

# Legislative Assembly,

Thursday, 7th November, 1929.

	PAGE
Alsatian Dog Bill, Select Committee, extension of time	1415
Bills: Land Tax and Income Tax, report ...	1415
Miner's Phthisis Act Amendment, Com., report	1415
Industrial Assistance, returned ...	1417
Land Agents, returned ...	1417
Loan, £2,250,000, 2a., Com. report	1417
Public Service Appeal Board Act Amendment, 2a.	1420
Vermion Act Amendment, Council's Amendment	1421
Sandalwood, 2a., Com. report	1422
Criminal Code Amendment, Com.	1429
Motion: Migration of girls ...	1431

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

## ALSATIAN DOG BILL, SELECT COMMITTEE.

### *Extension of Time.*

On motion by Mr. Clydesdale, the time for bringing up the report was extended for one week.

## BILL—LAND TAX AND INCOME TAX.

Report of Committee adopted.

## BILL—MINER'S PHTHISIS ACT AMENDMENT.

### *In Committee.*

Hon. T. Walker in the Chair; the Minister for Mines in charge of the Bill.

Clause 1—agreed to.

Clause 2—Interpretation of Section 8:

Hon. G. TAYLOR: What does the clause really deal with?

The MINISTER FOR MINES: The clause has been inserted in the Bill for the purpose of legalising the administration of the Miner's Phthisis Act as at present carried out. The parent Act provides that a man must be working in, at or upon a mine, but in practice we have allowed men to have the advantages of the Act, if they are suffering from tuberculosis, up to within 12 months of the date when they last worked on a mine. There is no legal authority for that course, and the clause will remedy that position. A man may have been out of the mining industry for three months, and as the law stands

now, we could not pay compensation to him if he were found to be suffering from the disease.

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: Why do you make the period 12 months.

The MINISTER FOR MINES: That is the period specified in the Workers' Compensation Act, and this will bring the Miners' Phthisis Act into line with the Workers' Compensation Act.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: I am glad the Minister has made that explanation, and it is now clear to us that the clause will bring the Act into conformity with the Workers' Compensation Act.

Clause put and passed.

[Mr. Lambert took the Chair.]

Clause 3—Amendment of Section 9:

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: We discussed this matter at considerable length last night, and the Minister rather doubted my interpretation. I contended that the clause means that a miner will have the choice of coming under the provisions of the Miner's Phthisis Act, or under those of the Workers' Compensation Act. The position is clear from the wording of the clause in the amending Act that was introduced by the Minister for Lands when he was Minister for Mines, and the amendment now sought by the present Minister for Mines is really merely a change in wording. As the law stands to-day, if a miner becomes entitled to compensation under the Workers' Compensation Act, then the provision of the Miner's Phthisis Act do not apply to him. We will change that under the clause in the Bill, and will give the miner the choice as to which Act he will come under. If the Minister can justify that as being right, then we will agree; but I would like to hear what he has to say.

The MINISTER FOR MINES: I still say that the interpretation placed upon the clause by the hon. member is not correct.

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: Then why do you propose to alter the law?

The MINISTER FOR MINES: Because to-day we are paying compensation to miners suffering from tuberculosis under the Miner's Phthisis Act, and not under the Workers' Compensation Act. The report I read when I introduced the Mines Estimates indicated that since the inauguration of payments under the Third Schedule of the

Workers' Compensation Act, there have been three instances only in which men suffering from tuberculosis have been compensated. Two of the men had left the mine because of their incapacity prior to the proclamation of the Workers' Compensation Act. Since then only one man who has T.B. as well as phthisis is being paid. The reason for the amendment is that the Crown Law authorities have ruled that a man is not entitled to compensation unless he is registered on the register of the Mine Workers' Relief Fund. A fair percentage of the men being paid under the Phthisis Act, because they have T.B., have been certified on examination by the doctor subsequently to be totally incapacitated, and therefore they are entitled to claim under the Workers' Compensation Act, which debars them from being paid under the Phthisis Act. Another section of the Workers' Compensation Act provides that a man must be totally incapacitated before he is entitled to compensation, but it is difficult to prove total incapacity. A man on afternoon shift is examined in the morning, after having worked the night before. Photographs are taken at the laboratory, but perhaps are not developed for four or five days. The man works up to the time of receiving notice of prohibition, and therefore we cannot prove that he is totally incapacitated. When the doctor certifies that he is totally incapacitated he would have a claim under the Workers' Compensation Act, but while the Miner's Phthisis Act stands as at present, he would be debarred from being paid under that measure. We are paying all claims, whether the men have phthisis or not, and that is what we wish to continue.

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: Why not simplify it?

The MINISTER FOR MINES: This clause will simplify it. If a man had T.B. only, he could not be declared totally incapacitated and receive compensation under the Workers' Compensation Act. We have to pay him under the Miner's Phthisis Act. It is not fair to pay him under the Miner's Phthisis Act and to deny the same benefits to an unfortunate man who has advanced miner's phthisis as well as T.B., and compel him to come under the Workers' Compensation Act.

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: He takes his choice.

The MINISTER FOR MINES: No, he cannot claim under both. Under the amendment, if he has tuberculosis, he must be

paid under the Miner's Phthisis Act, irrespective of whether he has phthisis. Why treat a man with the double disease worse than a man with the one disease?

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: The Minister has admitted that the man can take his choice.

The Minister for Mines: No, he cannot.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: Such confusion and bother should be avoided in our legislation. We are paying the premiums under the Workers' Compensation Act and are paying money under the Miner's Phthisis Act, and it is evident that it would not do to let a claimant have his choice. Apparently the Government have been doing something illegal.

The Minister for Mines: It was only discovered on the 24th September.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: Unless we pass some legislation, injustice will be done. I am not opposing this measure. Men are suffering and we wish to relieve them. I do not think it is right that the State should pay the Third Schedule premiums for the newly established mining companies. We have accepted the fact that the older companies at Kalgoorlie are not able to carry much more in the way of charges, and we do not object to the Minister paying the premiums for them out of the funds provided by the Federal Government. The Minister, however, should not extend those payments to the new companies.

The Premier: I do not think that either new or old will get much more.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: Let us pass this measure and the whole matter can be considered when it is determined who is to pay the Third Schedule rates.

Hon. G. TAYLOR: The Leader of the Opposition has contended that a claim could be made under both measures. If a man claims under the Workers' Compensation Act for total incapacity he receives a lump sum of £750, but if he claims under the Miner's Phthisis Act he receives so much a week for himself, wife and family up to £4 5s. That is the more sensible proposition for a man with a family. The Leader of the Opposition says a man has his choice, and the Minister says he has not. Since the discussion I had with the Minister this afternoon I have learned that other legal people think there is great force in the argument of the Leader of the Opposition. A man may receive a lump sum under the

Workers' Compensation Act and when that is exhausted he comes back under the Miner's Phthisis Act. That is the statement set up, but it seems quite absurd. If this is going to be the result of the amending legislation, I am amazed to think that the Minister should bring it down. He would not expect the Committee to pass it. Provision should have been made in the early days of the industry to see that the mines themselves supported those who were injured in health by reason of their occupation. The sympathy of everyone goes out to these unfortunate people. The Government should take steps to place future obligations upon the new mines that are being developed rather than upon the taxpayers. I hope it will not be found that this Bill fails to effect the end desired.

Clause put and passed.

Clause 4, Title—agreed to.

Bill reported without amendment, and the report adopted.

## **BILLS (2)—RETURNED FROM THE COUNCIL.**

1, Industries Assistance.

2, Land Agents.

With amendments.

### **BILL—LOAN, £2,250,000.**

#### *Message.*

Message from the Lieutenant Governor received and read, recommending appropriation of the purposes of the Bill.

#### *Second Reading.*

**THE PREMIER AND TREASURER** (Hon. P. Collier—Boulder) [5.7] in moving the second reading said: It will be seen that the amount set out in the Bill is comparatively small. In reality it is the smallest Loan Bill since 1921. There is a reduction of over 50 per cent. compared with that of last year, the amount being £4,800,000, and of this Bill £2,350,000, or a reduction of £2,550,000. This is brought about to a great extent by the small amount of our borrowing during the last two years, and the consequent large amount of loans authorised, but not yet raised. These total—the amounts authorised but not raised—

£6,583,000, made up of the Treasury Bonds Deficiency Act £55,000, the balance of the 1927 Loan Bill of £1,727,000, and the whole of last year's Loan Bill of £4,800,000.

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: Why with such a large authorisation is more money needed now?

The PREMIER: Although we have been unable to borrow on the loan market, the expenditure has had to go on. We have, therefore, overspent our loan raisings. Funds have been provided to meet this from other sources, such as bank overdrafts, temporary advances from the Commonwealth, migration loans, and counter sales.

Hon. G. Taylor: The overdraft must amount to a good deal.

The PREMIER: Yes. The bank overdraft on temporary advances will be adjusted when a loan is floated. Certain services such as the Agricultural Bank capital, railway construction, water supplies, and group settlements are continuous, and funds must be found for them. Other works authorised may be gone on with although funds have not been raised for them. That is why we have to borrow this money. Take the Meekatharra-Wiluna line. In last year's Loan Bill, the amount of £70,000 was authorised for this work, but the expenditure already has been considerably in excess of that. Although we have authorisations, and have passed Bills for works, there has been an expenditure in excess of authorisations, and expenditure in some directions for which there has not been any authorisation. When a work or service exceeds the authorisation the expenditure is charged to loan suspense, and it is cleared when the following loan is floated. It will be seen from the Loan Estimates that there is an expenditure of this nature totalling £94,000, that is loan suspense carried forward from last year and to be cleared this year. The reduction of our loan expenditure is covered by this year's Loan Estimates, and although naturally not nearly so great as that of the Loan Bill it also has an effect on the Loan Bill. When I introduced the Budget I dealt very fully with the financial position, and the difficulties of raising money. There is no need, therefore, for me to go over the ground again. The difficulty exists both in London and in the Commonwealth. We note from this morning's paper that it is proposed to raise a ten million loan within the Com-

monwealth. That will not go far amongst so many who stand in need of it.

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: It will help a little.

