

sure that business would be entirely eliminated. All we could do would be to grow potatoes, or endeavour to grow them, when they could be produced cheaply. So we will run up against the board, because, if we want to grow potatoes when we can get a good crop, the board will say, "No, you can only grow a portion of your requirements at that time. You must grow more in the late season." But there is no guarantee that the grower will receive an adequate return for his labour and the risk he takes in growing an out-of-season crop. This might lead to a serious shortage during the early spring months.

However, taking the industry as a whole, I feel that controls such as we experienced during the war did quite a lot of good. People have become used to them and have realised that it is sometimes necessary to be cruel to be kind, and for someone in authority to tell them not to grow potatoes lest they should go bankrupt. I feel that this measure will do quite a lot of good for growers and the industry, although it may adversely affect certain individuals. The Bill provides that there shall be three growers' representatives on the board, two to be elected and one to be nominated by the Minister. With regard to previous Bills that have sought to control primary industries, I have been somewhat opposed to the idea of only two out of the three members being elected; but I have come to realise that perhaps it is a good thing, because, if all were elected, there might be petty jealousies between sections or districts engaged in the industry. But if two growers are elected by the commercial growers, then the Minister, if he has the good of the industry at heart, as I believe he has, will nominate a third who will, with the other two, give balanced representation. For that reason I think the number proposed to be elected is quite sound.

Regarding the definition of "commercial grower," I am pleased to know the Minister has an amendment, and I hope that amendment will take into consideration production rather than acreage. In the outer metropolitan area, there are some districts where the yield from two acres is very much higher than that from 10 acres in other places, so I hope the Minister will provide an amendment to cover those smaller areas that pro-

duce large quantities of potatoes. Generally speaking, the Bill provides for a board that will benefit the industry, and for that reason I support the second reading.

On motion by Mr. Hoar, debate adjourned.

ADJOURNMENT—SPECIAL.

THE PREMIER (Hon. F. J. S. Wise—*—Gascoyne*): I move—

That the House at its rising adjourn till 2 p.m. tomorrow.

House adjourned at 5.58 p.m.

Legislative Council.

Wednesday, 20th November, 1946.

	PAGE
Questions: "The Cloisters," as to conforming to building by-laws	2034
Railway trucks, as to ralling wool, Albany to Fremantle	2035
Motion: Urgency, railway strike and secret ballot, withdrawn	2035
Railway strike, as to intervention by local authorities	2046
Bills: Daylight Saving, 1R. Standing Orders Suspension, 2R. remaining stages	2041
Traffic Act Amendment (No. 2), Assembly's Message	2052
State Housing, recom.	2052
Vermin Act Amendment, recom.	2054
Adjournment, special	2056

The PRESIDENT took the Chair at 2.30 p.m., and read prayers.

QUESTIONS.

"THE CLOISTERS."

As to Conforming to Building By-laws.

Hon. L. B. BOLTON asked the Chief Secretary:

1, Has the attention of the Government been drawn to a paragraph in "The West Australian" of the 19th November regarding temporary buildings at "The Cloisters" in St. George's-terrace acquired by the Government?

2, Will the Government take the necessary action to conform to the building by-laws of the City of Perth?

3, If not, how can the Government expect ratepayers to obey the law in this and other directions?

The CHIEF SECRETARY replied:

1, 2, and 3, All departmental work for alterations both to "The Cloisters" and to any temporary buildings located in the grounds has ceased pending a decision as to the use of these premises for State purposes.

RAILWAY TRUCKS.

As to Railing Wool, Albany to Fremantle.

Hon. H. L. ROCHE asked the Chief Secretary:

1, Is the Minister aware that prior to the railway hold-up, there was a delay—running into weeks—in the supply of railway trucks for the cartage of wool and stock feed wheat from the country?

2, Will the Minister make inquiries and advise the House how, in the above circumstances, between the 23rd October, 1946, and the 7th November, 1946, trucks were made available at Albany to rail approximately 1,500 bales of wool from that port to Fremantle?

The CHIEF SECRETARY replied:

1, There was some delay which was caused by the shortage of locomotive power.

2, This wool was urgently required at Fremantle for sale on the 11th November and had already been appraised for the Albany sale, which, due to buyers not attending, was a fiasco. The wagons for this consignment were provided as available from inwards loading.

MOTION—URGENCY.

Railway Strike and Secret Ballot.

The PRESIDENT: I have received the following letter from Hon. A. Thomson:—

I have to inform you that, at the next sitting of the Council, it is my intention to move, under Standing Order No. 59, the adjournment of the House to discuss a matter of urgency, namely:—

That, as under the Industrial Arbitration Act, as now constituted, the court has no power to order a secret ballot to be held to ascertain the opinions of the rank and file of the members of the union concerned in the matter in

dispute, legislation should be introduced, forthwith, to give the Court of Arbitration the power to order such a ballot to take place.

It will be necessary for four members to rise in their places to support the proposal.

Four members having risen in their places,

HON. A. THOMSON (South-East)
[2.36]: I move—

That the House at its rising adjourn till Friday, the 22nd November, at 2.30 p.m.

It is quite unnecessary for me to labour the very serious position with which we are faced at present. I personally am neither taking sides nor charging anyone with having done something wrong. My motion deals with the enginedrivers' union, which has caused the wheels of industry in this State to cease revolving. Under the railway regulations, a driver of a locomotive has the right, if he deems it to be unsafe, to refuse to take the engine out on the road. The union registered its protest against the Garratt engines and, having done so, I consider that its members did their duty as employees of the Railway Department. In my opinion, however, the union should not have thrown on to individual drivers the responsibility for refusing to drive these engines, as that was really a challenge to the Railway Department. The Government accepted the union's protest as to the safety of the engines and appointed a judge of the Supreme Court to act as a Royal Commissioner. I am aware that exception was taken to his appointment, because those objecting considered an expert engineer should have been appointed as commissioner.

The practice of Parliament has been to recognise that a judge of the Supreme Court should be, and is, unbiassed, and that any decision he gives is decided entirely upon the evidence and the expert opinion offered to him. Therefore it can be truthfully said that the Royal Commissioner did not condemn the union representatives for refusing to work these engines. After collecting exhaustive evidence he agreed with the union that until the necessary structural alterations and repairs were made to the A.S.G. engines they should not be run upon the roads. The Government accepted the decision and stated that it would ensure that the engines would not be put in traffic until they were structurally safe. I have nothing further to say as to the disastrous results

that the holdup is having on the people of the State, or the severe loss that is being suffered.

My point is not to condemn either section at this stage, because we know there is a feeling of bitterness arising on both sides. It may be suggested that I am doing this entirely for political purposes, but such an objective is furthest from my mind. When the Industrial Arbitration Act was introduced many years ago, and later when it was amended and put into its present form by the late Hon. Alex McCallum, Hon. P. Collier and others, it was contended, after a 19 hours' discussion in a conference of managers representing the two Houses, that it was the best one in the whole of Australia.

Hon. C. B. Williams: Still, that is over 20 years ago.

Hon. A. THOMSON: Yes, times move. I am dealing with the question as it was then. Unfortunately we find that the court has no power under the Act to order a secret ballot to be taken. It will be admitted that the Premier has made an honest endeavour to bring about industrial peace. It is unfortunate that the letter he sent to the individual members of the union has been construed as asking the men to go back upon the union. I do not for a moment think that the Premier had any intention of suggesting that the men should be disloyal to their union, but he did make a personal appeal in the hope that they might be able to arrive at some decision to solve the present stalemate.

The Government has been requested to send its representatives to explain the position to the various branches of the union. When the Government ceases to function in the way that it is intended to operate, it has the right of appeal to the electors so that a secret ballot might be taken to say who shall govern the State. We have arrived at the stage when it is essential to give the rank and file of the enginedrivers' union the right and privilege which the Government of this State enjoys. I do not want to bring in any controversial matters, but we do know that when a meeting of representatives is held and the militant section is in control, it is difficult for anyone to raise his voice to put forward an aspect contrary to what that militant section desires to achieve.

Hon. C. B. Williams: Did that apply to the Primary Producers' Association when it dissolved its political side?

Hon. A. THOMSON: I am not bringing in any sectional troubles or desires at all.

Hon. C. B. Williams: It seems to me you are.

Hon. A. THOMSON: I can speak from personal experience, and Mr. Williams, who has just left the Chamber, has also had a good deal of personal experience of these matters. In my early days in Western Australia I had the temerity to suggest a certain course of action, and I know how I was dealt with. But that has nothing to do with the present case. If it is fair and reasonable that we should determine who shall govern by means of a secret ballot, I maintain it is also essential at the present juncture that the individual members of the Locomotive Enginedrivers, Firemens and Cleaners Union should also have the right by secret ballot to decide whether a majority—

Hon. F. E. Gibson: Cannot the union take a secret ballot now, if it desires to do so?

Hon. A. THOMSON: But who will order the taking of the secret ballot? Under present conditions, it is a matter entirely at the discretion of the union executive. I would prefer an independent authority to be in charge of the conduct of the secret ballot. I can speak feelingly from practical knowledge of what happens in the country districts where small numbers of votes are recorded, and I assume other members have had similar experiences. The established custom is that when several small boxes are received, the votes are taken out and mixed up together. That is done because, from a thorough knowledge of the people living in the outlying areas where perhaps 20 might vote for me and three for the other man, if that course were not adopted the secrecy of the ballot would be lost.

