

He admitted the amendments were desirable, and apparently the remainder of the Bill was desirable—

—although desirable, were not very important.

He went on to say that the other amendments were obnoxious. One would have thought that after this House had given way except for four amendments, some spirit of compromise would have been shown; but the Minister, on being asked whether he proposed to give further consideration to the Bill, merely said that that was not his intention, and the Bill was thrown aside. In view of what was done by another place on that occasion, I can assure the Government it is not going to get my vote for this Bill. That is one reason. Other reasons are that I find quite a number of the suggested amendments are such as are unacceptable to me. My vote will be cast against the Bill.

On motion by the Chief Secretary, debate adjourned.

ADJOURNMENT—SPECIAL.

THE CHIEF SECRETARY (Hon. W. H. Kitson—West) [5.39]: I move—

That the House at its rising adjourn till Tuesday, the 11th October.

Question put and passed.

House adjourned at 5.10 p.m.

Legislative Assembly,

Tuesday, 4th October, 1938.

	PAGE
Question: Workers' Compensation Act, appointment of woman medical officer	1192
Bills: Fremantle Gas and Coke Company's Act Amendment, 2R.	1192
Mines Regulation Act Amendment, 2R.	1193
Lights (Navigation Protection), 1R.	1194
Bureau of Industry and Economic Research, 2R.	1194
Parliamentary Disqualifications (Declaration of Law), 2R, point of order	1200
Northam Municipality Loan Authorisation, 2R., Com. Report	1209
Annual Estimates, 1938-39, Com. of Supply	1210
Votes discussed: Unemployment Relief and State Labour Bureau	1210
Adjournment, Royal Show	1227

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

QUESTION—WORKERS' COMPENSATION ACT.

Appointment of Woman Medical Officer.

Mr. RAPHAEL (without notice) asked the Minister for Employment: 1, Is Dr. M. A. Radcliffe-Taylor being considered for appointment to fill the position occupied by the late Dr. Lovegrove? 2, Has the Government given consideration to the fact that there are Western Australian male doctors available to fill that position? 3, Has it considered that about 99 per cent. of those to be examined under the provisions of the Workers' Compensation Act are men? 4, Have the men's feelings been considered in view of the proposal that a woman shall conduct the examinations?

The MINISTER FOR EMPLOYMENT replied: 1, Applications for this position were called in the usual way by the Public Service Commissioner. Favourable consideration is being given to the application of Dr. Radcliffe-Taylor. 2, 3, and 4, So far as I am aware, the matter has not yet been finalised.

BILL—FREMANTLE GAS AND COKE COMPANY'S ACT AMENDMENT.

Second Reading.

THE MINISTER FOR WORKS (Hon. H. Millington—Mt. Hawthorn) [4.35] in moving the second reading said: In the metropolitan area, as is well known, there are two gas-supplying authorities, namely, the Electricity and Gas Department of the Perth

City Council, and the Fremantle Gas and Coke Co. The Act under which the Fremantle company operates limits its scope to within a radius of five miles from the Town Hall at Fremantle. The jurisdiction of the Perth authority was originally restricted to within a radius of five miles of the G.P.O., but, under an amendment passed last session, the department can now supply outside that radius, subject to the approval of the local authority concerned and of the Governor. In pursuance of the power given in the amendment, approval has been granted to the Perth authority to supply the whole of the territory in the Nedlands road district, which is outside the five-mile radius. Certain relatively small sections of the municipalities of Claremont and Cottesloe, indicated on litho No. 41, which I shall place on the Table, are not included within the limits of either authority, and to give residents within those sections the advantage of a gas supply, the Bill has been introduced. The boundaries defined in the Bill have been agreed to by the two supplying authorities as being the most convenient, taking into consideration the local existing mains. The Bill provides that an extension can be made only at the request of the local authority concerned, and with the approval of the Governor. Last session's Bill, which lapsed, sought to give the Fremantle company power, with the approval of the Governor, to extend to any territory outside the five-mile radius from the Town Hall, Fremantle, but we now consider it preferable definitely to prescribe the area in which an extension by the company may be made.

On the previous occasion when Parliament dealt with a measure affecting the powers of the Fremantle company, that concern sought the same rights as those enjoyed by the Electricity and Gas Department of the Perth City Council. The Government was not prepared to agree to such a proposal. The advice it had was that an Order-in-Council was irrevocable and, while the need to exercise care was not so pronounced with regard to a local authority, the extension of such power to a private company was not considered justifiable in the circumstances. During the intervening period, the representatives of the two local authorities have conferred and agreed to the delineation of the extent of the Fremantle company's extensions, as set out on the litho. The effect will be that the company will be able to extend its operations accord-

ingly, but under the same terms as prescribed in the original Act. As the two suppliers are in agreement, and as the Fremantle company's powers are definitely determined, I do not think there will be much opposition to the proposal. I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

On motion by Mr. North, debate adjourned.

BILL—MINES REGULATION ACT AMENDMENT.

Second Reading.

THE MINISTER FOR MINES (Hon. A. H. Panton—Leederville) [4.41] in moving the second reading said: The Bill is small but long overdue. Section 55 of the Mines Regulation Act of 1906 reads—

The Governor may, by notice in the "Government Gazette," direct that the wages due to all workmen employed on any mine shall be paid in two instalments in each month. Any manager who fails to comply with such direction shall be guilty of an offence against this Act.

At present, the mining companies are paying their workers on the 3rd and 18th of each month. That has caused much discontent over a long period. The miners represent the only section of the community not paid weekly or fortnightly. After much agitation, and in consequence of a petition that I have in my office, and which bears the signatures of 4,070 people residing in the Kalgoorlie area urging that the amendment proposed in the Bill be made, the Government proposes that the workers on the goldfields shall be paid every second Friday. That is the sole provision in the Bill, the effect of which will be to repeal Section 55 and substitute the following new section in lieu—

The Governor may, by notice in the "Government Gazette," direct that, notwithstanding the provisions of this or any other Act of Parliament, or the terms of any award or industrial agreement—

Industrial agreements do not provide any particular time for such payments—

—made under the provisions of the Industrial Arbitration Act, 1912-1935, the wages due to all workmen employed on all mines shall be calculated up to and paid on the last Friday of each successive fortnight after the date fixed by such notice.

That is the main portion of the proposed new section, but it continues with a proviso that will enable the Government, by pro-

clamation, to exempt any particular mine from the application of the section. Members will readily appreciate that it would be difficult for those controlling mines in the back country, or in the far North, to comply with such a provision. Hence the necessity for power to exempt them by means of a proclamation. The time has arrived when the mine workers should be placed in the same position as other industrialists, more especially as goldmining operations are on a particularly sound basis. No hardship will be suffered by anyone in consequence of this alteration. Civil servants are mostly paid fortnightly; those who are not, are paid weekly. I do not think there will be any objection to the proposal in the Bill, and I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

On motion by Mr. Patrick, debate adjourned.

BILL—LIGHTS (NAVIGATION PROTECTION).

Received from the Council and read a first time.

BILL—BUREAU OF INDUSTRY AND ECONOMIC RESEARCH.

Second Reading.

Debate resumed from the 22nd September.

MR. TONKIN (North-East Fremantle) [4.46]: When introducing this Bill, the Minister said that he felt considerable pleasure, and I think he was justifiably pleased in bringing such a measure before the House. He mentioned that the object of the Bill was to set up a bureau to carry out research work in industry, in order that industry might be further developed and additional opportunities for employment provided. I do not think it possible to find better objects than these, and that is why I say the Minister was justifiably pleased when introducing the Bill. He mentioned the desire of the Government to ascertain avenues for development; and, having ascertained those avenues, the intention of the Government to assist in the establishment of industry within those avenues. If we pause for a moment and take a survey of the existing position, we find the outlook for young people is decidedly black. I recall quite vividly what was done for the youth of the

country at the beginning of the depression. The young people were gathered together and concentrated in camps at Blackboy and Fremantle.

Mr. Sleeman: Not all of them.

Mr. TONKIN: Many of them were. That was the best the Government could do for them at the time. Subsequently, an improvement was effected. Work was found in various parts of the State for the young single men at a rate of about 30s. per week. Some were employed on relief work. They have been on relief work for four or five years. Others have not been employed on it at all. That is the best we could offer those young people, and if we were to ask members to suggest an improvement upon this scheme, they would reply, "They ought to be absorbed in industry." That is what the Leader of the Opposition and the member for Nedlands (Hon. N. Keenan) said the other night. It may be true, but I can see very little hope of the absorption of our youth in primary industries, because it seems to me that our primary industries have been overdeveloped to such an extent that we must call a halt. The member for Nedlands made no secret of the fact that he believes a change-over from primary industry is vitally necessary now. He goes so far as to say that there is no future for our primary industry. He quoted two examples. He said that the cost of the production of wool was as high as its selling price, and that there was very little hope of reducing that cost. With wheat production, he said we were not able to compete with countries that could produce that commodity at a cheaper cost. He then made the definite statement that there was no future for primary industry in Western Australia for a number of years to come, if at all. I could not expect the Leader of the Opposition to go so far as to say that, because his feet are firmly planted in primary industry; that is where his chief interests lie, and naturally he believes in that industry. But he must realise that we have reached a stage in the development of our internal economy where primary industry has been over-developed, and when we will have to effect some change to bring about a better balance. We cannot hope to absorb very many of our unemployed young people in our primary industries. One of the drawbacks of this State is that we have been unable to take advantage of the lull in business which the defence ex-

penditure has given to the other States. Industries in Victoria and New South Wales have been benefited considerably, because the defence expenditure is finding its way to the factories and providing employment for large numbers of men there. Western Australia, however, derives no benefit from that expenditure, despite the fact that we have to contribute a large proportion of it. The Royal Commissioner who inquired into the youth unemployment problem blamed our unco-ordinated go-as-you-please methods for producing idleness. I agree with him. There is no set plan. Business men simply make up their minds to have a shot at something; some of them are successful, the majority fail. There is no co-ordinated effort, so we cannot wonder if in most instances such efforts are fruitless. The Royal Commissioner said that a policy of laissez-faire should not commend itself to a young nation. Of course it should not, but nevertheless it is the policy of this State. In practice, it is nobody's business to undertake a general survey of probable future demands, said Professor Fisher, but every successful business man does, within the limits of his knowledge and capacity, attempt something of the kind on a small scale, and the extent to which he is successful in his efforts is an important factor in determining the volume of employment which is made available. If members will but consider that statement for a moment, I feel certain they will agree with every word of it. In practice, it is nobody's business to undertake a general survey of probable future demands. Every successful business man does, within the limits of his knowledge and capacity—and there is the restriction—attempt to make such a survey, but the survey is within the limits of his knowledge and capacity; and, may I add, within the limits of the facilities available to him. The purpose of the Bill is to set up an organisation, the business of which will be to investigate, to make research upon proper lines, to obtain necessary information concerning probable future demands, and to make information available to the people who require it. Therefore, in place of spasmodic effort by some business men, we shall have the co-ordinated effort of the bureau, and we should expect something better from it than we have obtained up to the present. The concluding part of Professor Fisher's statement was—

... and the extent to which the business man is successful in his estimate is an important

factor in determining the volume of employment which is made available.

Therefore, we are dependent for the employment of our people upon the success which attends the efforts of those business men who do attempt to make research in order to ascertain probable future demands.

It has been suggested by yourself, Mr. Speaker, and by the Leader of the Opposition, that members of Parliament could quite effectively carry out the necessary research and assist industries to become established; but the Leader of the Opposition, after making that statement, immediately denied it by saying that members had too little time, as it was, to read the reports which are tabled in this House. That is true. I hazard a guess that not 2 per cent. of members read all the reports that are tabled. We see them on our benches; we read some of them and parts of others, but I assert that not 2 per cent. of members read all the reports that are tabled.

Hon. C. G. Latham: I meant while the House was in session.

Mr. TONKIN: But members do not read them.

Hon. C. G. Latham: Not while the House is in session.

Mr. TONKIN: The Leader of the Opposition said members had insufficient time to read all the reports placed before them. If we have insufficient time to do that, how can we find time to make necessary research and obtain information that can be relied upon by people who are desirous of establishing industries? It would be ridiculous for us to offer help in that direction. Odd members may knuckle down to the task and do it with a great deal of enthusiasm, but my opinion is that no results would be obtained that would be of great value to people seeking to establish industries. In short, what would be everybody's business would be nobody's business; the result would be very poor indeed. This Parliament has been established for very many years, so have Parliaments in other States and countries, but I have yet to learn that members of this Parliament have, by their research, gathered sufficient information of much value for the establishment of industries. So I put that suggestion aside as being of no consequence whatever in relation to assistance to industry.

The Leader of the Opposition and the member for Nedlands both said that second-

any industries could not successfully be established in this State. They were at some pains to prove that those industries could not be established. I put it to members, how much enthusiasm would the Leader of the Opposition and the member for Nedlands display if they were engaged in research work to assist industries, when they are firmly convinced beforehand that secondary industries cannot be established in the State? Having that idea, they would not be likely to find out very much of assistance to industries. They have stated here that such is their opinion; that it is useless to establish secondary industries in this State. Members will find the reasons of those hon gentlemen, if they have forgotten what they were, in the columns of "Hansard." If the bureau is established there will be a systematic effort towards the acquiring of necessary knowledge as against the spasmodic attempts made in the past. We have had a local products campaign, the object of which has been to give a filip to industry and to assist in its establishment. Those efforts have been temporarily successful, but they have been too spasmodic to be of any great service. What is needed is a concentrated effort whereby we can initiate a movement for expansion. We can do it through the bureau. It was refreshing to hear the remarks of the member for Claremont (Mr. North) who supported the Bill. He is always hopeful and enterprising and also prepared to experiment. If we are not prepared to experiment, we will not get anywhere. The present stage of the world's development is the result of the desire on the part of a large number of people to carry on experiments. If we take all the advantages that have accrued we will find they are the direct result of experiment. If the people who experimented started off by saying that it would be useless to do so, they would not get very far. It is remarkable how the opponents of a measure such as this all use similar phraseology and similar arguments. The Leader of the Opposition said, "I cannot see one thing in it." He was referring to the Bill. The member for Nedlands said, "The Bill is one in which I cannot find any particular merit; the Bill will not be the means of doing any good whatever." On looking up Queensland "Hansard" I find that those were the exact words that were used by Mr. Moore when he was opposing similar legislation in the Queens-

land Parliament. He, too, said that he could not see any value in the Bill. He could not be expected to do so, I suppose, because he did not want to, and he was not prepared to go into the merits of the case. He simply said that he opposed the Bill because, I suppose, it came from the Government and the best way in which to oppose it was to say, "We cannot see any merit in it." There is a great similarity in the arguments used in this House and those used in the Queensland Parliament. What was the case of the Opposition? The Leader of the Opposition gave an outline of it. He admitted the existence of the unemployment problem, especially youth unemployment. Then he said that the only solution was to absorb all those men in industry and added, "We cannot establish secondary industries." Next he said, "I have no desire to see the Bureau established here" and added, "We have sufficient talent in this House to do all that is necessary to establish industry." He told the House that he would not go to men in St. George's Terrace to seek certain information, but he would prefer to get it from members in this House. Next he told us that members had not had sufficient time to read the various reports tabled in the House. Of what value then would be the opinion of members, or what assistance could members give in the establishment of industry? Later the hon. member accused the Labour Government of being very incompetent for not having made it possible to absorb youth in industry, notwithstanding the fact that it was not possible to do so.

