to, six have prices in excess of the price in Western Australia. From that point of view, therefore, we have no complaints. I hope that the city and goldfields people who use margarine will take notice.

Hon. J. Cornell: "Eat more butter!"

Hon. W. J. MANN: Yes, more South-Western butter. In the sphere of the Australian Dairy Products Board and Dairy Council—although these are not matters of State control—I wish to voice my opinion that Western Australia is entitled to a greater measure of consideration than has hitherto been given us. There is no equity in the arrangement under which we are working now. Whilst the bigger States have direct representation on the board, Western Australia, Tasmania and South Australia are grouped together and have only one representative—the gentleman to whom I have just referred. We are highly fortunate in this respect, that the representative of the three States happens to be a Western Australian. If the representative of the three States happened to be a Tasmanian, then the interests of Western Australia would, I am sure, suffer materially. The Governor's Speech records the building of bulk-handling terminal facilities at Bunbury, which are to be completed, we understand, in time for next season's shipping. The steady increase in population and business in that part of the State no doubt warranted the Government's action. Bulk-handling facilities, while not too satisfactory perhaps to certain workers in those parts, will prove a considerable advantage in the main to the town and district. The usefulness of the bulk-handling facilities is likely to be limited unless the Government take steps to provide at least two deep-water berths in order that the big ships can come alongside and pick up cargo. The provision of two deep-water berths presents no insurmountable difficulties. I am informed that the required depth

of water may be secured in two ways, either by deepening the present berths or by running out a short spur from the jetty to a spot where as much as 40 feet of water can be obtained without reaching basalt. The fat lamb production of the South-West is increasing rapidly, and the provision of deep water is essential for their shipment from Bunbury. I contend that the time for the abolition of that extra imposition of rail freight from Picton to Fremantle on South-West grown fruit, is overdue. There is no justification whatever for hauling a perishable commodity like fruit over 120 unnecessary miles to Fremantle, when its natural port of shipment is at Bunbury. Bunbury has suffered by the loss of a lot of coal-bunkering trade through the lack of deep-water berths, so that no matter how the question is viewed, the Governments' duty in this connection is inescapable. Allied to shipping is the necessity for the duplication of about four miles of railway between Picton Junction and Bunbury, a comparatively inexpensive work which is most essential, and should be put in hand right away. Picton is an important junction; all lines converge there. There is only a single line into the port. Considerable difficulty is experienced when there are a number of boats being worked and there is a lot of traffic on the line. Improved shipping facilities are still required at Busselton, so that the port there will be assured of the shipment of the produce of its hinterland. The lighting of the jetty for the safety of the wharf labourers is another urgent necessity at Busselton. One cannot understand the refusal of a Labour Government, to insist upon it. The stock excuse is that it is a matter for the Railway Department, but if the Fremantle lumpers were asked to handle dangerous cargo like timber in darkness, there would be such a howl of indignation as would necessitate Fremantle resident members of Parliament remaining in Perth or reaching their homes by back streets until the matter was righted.

Hon. G. Fraser: Are you sure that Fremantle is lit up well?

Hon. W. J. MANN: More than that.

Hon. C. B. Williams: Showers and everything.

Hon. W. J. MANN: Yes they have everything they desire there. Several references have been made in this debate to the necessity for additional educational facilities in

the country. One realises that the educational vote in this State imposes a very big burden on the State, but free education is Australia's almost undisputed policy. Hence we must do the thing properly and decently. Members have quoted from letters in this connection. I do not propose to do that, but I will give one illustration of the difficulties that are being experienced. I know of one district in which there is a school having 20 scholars. The Parents and Citizens' Association have raised about £50 for purchasing different requirements for the school which were not provided by the Education Department. This school is built in a bleak position, and a shed was required to be used for manual training, and at the same time to provide some protection for the children in wet or very hot weather. Not far distant was a group school not being used. It had teachers' quarters alongside. The people made an offer to the Government to dismantle, cart, and re-erect the teachers' quarters at the school and do everything under the Government's supervision. The department turned down the scheme. In another case a small shed was required, and the parents and citizens offered £10 towards the cost. They were pretty hard up too. But again the Director of Education had to refuse because he said there was no money provided for such purposes. I know that the Education Vote is very large, but I think it is a great pity that the Government cannot have a small portion set aside for purposes of this kind. They are not very big requirements.

Hon. G. B. Wood: But there are a lot of them.

Hon. W. J. MANN: There may be a number of them, but it must not be forgotten that the country school youngster does not get half the advantages and facilities that the city children do, and if there is any possibility of preference being given to make schools comfortable, it should be given to country schools. I know of one school where it is as cold as charity in winter and like an oven in summer. No city children are asked to put up with conditions like that. I would like to see the Government put by a portion of the Education Vote in order that small necessities throughout the country might be provided as far as possible. I hope the Government will give greater consideration to the applications for workers' homes in the country. I understand that the ratio of approvals is some-

thing like four in the metropolitan area to one in the country. I had occasion to ask recently that the application of a country worker should be expedited if possible. That application has been in for some months, but I was told that he would have to wait at least 12 months before he could expect the application to be dealt with.

Hon. G. Fraser: That is usual.

Hon. W. J. MANN: I am not saying it is not, but it seems a pity that this very estimable work cannot be expedited. The workers' homes scheme has proved a success. There are hundreds of young people residing in their own homes now with a sense of security which they would never have had but for this scheme. I have only one other matter to which I will refer. I had intended to deal with the necessity for much greater attention being given to the tourist business in this State, but as my remarks cover a wide range, I propose to reserve them for another time. One thing I must refer to, however, and that is a matter which was touched upon by my colleague earlier this afternoon: that is the necessity for the rebuilding of Cave House at Yallingup. I have spoken so often on this subject that hon. members are fully acquainted with the reasons why it should be done. I, however, differ from my colleague in one respect. I am not in favour of handing over this matter to the State Gardens Board.

Hon. H. Tuckey: You would get something done.

Hon. W. J. MANN: I am sure something will be done. I know the Chief Secretary is keen on this work being put in hand, and I hope when he replies to this debate he will be able to indicate that the Government propose to commence the work immediately. An interjection was made that if the Cave House was handed over to the State Gardens Board, we would get somewhere. I ask the hon. member who has just interjected to tell me one instance during the last five years of the State Gardens Board having done anything for Yallingup, Margaret River, or Augusta Caves.

Hon. J. Cornell: They have nothing to do with those caves.

Hon. W. J. MANN: They have done nothing in the past and I have no confidence that they will do anything in the future.

**HON. J. CORNELL** (South) [6.13]: I do not wish to detain the House long, but having made a few interjections during the debate, and having asked certain questions, I feel it incumbent upon me to say a few words. The first thing with which I have to deal is the question of preference to unionists as instituted by the Tender Board.

Hon. F. H. Gray: You used to advocate that at one time..

Hon. J. CORNELL: I have never advocated it. I do not advocate it now. Some hon. members seem to have lulled themselves into a position of false security as a result of the answer given (by way of a statement from the Premier) to the opposition to this clause in the tender form to the effect that the clause in the contract which came under the aegis of the Tender Board had been referred back to the Tender Board. That does not alter the position which exists. According to the Minister to-day, and according to the Premier, every contract let by the Public Works Department and every contract approved by the Commissioner of Main Roads, has a clause to the effect that preference of employment shall be given to members of recognised unions.

Member: Only "recognised unions"?

Hon. J. CORNELL: We know what "recognised unions" mean. I presume a recognised union would be one which provided for membership of the particular class of men likely to be employed in connection with the contract concerned.

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

Hon. J. CORNELL: Prior to the tea adjournment I made brief reference to the Government's policy of preference to unionists and I endeavoured to reply to an interjection as to what was meant by a recognised union. I think I said that a recognised or appropriate union would be a union concerned with a particular class of work, as set out in the contract. Assuming for the sake of illustration that it was a workers' homes contract, a recognised or appropriate union there would be, to begin with, that concerned with the putting down of the foundation; then would come the bricklayers, the carpenters, the plumbers, the painters, and the labourers associated with those allied trades. According to the clause in the Public Works contract, every one of

those workmen would have to be a unionist before he could get a job. So preference would be given to the men who were members of those several unions. The question of preference, that is to say, the question whether a man was or was not a member of an appropriate union, would be ascertained by the contractor putting the question to the workman, "Are you a member of such and such a union?" As to whether the man was a financial member, the contractor would settle that by asking to see his contribution card. If there are sufficient unionists offering for any work specified in any tender from the Public Works Department, a non-unionist will not be considered; that is to say, if this policy of preference to unionists is to be carried out it will be carried out in that way. If there are sufficient unionists available, nobody else will be employed. Now we come to the second part: If members will refresh their memory they will find that where any person who is engaged is not a member of a recognised union he must within 14 days of his employment make application to join the appropriate union, and he must complete that application. As to when he shall complete the application there is nothing very definite said, but he must apply to be admitted as a unionist within 14 days of his engagement. Here again, if he does not comply I take it the terms of the contract are such that it will fall upon the employer to replace him, and if a unionist is offering, to employ that unionist instead of continuing to employ that non-unionist; and if a unionist is not offering, there certainly would be somebody who would readily make the application to join the union, and complete that application. I suppose that for every pound involved in a Tender Board contract there would be £10 or £20 in a Public Works contract. And by the way, according to the answer given to my question to-day, those terms I have referred to were sent to the Tender Board through the usual channel for incorporation in the tender form. Surely, "the usual channel" indicates a direction given from a Minister of the Crown, if not from the Cabinet itself. For it was a Cabinet decision, and I understand that Cabinet has not a secretary, so in all probability a Cabinet decision would be sent along by the Premier.

Hon. J. J. Holmes: I do not think that anyone but the Treasurer can give such an instruction from Cabinet.