The PREMIER: Yes, for a time. It has to meet the requirements of the whole of the States. I need not remind the House that although this Bill authorises the raising of money, it does not empower the Government to spend it. This power is given by the Loan Estimates, which passed the House last night. From reference to the schedule it will be seen that no new works are proposed. It has been possible to transfer certain items, where the authorisation was greater than was required, to other items that were in need of funds. That has had the effect of somewhat reducing the amount. There is nothing to explain about the Bill. It is the usual Loan Bill that comes forward every session, except, as I pointed out, it is much smaller this year than in previous years, because of the fact that we will have such a large amount already authorised in past Loan Bills, but not raised. The main sum is that of the Loan Bill of last year, £4,800,000, which has not yet been raised, although we have the authorisation. This accounts for the small amount provided in this year's Bill. I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

HON. SIR JAMES MITCHELL (Northam) [5.15]: It is true, as stated by the Premier, that the figures in this Bill represent rather less than half the amount of last year's Loan Act; but there is, in addition, the accumulated authority. The Treasurer sets out well-armed with authorisations to borrow. Whether he will be able to borrow is another question, depending on the willingness of the people to lend to the Commonwealth Treasurer, who is the man to raise the money. The flotation must be done through the Federal Loan Council. I regret that money has to be raised in Australia just now. The Premier says the amount so raised will not go far. Naturally it will not, because it has to be divided amongst the various Australian Governments. What I cannot understand is that whereas we have £25,000,000 to pay in London, the Loan Council propose to raise little more than sufficient to cover that interest bill. A difficult position will be created if money is borrowed in Australia to settle the interest bill in London. It must be quite

clear to everybody that one cannot have money to lend whilst one's exports are not greater than one's imports. To our imports must be added our interest bill of £25,000,000 in London. Last year Australia sent away £144,000,000 worth of goods, and brought in £143,000,000 worth, besides having to pay £25,000,000 in London. This year the position will be much worse, because of the fall in the price of wool. I notice that the Loan Council brought down authority to borrow during this year two amounts almost equal to the London interest bill, but very few millions over that amount, and certainly not sufficient to enable us to borrow £10,000,000 in Australia. A country in the position of the Commonwealth cannot have money to lend. The amount raised will be taken from industry, and the result will not be good in this new and developing country; in fact, it will make money dear and scarce for the better work done by individuals. The money borrowed will be shorn of its usefulness, even if it does eventually return to private hands, since it moves so slowly once it gets into the hands of the Treasurers—much more slowly than money circulates in the hands of private persons. I think the House agreed the other day that rapidity of sale is nearly as important as sale itself. If sales can be made quickly, and payments made quickly, the money can be used over and over again, resulting in real production of wealth. Loans become useful internally only because they set up credits which the people are able to use. In this case the Premier says we shall have £10,000,000 clear. But shall we? I believe our commitments abroad will absorb some of this money, in addition to the money we shall be able to raise in London if the limit set by the Loan Council is to be observed. That limit can be varied, and I believe it will have to be varied. Australia ought to be the most prosperous country in the world. There are obvious reasons why it is not as prosperous as it should be. One of the troubles is that in Australia there are two authorities controlling affairs—one authority with a great deal of the responsibility, almost the whole responsibility, to the people, and the other authority taking a great deal of the taxes without undertaking the things that mean so much in the daily lives of the people. The Federal Government hardly enter our daily lives. Whenever they do render a service, as through the post office or the telegraphs, they make a special charge

for it. People who use the post office or the telegraphs pay just as surely as people who use the railways pay. The Federal Government collect taxes here, but cannot do much in this country, because they have neither territory nor the right to develop territory. They propose to suspend part of the Migration Agreement, and this will be a serious thing for our Premier. People will still come here from the Old Land, notwithstanding the suspension of the Migration Agreement. We cannot have unemployed arriving here to be unemployed in this country; there must be something for them to do when they come here. It is to be remembered that under the Migration Agreement Western Australia is to get £10,000,000. We have had £4,400,000 of this amount, implying a considerable saving each year in interest. In the 10 years it means an advantage to the State of £3,875,000 on the expenditure of £10,000,000 in development. It is a wonderful advantage, firstly to have £10,000,000 to spend on development work, and secondly to receive from the British and Commonwealth Governments £3,875,000 because of that expenditure. I am hoping that we shall get some cheap money this year, notwithstanding the Federal Prime Minister's opinion that people ought not to be brought to Australia. Our loan expenditure has been seriously curtailed; indeed, much of the money is already spent, was in fact spent before the end of last year. We shall be facing the expenditure of about £2,000,000 for the rest of the year, unless the Premier can arrange for an extension of the overdraft in London. We have spent loan money, although we have not borrowed as we usually do on the London market. Nevertheless, we have borrowed. We have not issued bonds to the public for money, but we have pledged our credit at the banks and elsewhere.

"The colonel's lady  
And Judy O'Grady  
Are sisters under their skins."

It makes no difference at all whether we raise money by overdraft or by bonds. Last year we expended about £4,300,000. We have been able to borrow temporarily from the Commonwealth Government, who by reason of their banking facilities ought to be able to lend the State Government money temporarily as they have done. Our overdraft in London cannot be much less than a couple of millions now. I dare say we

shall be able to continue to overdraw in London against the time when we shall be able to float a loan. In that case the Premier will probably have for the whole year the amount allotted.

The Premier: It is important how long the position in London as regards borrowing will last.

Hon Sir JAMES MITCHELL: The Premier knows I regard the position as having been created not by inability of London to lend, but by inability of London to lend in a way that is suitable for the imports of Australia. The people in the Old Land know full well that our imports from America will be much greater than our exports to America, and that money will have to be paid by us for the difference. Britain is not likely to say to us, "You can have twenty or thirty millions to pay to America." The refusal will be not on the ground that the money would go to America, but on the ground that it is impossible for Britain to lend under such conditions. Before the war Britain drew money from America—about £30,000,000 annually. Now she pays America £30,000,000 in interest annually. This alters the position to the extent of £60,000,000, and creates the difficulty in which Australia finds herself. Clearly, that is the position. It is a pity that it is so, but it probably will lead to good, as I believe we shall before long arrange with Britain to take a great deal more of her requirements in the way of food and raw materials from Australia, exchanging Australian trade for hers. That seems to me entirely right; the idea is one that ought to be encouraged. If we could be perfectly certain of supplying Britain with some of the foodstuffs and raw materials that she imports, she could lend us the money that we must have, not from within, but from without, for the development of our vast undeveloped territory. It must be quite clear to all of us that if Western Australia is to be developed, it will be done not by the aid of rich men but by the aid of poor men. The necessary funds for working on long-term credit will not be found by any financial institution, but must be found by the State. I hope the Government will be able to keep employed all the people who should be employed as a result of the expenditure of these loan moneys. That will mean limiting our purchases so far as we can in connection with

that class of work. Naturally, there must be some amount spent on material. I do not object at all to the passing of the Bill, which really provides that the Treasurer may raise the money required to carry out the works Parliament has authorised. That is inevitable, and has always been done. The House naturally expects that what is agreed to shall be carried out.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

*In Committee.*

Mr. Lambert in the Chair; the Premier in charge of the Bill.

Clauses 1 to 6—agreed to.

First Schedule.

Mr. BROWN: I should like to ask the Minister for Railways whether the Pingelly railway station is included in this.

The Premier: We do not put even an important country railway station in the prospectus of a Loan Bill.

The MINISTER FOR RAILWAYS: The hon. member should have raised the question on the Loan Estimates. This is only giving to the Treasurer authority to raise a loan.

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: But the hon. member could move to cut out the whole item.

The MINISTER FOR RAILWAYS: He could, that is true. As a matter of fact, the work promised at Pingelly is going to be done in due course, provided our financial proposals are carried out.

Schedule put and passed.

Second and Third Schedules—agreed to.

Preamble, Title—agreed to.

Bill reported without amendment and the report adopted.

**BILL—PUBLIC SERVICE APPEAL BOARD ACT AMENDMENT.**

*Second Reading.*

**THE PREMIER** (Hon. P. Collier—Boulder) [5.35] in moving the second reading said: There are no important amendments in this small Bill. The few provided are found to be necessary as the result of the operations of the Act during the past eight or nine years. I do not think there is any-

thing to which the House will object. It is provided that the permanent officers of the Forests Departments employed in the field, not in the office, will have the right to go to the appeal board. They have not that right at present. They had it prior to the passing of the Forests Act in 1919, but that Act placed them under the control of the Conservator of Forests and so they were exempt from the Public Service Act. Since then they have not had any right of appeal, and it is only fair that they should have, like the rest of the permanent public service officers.

Hon. G. Taylor: Do they complain?

The PREMIER: They want the right, the same as the rest of the public service. It may be that very few of them would go to the appeal board, but it is only fair they should have the right to do so. It is also proposed to allow some alteration in the personnel of the appeal board itself. At present the board is composed of three members, a judge of the Supreme Court, a representative of the Government, and a representative of the public service. In the public service there are three divisions, the administrative, the professional and the clerical and general; and it is proposed that when there is being heard an appeal from an officer of the administrative division the service will be allowed to elect to the appeal board an officer from that division. So, too, when appeals are being heard from the professional division, an officer from that division will have a seat on the board; and the same privilege will be enjoyed by the clerical and general division. The system should result in better working, for the board through its additional temporary member will have a fuller knowledge of the division. There can be no objection to that change. In Clause 4 there are some amendments consequential on the first amendment, the permitting of permanent field officers of the Forests Department to go to the board. Again, in the past when an office in the public service becomes vacant the Public Service Commissioner could reclassify that office before filling it. From that individual classification, as contrasted to the general classification, which takes place periodically, there was no right of appeal to the appeal board. I think the whole principle of an appeal board is that any officer aggrieved respecting his classification should have the right to go to the board. So if, following a general reclas-

aification, every member of the public service has the right to go to the appeal board, there can be no reason why, if the Commissioner reclassifies a single office, there should not also be a right of appeal from that reclassification. Provision is made for such an appeal. Also the Bill provides that appeals must be made through either the Civil Service Association or the Teachers' Union, the only two organisations affected. At present an individual officer may appeal direct to the appeal board, but the Bill provides that the appeal must be made through the association or union concerned. It is also proposed to adopt the practice of the Arbitration Court of permitting either side to speak to the minutes of a decision of the Appeal Board. That, of course, is only in respect of anomalies or inconsistencies in the decision it would not be permitted to argue the whole case over again and contend that the decision was wrong and ought to be reversed. The object is to avoid anomalies in a decision resulting from a want of intimate technical knowledge of the public service. There may be anomalies or inconsistencies in a decision, as sometimes occurs in an award of the Arbitration Court, in which event either side will be permitted to address the appeal board on those anomalies.

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: It will mean adding to the work of the board.

The PREMIER: I do not think so. It has been found very useful in the work of the Arbitration Court.

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: The Arbitration Court is always a long way behind in its work.