That in effect was the case advanced by the Leader of the Opposition. What was the case of the member for Nedlands? He admitted the existence of the problem and referred to youth unemployment. The hon. member went further than the Leader of the Opposition and said that primary industries were practically finished and there was a necessity for a change-over in our economy. He said that we had to face the change. Those were his very words, but he would not face it. He said that neither the C.S.I.R. nor the proposed bureau would establish secondary industries in this State; in fact, the establishment of secondary industries could not be carried out in Western Australia. That was his dictum, that it would not be possible to establish secondary industries in this State. That too, was what the Leader of the Opposition said.

No wonder the Premier then interjected, "We are not going to throw up our hands in despair." The attitude of the Leader of the Opposition and the member for Nedlands was that of despair, that there was no future for the primary industries, and that we could not establish secondary industries. What on earth, therefore, are we to do? If we establish the bureau we shall at least feel that we are trying to do something, that we are grappling with a problem, and that we will have somebody to see whether industries can be established in the State. But to start off and say that they cannot be established, and then chide people for not establishing those industries seems to me a ridiculous situation. I am not going to believe we cannot establish secondary industries in this State because we have already done so to an extent. The Government, through the Minister, has intimated its intention to render assistance to industry if it can be found that avenues for such assistance exist. I feel sure they do exist. The Leader of the Opposition mentioned that on account of the hours of labour and the wages we pay it was not possible to establish secondary industries here. The member for Nedlands said that was not possible because of the tremendous competition of the amalgamated businesses in the Eastern States. Are we to sit down in despair and say that that is the position and that therefore we are finished? Are we to say that there is no future for our primary industries, that we cannot establish secondary industries, and therefore we must give up the ghost? The proposal before the House will be an attempt to establish secondary industries, and if the attempt fails then it will be time to say that we cannot do so. At least let us make an attempt. Are we to say to those young people who have never had a regular job and whose only employment has been two or three days' work each week on Government relief, that there is no chance for them? We should say, "We will keep on trying until we achieve something." I am surprised that some hon. members are not prepared to make the attempt. There was an organisation in Queensland that was appointed to carry out research work and to make recommendations, but it had no administrative power and when the Queensland Government introduced a Bill to set up a bureau of industry and economic research, it was argued that it would be

necessary to give administrative power to that body so as to enable it to function properly. So that Government set up its bureau. Had experience proved that the existing organisation was useless, the Government would not have taken a further step. The Royal Commissioner in this State, Mr. Wolff, gave it as his opinion that the Queensland bureau was doing effective work, and he recommended that a similar institution be established in this State. Mr. Wolff was able to investigate certain work of the Bureau in Queensland and there was information placed at his disposal that we have not been able to get. Therefore, I am prepared to accept his view rather than the views of those who have not had any experience of the working of a bureau, but who are only arriving at conclusions without a proper knowledge of the facts. So I hope the Bill will pass this House by a big majority and that the bureau will be established. I am not so pessimistic as to feel that no good will result from it, nor am I going to be so stupid as to imagine that following on the establishment of the bureau, all our problems will be solved and that we will then be lulled into a sense of security. What I am expecting, however, is that the bureau will achieve some measure of success and if it only results in putting 100 additional men into work, it will have done some good. I am not prepared to accept the policy of the members to whom I have referred, which is a policy of despair. The member for Claremont welcomed the Bill, and I welcome it, and I hope the operations of the bureau, when it is established, will be the means of opening up a new era of industrial success in this State.

MR. CROSS (Canning) [5.13]: Several days ago I listened to the Leader of the Opposition speaking to the second reading of the Bill and I was astounded to hear that the hon. member was not able to say anything useful in support of the measure. I have heard unfavourable comments in the metropolitan area about the attitude of certain members towards the Bill which, by the majority of the people, is considered to be an honest attempt to exploit some of the latent wealth of this State. We have listened week after week to speeches made by members opposite, in the course of which they have given us a pitiful description of the position of the wheatgrower. Yet they never support anything that would assist to

put the State on a better basis. If a financial check-up were made of the case of the wheatgrower in the State, extending over a period of the last 20 years, it would be found, allowing for all the writing down that has been done by the Agricultural Bank and various Government departments, and the assistance given to wheatgrowers, that the whole of the wheat grown in this State had been produced at a loss. The resources of this State should be exploited to the utmost so that the whole of our people may be engaged in remunerative and reproductive work. By exploiting our secondary industries we would be expanding the local market for the farming community. Despite continuous complaints concerning drought conditions, we know we still have over a hundred thousand square miles of country where the rainfall exceeds 20 inches. This rainfall is continuous. We should have a big stocktaking so that even the wheatgrowing community may be put on a better basis. Some 25 or 30 years ago scarcely any farmers in the Great Southern kept sheep. An enthusiast then came along and introduced sheep. Some of the farmers claimed that this would prove a failure, and maintained that wheatgrowing was an industry quite apart from sheepraising.

Hon. C. G. Latham: That was long before you started farming.

Mr. CROSS: A man named Charlie Sweeting went to Wagin and began to raise sheep on a large scale. He also introduced an industry, flax growing, that was quite new to the Great Southern, and was laughed at for doing so.

Hon. C. G. Latham: Was it a success?

Mr. CROSS: This enthusiast achieved a certain measure of success.

Hon. C. G. Latham: The crop has never been a success in this State.

Mr. CROSS: He was the first man in the Great Southern to grow rye. The Leader of the Opposition cannot say this experiment was not a success.

Hon. C. G. Latham: It was a very unprofitable crop.

Mr. CROSS: Not as unprofitable as is wheatgrowing to-day.

Hon. C. G. Latham: You are out of your depth.

Mr. CROSS: All kinds of investigations and research work should be embarked upon so that we may find means of using our land to the best advantage. Western Aus-

tralia is capable of producing a great variety and volume of products, the development of which has not yet been attempted.

Mr. Doney: Such as?

Mr. CROSS: Twenty-five years ago in Victoria Park castor oil trees grew wild. I do not know whether the plant can be grown profitably, but someone should be placed in a position to find that out. No one can deny that our sandy soils are highly suitable for the growing of grapes. Most members will know that grapes yield a high percentage of glucose. Up to date it has not been found possible to convert glucose into sugar on a commercial basis. Should some laboratory be able to discover the secret, great wealth would be provided for Western Australia and the State would be practically independent of outside sugar supplies. Such research work could not be undertaken by any member of this Chamber, but must be conducted in a chemical laboratory. For years wheat farmers have been burning most of their straw. Has any attempt been made to convert the straw into cellulose for the manufacture of paper and artificial silk?

Mr. Mann: We want to grow wool, not to make artificial silk?

Mr. CROSS: There may come a time when our straw, instead of being burnt, will be put to some useful purpose. To discover ways and means of doing this should be the job of a research laboratory. Owing to the activities of certain State Departments a year or two ago our imports dropped appreciably, but they are gradually increasing again. Manufactured goods that could be produced locally are coming into Western Australia from the Eastern States. I dare say, to give a moderate estimate, the women in this State use not less than a million pairs of silk stockings annually. These are all manufactured in Melbourne or Sydney.

Mr. Mann: They could be manufactured here without the help of this Bill.

Mr. CROSS: The bureau could make available the necessary information and thus attract people with capital to invest in this business.

Mr. Mann: What nonsense!

Mr. CROSS: With the resources that we have at hand it should be possible to manufacture artificial silk for this purpose.

Mr. Thorn: We ought to endeavour to find out how to stop ladders occurring in stockings.

Mr. CROSS: We import annually millions of gallons of petrol, but grow wheat at a loss. Has any attempt been made to manufacture power alcohol from some of our wheat, instead of its being sold at a loss?

Mr. Warner: It is made out of blackboy, is it not?

Mr. CROSS: Many matters could be investigated so that new industries might be established and work found for our unemployed.

Mr. North: Do you see any chance of the Federal authorities doing the work?

Mr. CROSS: If we wait until the Federal Government does anything much for this State, probably we shall all be dead.

Mr. Thorn: Everything you are putting up is secondhand.

Mr. CROSS: We have a greater variety and volume of minerals than are found in any other State of the Commonwealth.

The Minister for Employment: Will you give us details?

Mr. CROSS: Many industries in this State could be exploited if only we had the necessary information concerning them. We would then be able to manufacture locally much that we now import.

Mr. Thorn: I am of the same opinion, but would like to know where those industries are.

Mr. CROSS: If I mentioned to the hon. member something about his own district it would probably be new to him. The hon. member can be very sarcastic, but he does not know of the big deposits of high grade gibbsite laterite at Toodyay. Other big mineral deposits also exist in that electorate.

Mr. Thorn: Where are they?

Mr. CROSS: It would be better if the hon. member paid more attention to those matters and less to making foolish interjections.

Mr. Withers: He would not know about them if they did not grow on trees.

Mr. CROSS: Zinc deposits occur in Western Australia, but only a feeble attempt has been made to exploit them. Between 1907 and 1916 a prospector worked one of those deposits and exported 180 tons of the mineral. Since then activities in zinc have finished and the deposits have been forgotten. In connection with the recovery of arsenic, this mineral is being exploited by the mines at Wiluna, where 300 tons per month are extracted. This industry too is capable of expansion. Other minerals are found at Mallina where antimony is known to exist. Nothing much has been done to

exploit that mineral. A small quantity was exported by two brothers some years ago for a return of £1,800. Soon after that the two men left the district and nothing more has been done with the deposits. We know, too, that native bismuth exists in the State. At present supplies are being imported from the Eastern States and Great Britain. At Melville, in the Yalgoo district, about £1,000 worth of the mineral was extracted. A new metal was discovered not long ago at Comet Vale, namely, goongarite. When assayed by the Mines Department the sample showed 28.8 per cent. of bismuth, 54.3 per cent. of lead, and 1 per cent. of silver. Nothing has yet been done to exploit those deposits. No State in Australia has refractory ores to the extent that they are found in Western Australia. Take magnesite, which I mention because I saw a lump of it brought into the corridor by a member a few days ago.

Mr. Thorn: If that member were here now, he would put you right.

Mr. CROSS: In various parts of this State there are workable deposits of that mineral close to the surface. No attempt has been made to exploit them. Yet we import from Sydney "Bon Ami" when we have better material for the purpose here. My information is that in the Coolgardie district it could be put up in tins and sold for a quarter of the present price. Indeed, the deposits are so large that we could almost supply the British Empire. In Britain itself the mineral is not found. It should be somebody's job to inquire into these matters. Take aluminium. Western Australia has fairly large deposits of that metal. In the Darling Range there are large areas containing bauxite, a collective name for the various hydrated oxides of aluminium. Last Friday a lady came to see me.

Hon. C. G. Latham: You are not the only member she has come to see.

Mr. CROSS: The lady came from Darlington, where she has a quarry containing large quantities of aluminium and fuller's earth.

Hon. C. G. Latham: They go well together.

Mr. CROSS: The quarry contains several other valuable minerals, but she is unable to develop the property.

Hon. C. G. Latham: What an extraordinary mixture!

Mr. CROSS: It may be a mixture. Facetious interjections may be all right for the Leader of the Opposition, in view of the

miserable contribution he made to the debate on this Bill.

Mr. Thorn: You had better get back to that quarry!

Mr. CROSS: I hold that many of these minerals should be exploited. Take pigments. The most important minerals for paint-making are red and yellow ochre, sienna, umber, galena, barite, jarosite, graphite and kaolin. Every one of these minerals is available in Western Australia for working in commercial quantities. The ochres are distributed over various parts of the State. Even a large quantity of red oxide is to be found at Toodyay.

Mr. Thorn: I know that.

Mr. CROSS: Western Australia has ilmenite, which is now used extensively for the production of a non-poisonous white paint. Ilmenite is distributed widely over the State. A mining report states that at Wannamal there is a series of large segregations of ilmenite in a dyke of epidiorite, carrying from 21.6 to 26.3 per cent. of titanium oxide. A deep valley at Mullalyup has yielded from 21 to 31 per cent. of a black concentrate assaying 41.9 to 49.8 per cent. of titanium. There is the widest scope for a chemical laboratory and for a research bureau to tabulate information of value to the people of Western Australia. Most people are aware that on South-Western beaches there are large strips of black sand. These will probably prove to be of economic value. But at present it is nobody's job to develop them. Hundreds of things could be done to put our people into work.

Hon. C. G. Latham: If those minerals were profitable, they would all be exploited.

Mr. CROSS: If we developed all these resources, we might attract people with money. This Bill, although I do not agree with it wholly, I believe to be an honest attempt to obtain and collate information and establish a bureau where that information will be available to those desiring it. Such a bureau would be able to assist towards the establishment of new industries in Western Australia. The measure should be supported so that the State may be placed in a better position for everyone in it. Numerous other products could be grown here. At Wagin a farmer has about an acre of almond trees, and he has been selling the almonds at not less than 1s. per lb. It might even pay some farmers rather than grow wheat, to grow

almonds and export them to Britain, where good prices are obtainable. Recently I heard the member for Subiaco (Mrs. Cardell-Oliver) give information about Brazil, the place where the nuts come from. I do not know whether the hard-shelled Brazil nuts that sell for so good a price in Europe could not be grown here. Good land for the purpose exists in the South-West, and I do not know that the experiment has ever been tried. I support the Bill in the hope that it will prove of service to the State. The department that is contemplated need not be expensive. Unquestionably someone should be appointed to do the job for the advancement of the State.

On motion by the Minister for Works, debate adjourned.

BILL—PARLIAMENTARY DISQUALIFICATIONS (DECLARATION OF LAW).

Second Reading.

Order of the day read for the resumption from the 20th September of the debate on the second reading.

Point of Order.

Hon. C. G. Latham: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker. Is this a Bill requiring an absolute majority of the House for its passage?

Mr. Speaker: Yes. In order that it may pass, it will be necessary to have an absolute majority of the House in its favour.

Debate resumed.

MR. McDONALD (West Perth) [5.40]: I do not propose to support the Bill. I agree with the Minister for Justice that something has to be done to make the position clear with regard to the qualification of members of Parliament, but I do not think that in this measure he is going the right way about it.

The Minister for Justice: That is the way they went about it in England.