Hon. J. CORNELL: Well, according to the answer given to to-day's question the Cabinet decision was sent along to the Tender Board for incorporation in the tender form. The only argument now can be as to the phraseology used by the Tender Board; and the language used in the contract form of the Public Works Department is much the same as that in the tender form. We know that for quite a long while the question of preference to unionists has been insisted upon in Government sustenance work and other work that comes under the direct influence of the Government. The sustenance worker and the road worker have been forced to take out A.W.U. tickets.

Hon. C. B. Williams: The poor old A.W.U.; are there no other unions?

Hon. J. CORNELL: I presume that if there are other unions involved the appropriate foreman will interest himself and see to it that all those on public works join the union.

Hon. C. B. Williams: There are fewer than 2,000 in the A.W.U. Where are the others?

Hon. J. CORNELL: If the Government adopt the policy of preference to unionists the unionists themselves will see to it that the policy embraces all of them. It would never do to put such a policy into operation in regard to only a few unions, leaving out the others. The Government have no right to say that one body of men shall come under the class of work catered for by the A.W.U. and not have to take out a ticket, whereas men doing other work would have to take out tickets. I warn the Cabinet that to ask a sustenance worker to take out the ordinary form of ticket without consideration as to his obligations and as to the wage he is receiving as a half-time worker, is nothing short of an outrage and will not bear any close scrutiny at all. I can look back to the day when most unions did not ask a man to contribute his fees when he was out of work; his contributions ceased while he was out of work. But the position to-day is that none of these niceties appear to come into the situation. By way of interjection I said that if the money involved in the transaction was money subscribed or found by the unionists, there would be some justification in adopting this policy of preference to unionists, this principle that a man who earns his daily bread must join a union because it is the Govern-

ment policy. But by no stretch of the imagination can the amount of money involved be construed as being the prerogative of any section of the community to contribute; it is a contribution by all sections of the community; all sections of the community are taxed to find every shilling that is involved in a public works contract or a main roads contract, but a man who is forced to contribute is asked to join a union in order to get back some of what he has contributed towards the upkeep and the continuity of this State. He is asked to contribute more—I am not going into the political side of it because that, like Nemesis, is hovering appropriately over the present Government by reason of the action involved. But I want to get a little higher; I can recollect a quarter of a century ago when the Labour Party of this State was returned with 36 members in another place. It endeavoured in a lawful manner to have the principle of preference to unionists placed on the statute book. The Government realised that though they had 36 members, out of 50 in another place, Parliament is made up of two Chambers, and there was another House to take into consideration. They endeavoured to have embodied in the Industrial Arbitration Act of 1912 the principle of giving to the Arbitration Court discretion on the question of preference to unionists. This is a tribunal set up, largely by labour unions themselves, to deal with industrial disputes. The Government of the day failed, and have failed since, to induce a united Parliament to agree to placing this power in the hands of the Arbitration Court. Let members go back to May, 1933, and to 1927, when the Labour Government came back. An endeavour was made then to have this done. In 1933, the Labour Government came back with a majority of ten, and endeavoured to get the Legislature to give this specific power to the court. Let members go back 18 months, when the Government were returned by the skin of their teeth, with a majority of one, it is true, but representing a minority of the electors of another place. They said then, "Our policy, so far as every penny we spend, shall be one of preference to unionists in all public works contracts, in all Government tenders, main roads work, and Government expenditure generally." It was to be a question of preference to unionists. I think that is wrong.

Hon. J. J. Holmes: Do you only think so?

Hon. J. CORNELL: That is how I feel about it. I have said it was immoral.

The Honorary Minister: You did not always think so.

Hon. J. CORNELL: If men are to be coerced into becoming unionists, they can only be forced by the Legislature giving the necessary power to the Court of Arbitration. The New Zealand Labour Government have said by Act of Parliament that all Arbitration Court awards shall contain a clause providing for preference to unionists.

Hon. G. Fraser: That country must be a long way ahead of this State.

Hon. J. CORNELL: So it is. In New Zealand, Ministers have pooled their salaries, with the result that, instead of a Bill being introduced to increase salaries in the House of Representatives there, the pooling has provided another £100 a year for every member of the Labour Party not in the Ministry. We have a long way to go to catch New Zealand in that respect. Ministers in this State have never pooled their salaries and given other members of the party in Parliament a further £100 a year.

Hon. J. J. Holmes: How do you know they have not done so?

Hon. J. CORNELL: I do not know that they have done so. I have never been an advocate of preference to unionists, or rather compulsory unionism. It has been said that the clause in the tender forms amounts to compulsory unionism. The Chief Secretary shakes his head.

The Chief Secretary: I say it does not.

Hon. J. CORNELL: If an insufficient number of unionists is available for any particular work, those non-unionists who are employed on it shall within 14 days join the union. If that is not compulsory unionism, I do not know what it is. Whilst arbitration is largely maintained because of unions, a certain amount of obligation is cast upon all those who benefit as the result of the work of unionists to contribute something towards the cost. There is some room for argument on that score. Unionists as well as employers who have to go to the Arbitration Court should be relieved of a great deal of the burden now cast upon them. The point is, who should lay down the principle of preference to unionists, the court or the Government? Cabinet has only laid

it down as a principle, because the Legislature would not give discretionary power to the court to do so. My argument has always been that if a person cannot be reasoned with to join an organisation, the organisation is better off without him. One of the most ardent opponents of compulsory unionism I have ever known sat in the seat of the Honorary Minister 25 years ago, and introduced the 1912 Industrial Arbitration Act. He said that up to the second Broken Hill strike he had believed in all men being unionists. They had won the first strike on that question, but had lost the second, because the men had all become unionists, and those who had been forced to join were the very men who let the others down. From then on to the day of his death he was opposed to compulsory unionism. We have heard about Fascist organisations and Communism, and we have heard from the Premier and others regarding the wisdom of endeavouring to perpetuate our present legislative institutions, the freedom that surrounds them, and the freedom of action upon which they are built. All these Fascist organisations mean submerging the Legislature, submerging the Government, as is the case with Italy, until the country is in the hands of one man. Nazism, as I understand it, means the submerging of all the free institutions that Germany enjoyed at one time. The largest party in the German Parliament at the time of the war was made up of Social Democrats, and the leading thought in Europe consisted of social democracy. The submerging of all those institutions has led to the control of situations by half a dozen men. We know that freedom of thought has been submerged in Russia, where the control is in the hands of the few.

Hon. C. B. Williams: There were no democrats to submerge in Russia at the time of the revolution.

Hon. J. CORNELL: There were a few, but there the government is now by a few. As we know, the Legislature as a whole of this State declined to vest in the Court of Arbitration discretionary power to grant preference to unionists, but the power taken by Cabinet represents the submerging of Parliament by giving the control to half a dozen men. Whether the Government intend to go on with that policy, I do not know.

Hon. J. J. Holmes: That depends on Trades Hall, does it not?



Hon. J. CORNELL: Since sustenance workers and others have been forced harshly into joining unions, unionists on the goldfields I have met during the last two or three years, men who bitterly opposed me during the war on the question of conscription, have said to me "Jim, you advocated conscription in a very wide field, and to-day quite a number of people who opposed conscription are enforcing industrial conscription in a very narrow and harsh sense." That is what we are coming to. I do not wish anything I have said to be taken as being vindictive against the Government. I am not in any way vindictive. Most of the members of Cabinet I have known for a long time. After an association with working men extending over half a century, I do think the Government have taken a false step. They have taken the step which previous Governments refused to take. They have got themselves into a position from which, if they do not soon retract, they will be unable to extricate themselves. In the interests of good and fair government, and of the men themselves, I counsel toleration on behalf of those they are endeavouring industrially to conscript. If that course were to be followed, the Government would probably retain the respect that they are gradually losing; and if they do not retract, they will deserve to lose that respect. I wish to make one or two points relative to Sunday trading. I join with Mr. Parker in his remarks regarding the licensing laws. I shall not enter into any controversy regarding Sunday hotel trading on the goldfields because, taken by and large, I maintain that Sunday trading is rampant throughout Australia. We know that there is a speak-easy here and a speak-easy there, and if a person desires to get a drink on a Sunday, he can get it. Almost from my earliest recollections on the goldfields, I have appreciated the fact that climatic conditions there are probably more conducive to a desire to drink than anywhere else I know of.

Hon. J. M. Macfarlane: What about Marble Bar?

Hon. J. CORNELL: I understand there is a beer strike in progress there. Then, again, I take the view that if a glass of beer will not hurt a man on any day from Monday to Saturday, and it is available to him when he wants it, I fail to see why he should not be in a position to have a drink on a Sunday. There is the alternative that may

be advanced in the suggestion that if a man desires a drink on Sunday, he can buy it on Saturday and take it home with him. That is the last place to which I would advise any man to take his drink. Generally speaking, our licensing laws are, in my opinion, 20 years behind the times. I agree with almost every word used by the Premier of Tasmania, Mr. Ogilvie, who, when speaking on this subject, asserted that on the question of drinking, and several other such topics, we in Australia are suffering from smug democracy and smug hypocrisy.

Hon. C. B. Williams: You do not put the parsons in with us in that respect?

Hon. J. CORNELL: I think the parsons are largely the product of ourselves. Any one who had anything to do with the Great War is able to appreciate what happened in Europe then and what has happened since, and will realise the position. A Frenchman, for instance, can be accompanied by his wife and the man can enjoy his drink while his wife sips her cup of tea. No one abuses the privilege. The time is long overdue in Western Australia for drastic alterations in our liquor laws. I would advocate a limited form of Sunday trading. We hear people going into hysterics about all the home land does. If you say anything about the home land, you are apt to get your eye filled. People who suggest that drinking is wrong on Sundays, conveniently forget that in the home land a man can get his drink on a Sunday. I understand that in Mr. Nicholson's country the hotels close only when a funeral passes by.

Hon. J. Nicholson: The hotels there are not open on Sundays.