I maintain that the same principle should apply in taking a ballot of the branches of the union under the conditions existing to-day. Unless that course were adopted, the secrecy of the ballot would be destroyed. I propose to read to members a telegram I sent the Premier last Saturday. Like many others, including members of Parliament and of the public as well, I waited in the hope that the trouble might possibly be amicably settled. As a matter of fact, I was

absent from my parliamentary duties last week because, with hundreds of others, I was marooned in the country and could not secure a lift to return to Perth. With a sincere desire to assist, I sent the following telegram to the Premier:—

Respectfully suggest Government and President—

I was referring to the President of the Arbitration Court—

—order secret ballot of all members of loco. union under Court's supervision. If the majority decide on return to work, de-registration be cancelled. Suggest run special Diesels to various centres to take the ballot. If special legislation necessary, confident Parliament support you.

I feel that if a majority of the members of the union had a right to express their opinion at a secret ballot under the supervision either of the Arbitration Court or of the Chief Electoral Officer, Mr. Marshall, we would know where we stood. I mentioned the running of special Diesel coaches and my idea in that connection was that the ballot should be taken at each centre, the votes then being taken to Perth and all mixed up together. If that course were adopted, there would be no possible chance of anyone having knowledge of who had or had not voted in favour of the executive's attitude, and the decision of the majority would prevail. I feel that we have arrived at a stage where, so far as we are aware, both the Government and the Arbitration Court have exhausted every means at their disposal to bring about a return to peace in industry and have apparently failed. We know that others are anxious to bring about a cessation of the strike, and I have always been firmly convinced that the workers themselves can be depended upon to do what they honestly believe to be right. There is much more that I could say. Unfortunately, the Arbitration Act does not, as far as I know, contain any power enabling the Arbitration Court to order a secret ballot to be held.

Hon. G. Fraser: If one were held and the majority endorsed the executive's decision, what then?

Hon. A. THOMSON: We would have to accept the decision of the majority.

Hon. F. E. Gibson: Why?

Hon. A. THOMSON: Are members of this House and is the Government satisfied

that an absolute majority of the members of the union endorses the hold-up?

Hon. F. E. Gibson: How could they know?

Hon. A. THOMSON: The only means by which they could ascertain that would be by the method I suggest.

Hon. G. Fraser: And supposing they are, what then?

The PRESIDENT: Order! I ask the interjectors not to peep into the future. The matter of urgency is that the Arbitration Act should be so amended as to allow the court to take a secret ballot. That is the essence of Mr. Thomson's theme.

Hon. A. THOMSON: Yes, Mr. President, and I am sorry I was drawn away from it for the time being.

The PRESIDENT: The hon. member was not the only one, for the interjectors were in the same position.

Hon. A. THOMSON: I am imbued with a sincere desire to end the industrial conflict that is in progress. If ever there was a time when we wanted peace in industry, it is now. The cost of commodities is going up in country districts, and the extra road haulage necessitated by the strike must further increase the cost of living. Despite the assistance available to those who can claim payments under the Commonwealth social service scheme, no-one can tell me that that course is of benefit to the working man. From bitter experience I know that it takes a long time to balance the losses caused in times of depression or through a strike. I commend to the serious consideration of members the motion I have moved. It is time Parliament endeavoured to play its part. People say, "What are you going to do?" There are many people in the country as well as in the cities who consider it is time a secret ballot was taken, and I urge the Government to adopt that course.

I have nothing to say in condemnation of the Government. I think it has done everything possible, and the pity of it is that we are confronted with the unfortunate situation that exists today, with thousands of people out of work and the position getting rapidly worse. Last night was the first I have spent in the city under present conditions. In the height of the war Perth was never as dark and dismal as it was last night. I submit the motion.

THE CHIEF SECRETARY (Hon. W. H. Kitson—West) [3.0]: I give the hon. member credit for being anxious to do something to bring about a termination of the present position. I think he will realise that anything I say must be my own personal views because so far I have had no opportunity to consult the Government on the matter. This is a very important question. There is nothing to prevent the loco. enginedrivers themselves taking a secret ballot if they so desire. It is true that there is no authority under the Industrial Arbitration Act for either the Arbitration Court or the Government to order a secret ballot. There is a very big difference of opinion as to whether a secret ballot under these circumstances would be of any avail. Experience has shown in other places where this power exists, that the results have usually been most unsatisfactory.

Hon. A. Thomson: It is worth a trial.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: The hon. member is entitled to his opinion. Within recent times there have been big industrial disputes in the Eastern States. There was one recently in Queensland. There, apparently, the Government had authority to order a secret ballot and it did so, but eventually it had to call it off because of certain practices that were being indulged in. For instance, it was found that large numbers of forged ballot papers were being used and that other things, too, were happening.

Hon. A. Thomson: I have greater respect for Western Australians than to think that of them.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: I am speaking of another State. The position was found to be so bad that the Government had to call off the secret ballot, and it did so. So far as I am concerned the issue today is a much greater one than the mere issue as to whether Garratt engines should run. I do not want to be drawn into a long discussion on the subject, especially at the present stage, but I think members will appreciate that the Government has been very tolerant indeed. It has done nothing that in its opinion would be likely to inflame feeling on the part of the loco. enginedrivers concerning this particular dispute. I think it will be admitted that

we have gone as far as it is possible for any Government to go—

Hon. G. W. Miles: Hear, hear!

The CHIEF SECRETARY:—in our endeavour to find a solution of the problem. The issue today, to put it briefly, is as to whether the loco. enginedrivers shall be the sole arbiters as to these engines being safe. That is the union point of view. From the Government point of view the issue really is as to whether the executive of the union shall govern this State so far as railways are concerned, or whether the Government shall do so.

Hon. G. W. Miles: That is the point. Everyone should be behind the Government.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: We have offered to the union a solution of the problem which we believe to be exceedingly fair. One need not deal with side issues. The Government has said, "We are prepared to appoint a committee of three, and we are prepared to accept the decision of that committee; your union to have the right to have representation on that committee and the Government representatives to be selected by the union from a panel of six men." It seems to me that is going even further than any Government ought to be expected to go. The union however, has taken up the attitude that it is not prepared to accept the decision of such a tribunal, and it simply says in response to all representations, "We ourselves are going to determine whether Garratt engines shall run or not." Involved in that is the bigger issue to which I have referred, and one which is most important from the point of view of any democratic country.

To do what Mr. Thomson desires would necessitate an amendment of the Industrial Arbitration Act. I cannot commit the Government to do that. All I can say is that Mr. Thomson's remarks will be conveyed to the Government at the earliest possible moment and that it will give consideration to the suggestions he has made. Further than that at this moment I cannot go. I want members to realise that this question of secret ballots has been raised from time to time during recent years, and, as I said previously, it is not necessarily a panacea for industrial troubles. It has been tried elsewhere and has failed. Following on the lines of an interjection by Mr. Fraser I ask: What position do we reach in the event

of the majority of the locomotive engine-drivers adopting the attitude that has already been taken up by the executive? We shall be in just the same position! Sooner or later there has to be a solution of the problem. It is unthinkable that a trouble of this kind can go on indefinitely.

It can be said that if the dispute does carry on for much longer the whole country will undoubtedly be in a state of chaos. This is the time when we are preparing to deal with our harvest, which is a most important matter for the economy of the State. Members may rest assured that the Government is just as anxious as they are to see that this dispute is terminated speedily and with satisfaction to all parties, not excluding the locomotive enginedrivers. I hope that whatever is moving at present will lead to a speedy termination of the trouble. I do not know whether I would be in order because I do not know very much about it, but I understand that the Lord Mayor of Perth and the mayors of Fremantle and Midland Junction interviewed the Premier in regard to certain motions which had been carried at meetings in Fremantle and Midland Junction. I think it was made clear to them that so far as the Government is concerned the main stumbling block at present—perhaps the only one—is that the locomotive enginedrivers are not prepared to abide by the decision of the committee to which I have referred.

I am advised that the Premier told the Lord Mayor and the mayors of Fremantle and Midland Junction that the moment the locomotive enginedrivers were prepared to agree to any decision arrived at by that committee the strike was finished. If that is so the issue is boiled down to a simple one, and it is up to the locomotive enginedrivers to give consideration not only to their own viewpoint but to that of the general public of the State. I will refer the matter brought forward by Mr. Thomson to the Government at the earliest possible moment, and I regret very much I am not in a position to say yes or no to the hon. member's suggestion.

HON. SIR HAL COLEBATCH (Metropolitan) [3.10]: It would be a matter for deep regret if anything should be said in the debate that would lead the public to suppose that this House was other than solidly behind the Government in this em-

ergency and prepared to render it every possible support. Regarding secret ballots, I make these three observations. To hold a secret ballot before a strike is declared would be an excellent procedure, something that should be made general, but now, first of all what guarantee is there that the ballot could be kept secret? That is a minor point. This is the major point: Suppose a secret ballot decided in favour of the attitude adopted by the union executive!