Mr. McDONALD: And that is precisely the reason why the Minister is going the wrong way about it now. I shall endeavour to explain why I think the Bill is not the right way to deal with the matter. The Act from which Sections 32 and 34 of our Act were taken is, of course, the English Act of 1782, as the Minister has explained; and in the relevant sections of the English Act of 1782 and Section 32 of our Act, which for

all material purposes is the corresponding section of the English Act, Parliament had divided the section into two parts. The first part referred to all contracts made by a member of Parliament with the Crown. That of course would cover contracts relating to land or goods or services or money. It had the widest possible scope. The second part of the section referred to a more limited class of contract; in fact, to only two kinds of contract. It referred to contracts by a member of Parliament to supply goods to the Crown and contracts by a member of Parliament to supply money to the Crown for the purpose of being remitted abroad. In England in 1931, as the Minister said, the House of Commons passed a declaratory Act in which it declared that the section in the English Act on its true interpretation meant to refer only to the classes of contract mentioned in the second part of the section—contracts for the supply of goods to the Crown or contracts to furnish money to the Crown for the purpose of being remitted abroad. By the Act of 1931 the House of Commons passed a declaratory law stating that the parent Act of 1782 meant that those were the only contracts to which the parent Act was intended to apply.

Sir Stafford Cripps, Attorney General in 1931, in introducing the Bill into the House of Commons, said there had been differences of opinion as to how to construe the English Act. Some eminent lawyers considered that the first part governed the meaning of the whole section and that the section applied to contracts of every kind, while some lawyers held that the latter part of the section, which mentioned only two kinds of contracts, governed the whole section and that the whole section therefore must be read as applying to those two classes of contract only. Sir Stafford Cripps said he had formed the opinion that the limited construction was what Parliament meant when it passed the Act of 1782. Sir Stafford is an eminent lawyer, as the Minister rightly said, but he did mention that other eminent lawyers held different views, and I cannot but believe that Sir Stafford Cripps was being ruled by his heart rather than by his head.

The Minister for Mines: No, it is unusual for lawyers to do that.

Mr. McDONALD: Very unusual. As an eminent member of the Labour Party, his heart seems to have been torn by the danger and misfortune that might descend upon a certain member of the nobility, and so he

adopted what I might term the politically humane construction and was able to reconcile his conscience with an interpretation that would preserve the nobleman from the consequences of the other construction of the Act. Whatever may or may not be said for the view of Sir Stafford Cripps in England in 1931 on the English parent Act of 1782, there can be no doubt that we are not entitled to follow the English precedent when applied to our Act. If I may occupy the time of the House on a matter which is not without importance and on which I am sure all members desire to do the correct thing—

Mr. Marshall: We depend a good deal upon you and your legal mind.

Mr. McDONALD: I thank the hon. member.

Mr. Marshall: Not that you are so complimentary towards me.

Hon. C. G. Latham: We regard the law of the member for Murchison as fairly sound.

Mr. McDONALD: The English parent Act corresponds with Section 32 of our Act. The English declaratory Act said that the contracts therein mentioned meant only contracts to furnish goods to the Crown or money to the Crown for the purpose of being remitted abroad.

Hon. C. G. Latham: The Imperial Government does not enter into many contracts, I should think.

Mr. McDONALD: I do not think the Imperial Government does enter into many contracts such as does the Government in this State. In England roads are probably matters for local authorities. In fact there has been a great deal of devolution in Great Britain to local authorities. In England the Act of 1931 declared that the parent Act meant only contracts of two classes—contracts to furnish goods to the Crown and contracts to supply money to the Government to be sent abroad. But the English Act did not contain a provision similar to Section 35 of our Act. Section 35 states that the foregoing provisions of Sections 32 and 34 shall not extend to any contract in respect to the sale or occupation of Crown lands. That shows that in framing our law the Legislature considered the contracts referred to included contracts relating to land, because by the immediately next succeeding section Parliament excluded contracts dealing with the sale or occupation of Crown

lands. The English Act contains no similar provision dealing with Crown lands, and in my view Sir Stafford Cripps could not possibly have arrived at the same meaning of the English Act with the same certainty and in the same terms if the English Act had contained a provision similar to Section 35 of our Act. Therefore the parallel in England is not a valid one. Because England was able to pass a declaratory measure, it is not to say that we can do so on a totally different Act. A declaratory Bill has very limited scope; it is a Bill to say what the Legislature meant when the original law was passed. It is impossible to have one Bill dealing with two Acts, one passed in England and one in Western Australia, and declaring both mean the same thing, when the two Acts are different in terms. To take an extreme case, we might as well pass an Act giving the same meaning to the Farmers' Debts Adjustment Act as to the Bills of Sale Act. I do not think we would be correct if we followed the English parallel because it is not a parallel.

Mr. Needham: Is there any relationship between the two Acts?

Mr. McDONALD: There is a relationship, but the difference is so great that we could not attribute the same meaning to each of the two Acts.

Hon. C. G. Latham: The ramifications of the two Governments are so entirely different.

Mr. McDONALD: Yes!

The Minister for Justice: The ramifications of the two Governments make no difference here.

Mr. McDONALD: I accept that. Strictly speaking, the Minister is correct. The House is not concerned with the ramifications of the Government in England and the Government in Western Australia. It is concerned only in a declaration of what Parliament meant when it passed this particular Act. The Government proposes to give to the Western Australian Act precisely the same meaning as the English Parliament gave to the English Act, whereas the two Acts differ materially in principle.

The Minister for Justice: We are dealing with sections of the Act, just as the English Parliament dealt with sections of the Act.

Mr. McDONALD: We cannot deal only with sections of the Act. When construing the Act, we have to look at all the sections.

One section may say something, and in other sections there may be provisos for conditions affecting the interpretation of the former section. We cannot take one section and say that that alone is the one to consider, without having regard, as in this case, to the sections immediately following. This Bill is introduced upon invalid grounds, upon a parallel with England that cannot justly be drawn. Furthermore, I submit, the Bill is undesirable. It says that the only contracts in respect to which a member of Parliament is debarred from undertaking are those of lending money to the Crown to be remitted abroad, and those of furnishing goods to the Crown. We have forbidden any member of Parliament to lend money to the Crown to remit abroad. That prohibition was taken from the Act of 1782 passed in the time of George III. It was intended to prohibit the lending of money to the Government by means of credits to be sent to America for the payment of soldiers engaged in the American Civil War. In those days no banks existed. The only way in which money could be sent to America was to arrange with a merchant who had a credit at Washington for, say, £100,000. The Government would say, "I will buy your credit." The merchant or individual, however, made such extortionate demands on the Government, some of these people being members of Parliament, that the Government had to prohibit such contracts, as it did in the Act of 1782.

Mr. Needham: I doubt whether many members have any money to lend to the Government.

Mr. McDONALD: That is why I say the Minister is putting something into the Bill that has no real meaning.

The Minister for Justice: We are not altering the Constitution in any way, but only declaring what it means.

Mr. McDONALD: The Bill, if passed, would alter the Constitution. It declares what the Constitution means in flat defiance of the terms of the Act. The Minister is giving the Constitution the same artificial meaning as if he said the Agricultural Bank Act had nothing to do with land. That, of course, is an extreme case. We do not want to pass absurd legislation. Of what use is it to say that members of Parliament are prohibited from lending money to the State to be remitted abroad? Undoubtedly the Minister is attempting to put something

into the Constitution. Treating the Bill as an amendment, I ask of what use is it to put this into the Act, when it does not exist and is archaic?

The Minister for Justice: It does exist for it is in the Constitution.

Hon. C. G. Latham: No one gives you money to send abroad.

Mr. McDONALD: It does not, in fact, exist in the Constitution except as a fragmentary part of the Constitution. By this Bill the Minister declares that he is taking a fragmentary part of the Constitution and that this is the whole meaning of the Constitution, and is ignoring the remaining parts. That is my objection to the Bill. If this is to be taken, contrary to the Minister's contention, as an amending Bill, it starts off by dealing with something that has no application to the State. This provision is as dead as the dodo. No one lends money to the State to be sent abroad. The money is always raised by the Commonwealth Government to be sent abroad, through the Loan Council and the banks. Taken as an amendment of the Act, the first part of the Bill deals with something that has no more application to current affairs than has the feudal system.

The Minister for Justice: It has while it is there.

Mr. McDONALD: If we deal with this as an amending Bill, we find that the second part contains something of real application, namely, the disposal of goods to the Crown. No member is likely to lend money to the State to be sent abroad. As the member for Perth (Mr. Needham) said, we have not the money to lend. Apart, then, from the question of selling goods to the Crown, a member of Parliament under this Bill will be able to do anything he pleases, if the measure is passed in its present form.

Mr. Patrick: He could sell his property to the Crown.

Mr. McDONALD: Yes, and a member could do much more than that. He could sell a gold mine to the Crown. He could enter into a contract with the Crown. Then, as it would not be regarded as an office of profit under the Crown, a member could be paid £10,000 a year to act as an adviser to the Crown. Any member of the Country Party could accept the position of adviser to the Government in respect of, say, light lands. On the other hand, any member

sitting on the Government benches for a small remuneration like £20,000 could be appointed as adviser to the Government on industrial matters.

Mr. Patrick: At any rate, they would all sell their farms to the Government.

The Minister for Mines: Let us pass the Bill first!

Mr. McDONALD: All this may or may not be advisable. Of course, I am putting extreme cases forward. For my part, I do not suggest that they are desirable. The point I wish to make is that no prohibition will be imposed upon such acts if the Bill be passed. I could buy all the surplus stores from the Government at any price I liked to pay. There will be no provision to deprive me of that right. I could borrow any sum the Government thought fit to lend me, without giving any security at all to the Crown. All these things are possible under the Bill because members of Parliament, this being a declaratory measure, will be able to make any contracts with the Crown, apart from lending money to be sent abroad and to sell goods to the Crown. From the point of view of desirability, I do not regard the Bill as dealing with the matter in the best way.

The Minister for Justice: That is what members of Parliament can do in the House of Commons, is it not?

Mr. McDONALD: But under a wholly different Act.

The Minister for Justice: But irrespective of the Act, they can do that.

Mr. McDONALD: It does not matter about the different Acts.

The Minister for Justice: But can a member of the House of Commons do all these things?

Mr. McDONALD: Perhaps he can. A legal member, under the provisions of the Bill, could be engaged at £10,000 a year to act as legal adviser to the Government. I do not think it is desirable that such a position should be created. I draw attention to what the Leader of the Opposition stated just now when he mentioned that in England the opportunities for an individual to enter into contracts with the Crown were very limited compared with those that obtain in Western Australia.

The Minister for Justice: With all the rearmament that is going on!

Mr. McDONALD: Even so.

Hon. C. G. Latham: At any rate, that would be controlled by the supply of goods.

Mr. McDONALD: It is most undesirable that there should be a contract between a member of Parliament and the Crown in relation to re-armament. The Minister's Bill opens the door fully, except to the extent of one little bit. What should we do? We must do something in this matter, and I wish to express my opinion that Parliament should meet the situation, not evade it. The Minister's declaratory Bill amounts to mere evasion. What we have to do is to amend the Constitution Act and we should say in precise terms what contracts will disqualify a person from entering Parliament and a member remaining in Parliament. That is not attempted by means of the Bill. A measure passed in the Legislative Council in 1935 dealt with the situation fairly well. An amendment appearing on the notice paper to-day in the name of the member for Katanning deals with it pretty well. I am prepared to accept the terms of the amendment, but I claim we should not accept this declaratory Bill. The proper and really the only thing we should do is to introduce an amending Bill. Instead of Western Australia having a Constitution Act that is more or less ridiculous and will apply to only two forms of contracts, we should have a categorical statement of contracts that can be entered into by candidates for Parliament and by members of Parliament themselves. With regard to the amendment on the notice paper, I presume Mr. Speaker, I am in order in discussing it.

Mr. SPEAKER: Yes, in a general way.

Mr. McDONALD: The curious thing is that the amendment on the notice paper is completely irreconcilable with the Minister's Bill. Whereas the Minister's declaratory Bill states that Sections 32 and 34 apply only to two classes of contracts, if the member for Katanning's amendment be agreed to, the measure will still be a declaratory Bill and will imply that Sections 32 and 34 apply to all classes of contracts. But the Minister's Bill says that Sections 32 and 34 are not concerned with contracts regarding land or loans of money. The amendment of the member for Katanning accepts that Sections 32 and 34 are concerned with contracts regarding land and loans of money and proceeds to except from them certain contracts regarding land and loans of money. So the hon. member's amendment, which I think is very well drawn and states the position fairly, should be the subject of

another amending Bill, and cannot be tacked on to the Minister's Bill, with which it is irreconcilable. It involves a principle which is diametrically opposed to the Minister's Bill. That Bill says that the narrow interpretation of Sections 32 and 34 is the true one, and the hon. member's amendment says that the wide interpretation is the true one and makes certain exceptions. They cannot both be true. One must be right, and the other wrong.

Mr. Marshall: Cannot both be wrong?

Mr. McDONALD: I wish to add a few more words, without detaining the House too long. I have said that the proper course would be an amending Bill, and that the amendment should in my opinion be as set out in the amendment of the member for Katanning. I would support such a Bill. That Bill must be passed, and should be passed by this present Parliament, because candidates for the next Parliament must know precisely whether or not they are entitled to stand. It is the duty of Parliament to make that clear to the country, and we must make it clear by passing an Act through this present Parliament. That should be an Act amending the Constitution, and I suggest incorporating the provisions drawn by the member for Katanning in an amending Bill.

Without going into further expressions of opinion, I would say that some members may have had contracts with the Crown in respect of which there is the grave doubt that they may infringe the proper construction of the Constitution Act. It is therefore the duty of Parliament to remove that doubt as to the future by an amending Bill. That amending Bill, in my opinion, should not be retrospective. It should operate in the ordinary way, from the time that it receives the Governor's assent. It will then declare the law as applicable to the future and as applicable to then members of Parliament. It will not take away any rights to sue for penalties which accrued prior to the granting of the Governor's assent. Actions for penalties, by Section 49 of the Constitution, must be brought within three months. Now, if there have been penalties incurred by any member of Parliament, then any member of the public is entitled, and will be entitled if my suggestions are approved by Parliament, to exercise his right to sue for penalties up to the time the Governor's assent is given to the Bill.

The Minister made some references to the term "common informer," and I do not wish to let them pass. There are two types of informer who can sue for penalties or for punishments. One is the Attorney General, namely the Minister himself, who, as Minister for Justice, now occupies that high office in the Government. He is the official informer. He lays informations in the Crown Law office charging people with misdemeanours, particularly those relating to abuse of office and wrongs of that kind. On those occasions proceedings are taken by the proper Crown officers to secure the prescribed punishments, which may be imprisonment or may be fines. But it is the Minister himself, the Minister for Justice, who is the chief official informer on behalf of His Majesty the King. The Minister who occupies a similar office in all British countries is the official informer on behalf of His Majesty the King. The King prosecutes on behalf of his subjects in the courts of criminal law. The common informer is called "common" only to distinguish him from the official informer, who is the Minister himself. The common informer and the Minister who is the official informer do exactly the same work. The official informer functions when somebody reports to him that there has been a breach of law. But he would also, if he did his duty, function if he saw a breach of law even though nobody reported to him, because he is sworn by his office to administer the law.

Sitting suspended from 6.15 to 7.30 p.m.