The PREMIER: Not now; at present it is pretty well right up to date with its work. After all, there would not be many anomalies or inconsistencies in a decision of the appeal board, so I do not think this innovation would entail very much work on the board or take up much of its time. The Appeal Board Act of 1920 contains a section imposing penalties upon officers taking part in a strike. Really, the Appeal Board Act was not the place for such a section; it should have been in the Public Service Act.

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: It really does not matter where it appears.

The PREMIER: No, but it is really not relevant to the subject matter of the Appeal Board Act. However, that does not matter; it is there and the penalty involves the forfeiture of all public service rights including

superannuation. That penalty is amended and reduced. The union may now be fined and the individual or individuals may also be fined. It is a very serious step to take for members of the public service to go on strike, but having done so, many of them, as in the case of others who strike, are innocent men led into it. It is a pretty drastic penalty to take away all their rights, including superannuation. It may be argued that the penalty, being severe, would act as a deterrent.

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: Why make the penalty so high now?

The PREMIER: It is £100 for the union and £10 for the individual. I think it is a fairly stiff penalty for a comparatively small organisation. Those are the main features of the Bill. I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

On motion by Hon. Sir James Mitchell, debate adjourned.

## BILL—VERMIN ACT AMENDMENT.

### *Council's Amendment.*

Amendment made by the Council now considered; Mr. Lambert in the Chair; Mr. Sampson in charge of the Bill.

Clause 2.—Insert at the end of the proviso the following words:—"Unless such holding is used for agricultural or pastoral purposes."

Mr. SAMPSON: I move—

That the amendment be not agreed to.

The Bill as it went to another place provided that no vermin rate should be assessed or be deemed to be imposed or payable for the financial year commencing on the 1st July, 1930, and for any subsequent financial year in respect of any holding owned by or on behalf of any religious body, or exclusively used for the purpose of a public hospital, benevolent asylum, orphanage, or for other charitable purposes. Another place proposes to add the words "unless such holding is used for agricultural or pastoral purposes." If the addition is made the usefulness of the proposed amendment will be destroyed. Further, I submit that unless the land is so used, it will become more subject to the vermin evil. If it is used as the Bill proposes, vermin cannot multiply to the same extent. When we were considering the second read-

ing of the Bill I drew attention to the exemption from the incidence of taxation of lands owned and used by charitable, religious and educational institutions. With the permission of the Committee, I should like to submit a statement showing the position of a number of the institutions in respect of the land held and the vermin tax paid or payable by them:—

**Church of England:** The land taxed, and on which the Church of England trustees pay the vermin tax, includes the Swan Boys' Orphanage and the block held for a Girls' Home. The annual tax paid is about £13.

The Swan Boys' Orphanage is indebted to the trustees to the extent of about £700—the income available for this institution is not sufficient to meet the ordinary expenses, and the strictest supervision of accounts is always exercised. Although the annual vermin tax may not appear a large sum, it is a charge which increases the annual deficiency.

Farming operations are carried out at the home, and a large quantity of vegetables and the like is produced and consumed at the home. No trading operations are carried on in this connection, that is to say, the produce is not sold to the public.

**Salvation Army:** The Seaforth Homes at Gosnells are eligible for taxation, but the assessment of this property is only now receiving attention.

The land has been valued, and the authorities are expecting their assessment notice, which will be retrospective as from 1926. The tax will probably be about the same as that paid by the Church of England. The Seaforth Home is not self-supporting, and the Salvation Army Funds provide the large annual deficiency of about £1,000.

**Fairbridge School Farm:** The property is taxable under the Act, as it comprises over 160 acres of land. No tax has been levied yet, but the Commissioner may assess the property as from 1926. On account of the size of the farm (over 3,000 acres) the tax should be more than on the previously mentioned properties. This school is a training centre for children, and cannot in any way be regarded as a trading concern.

**Roman Catholics:** The various properties which are taxable are as follows:—318 acres of land near the Home of Good Shepherd, the Little Sisters of the Poor, and the other homes at Leederville. The only purpose for which this land is being used at present is for the grazing of cattle from the homes in the vicinity of Monger's Lake.

**Swan Locations 279 and 314,** containing 224 acres, on the Canning River, has been held until recently by the Archbishop, and has now been transferred to the Christian Brothers, who intend building a Boys' College on the land in the near future—the plans have been prepared.

**Beagle Bay Mission,** containing 10,000 acres, which is conducted by a Brotherhood as a mission for natives, has been taxed. There is practically no revenue from the mission, but a Government subsidy is given. The financial

position of the home is bad, as the community which controls the home is a poor one.

**Clontarf Orphanage** and the **Castledare Home** on the Canning River, are both taxable, but no assessments has yet been made. The former is conducted as an Orphanage for boys and the latter as a home for mentally deficient boys. Farming operations are carried out, and the produce grown is used for home consumption. The Christian Brothers control these homes.

The **Tardum Farm** is being worked in conjunction with Clontarf Orphanage as a training school for the orphans when they are old enough to leave Clontarf. This farm has been taxed. The farm is not yet self-supporting, and has been financed by a committee. Should any profits be made they will be applied to wards the funds of Clontarf.

**New Norcia properties** are taxable. The properties include a school for boys, one for girls, and a native school. Farming operations are carried on by the Community, and the profits made are applied towards the native missions at Mogumber and in the North-West, but not Beagle Bay Mission, as this one is conducted by a separate Brotherhood.

**Parkerville Homes:** These homes for orphans at Parkerville are eligible to be taxed, but so far the Commissioner has not levied a charge. The homes are greatly dependent upon the support of the charitable public, as the efforts made towards farming cannot produce sufficient for home requirements. The financial position of the homes causes a great deal of concern to those in control, and here again the imposition of this tax will create further hardship.

All of the orphanages mentioned take children who are committed to the care of the State through the Children's Court. The Government allow 8s. or 9s. per week for children so committed. The cost of maintaining the children in accordance with the requirements of the Government is probably 12s. to 14s. per week. It is therefore evident that any additional charge made to these homes creates further hardship on the religious and charitable bodies who control them. It is only by the splendid help the public give to these institutions that they are able to continue the good work they are doing.

I did not furnish these particulars to the Chamber on second reading because I felt that the principle of exempting such institutions from taxation was so generally accepted that to give the particulars would involve taking up time unnecessarily. I now regret not having given them at an earlier stage.

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

Resolution reported, and the report adopted: and on motion by Mr. Sampson a committee, consisting of Mr. Clydesdale, Mr. North, and the mover, drew up reasons for not agreeing to the Council's amendment.

Reasons adopted, and a message accordingly returned to the Council.

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

## BILL—SANDALWOOD.

### *Second Reading.*

**THE PREMIER** (Hon. P. Collier—Boulder) [7.30] in moving the second reading said: This small Bill has been found necessary because of the rather difficult and critical position that has been reached by the sandalwood trade. It is known that for many years Western Australia has exported considerable quantities of sandalwood to China but until 1924 the State received very little direct benefit from the trade, which fluctuated considerably from year to year. Prior to the introduction of the regulations in November, 1923, to control the pulling of sandalwood on Crown lands, the annual exports of the wood ranged from 3,000 to 14,000 tons per annum, and the trade was characterised by a series of short boom periods and long slumps. During the boom periods the pullers received high wages, but during the slumps they were forced to sell at very low figures, which gave them a poor return for their labour. Up to 1920 the royalty was only 5s. per ton, but from 1920 to 1922 it was £2 per ton. Under the regulations issued in 1923 a system of licensing merchants handling wood from Crown lands was introduced, and the maximum output from Crown lands was fixed at 6,000 tons per annum. The licenses granted to the licensees provided that the getter was to get £16 per ton on rails at Fremantle, and should receive prompt payment for his wood. The Government received a royalty of £9 per ton, which resulted in an annual revenue to the State since then of from £40,000 to £50,000. As a result of the restrictions imposed upon the industry regarding the quantity of sandalwood to be pulled from the Crown lands of the State, the attention of all parties interested in the trade was directed in 1923 to the possibility of increasing their quota or obtaining supplies outside the control of the Government. What happened is pretty well known to hon. members, but I shall review the history of the trade as briefly as I can in order to show the need for the Bill at this juncture. The appreciable success which attended those efforts is disclosed by the returns. I am re-

ferring to those obtained by people, apart from the licensees, who were solely engaged in getting sandalwood from private lands.

Hon. G. Taylor: It developed into a good business.

**The PREMIER:** Yes. In order to show how their activities have been fairly successful, I may mention that in 1924 there were 2,418 tons pulled from private property, and in 1925 the quantity had increased to 4,926 tons. In 1926, 1,723 tons were pulled from private property, but in the two succeeding years the quantity fell considerably. In 1927, 559 tons were pulled from private property, and in 1928, 826 tons. That falling-off was due to the fact that in those years, these people transferred their activities to South Australia. It was discovered at that stage that sandalwood was also to be obtained in the neighbouring State, and the men principally engaged here in pulling the timber on private property, devoted their attention to South Australia.

Hon. G. Taylor: Where the royalty was very low.

**The PREMIER:** Yes. I will deal with that phase directly. In 1929 the quantity pulled on private property aggregated 1,299 tons. This is where an important aspect comes in and a difficulty arises. There was no sandalwood pulled in South Australia, so far as we know, until 1927 when about a hundred tons were obtained. In 1928 the output rose to 328 tons, and in 1929—that is, for the financial year—to 2,441 tons. Hon. members will realise that insofar as South Australia has come into the business and increased its output, so it has been detrimental to the trade in Western Australia, because it has always been recognised generally that the market in China cannot absorb more than between 6,000 and 7,000 tons per year. However, South Australia came into the trade this year to the extent of 2,441 tons from private property and 2,276 tons from Crown lands, making a total of over 4,700 tons from that State. It will be seen, therefore, that we were threatened with being pushed out of the business altogether. The inducements that were present for these people to start operations in South Australia are to be found in the fact that in the first year they paid as royalty 10s. per ton only as against a royalty received in this State of £9 per ton. Moreover, they secured the sole right to take that timber for one year at that rate. Of course we made representations immediately to the South Aus-

tralian Government and advised them of our position, of what we were obtaining, and of what they might secure as well. As a result, the position was altered after the first year. It will be seen from the figures I have quoted regarding the position in Western Australia from 1924 to 1926, that large quantities of sandalwood were obtained nominally from private property, but we know that a large proportion of it was pilfered from Crown land. In 1926 we had to tighten up the control over these private getters and appointed many inspectors, at considerable cost, to patrol both Crown lands and private property to prevent the wood being taken from Crown lands. I have already mentioned that at the outset a royalty of 10s. per ton was paid in South Australia. Since 1927 we have discussed the matter with the South Australian Government. At our request, the South Australian Minister controlling forest matters visited Western Australia, and I discussed the whole question with him. Last year our Conservator of Forests and one of the Ministers went to South Australia and again took up the matter with the Government there. That was done to see whether we could not come to some arrangement in the interests of both States and both Governments. As a result we have arrived at an arrangement, and the basis of it is that there shall be approximately 2,500 tons taken from Crown lands in South Australia and 5,000 tons from Crown lands in Western Australia.