Is it suggested that this Government and this Parliament, the Arbitration Court and the people of Western Australia should abdicate their rights and allow themselves to be dictated to by the union? Of course, we cannot have a secret ballot unless we are prepared to accept the resultant decision. Should we be prepared to accept the decision in the present atmosphere, when we know the influence that the leaders of the union have over their members? Should we be prepared to accept a decision that the action of the executive be endorsed, that it should be given the right to run the country and that its attitude should be one of dictating to the Government, to Parliament and to the Arbitration Court? We cannot have a secret ballot on the assumption that we are going to win it. If we take a ballot on any kind we must be prepared to accept the consequences and abide by the result. I hope the attitude of all members of this Chamber will be that we stand solidly behind the Government in this emergency, and give it every support it can possibly ask for.

HON. G. W. MILES (North) [3.13]: I endorse the views of Sir Hal Colebatch. It is regrettable that this motion has been moved today. The representatives of the country had their opportunity when the Premier made his statement last week, but they did not stand up in their places nor did the leaders of the two parties stand up and say they were behind the Government. It is not only the enginedrivers' union that is affected but the whole of the people of the State. Something like 490,000 persons are being defied by a small section. In my opinion that amounts to nothing but anarchy. Every man, woman and child should stand behind the Government in fighting this trouble to a successful issue. If a ballot is taken, what are we

to do if the decision is against the Government?

Are we going to allow a handful of unionists to dictate to the rest of the people how the country is to be run? The Government must run this country or be prepared to get out and hand over to a small section of communists. The crisis is here. If the men had only played cricket and taken the umpire's decision as final, there would be no strike today. That umpire was the president of the Arbitration Court; and if they had accepted his verdict, there would be no hold-up of industry in this State. I would like the House to carry a motion supporting the action of the Government.

The PRESIDENT: There is nothing to prevent the hon. member moving such a motion if notice has been given.

Hon. G. W. MILES: It would be better to do that than support the motion before the Chair.

Hon. A. Thomson: Then why do you not do something instead of sitting there?

Hon. G. W. MILES: I have been trying to keep quiet and to assist the Government in that way.

Hon. G. B. Wood: Yet you have blamed people in another place for not getting up and supporting the Government!

Hon. G. W. MILES: Yes, I blame them for not supporting the Government when they had the opportunity to do so.

The PRESIDENT: Order! The hon. member must not reflect on members of another place.

Hon. G. W. MILES: In my opinion the opportunity was lost to the other parties in this so-called democratic Parliament of saying, "We are here to preserve law and order and are opposed to the anarchists running this country at the moment."

Hon. C. B. Williams: Who is running this country—the Government or anarchists?

Hon. G. W. MILES: The anarchists.

Hon. C. B. Williams: This Government runs the country.

Hon. G. W. MILES: I am behind this Government.

Hon. C. B. Williams: The Government does not consist of anarchists.

Hon. G. W. MILES: No.

The PRESIDENT: Does Mr. Thomson wish to withdraw the motion?

HON. A. THOMSON (South-East—in reply) [3.20]: I would like to repudiate any suggestion made by Mr. Miles—

The PRESIDENT: There is no necessity for that. It was not germane to the question.

Hon. A. THOMSON: Mr. Miles said it was regrettable that such a motion was introduced. That is his opinion. I have been approached by many people of all sections in the country who are feeling very perturbed about the matter. I defy Sir Hal Colebatch or anybody else to say that I attacked the Government. I think I was fair. I commended the Premier for his action and I definitely said I was not taking sides one way or the other.

Hon. C. B. Williams: Do you think that introducing this motion will do any good?

Hon. A. THOMSON: Parliament is more important than the Lord Mayor of Perth or the mayors of Fremantle and Midland Junction. Parliament is supposed to govern this State, not mayors of municipalities. It is for Parliament to have a say in this matter. With all due respect, I would reply to those who voiced criticism and asked what would happen if the majority of the unionists supported the executive in its action, that exactly the same as is occurring today would happen then. But the rank and file should have an opportunity to express their opinion. We are refusing them that opportunity.

Hon. C. B. Williams: They have it under their rules.

Hon. A. THOMSON: They have it under their rules!

Hon. C. B. Williams: Of course they have!

Hon. A. THOMSON: I am dealing with the matter from a broader aspect. It is not a question of union rules, but of the State of Western Australia. The people themselves are suffering.

Hon. C. B. Williams: The union members have every right to ask for a ballot if they want it, and a secret ballot, too! The hon. member knows that.

Hon. W. J. Mann: We all know that.

Hon. C. B. Williams: Then why waste our time on the matter?

The PRESIDENT: Order!

Hon. C. B. Williams: Yes, Sir. I will leave the Chamber.

Hon. A. THOMSON: We know what the hon. member said is true; but the Chief Secretary pointed out what happened in another State when a secret ballot was ordered. Fraudulent ballot papers were included in the count. If such a ballot were under government control, however, there would be an assurance that such action would not occur. The production of his union ticket would give every member of the union a right to vote, and nobody else would be entitled to such a vote. I do not know that the hot air produced by my friend Sir Hal Colebatch was very helpful to the discussion.

Hon. G. Fraser: Do you think this discussion has been helpful in the matter of assisting a settlement?

Hon. A. THOMSON: I do. I think it is an indication to the public of Western Australia that Parliament is at least interested. Members have been asked what Parliament is going to do about the matter. We know that the Government has done everything in its power.

Hon. G. W. Miles: Get behind the Government! That is what you need to do.

Hon. A. THOMSON: Some people make me tired! They are big and make a terrible noise, but that is about all, I am sorry to say. I have brought this matter forward with no other purpose than that of trying to see whether it is possible to evolve some way of overcoming the impossible position with which Western Australia is faced. I am not charging any section with being anarchists or communists. All I am asking is that people shall have the right and privilege we all enjoy to decide their own destinies in their own way. In accordance with the rules of Parliament, I must ask leave to withdraw the motion.

The PRESIDENT: Not necessarily. It is customary to ask leave to withdraw, but the hon. member is not bound to do so.

Hon. A. THOMSON: If I were to insist on the motion being put, I would be accused of doing what some of my friends have been ungenerous to suggest I am

doing. I therefore follow the usual custom and ask leave to withdraw the motion. I hope, however, that as a result of the discussion that has taken place something will be done. I thank the Chief Secretary for his very interesting and fair-minded remarks. That is more than I can say about the remarks of some of my colleagues.

Hon. G. B. Wood: Whom do you refer to as your colleagues?

Hon. A. THOMSON: I mean the House.

The PRESIDENT: Is it the wish of the House that leave be given to withdraw the motion?

Hon. G. W. Miles: No.

The PRESIDENT: As there is a dissentient voice, the motion cannot be withdrawn, but must be put.

Hon. F. E. Gibson: Put the question again, Mr. President!

Hon. A. Thomson: I am willing for my motion to be put.

The PRESIDENT: I appeal to Mr. Miles not to break an old custom of this House. After a discussion on a motion for adjournment in circumstances such as these, it is usual for leave to be granted to the mover to withdraw.

Hon. W. J. Mann: Would I be in order, Mr. President—

The PRESIDENT: No, the hon. member would not be in order.

Hon. W. J. Mann: I wanted to ask a question.

Hon. G. W. Miles: I am prepared to withdraw my opposition.

Motion, by leave, withdrawn.

BILL—DAYLIGHT SAVING.

First Reading.

Received from the Assembly and read a first time.

Standing Orders Suspension.

THE CHIEF SECRETARY (Hon. W. H. Kitson—West) [3.24]: I move, without notice—

That so much of the Standing Orders be suspended as is necessary to enable the Bill to pass through all stages at this sitting.

Question put.

The PRESIDENT: There being no dissentient voice, I declare the motion carried by an absolute majority, in accordance with Standing Orders.

Question thus passed.

Hon. C. B. Williams: I presume a majority will still be required to carry the Bill?

The PRESIDENT: I did not want to divide the House when there was no dissentient voice.

Second Reading.

THE CHIEF SECRETARY (Hon. W. H. Kitson—West) [3.26] in moving the second reading said: Members will appreciate that this Bill has been introduced by the Government to meet the most unusual circumstances that prevail. The idea is that we shall mitigate as far as possible some of the inconveniences and embarrassments being faced by people, particularly in the metropolitan area. The purpose of the Bill is to ensure that those within a radius of 35 miles of the metropolitan area—which I understand is the extent of the reticulation of electric current—shall be subject to what is commonly called daylight saving. We are all aware that after having done their day's work large numbers of people under present conditions reach their homes just as daylight is finishing. Many are eating their evening meal in the dusk and mothers are putting their children to bed and carrying out the ordinary duties of their household at a time when they are accustomed to having artificial light in the way of electricity and so on.

Hon. C. B. Williams: You want to transfer it from night to morning. They will have to get up with candles instead of going to bed with them.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: As the sun rises just after 5 o'clock in the morning, I do not think the hon. member will be very much concerned from that point of view.

Hon. C. B. Williams: The hon. member is up before 5 o'clock every morning; but you propose to have people up at 4 o'clock in the morning. That is stupidity.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: This is rather more serious than I suppose the hon. member will admit.

Hon. C. B. Williams: There is no electricity at stake on this occasion. It is scandalous.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: The Government is anxious to give people in the metropolitan area an opportunity to utilise daylight hours, and this Bill provides for daylight saving to the extent of up to two hours, which could be brought about by proclamation. If the Bill is passed, it is the intention of the Government to issue such a proclamation covering the area I have already mentioned and for the period stated. I think there is quite a lot of support for this idea.

Hon. A. Thomson: How long do you suggest it shall last?