Hon. J. CORNELL: I have always been at a loss to understand how the Scotsman attained his holding capacity. I understand from what Mr. Nicholson says that Scotsmen must drink enough on Saturdays to carry them over Sundays. I will support any reasonable measure for the liberalisation of the liquor laws that will enable Sunday drinking not to be regarded as an evil but as a privilege to be enjoyed by those who require a stimulant. The only qualification I would suggest is that the privilege shall not be abused. That is the position as it applies in Continental countries, and that is what should obtain here. I have one son and all I have enjoined upon him is that if he does not drink alcoholic liquor, he will lose a lot of conviviality.

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

Hon. J. CORNELL: I have told my son that if he does drink, he must drink like a gentleman; let the other fellow drink himself under the table, but he must not allow himself to drink in that way. If we preach and practice that principle, we will go a long way towards obviating the abuse of a privilege. So far as my goldfields constituents are concerned, if the Government are prepared to introduce a Bill to liberalise Sunday trading conditions and cut out the bona fide traveller provisions of the Act—at any rate the motor car has practically settled the bona fide traveller—I am prepared to support such a measure. On the other hand, if the Government are not prepared, in view of the comments indulged in regarding Sunday trading, to ask the Legislature to move with the times, I think they should enforce the law as it stands. If they will move in this direction and the legislature refuses to institute reforms that will advance with the times, there is no justification for the Government being too harsh for the time being. They could tell the people that if they were not satisfied with a partial enforcement of the law in a logical manner, they could put them out at the next election. With regard to the emergency legislation, I understand there are only two of the Acts remaining on the statute-book. In my opinion they should be wiped off the statute-book or, as an alternative, we should review the situation in the light of experience and say to the people affected, "We have made provision regarding interest and conditions, and that is a fair thing. We will alter the conditions that necessitated this legislation, and start off afresh." The present situation does seem absurd. We are giving all but one or two sections of the community relief from various portions of the emergency legislation, and yet are perpetuating the impositions where others are concerned. Then there is the question of superannuation. We are long overdue for specific efforts in the direction of a system of superannuation for Government employees. There may be some excuse where the civil servants are concerned for this neglect in the past, but I cannot see any where the police are concerned. For many years the police have been asked to contribute so much from their salaries towards the provision of retiring allowances, whereas the civil servants have merely been asked to satisfy the Public Service Commis-

sioner that they have insurance policies for £200 at death. I know the State is short of money, and it looks as though we shall continue in that position for a long time. The only people entitled to receive superannuation to-day are similarly situated to some of us. They are reaching the end of their tether, and it will not be long before no one will be entitled to superannuation unless something is done soon. Finally, I wish to reiterate what I said last session regarding the financial emergency tax and the income tax. The former has grown to a return of £1,000,000 or more, and if that tax is to be re-enacted, for the love of Heaven, let its title be changed! The newspapers publish reports that we are round the corner and enjoying an excellent wave of prosperity. If that is so, then the tax is surely not a financial "emergency" tax but a financial "necessity" tax. I understand the South Australian Government have emerged from their difficulties as well as we have, and they have not required to have recourse to two classes of taxation as we have. Let us face the situation and admit that the financial emergency tax must remain. That being so, let us merge the two taxes into one. To-day there are men in receipt of £3 15s. 0d. who have contributed nothing towards either tax. On the other hand, there are thousands of men in the Central, South, and East Provinces, and some in the North Province, who are slugged every time and can escape from neither impost.

Hon. C. B. Williams: And they have to pay an extra penny for their beer.

Hon. J. CORNELL: We are long overdue for a proper overhaul of our methods of taxation, and one tax only should be imposed, one that will be more equitable than the present arrangement.

HON. L. CRAIG (South-West) [8.13]: Criticism has emanated from the members of the Government regarding the treatment of industrial Bills in this House. Perhaps there is a little justification for that complaint, and the treatment meted out to those Bills may not have been quite all that it could have been. On the other hand, I would point out that extreme protection has been given to industrial workers who are organised, and very little consideration shown to workers who are not organised. I have particularly in mind at the moment, having just returned from a visit to the North

where the matter was brought back to me again, the protective legislation passed for the welfare of such people as shearers. Provision is made for the construction of sheds that must conform to certain regulations and include special provisions for beds, showers, and so forth. No one has any objection to that. But when it comes to the out-camp man who lives on the station and who bears the heat and burden of the day, no protection is given to him at all. Some of the out-camps at the bigger stations are a disgrace, and I am a station man. There are sheds which are made up of no more than four posts and ti-tree. I consider that where station-owners are not prepared to give decent accommodation to the men living in many cases 30 miles from the homestead, where the only scenery is a windmill, they should be compelled to provide at least a certain standard which, I am sorry to say, to-day is not to be found at all the stations. I hope I am not treading on the corns of North-West members, but I have discussed this with men who live in the North, and they agree with me—and some members who have lived in the North will also agree with me—that many station owners, well-to-do, are not providing for their out-camp men that accommodation to which those men are entitled. The main object of my few remarks to-night is to draw attention to the vermin menace. We have given a great deal of consideration to this question—the Pastoralists' Association, the Royal Agricultural Society, the Road Board Association and the Primary Producers' Association have discussed the question, and have urgently brought under notice the great depredations by vermin, particularly dogs and foxes. Other kinds of vermin were also discussed, but the greatest fear of all farmers or stock owners is the danger arising from dogs and foxes. I have obtained some figures, and I find that where the bonus has been reduced the number of dogs caught was also smaller. When the bonus was raised so the number of dogs and fox scalps sent in increased. Up to April, 1934, the bonus on dogs was £2 per head, and in that year no fewer than 12,720 scalps were paid for. The bonus was then reduced to £1, and the number of scalps immediately dropped to 10,801. Since then the number killed has remained more or less stationary in spite of the admittedly large increase in the number of dogs in the different localities. The bonus on foxes in 1935-1936 was 5s., and in that year the num-

ber of scalps sent in was 32,711. In 1936-37, the bonus was reduced to 2s. 6d., and the number killed dropped to 26,889, a fall of 8,000, and this in spite of the great increase in the number of the vermin. Eagles are minor things. The point I wish to make is that in the North where dogs were becoming under control, the pest is now sweeping through the country in waves never previously experienced. On the station in which I have a small interest, and which is 180 miles from Carnarvon, 40 dogs were recently caught by a half-caste who will receive £4 per skin. The road board will contribute £1, the station-owner £2, and the fourth £1 will be paid by the Central Vermin Board. There have never been so many dogs killed on that station for many years. On stations where dogs had never previously been seen the vermin are now making their appearance. The same thing applies to foxes. In places where previously they had never been seen they are now to be found carrying on destruction. The amount of money in the Central Vermin Fund is not sufficient to pay more than the bonus at present given, that is, £1 per dog and 2s. 6d. per fox, and a similar amount for eagles. It was pointed out by the conference which we attended, and at which there were present members of the Central Vermin Board and pastoralists from Wiluna, that money for the payment of the bonus for the destruction of dogs would in some way or other have to be increased. The question arises, how this is to be done. Figures were obtained, and it was found that farmers and graziers since the inception of the vermin tax had paid no less a sum than £260,000 for the destruction of vermin—dogs and foxes. That amount would be in addition to the vermin rate struck by the particular road boards. The Government have never given one penny; no money at all has been allocated from Consolidated Revenue for the destruction of vermin. It was contended at the conference, and rightly so, that the depredations of dogs and foxes had a serious effect on the community as a whole. It was held that the question was definitely a national one, and at least sections of the community other than those concerned should be asked to contribute towards raising the money which is so absolutely essential for doubling the bonus on dogs from £1 to £2, so as to provide approximately £26,000 per annum. If one-

fourth of the land rents could be set aside for this specific purpose, sufficient would be raised to provide the extra money. I understand that a fourth of the land tax would approximate £30,000, and it would also have the effect of securing contributions from sections of the community other than those engaged in agriculture and stock-raising. I hope the Government will give serious consideration to the aspect of providing from the land tax rather than from Consolidated Revenue, funds required for this very necessary purpose. The Victorian Government contribute from Consolidated Revenue roughly £90,000 a year for the destruction of vermin. That Government realise the necessity existing to-day for the destruction of vermin, and I hope something similar will be done by the Western Australian Government. I should like to add that a deputation is being arranged to wait on the Minister for Agriculture as soon as he is able to receive it, to urge the necessity for dealing with this question as soon as possible. I should like to add a few words on borrowing. We are told, and I believe it to be true, that we are very close to a wave of prosperity. I believe we are going to have a period of prosperity the like of which we have not seen for many years, more particularly industrially than in any other way. Everything points to it. Perhaps therefore the time is opportune to express some views on what in my opinion the Government should do in times of prosperity as against times of depression. From 1926 to 1931 the average Australian Government borrowing was £31,000,000 per annum—Commonwealth and States. From 1930 to 1934, our depression years, this dropped to £25,000,000, and the effect, of course, was to intensify the depression. That was very obvious. The depression struck us, and immediately Governments reduced their borrowing by £6,000,000. The Commonwealth at that time was the greatest offender. They curtailed their borrowing for public works from 8.2 millions to £2,000,000, thus throwing on the States the full burden of relieving unemployment. I think the States appreciated that fact at the time. In the States the net loan expenditure dropped from £25,000,000 in 1929-30, to £12,500,000 in 1930-31, and down to 6.2 millions in 1931-32. The point is that when private employment was unable to absorb workers

the Governments were in the same position and they deliberately, through the difficulty of obtaining money and other causes, reduced the amount of their borrowings. The question arises, what then should be the policy of Governments in times of depression? It seems obvious that the Government should endeavour to create an even balance by deliberately curtailing public works in prosperous times; first of all because private enterprise is more able to provide the employment necessary, and secondly it would have the effect of reducing competition for money, and thus help to keep down the rate of interest. In times of depression when private enterprise is unable to provide employment, then should Governments use their utmost to borrow considerably more money for public works, and thus even up the position between prosperity and depression as much as possible.

Hon. H. Seddon: Where are you going to get the money?

Hon. L. CRAIG: It is possible to get it.

Hon. H. Seddon: How?

Hon. L. CRAIG: On the local market.

Hon. H. Seddon: It is not there.