Hon. G. Taylor: That is 7,500 tons altogether.

The PREMIER: Yes. The royalty in South Australia is now £9 10s. per ton, or 10s. per ton more than our royalty. The Government there called for tenders and that was the tender they obtained. At the beginning of this year, it became obvious that it would be impossible to stabilise the sandalwood market by limiting the output from Crown lands only. We could not expect that the market in China could be held if our control was restricted to Crown lands only. The supplies available on private property in both Western Australia and South Australia were greatly under-estimated, and the difficult position of the industry to-day is principally due to the 4,000 tons obtained from private property during the last 12 months. It was not thought in South Australia, nor yet in Western Australia, that there was anything like the quantity of sandalwood on private property that results

during the last two or three years have shown there is.

Mr. Mann: Being sold from there?

The PREMIER: Yes. It was said that much of the wood came from areas along the trans-Australian railway, and also that it had come from Hampton Plains, but it is most difficult to catch these people. We would require an army of inspectors to do so, but from tracks and other indications, we know that a lot of the sandalwood has come from Crown land. It was evident that present prices could not be maintained unless there was some drastic restriction placed upon the output, and to meet that situation arrangements were made on the 1st August this year between the Government and the South Australian Government. From the standpoint of Western Australia, that agreement provides that for the six months from the 1st August, 1929, the pulling of sandalwood from all sources, including Crown lands and other lands under departmental control, as well as from private property, shall be restricted to a total quantity not exceeding the balance of the 12 months' quota of 4,935 tons not pulled from Crown lands or other lands under departmental control prior to the 31st July, 1929. That means that our share of the trade in conjunction with South Australia for this year will be practically 5,000 tons, and as some portion of the year has gone, the total amount allowed in the agreement was reduced to the figure I have mentioned. Then for the 12 months from the 1st February, 1930, when the sandalwood year commences—

Hon. G. Taylor: That is when the new contracts come in.

The PREMIER: Yes. From the 1st February next the pulling of sandalwood in Western Australia from all sources shall be restricted to a total quantity not to exceed 3,935 tons, being 1,000 tons less than the year's quota of 4,935 tons. Under the agreement with South Australia, we cannot market next year from all sources more than 3,935 tons. Hon. members will see that that is a great falling-off compared with the 7,000 tons pulled four or five years ago, before South Australia came into the trade, or before the pulling of sandalwood on private property became so active. Then the agreement, as it affects South Australia, provides that for the six months from the 1st August the pulling of sandalwood in

that State from all sources, including Crown lands, land under the control of the department and private property, shall be restricted to a total quantity not to exceed 2,900 tons not pulled from Crown lands or other lands under departmental control prior to the 31st July, 1929. It also provides that for the 12 months from the 1st February, 1930, the pulling of sandalwood from all sources in South Australia shall be restricted to a total quantity not exceeding 2,700 tons. We leave it to the South Australian Government to decide for themselves what steps they will take to control operations on private property in that State. In accepting these quantities, the South Australian Government gave us to understand that after next year they will expect to go fifty-fifty with us in the output of sandalwood from Australia. Then this is rather serious for the State: quite recently sandalwood, certainly of an inferior quality, has been discovered in Queensland.

Hon. G. Taylor: But that is not of a very good quality.

The PREMIER: No. Neither is the sandalwood in South Australia as good as ours, but the Chinese are prepared to take any inferior wood in order to break down the control established in this State, and the private property wood they are getting at a cheaper rate is being mixed with the inferior sandalwood from South Australia and Queensland. So it will be seen that Queensland may also become troublesome in the very near future. At the present time the only serious accumulation of excess stocks on the market is held by the sandalwood licensees at Fremantle. Those stocks amount to approximately 7,000 tons, and £175,000 has already been paid out against those stocks. On that amount, of course, interest is being paid by those who bought the stocks.

Hon. G. Taylor: Then there is insurance.

The PREMIER: Yes, in addition to the interest. Whilst those licensees within the control of the Government have been holding the market in China, other people, principally the private property owners in Western Australia, have been reaping the benefit and getting away shipments when none could be sent by licensees from Fremantle. If the restriction on the output is not generally enforced there is a possibility that the owners of those stocks may not be able to hold them, and so the market will collapse, in

which event there will be no sale for any sandalwood. The purpose of the Bill is to require the private property owner who has sandalwood on his land to share in the restrictions that make possible the sale of the wood. The Bill proposes to bring the owner of private property on which there is sandalwood under control and restriction, as has been done regarding the output from Crown lands.

Hon. G. Taylor: Have you decided upon any proportion?

The PREMIER: Yes. During the years 1924 to 1927 the whole of the private property wood was handled by the firms holding licenses to obtain wood from Crown lands. Since that date the other parties have had no interest in stabilising the market. They are just out for quick profits while the price is high, and they quit the business if the market collapses.

Mr. Teesdale: With no stocks on hand.

The PREMIER: With no stocks on hand. They have become so bad that we have introduced drastic regulations with a view to restricting them. We have not allowed their wood to be marketed or trucked until inspected by an officer of the Forests Department, and we charge them a fee for the service. We have tried to control them as much as possible by regulation, but the power is not sufficient. They have a great advantage over the licensees, because they are paying very low prices to the farmer. As a rule they do not pay so much a ton, but make a deal with the farmer by saying they have been over his property and are prepared to pay him a lump sum of £5 or £10 for the whole of the sandalwood on his property. The farmer, not having been very much interested in sandalwood, and not knowing the value of his wood, accepts the cash offered him, which represents perhaps only 10s. per ton. Then again, much of this private pulling is done by cheap foreign labour. We know that, because we have prosecuted a number of them for pulling from Crown lands. In every case it is the foreigner who is prosecuted and has to pay a fine. Then he gets the sack and goes out, but another foreigner comes in and takes the risk, while the men in the business are taking no risk at all. That is the position, and if it is allowed to continue the only people to benefit will be the Chinese, while those who will suffer, apart from the licensees, will be about 400 prospectors and sandalwood getters on the goldfields. They will be thrown out of

work, because the market rates will drop down to what they were before; and in any case, whether or not the market collapses, so long as so much private-property wood is going to China, and our Crown land wood, for which high prices are paid, is remaining in stock, or will not be pulled, the prospectors and getters will be out of work while the foreigners pulling on private property will be employed. It is proposed that the Bill shall continue in operation until December, 1932, or a little over two years, after which the position can be reviewed. It will not either directly or indirectly interfere with an owner's property in sandalwood, so there can be no question of confiscation nor of private property rights. The private property owners are getting the benefit of the limitation of supplies, and it is only fair that they should stand in with the Government, otherwise the market will be lost. Then, too, the knowledge that both the Crown lands and private-property sandalwood in this State can be controlled will be a big factor later on in our arriving at favourable terms in any negotiations with South Australia or Queensland, should we reach that stage. At the beginning of each year we fix the total quantity of sandalwood that can be pulled for that year, and which the market can absorb. That is, of course, having regard to requirements and stock. We do that in consultation with the South Australian Government. Under the Bill the figure will be fixed and will be gazetted, and of that figure—whatever it may be—say 5,000, or 6,000 tons from the two States, the Bill proposes that not more than 10 per cent. shall be set aside for sandalwood from private property.

Hon. G. Taylor: Does that apply to us alone?

The PREMIER: Yes. South Australia will please itself what it does. It does not affect us, because we have an agreement with South Australia as to the total quantity to come from that State, and so we are not concerned as to whether it comes from Crown lands or from private lands. Under the Bill, too, the private property owners will be required to make application to the Forests Department, and will be issued a license to pull and dispose of their wood. It is provided also that the granting of those licenses shall be in order of priority of application. But should the application be in excess of the 10 per cent., the quantity allowed, the

allocation will then be made by the Minister in charge of the department.

Hon. G. Taylor: Do you contemplate giving the applicants a certain proportion each?

The PREMIER: That will be the idea, with a view to spreading it over as fairly as can be, in the order of priority. It would not do if one applicant, say the Midland Company or the Hampton Plains Company, were to apply for the whole of the 10 per cent.; it would not be fair to grant that application and exclude all others. However, the quantity to be allocated will be determined by the Minister. Those are the main features of the Bill, and I hope it will receive the approval of Parliament. It may be argued in some quarters that Parliament has no right to say to any person owning private property that he shall not dispose of his wood when and how and in what quantity he pleases. But it is in the interests of all concerned—the 400 men engaged in the industry on the goldfields and those who have large stocks on hand which have been paid for. Some of those stocks have been lying there for years, were there when I came into office five years ago. The interest burden on the money paid for that wood must be enormous; so much so that nearly all the traders who have licenses have serious difficulty in carrying on. They cannot keep on buying wood, paying £16 per ton for it, and paying the Government £9 per ton for it, and seeing it stocked in Fremantle while other wood from private land is being shipped in considerable quantities.

Mr. Teesdale: Will the Bill enable you to control shipment of the wood?

The PREMIER: It gives us control.

Mr. Teesdale: Of the shipping?

The PREMIER: Well it will be an offence to pull the wood. For that the pullers can be prosecuted and fined. So if they cannot pull the wood they cannot ship it. But apart from the shipping of it, they cannot pull wood without a license, and holding a license they cannot pull more than the quantity allocated to them.

Hon. G. Taylor: If they did you could confiscate the wood?