The CHIEF SECRETARY: As long as is necessary. It is only for the purpose of meeting the extraordinary circumstances with which we are faced. As soon as electricity is available, the proclamation will be withdrawn. I want members to understand that this is purely an emergency measure, which is essential if we are to take advantage of the daylight hours. It is a small Bill, and I am sorry members have not been able to have copies of it before this. However, it speaks for itself, and I have no doubt that members will have definite ideas as to whether a suggestion of this kind will be of benefit to people of the metropolitan area. I think it is highly desirable and will be of great assistance to a large number of people within the suggested radius. There may be some small complications on the outskirts of the 35-mile radius, by virtue of the fact that this measure will apply only to the area within that radius, but I do not think the inconvenience will be very great. I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

HON. SIR HAL COLEBATCH (Metropolitan) [3.32]: I heartily support the Bill and am glad that the Government is reserving to itself the right to extend the operation of this measure for so long as is deemed necessary. It is obvious that even after the railway trouble is over there will be an acute shortage of coal for a long time, and it will be necessary to take every step possible to eke out supplies.

HON. C. B. WILLIAMS (South) [3.33]: I shall speak against the measure, but will not vote against it. There was never anything so stupid as daylight saving in this country. I am always up at 5 a.m., because I forget to put out the billy for the milk and the milkman wakes me at 4.30. I assume that, when this measure is passed, the milkman will call at what will be in reality 2.30 a.m. On the last occasion when we had daylight saving, and when it was introduced more than a quarter of a century ago, there was a purpose behind it, but that does not apply today. The primary producers do not rise by the clock. They work as soon as there is sufficient light. Thirty years ago in Kalgoorlie we had to get up and go to work at 7 a.m., owing to daylight saving, when we should have gone at 8 a.m.

Hon. L. B. Bolton: There are not too many going to work at present, unfortunately.

Hon. C. B. WILLIAMS: I am interested only in the men who are going to work. Some people, such as Mr. Bolton, can have electric lights, run from their car batteries, and others may have homes well provided with windows, as is Parliament House, but the majority of people will have to use candles while getting breakfast if this measure is passed. There is no daylight at 2.30 a.m. The purpose of a similar measure years ago was to save coal, but this will only be a further expense on the people in the metropolitan area.

Hon. L. B. Bolton: How?

Hon. C. B. WILLIAMS: The hon. member does not get up early in the morning, or he would not ask that question. If I am a worker—

Hon. W. J. Mann: If?

Hon. C. B. WILLIAMS: I was. There are workers today in my household. I am the only one that has got an easy job, up to date. This measure is only for the benefit of the lazy duchesses who go into town and do not get home in time to get their husbands' meals. While this trouble is on, the business people should say that they only want their employees to work until 4 p.m. Some of my family work as far afield as Guildford and Midland Junction. They have to walk to Bassendean in order to catch a bus home. Only people in my

state of health go to bed at 6 p.m. Normally children are put to bed before it is dark and the majority of them go to bed when they want to.

Hon. F. E. Gibson: No.

Hon. C. B. WILLIAMS: I know that my grandchildren are out as long as there is daylight. It would be to its credit if the Government suspended the schools while this trouble lasts, instead of putting parents to all the trouble of trying to get their children to school and home again. The school day normally commences at 9 a.m. and ends at 3.15 p.m., but when this measure is passed the schools will come out actually at 1.15, in the hottest part of the day. The children will then have to walk home, because there are not sufficient buses to transport them. They will have to walk home in the heat of the day because somebody has suggested that if this measure is not passed lazy women will not be home in time to cook tea for their husbands.

I know the unions as well as anyone knows them, and I am behind the Government of this State. If everybody was as solid as I am there would be no strike. Fifteen hundred men in this country are not going to get me out of bed at 3 a.m. By passing this measure the Government will be giving way to the strikers. It will inconvenience the people of the State simply because 1,500 men have said they will not do something. Daylight saving will mean that the people must spend more money on candles.

Hon. L. Craig: They cannot buy them.

Hon. C. B. WILLIAMS: Then how are they to get to work, as they must have candlelight in order to get breakfast? It is all right if they can get kerosene lamps or candles, but there is no saving grace in this measure. It will not save an ounce of coal, but will put an added burden on those least able to bear it. I get up at 5 a.m. and now I am to be asked to get up at 3 a.m.—not 3 a.m. by the clock, but 3 a.m. by nature.

Hon. G. Bennetts: People will want an extra meal before they go to bed, having got up so early.

Hon. C. B. WILLIAMS: That is so. If I have ever heard of anything so "nit-witty," I will be kicked. I really did not think this measure would come forward, as

it is absurd in a country where it is not dark until 7.30 p.m. It is only the loiterers in the pubs who do not get home before 6.30, and they have plenty of liquid refreshment—barley food, as Mr. Bolton knows, being a grower of barley. If the House carries this measure all I can say is that the strikers will have won a round and will have stampeded the Government to the extent that it introduces daylight saving. Why not continue as we have been carrying on? There has been no inconvenience.

Hon. G. B. Wood: Not for you, but for other people.

Hon. C. B. WILLIAMS: The hon. member can better afford a taxi than I can, but I have a chance of getting home, so long as Mr. Gray has his automobile. I know the strike will go on, and if the trains are running again before Christmas we will be very lucky. In the first week of the strike the men are purse-proud. In the second week their wives start to nag. In the third week the wives nag more, because there is no money coming in, and in the fourth week the men find that their neighbours will not talk to them. As yet we are only in the second week of the strike. I have been through all this. This union is very purse-proud and the men will not go back to work this side of Christmas, unless something unforeseen comes about. Something might be done with 3,000 workers concentrated in Perth, but in this case there are 1,500 workers scattered throughout Western Australia. Never mind about the latter or the Press. If ever there was anything to be said in favour of daylight saving, it was not in a country where one has to wait for darkness in order to go to bed. Though I consider it silly, I am almost obliged to vote for the Bill.

HON. G. B. WOOD (East) [3.45]: I am one who is going to do the silly thing, according to Mr. Williams, by supporting the second reading. The only doubt I have is whether the Bill goes quite far enough. I would prefer to see it applied to the whole State. With its operation restricted to a radius of 35 miles, I can foresee confusion occurring when country people come to the city. Today we saw at Midland Junction hundreds of trucks that had brought down sheep for sale. Next Wednesday, many of those people might be two hours late,

though I dare say they will not be caught twice in that way. The same thing applies to the metropolitan vegetable market. A number of trucks come from the vegetable-growing districts of Northam and York for the 4.30 market. I raise this point because I cannot see how it is possible to separate the country from the city, and, in view of the risk of confusion, I hope steps will be taken to amend the Bill in the way I have suggested.

HON. L. CRAIG (South-West) [3.47]: I wish to point out an anomaly in the Bill. The measure is to have application within an area having a radius of 35 miles from the General Post Office. Recently we had a Bill before us in which the radius was taken from the Town Hall, and I mentioned on that occasion the mark from which these distances should be calculated for all purposes. To have a basic point is only sensible. I express satisfaction at the action of the Government in introducing the Bill, which will bring pleasure to many people who at present are suffering great inconvenience. The ordinary man now rises at about 6 a.m. or 7 a.m. and there will still be ample daylight for him if the clock is advanced, while in the evening there will be daylight till 9 p.m. If the anticipations of Mr. Williams are realised and the strike continues for a considerable time, it may become necessary, through lack of fuel—there is a great dearth of certain fuels—to extend the radius within which the measure shall operate, but no provision is made for that in the Bill.

The Governor should be empowered to extend the area if thought necessary. Various plants outside the metropolitan area are generating power, but they may not be able to continue to operate. Hurricane lanterns are difficult to get and ordinary lamps are almost unprocureable, and a continuance of the strike for another month would cause great inconvenience beyond the 35-mile radius. If it were not for the risk of delaying the passage of the measure, I would suggest the insertion of the words "or such other area of the State as the Governor shall determine." Then, whenever considered necessary, the area could be extended. The measure is a very desirable one. The only complaint I have heard has come

from mothers of little children, who say they will not be able to get their children to sleep at the usual time.

HON. G. BENNETTS (South) [3.50]: I support the second reading. Mr. Wood suggested extending the operation of the measure to the whole of the State. If he proposes the inclusion of the Eastern Goldfields, I have a telegram stating that the people there would not approve of it. When the matter of daylight saving was last brought up in Kalgoorlie, strong protests were made by the people to the local governing bodies against its being instituted. Men on the Goldfields work three shifts, and to introduce daylight saving would cause great inconvenience. Like Mr. Craig, I also had complaints from mothers that children could not be got to bed at the usual hour if daylight saving were introduced.

HON. H. TUCKEY (South-West) [3.51]: I do not favour extending the measure to apply to country areas as I do not think there is any need to worry about the country people. There might be something in what Mr. Wood said about confusion arising when people were bringing produce to the Perth Markets, but they would soon become accustomed to leaving a little earlier in order to reach the market in time. Apart from that, there is no need to discuss the effect of the measure on the country. Farming people usually work while daylight lasts, and no matter how much the clock may be advanced, they will continue to work in the same way. Daylight does not fail until about 7.45 p.m., and I think the people in the country can do all they wish without there being any need to advance the clock a couple of hours. I would oppose any move to make the measure apply to the country.