Hon. L. CRAIG: It is. If the Commonwealth Government could have borrowed money during the depression—

Hon. H. Seddon: They borrowed all they were able to borrow.

Hon. L. CRAIG: I do not think so.

Hon. H. Seddon: I am sure of it.

Hon. L. CRAIG: Now there will be a little voice crying in the wilderness about lotteries. I do not object to lotteries in any way. I consider they are doing excellent work and fulfilling a need, but what I object to is definite advertising to encourage people to invest in lotteries. That was never the intention of Parliament, nor should it be the intention of the Government to encourage people to put money into lotteries.

Hon. J. M. Macfarlane: There are people going around the country advocating it.

Hon. L. CRAIG: I have culled two advertisements from the newspapers. One of them, presumably inserted by the Lotteries Commission, reads—

The Wonders of 2s. 6d.

The humble half-crown, alone it's worth thirty pence . . . . What is its probable value when converted into a ticket in No. 53 Charities Consultation? . . . . £2,500, £1,000, £500, £30, £20, or what? . . . . It might become any one of the 2,396 prizes which will be distributed . . . . Any one of them will show a

substantial increase on the original thirty pence. Give your 2s. 6d. a chance to work for you.

There is a direct invitation to people to contribute to lotteries. Such an advertisement would probably have a very serious effect on youths. Seeing an advertisement like that they might be induced to contribute, whereas otherwise they might have no intention of doing so. To insert such an advertisement is quite wrong. Another advertisement reads—

See what 2s. 6d. Might Do.

£2,500 would be a handsome profit on an investment of 2s. 6d. and it is possible for you to obtain that profit by buying a ticket in No. 52 Charities Consultation.

£2,500—why, that would mean the independence you have so long hoped for. Pounds to spend without first counting your pence. Money to invest in a home, a car or a holiday, and still have a sound balance at the bank.

Such advertising is morally wrong. Let us provide for the need for which lotteries were created, but we should stop at this cheap form of advertising to induce people to invest their money when otherwise they probably would not do so. A few days ago I made some inquiries about aborigines, of whom I saw quite a number hanging around the town of Carnarvon, peering into windows. I asked one or two station owners whether they would employ the men and the reply was, "Definitely we would not employ them." Station managers are prepared to employ some natives, but there is a feeling that those hanging around towns are unsuitable for employment. The police, I understand, are doing their work quite well and providing the natives with rations as instructed, but it seems to me that the site for the native camp should be at some distance from the town. When I suggested this to various people, the reply was, "Yes, the camp should be away from the town where there would be some inducement for the natives to go out and perhaps do a certain amount of labour on stations." Obviously there are thousands of foxes and in parts many dogs. I inquired whether natives could be put on to destroying those pests and the reply was, "No, they would not go if they were told to go." Apparently the town is the attraction. My remarks do not apply so much to the older natives or to the grown natives, but the children are becoming loafers and I am afraid they will never receive employment on stations so long as they are given rations and allowed to go indis-

criminately into the town. If this sort of thing is happening at Carnarvon, it is probably happening elsewhere. The camps should be located as far as possible from white settlement so that the instincts of the natives to do something useful might be encouraged. We have excellent boys on one station, boys who are always happy, but they are of quite a different type. As soon as a native comes into contact with a town he seems to deteriorate. If that is so, surely it would be wise to distribute the rations 50 or 60 miles from the town. Motor lorries are being despatched from the towns almost daily, and surely the rations could be forwarded to the camps and the natives kept away from the towns.

Hon. J. J. Holmes: In one town in the North a part of a picture show is set apart for natives.

Hon. L. CRAIG: When natives are on rations they should not be encouraged to remain around a town. At times they obtain liquor, and then they are apt to get into touch with derelict whites and half-caste children are born that become a burden on the Government. While I was in the North I obtained some astounding figures relating to whaling. I do not know to whom the whalers pay a license fee and I believe that they pay only a small sum. I was informed that the whalers were taking £6,000 to £10,000 worth of oil per day off the coast at Carnarvon at present.

Hon. E. H. Angelo: The manager told me they averaged that much.

Hon. L. CRAIG: A 40-ton whale could be treated and turned into oil in 20 minutes, and the catch expected by the two factory ships was 1,000 whales each. So great was the supply of oil being obtained that 300 tons of crude motor spirit was tipped overboard to make room for whale oil. It seemed wrong that probably millions of pounds worth of oil should be taken from Western Australian waters in one year and that all this wealth should go to a foreign country, while all the State obtained was perhaps £3,000 or £4,000 in the shape of license fees.

Hon. E. H. Angelo: I think the fees amount to £1,000.

Hon. L. CRAIG: Does the Chief Secretary know how much the whaling fleet pay by way of license fees?

The Chief Secretary: The amount is very small.

Hon. L. CRAIG: It is wrong that such a colossal amount of wealth should be taken away and that the State should get so little in return. I believe that the whalers fish within the three-mile limit.

Hon. J. J. Holmes: No.

Hon. E. H. Angelo: Yes, they do.

The Chief Secretary: We can only give them a license for territorial waters.

Hon. L. CRAIG: The fact that the Government grant a license for the whalers to fish in territorial waters shows that they do fish there.

Hon. J. J. Holmes: And they are going to turn some of that oil into margarine and sell it to us.

Hon. L. CRAIG: That is so. We should certainly get a larger return from such a lucrative industry. I support the motion.

**HON. C. B. WILLIAMS** (South) [8.40]: I wish to thank you, Mr. President, and Mr. Cornell particularly for having assisted me when I was quite unable to attend to many matters that constituents expect of us. It is pleasing to think that in the course of nine years this was one in which we have not been required to face the expenses of an election. I trust that the result of the election next year will be agreeable. It is certainly sad to see a member pushed out into the cold world after an election, and I for one hope that we shall all be here next year. I should probably not have spoken on this motion but I understand the Government have introduced a Bill to amend the Workers' Compensation Act. There are some features of the existing law relating to miners that I should like to see amended on the lines of the requests presented to the Minister for Mines during his recent visit to the fields. I refer to a widow who secures a lump sum settlement and who can immediately go on the Mine Workers' Relief Fund and draw 30s. a week, whereas another widow who receives her compensation, not in a lump sum but by weekly instalments, has to exhaust the £600 of compensation before she is entitled to benefit under the Mine Workers' Relief Fund. Thus one woman gets £600 in a lump sum plus 30s. a week from the date of payment, while another receives only her weekly allowance. Although I have faith in our magistrates, I do not think it right that a magistrate who deals with these cases should be associated with the Mine Workers' Relief Fund as

chairman. When the law was framed it provided that the resident magistrate should be the one person having the right to award a lump sum or allocate the money at so much per week. The magistrate should not hold a dual position of that kind. He can award Mrs. Jones £600 compensation in a lump sum and as chairman of the Mine Workers' Relief Fund he, representing the Government, is able to tell Mrs. Thomas that she will be paid only so much per week. No man should be placed in a position that will enable him to give money to one person and withhold it from another.

Hon. J. Cornell: The passing of the Mine Workers' Relief Act altered the whole thing.

Hon. C. B. WILLIAMS: That is so. It is a contributory scheme, the State providing one-third of the money. I admit that every widow is not to be entrusted with £600 in cash. In all the cases I have taken before the magistrate, I have endeavoured to do my best for the people concerned and at the same time to let the magistrate know whether they were capable of handling the money, and he has acted accordingly. Reference has been made to preference to unionists. The A.W.U., of which I am senior vice-president in this State, seems to have a lot of stones thrown at it. I agree with those who say that sustenance men should not be required to pay the same amount as miners pay, but we have to function for such men whether they belong to the union or not. The present Government, though a Labour Government, have quite a lot to learn about Labour principles. They do not give the workers very much; they give only what the workers are able to demand. Now as to this preference business. There are 7,000-odd sustenance workers on Government works. The Australian Workers' Union does not possess 2,000 of them. To the end of May that union had 3,100 men in its construction section, which embraces sustenance workers and all other workers in various industries the union controls. In its mining branch the union has 8,000 men. Yet with all these factors we lost £2,000 last year. In fact, if the position does not improve, we shall have to sack three officials at the end of December. Then why all this song? Why not pick other unions? Why always pick the A.W.U.? We have not 2,000 of the 7,000 workers employed by the Government. It would be better for the Opposition in another place to cease making

political capital out of this matter. The fees paid to the Labour Party for services rendered by the Trades Hall would not amount to £60 a year. We have wasted much more than that amount arguing in this House whether the thing is right or wrong. I have been an organiser of the union for years and I know just what compulsory unionism amounts to. I understand the idea behind the Government's policy to-day is that certain big business firms in Perth refuse to allow unions in their business or to allow their employees to become interested in unions.

Members: That is not right.

Hon. J. Cornell: It would be better to tackle the question on those lines.

Hon. C. B. WILLIAMS: I understand the Ford works do not allow the employment of union men, except fitters, even in this town. I understand that a large electrical firm called Charles Atkins and Co. do not allow trade unionists into certain sections of their business.

Hon. J. Cornell: I do not think it is a question of wages there.

Hon. C. B. WILLIAMS: It is not a question of wages there or anywhere. Mr. Cornell knows that. He knows all about that phase. It is a question of union shops having to provide union conditions and union wages. Union shops have to pay top wages.

Hon. J. M. Macfarlane: But the awards are there.