The PREMIER: We do confiscate a fair quantity of wood now, when it purports to come from private land and we can prove that it has come from Crown land. In those circumstances, in addition to the offenders being prosecuted and fined, the wood is confiscated. Sometimes they are paid a little

if they put up a deserving case, but unless control is exercised over the wood now being pulled from private property, it seems to me the market will collapse. Without the control that has been exercised in recent years, the price would fall, the benefit would go to the Chinese, and everyone else would suffer. The Chinese know the position just as well as we do, and they give every encouragement to those men and to one man in particular. There is one man who is doing most of the private wood pulling in this State. The member for Mt. Margaret knows him well. He it was that went to South Australia, and though he was only a getter here a few years ago, he made a lot of money in South Australia in the first 12 months. There he was paying a royalty of only 10s. per ton, whereas we were trying to compete with him on the basis of £9 royalty. He sold every ton of wood he could get and did well out of it. South Australia refused to allow him to carry on after the first year, and he returned to this State and is now operating here. The Chinese know the position perfectly well and are encouraging that man. They are taking a class of sandalwood that they would not take before. We were surprised to find such a considerable quantity of sandalwood coming down from Hampton Plains, because that country has been cut over ever since the goldfields were discovered, but we found that the man was picking up the dried and broken limbs and scraps and everything else that could be called sandalwood, which the Chinese would not take previously but which they are taking now with the object of breaking down the control and securing the wood at a lower price. I have explained the purport of the Bill, and I think it is in the interests of everyone concerned that the measure should be passed. I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

**HON. SIR JAMES MITCHELL** (Northam) [8.2]: I doubt whether the Chinese market would now be in a position to take 6,000 tons of wood if we had not restricted the pulling to that quantity when Western Australia was the source of supply. Now we have not only this State but South Australia coming on the scene with a considerable quantity of wood. We do not want to go back to the time when we got 5s. per ton royalty on sandalwood; neither do we want to go back to the time when we got £2 royalty, and when all the cutter got was a clear £5 per ton. The cutter received £11

a ton at Fremantle, and from it had to be deducted a royalty of £2, an average freight of £2, and about another £2 a ton to get the wood to the siding, so that he actually netted £5 for his wood. Under the arrangement that has applied since 1923, the cutter has received £16 at Fremantle and so he is now paid £12 for the work of pulling the wood as against the £5 he received previously. It is very much better for the cutter to sell five tons of wood at £12 a ton than 12 tons of wood at £5 a ton. We can at least ensure the men getting as much money as they made under the old system. The State has received an amount approaching £300,000 by way of royalty during the last six years.

The Premier: Hardly that much.

**HON. SIR JAMES MITCHELL**: Certainly the Treasury and the cutters have received half a million between them, and I am safe in saying that the Treasury has had £250,000. That is more than either received before, and it represents something we have done for the getter. Unless we make some drastic move, the Treasury must lose a certain amount of royalty and the getter must also lose his price. Sandalwood on private land was not worth pulling until we made the arrangement in 1923. We have made a price for the wood, and we have a perfect right to control the output of wood from privately-owned land. We shall not do anyone a scrap of harm by passing this measure. It is unusual to say to a man that he shall not pull the wood on his own property except in our way, but unless we do that, the price of wood will revert to what it was in 1921-22 and will not be worth the getting. So the owner of wood on private land will not lose; in fact he is gaining a great deal now, and he would lose what he is now getting but for the passing of the Act. Restriction may delay the sale of his wood for a time, but I have no hesitation at all in saying that owners should put up with that. I have no hesitation in stimulating by law that they must put up with it.

The Premier: They will get a better price for their wood. A smaller quantity of wood will give them as much money as a larger quantity gave under the old conditions.

**HON. SIR JAMES MITCHELL**: I have no hesitation in taking necessary steps to preserve to the people of this State the £25 per ton we are getting for the wood. The getter has to be considered and so has the Treasury. Instead of £11 a ton, we are now

getting £25, and it is very nice to receive £150,000 from 6,000 tons, as against the £66,000 we received before the arrangement was made. There was objection to the old arrangement and I suppose there will be objection to this arrangement. While one does not like to disturb any private arrangement that has been made, no private arrangement could command a reasonable price if the whole of the wood in Australia were sold under other than restricted conditions. It is something to have been able to induce South Australia to join with this State in restricting the output. The result to South Australia is that she is getting £9 10s. a ton royalty as against 10s. per ton which she was willing to take in the first year.

The Premier: She gets £20,000 a year in royalty now.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: Yes, whereas she received only a few thousand pounds in the first year. I have no doubt that someone will be injured and someone will make a fuss about our legislation. We shall be told that it is drastic and that we have no right to pass it. I have no doubt at all that a great deal of the wood sold as wood from private property has been taken from Crown land. I cannot see why the State should have to pay a number of inspectors to ride about the country and watch people who are taking the wood.

Hon. G. Taylor: Even so, they cannot police it effectively.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: Of course not. Until the royalty paid for wood on privately-owned land is the same as the royalty for wood on Crown land, there will always be an incentive for people to take the wood from Crown land. I suppose when they pull from privately-owned land they do pay some royalty. They pretend that the wood comes from the privately-owned land over which they have a right to cut, but I suppose they have to pay the owner something by way of royalty.

The Premier: They generally give the owner a lump sum of £5 or £10 to cut over his land. Usually they are not on a tonnage basis at all, but have the right to cut over all the land.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: A man who sells wood under those conditions must be very foolish.

The Premier: But his property might be adjoining Crown land and he might have

no wood at all, or only a tree or two. The men give him £10 to go through his land and they pull the wood from Crown land through his land. We cannot get a conviction unless we catch them pulling on Crown land. If they are caught on the private land, although the track to the Crown land is clear, we cannot get a conviction.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: Is that so?

The Premier: As a matter of fact, some owners of land paid in that way have no sandalwood at all on their property. The men simply go through their property and that is all.

Hon. G. Taylor: Some of them have just a few stumps left.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: Under this measure we shall have the right to ship 5,000 tons this year. That is a larger quantity than I thought South Australia would agree to, and no one can complain about it. Ten per cent. of the quantity may be taken from privately-owned land. I suppose there will be very few people pulling on privately-owned land, and no one will be hurt by the proposal.

The Premier: That will be about 500 tons.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: Unless we give the power sought under this Bill, sandalwood will not realise £25 per ton, but will recede to the old rate, and at the old rate it will not be worth cutting. I hope the House will agree to the proposal. For the first time in the history of the State, we protected the getter of the wood as well as the Government under the 1923 arrangement. A good deal of trouble was caused when we made the arrangement, but there is no need to go back over the old arguments. I intend to help the Premier to do what I believe is in the best interests of the State and absolutely necessary for the protection of the sandalwood getter and the revenue of the State. It is in the interests of the people so far as they are interested in sandalwood that this Bill should be passed into law.

Mr. Teesdale: Hear, hear!

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: Consequently, I hope the House will approve of it and that it will become law as soon as possible.

**MR. CHESSON** (Cue) [8.13]: I support the second reading of the Bill. When we restricted the output of sandalwood some years ago, I realised that it was in the best interests of the State to do so. By that legislation not only did the Government receive a decent royalty, but the puller obtained £16 per ton for the wood. The result was that some of the benefit was shared by prospectors, because men out on the fields were given an opportunity to participate. I hope that this legislation will be passed. Although South Australia has entered the market, if Western Australia can place 5,000 tons during 1930-31, it will be a good thing for the State. I hope there will be no reduction in the quantity of wood allocated to prospectors, because by their operations they are serving in a dual capacity. They pull sandalwood in order that it might assist them to continue their prospecting, and their work might easily mean the opening up of a big field. Consequently, we ought to encourage them in every possible way. I am quite sure that a great deal of wood that is actually pulled on Crown lands is sold as having come from private lands, and the Government are therefore done out of the royalty. The method of restricting wood pulling on Crown lands to 10 per cent. of the total output is a good thing. Of what use was sandalwood to these people before the Government stepped in, and restricted the amount that was exported? At that time it was not worth £2 a ton to them. Now the price is up to £25 a ton. The Government also are receiving a fair return out of royalties, and the puller himself is not doing badly if he is close to a railway. Some of the pullers are working from 80 to 100 miles from the head of the railway on the goldfields, and do not get much out of their work with sandalwood at £16 a ton.

**HON. G. TAYLOR** (Mount Margaret) [8.16]: I am glad the Premier has brought down this Bill. The sandalwood industry was commencing to fall into a parlous condition because of South Australia entering the market. We are now told that the position is improving. The Leader of the Opposition has suggested there will be some heartburnings if the Bill is passed. If it is passed the heartburnings will be nothing compared with those which arose when the original arrangements were made some half

a dozen years ago, that led to the present position being entered into between the Government and the exporting firms. It was a fine arrangement for the State. Many people foresaw disaster if the proposals advanced by the then Premier were agreed to. It is pleasing to know that the very people who opposed the scheme so much are in favour of it to-day. They realise the value of it. Those who are going to find fault with the Bill before us will in five years perhaps be in the same position as those who opposed the earlier arrangement. It is no use trying to keep up the price of wood by any method unless the Government have control over the privately-owned wood. I do not suppose many people were engaged in getting wood from private property until the agreement was made, when sandalwood became worth £25 a ton at Fremantle. As soon as that position was brought about the sandalwood getter at once interested himself in the industry, because he thought it was better than looking for gold. Every man in the back country wanted to be a sandalwood getter because there was money in the business. The wood has now been cut out to such an extent that it is becoming scarce. In my electorate, from which a great deal of sandalwood has been obtained, the long distance of cartage is practically killing the industry. Last year a good deal of the wood cut in the Mount Margaret district had to be carted 125 miles. Owners of private property on which sandalwood is growing can have no complaint and no grievance against the Bill.

The Premier: It is the control over the wood on Crown lands that has given them a market for their wood.

**HON. G. TAYLOR**: It was the arrangement made by the Government to control sandalwood and get a higher royalty upon it that has made the commodity so valuable to private owners. They did nothing to bring that about. The wood was standing idle on their land, and no value could be attached to it. It is now worth money. It is only right we should protect the industry and give the Government control over it. Private owners would not be in the position they occupy to-day but for the legislation that was passed. I am not afraid of any great outcry from anyone. When the matter is put before them there can be no suggestion that anyone here will profit finan-

cially as an individual. No member of Parliament can be attacked by anyone and no inference can be drawn that he will get anything out of it. No suggestion of that kind can be advanced. The road is therefore clear. There should be no hesitation on the part of any member to pass this Bill. If the present position is allowed to remain, as the Premier has indicated, there will be such a slump in sandalwood that many of our people will suffer. Whatever quota is given to Western Australia, in the negotiations with South Australia, I hope the Minister for Forests will preserve as much of the output as possible for our goldfields prospectors. There are many old fellows up there who are fit for nothing else but prospecting, and securing five or ten tons of sandalwood a year will help them keep the pot boiling. I hope whatever happens they will not suffer in any degree from South Australia butting in on the industry. The result of South Australia's entry into the field may be that instead of Western Australia exporting 6,000 tons a year the quantity may be reduced to a little over 4,000 tons. I hope the Premier will give these goldfielders an opportunity to continue in the back country as they have been doing for the last 35 years. I support the Bill.