Mr. McDONALD: It may happen that the authorities who are responsible for enforcing the law may not enforce it, so constitutional usage in English countries has, for a very long time, provided that any citizen who is affected by a breach of the law may, as a common informer, approach the court to enforce the law. And the objective has been considered by English Parliamentary practice as very salutary, because it is a check on authority. It means that if there were no such check through a common informer, and if authorities did not enforce the law, citizens would have difficulty in finding a remedy; but by this constitutional usage any person who is aggrieved and affected, as a subject or citizen, by failure to enforce the law may approach the court to enforce the law in his capacity of what is called common

informer, as distinguished from the official informer, who is the officer of the Crown or the officer of the Government. It is true that Parliamentary enactments which give the right to a citizen to approach the court as a common informer, mostly award that a penalty may be recovered from the offender in order to be paid to the common informer. That is an inducement given by the Legislature to the subject to secure the enforcement of the law if constituted authority fails to enforce it. But it may also happen that a common informer, in suing, may not be seeking a penalty at all. He may be entitled by law to a penalty, but he may not even wish to have the penalty. He may be actuated by the highest of motives; and I think there are a number of recorded cases where the common informer has approached the court from the highest possible motives in order to secure proper enforcement of the law, possibly against those in high and influential places. Therefore, this safeguard of the man in the street, the common man, the uninfluential man, by which he can approach the courts of the country to enforce law when constituted authority fails to do so, has been regarded as a valuable constitutional safeguard in English-speaking countries. While some informers may not be actuated by the highest motives, there is no reason to belittle the value of this constitutional safeguard. I referred to common informers by way of parenthesis when I was speaking on the amendment of the member for Katanning (Mr. Watts). That amendment, in my opinion, will clarify the position as far as members of Parliament and the contracts they may enter into are concerned, but it cannot be incorporated in a declaratory Act, and the member for Katanning, for whose legal attainments I have high respect, could not. I think, seriously argue that. His amendment is suitable for an amending Act. A declaratory Act is, of course, an Act to declare what the real meaning of the Legislature was as expressed in the parent Act. It is not meant to amend the parent Act, it is to declare what the Legislature, in passing the parent Act, meant to say according to the words used in the parent Act. On the construction of the parent Act, which is involved by the amendment of the member for Katanning, the parent Act will apply to all contracts referring to

land, goods, shares, mines, farms and everything else.

Mr. Sleeman: Not to services of the legal profession.

Mr. McDONALD: His amendment has a wide construction, as opposed to the Minister's declaratory measure, which limits the construction of the Act. The amendment of the member for Katanning, if read into this declaratory Act, would have this result: the original Act, on his interpretation, would apply to all contracts of whatsoever kind. That would mean that the Bill as amended by him would then declare that the parent Act would apply to all contracts of whatsoever kind, except the contracts specified in the amendment of the member for Katanning, namely, contracts for loans of money from the Crown, contracts for services rendered by the Crown, including insurance or indemnity of the individual, and contracts for the supply of goods by the Crown. The amendment of the member for Katanning, if incorporated, would mean that the Legislature in 1890 used words with the intention of excluding those classes of contracts; and, of course, in 1890 the Legislature never dreamt of a State Insurance Office under which a member of Parliament might obtain an insurance or an indemnity. At that time the Agricultural Bank was not in existence and loans were not made by the Crown or by a Crown instrumentality to people who were farming. But under the amendment of the member for Katanning, if adopted, the measure would declare that in 1890 Parliament meant to except all those classes of contracts.

Hon. C. G. Latham: A State Savings Bank was in existence at the time, and the question was raised then.

Mr. McDONALD: That might possibly be so; but Parliament would then be putting into the mouth of the Parliament of 1890 the intention, by its words, to exclude all those classes of contracts. We cannot do that by a declaratory Act. If the 1890 Act, on the interpretation of the member for Katanning, applies to all contracts, it imposes disqualification upon all persons who directly undertake, execute, hold or enjoy any contract or agreement entered into with any person for or on account of the Government of the colony. The Act of 1890 then proceeds to make two exceptions. The first exception is in favour of members of a com-

pany of more than 20 persons that enters into a contract with the Crown, and the second exception is in the case of contracts for the sale or occupation of Crown lands.

Hon. C. G. Latham: And a third dealing with the loan of money to the State.

Mr. McDONALD: No, that is covered. On the interpretation of Section 32, all contracts are forbidden except those two classes of contract. The Legislature in 1890 was therefore explicit; it allowed only two exceptions and stated exactly what those two exceptions were. If the amendment of the member for Katanning is incorporated in this declaratory Bill, the effect will be to declare that the Legislature of 1890, when declaring two exceptions only, meant four, five or six exceptions. That, of course, cannot be done. The member for Katanning will agree that his amendment can only be an amendment in the proper sense of the word to the parent Act, and cannot be contained in a declaratory Bill.

The Bill proposes that, if passed, it shall be read as if the declaration had been made when the parent measure was passed 48 years ago, and deemed to be part of the parent Act. If this were a true declaratory Bill, that would be perfectly correct, because the measure would be declaring what the Legislature said it meant in 1890. This, however, involves an indemnity. It means that even if a member of Parliament has incurred a penalty or disqualification, he will be saved by the Bill from any consequences, or from any action by any person such as a common informer, or anyone else who may seek to declare that he had incurred disqualification and penalties.

Mr. Lambert: You know that in registering a company you can put 20 dummies in for one share and the rest can hold a million shares.

Mr. McDONALD: Yes.

Mr. Lambert: Then inform the House upon it.

Mr. McDONALD: I cannot range from cabbages and kings to sealing wax, like the hero in the book of Lewis Carrol. I have quite enough on my hands to deal with the Constitution without touching the Companies Act. The amendment of the member for Katanning, if incorporated in the measure, would operate as if it had been in the 1890 Act. In other words, his amendment and Bill involve an indemnity hav-

ing retrospective action. They go back 48 years.

Mr. Needham interjected.

Mr. McDONALD: No, the effect would be the saving of any penalties or disqualification for which any member might have become liable. I have the deepest appreciation of the position of members—of whom I may be one—who may possibly be in danger of disqualification and penalties. Members might reasonably contend that there is some ambiguity in the construction of the Act. That to some extent is an excuse or, at all events, it lessens any blame that might be attached to a member who may have incurred an infringement of the Act.

Mr. Lambert: Such as a solicitor retained by the Crown.

Mr. McDONALD: Precisely. If he was a member of the House, he would have committed a breach of the Constitution Act. But I am faced with this position: Various Acts of Parliament are not free from ambiguity. Day by day in the courts of law men are prosecuted for breaches of those Acts. A man is brought before the court perhaps for a breach of the Industrial Arbitration Act.

Mr. Raphael: And the poor unemployed for getting a bit of sustenance are prosecuted.

Mr. McDONALD: A man might commit a breach of the Police Act, by reason of information given by him to the Department of Employment. An employer or employee might be prosecuted for a breach of an award or the Industrial Arbitration Act in circumstances where there might be a legitimate difference of opinion as to the construction of the award or the Act. That happens not infrequently, but if the court holds that the person prosecuted is, on its interpretation of the award or Act, guilty, he is convicted and some nominal penalty is imposed. Take an Act familiar to members—the State Transport Co-ordination Act. A farmer or some other carrier may be using a truck for the carriage of goods, not knowing that he is committing a breach of the Act, perhaps because the Act is not clear. A case of that sort recently was taken to the Full Court to determine whether farmers had certain rights under the Act. If a prosecution is launched and the court in interpreting an Act, the terms of which may be somewhat difficult to construe, finds that an offence has been committed, the accused person has to put up with the conviction and the penalty,

although the latter may be a small one. In the case of members of Parliament—including myself—it can be said, platitudinously, that we who make the laws should set an example in maintaining them and meeting any penalty incurred by a breach of the laws. It can be said that if the law is ambiguous, Parliament should amend and clarify it. Should there be an ambiguity in the law it is within our power to remove it. If we do not remove the ambiguity, and on the construction of our Constitution Act adopted by a court, any one of us is held to have incurred a disqualification or a penalty, as a matter of principle it may be said, I think with justification, that we should accept the consequences.

Mr. Lambert: Did you not find that out when you accepted an office of profit under the Crown?

Mr. McDONALD: The hon. member desires me to convict myself, but I have no intention of doing so. We should not pass retrospective legislation. Under Section 49 of the Constitution Act, any person who desires to sue for penalties must do so within three months, a very limited time. The position regarding this doubt as to whether there have been any breaches of the Constitution Act by members of this or another House, has been known for some time, and if any person desires to have the doubt decided, he will have an opportunity for some weeks to take the necessary proceedings and approach a court. I hope no one will do so, because, possibly, there can be some argument as to whether there has been a breach of the Constitution. It may be that in some instances, if not in all, a kind of breach that is not only free from blame, but almost unavoidable, has been committed. Take a farmer who under the Transport Act cannot send his wheat or wool by road. He must send it by rail. If the railways can be regarded as the Crown, the farmer will be compelled by the laws of the country either to leave his produce on the farm or break the Constitution by sending it over a Government instrumentality to market for sale. We can see that in many instances, in travelling on the railways, in having contracts with the Sewerage Department to have one's premises sewered, and in a variety of other ways, a member may unwittingly infringe the exact terms of the Constitution Act. I do not expect that in these circumstances anyone would take action for penalties, in particular when

members of this House will in a few months be going to the country for the general elections. It would very largely be waste of money to take proceedings against any member of this House, when in any case he would be ceasing to hold his seat within a few months, and be presenting himself to the electors for re-election.

I will conclude by endeavouring briefly to state my views. The first is that the Minister's Bill assumes that our State Act is similar to the English Act, whereas that is not the case. To assume that two different Acts can be interpreted in the same terms, would be a contradiction, because the two Acts differ so greatly in material principles that they could not be declared to mean the same thing.

The Minister for Justice: You could hardly say that.

Mr. Lambert: In the Supreme Court every day you get interpretations on case law that differ from each other.

Mr. McDONALD: The two Acts are radically different from each other as to their interpretation.

Mr. Lambert: Judges of the Supreme Court take the interpretations of the English Act.

Mr. McDONALD: If an English Act is the same as ours, or even when it contains phrases that are the same as are found in our Act, it may be entitled to the interpretation given to the local Act. It is impossible to say that when two Acts, one an English Act and the other a State Act, are in different words—because we must read all the sections of the Act and not take out one section—and the differences are material, the different Acts have precisely the same meaning.

Mr. Lambert: Our local judges have interpreted decisions on English law that have no reference to the local Act.

Mr. McDONALD: That is a matter for the judges. The point is that the Minister's Bill cannot be a declaratory measure, declaratory of our State Act, without making a farce of the term "declaratory Act."

Mr. Raphael: Lawyers differ.

Mr. McDONALD: Lawyers would not disagree on this point. This Bill cannot be a declaratory measure. I look upon it as an amendment to the Act, and I have pointed out that as an amendment it is a failure because it deals only with two contracts, one of which has no application whatever

to the State, and the other touches only a limited part of the field that might be covered by contracts between the Crown and a member of Parliament. The Minister, by this Bill, if it is an amendment to the Act, opens wide the law of contracts between members of Parliament and the Crown.

The Minister for Justice: You know it is not an amendment. Why argue that way?

Mr. McDONALD: Because, with all due deference to the Minister, the Bill can be only one of two things, a declaratory Act or an amending Act. It is not a declaratory Act and it is a bad amending Act. Which ever way we look at it, it has an absurd meaning. The measure deals with conditions that are 150 years old, and have ceased to have any real existence in this State.

Mr. Lambert: It would save some of your clients.

Mr. McDONALD: I am not bothered about my clients. As an amending Act it is not an amendment that I think this House could or should or will adopt. The amendment put forward by the member for Katanning (Mr. Watts) considered as an amendment to the Constitution Act, does, I think, clarify the position and is worthy of acceptance by the House. The hon. member proposes to include his amendment in what is called a declaratory Act, whereas the Minister, by his Bill, declares that the original Act applies only to two contracts and not to general contracts. The amendment of the hon. member implies that our Constitution Act applies to all contracts. He then proceeded to except certain contracts. Both cannot be right. The English Act and our Act are two entirely different things, and are irreconcilable. The amendment of the hon. member cannot be brought into a declaratory Act, because the wording of it could not be read in conjunction with the parent Act. The wording is diametrically opposed to the wording of the parent Act. The parent Act says that only two classes of contracts are to be excepted, and the amendment of the member for Katanning involves that Parliament, while saying that only two classes of contracts are excepted, meant to declare that five or six classes entirely different were also to be excepted. That is too far from the meaning of the English language. I then said that I would support an amendment, not an evasion, a direct amendment of the Constitution Act incorporating the amendment drawn by the

member for Katanning, and that the amending Bill should be brought in and passed by this Parliament, because it is essential to allow candidates for the next Parliament to know whether or not they are qualified to stand and, if elected, to sit.

I also said that I am opposed to legislation of this kind with a retrospective application. I do not think the amending Bill should take effect until the Governor's assent is given, and until then the public, if they think that any member has incurred penalties, are entitled to enforce any rights they possess on a proper construction of the law. I oppose the Bill.

On motion by Mr. Marshall, debate adjourned.

BILL—NORTHAM MUNICIPALITY LOAN AUTHORISATION.

Second Reading.

Debate resumed from the 22nd September.

MR. WATTS (Katanning) [8.4]: I do not think there is any need to oppose the second reading of the Bill, or indeed to oppose it at any stage. From information supplied to the House by the Minister, and from more supplied to me by the Minister since, it appears that the Northam Municipality, having acquired £27,000 by way of grant from a fund provided by the Federal and State Governments, raised a loan of £27,000 to complete certain sewerage installations. When it had got well on the way towards completion of the sewerage work, it discovered that it was not going to cost the total sum of £54,000, but apparently a sum of only £40,000. Then the council took the necessary and proper steps for the surplus to be expended on certain drainage work to prevent portion of the town of Northam from being flooded in wet weather. When it had finished the drainage work, it was discovered that it was unable, owing to some miscalculation when the sewerage work was entered upon, to complete the latter without a further sum of £4,000. Accordingly it approached the financial institution with which it deals for a loan of £4,000 to complete the work, but found that it could not get the loan because the original authority was to raise only £27,000, which it had expended; and

it was then in a position only to apply for a loan by the use of advertisements, specifications, and opportunity for referendum. It found then that it could not comply with those conditions because the work was already in a state of completion, rendering it impossible, among other things, to publish specifications of work which it intended to do but which was already done. The municipality was finally faced with the situation—to cut a long story short—of being obliged to come to this Parliament for legislation to validate what had taken place—to wit, taking out an amount of £4,000 from the electric lighting account, apparently a perfectly lawful proposition, which amount it now has to replace by a loan of a similar amount.