Hon. C. B. WILLIAMS: I am only going on information I have received from the unions. Letters have been quoted, probably from "C" class men. At present I myself am a "C" class man. As regards the letters Mr. Thomson read out, I said the writer of them was a liar, because when money is deducted from one's pay one gets an acknowledgment. When I gave permission to deduct money from my pay, I always knew the reason for the deduction. The A.W.U. ask that certain men should pay 25s. spread over a period of three months. There has been no demand for one payment of 25s., but for half-crown instalments. For that the men have the protection of the union. Once a man gets a ticket from the A.W.U., whether he is working on sustenance or in any other capacity, the ticket for 12 months holds good throughout Australia, and not only in the city of Perth. It gives the holder the

right to work in a mine here or in the Queensland canefields. He is asked to pay 6d. a week for his trade unionism. The time has arrived when the Government should put the unemployed on full time; that is, those of the unemployed who are eligible to work for full time. The "C" class men should be referred to the State Charities Department for sustenance. We should not tax the country to send men on jobs and do work which when done by them costs £8 or £10 whereas it should cost only £4 or £5. I am referring to the Norseman pipeline as an example. Hon. members say the depression has passed, but the present Government must understand that thousands of people are out of work in Perth and preferring to live in Perth on the dole while other people have to go into the mining industry and sacrifice their health. Young men have left the farms because their fathers have gone broke or because of the banks restricting overdrafts. The young men have had to go to the mines to work. This country is asked to carry thousands of people hanging around Perth on the dole. Those people must be satisfied to do so, or they would not remain in that position for 24 hours. I do not believe in the Government hand-feeding and spoon-feeding hundreds of people who will not leave the city. Part-time should be cut out and full-time at full rates of pay should be made available for people able to do that work. Those unable to do it should remain on the charity of the State, where they were prior to the depression. It is deplorable to see thousands of young men tramping the country unable to get work. This Council should do its part by the country. This Council should pass industrial legislation which will give satisfaction to the majority of the men and women suffering in Western Australia. The House has been blamed for not passing industrial legislation. I trust that during this session the Council will not refuse to pass such legislation, or if the House does refuse I hope the Labour Party will have stomach enough to take the Council on. No long speeches, but go to the country on the question whether the wings of the Council shall be clipped. We members of the Labour Party are supposed to come here with one purpose only, to abolish the Legislative Council. The Government look upon Mr. Fraser as the white-haired boy of the Upper House. Mr. Fraser is always chosen

to move the adoption of the Address-in-reply. Perhaps I am a bit jealous of the hon. member. We both came here together, and on six occasions the hon. member has been chosen to move the Address. All the Governments of Western Australia should be ashamed of themselves to know the number of people, and particularly young men, seeking food and work. The present Administration is supposed to be a working-class Government. If the workers cannot get a fair deal from the Labour Party to which they contribute their cash, their work, and their loyal support in season and out of season, the time will come, and come speedily, when the Labour Party will go out of existence. It is only the sheer loyalty of the workers who have stuck to the Labour Party and are sticking to the Government now that keeps Labour in office. The Labour Party is content to remain in office with a majority of only one. We should cry out because Labour members stay in office with a majority of one while there are thousands of workers unemployed and thousands receiving merely the dole of 30s. to 33s. a week. Eight years ago Mr. Baxter introduced into this Chamber taxation which those of us who were loyal to the workers opposed strenuously here. But the workers still have legislation which inflicts that taxation upon them, taxation imposed at the instance of a National Government. We swore this taxation was not for the benefit of the people. Yet members of the Labour Party have to witness this same taxation placed on the backs of the workers at the present time. I trust that this year the emergency tax will be abandoned. I notice that an hon. member has asked a question about the amounts collected through the gold profits tax and the emergency tax. The taxation on gold amounts to very little more than the emergency taxation. The Government of this country should be ashamed to tax the workers at only a few thousand pounds less than the tax on gold production. When gold-mining was down and out, both the State Government and the Federal Government gave a lot of assistance to keep the industry alive. Now that the industry has had four or five very prosperous years, there is no reason why it should not pay its share of the taxation of the State in order to help the farmers who are down and out, with debts of thousands of pounds around their necks.

Hon. J. Cornell: We should drop the tax and take part of the premium.

Hon. C. B. WILLIAMS: That is what we should do. I got to that stage of opinion quite a long while ago. We are supposed—supposed, I say—to represent a party which believes in the socialisation of industry. In another place recently one hon. member complained about the pies and the other food in the railway refreshment rooms. Were the Labour Party honest in their attempt to put into effect their policy of socialisation of industry, here is a direction in which, in a small way, they could commence the work. They could socialise the service on the railways so far as the dining cars and refreshment rooms are concerned. But evidently there is someone very much stronger than the Government, or the Government would not endure the ridicule heaped upon them not only by people in Western Australia but by people from other parts. There must be more graft in the Railway Department than one would conceive possible. I drew attention once before in this House to what happened at Kalgoorlie in regard to Peter's Ice Cream Company and a man named Jack Hehir. I pointed out how the share list showed that the Commissioner and the Secretary of Railways, and somebody named Hickey who was then on the Transport Board, had more shares in that company than anyone outside could get. Concessions were refused to the man Hehir who was going to start an ice-cream works. When he began those works, concessions were given the next day to Peter's Ice Cream Company in which all those railway officials were shareholders. If that sort of thing was done then, it is done now, and I want to know who is behind the present tenderer who got the concessions on the railways. It is a standing disgrace that a party which is supposed to believe in the socialisation of industry have not socialised the control of the refreshment rooms, although the railways themselves are socialised. It is a disgrace that they have not got a man capable of conducting this service, but have given it to someone who learnt how to make pies when the war was on, and treats us accordingly. I have had letters from the police and the railway people and others regarding superannuation. I know the usual excuse will be made for the failure to provide a measure along these lines—the excuse that it is a Commonwealth matter. Everything seems to be a Commonwealth matter,



but we should take some steps in this State to introduce some method of superannuation, not only for the Civil Service but also for the public generally. The miners pay quite a lot of money out of their wages—4s. 6d. to 5s. a pay—for practically no benefits whatever; just medical attention and mine workers' relief. That scheme could be elaborated and the workers asked to pay a lot more than that so that there would be some insurance against sickness, unemployment, etc.

Hon. J. Cornell: Contributions to friendly societies from the miners would bear inspection too.

Hon. C. B. WILLIAMS: That is so. I have here a pamphlet entitled "The A.W.U. Policy." It deals with "insurance against all sicknesses, also personal accidents during non-working hours." It is issued by the Australia Provincial Assurance Association, Limited. I suppose the A.W.U. would say that they had nothing to do with it, which is true. I draw attention to the matter to show how alive these people are to the possibilities, and what big mugs they think the men are when they ask them to pay £2 12s. a year for the benefits offered. It does, however, show the openings which must exist for a superannuation scheme, not only for civil servants but for all workers in this State. These people asked the 8,000 miners to contribute about £20,000 a year, on the basis set out for practically no benefits whatever, because of the fact that the Government take no interest whatever so far as I can see, except to see whether they can hang on to office till the end of their term. Some of the members of the Ministry are getting old, and all of them have got the superstitious idea that the Labour Government cannot last any longer than six years, that the swing of the pendulum must come, and out they will go, but that the same old team will come back three years later. There are 21 or 22 safe seats in the Assembly for the Labour Party and there are about eight to ten doubtful. We have just enough to make a majority. It is only a majority of two, but a majority of two should not stultify any Government's efforts to improve the lot of the people they represent. It is a good majority. A majority of any description is a good one, and we have no right to sit down and

eke out our time just mouthing words. I hope the Government will not introduce that iniquitous tax which members have pointed out hit people out of the metropolitan area harder than anyone. The people on the goldfields have to pay 33 per cent., or one-third of their income in rent, against 25 per cent. in Perth. Yet the basic wage earner on the goldfields has to pay taxes which the basic wage earners in Mr. Fraser's constituency do not pay. I hope the Labour Party will not be brought to heel again in this Chamber through a proposal to exempt ministers of religion from the financial emergency tax. Whoever put that suggestion forward should be chastised. It was an awful shame, an insult to people's intelligence. Which ministers of religion support the Labour Party? I have found them generally opposed to the Labour Party. There is one section of the religious community which wants the State to pay for its schools. The others are generally more or less on the side of the capitalist. One does not know where one is with ministers of religion in politics. I consider that the Labour Party should keep clear of parsons of any denomination at all. I saw that some of them objected that they had not requested the Government to exempt them from payment of the tax. So much to their glory. It is appalling, however, to think that the Labour Party should exempt the parsons and priests with fat livings, and tax the poor devils who have to go underground and sweat their eyebrows off, risk their lives, and face certain death when they are from 35 to 47 years old. I suppose I have to take my share of the blame because I was not at the caucus meeting when that was discussed. If I had been I would have dropped dead, but I imagine the party got such a towelling from this conservative Upper House on the last occasion that the attempt to introduce such a clause will not be made again. If my voice could stop it, the proposal would not get as far as this House. I hope that the Government will carry out their election promises to the workers and will endeavour to carry them out faster than they are doing. It is no good the Government getting rid of legislation by passing it on to this Chamber where it will be thrown out, and then sitting back and pointing to the wonderful things they have done. They have done nothing of the kind. The members of the Government, as far as