**MR. SAMPSON** (Swan) [8.23]: The time is not inopportune to pay a tribute to the thoughtfulness which prompted the ex-Minister for Forests, Hon. J. Scaddan, to bring down an amendment to the Act of 1923. He did a wonderful service to the State. He was the means of the State receiving a considerable sum of money from those who are resident outside. As the Premier was generous enough to say some time ago, the good that men do lives after them. The thoughtfulness and farsightedness of Mr. Scaddan lives to-day, and I am sure the Premier will admit they have been most helpful in securing finance to assist in carrying on the affairs of State. The Bill evidences that the principle of control as contained in Clause 3 is essential. I am very interested in this and particularly in the wholehearted acceptance of that principle by the member for Mount Margaret (Hon. G. Taylor). Not long ago when control was being sought in the marketing of fruit he and others saw much evil in the principle.

Hon. G. Taylor: We saw the evil, but passed the legislation.

**Mr. SAMPSON**: I hope the hon. member will always help along those lines.

Hon. G. Taylor: I have been doing it all my life, and am getting tired of it.

**Mr. SAMPSON**: It is a tardy acknowledgment of the reasonableness and necessity for control in marketing. This Bill deals with the marketing of sandalwood. The arrangements are admitted by the Premier and others to be in the nature of definite control. There is no ambiguity about it. No longer will either the lessee or the grantee of land have the full control over this timber he has had in the past. In the same way as the fruit producer will benefit because of the organisation of his industry, so will the owner of sandalwood country also benefit.

Hon. G. Taylor: You are going to sprinkle sandalwood on the dried fruit, are you?

**Mr. SAMPSON**: The lesson which has never been fully and completely accepted in respect of fruit marketing must strike home and prove convincing, since it has been so eloquently advanced and clearly put forward by the Premier as well as by the Leader of the Opposition. No one should hesitate to do what is proposed. Beyond that I do not know that we need go. Since the necessity for control in the marketing of sandalwood has been urged wholeheartedly, and as will be seen in a few moments, the Bill will go through without a division, so I hope will the same principle be acknowledged and accepted in respect of fruit and other products, whereby a distinct advantage may accrue to the producers. When it is given to them it can be said with equal truth that those who consume also benefit. I support the second reading of the Bill.

**MR. MANN** (Perth) [8.27]: I intend to support the second reading, but am not following the argument put forward by the member for Swan (Mr. Sampson). His argument is not analogous to this case.

**Mr. Sampson**: You will come to repentance equally with the member for Mount Margaret.

**Mr. MANN**: In this case the market has been provided by the Government and certain licensed contractors who control the output and keep up the price of sandalwood in China. Those who took no part in the campaign are exploiting the market that has been prepared by others. The case put up by the member for Swan was the exploita-

tion of the consumers of this State. The two things are not on all fours.

Hon. G. Taylor: Do not be too hard upon him.

Mr. MANN: I will not press that point.

Mr. Sampson: I have an idea there is an object to exploit someone in this.

Mr. MANN: The argument advanced by the hon. member is not analogous to this Bill. The licensed buyers of sandalwood have been hard put to retain the market for the last two or three years. Had the State been controlling the output it is doubtful whether control could have been held. It is only the great knowledge these licensed sellers have of the China market, and of the Chinaman's eccentricities and his methods of trading, that has enabled us to hold the trade up to now. Those Chinese who deal with sandalwood in China are just as well acquainted as we are with conditions in Western Australia. They know the quantity of sandalwood stacked at the seaports of this State, and also the quantity available in South Australia. The South Australian wood is of inferior quality, and would not be purchased by the Chinese alongside the Western Australian wood except for the lower price of the former. If the Bill goes through and the State is enabled to control sandalwood alleged to come off Crown lands, I doubt whether the South Australian commodity will sell alongside the Western Australian in the China market.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

*In Committee, etc.*

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

## MOTION—MIGRATION OF GIRLS.

MR. TEESDALE (Roebourne) [8.36]: I move—

That this House, whilst in favour of the migration of British subjects, is of the opinion that on account of the difficulty experienced by numerous girl migrants to Western Australia in finding suitable employment, steps should be taken to regulate the flow of such migrants by ensuring that they shall not be encouraged to leave England except under the auspices of some society or association which will be responsible for finding them employment here; and that this House disagrees with the statement made by Mr. Ponsonby, Parlia-

mentary Under Secretary for the Dominions, published in the "West Australian" of the 11th October, that adequate employment is available for girl migrants in Australia, not only as household assistants, but in all the professions.

Every member knows of the deplorable prevalence of unemployment among male and female shop assistants in Perth. No more unfortunate position can be conceived than that of a girl or woman out of employment, with no home to fall back upon, without money, and with no prospect of obtaining work. A man can tramp the streets or roam the country looking for work; but the unhappy girl or woman cannot tramp the streets—though, most unfortunately, some of them do, and, what is still more pitiable, some remain there for the purpose of securing food and clothing. The less we have of that, the better. At present there are between 600 and 700 men, women and girls on the unemployed register of the Shop Assistants' Union. That is indeed a sad state of affairs. These employees cannot take part in indignation meetings, or parade the streets agitating for help. They have their pride, and they suffer patiently and in silence. In my youth I was a shop assistant; but, thank God! I had the sense to clear out of that walk of life speedily. Shop assistants hold some of the worst paid positions in the State, with the longest hours, and under anything but hygienic conditions. The unfortunate shop assistant has to stand there—

The Premier: Smiling patiently at people.

Mr. TEESDALE: —day after day serving customers who occasionally are most trying. A shop assistant must not look the least bit cross, or she will get the sack. It is in the last degree unfortunate that so many of this class should be out of employment in a comparatively small place like Perth, because the prospect of their being absorbed is of the slightest except for a few days at sale time. Only lately a Perth street offered a deplorable illustration of the sad position that obtains. A certain drapery firm advertised for assistants, and the front of the shop was positively packed with unhappy girls waiting like a mob of sheep for the small number of positions available—positions that would in any case last only a few days. All this has nothing whatever to do with the Government, but is due to the disadvantageous state of trade and to

the unfortunate fact that nowadays many parents look with disfavour upon a girl's entering domestic service. Parents all but invariably encourage their daughters to go into shops. Had I a sister, I would fifty times rather she went into a good, Christian, middle-class home to hold a position there, than that she should become a shop assistant. Her surroundings would be far healthier and her life much happier; and at the end of the year, all things considered, she would be better off financially. Yet people look askance upon girls going into service. I am glad to know that there has been quite a little movement, attended with success, to encourage girls to give up the shop assistant business for domestic service. I trust those girls will find comfortable homes, where they will be treated properly, treated as they should be. I hope also that the movement will result in shops being short of assistants. I would not bar girls from working in shops, but I would much rather see a large proportion of men standing behind the counters all day than girls who have eventually to become mothers and make homes for themselves. Some girls assisting in shops become debilitated in health even before marriage. That is not much of a commencement in married life for them. Recently a drapery firm went out of business. That circumstance threw out of employment 50 or 60 girls and young fellows. There is no possibility of their being absorbed, as no new drapery shops are being started and other shops are gradually reducing hands. Except for a few days at sale time, those 50 or 60 girls and youths will remain on their union's unemployed register. Emphatically that is a sad state of things; and I am justified in calling attention to what is calculated to intensify the unfortunate position. A recently published statement I advisedly describe as unlucky; since no one wishes that British girls should come out here and, owing to the fact that many of our own daughters are out of work, remain unemployed, and perhaps in some cases are forced to take to the streets. I am as great an upholder of the British as anyone is, and therefore I do not desire to see my countrywomen come here merely to add to the existing unemployment difficulty. They are far better off at Home with their friends. There they can go into domestic service, which is not looked down upon in the Old World. I would much rather that they re-

mained at Home than that they should come here to fill the imaginary positions which Mr. Ponsonby says are open to them. I contend that positions are not open to them, and I shall prove it. Mr. Ponsonby is reported as saying that there are rosier prospects in the Dominions for girls getting married than there are in Britain. I do not know that just now we have too many men looking for wives. Any men so employed can easily be obliged. I am prepared to lay a couple of dozen of them on to brides straight away.

Mr. Sampson: We have our home products to consider.

Miss Holman: The member for Roebourne is not personal, is he?

Mr. TEESDALE: No. I never dreamt of being personal. I did not see the member for Forrest (Miss Holman) while I was speaking. When I do try to be personal, I make the personality as pronounced as possible. However, here is a responsible official at Home who has stated publicly that there are rosier prospects for girls to get married in Australia than in Britain. Mr. Ponsonby also said that women were wanted in the Dominions—and this is the most serious aspect—not only as house assistants, but in all the professions. I know of one fairly old profession here in which there are no vacancies. God knows that profession is sufficiently filled. In Perth to-day numbers of girls who are competent clerks, accountants, typistes, and commercial bookkeepers, find themselves out of employment. Mr. Ponsonby states that all the professions in Australia are open to girls. They may be open, but they offer no available billets. I know of scores of girls whose feet are sore from walking about day after day to inquire of firms whether there is a chance of securing a position. The reply is always the same, "Very sorry, but we are not putting on womenfolk; we are rather inclined to put one or two off."

Mr. Brown: Are you speaking about domestic work, too?

The Premier: At any rate, the member for Roebourne seems to have an extensive acquaintance with girls!