From all that can be gathered from the evidence available—and I may say I have made some inquiry into the matter—it appears that everything that was done, was done in a perfectly bona fide manner. There was no intention whatever at the time the extra work was gone on with, to occasion such difficulties as have arisen. There being no absence of bona fides, it seems to me there is no reason why the Bill should be opposed at any stage. At the same time I think the Legislature should issue a word of warning to local authorities. This is the second time during the present session that we have had before us legislation to validate the non-completed loan proposals of two local authorities, or, as in this case, proposals they have been unable to complete, in accordance with the law which governs their control of the districts of which they have the supervision. It seems to me that local authorities should be definitely told that in future their operations of this kind, while we are prepared to overlook errors in certain circumstances, should be carefully scrutinised and the utmost care taken to see that these situations do not arise. In my opinion it is hardly fair for the Legislature to have to concern itself with validating actions of local authorities who know, or at least should know, very definitely the conditions under which they are allowed to govern their districts. It does not seem right to me that the Legislature should have to make inquiries. Members have to find out, from such sources as they can obtain information from, whether the actions of local authorities are bona fide or not, so that the Legislature may satisfactorily

conclude whether it should support such legislation. I contend that a word of warning issued by the Government would have a moral effect. From the information supplied in this particular instance, I see no reason why any objection should be taken to the Bill, and I therefore support the second reading.

THE MINISTER FOR EMPLOYMENT (Hon. A. R. G. Hawke—Northam—in reply) [8.9]: It is quite correct, as mentioned by the member for Katanning (Mr. Watts), that additional information concerning the activities carried on by the Northam Municipal Council came to hand after I had made my speech in moving the second reading of the Bill. As soon as that additional information did come to hand, I placed it in the possession of the member for Katanning in order that he might be fully advised on the subject. The information originally sent, which I gave to the House, was to the effect that the Northam Municipal Council had received £27,000 by way of loan, and had received a pound for pound subsidy, which brought in another £27,000, making in all £54,000 for the purpose of carrying out a sewerage scheme in Northam. Originally we were informed that on account of certain unforeseen circumstances, the scheme had cost £4,000 more than had been estimated. The additional information indicates that the sewerage scheme itself cost, not £54,000 but £44,000, and when the council found that the scheme was being carried out at much below the original estimated cost, it was decided to carry out a flood-water drainage scheme for an expenditure of £14,000. Through extending the original scheme to cover the flood-water drainage scheme, the Council found it was £4,000 short of the funds necessary to finance the complete operations. I make that explanation so that members shall have the fullest possible information before them.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

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

ANNUAL ESTIMATES, 1938-39.

In Committee of Supply.

Resumed from the 29th September; Mr. Sleeman in the Chair.

Vote—Unemployment Relief and State Labour Bureau, £68,200:

THE MINISTER FOR EMPLOYMENT (Hon. A. R. G. Hawke—Northam) [8.15]: At the end of June this year 6,634 men were employed on relief work or were in receipt of sustenance. The comparable figures for the year ended the 30th June, 1936, show that 8,000 men were so provided for, and for the financial year ended the 30th June, 1937, the number was 6,485. I regret having to report that during the last few weeks the number of men dependent upon the Government has increased to some extent, representing the first appreciable increase for quite a long period.

Mr. Doney: Is not this the first increase reported at the end of a financial year for about six years?

THE MINISTER FOR EMPLOYMENT: At certain periods the number has always increased.

Mr. Doney: I daresay.

THE MINISTER FOR EMPLOYMENT: At the end of July last, there was an increase compared with the corresponding period for the previous year.

Mr. Hegney: To what do you attribute the increase?

THE MINISTER FOR EMPLOYMENT: A number of factors contribute to that increase. Most members are aware that during July, August and September there was a slackening off of operations in a number of important private enterprises. The greatest slackening off of activities occurred in the timber industry and in the building trade. In the former, the result was due to the falling off in overseas orders and to a lesser extent in local orders. I am pleased to state that overseas orders have increased in recent weeks and already beneficial effects are apparent. The industry will almost certainly absorb a considerably increased number of men, for whom employment will be found. That applies more particularly to the sleeper-hewing section.

Mr. Hegney: What effect do you think the basic wage declaration had regarding the dismissal of men?

THE MINISTER FOR EMPLOYMENT: I would prefer to deal with that particular phase at a later stage of my remarks. The building trade boomed for several years. Quite a number of competent observers expressed the opinion on more than one occasion that the industry had over-boomed and that a period of comparative slackness would inevitably ensue.

Mr. Doney: Was that not your opinion?

THE MINISTER FOR EMPLOYMENT: At any rate, that period did follow. Whether it represented a reaction borne of the building activities of the last two or three years or whether it had something to do with the advent of the winter months when building activities naturally lessened, I shall not argue at the present stage. Suffice it to say that those activities did lessen, with the result that a number of men, who ordinarily would obtain employment in the building trade, were confronted with unemployment. The Government took special steps to have work of certain classes commenced so that those tradesmen might be provided with employment of a useful nature. I think the work carried out by the Government in that direction, and which is being continued, will meet with the approval of every member of Parliament and of all the taxpayers who know the actual class of work being done. The unfavourable seasonal conditions have doubtless affected the volume of private employment available. Members of the Country Party will know that work available in the agricultural industry has not been so great during the present season as it was in the previous season and in seasons before that.

Mr. Doney: There were no climatic disabilities up to the end of June.

THE MINISTER FOR EMPLOYMENT: I think the member for Williams-Narrogin (Mr. Doney), if he will cast his mind back, will recall some serious climatic disabilities previous to the end of June. An extremely dry period occurred early in the season, with the result that seeding activities in many districts were greatly delayed. Therefore, men who would normally have been picked up for work then were not engaged, with the result that they had to seek temporary assistance from the Government. The season right through has been rather spasmodic.

Mr. Doney: Yes, since then.

THE MINISTER FOR EMPLOYMENT: When a season does not begin well and does not improve, a condition of affairs is created

which does not establish that degree of confidence so necessary if constant employment is to be made available to workers. We know the low prices of wheat and wool have been two factors that have tended to slacken activity not only on farms, but also on pastoral properties, and in many industries and activities carried on in the main country towns and, to an even greater extent, in the metropolitan area. The volume of direct employment in the wheatgrowing and pastoral industries has been less this year; and the volume of indirect employment in shops, warehouses and factories, as a result of the unsettled conditions in those industries, has been much less as a consequence. Unfortunately, owners and controllers of private industry either do not or cannot give consideration to their workers when slackness in trade reduces the volume of work available. As soon as a private employer finds it no longer profitable to employ workmen, he dismisses them, often at a day's notice. In a very short time those workmen become a charge on the State.

Mr. Sampson: A day's notice would amount to a breach of an award in most cases. Provision is made for longer notice than that.

THE MINISTER FOR EMPLOYMENT: If the member for Swan (Mr. Sampson) will take the trouble carefully to investigate the point on which he is now offering an opinion, he will find solid foundation for substantially altering the opinion he now so confidently offers.

Hon. C. G. Latham: If a worker is employed by the week, he must receive a week's notice.

THE MINISTER FOR EMPLOYMENT: Yes. Thousands of workers are employed by the hour and paid an hourly rate. Hundreds of workers are employed by the day. Often a workman receives an hour's notice, or a day's notice of termination of his employment.

Mrs. Cardell-Oliver: What notice does the Government give?

THE MINISTER FOR EMPLOYMENT: In the case of members of Parliament, three years.

Mrs. Cardell-Oliver: What notice does the Government give to men engaged on relief work?

THE MINISTER FOR EMPLOYMENT: That depends on the nature of the relief work. On rare occasions only does the Gov-

ernment give a relief worker notice at all. He is a permanent fixture.

Hon. C. G. Latham: If the worker does not pay his union fees he is given notice.

The MINISTER FOR EMPLOYMENT: The Leader of the Opposition is very wide of the true position. As a matter of fact, the greatest consideration is shown to the individual of whom the Leader of the Opposition is speaking.

Hon. C. G. Latham: I think you are a little kinder than was your predecessor.

The MINISTER FOR EMPLOYMENT: Despite the fact that at a conference of the Primary Producers' Association some three years ago, a resolution was unanimously carried to the effect that Parliament should be asked to make provision by legislation for compulsory unionism for the wheat-growers of Western Australia—

Members interjected.

The CHAIRMAN: Order!

The MINISTER FOR EMPLOYMENT: Unfortunately, where employment is concerned, lack of co-ordination exists between the activities carried on by private enterprise and those carried on by the Government. Need for improvement in that regard is apparent. All possible steps should be taken to ensure that owners and controllers of private industries should accept greater responsibility for the men they employ. At certain times, private employers become more panic-stricken than circumstances justify. I feel that frequently the first and only economy of which some of them are capable of thinking is the economy of sacking employees. More responsibility should be placed upon the shoulders of private employers in this respect. If I might venture an opinion, I would say that the first system of national insurance with which the Governments of Australia should have concerned themselves was a system providing for insurance against unemployment. Had a system of unemployment insurance been initiated in Australia, my opinion is that there would have been far less need for a system of national health insurance than there is with no unemployment insurance system operating. Much of the sickness that exists in Australia to-day is caused by the inability of large groups of men and women to obtain sufficient income to enable them and their children to enjoy a reasonable standard of living. They cannot obtain such an income because their employment is not constant, and because of the fact that no

well-ordered system is operating in Australia to protect people against periods of unemployment. If a wage earner who has family responsibilities is employed at the full basic wage for every week in the year, his struggle is difficult enough in all conscience. The struggle becomes infinitely more difficult if the worker is employed for less than 52 weeks in the year, because he and his family are not in receipt of a living wage the whole year round. When a family is not in receipt of a living wage the whole year round economies have of necessity to be practised. Those economies may be practised in a number of ways. Whichever way is adopted inflicts some disability, some damage, upon one or other member of the family. The disability or damage may be inflicted as a result of the family being compelled to live under bad housing conditions, being compelled to buy what might be called a cheap and nasty class of foodstuffs, or by being unable to obtain medical and other attention that may be necessary in the early stages of an illness. So, in my opinion, the Commonwealth Government, acting in co-operation with the State Governments, would have been far wiser had it evolved and initiated a scheme of unemployment insurance as against the national health insurance scheme recently passed that is to operate from the 1st January next. The State Governments are now spending huge sums of money in providing work for the relief of unemployed. True, some of that employment is of a full-time character, some of it in every State is of a part-time nature, and in some of the States, I understand, no full-time employment at all is made available to relief workers. I believe enough money is being expended to-day in the various States on relief work of this nature and on other relief in the form of sustenance to provide a basis upon which an unemployment insurance scheme could have been built in Australia.

Of the 6,634 men who were depending upon the Government at the end of June last, 467 were on sustenance, representing seven per cent. of the total. That percentage compares very favourably with the figure for June of the previous year, when 12 per cent. of the total number were on sustenance. In pursuance of the Government's policy, the general conditions of relief workers were still further improved during the last financial year. The policy of the Government at present is to provide

full-time employment for all those men who have more than three children under the age of 14 years dependent upon them. This does not mean that men with three or more children under the age of 14 dependent upon them are guaranteed 52 weeks' work in each year. It means that when those men are placed upon a particular job, they remain employed in that job until it is completed. If a particular job upon which they are engaged lasts for three months, they are employed full-time for three months; if it lasts for six months, they are employed full-time for six months, and so on. The policy of the Government is to provide work rather than sustenance, and the fact that only seven per cent. of the total number depending on the Government at June last were receiving sustenance shows that we have been very active in organising additional work, so that as many as possible of the men may be given work and wages, enabled to live as ordinary people do live, and have the freedom of making their own purchases in accordance with their own desires and needs, and thus, to a large extent, be assisted to regain the independence they lost as a result of the coming of the last trade depression.

Hon. C. G. Latham: What do you do with the C class men who cannot do that work?

The MINISTER FOR EMPLOYMENT: I will give the Leader of the Opposition information about the C class men at a later stage. As a result of the increased number of men who came upon the Government for assistance during July, August and early September, the Government convened a conference of departmental engineers with the object of having additional work organised so that the new men might not have to remain on sustenance for any long period, which is always undesirable, but in order that they might be given employment and wages. At present we are finding work for more men than have been provided for during the last 18 months. We hope that position will prove to be only temporary. We believe that with the coming of warmer weather and the increased activity that occurs in most private industries during the warmer months, the additional number thrown upon the Government in the winter will be re-absorbed in private employment. We also believe that others who have been depending upon the Government for perhaps longer periods will also be absorbed in private industry as a result of additional activity in that direction.

When deciding upon a programme of works, the Government is compelled, owing to the limited amount of loan money available, to give consideration to the percentage of labour as compared with the cost of material in the expenditure estimated to be involved in a particular job. We frankly admit that all Governments have, during recent years, carried out with loan money many works that were not economically justified. All the Governments have been practically compelled to give preference to those jobs which were likely to absorb, so far as cost was concerned, more for labour than for material. The best class of work is that which requires a great deal of material. This class of work is the best from the State's point of view because it always brings a return to the State in the shape of interest and sinking fund on the capital cost involved. If we carry out work in which the labour cost is high and the material cost is low, it is generally of a type that brings little or no return in a direct way and probably little or no return in an indirect way.

Mr. North: You are at cross-purposes all the time.

The MINISTER FOR EMPLOYMENT: A conflict is going on all the time. Frequently the Government would prefer to do a certain class of work, but because of financial necessity and having to provide for a greater number of men than the available loan money warrants, the Government has to choose some other class of work that is not so economically desirable from the point of view of the State. This policy has been carried on for seven or eight years. Members will realise how increasingly difficult it is becoming to find jobs that absorb the major portion of costs in labour as against material. As these jobs become more difficult to find, so does the cost of employing men increase. Some two years ago we were able to employ men at an average of about £5 to £6 per man per week. To-day the cost is moving up to between £7 and £8 per man employed per week. That increase in the weekly cost of employing each man is partly due to improvements made in the employment scheme, but is mainly due, I should say, to the fact that as time goes on the Government finds itself compelled to take on the more expensive types of job, with the result that much greater outlay has to be incurred in the purchase of materials.

These jobs, which absorb a much greater percentage of cost in material than labour, are not necessarily bad jobs from the point of view of employment. They may be had from the point of view of providing direct employment to men dependent on the Government. On the other hand, they may be good providers of employment in factories and workshops from which the required materials are purchased.

Mr. Patrick: The jobs provide an indirect benefit.

The MINISTER FOR EMPLOYMENT: Yes. All work of this nature provides a great deal of indirect benefit if the materials required for any particular job can be purchased from local factories and local workshops. There is then not so much objection to that class of work.

Mr. Doney: There should be none in that case.

The MINISTER FOR EMPLOYMENT: The carrying out of such works keeps up

the volume of employment in private industry. That volume has to be maintained, otherwise the number of men to be provided for by the Government automatically increases. The Government follows the policy of endeavouring, whenever possible, and within reason, to carry out works in connection with which local material will be mainly if not entirely used. As a result of that policy, the Government has maintained a fairly high level of employment in certain local manufacturing industries, where manufactured materials are used upon the classes of work carried out by the Government. I have a table showing how conditions have improved since September, 1933. It takes into consideration the effect of increases in the basic wage from September, 1933, to the present day. The different increases in the basic wage that have taken place since that time now amount to 11s. 10d. per week.

COMPARISON SHOWING IMPROVED CONDITIONS.