I see them, are more or less capitalistically inclined. I do not want it to be understood that I am the only johnny in step, but the Premier must be placed in that category. He became a shareholder in a mining company. He was quite entitled to do what he did. Nobody who believes in socialisation of industry wants to make money out of shares, but those people profess to believe in socialisation, and then buy shares and unload them. That is the idea of shares dealing. They must be bought as cheaply as possible, and unloaded on to someone else. Any leader of the Labour movement who is out to make wealth is not a true Labourite, and workers can hope for nothing from men of that calibre. No man who believes in socialisation of industry can be out to obtain money from investment. How is such money made? Somebody has to work to make interest. It does not befit a Labour man to have slaves working for him in order to bring in interest. The Labour movement is all right, but the point is that the leaders are not genuine. They are supposed to stand for socialisation of industry. They represent nothing of the kind. They adopt get-rich-quick methods. I desire now to speak on the burning question of consumption of liquor on the goldfields. I have been challenged to a debate with a man belonging to the Church of Christ, but I have a single-track mind and so has he on the drink question, and so there is not much chance of our reaching agreement. The last person in the world anybody with any sense at all would debate with is a parson, because he has a one-track mind. He does not mix with people as others do. In his own sphere he is respected, but as soon as he is outside that sphere he is in deep water. Ministers of religion have plenty to do on the goldfields towards helping to improve the lives of people. I believe that laws should not be broken. If the law is not sound the Government of the country should have backbone enough despite any opposition, to amend it. I have spent the greatest part of my life on the goldfields, and I did not drink until I was 35 years of age. Hotels do not worry me now except that I sometimes meet others there in friendly spirit. One is friendly at the start, and there are times when one gets a little more convivial, but one is alive and enjoying oneself, and we should all realise that life is short, and we should get what enjoyment

we can while we are here. Men drank in the goldfields 27 years ago to a far greater degree than they do to-day. The result was that people were stationed at those hotels watching for the police. As soon as the police came along everybody got out, but when the police moved off they all went in again, some of them perhaps to get drunk. But now we have had a commonsense administration of the laws for many years past, and so that old state of affairs has gone, and whenever now any hotel does not obey the police, there is something doing. We are in this position: I do not say the people of the goldfields should get drink on Sundays and that the people of Perth and of the country districts should not have that privilege. I say that all who want it should be allowed to have a drink on Sundays. At present one can get a drink at Kalgoorlie, but only until 6 o'clock in the evening. After that one cannot get a drink, except he be one of the favoured few. The club members, men from Hannans Club and other clubs, can get a drink, just as club members in Perth can get a drink on Sundays. So it is sheer hypocrisy to say that men on the goldfields can get a drink on Sundays, whereas men in Perth cannot. Practically one-third of the surface workers on the mines work every day in the week, and on Sundays three shifts around. It must be remembered that one-seventh of the production of gold in Kalgoorlie is produced on Sundays. The men are paid extra for their work on Sundays. While men have to work on Sundays the parsons do not object to that, do not object to the men having to work all day Sundays. There are at least 20 or 30 shafts at Kalgoorlie, and these take a number of men three shifts to see that the shafts are all in good condition. Those men work on Sundays, and there are other men up there who work on the Sundays. There is, generally speaking, a skeleton staff working on Sundays for all essential services. Of course I do not say that the mines are essential services, except for their wealth production. When the Arbitration Court award doubled the pay for work on Sundays, the mines closed on Sundays. I challenge any Government to say that so many men working right through on Sundays are not entitled to get a pot of beer without being branded as criminals for it. My challenge is there, and if I live a bit longer and there comes

another election my challenge probably will be put into effect. Thirty-odd years ago, when the term "wowser" was first coined, as it was then, so it is to-day: hypocrites they were and hypocrites they are to-day. I believe in the faith of my fathers, but those ministers in the Protestant Churches have driven thousands from those churches. It is an insult to my intelligence to know that my parents and my brothers and sisters are buried in the Church of Christ burial ground, and then that low-down pastor declares that he would be a common informer. I believe that all the others have dissociated themselves from that declaration. I trust the Government will introduce a measure that will allow us in Kalgoorlie to be honest with ourselves. Personally I do not have a Sunday drink once in a blue moon, but those who are working hard up there in that warm climate and who feel that they want a drink when they knock off, surely they should be entitled to get it. I will challenge anybody to say there is as much drunkenness in Kalgoorlie to-day as there was 30 years ago. It is nonsense to speak of men up there spending all their money in drink. I say that up there we have some of the best-dressed men and women in the State. The story is told that one man up there burst through drinking too much water and eating too much cake, while it has been held that our lunatic asylums are built up to accommodate religious cranks. I have said all I wish, except to declare definitely that if the Government will not introduce a Bill to allow of limited Sunday trade, I purpose bringing down such a Bill in this House. Certainly I will test the feeling of this House if the Government refuse to introduce a measure that will satisfy the needs, not only of the goldfields people, but of all sensible people in Western Australia. We don't want a man to be branded as a criminal because he has a pot of beer on Sundays. There are the tea-drinking cranks and the ginger-ale drinking cranks, so why should not a man who wants a pot of beer be allowed to get it?

Hon. J. M. Macfarlane interjected.

Hon. C. B. WILLIAMS: There are many Seventh Day Adventists in this country, and their Sabbath of course is not on our Sunday. However, that is not proof that

they are the only correct Christians in the State. It is all very well to say that the Seventh Day Adventist does not drink on Saturday, but perhaps he has his drink on our Sunday.

Hon. J. Cornell: We require to include the Jews in any such legislation.

Hon. C. B. WILLIAMS: I do not know that they have a Sabbath at all. However, the time has gone by when the wowsers of this community should govern and direct the sensible people of the community. Let them stick to their religion and try to keep their own people to the kirk which their fathers thought was the right kirk. I am pleased to say that when the deputation was taken to the Minister, not one of the 13 members of Parliament from the goldfields was asked to lead it.

Hon. G. B. Wood: Who led it?

Hon. C. B. WILLIAMS: A very honourable gentleman who would perhaps get lost in Hannan-street, and certainly would get lost in Boulder. He is a gentleman who has never seen the goldfields as we see them.

Hon. J. Nicholson: I think I was there before you.

Hon. C. B. WILLIAMS: Still to-day you would get lost in Hannan-street and in Boulder also. However, they asked the hon. gentleman to lead the deputation, and he fell for it. That was due to his characteristic courtesy. But the strange thing was that when the Chamber of Mines wanted somebody to move to disallow certain regulations here, they asked the hon. gentleman to lead the band, and he kindly did so. I do not know whether the parsons, when they wanted a man for the purpose, consulted the Chamber of Mines, and were perhaps referred to the Hon. J. Nicholson.

Hon. J. Cornell: You know that Scotsmen never refuse.

Hon. C. B. WILLIAMS: I know we have not much opportunity to refuse them. However, of all the 13 members of Parliament representing the goldfields, including you, Mr. President, none was asked to lead that deputation. I trust that if the Government will not alter the law, they will not alter the administration of the existing law. I remember when the Mitchell Government came into power. Many years earlier than that one could get a drink from 6 in the morning till 11 at night, or any other time. However, that was stopped. The late Mr. Harris and I informally waited upon the

late Mr. T. L. Davy, who was then Attorney-General in the Nationalist Government, and asked him not to curtail one or two little privileges that were enjoyed on the goldfields. We met him on the railway station at Kalgoorlie, and we asked him to have a pot of beer on the station. He said, "You cannot get beer here on a Sunday!" We showed him that we could and did. He said, "By Jove, I do not see any reason why this custom should be stopped." And it was not stopped. It lasted all the years that that Government lasted, and the people of the goldfields were not harassed about it. To-day there is a good bitumen road running from Kalgoorlie to Coolgardie, a distance of 24 miles. It means about a 25-minutes drive. There is a similar drive of 12 miles to Kurrawang, another drive of 12 miles to Kanowna, and a drive of 24 miles to Bulong, all on perfectly good roads, and all complying with the bona fide traveller provision. Yet the parsons of Kalgoorlie want the people to have the law obeyed or restricted. Hundreds go to Coolgardie. Most of them are travellers who are entitled to get a drink. If the Act was enforced taxis would run to these places, and we would have worse drinking than we have ever seen on the goldfields. There would also be sly grog shops. One of the most remarkable things about the business is that the parsons had to get financial backing. We understand that a number of people have gallon licences and that the parsons took money from them to enforce the closing of hotels on Sunday so that the holders of gallon licenses might sell their beer by the gallon on Saturdays. These are the people who are linking up with the parsons, men who admit they have put money into this campaign to finance two religious fanatics to come to Perth and dictate what people should drink on the goldfields. They themselves drink that concoction called tea which comes from filthy nigger countries where the niggers are suffering from cancer, leprosy, and other diseases. Instead of drinking that stuff, we could drink the wine of the country that comes from grapes grown on clean Christian soil. Notwithstanding that, we have these "wowseristic" impudent hypocrites who want to say what we should drink, that drink being that which comes from nigger races in the Far

East. If I meet a friend and he wants a cup of tea, we have a cup of tea, but if he wants beer we have beer. We are better friends and come to a better understanding if it is beer, and we always meet again. Mr. Holmes and I have not yet solved the question of leadership despite the "Westralian Worker" and the Labour Party generally. I thank members for their patient hearing.

**HON. H. SEDDON** (North-East) [9.34]: I have not had much time in which to prepare the remarks I have to make. There have been the usual references to the value of the Address-in-reply. Certain members have spoken of it as a waste of time. I do not hold that view. If there is one thing it does, it is to provide an opportunity for a free expression of opinion on every subject under the sun. It is a very valuable privilege. It would certainly be valued by those people I speak of if they ever lost it. We have only to compare the position of affairs in a free country like this with the position of affairs obtaining in other countries where freedom of expression is not only repressed, but where deliberate misrepresentation is the policy of the Government, to realise how valuable such a privilege is. Those members who attack the debate on the Address-in-reply are attacking one of the foundation stones of parliamentary government, in that if they had their way they would be limiting discussion on matters of public importance. We have all read of the effect of the suppression of truth in countries like Germany, Russia and Italy. We can only form an idea of the extent to which things have gone when we see some of the literature which is circulating under the authority of the Government of those countries. I would take the illustration even closer. In one of the States of the Commonwealth there is only one House of Parliament. In that State things are done which could never be done in this State where Parliament comprises two Houses. In that State things are entirely in the hands of the Government. When it comes to voicing an opinion or expressing an idea on matters of public import, if the Government so desire they can stifle the opposition. The closure is applied and that is the end of the discussion. With regard to proposals that are placed before the people, some things are brought forward and tolerated that would not be put up with here. I have an illustration of that statement. Under the

legislation of that State there is a system of dealing with hospitals which are controlled by district hospital boards. The boards consist of nine persons, four who are elected by the local authorities of the district covered by the board, and five who are nominated by the Government. The board determines the policy, and has the right to raise by means of special rates funds for the establishment and maintenance of hospitals. I was told of one district which is far away from the capital where a proposal was advanced for the building of a hospital costing £52,000. The four representatives of the local bodies strongly objected to such an expenditure being foisted upon the people. They were, however, overruled by the five Government nominees, and the district is now committed to the erection of that hospital. That is the kind of thing that occurs where there is only one House of Parliament and no Chamber which has the right to review and criticise and to amend such laws as are brought forward by a popular Government. This House has been criticised for its attitude on certain industrial Bills. Some were rejected on the second reading, and some I would have been glad to see carried a little further and reviewed in Committee with a view to amendment. At any rate there is one point which ought to be borne in mind, namely that it does not necessarily follow that because a Bill is brought forward by the Government it is the last word on the question, even though that be an industrial question. Many things are brought forward at the instigation frequently of minorities in the industrial world in the endeavour to place them on the statute book, but which a majority of the workers when the full sense of the proposed step is explained to them, would strongly oppose being placed on the statute book. So long as the attitude of this House is maintained from the standpoint of the best interests of the whole community, so long will it be carrying out its duty, and where it falls short of that high ideal so far will it be imperilling its position as a Chamber of review and criticism. Some of the contentions contained in the Speech are open to criticism. One paragraph says it is anticipated that the revenue for the coming year will suffer a reduction because of the lower income received from production last year. It also says it will be necessary to continue the expenditure on drought relief, etc. When