Mr. TEESDALE: Always quite in a fatherly way! They come to me for advice, and I advise them as well as I am able to. I want to advise the womenfolk in England not to come here for at least 18 months or two years. I want to see our girls here in positions. I want to see them comfort-

able, and I want to see that happen before we bring any more girls out from Home. It is dreadful to consider the position of many girls here to-day. They are in a far worse plight than men who can go anywhere and camp outside the suburbs; they can easily pick up a feed. On the other hand, the unfortunate girl has to keep herself spic and span in appearance. She must be fairly well dressed, or her appearance is a mark against her. She is down, if not spic and span from head to foot. How some of them keep themselves I do not know; I do not think the unfortunate girls themselves know how they do it. They have very few clothes nowadays, and I suppose they have to wash them very often, because new clothes cost too much for them to keep themselves supplied with new dresses. They cannot do it on the small pittance that many of them get. I feel great sympathy with these girls, because they suffer, and suffer silently. They do not go about the streets telling people all their troubles. They go on the same weary round each day, and then go home in the evening to their 5s.- or 6s.-a-week room and read some stuff they have read over five or six times before. Then they pray to God for the next day! I do not know how they can keep up their appearances. We do not want any more of that sort of thing in our midst; we have enough of it already. Other hon. members have as good an idea of the position as I have. I felt it necessary to voice this protest against the statement that has been made by Mr. Ponsonby. I hope hon. members will deal with the motion sympathetically, and that it will go forth from the Parliament of Western Australia that we do not want any more girls sent out here during the next two years except, perhaps, a few for domestic service. We do not want the wretched struggling of the crowds of girls already here added to by newcomers from the Old Country. Already we see them standing outside places in a queue, as though they were at a picture show. They are standing there in an effort to secure the right to work. It is a dreadful position, particularly in a small centre like Perth. I hope hon. members will support me in refuting the statements made by Mr. Ponsonby, and that Parliament will let it be known that all these professions are not open to girls. I recognise that Mr. Ponsonby can get out of it by saying that he referred to the medical profession, the psy-

chological profession, and half a dozen others. But we know that there is nothing in that. Such positions are one-man or one-girl jobs; not too many are employed in those professions. I am sure that the statement by Mr. Ponsonby will be understood by the girls in the Old Country to refer to positions such as those of typistes, book-keepers, accountants, ladies' helps and so on. In England there are many girls who are occupying some such positions, but there are very few openings for them in Australia. I know one girl who came out on the same boat as I did. She was engaged by one of the big firms in London that went into liquidation and she was furnished with a number of excellent references by the directors. That girl visited each of the Australian States, and was invariably told when she applied for a position that the firms could not afford to employ a girl of her ability because she would require too high a salary. She had been an accountant for five large piano factories in the Old Country but to-day she is a clerk in a good hotel here. It is a good position but very inferior to the one she left in the Old Country. There was a girl who came out to fill a position in one of the professions referred to by Mr. Ponsonby, but nowhere in Australia was she able to secure employment for which she was so well fitted. It is well known that many of the big firms in England employ girls as confidential clerks and in other similar responsible positions, and pay them high salaries. It is for such positions that girls would look if they took notice of Mr. Ponsonby's remarks, and I hope the House will support me in the move I am taking to refute those statements. We do not want girls of that type to come out here for the next two years.

**MR. SLEEMAN** (Fremantle) [8.52]: While I agree with the motion moved by the member for Roebourne (Mr. Teesdale) I do not think it goes far enough. It seems to me the motion will convey the suggestion that he refers to single girls only. It is well known that quite a number of young married girls come out with their husbands and other married women bring out their daughters. They, too, find difficulty in getting employment for their husbands and daughters.

**Mr. Teesdale:** The motion refers to girls and women.

Mr. SLEEMAN: I think it would be as well to refer more specifically to married women who come out with their husbands and children. They have great difficulty in getting positions for their families.

Hon. G. Taylor: You want to stop the lot.

Mr. SLEEMAN: At the present time it would be a good thing if they were stopped, because there is no further employment for them. Many of these people are brought out under false pretences. They are told at Home that if they come out here they will find a land flowing with milk and honey. They are told that if they come out everything will be all right. Many of them are told that they can go straight to the land and prosper. They are not out here long before they find what a mistake they have made. Quite apart from the single girls, young married women come out with their husbands, and it is not long before they are in dire straits. We also know that difficulties are experienced by nominated migrants. People out here nominate them, and when they arrive here, they find that the persons who nominated them cannot fulfil their obligations and the State has to support them. It would be wise if the member for Roebourne altered his amendment in accordance with my suggestion.

Hon. G. Taylor: Married women are not usually designated as girls.

Mr. SLEEMAN: If the motion is sent Home in its present form, it will convey the impression that the Parliament of Western Australia considers that single girls only should not come out here, thus implying that for married women and their daughters there are reasonable opportunities. It would be wrong for such an impression to be gained from the motion. There are no such opportunities here, and until there are those opportunities, we should let the people in the Old Country know what is the position. Continually I am being told by people who have migrated that if they could return Home, they would go to-morrow. They tell me that they came out here because of the glowing pictures painted to them in England. We know that that sort of thing is not right, and we should not allow any such wrong impression to be created.

MR. BROWN (Pingelly) [8.55]: I am rather surprised at the doleful tone adopted

by the member for Roebourne (Mr. Teesdale). I am given to understand that if there is employment for anyone in Australia, it is for girls. What occupations are these girls looking for?

Mr. Teesdale: Don't ask questions.

Mr. BROWN: What were they doing before they came here? There is room for hundreds of girls in Western Australia, if they will only accept domestic work. Are the girls that have been referred to, domesticated? Can they cook meals.

Mr. Teesdale: I would stop the lot of them coming out if I could.

Mr. BROWN: Are they factory girls?

The Premier: They are modern girls.

Mr. BROWN: Will the Premier give us the definition of a modern girl? We are giving our own girls a good education. I have no objection to that, but the fact remains that immediately we start to educate a girl beyond a certain point she regards domestic work as beneath her. She looks for work in other avenues.

Mr. Sleeman: Then you do not wish the girls to be educated?

Mr. BROWN: Yes, I do, but they should be taught something about domestic duties.

Miss Holman: They are taught domestic science in our schools.

Mr. BROWN: Then they do not view it from the practical standpoint. If a girl takes service in a house she considers she is being treated like a menial, and regards that position as beneath her. Very often the girl may be better educated than the woman who employs her. Education is not harmful, but we should teach our girls as much about domestic requirements as we can. Hon. members are well aware that if they go into some country towns, they will soon ascertain the difficulties regarding domestic service. In many instances I have found half-caste girls occupying domestic positions. I have asked for an explanation and have been told by the ladies that if they employed a migrant or even one of our own girls, she would not stay in the country districts for a week. They have to fall back on half-caste mission girls, who are bound to remain at their post.

The Premier: The half-caste girl has to work and earn her living.

Mr. BROWN: I have no objection to that, but the women-folk have to employ them because they cannot get white girls to remain in the country.

Mr. Wilson: They employ the half-castes because they are cheaper.

Mr. BROWN: I do not think it is that at all; it is because the white girls will not take to domestic work. Should an advertisement appear for girls as shop assistants or for some similar positions, it is no unusual sight to see girls lined up in a queue for an hour before the selection is to be made. On the other hand, if an advertisement were put in for a girl to assist in the house at 25s. per week, how many would apply?

Mr. Sleeman: Half a hundred.

Mr. BROWN: That is not so. As a member of the Legislative Assembly of this State and one who has all his stake in Western Australia, I do not like the idea of the motion going forth as an intimation to the Old Country that there is no place in this State for good honest girls. There are hundreds of bachelors still in Western Australia.

Hon. G. Taylor: And always will be.

Mr. BROWN: There are single men struggling, trying to make homes, when their object will be to secure wives. Those men will want for wives girls that are domesticated. The member for Roebourne must agree that 90 per cent. of the girls coming from the Old Country are not domesticated. I view this question very seriously. I have watched the children at country schools coming out in the afternoon, and I have marvelled at the number of young girls of about 12 or 14 years of age. When we consider all those young girls in our small country towns, we cannot but wonder what employment we are going to find for them. For instance, I have eight daughters, four of them still on my hands, dependent on what I can do for them. They are not looking for any work. They think their father has sufficient to keep them. I have no objection to that, but I think any able-bodied person, girl or boy, should be doing something at which he or she can earn a living. If tomorrow one of my girls decided to take a domestic position, she could earn £1 a week and her keep. Hundreds more girls could do the same. It is very serious that there should be so much unemployment amongst our men, but the fact remains there is plenty of work for honest domesticated girls. I do not know that the carrying of the motion will do any good. I am sorry the member for Roebourne should regard the position as being so bad.

Mr. Teesdale: In every State it is the same. It is not confined to Western Australia.

Mr. BROWN: I do not know whether these girls from England are still coming out in shiploads. If so, it is not right. But whenever a shipload of domesticated girls reaches Fremantle, those girls are snapped up directly.

Mr. Teesdale: Snapped up in a certain street, most of them.

Mr. BROWN: I do not agree with that. I say there is still plenty of honest work for those girls. Girls arriving from England, on leaving the ship, go into the migrants' home at Fremantle, where they are interviewed by ladies requiring domestic help. The girls, if competent, secure positions straight away. And even if not domesticated, those girls, so long as they are willing, will be taken into employment by ladies prepared to teach them their duties. Of course if we have none but typists and shop assistants and waitresses coming out, possibly they cannot get work immediately.

Mr. Sleeman: Do you advocate the bringing out of more typists and shop assistants?

Mr. BROWN: No, I say let us have domesticated girls.

Mr. Teesdale: I have no objection to that.

Mr. BROWN: But many of these girls, on arriving here, do not go looking for domestic work. I should like to know who judges them, who selects them, in the Old Country.

Mr. Teesdale: Australian women select them, and Australian doctors examine them.

Mr. BROWN: But have they to give a demonstration of what they can do? No, they only go before the examiners and declare what they can do.

Mr. Teesdale: Of course, some of them are assisted passengers.

Mr. BROWN: I believe there is plenty of room in Western Australia for any honest worker, girl or boy, and that all the girls we are getting could be absorbed in domestic work, in which event it would not be long before they secured husbands. On the other hand, our boys think of nothing but sport, and never give a thought to saving sixpence. Go down the streets of Perth and note how the people are dressed. The girls of Perth are the best dressed I have ever seen. That being so, surely Western Australia cannot be in so bad a state.

Mr. Sleeman: How old are the girls you have been looking at?

Mr. BROWN: I cannot say whether they are all under 20, but they look it anyhow. These days I cannot tell whether they are young or old, but I admire them and admire their dressing. Since all our girls are well dressed, there must be some money in the country and they must be earning their living in a decent honest way.

Mr. J. H. Smith: Over 70 per cent. of the girls of this country are earning only 12s. 6d. a week.

Mr. BROWN: But many of the girls have their homes to go to, and while they are earning that 12s. 6d. they are learning some trade or profession.

Mr. J. H. Smith: They are learning nothing whatever.

Mr. BROWN: We have unions here to look after the girls.

Mr. Sleeman: You would not allow domestic servants to be brought under the Arbitration Act.

Mr. BROWN: They are under it now.

Mr. Sleeman: They are not; you voted against it.

Mr. BROWN: Waitresses over 21 years of age get very decent wages. I have been told that a girl, if of a saving disposition, can easily put aside £1 per week. But our trouble is that our young men never think of saving; they are all fond of the girls, and they take them to theatres and dances and do not try to save sixpence. If our young men were of a thrifty nature they would be more disposed to marry, and then we should not have so many single young girls. We require to teach our young men thrift. Unfortunately, to-day they are all earning too much money. However, I still think Western Australia is a land of promise and, I sincerely hope, will find employment for all, more particularly our young women.