Rate.	Sept., 1933. Basic Wage, £3 9s. 3d.	October, 1936. Basic Wage, £3 12s. 6d.	Sept., 1937. Basic Wage, £3 14s. 11d.	Present time. Basic Wage, £4 1s. 1d.	Inclusive over Sept., 1933.
	£ s. d.	£ s. d.	£ s. d.	£ s. d.	£ s. d.
49 -	3 3 4	3 9 10	3 12 5	Full time, 4 1 1	0 17 9
42 -	3 0 2	3 6 6	3 8 11		1 0 11
35 -	2 14 6	3 0 8	3 2 11		1 6 7
28 -	2 8 6	2 18 4	2 19 7		1 5 5
21 -	2 2 2	2 12 0	2 13 11		1 3 8
14 -	1 15 8	2 8 10	2 10 7	3 3 5	1 7 9

Margins for skill and camp allowances are paid for over and above the rates shown. When people say that relief workers on the sewerage scheme in the metropolitan area are averaging well below the basic wage they would be wise to make further investigations. If they do so, they will find that, with margins for skill and other allowances, very few if any men in the metropolitan area are averaging, every week in the year, below the basic wage.

Mr. Doney: How do those in the country fare?

The MINISTER FOR EMPLOYMENT: For the most part they average at least the basic wage, even if they are on part-time, because, in addition to the basic wage, they receive margins for skill, when they are employed at any time upon work that carries

a margin and, in addition, they receive a camp allowance of 5s. 3d. per week, plus certain other allowances that are included in the various industrial agreements and awards covering the different classes of work carried out. Cycles of work for the lower-rated men are as follows:—

Man and wife—6 weeks on, 2 weeks off.

Man, wife and 1 child—7 weeks on, 2 weeks off.

Man, wife and 2 children—7 weeks on, 1 week off.

The higher-rated men are employed full-time whilst the job upon which they are employed continues. During the stand-down period, the lower-rated men are allowed to earn sufficient in private employment to bring their average weekly earnings over the whole cycle up to at least the basic wage. If the

lower-rated men, because of not receiving any margin for skill, or not being entitled to camp allowance or any other allowance, do not average at least the basic wage during their period of work with the Government, they are entitled to bring their earnings over their whole cycle of work and stand-down up to at least the basic wage without their next period of work with the Government being interfered with in any way.

Mr. Doney: Do you recognise any responsibility on the part of your department for any prolonged standing-down period, a period longer than those you are quoting?

The MINISTER FOR EMPLOYMENT: Yes, we do recognise responsibility. We are constantly endeavouring to provide additional works, so that no man, or as few men as unavoidable, shall be compelled to stand down for any substantial period. Our aim is to provide employment for each man when he is entitled to receive it. We know that occasions do arise, and arise all too frequently for our liking, when a job which is being carried on passes its most active period, with the result that the maximum number of men then employed upon it has to be reduced. From then on, until that job is completed, there is a progressive lessening of the number of men on the job. It is not always possible to have other work immediately ready to which those men can be transferred as soon as they are eligible for further work.

Mr. Doney: How do you recognise your responsibility when that situation arises?

The MINISTER FOR EMPLOYMENT: As I have explained, we do by every means at our disposal—

Mr. Doney: I want to know what those means are.

The MINISTER FOR EMPLOYMENT: The main means we have at our disposal are those of taking up immediately with the engineers of the different employing departments to have new works put in hand, so that the men concerned can be placed again in employment as soon as possible after becoming eligible for further work.

Mr. Doney: Your responsibility would not extend to supplying rations in that case?

The MINISTER FOR EMPLOYMENT: No. I mentioned earlier that employment in the agricultural industry had been less this year than in previous years. If hon. members take the trouble to obtain information

from the private labour exchanges and the Government exchange, they will find that the exchanges have not experienced that active period regarding applications for farm labour that they have experienced during previous seasons. We are hopeful that from now onwards the number of men applied for by wheatgrowers will increase. Haycutting has commenced in some districts, and the gathering of the grain will commence in every district very soon. We are hopeful that that will give us the opportunity to send men now dependent upon the Government to private employment of that nature, and no doubt the coming of the harvest will assist considerably in providing employment in that direction. Not only will it assist in a direct way, but by virtue of the fact that it will create additional activity in the Railway Department and in almost every direction, it will be of material assistance in providing employment of an indirect nature.

The placing of men who are medically unfit to do ordinary labouring work is always a difficult problem. Every effort has been made to find employment suitable to the physical condition of such men. During the past 12 months work has been put in hand on the State Farm at Wooroloo. That work is of such a nature as to be capable of being performed by what are known as C class men.

Mr. Doney: What type of work would that be? I thought it was clearing work.

The MINISTER FOR EMPLOYMENT: The work being carried on at the Wooroloo State Farm is of a light clearing nature. During the last eight or nine months we have been employing 40 married C class men on that work. Those men have previously been on sustenance only for years. Some of them had been on sustenance for as long as six years without having had any employment at all. They had not only had themselves but also their families reduced to a very unfortunate condition of existence, and in addition, most of them had developed an idea that they would never work again. They had to a large extent lost their spirit of independence, and had so to speak resigned themselves to living on sustenance or some such basis for the rest of their lives. The reports that have been received from the State farm following the putting in hand of this work have been encouraging. Only two men of the 40 originally sent there have

had to leave the work. One of them was obliged to leave on account of heart trouble. The other did not really have to leave, but obtained some position on a ship which was going to the Old Country. He left the work voluntarily. This goes to prove that the work is not too heavy for such men, and that the putting in hand of the work was an altogether satisfactory move. I may point out that the foreman in charge of the work pays particular attention to each man's physical condition, and that endeavours are made as far as is humanly possible to give each man work according to his physical condition. When the men go to this work in the first instance, they are allowed just to work themselves in quietly. There is no rush or bustle. There is no pressure put upon any of them to do more than it is possible for them to do. As the weeks go by, those men, as a result of the work they do, find themselves capable of giving a better day's work than they were able to do at the beginning. The experiment has been altogether successful, and has encouraged us to decide to put further work of this nature in hand at the Wooroloo State farm. We hope to be able to absorb an additional number of C class married men in the near future, and so provide some more men with the opportunity of employment suitable to their physical condition. Thus they will be given an opportunity to provide for themselves and their families on better standards of living than would otherwise be possible.

We also employ a number of C class single men upon light land clearing activities in the South-West. Most of these men are elderly. They are employed upon a part-time basis only. Their average weekly earnings approximate 32s. 6d. They do not have any set hours; that is to say, they are not called upon to work two days straight away but are allowed to use their own discretion and choose their own times for working, especially in the hot weather. The result is that most of the men work some hours in the earlier part of the day, do not work at all during the hottest part of the day, and then work again in the cooler hours of the afternoon. This system too has worked very satisfactorily, with the result that the men concerned are obtaining employment suitable to their physical capacity, which work otherwise would not be available to them. They appreciate very much what has been done

for them in that regard. Despite the efforts of some people to turn those people against the Government and to prevail upon them to condemn the Government by resolution or some other method, the men feel that the Government, in all the circumstances, is doing as much as reasonably can be expected, in view of the fact that there are over 6,000 men, most of them married, to provide for.

Mr. Sampson: Who would seek to turn those men against the Government?

The MINISTER FOR EMPLOYMENT: If the hon. member interjecting will have a quiet chat with me after the House rises, I will give him some confidential information on that point.

Mr. Patrick: Political agitators.

Mr. Sampson: At any rate, it was a remarkable statement for the Minister to make.

The MINISTER FOR EMPLOYMENT: During the year 796 applicants for relief work were examined by the District Medical Officer and of those 324 were stated to be B class men and 441 C class. Work especially suitable to the physical condition of C class men has been provided for 177 individuals. During the year one family comprising two adults and four children, and also two single men, were repatriated to the United Kingdom at an approximate cost of £180. The staff of the Employment Relief Department and the State Labour Bureau comprised in 1934, 84 officials; in 1935, 69; in 1936, 60; in 1937, 49; and in 1938, 48. This year provision has been made for a staff of 45.

The Council of Industrial Development has not been able to recommend as much assistance to industry during the past year as it desired, but as public funds have been available, assistance has been recommended and granted. Following the practice of many years, exhibitions of local products have been arranged regularly in leading country centres and on the goldfields. In the latter part of the State, the council has been fortunate in securing the active co-operation and assistance of the Railway Department, which has been instrumental in forming a live and hard-working committee at Kalgoorlie and Boulder. As a result of the work of that committee, supported by the Council of Industrial Development, the sale of local products at Kalgoorlie and Boulder has increased substantially during the last few years. Another valuable link

with the council is afforded through the Empire Shopping Week and Local Products Campaign Council, on which the department is represented. With the assistance of sub-branches of the Returned Soldiers' League, the Women's Auxiliary and other bodies, the campaign council has been the means of distributing over 40,000 posters throughout the State. Those posters brought before the public the need for their giving support to Western Australian industries. The Advisory Committee on Eastern Trade, for which the department is responsible to the Commonwealth Government, has closely watched matters relating to trade with the East, and contact has been maintained with trade commissioners appointed to various centres. Early in the year a trade delegation, comprising Messrs. Fitzpatrick, representing the flourmill owners, and Merry, representing the W.A. Fruit Shippers' Committee, visited Saigon in French Cochinchina. Their passages were provided by the State Shipping Service on the m.v. "Kangaroo." The delegation reported on the possibility of developing trade with those countries in certain commodities, and that report is now receiving consideration. Advantage was taken of the Royal Sesquicentenary Show in Sydney to bring the State's resources before the public of New South Wales and an attractive and effective display was arranged, which was representative of Western Australian primary and secondary industries. The department was also instrumental in arranging for displays of Western Australian goods for the Glasgow British Empire Exhibition. As a further means of stressing the importance of our secondary industries, a shop window dressing competition was arranged with the co-operation of the Women's Economic Council. Nearly 100 entries were received from retailers in the metropolitan area, and the judging committee had difficulty in selecting the prize winners from a great number of excellent entries.

In November next the Federal Conference of the Manufacturers of Australia will be held in Perth. I think it will be the first time that a Federal conference of that description has ever been held in Western Australia. An exhibition of local products will be staged in Perth during the period of the conference in the city. We are hopeful of being able to contact many of the manufacturers of the Eastern States, who will be

here for that gathering. I feel we may be able to achieve quite good results in building up the manufacturing industry in this State if we can make the essential contacts with representatives of manufacturing concerns in Eastern Australia.

Mr. Lambert: You are optimistic!

The MINISTER FOR EMPLOYMENT: It may be contended that those manufacturers are not likely to establish branches of their concerns here, seeing that they can send their goods from the Eastern States to Western Australia and sell them without difficulty. As a rejoinder to contentions of that description, I would point out that Nestles Ltd. established a branch of its concern here a few years ago. That branch continues to operate and in recent times has been expanded. At present Nestle's factory at Warroona is actually exporting manufactured goods to the Eastern States.

Mr. Lambert: You know why the company established the branch industry at Warroona? It was merely to squelch a local company that had started.

The MINISTER FOR EMPLOYMENT: If Nestles did that to squelch a local company, the move was not successful.

Mr. Lambert: Ask Mr. Macfarlane, M.L.C., and he will tell you why Nestles started here.

The MINISTER FOR EMPLOYMENT: I do not admit that Nestles came here for that purpose.

Mr. Lambert: The firm definitely did come here for that purpose.

The MINISTER FOR EMPLOYMENT: Even if Nestles did, the firm was entitled to establish works here. It is far better to have the firm operating here, even in competition with our own factories, rather than for it to carry on the whole of its manufacturing activities in the Eastern States and simply dump supplies in Western Australia and knock out our locally-established industries.

Several members interjected.

The MINISTER FOR EMPLOYMENT: The fact remains that Nestles came to Western Australia—

Mr. Lambert: And should be kicked out again.

The MINISTER FOR EMPLOYMENT: Nestles is still here and, more important still, its manufacturing activities have been extended in Western Australia quite recently.

Mr. Doney: That is to say, Nestles (W.A.) Ltd., successfully competed with Nestles of the Eastern States—by arrangement.

The MINISTER FOR EMPLOYMENT: On the occasion of my next visit to Waroona, I shall have considerable pleasure in inviting the member for Yilgarn-Coolgardie to accompany me.

Hon. C. G. Latham: If you have as much bother with him there as you have with him now, you will have difficulty in getting rid of him.

Mr. Lambert: If you ask Mr. Macfarlane, M.L.C., he will tell you all about this matter.

The MINISTER FOR EMPLOYMENT: I have no interest in Mr. Macfarlane nor his activities. There are a few other matters to which I desire briefly to refer. During 1937-38 the number of male applicants for work at the head office of the State Labour Bureau in Perth and at the country branches totalled 7,549, compared with 8,092 during the previous financial year, showing a decrease of 543 males. On the other hand, the male engagements for the last financial year totalled 4,028 as compared with 4,327 for the previous financial year, or a decrease of 299. During the year 4,238 persons were assisted with fares, to enable them to proceed to private employment. Of these, 4,232 received advances for fares on repayment conditions. The cost of repayable fares was £5,684, as compared with £6,346 for the previous year, a decrease of £662. The refunds collected during the year amounted to £5,376, as compared with £5,863 for the previous year. The percentage of fares advanced which was subsequently collected was 94.58, which is a record for collection of fares advanced. Most of the fares advanced by the State Labour Bureau are for men who have been picked up by private labour exchanges. Those exchanges pick the men up and send them to the State Labour Bureau to ask the bureau to advance the fares. It has been urged against this Government that it is out by any means at its disposal to wreck or put out of business private labour exchanges.

Mr. Sampson: The Government has had several shots at doing that.

Mr. Needham: Does the bureau share the fees?

The MINISTER FOR EMPLOYMENT: The Government could possibly put the private labour exchanges out of business by the simple method of no longer advance-

ing fares to men picked up by the private exchanges.

Mr. Doney: The private exchanges, of course, assist you.

The MINISTER FOR EMPLOYMENT: If they did not exist, then the men concerned would be picked up at the State Labour Bureau.

Mr. Doney: That is the point.

Mr. Sampson: The private labour exchanges create work.

The MINISTER FOR EMPLOYMENT: Yes, probably for an office boy here and there.

Mr. Sampson: Yes. That is the point—little by little; that is the spirit.

The MINISTER FOR EMPLOYMENT: The cost of maintaining the State Labour Bureau is chiefly incurred by having to follow up and collect from men picked up by the private labour exchanges the amount advanced for fares. The State Labour Bureau is put to a great deal of work first in providing the money for the fares and then in following up the men to collect the amounts advanced. No one could legitimately object to the State Labour Bureau charging the private labour exchanges a small fee for this work.

Member: They would pass it on to the employee.

The MINISTER FOR EMPLOYMENT: The State Labour Bureau has all the facilities to carry out the work to which I have referred. This point must be considered, that to the extent these men are picked up, whether by private labour exchanges or by the bureau, unemployment is correspondingly decreased and the number of men dependent upon the Government is lessened. At the women's branch of the State Labour Bureau, the total number of applications for work during the year was 1,589, and the engagements, including day workers, numbered 1,843. Domestic workers continue to be scarce. The officer in charge is at all times unable to secure suitable domestic workers for vacancies available. This applies especially to country positions. Employers are increasingly realising the fact that, in order to obtain satisfactory domestic workers, wages and working conditions must be made as attractive as possible. Employers who fail to do this are usually disappointed in the class of domestic worker they obtain.