HON. W. J. MANN (South-West) [3.53]: As the Government is intending to do something helpful, I propose to support the second reading, but I hope it will not be necessary to extend the operation of the measure to the country areas. When daylight saving was previously proposed, hundreds of complaints were received from dairymen. They found it quite difficult to make the cows realise that they had to

stand up a couple of hours earlier than usual to be milked. Mr. Craig laughs, but he should know that there were complaints that the milk-yield was considerably diminished for some time. For this reason I hope it will not be necessary to do more than is provided for in the Bill.

HON. L. B. BOLTON (Metropolitan) [3.54]: I support the second reading and commend the Government for having taken this action. The Bill provides for a period not exceeding two hours, and it might be found that to advance the clock one hour would be sufficient. I do not know whether it has been definitely decided to proclaim two hours or whether the Government will at first experiment by making it one hour. The Bill is very necessary in the interests of many small industries that are able to carry on but cannot do much work after 4 p.m. It will also be very helpful in the shopping centres of the city. I agree with those members who contend that, for the time being, the measure should be confined to the metropolitan area because I cannot see that any extension to the country is necessary at present.

HON. G. FRASER (West) [3.55]: Unlike my colleague, I intend to support the measure, which I believe is a move in the right direction. During recent weeks, many people have suggested action along these lines, not knowing that it was the intention of the Government to introduce legislation in view of the likelihood of the trouble lasting for some time. The only people from whom protests might be received are mothers on account of the difficulty of getting children to bed while the sun is still up. However, I believe that the amount of good will outweigh any disadvantages. I hope that no move will be made to extend the scope of the measure beyond the 35-mile radius, because I am afraid such an attempt might wreck the Bill.

I have a vivid recollection of the last occasion when daylight-saving proposals were introduced. The protests then came chiefly from outside the metropolitan area, and I believe it was on account of the objections from the country that daylight saving was not then introduced, although it was adopted in other parts of Australia. I

consider the Government was wise in confining the Bill to the metropolitan area, and I should not like to see its passing jeopardised by extending the radius beyond 35 miles.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

Sitting suspended from 3.57 to 4.20 p.m.

In Committee.

Hon. G. Fraser in the Chair; the Chief Secretary in charge of the Bill.

Clauses 1 and 2—agreed to.

Clause 3—Advance of time during certain periods:

Hon. C. B. WILLIAMS: I think one hour is reasonable.

Hon. J. A. Dimmitt: This is to be only by proclamation.

Hon. C. B. WILLIAMS: That is quite all right. This Chamber generally objects to proclamations. I move an amendment—

That in line 9 of Subclause (1) the word "two" be struck out and the word "one" inserted in lieu.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: I do not think we should make any alteration to the Bill which provides for any period up to two hours. We should leave this matter to the discretion of the Government. This is urgency legislation and we are hopeful that whatever proclamation is made will not be for long.

Amendment put and negatived.

Clause put and passed.

Title—agreed to.

Bill reported without amendment and the report adopted.

Third Reading.

Bill read a third time and *passed*.

MOTION—RAILWAY STRIKE.

As to Intervention by Local Authorities.

HON. E. H. H. HALL (Central) [4.26]: I move—

That in the opinion of this House, pending the hearing of the dispute on the A.S.G. engines by an impartial body on which the union has a representative, public meetings convened by local governing authorities should

be held throughout the State requesting the members of the Locomotive Engine-drivers, Firemen and Cleaners' Union to return to work and thus enable the ordinary activities of the people of the State to be resumed.

When, yesterday, I gave notice of my motion I had no idea that Mr. Thomson was going to move the adjournment of the House this afternoon. However, the subject covered by him is quite different from that with which I propose to deal. Because of the stage that negotiations in the present industrial trouble have reached, it is borne in on me that a motion such as this is necessary. There are people who say that it is best to remain quiet in case a spanner should be thrown into the wheels of industry. On most occasions I agree with that principle, but the present matter is so serious that I believe it is time that all right-thinking people should declare themselves, and my motion is an invitation to give effect to that idea. I am 100 per cent. with those who commend the Government for the tolerant attitude it has shown throughout the negotiations. Therefore it is far from my thoughts to indulge in any hostile criticism of any act of the Government in this unfortunate dispute.

But I ask myself: What form of government are we living under in this country? It is known, amongst other names, as a form of responsible government. Just what does that mean? To whom is it responsible? It is well known that the Government is responsible to the people. In the last few years, during my occupancy of a seat in this Chamber, I have come to realise more and more that unless a Government has the wholehearted support of the people it represents, it does not matter what its capabilities are. I allow the other fellow his full right to say that we should keep quiet on these occasions, but we are functioning under a system of responsible government, and the Government is here to rule us. It has been elected to its present position by the people and is there to use its best endeavours to administer the affairs of the country so that it shall be run in the interests—of whom? Not in the interests of any one particular section or of any number of sections, but of all the people.

Today we are face to face with the consequences of the action of a union with a comparatively small membership. And yet

we see the effect of its action not only upon the metropolitan area but upon the State as a whole. By its action it has imposed inconvenience, loss and suffering upon men, women and children, upon the aged, the blind and the infirm. In part of the province I represent—the far-flung Murchison—the people there have, goodness knows, suffered during the past few years through a visitation of nature in the form of an unprecedented drought. On top of that, now at the hands of their fellowmen they are confronted with the situation in which the State finds itself today.

Surely this is the time when—I forget who the individual was that made the statement, for it was a long time ago—the truth of the saying is amply evident: “Now is the time for every man to come at the call of his country.” That is the position. We have a law on the statute-book. Either we support the Government or we support the union. Since I have been a member of this Chamber I have never hesitated, when I thought it necessary, to castigate and criticise the Government to the full. On this occasion I commend it. Despite some who believe to the contrary, I think this is a time when we should not be quiet. I shall not be quiet, be the consequences what they may. I will stand up in my place and commend the Government upon the stand it has taken in this iniquitous and illegal act by the Locomotive Enginedrivers, Firemen and Cleaners’ Union.

I ask the House to respond to the invitation I extend and to suggest to local governing bodies that they convene the meetings I suggest. It can be truthfully said that those local bodies are constituted of men who in their actions as road board members are free from party politics. I, with other members, have had lengthy experience on various local governing bodies. In my association with them I have never noticed anything approaching party political feeling. They carry out their work quite apart from political considerations, and we should give the people throughout the State an opportunity to declare themselves on this matter and indicate whether or not they stand foursquare behind the Government of the country, which is endeavouring to administer affairs of State in a lawful

and law-abiding manner. I therefore have pleasure in submitting my motion.

HON. H. TUCKEY (South-West) [4.34]: I second the motion. In my opinion enough has been said from time to time to indicate that we are solidly behind the Government in this unfortunate trouble. I am not altogether in accord with the motion as worded. I am not altogether in support of some references that have been made to certain political parties not having indicated that they were behind the Government from the beginning. I think every member of Parliament has felt it his duty to remain quiet in the present situation in order to allow the Government to handle the matter. I am confident that the Government is conscious of the fact that Parliament is behind it, otherwise political parties would have made political capital out of the embarrassment of the Government as far as they could. In my opinion, the Government has known right through that it had the full support of every member of Parliament.

The motion suggests the help that might be given to the Government by the local authorities. No doubt those local governing authorities represent a very strong section of the community. Throughout the State there are 127 country boards quite apart from other local governing authorities. I cannot speak for them all, but I would be game to assert that the great majority of them are just as much behind the Government as are members of this House. Quite apart from the motion every indication has been given to the Government that the boards were prepared to assist the Government, which has been advised to that effect. If anything more can be done along the lines suggested in the motion, I am quite sure that the local authorities will do all they possibly can. On the other hand, I think it is for the Government itself to indicate whether it desires the assistance suggested.

In my opinion, the road boards could do a very great deal in offering transport facilities. Most of the boards have large trucks by the use of which they could greatly facilitate transport services. I take it that as soon as occasion arises the Government will request that assistance, and I do not know that it would not be better tactics

to adopt that course than to work along the lines suggested. I prefer to leave the Government to say whether help is required. Certainly if anything were done along the lines suggested in the motion, men in various parts of the State who are on strike would be reached and their views obtained.

Hon. E. H. H. Hall: That is so.

Hon. H. TUCKEY: I know of no bodies whose help and co-operation would be more willingly extended to the Government if desired than the road boards of this State. I will do everything I possibly can in my official capacity, but I want to do it in the right way. I do not desire to add fuel to the fire. I certainly desire to secure the cessation of this terrible strike which is causing so much loss and inconvenience to the people. I think we have done as much as we can by debating this matter. We have not criticised the Government, nor is there any such desire. Our only object is to assist and I know that the road boards throughout the State will help as far as they possibly can.

HON. G. B. WOOD (East) [4.38]: I commend Mr. E. H. H. Hall for introducing the motion, but I do not know that it is necessary for public meetings to be called throughout the country. Amongst the people with whom I come in contact quite 90 per cent., if not more, are behind the Government. I move about people of all shades of opinion, and I have met very few indeed who are behind the striking union in this instance. If that is good news to the Government and furnishes any comfort, I am very glad to be able to pass on that information.