I last spoke I did not have the benefit of the complete figures for the year just closed. I wish now to make certain remarks concerning that paragraph. If members will refer to the statistics published from week to week showing the bank clearances they will see that for the expired portion of the year the bank clearances were higher than they were last year. That state of affairs has continued for some time. As these clearances are a good indication of the activities in the commercial sphere, they indicate so far as the progress of the country is concerned, that the State is continuing in the right direction. There are other figures to which I would refer in support of my contention that the Government have no reason to expect a reduction in revenue for the coming year, but rather have reason to expect an increase in revenue. If members will refer to the proceeds from the hospital tax from year to year they will observe that these have increased very considerably. That being an indication to some extent of the national income, the argument is that that income, which is the income on which taxation this year will be based, should yield a higher return than that received last year from the previous year's income. Although I do not contend that the national income can be entirely deduced from the proceeds of the hospital tax, I maintain that the increase represents an indication of the national income. If we take the proceeds of this tax and multiply them by 160, we will see that it is a very good indication of the national income. We have to remember, too, that the exemption under the hospital tax is no more than £1, and very little income therefore is lost by means of that exemption. The national income calculated on this basis has risen from 21½ millions in 1932 to 37½ millions in 1937. If we accept that as a criterion of the national income, the national income for the year ended 30th June, 1936, was £33,000,000, calculated on this basis, and for the year 1937 it was 37½ million pounds. There is a very strong indication there that the income for the Government in the year to come will be very considerably more than it was last year. When speaking on the Supply Bill I said that the Government had nothing to complain about on the score of revenue. The revenue they received last year, even allowing for the reduction in the Commonwealth contributions, was higher than

the revenue they calculated on receiving. How well they actually did is more plainly indicated when we consider the figures which have been placed before us for the whole year. It was very interesting to take notice of the figures supplied to the member for Avon (Mr. Boyle) in the Legislative Assembly with regard to the hospital tax. That is a tax in that it is a burden on the public. It was shown that while the hospital tax was £234,599 for the last financial year, the expenditure on hospitals was something over £20,000 short of that amount. Although the expenditure under that heading was overdrawn at the beginning of the year, when we get the complete figures before us, they will prove very interesting. I think it will be found that the Government will have a considerable margin on the right side with regard to the hospital tax as compared with hospital expenditure. Again, the Government have benefited considerably in making provision for hospitals because of the contributions from the Lotteries Commission, which have relieved them of a considerable amount of expenditure that they could have been expected to undertake from Government funds. Again, there is the gold profits tax. The figures supplied to me as being the 1937 receipts from that tax, namely £89,000, show that the Government are securing a very handsome recoup compared with the amount they have spent in assisting sufferers from miners' phthisis. The amount charged regarding miners' phthisis, apart from that incurred, and paid, by the State Insurance Office for 1936 was £57,600, and the amount received from the gold profits tax was £77,000. For the financial year that has just closed, payments on account of miners' phthisis, after deducting the amount that the Government received from the State Insurance Office, was £55,000 whereas the receipts from the gold profits tax were £89,000. It must be remembered that payments on account of miners' phthisis are diminishing each year, because the Act no longer sanctions any further responsibility, and mining cases that arise from time to time are now dealt with under the Mine Workers' Relief Fund and industrial insurance. Certainly, the Government contributions to the Mine Workers' Relief Fund have increased steadily since 1934, but even taking that into consideration, the Government are showing a handsome margin on the right side in consequence of

the receipts from the gold profits tax. Then there is the question of the Goldfields Water Supply. The figures concerning that undertaking are very interesting, especially to people residing on the fields. For many years the Government have argued that the water supply operations are not paying, and they have indicated that a considerable amount was owing to Consolidated Revenue. Although that statement, as it stands, is correct, it must be remembered that the Metropolitan Water Supply undertaking has benefited very considerably from the Goldfields Water Supply scheme, from the standpoint of the quantity of water the former has been able to draw each year for the absurd sum of £2,500. That works out at something under 3d. per thousand gallons, whereas the minimum price charged for water on the fields is 2s. 6d. per thousand gallons.

Hon. C. G. Elliott: It is 7s. 6d. per thousand to the mines.

Hon. H. SEDDON: Yes, but the lowest charge on the fields is 2s. 6d. per thousand. Thus, water from the goldfields scheme has been given year after year to the metropolitan scheme at a fixed price of under 3d. per thousand gallons.

Hon. C. G. Elliott: They are on a pretty good wicket.

Hon. H. SEDDON: Had the minimum charge applicable on the goldfields been levied in respect of that water, there would have been a profit shown instead of the deficit since its inception. The figures for 1936 indicate that, even allowing for working expenses, interest and sinking fund charges, the scheme last year, allowing also for the fact that supplies had been made available at 3d. per thousand gallons, the undertaking shows a surplus of £22,000. The figures we have had placed before us regarding last year's operations indicate that there should be a very much greater surplus on the operations of the water scheme. Whereas revenue from water supplies for 1936 totalled £234,400, the revenue this year, according to the figures available from the "Government Gazette," was £286,200. Whereas the working expenses last year totalled £114,400, those for this year represent £120,300. Interest and sinking fund payments for last year represented £104,000, leaving a surplus of £22,000. The total difference between the working expenses and receipts this year is £166,500, and

there should be a good balance on the right side from the operations of this scheme. I quote those figures to show that, from the standpoint of revenue, the Government have displayed sound judgment, and are doing very well indeed. But when we turn to the expenditure, we find there is ground for criticism. A little while ago I quoted figures dealing with the expenditure, and a closer analysis indicates that one of the greatest increases under that heading occurred under the Treasury, "Miscellaneous Services" costing £605,900 in 1936, and £751,600 in 1937. With regard to public works and buildings, the cost in 1936 was £88,500, and in 1937 £103,335. An increased expenditure of £50,000 is disclosed with regard to the Education Department, and something like £12,000 increase on account of public health expenditure. Agriculture generally accounts for an increased expenditure of £12,000, the railways for an increased expenditure of £190,000, and electricity supply an increased expenditure of £29,000.

The Chief Secretary: Are you suggesting we should have had increased expenditure in previous years?

Hon. H. SEDDON: I suggest that had the same control been exercised over expenditure this year as was exercised last year, the deficit of £371,000 would not have been recorded.

The Chief Secretary: What do you mean by "control"?

Hon. H. SEDDON: The items of expenditure I have referred to require a considerable amount of explanation. When we read in the Lieut.-Governor's Speech that the causes regarded as responsible for last year's deficit are the reduction in the Federal grant by £300,000 and increased expenditure arising from the drought, it is hard to reconcile those statements with the figures I have quoted from Government accounts. They certainly require considerable explanation, much more than we have had so far, to enable us to deal with them. I have shown that the national income has increased year by year, and the figures relating to bank clearances indicate considerable activity in business generally compared with the preceding year. All this indicates that the Government are doing very well with regard to revenue, but apparently the more revenue they receive, the greater expenditure they embark upon. When it comes to a question of departmental expenditure, there is one

department to which I desire to refer, because it appears to me that it has not received anything like its proportion of benefit from the Government's generosity, nor has it received anything like the consideration it is entitled to from the application of Government policy. There was a time when the policy regarding nurses in Government hospitals was nothing short of a disgrace to any Government, and particularly to a Labour Government. That was until the time the nurses secured an award governing their conditions. Until then, despite repeated representations, both in this Chamber and outside, with regard to the hours worked by the girls and the wages they received, Governments failed to remedy the position, especially Governments that advocated Labour principles.

The Chief Secretary: This House cannot take any credit for that change.

Hon. H. SEDDON: Yes, it can. This House repeatedly drew attention to the conditions under which the girls were working, and urged Governments to give consideration to that phase in times of prosperity. However, the department to which I wish to refer as being entitled to far more consideration from the Government than has been apparent for a long time, is the Police Department. The time has arrived when the Government might well turn their attention to that section of the Government service, and give more consideration to their employees there. That is particularly so if we are to be guided by the circular that, I presume, other members have received as well as myself. There is one grievance the officials of the Police Department have that I think is well founded and certainly demands investigation. I refer to the question of promotions. I am given to understand that promotions are determined by the Promotions Board, which consists of inspectors in the Police Department. While promotions are determined by that board, apparently the claims of all those entitled to promotion are not considered in the matter. A preliminary selection is made, and the board adjudicates upon such applications as are placed before them. That, in my opinion, leaves the position open to a state of affairs that is certainly not desirable. The officer does not know whether his claim for promotion has had fair consideration: his claim may not have gone

forward for consideration by the Promotions Board. The police have requested for a considerable time that this method of promotion should be revised, and an opportunity given for all claims for consideration to be reviewed. There is another matter that demands urgent attention from the Government. I refer to the conditions that apply to members of the police force injured in the course of their duties. We all recognise the important functions performed by the police, and appreciate the fact that they carry out their duties with tact and discretion. When we read of the treatment those men receive when anything happens to them in the course of their duty, we can only come to the conclusion that it is no credit to any Government. In the circular it is pointed out that in the event of a man being killed in the course of his duties, his widow or dependants are entitled to receive a special gratuity of a maximum of one year's pay. When members realise that if a man is killed in a mine or on the railway line in the course of his employment, he is entitled to receive up to £600 under the provisions of the Workers' Compensation Act, they will appreciate the differential treatment. Again, a constable who joined the force in April, 1920, had his police career terminated at the age of 37 years through injuries received on duty, his wife and three children being dependent on him. This man was practically crippled for life and he received 16½ months' pay—for which he had contributed, I think, £376—and a special gratuity of £278 compensation.