Mr. Doney: Does the same method of advancing fares and making collections prevail in the case of female workers?

The MINISTER FOR EMPLOYMENT: Yes. Dealing with the Factories Department, 2,848 factories were registered during the year ended the 31st December, 1937, as compared with 2,783 in 1936 and 2,660 in 1935. The number of persons engaged in the factories was 27,630, compared with 26,406 in 1936 and 23,713 in 1935. The number of factories registered and the number of persons employed therein at the end of last year are the highest yet recorded. Shops to the number of 9,272 were registered last year, giving employment to 34,438 persons. The corresponding figures for 1936 were 9,074 shops and 32,487 persons. The number of shops and warehouses registered in 1937 was the highest since the Act became law in 1921, while the number of persons engaged in the shops and warehouses is also higher than in 1936, when 32,487 persons were employed and in 1935, when 30,807 persons were employed. During the year 1937, 9,856 factories and 10,834 shops and warehouses were visited. The inspections were made under the provisions of the Factories and Shops Act, 1920-37; while 213 other inspections were made under various awards and industrial agreements under the provisions of the Industrial Arbitration Act, 1912-37. As a result 331 orders or instructions to remedy defects were issued; no trouble was experienced in securing compliance with the orders. Persons to the number of 156 were receiving wages less than the rates provided by the Act or by various awards and agreements; and arrears of wages amounting to £203 8s. 3d. were recovered by the workers concerned. The number of persons convicted for breaches of the Factories and Shops Act was 50; while 63 persons were convicted of breaches of various awards and industrial agreements. Fines amounting to £145 3s. and costs amounting to £53 2s. 2d. were imposed. During the year 356 accidents were notified to the office. Careful inquiries were made as to the causes of the accidents and, where necessary, action was taken.

The Shearers' Accommodation Act is also administered by this department. As a result of the department's operations—assistance was given by police officers in outlying districts—many improvements to existing

accommodation have been effected. Inspections under the Act to the number of 35 were recorded during the year under review.

I desire to say a few words on the Child Welfare Department. On the 1st July, 1938, 4,825 children were under the care of the department, a decrease of 208 compared with the previous year. Of the total mentioned, 610 were maintained in institutions. The institution caring for the largest number, 79, was the Swan Boys' Orphanage. The next in order is the St. Joseph's Orphanage for Girls, which cared for 70 children. In addition to the 610 children being maintained in institutions, 359 wards were boarded out with private families. On the 1st July, 1938, relief was being given to 1,014 cases. The largest groups were—

Widows	335
Incapacitated husbands ..	330
Deserted wives	158

In the families being assisted by the department 2,580 children were receiving assistance who were not wards of the department. Each of the homes is visited at least once a quarter by a departmental inspector, five of whom are qualified nurses. At the 30th June, 1938, 147 licenses for street trading were issued to children. Of the total, 103 were issued to boys between the ages of 12 and 14, and 44 were issued to boys between the ages of 14 and 16 years.

The Revenue Estimates provide for an anticipated expenditure of £131,050, as against an expenditure for the previous year of £120,957. The special feature of the increased revenue expenditure for the current financial year is due to the higher rates of assistance proposed to be made available to widows upon whom children are dependent.

Mr. Raphael: About time, too!

The MINISTER FOR EMPLOYMENT: Details of the increased allowances to be made available to such families are at present receiving consideration. We hope that the whole of the details will be decided in time to permit of the increased allowances being paid not later than the first week in November.

Mr. Doney: A very desirable departure.

The MINISTER FOR EMPLOYMENT: The increased allowances will apply mainly to the smaller families. The widows with one child, two children or three children represent the families in a particularly unfortunate position under the scale of allowances that is now and has been operating for

some time. During the last two or three years the floating scale of allowances from 7s. to 9s. per unit of family per week has been liberalised to quite a substantial extent. In other words, a far greater number of families has received either 8s. or 9s. per unit of family per week compared with the number receiving 7s. per unit per family per week.

Mr. Needham: What will be the maximum amount under the new scale?

THE MINISTER FOR EMPLOYMENT: The whole of the details are now under consideration. The point mentioned by the member for Perth is one of the matters being considered, and we hope that before the end of the month information can be given to Parliament indicating just how we propose to alter the allowances and the extent of the increases to be granted to the different family groups.

At the 30th June, 1938, assistance was being rendered to 1,147 families, 441 incapacitated husbands and 2,580 children, a total of 4,168 persons in receipt of assistance. Those figures disclose a decrease during the 12 months of 83 cases. Ever since the worst years of the depression there has been a progressive decrease in the number of families relying upon the Child Welfare Department for assistance. That a much larger number of families should be compelled to seek assistance from the department in the worst years of the depression was only natural. As economic and general conditions have improved, there has been this gradual but nevertheless welcome decrease in the number of families dependent upon the Child Welfare Department. Evidently as conditions improve, some of the widows either receive offers of marriage, or find suitable employment, or are assisted in some other way to an extent that they no longer have to seek assistance for themselves and their children from the department.

The information I have given to the Committee covers fairly comprehensively the activities of the different departments that are my responsibility. These departments are somewhat troublesome. Departments dealing with the problems that arise from poverty are not of a type that bring much satisfaction to the Minister in control or to the officers associated with those departments. Nevertheless, I take this opportunity to express my appreciation of all the officers concerned. I also take the opportunity to express my appreciation of the reason-

able way in which members of Parliament have always approached the department and me whenever they have found it necessary to call.

Mr. Marshall: In 100 per cent. of the cases?

Hon. C. G. Latham: Is this the final speech of the Minister for Employment?

THE MINISTER FOR EMPLOYMENT: I should prefer that the member for Murchison did not press his question as to whether my remark applies to every member. If he pressed me hard enough on the point, I might have to make one exception. Although on the surface, relations sometimes appear to be strained, in reality the relations existing between members of Parliament, the officers of the department and the Minister in control are reasonably happy. I have pleasure in introducing the Estimates.

MR. NORTH (Claremont) [9.29]: The Minister has given a full and clear review of the activities of his departments, and I have no desire to traverse the ground that he has covered. Still, I should like to express my pleasure that the vote is being expended. Sometimes the votes for the Child Welfare Department and Department of Employment are not spent, and if there are any votes that should be utilised to the fullest extent, surely they are the ones. I should imagine that we might reasonably judge our standard of civilisation by the manner in which we look after those people who are unfortunate in their careers or in their chances in life. The Minister raised an important point when he stressed that the department was now considering whether it was best to take on jobs that employed a lot of men and a little material, or whether it was better to take on works where the money was chiefly spent in material and only a small proportion absorbed in labour. The point is an interesting one, and it may be said that the whole of our economic system depends upon the answer to the question. In the early days of the depression we were charged with sending men to pick the grass from footpaths. We have now reached the stage when it is suggested by the Minister that works involving less labour and more material constitute works that are better from the point of view of the State. When saying that he is clearly raising the economic issue that was

raised in the early days of the depression, and has not yet been solved. If we continue more and more to engage in important works, using less and less labour, the problem will become more involved and there will be more unemployed workers to deal with. On the other hand, if we continue to carry out those works that require more labour and less material, we shall be searching for works that will be less useful and less productive of benefit to the State, and our second condition will be worse than the first. The Minister pointed out that by engaging in works which used much material and only a little labour, in the long run that would help the industries of Western Australia in a better way than if we absorbed mostly men and but little material. This matter must be thrashed out. It cannot be left for long before we obtain a new viewpoint concerning it. Nearly all the possible works that the Government could countenance have already been completed. There remain now only the lesser number of works that can be considered at all before we come to the more valuable works in the sense of a greater amount of material and a lesser amount of labour.

Mr. Raphael: What about the trans-line or all-Australia route?

Mr. NORTH: I know it is difficult to make clear the points at issue, but they are very important. We are reaching the stage when, with the backing of the department and the authority of the Minister, it has become vitally important to undertake works that do not require so much labour, but if we reach that stage we shall have to increase our loans so that we may keep the same number of men in employment. That will mean more millions of borrowed money for the same volume of employment. The other side of the paradox I have already stressed. Detailed jobs are only too numerous. When we get away from the idea of saying we must have an army of men at work, and must use as little material as possible, we shall be carrying out those works that will be of greater value to the State; but they will cost much more and consequently will be more difficult to carry out. Once again we shall be arriving at the position that was reached at Munich by the Big Four. We shall have further unemployment and poverty at a time when we were never so rich in history. The Minister approached the subject from the practical, everyday view-

point. That is a point which must obtrude itself upon us more and more as the years go by. With other members I listened with interest to his illuminating speech. The Minister went into every detail. I was not pleased to hear that the building trade seemed to be falling back, and sincerely hope there will be a revival as the warmer weather approaches.

[Mr. Hegney took the Chair.]

MR. SAMPSON (Swan) [9.35]: The Minister is to be congratulated upon the increase in the percentage of those who have repaid their railway fares. This may be taken as a criterion in respect to work. When is it likely that workers will again be given the opportunity to work without the degradation of being required to qualify for sustenance? I am very anxious to see that method brought to an end, as I am sure the Minister himself is. Unfortunately those men have no trade. I am afraid the conditions that brought about the position in respect to unskilled workers generally, and their need for sustenance, is being repeated indefinitely. Boys in the Technical School, where they should be given the fullest opportunity to learn, have to face certain restrictions. In a number of classes boys are not permitted to learn what is being taught. The classes are available only to boys already apprenticed to work. That, I submit, is unwise, and amounts to a conspiracy to deprive lads, who might otherwise learn sufficient to enable them later on to earn a living, of the opportunity to do so. Many unskilled workers have a most painful and abhorrent lot to look forward to. One cannot say that much of the work they could do is really unskilled. The construction of roads and railway work does call for effort. The deprivation that men suffer in respect to self-reliance, and the knowledge that they are being given relief work as a charity, must have a bad effect on their morale. The Minister referred also to the necessity for men taking out union tickets. I cannot conceive that such a system should be allowed to continue. Men who are required for relief work must, before they can obtain food and clothing for their children, pay some of their small earnings to secure a union ticket.

Mr. Withers: Surely that topic has run the gamut of a good many years.

Mr. SAMPSON: I regret that such a system should exist. The policy of insisting on

men taking out a union ticket when they are in distress should be brought to an end. The whole question is very close to the heart of the Minister. I can only think he is required to do this and does it.

The Minister for Employment: Ninety per cent. of them do it voluntarily.

Mr. SAMPSON: Probably the poor unfortunates are afraid that if they do not take out a ticket voluntarily they may not be permitted to work.

The Minister for Employment: That is not so. The other 10 per cent. have dodged the taking of a union ticket.

Mr. Raphael: How disgraceful!

Mr. SAMPSON: It is very disgraceful. In this case we are thinking together, speaking together, and supporting each other. When all is said and done it would not matter so much if the men were in regular work, because then they could afford the ticket. There is nothing to be said against the adoption of a policy that all should pay for advantages obtained. But what advantage does a man get who has to depend on relief work, which of course is not full-time work? What assistance does he get?

Mr. Raphael: You had a £3 maximum, do not forget!

Miss Holman: And 35s. a week.

Mr. SAMPSON: While the member for Victoria Park (Mr. Raphael) looks back to what happened some years ago, that is not the point; it will not do a bit of good. He should look at matters as they are now and see whether his youthful enthusiasm cannot find any objection to the present position. It will, of course; and I hope that before the general discussion closes, you, Mr. Hegney, will be in your ordinary seat and voice your objections, because I am convinced that you do not stand for men on relief paying for a union ticket. I regret that the Minister for Employment did not refer to a most useful and practical effort which is being made by the New South Wales Lands Department. Thereby boys of 15 to 20 years of age are given work on a State farm.

The Minister for Mines: What are they to do on a farm here? Grow wheat?

Mr. SAMPSON: There are many other things, of which I shall tell the Minister in a moment. I desire to tell this tale in regular sequence. I would have been

pleased had the Minister for Employment made some reference to the splendid work being done by the New South Wales Government in regard to those boys. They are placed on the land at Seheyville Training Farm near Windsor, New South Wales. The remarkable thing about this is that the lads are guaranteed that after eight weeks' training they will get a job on a farm. During the eight weeks they are given every consideration; they enjoy a certain amount of leisure and indulge in sport, and even get pocket money. They are cared for as boys should be cared for, and all that is best in them is developed. Those lads are brought to a liking for farm work, and the project is well worth inquiring into. I hope the Minister for Employment will go into the matter and perhaps provide something similar here.

The Minister for Mines: We will send him over to have a look at it.

Mr. SAMPSON: If the Minister for Employment will promise to go into it. I will get some more matter over. The Sydney "Daily Telegraph" had an advertisement relating to this. From it I could read out all those details.

The Minister for Employment: Are you adding the Sydney "Daily Telegraph" to your chain?

Mr. SAMPSON: The Sydney "Daily Telegraph" is really more of a sister company.

The CHAIRMAN: I hope the member will connect those remarks with the Estimates.

Mr. SAMPSON: Yes, Sir. In the Sydney "Worker" also this opportunity for boys is being advertised. That is worth while. To-night someone inadvertently called the Minister, "the Minister for Unemployment." He is not the Minister for Unemployment, but the Minister for Employment; and a practical and definite step forward in the carrying out of his work under that designation would be taken if he would give consideration to, and adopt, the same methods as have been adopted in New South Wales.

The Minister for Mines: We could send the boys on Kalamunda way.

Mr. SAMPSON: Yes: on an experimental farm to be established there. Perhaps the boys could be given work on that farm. The Government is otherwise not lacking in

experimental farms. However, I do not want to delay the opportunity for those boys. I want to encourage the lads, so that there will be generated a liking for work on the land. That is highly important.

One other phase I want to speak on briefly, relates to providing able-bodied men with rations. If it is unfair to the men, and certainly not useful to the State. By far the better course would be to revert to a system which was in existence some time ago, whereby if suitable work was not available, arrangements were made for men to work for local authorities. Far better would that be for those men, and the men themselves would greatly prefer it to receiving rations without doing work. That is distasteful to the men, and is futile, and does not get them anywhere. In fact, it does a lot of harm. I hope consideration will be given to this subject. It is demoralising to give men rations and deny them work. I know that in the hills, certainly a long while ago, it was proposed that this be done, and a meeting was called to protest against it. The men said they would not accept rations or anything else unless they were allowed to work in return. That spirit is in the heart of every man who is properly constituted.

The Minister for Mines: What do you mean by that?

Mr. SAMPSON: I am not reflecting on the Minister for Mines. I hope the minister for Employment will give consideration to this aspect. Those men should not be compelled to throw away their last vestige of self-respect and self-reliance before being approved for sustenance. They should be provided with work on the roads, the railways or on similar so-called unskilled jobs, without having to sacrifice their manhood. I appreciate the work that the Minister has to carry out, but I think there are different directions in which improvements could be effected, to some of which I have referred briefly.