I can see no prospect at all of the Government being defeated in the contest. In 1921 when a railway strike was in progress, I do not believe there were more than one or two motor trucks on the road. Today with the present strike in progress. I saw one of the most amazing sights I have witnessed during my lifetime. At Midland Junction just before 6 a.m. hundreds of motor trucks were to be seen bringing sheep to the Midland Junction markets. It was an extraordinary sight. I have it on the authority of one of the managers of a stock firm, that 18,000 sheep were de-

livered to the markets today by motor truck.

While that can take place we need have no fear as to what the upshot of the industrial trouble will be. I know there are heavier goods that cannot be carted by road so well and so expeditiously, but nevertheless there are some enormous trucks on the road today and I believe we can fight the railway men to the end. I have made no secret as to where I stand, and I think every other member of the House has done likewise. It is our fight, not merely the Government's fight; we should all fight these people in every way we possibly can.

Hon. E. H. H. Hall: It is the people's fight.

Hon. G. B. WOOD: That is so. Farmers from all over the country districts deliver their sheep by truck to the Midland markets, and if they can do that they can move the wheat as well. We know what quantity of wheat was handled when the railways could not transport it. In my opinion it will not be long before the railway men cave in. I make this suggestion to the Government. When the strike is over, some relaxation of the transport regulations should be authorised seeing that they have hampered the primary producers so much in the past. Why should I and other farmers, located 60 miles or more away, be debarred from trucking our sheep to the Midland Junction markets? Let members consider what happened this morning. In 1¾ hours I had transported my lambs from the farm to the Midland saleyards and I was away again within two hours. What is the alternative? If I transport my sheep by rail, I have to drive them to the siding, which takes three hours.

Hon. L. B. Bolton: And do it the day before they are trucked.

Hon. G. B. WOOD: Sometimes others do it two days before, but generally the day before. Then the sheep are in trucks for 12 hours and sometimes as much as 18 hours. I load the sheep on the trucks at my siding at 5 a.m., and it is 5 o'clock or later next day before they are unloaded. People will not stand that sort of thing, seeing that not only sheep are concerned. I urge the Government at this stage to make an announcement indicating that there will be a relaxation of the transport regu-

lations, for I am sure people will be anxiously looking for it. As to the public meetings suggested by Mr. E. H. H. Hall, I do not know that they would help, but the move would not do any harm.

Hon. E. H. H. Hall: The other side is holding meetings.

Hon. G. B. WOOD: That is so. I see that today one gentleman was discussing the matter at Fremantle with the object of stirring up the lumpers. Is he to be allowed to do that? Cannot his activities be curbed? I hope the Government will do what is possible to deal with this gentleman and, if he is to continue as he has been going on lately, they should put him somewhere where he cannot do it. I do not know that there is anything further the Government can do and the motion, if agreed to, might have the effect of stifling up some of the people. I hope the motion will indicate, if it is necessary, that this House is behind the Government and that we will let the people know that that is the position.

HON. W. J. MANN (South-West) [4.44]: I know Mr. E. H. H. Hall means well with regard to his motion, but I doubt the wisdom of his idea of asking the Government to sponsor meetings all over the country.

Hon. E. H. H. Hall: I am not asking the Government, but this House, to do that.

Hon. W. J. MANN: I think it would be very much better and have more force if people held meetings of their own accord.

Hon. G. B. Wood: Someone has to organise them.

Hon. W. J. MANN: I do not see my way clear to support the motion. I do not like the way it reads, either. It begins—

That in the opinion of this House, pending the hearing of the dispute on the A.S.G. engines by an impartial body—

Does that reflect, or could it be taken to reflect, on the body that has already heard this dispute?

Hon. E. H. H. Hall: I referred to the body suggested by the Premier.

Hon. W. J. MANN: The motion continues—

—on which the union has a representative.

Can a body on which the union has a representative be an impartial body? Is it likely to be? I am afraid I cannot support the motion.

HON. E. M. HEENAN (North-East) [4.46]: I think we will readily agree that it is the desire of all of us to do what we can to effect an early termination of this unfortunate dispute. I am absolutely convinced that no-one could possibly do more than the Government has done and is doing. I am afraid that a motion like this will not get anyone anywhere. It only gives members an opportunity to speak and perhaps unwittingly give utterance to some statements that might cause embarrassment and might even have the effect of prolonging the dispute.

Hon. G. B. Wood: There is only one language they know.

Hon. E. M. HEENAN: The motion, as it reads, means very little. If local governing bodies want to hold meetings, they can do so already. The carrying of the motion will not get us anywhere, and I cannot see any purpose in it.

HON. G. FRASER (West) [4.47]: I do not like pious resolutions at any time and I do not think this one goes beyond my idea of a pious resolution. We are suggesting that local governing bodies shall call meetings. That can be done without this House passing a motion asking them to do it. If there were a motion providing a definite line of action for this Chamber to take, I would consider such a motion on its merits.

Hon. G. B. Wood: Why do you not amend it to your liking?

Hon. G. FRASER: I do not agree that at this stage the matter is worthy of the consideration of Parliament. At a time when there is some slight prospect of a settlement of the dispute, it is better to leave the question to those best able to control the situation. I am not saying that I know of any definite move being made towards a settlement, but the matter is still in the early stages, when a suggestion may be made as a result of which a settlement can be reached.

Hon. L. B. Bolton: I thought it was in its late stages.

Hon. G. FRASER: Knowing the length of time that quite a number of disputes have lasted in past years, I am inclined to think

that the first week or so of a strike is not a very long period. I do not see that any good purpose can be achieved by carrying this motion, and I therefore do not intend to support it. If there were a motion calling for definite action, I do not say necessarily in connection with this strike, but something that would get us somewhere, I would be inclined to support it or consider it on its merits, but this appears to be merely a pious motion asking somebody else to do something, and the people concerned can please themselves whether they do it or not. I oppose the motion.

THE CHIEF SECRETARY (Hon. W. H. Kitson—West) [4.50]: It is problematical whether a motion of this kind has any real value. Much would depend on the attitude adopted by those convening the meetings, if they acted on the opinion of this House. It has already been pointed out that local authorities are at liberty to call meetings at any time they wish to deal with this or any other subject; and I am afraid that under present circumstances it would somewhat complicate matters if the various local authorities were expected to comply with a motion of this kind. It frequently happens that when meetings are called, people who are really ill-informed on the subject under discussion, take sides. Just as Mr. Wood has the idea that an official of the enginedrivers' union should not be allowed to address any other trade union on this dispute, so the union might think that people in the country have no right to address meetings giving the opposite point of view.

Hon. G. B. Wood: I had in mind the idea that someone else might be incited to strike.

The **CHIEF SECRETARY**: I am suggesting it is problematical whether a motion of this kind has any value. I have already referred to the fact that certain meetings have been held in the metropolitan area, and we know that motions were carried and conveyed to the right quarter. The same thing would happen in country districts if local authorities called meetings. It would be no use carrying a motion unless that motion were conveyed to whatever quarter it was intended for, which, in this case, would be the union.

One can imagine what would happen to resolutions of that kind at the present stage, if we are to take any notice of the attitude that has been adopted by the union up to date. Mr. Hall having ventilated his ideas, I think he might be well advised not to press this matter to a vote but to leave it where it is, because there is nothing in the motion calling upon the House to communicate with local authorities. I do not know whether Mr. Hall desired that that should be done. Some of them will have a knowledge of what has transpired here and I think it would be better to leave the matter there at this stage. The hon. member might well consider withdrawing the motion.

HON. H. S. W. PARKER (Metropolitan-Suburban) [4.54]: I did not desire to speak on this matter, but I feel it is one's duty to indicate how the question appears to one. Personally, I agree with the Chief Secretary that this motion will not assist in any way. It seems to me there are far too many meetings and far too little is done. It is about time something was accomplished. I think every one of us would desire to convey to the Premier his support and to give every possible assistance to bring this strike to an end. At the same time, we must expect the Premier and the Government to do something. No doubt we cannot be fully informed. I agree with that. But since we do not know what is taking place, the patience of the public is rapidly disappearing.

Something must be done one way or the other to bring the matter to a head. Out of all evils something good generally arises; and in this instance, as Mr. Wood has pointed out, as the result of the strike it has been shown clearly and distinctly that the Transport Co-ordination Act must go or be considerably amended. Moreover, the fact that the railways have got into the hands of people who are endeavouring to run them for their own good, has sounded the death knell to the system. The loco enginedrivers should be brought face to face with the fact that in future only half of their number will be required because road transport has proved far more efficient than the railways.

If the Government could do something to bring these men to book, to a realisation of their utter foolishness and to an appreciation of the fact that they are acting

against the interests of their comrades in other unions; if they could be brought to understand that they are causing great misery and, I regret to say, considerable ill-health and perhaps even worse; then it may be that the members of the union as a whole would realise the unfortunate position in which their officials have placed them and the community in general. It would be very wrong of me to attempt in any way to discuss the merits or demerits of the strike. But I would say that no strike is justified that is likely to cause inconvenience, ill-health and ill-feeling in the community.

As a result of this dispute, many sick people are unable to receive x-ray treatment and the health of others is being seriously affected. The longer the delay in reaching a settlement the more dangerous will the situation become. Something will have to be done very quickly or the public will take the matter out of the hands of the Government and of the union which, of course, we would all very much deplore. I sincerely trust the Government will let the public know what is being done, with a view to putting an end to the present impasse.