Hon. J. NICHOLSON: He did not get back the whole of the amount he paid in over a period.

Hon. H. SEDDON: The greater part of his compensation for injuries which practically terminated his police career gave him back his own contribution to the superannuation fund. Then there was another case of a constable whose death occurred recently at 51 years of age. The Government Medical Officer certified that his death was hastened through injuries sustained on duty. His widow received £100 over and above the ordinary gratuity. Other instances are quoted here, but members have seen them, and I do not wish to read them, although they indicate very clearly the position of the men in the police force. That position is certainly due

for revision, and there should also be provision made for strengthening the superannuation fund. When a man has received injuries in the course of his duty, he should get at least as much compensation as would be awarded him under the Workers' Compensation Act, rather than being left to the existing conditions. Now there is another question, a somewhat unpleasant one. To-night I have sat in this Chamber and listened to remarks that do not bring credit to any hon. member. They could only be explained on the theory that the speaker was carried away by his personal feelings. But I think a man should be more careful to recognise qualities in people who at any rate do stand for high ideals of personal conduct. I am prepared to give credit to the ministers of religion for having brought forward publicly certain violations of the law. It is greatly to be regretted that the argument that has taken place in regard to the action of those ministers should have been all round the question and wide of the mark, which is as to whether the law is or is not to be enforced. If it is thought desirable in the interests of the community, and at the request of a large section of the community, that the law should be amended, well and good, but there has been no outcry, no public request, that the law in this case should be amended. What they brought under the notice of the Minister of the Crown was not so much the question of Sunday trading as the fact that the law was being openly flouted, and nothing was being done to suppress that. That is the point that has been lost sight of in the discussions for and against the action of the ministers. There is an argument, supported by some public opinion, an argument that the law should be amended and that a certain amount of trading should be allowed on the Sunday. I have nothing to say now about that; except that I should like members to view it from the standpoint of the work they are doing and the responsibility that devolves upon them as law makers. If members are going to determine their public policy by the fact that sufficient people flout and set the law at defiance, how far are members going? It appears to me that once we acknowledge that that is the principle governing our legislation, it will not be long before there are sufficient people defiant enough to defy any



law—and that will be the end of all law. I want briefly to refer to the effect on the community of this flouting of our laws. Where the people, especially the young people, see a law set aside and flouted and laughed at, can it be wondered at that those young people on reaching maturity have not the sense of responsibility that they would have had had they been brought up in a community where the law was respected? That is all I have to say on this question, but I do regret certain expressions made in this Chamber to-night touching men whose lives stand out as examples of devotion to high ideals, men who, after all, are living on a pittance which very few men would undertake unless they were inspired by high ideals. I can only deplore the references that have been made to those men in the course of the debate to-night. Now a very important question to the people of the goldfields is that of silicosis. There has been a lot of references to the fact that silicosis has effected a very considerable toll on the lives and health of the people engaged in our mining industry. I want to refer to-night to a table published by Dr. Moore, the doctor in charge of the laboratory at Kalgoorlie. The table refers to the number of men who have passed through the laboratory at Kalgoorlie, but does not include the men dealt with by the travelling laboratory. The figures disclosed are very interesting. They show a considerable improvement in the incidence of the disease. The improvements made have been most encouraging, and the doctor points out that the incidence of T.B. in our mining population is now very little, if anything, above the incidence of T.B. in the organised community. When it comes to silicosis the figures show the effects on people who have worked for a large number of years in our mines. They indicate that out of 4,231 persons examined in 1933 only .2 per cent. were reported as suffering from silicosis; whereas in 1930 the percentage of sufferers was 3.3 per cent. That is a considerable improvement and it is contended that the conditions of the mines have been so improved that the danger of infection has been greatly reduced. This is a state of affairs that should give every satisfaction to people who are concerned with the welfare of the men in the mining industry. The doctor, I understand, presented a paper which was read at the Medical Congress held in Adelaide last week, in which he carried his experience much further. I

strongly recommend the Government to obtain a copy of the paper because I believe certain deductions were made that will have a material bearing on the future of men engaged in the mining industry. The doctor has certainly shown that under ordinary conditions the effect of dust is very slow, but, on the other hand, there are certain conditions where the effect of dust is considerably accelerated and the working life of the man is materially shortened. There is however, one development in this world-wide attack on silicosis that I should like to bring under the notice of the Government. In other parts of the world silicosis is regarded as a very serious complaint in the mining industry, and in the Dominion of Canada there has been a special investigation and a line of special medical research into silicosis with the idea of bringing about its prevention. I quote from "The Manchester Guardian Commercial" of the 23rd July, 1937, an article entitled "The Fight Against Silicosis; a New Line of Attack."

Latest developments in the battle against silicosis have been the result of experiments conducted by J. J. Denny, Metallurgical Engineer for McIntyre Porcupine Mines, Ltd.; W. B. Robson, Chief Surgeon of McIntyre Porcupine Mines, Ltd.; and Dudley A. Irwin, Associate Professor, Department of Medical Research, University of Toronto, together with the assistance of Sir Frederick Banting, of insulin fame, who was engaged by the experimenters in a consulting capacity.

The cause of silicosis, in South Africa and the United States as well as in Canada, is the inhalation of fine, freshly broken particles of quartz into the lungs, where, experimenters have determined, a chemical reaction is set up through the dissolving of the silica in the body fluid, causing fibrotic changes in the lungs, which in turn may predispose the victim to tuberculosis. In common with other Canadian mining companies, McIntyre Porcupine has been conducting an independent investigation of the problem for some time. In November, 1932, 50 guinea pigs were placed in the crusher house tunnel of the mill, where a considerable quantity of fine dust containing 35 per cent. free silica was being constantly produced. Rabbits also were used.

Various elements and compounds were investigated, and on 4th March, 1936, it was discovered that small amounts of metallic aluminium, introduced into the dust, almost completely prevented the silicious material from passing into solution and setting up the chemical reaction which is the important factor in creating a silicotic condition of the lungs.

So interesting have been the results that the experiments with animals have recently been removed from the McIntyre mine to the Banting Institute at Toronto. Just how the new

discovery will be given practical application is a problem that has not yet been worked out.

It is very interesting to note the result of experiments in other parts of the world in dealing with silicosis and to find a line of investigation which might materially benefit the men engaged in the industry. I trust that the progress of the State in the current year will be substantial. From the figures before us there is every possibility of a prosperous year, especially now that the outlook in the farming industry is so much brighter than it was a few weeks ago. Still, there is undoubtedly room for a considerable amount of improvement in the finances, a fact that members will realise when they appreciate the tremendous load of accumulated deficit that has yet to be wiped out or funded in order to place our finances in a sound position. Let me conclude by referring to some remarks by Mr. Craig relating to the history of Government finance in Australia previous to and during the depression. It seemed to me that the hon. member had gathered a wrong impression of the state of affairs that existed regarding banking and Government finance. I should like members to obtain a copy of the report of the Federal Royal Commission on Banking, because it contains an interesting resume of the history of banking in Australia, especially with reference to the Commonwealth Bank and the policy maintained by Governments, banks and other financial institutions during the depression. I believe there is truth in the contention that much of the slump was due to over borrowing and over spending during the time of prosperity. Therefore, with Mr. Craig's argument for curtailing borrowing in times of prosperity, I entirely agree; it is a policy that Governments should adopt. As regards financing during the depression, however, let me point out the position in the banking world. Both banks and Governments discovered that the money needed to tide over the depression was not available. The depression found the banks with advances somewhere in the region of 100 per cent. of their deposits, indicating that the only available sums upon which they could operate were reserve funds and capital.

Hon. L. CRAIG: The private banks called in their loans.

Hon. H. SEDDON: That was their position, and it was one that would cause concern to any banker. Obviously it was a most dangerous position for any banking

institution. The important ratio between deposits and advances had to be weighed carefully. The effect of the reduced activity in the commercial sphere restored to the banks a considerable amount of money that had been employed in commerce and industry, and that money was taken up by the Governments in the form of Treasury bills and was utilised to assist Governments to carry on during the slump. The money that ordinarily would have been employed in industry was taken by Governments on short term loans and used by them to lessen the severity of the depression. When conditions began to improve, the money was required in industry, and the result was that the short term loans had to be seriously considered. Hence we find that the policy of the Commonwealth Bank was one of constantly advising Governments to restrain and restrict their loan expenditure in order that those funds might be restored to the ordinary channels for industrial and commercial use. We all hope that state of affairs will continue. When it comes to a question of providing funds during a period of depression the first step is to arrange for the establishment of a reserve during times of prosperity. That is a point I wish to emphasise. It is necessary that Governments, in order to smooth out the peaks and valleys so far as the finances are concerned, should have in reserve sums of money accumulated during times of prosperity that they may spend in times of depression. That is one reason why I have always advocated national insurance, and why I am so pleased to see that the Federal Government have at last made this important question one for immediate further investigation. It appears to me that national insurance will provide in times of prosperity a fund that can be made available during times of depression, and thus help to keep the standard of the community more or less on an even footing rather than have what was experienced in the last few years a sudden drop in prosperity to conditions which caused so much suffering and privation. I support the motion.

On motion by Chief Secretary, debate adjourned.

*House adjourned at 10.22 p.m.*