MRS. CARDELL-OLIVER (Subiaco) [9.51] I hope the Minister will include me as one of those who have gone to the department and received courtesy and help throughout the year. I cannot help thinking, as I also thought last year, that if a stranger should wander into the Chamber while the Minister was talking, he would come to the conclusion that he would almost

prefer to be one of the relief workers rather than be in permanent employment. The Minister told us that men had been employed on full time. That is really a misleading statement, although true. Men are employed on full time, but only so long as the job lasts. Many men are out of work for months at a time, so that by the end of the year they find they are hardly any better off than they were under the old arrangements followed by the department. There are other phases that the Minister should consider. He mentioned that many of the men with families of three or four were employed. The majority of those men, however, are employed away from their homes, with the result that family life has largely broken down. Many of the children in various homes are there because of their wrecked family life. In fact, I believe that 75 per cent. of the children in those homes owe their position to broken marriages and ruined home life. A great deal of the unhappiness is occasioned through the father having to work away from his home. I know of some instances where the children almost refused to have their father back. They do not want him back after he has been away for some weeks. Such a position makes it not only unpleasant for the father, but gives rise to much unhappiness in the home. Instances have come under my notice of boys or girls, 13 years of age, who have disagreed with their mothers, have gone out at night time and done what they desired. The mothers have no control over them and the fathers are away and cannot exercise the necessary authority.

The Minister for Health: It is not necessary for the father to be away from home for that sort of thing to happen.

Mr. Fox: It happens in normal times.

Mrs. CARDELL-OLIVER: That is so, but the position is emphasised now and in many instances the cause is attributable to the absence of the father, who has to work away from the home. As to the position of what I describe as the seven-shilling a week man, the Minister knows it is impossible for an adult to live on such an amount. I shall not labour the point, because I know the grant is not sufficiently large to enable the Minister to pay more and that he would pay more if he could do so. Certainly 7s. a week is not sufficient to enable any human being to live, and many of the men are considerably under-nourished. The Minister

said that the men in receipt of 30s. 6d. were employed, and while that statement may be true in theory, it is not true in fact. Many are employed for a short time only. I visited a number of camps on the goldfields and ascertained that the men were employed for one week on and one week off, or perhaps two weeks on and one week off. In consequence the men did not receive anything like the wage they were supposed to get. The effect of being kept away in the country under such conditions, miles away from any centre, is demoralising. The men have to lie under the mulga bush in the evenings or else in a hot tent and at times, for weeks, are without employment. That is most demoralising. A far better arrangement would be to keep them employed.

Mr. Lambert: What was done by the Government that you supported? You should be ashamed to attack the Minister on that point.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I must ask the member for Yilgarn-Coolgardie to keep order.

Mr. Lambert: You should be ashamed to mention it.

The CHAIRMAN: Order!

Mr. Lambert: You can't get away with that much.

Mrs. CARDELL-OLIVER: The Minister has not clearly defined what a C class man is. I have asked questions with a view to ascertaining what type of work should be provided for men in that category, but the Minister did not give an accurate definition. I applied to the department for a statement regarding the work of C class men, but I did not get any satisfaction there. I was informed that some types of forestry work were made available, but on the other hand, the men themselves told me that they were put on to pick and shovel work. Some are over 60 years of age and when they return from work of that nature, many of them are ill and unable to work again for some time, thereby becoming a charge upon institutions.

Unofficially the Minister informed me that the success of advertising was to be found in repetition. In the circumstances, in dealing with the Child Welfare Department, I desire to repeat statements I made formerly regarding milk supplies for children. I wish to do so in answer to the member for Victoria Park (Mr. Raphael) who rather questioned milk as a suitable diet for children.

Mr. Raphael: I quoted medical authorities.

Mrs. CARDELL-OLIVER: I have received a letter that may be of interest to the hon. member. It reads as follows:—

My attention has been drawn to certain extravagant statements made in the House by Mr. Raphael, M.L.A., for Victoria Park, when speaking with reference to the matter of free milk for children. For your information I enclose two analyses of samples of milk supplied to the children, also a check analysis, the latter reading as follows:—

“The analyses of the milk samples (A), (B) and (C) submitted by you are up to the standard and are of excellent quality.”

On behalf of the Free Milk Council, which is doing an honorary work of major importance for the welfare of an important part of the community, I would be glad if you would refute these wild and ungenerous statements.

The CHAIRMAN: The hon. member is not in order in replying now to statements made on the Health Estimates.

Mrs. CARDELL-OLIVER: I was simply replying to statements made by the member for Victoria Park, and I thought I could do so when discussing the Vote for the Child Welfare Department. However, in conclusion I wish to say that the analyses of the milk which was given to the children show that the samples were absolutely pure.

Mr. Withers interjected.

Mrs. CARDELL-OLIVER: I have three statements and I am willing to lay them on the Table. I am not a betting woman, but I would like to bet any member of this Chamber that the children are getting wholesome milk.

Mr. Raphael: I ask the member for Subiaco to lay on the Table the letter that she read.

Mrs. CARDELL-OLIVER: I will do so with the greatest of pleasure.

[Mr. Sleeman took the Chair.]

MR. MARSHALL (Murchison) [10.2]: The contributions so far made on these Estimates with regard to employment or unemployment, according to the viewpoint of each member, in my humble opinion get us practically nowhere. As years pass, although one might imagine on the figures submitted that the position is improving, one has only to take a comprehensive view to realise that there has been no real advance. The statement has been made that men are now get-

ting full-time work, but there was a reservation which implies that men, after all, get only partial employment. The Government itself admits that it cannot now find work when the money available must be expended chiefly upon material instead of labour. In other words, the Government's greatest difficulty is to find work where the greater part of the expenditure will be in wages. We have now reached the point when the Government can find little, if any, of that class of work. To the unfortunate person obliged to depend upon the Government for work, it does not matter whether the work is termed full-time or not, as the full-time obligation upon the Government lasts only as long as the job upon which the worker is engaged is continued. It is incorrect, therefore, to say that men are employed full-time; they are little or no better off than they have been in past years. I frankly admit that, comparing the period 1930 to 1933 with the period 1937 to 1938, the lot of these unfortunate people has been improved materially. In fairness to all concerned, however, I point out that during the period 1930-33, the Government was attempting the miracle of governing without the sinews of war. The Government at that time had no loan money to spend. The banks had closed down on the Government upon the recommendation of Sir Otto Niemeyer, who represented the banking monopoly. The Government foolishly thought it was within the realms of possibility to function without borrowing money. The experiment was tried from 1930 to 1933, and I need not remind members of the deplorable condition into which all the States drifted. Loan money is as essential to industry to-day as is blood to the human being. We therefore find our Premier and Premiers of other States negotiating in what is termed a Loan Council meeting to obtain money for the State. Mark you, Sir, and let no one be under any misapprehension. The Loan Council does not decide the amount of money the States shall get; it only decides what the States really require. We are aware that the Treasurers cut the requirements down to the very minimum, but even so, the States do not get what they actually need. They get what the money monopoly decides to give them. I repeat, the Government does not rule. We are assuming we have sovereign rights, but we have not. Each Gov-

ernment is under a definite obligation to give effect to the bankers' policy. For member to complain about the state of affairs is useless, unless they are prepared to tackle the source of the evil. That is where our trouble lies. Let every member tackle it. Start there, and we may get somewhere. Continual arguments in this Chamber, and the throwing of unfair exchanges across the Chamber about what my Government did, or that Government did, or this Government did, will not get us anywhere. Those who control money control the destiny of this and of other countries. All I, as a goldfields representative, can say, is that we play our part in raising money by way of taxation to keep the country's credit fair, stable, and to keep workers in employment in the city. Goldminers are taxed to the hilt. I think they work one day a week to provide the money necessary to stabilise our credit, and so that the State can borrow to provide employment for those who work in the city, or wherever the Government has work for them to do. The department provides nothing for the unemployed on the goldfields. Those men walk long dry stages in search of work; they have to put up with all sorts of trials and tribulations and make many sacrifices, and not a penny of public money is returned to them by way of sustenance. Goldfields members are fully entitled to call for a new policy under which all unemployed will share and share alike. If people depart from the activities of the Government in search of employment and fail, they receive no encouragement. If they do not venture, they get at least some consideration. In essence, therefore, the Government is encouraging people not to go out and look for private employment because if they do so, they receive no consideration at all. When the unemployed on the goldfields get work the consideration extended to them is that of the Taxation Department.

Under this department provision is made for the Arbitration Court. I have conferred with quite a number of people whose opinion is worthy of respect upon the legality of the court's action in imposing a further penalty in an award. I made some reference to this matter a few evenings ago by way of protest. I have made further investigations and obtained several opinions. Search the Act where we will, we cannot find any power given to the court to impose a penalty such as has been inflicted on the

goldminers and coalminers. When we reach the vote for the Arbitration Court I propose by way of protest, to move an amendment to reduce the amount. That the court should assume the right to impose two penalties upon a section of workers and leave the other section entirely immune is bad enough, but to assume powers not granted by Parliament is going too far for my liking. The penalty clause provides for a deduction from the workers' wages of payment for a holiday in the event of the men participating in an unauthorised stoppage of work.

Mr. Needham: It amounts to a double penalty.

Mr. MARSHALL: Quite so, but in essence it amounts to a reduction of the earnings of the workers. Many years ago the court, after due consideration, granted holidays to the miners. The court concluded that the workers in the gold mines were entitled to one day's holiday pay for each month of service rendered. If the court has a right to insert in an award a clause deducting the equivalent in money of one holiday, it is reducing the worker's earnings. I put it to the member for West Perth (Mr. McDonald), who gave us such an exhaustive speech on constitutional law this evening, whether in the event of the court having awarded the workers, say, £1 per day for every day's work, it was then entitled to say that if the men participated in an unauthorised stoppage, the wage rate should be reduced to 10s. per day. Would the hon. member say that that was legal, right or just?

Mr. Hughes: The courts have never determined that there is power to do so.

Mr. MARSHALL: The hon. member must know that to go to law is a most expensive matter. None knows that better than he.

Mr. Hughes: I think I am on the right side.

Mr. MARSHALL: I cannot say: I have not yet been called upon to pay for the hon. member's services, but I wager that they would not be given gratis. When the Arbitration Court provides for a deduction of pay equal to one day's holiday, it is equivalent to reducing the workers' wages. The court is inconsistent if, after making an award granting certain rates of pay, it embodies a clause to deprive the workers of portion of that pay. A further aspect deserves consideration. Not only does the court make a deduction from the wages earned by the worker, but in effect it hands

the money back to the employer. If the employer does not pay for those holidays, he is profiting by the amount he is entitled to deduct under the penalty clause. Men in a position to give a sound opinion assert that the court has exceeded its jurisdiction in inserting the penalty clause in those awards. I claim that the court has no right to impose such a penalty. Had Parliament intended that the court should have such power, provision would have been made in the Act. That was neither done nor contemplated by Parliament. The penalties for all breaches of the Act and of awards are definitely stipulated in the Act. Yet the court has now usurped this power and imposed a further penalty upon one section only, and by so doing has reduced the earning power of one party and increased the profits of the other party. That is wrong and illegal and the court had no authority to do it. When we reach the division concerned I will move accordingly.

MR. McDONALD (West Perth) [10.21]: Much could be said on this topic but I propose to touch only one or two points. The Minister referred to the desirability of a national scheme for insurance against unemployment, in advance of a scheme for insurance against sickness. If my impression is correct, that was attempted by the Federal Government. It made overtures with the idea of bringing in a scheme of insurance against unemployment. This involved the vacation by the States of part of their field of taxation. All had been raising money specifically for unemployment relief. If my impression is correct, it became obvious that if unemployment relief was the subject of national insurance and contributions by workers and employers, some of the taxation should be lifted. That raised a question of considerable difficulty. For the time being I think there was no alternative but to postpone the introduction of a national scheme for unemployment relief. It cannot be placed at the door of the Federal Government that unemployment insurance has not yet been put upon the statute-book. The Minister also referred to 300 or 400 men of the C class for whom it had not been possible to obtain suitable employment. These men are receiving 7s. per head for each unit of the family, and in some instances have been getting that for years. The Minister spoke

of some men being for six years on sustenance. A case came under my notice the other day of a man who had spent 12 months on the 21s. scale, and during that time had only seven weeks' work. That was the information given to me. At all costs the State must grant some aid to these people who, for months, and perhaps years, have been living on a family income of possibly 21s. or 28s. a week, plus some little extra that they have been able to earn. Some of them suffer from disabilities of various kinds, as a result of which they cannot even do light work. They have the utmost difficulty in earning a few shillings a week at any kind of outside employment. Their household conditions, their furniture, and their clothes, have been reduced to the lowest possible level. Any Government, and any Parliament must at all costs do something to improve the condition of men in the C class. I do not care at whose cost it is done, whether at the cost of the taxpayer on the higher income, or whether as a general contribution from the taxpayers, but in any case, something must be done. I hope the Minister will be able to help these people in the near future.

Progress reported.

ADJOURNMENT—ROYAL SHOW.

THE MINISTER FOR LANDS (Hon. M. F. Troy—Mt. Magnet) [10.24]: 1 move—

That the House at its rising adjourn till 4.30 p.m. on Thursday next.

Question put and passed.

House adjourned at 10.25 p.m.

Legislative Assembly,

Thursday, 6th October, 1938.

	PAGE
Questions: Electricity, underground mains	1227
Hospitals, air-conditioning, standardisation, medical-social workers	1227
Bills: Sailors and Soldiers' Scholarship Fund, 1B.	1228
Inspection of Scaffolding Act Amendment, 1B.	1228
Northam Municipality Loan Authorisation, 3B.	1228
Fremantle Gas and Coke Company's Act Amendment, 2B.	1228
Mines Regulation Act Amendment, 2B.	1229
Bureau of Industry and Economic Research, 2B.	1230
Parliamentary Disqualifications (Declaration of Law), 2B.	1237
Annual Estimates, 1938-39: Votes and Items discussed	1245
Unemployment Relief and State Labour Bureau	1245
Crown Law Offices	1258

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

QUESTION—ELECTRICITY SUPPLY, UNDERGROUND MAINS.

Mr. NORTH asked the Minister for Railways: 1, Is the advantage to be derived from placing electric mains underground in the Cottesloe district offset by the extra cost? 2, Will this matter receive attention—in view of the prevalence of storms and hurricanes—when the new power plant has reduced production costs? 3, If not, will consideration of the proposal be confined to the central sea-front, where beautiful Norfolk Island pines have to be mutilated and their growth stunted in order to keep them free from power wires which are stretched directly over and through them?

The MINISTER FOR RAILWAYS replied: 1, Yes. The cost would be prohibitive. 2, No. 3, Answered by No. 1.

QUESTION—HOSPITALS.

Air-conditioning, Standardisation, Medical-Social Workers.

Mr. SAMPSON asked the Minister for Health: 1, What progress has been made in the matter of air-conditioning in operating rooms of public, committee, and the larger private hospitals? 2, Does the medical-social worker, who, it is understood, forms portion of the complete scheme of hospital standardisation, play an important and useful part in the follow-up of patients after they have been discharged? 3, Is it possible, by this means, for patients to secure more