HON. E. H. H. HALL (Central—unreply) [4.56]: I object to my motion being referred to as a pious resolution. We live in a democracy, and people should be invited to express their opinion on a very serious matter such as this. The dispute affects not only the metropolitan area but the whole of the State, and to call this a pious resolution is, to my way of thinking, not quite fair. However, the member who referred to it as such is entitled to his own opinion. We have heard two members supporting the Government ask the question, "What is the use of doing anything?" That is just it; I differ from them. I say that this upheaval is of such vital importance to the State that it is up to every man and woman to do something to let the powers that be—namely, the Government—know that he and she admire the stand taken by the Government and are heartily behind it.

I have not taken the trouble to find out how many locomotive depots there are in this State. I know how many there are in my own province, and I am firmly convinced that if meetings were held where

there are such depots they would have an effect on the members of the striking union situated in those areas. A meeting was held on the Esplanade on Sunday. It was called by the union and we were informed by the Press that out of 400 people who were present, only one or two dissented from a resolution commending the union's stand. Again there were meetings at Fremantle and at Midland. I think it was circulated in the Press that the president of the union said he would have, "Nothing more to do with the people over there," waving his arm in the direction of the Arbitration Court, or "with the people over there," waving his arm in the direction of Parliament House.

That is not fair comment or comment that will make for good government in this State. Some member said, "Who is going to call meetings? They have got power to call meetings." Of course there is power to call meetings. Surely these trite sayings do not get us anywhere. In circumstances such as we are faced with, it is necessary for somebody to take the lead, and who is better fitted to take the lead than Parliament? Mr. Mann said I was calling on the Government. I submit that the hon. member had not taken the trouble to read the motion.

Hon. W. J. Mann: I corrected that.

Hon. E. H. H. HALL: I was careful to refrain from any such silly suggestion as requesting the Government to ask people to support it. As I said before, the Government should have the active support of every elector in the State. Before this question is put, I wish to thank the Chief Secretary for his suggestion that I withdraw the motion, but I cannot agree to do so. I intend having the motion put to the House. By my motion, I am not asking the men to return to work on the Garratt engines, but to return to work and to abide by the result of the investigations of a committee, on which there will be a representative of the union, an independent engineer from the Eastern States, and a representative of the Commissioner of Railways. I am not asking the men to go back on their union principles; and I would not submit the motion if it made a request of that sort.

I, with other members, know many of these men personally, and we could not wish, either individually or personally, to

meet better men. If it were pointed out to them by people in their respective localities that they are inflicting grievous injury on the whole of the State, I think they would agree that it is time they regretted the impetuous action that they have taken and, in the interests of the State, went back to work, leaving the questions relating to Garratt engines to the committee.

Hon. G. Bennetts: Does not the hon. member think the local government bodies are capable of calling meetings without direction from us?

Hon. E. H. H. HALL: I thank the hon. member for the interjection, but I think it is time the people of the State were given a lead, and from where could the lead better come than from the Parliament of the State, representing the people of the State?

Question put and passed; the motion agreed to.

BILL—TRAFFIC ACT AMENDMENT (No. 2).

Assembly's Message.

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

BILL—STATE HOUSING.

Recommittal.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: Before the Bill is recommitted—I understand that is the desire of Mr. Tuckey—I hope I am in order in referring to a matter that was deferred during the Committee stage. Mr. Parker desired to know what was the reason for the inclusion of Clause 14, which makes the commission a Crown agency. I was asked if I could explain that clause and I said at the time that I thought it was a legal provision that the draftsman considered necessary. The information supplied to me is somewhat on the same lines. Clause 14 is desired to make quite clear that the commission will be an instrumentality of the Crown. It will be composed of various responsible officers, all appointed by the Governor, and having very important functions to discharge. The Crown is therefore happy to delegate to the commission the Crown's powers for the purposes of the Act. I draw attention to the words "for

the purposes of this Act" which limit the scope of the commission's powers. The Crown is not bound by any statute unless it is expressly made so bound or is bound by necessary implication from the wording of the Act. It is desired that this commission shall have the same powers as the Crown and be entitled to the same privileges. It is really a delegation by the Crown to highly trusted officers who are fully conversant with State housing to administer the Act on behalf of the Crown, and for that purpose it is deemed necessary to give the expressed powers to the commission.

There has been a recent tendency in the High Court, notably in the grain elevators case, to doubt whether certain commissions and boards appointed under statutory authority are Crown instrumentalities. In the grain elevators case it was held that that board was not a Crown instrumentality. It is desired in the case of the State housing commission to remove all doubts and state expressly that the commission shall have all the powers and privileges, rights and remedies of the Crown for the purposes of the Act.

On motion by Hon. H. Tuckey, Bill recommitted for the purpose of considering a new clause.

In Committee.

Hon. J. A. Dimmitt in the Chair; the Chief Secretary in charge of the Bill.

New clause:

The CHAIRMAN: I think a mistake has occurred, and that the hon. member is wrong in saying he desires to introduce a new clause. I think he wants to add a proviso to paragraph (a) of Subclause (1) of Clause 21.

Hon. H. TUCKEY: It is my desire to limit the power to acquire private land to a period of five years from the commencement of the Act. If we insert a paragraph as suggested, it would only refer to this part of the measure, Clause 21, while Clause 29 has a similar provision. I move—

That a new clause be inserted as follows:—
"23. Private land may be compulsorily acquired under this part of this Act only within a period of five years after the commencement of this Act."

In my opinion it would be wrong to make the provisions of this Bill permanent. It is a drastic action to acquire private land whe-

ther it suits the owner or not, and I feel that if a period of five years is provided, that will be ample time in which to overcome the present emergency. There is some difficulty in acquiring land to meet the great shortage of houses and this power may be necessary at present, but it should not remain in force for all time. I cannot see why a continuance Bill should not be introduced, if necessary, after the expiration of five years. This drastic power should certainly be limited to that period. The Workers' Homes Board has done a very good job, but perhaps we shall not always have such sympathetic administration. One member suggested that the period should be limited to three years, but I have been generous by making it five years. I am sure it is the wish of all members that we should return to normal conditions as soon as possible.

Hon. G. FRASER: I oppose the proposed new clause. Has the hon. member considered what the result might be? If the commission were thus limited it might be forced into buying land required for the next 20 years, and thus doing an ill-service to land owners. As the Bill stands, the commission would acquire land only as it was needed.

Hon. Sir HAL COLEBATCH: I cannot see that any possible harm could result from including the new clause. Certainly within five years this legislation will have to be amended in various ways and, if it is found necessary that this power should be continued, the Government can ask for it. This compulsory taking of people's land is objectionable, and though circumstances may justify it at present, it is easy to go too far. To pass permanent legislation to meet an emergency is not sound.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: I oppose the new clause. I am surprised at the two members who have supported it. Surely they realise that the Government has the responsibility of acquiring land for Commonwealth and State housing schemes and the commission must adopt a long-range plan. It must look more than five years ahead. True, the Act could be continued after five years, but why should the Government have to do that? The commission would be forced to acquire more land within that period than it otherwise would do.

Hon. H. Tuckey: Not necessarily.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: It would be essential if the commission were to carry out

its job. The new clause would have a cramping effect on the operations of the commission. Such a body would not be likely to buy land unless it was urgently needed.

Hon. L. CRAIG: The new clause is desirable. We have reached the stage where a principle is involved. Is the Government to be empowered for all time to ride roughshod, as it does sometimes—

The Chief Secretary: I must object to that statement.

Hon. H. S. W. PARKER: He is not referring to your Government.

Hon. L. CRAIG: I am referring to a Government instrumentality being given the power to ride roughshod over individual rights and acquire any land considered suitable.

Hon. G. Fraser: Cannot it do that under the Public Works Act?

Hon. L. CRAIG: We should not empower the Government for all time to acquire anybody's land. Is it wrong for a man to buy land in the hope of selling it at a profit later on? I cannot see that it is. Individual initiative should not be stifled. We should let the Government know that this is temporary legislation and not a measure to be accepted for all time.

Hon. H. S. W. PARKER: I have regarded this measure as a piece of permanent legislation. As population becomes more dense, the commission will require the power to secure land held by private individuals. I disagree with Mr. Craig in his remarks about a man buying land with a view to making a profit. The object of the Bill is to enable people to get land at a reasonable price. It is detrimental to a suburb when people hold land for a profit. As a fact, that cannot be done in these days because rates and taxes are so high. I doubt whether the new clause would have any effect, because Clause 14 bestows on the commission all the rights and privileges of the Crown. Sufficient safeguards have been inserted to ensure that a man whose land is acquired will get his rights. The new clause would unnecessarily hobble the powers of the commission.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: The Government has power under the Public Works Act to resume any land for Government purposes and this would be a Government purpose. Adequate provision has been made for an appeal by an owner who is dissatisfied with the

action of the commission in compulsorily acquiring his land. Even the man mentioned by Mr. Craig is given adequate protection. There was really no need to include in this measure provisions for the acquisition of land, but the Government thought it better to include them and thus save the necessity of referring to the Public Works Act. The new clause would merely cramp the activities of the commission.

Hon. H. TUCKEY: There is no desire to cramp the activities of the commission. It would be quite competent to ask Parliament to continue this legislation should it be desirable and necessary. In days gone by, members would have debated this Bill for weeks; it has gone through in a matter of hours. That is because we are living under abnormal conditions and members are inclined to allow drastic clauses to pass. I think the provision most undemocratic.

New clause put and a division taken with the following result:—

Ayes	13
Noes	10
					—
Majority for			3
					—

AYES.

Hon. C. F. Baxter	Hon. C. H. Simpson
Hon. L. B. Bolton	Hon. A. Thomson
Hon. Sir Hal Colebatch	Hon. H. Tuckey
Hon. L. Craig	Hon. F. R. Welsh
Hon. R. M. Forrest	Hon. G. B. Wood
Hon. W. J. Mann	Hon. A. L. Leton
Hon. H. L. Roche	(Teller.)

NOES.

Hon. G. Bennetts	Hon. W. H. Kitson
Hon. G. Fraser	Hon. G. W. Miles
Hon. F. E. Gibson	Hon. H. S. W. Parker
Hon. E. H. Gray	Hon. C. B. Williams
Hon. W. R. Hall	Hon. E. H. Hall
	(Teller.)

New clause thus passed.

Bill again reported with a further amendment.

BILL—VERMIN ACT AMENDMENT.

Recommittal.

On motion by the Honorary Minister, Bill recommitted for the purpose of considering a new clause.

In Committee.

Hon. G. Fraser in the Chair; the Honorary Minister in charge of the Bill.

New clause:

The HONORARY MINISTER: A flaw was discovered in Section 98 of the Act and it vitally affects this Bill. I move—

That a new clause be inserted as follows:—

“5. Section ninety-eight of the principal Act is amended by inserting in Subsection (2) thereof the words ‘and upon the roads bounding or intersecting the same’ after the word ‘holding’ in the final line of this subsection.”

The flaw was discovered by the Mukinbudin Road Board. The point was discussed some six years ago by the Road Board Association, but was overlooked. A farmer must destroy vermin on his own land and he may open up burrows or warrens on the road and thus cause danger to traffic. It would be some time before the local authority could take the steps necessary to remedy the damage, and this amendment makes the farmer responsible for filling up the burrows or warrens that he has opened up. The department favours the amendment.

Hon. H. TUCKEY: Does this amendment mean that farmers will be obliged to fill in rabbit warrens on roads or merely poison the rabbits? Furthermore, would the farmer be responsible for only half or the whole of the road?

The HONORARY MINISTER: He would be responsible only for the portion of the road bounding his property.

Hon. L. Craig: Would the amendment compel him to destroy rabbits on the road and fill in the burrows?

Hon. L. B. Bolton: What does the farmer pay vermin rates for?

Hon. C. F. Baxter: Why does he rabbit-net?

The HONORARY MINISTER: I think the amendment is reasonable and the average farmer will welcome it. The letter from the Mukinbudin Road Board states—

Section 96 (1) empowers the board to specify the means to be adopted for the destruction of vermin on roads, but the authority is only effective after notice in the “Gazette” and one month after advertisement in a newspaper. Section 96 (2) empowers a board to specify the means to be adopted at once on holdings but not on roads; and it is for that immediate authority that the desired amendment is sought. In explanation, isolated cases do arise where rabbits have made a burrow or warren on to a roadway. Under the Act, as it is (Section 94), the adjoining

owner is responsible for destruction of the rabbits, and by that section compelled to destroy them, but he can leave the warren wide open and let it remain a danger to traffic until such time as the board sends a man out to fill it in.

If the desired amendment is inserted the board could specify the filling in of the warren as part of the means to be adopted in destroying the rabbits. This would inflict no injustice on the landholder as the responsibility is already his for the rabbits being on the road.

Mr. Tuckey may remember this—

This suggested amendment was approved of by the 1940 Conference, and after some correspondence with the then Chief Inspector of Rabbits received his approval and promise to have inserted when the Vermin Act was next under review.

As I said, the matter was unfortunately overlooked.

Hon. A. THOMSON: I think the amendment requires further consideration. I do not know whether all local authorities are aware of the effect of the amendment. The proposal seems to me to be an additional impost placed upon the farmer who today has the onus of destroying vermin on his own land. It does not seem right to extend that responsibility to country roads, because on occasions a man might have considerable areas of his property running alongside a road, and the country may be thickly infested with rabbits.

Hon. L. CRAIG: That power is in the Act now.

Hon. A. THOMSON: Then why the necessity to put this in?

The Honorary Minister: To make it safe.

Hon. A. THOMSON: I would like the Minister to report progress because I desire to get further information by discussing the matter with some of the members of the Royal Commission.

Hon. H. TUCKEY: I cannot recall what took place at the conference in 1940, but if a resolution was passed dealing with this matter, it would be easy to get the information from the secretary. There may be some opposition to the filling in of holes. It would depend somewhat on the extent to which the roads were damaged, but that would be the responsibility of the local authority. If a reserve is vested in a road board, that board is responsible for the destruction of vermin on it, and for the

eradication of noxious weeds on roads. If the Minister postponed this matter, we could probably get the necessary information.

Hon. C. F. BAXTER: Two members say there is already authority in the Act. I cannot recall any such power being there.

Hon. H. S. W. PARKER: It is in Section 96.

Hon. C. F. BAXTER: Why the necessity for the amendment? It is simply for serving notice. It does not include the railways.

Hon. H. S. W. PARKER: Section 96 of the Act provides that it is the duty of every owner and occupier of a holding to destroy all vermin on such holding and upon any roads bounding or intersecting it. Section 98 provides that the Minister, or a board, may cause to be served on an owner notice to take certain steps, but it does not say that notice can be given in respect of land adjoining, nor do I see any provision to fill in holes.

Hon. C. F. BAXTER: The inspector would see to that.

Hon. H. S. W. PARKER: This gives the Minister power to say, "Do it."

Hon. G. B. WOOD: The local vermin board, or the Minister, can make a farmer do practically anything to suppress rabbits. If a farmer takes a poison cart around and does not do the work properly, he can be told to fill in the holes. The amendment seeks to extend it to the roads.

Hon. H. S. W. PARKER: That power is already in the Act.

Hon. G. B. WOOD: There is power to make a farmer use his poison-cart, but not to fill in the holes. The amendment gives the board power to make a man do anything it thinks fit. I would like to report progress and get clarification of the matter.

The HONORARY MINISTER: It is apparent that it is unworkable and uneconomical for a road board to repair any damage that a farmer has done in the destruction of rabbits. Do we want a board sending a man 20 miles to repair a road in front of a farmer's property?

Hon. A. Thomson: Supposing a farmer has to go three or four miles?

The HONORARY MINISTER: He would not have to go that far unless he had a big property, and it is easier for a big farmer to do these things than for a small one. This would apply to unreasonable farmers. I cannot imagine a man with a sense of responsibility doing this work and leaving the land near the fence in a condition dangerous to traffic. If members want to investigate the matter further, I will report progress.

Hon. A. Thomson: You know what the department requires; I do not.

The HONORARY MINISTER: It is what the road boards require, and they are backed up by the departmental officers.

Progress reported.

ADJOURNMENT—SPECIAL.

THE CHIEF SECRETARY (Hon. W. H. Kitson—West): I move—

That the House at its rising adjourn till 2.30 p.m. tomorrow.

Question put and passed.

House adjourned at 5.57 p.m.

Legislative Assembly.

Wednesday, 20th November, 1946.

	PAGE
Question: Aborigines and Professor Elkin's visit, as to tabling correspondence	2054
Motions: Additional sitting day, passed	2056
Railways, as to inquiry into efficiency and administration	2060
Traffic Act, to disallow angle parking regulation defeated	2076
Bills: Companies Act Amendment, 1A.	2056
State Forest Access, 1A.	2056
Daylight Saving, 2A., remaining stages	2056
Returned	2077
Hairdressers Registration, report	2060
Traffic Act Amendment (No. 2), Council's Amendment	2077
Loan Estimates, 1946-47, Com.	2077
Adjournment, special	2086

The SPEAKER took the Chair at 2 p.m., and read prayers.

QUESTION.

ABORIGINES AND PROFESSOR ELKIN'S VISIT.

As to Tabling Correspondence.

Mr. RODOREDA (without notice) asked the Minister for the North-West: Did he read an article in this morning's issue of "The West Australian" referring to a proposed visit to this State by Professor Elkin? If so, will he accede to the suggestion that the correspondence between the Minister and the writer of the letter be laid on the Table of the House?

The MINISTER replied: The answer to the first part of the hon. member's question is yes. The answer to the second part is that I have no objection to laying those papers on the Table of the House. The papers will disclose that there was a private conversation between Archdeacon Parry of Perth and Mr. Taylor, representing the National Missionary Council, of which no shorthand notes were taken. The correspondence from then onwards is available and will be laid on the Table of the House.

BILLS (2)—FIRST READING.

1, Companies Act Amendment.

Introduced by the Minister for Justice.

2, State Forest Access.

Introduced by the Minister for Forests.

MOTION—ADDITIONAL SITTING DAY.

THE PREMIER (Hon. F. J. S. Wise—Gascoyne) [2.5]: I move—

That for the remainder of the session the House shall meet for the despatch of business on Fridays in addition to the days already provided.

Question put and passed; the motion agreed to.

BILL—DAYLIGHT SAVING.

Second Reading.

Debate resumed from the previous day.

MR. WATTS (Katanning) [2.6]: I agree with the Premier that there is at the present time need for consideration of legis-