HON. SIR JAMES MITCHELL (Nor-tham) [9.9]: I agree that there is plenty employment for girls willing to go into domestic service, but I do not think it wise to encourage those who want office work, or work in shops, to come out here from the Old Land. It is a very good suggestion that young girls coming out from England should come to some organisation that will be responsible for them. It is not right that young girls should be stranded in a country far away from their relatives and friends, and with no place to go to. But of course

we have homes for them, as for example the Salvation Army Home at Fremantle, which each year brings out a couple of hundred girls and looks after them on arrival. I suppose in almost every instance there is a position waiting for each of the girls that come out to the Salvation Army Home. And if a girl should lose her employment there is the home for her to turn to. All these girls coming out here should come to some organisation or institution that will look after them. It would be quite wrong to say there are openings in all the professions for girls coming out from the Old Land. There are not, and will not be. We have a great many of our own young people growing up and becoming available for that class of work year after year. I do not quite see how we can censure this British Minister.

Mr. Teesdale: I do not want to send any censure to him.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: Of course if my friend says Mr. Ponsonby deserves censure, we must agree and pass this motion. It is unfortunate that we cannot take more people from the Old Land, but it is quite useless to have men and women coming here and joining the ranks of the unemployed. In a new country such as ours there should be work for all, but we have so organised our affairs that employment is scarce now and will be scarce for some time to come. I am not at all sure that migrants coming out here are misled by the officials at Home. We often hear people about to visit the Old Country saying, before they leave Western Australia, that they are going Home to tell the truth—as if nobody before them had ever told the truth! It is very unfortunate that it should be so difficult to believe the truth and so easy to accept the statement that is untrue.

The Premier: My experience is that those people who come out here and say they were told glowing tales are not telling the truth. I did not hear any misrepresentation when I was in England.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: I do not for a moment believe that the present Agent General, or his predecessor Sir Hal Colebatch, or any of the Agents General, have done other than state the facts as they knew them. I do not believe that Mr. Staples, who represents us at Australia House in London, or Colonel Manning, or Mrs. Manning, would be likely to misstate the posi-

tion. Why should they? There is no need to do it. But it may easily be that irresponsible people have over-persuaded others to come to Australia. We cannot be held responsible for that.

The Premier: Visitors from Australia may have done so.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: It is not very difficult to believe that conditions in this new and empty country can be far better than the conditions in the Old Country over-supplied with people. And surely the people at home can be excused if they say to their young people, "There is better hope for you out there in Australia than you will find in England." But we are very anxious to believe that people are over-persuaded by our representatives, and that our representatives over-state the position. In either event the people of Western Australia are very prone to understate the advantages this country offers. I do not know which is the worse, the man who understates or the man who overstates; both are to be avoided.

Mr. Teesdale: Then there is the shipping crowd, which gets a pound a nob for every migrant.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: I wonder what would happen to this country if we were to send 100,000 people away from it. It would be so much worse for Western Australia and there would be so much less work to be done by the people remaining. It is impossible to judge the amount of work available by the number of people, but it is a fact that in a new country there should be much work in many directions. Let us send this motion to our old friend, the Agent-General (Hon. W. C. Angwin), and let him do what he thinks wise with it. No British Minister would desire to make a mis-statement, and it will probably be well to warn him.

Mr. Teesdale: The Agent-General would support it if he were present.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: Yes. I am anxious that girls should not be encouraged to come here to engage in office work, but I am not anxious to discourage girls who desire domestic work so long as there are openings for them. If this country does offer opportunities for our own flesh and blood in the Old Country, we ought to let them know of it and let them come here, but I repeat that it is useless to bring people to Western Australia if there is not work for them to do. There will be work for

them, and such work as is available we should offer to British people. I support the motion and hope that the member for Fremantle will grow a little more cheerful.

Mr. Sleeman: You evidently do not meet as many of them as I do.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: I think the hon. member had better change his residence for a few weeks and then perhaps his liver would improve.

MR. WILSON (Collie) [9.17]: I agree with all that was said by the member for Roebourne and shall support the motion. At the same time I do not think it goes far enough; it would be wise to refer not only to England, but to Scotland, Ireland and Wales.

Hon. G. Taylor: The girls all come through England.

Mr. WILSON: I make that suggestion to the member for Roebourne. When I was at home I saw hundreds of girls out of work on account of factories having been closed, and many of them are coming out here. Through lack of patriotism of Britishers, the mills have had to be closed and the trade has gone to Japan and Germany. The linen trade of the North of Ireland has been completely lost, the Japanese having collared some of it and Germany the remainder. Since my return to Western Australia I know that many such girls have come out and have been unable to get work. There are now hundreds of girls in Perth who cannot get a position either in restaurants, in small shops or in the larger stores. There is a good deal in the assertion that a lot of them are not fit for domestic duties, but that cannot be said of all of them. When we come to look for billets in the country for them, not too many are to be found.

Mr. Teesdale: That is quite right.

Mr. WILSON: I am surprised at the member for Pingelly asserting that hundreds of domestics are wanted.

Mr. Teesdale: I wonder if he could find a dozen billets in Pingelly for domestic girls.

Mr. WILSON: If an advertisement were inserted in the newspaper that the member for Pingelly could place half a dozen girls, he would get half a hundred applications, and some of the applicants would be good ones, too.

Mr. Teesdale: I should not be surprised if they rushed him to-morrow.

**Mr. WILSON:** I support the motion and suggest that the reference might be extended beyond the boundaries of England.

**MISS HOLMAN** (Forrest) [9.20]: I support the motion. I wish particularly to address a few words to the member for Pingelly concerning the remarks he offered.

**Mr. Sleeman:** He needs it.

**Mr. Wilson:** Yes, give him the cane.

**Miss HOLMAN:** He seemed to be quite sorry that the girls of to-day were receiving a good education that would enable them to take positions other than in domestic service. He did not seem to think much of the modern girl. He said he had seen girls who appeared to be under 20 in the street beautifully dressed. I wish to point out to the hon. member that the reason they looked so nice was because of their domestic science training and because of their doing their own dressmaking, sewing, washing, and ironing after they returned home from work. The hon. member regretted that the migrants included girls other than domestics. If he had read thoroughly the paper which he quoted a couple of times, he would have seen letters written by domestics employed in this State and would have learnt the reason why girls are not anxious to work as domestics. Not long ago we had the spectacle in this Parliament of legislators refusing to allow domestic servants to enjoy any protection under the Arbitration Court.

**Mr. Wilson:** Members forget about that.

**Miss HOLMAN:** Domestic servants have to work very long hours and their work is hard, and if they do get £1 a week as the member for Pingelly suggested, they are very lucky.

**Hon. Sir James Mitchell:** What a rotten world it is! Why not all come into Parliament?

**Miss HOLMAN:** Thank God, some of them can enter Parliament nowadays! A few remarks were made about shop assistants. I can assure members that the girls in some of our town shops are very well treated, but on the other hand some of them are sacked as soon as they reach 21 and so can command a decent wage. Clerks have to dress decently and some of them have mothers, sisters and other dependants to keep, but clerks do not receive such wonderful wages. Our city commercial colleges are full of girls studying to become clerks and typistes.

**Mr. Brown:** That is the trouble.

**Miss HOLMAN:** The hon. member wants only a few domestics to come into the country, to work hard and long and get only small wages.

**Mr. Brown:** They make very good wives anyhow.

**Miss HOLMAN:** How many wives does the hon. member want? He mentioned also that some of the organisations, on receiving a contingent of girls, advertised that they had all been placed in good jobs. This motion does not relate to girls who come here under agreement with organisations or associations and are well looked after.

**Mr. Sampson:** Do not you consider that office work is harder than domestic work?

**Miss HOLMAN:** Office work entails harder brain work, but not such long hours.

**Mr. Sleeman:** It depends for whom the girl is working.

**Mr. Teesdale:** The conditions are better.

**Miss HOLMAN:** In an office there is no Saturday afternoon or Sunday work, and if a clerk is called upon to work back at night, she is paid for it. I agree with every word members have said in support of the motion.

**Mr. Lindsay:** Including the member for Pingelly?

**Miss HOLMAN:** The member for Pingelly did not support the motion. If we had more factories and secondary industries that would provide work for girls, we might be able to absorb more girl migrants. At present one has only to go to the timber districts and see the girls there for whom there is practically no future. The member for Pingelly said they make good wives. They do, but surely they are entitled to an opportunity to work for a living between the time of leaving school and making good wives!

**MR. J. H. SMITH** (Nelson) [9.25]: I support the motion, which I consider is a wise one. I do not agree altogether with the member for Forrest in her remarks about domestics, although I agree with what she said about the girls in the country districts. We have girls in the country who have received the best education that the country can give them. Many of them hold the junior certificate, and yet they are working in shops for wages of 7s. 6d. to £1 per week, and consequently their parents have to keep them. That applies to girls up to 20 years of age and even more. It is useless for such girls

to come to the city because possibly they are not domesticated and they have a certain amount of pride. We have broadcasted to the Old Country—England, Ireland, Scotland and Wales, as the member for Collie said—for domestics, and they come to Australia. Perhaps we have not sufficient young men to marry our own girls, or it may be that our girls are very hard to please. When girls arrive from the Old Country, we expect them to be thoroughly domesticated. Someone goes to the boat and engages them for work and they do not know how to boil water.

Mr. Lindsay: Without burning it.

Mr. J. H. SMITH: They cannot light a stove or do anything of a domestic character, although they are supposed to be domesticated. They also come out as typistes in search of occupations. The member for Roebourne is quite right in endeavouring to check that sort of immigration. While I do not agree with the member for Forrest, who inferred that those domesticated girls are made slaves, and have no award to regulate their hours or conditions of employment, many people in the country districts take them and teach them all they can. The girls are taken into the homes and though they may not be paid 35s. or 40s. a week, but perhaps £1 a week, they are given homes and are taught domestic duties. It was a happy thought and a wise precaution on the part of the member for Roebourne to submit this motion and I hope it will be carried.

Question put and passed.

## **BILL—CRIMINAL CODE AMENDMENT.**

### *In Committee.*

Resumed from the 30th October. Mr. Lambert in the Chair: Mr. Mann in charge of the Bill.

Clause 2—Insertion of section after Section 653:

Mr. MANN: Progress was reported to enable me to prepare an additional amendment to Subclause 2. It was desired by the Minister for Justice and members that the responsibility should rest with the court. I was not averse to that. When I introduced a similar Bill previously, it took that form. It reached another place, and that was the end of it. All I desire is that the

Bill shall be passed in such form that a mentally deficient person shall not pay the extreme penalty for an offence punishable by death. I move an amendment—

That to Subclause 2 the following paragraph be added:—"The report shall deal with the mental condition of the accused person at the time when the act charged against him is alleged to have been committed, so far as it can be ascertained by the board, and shall be filed in the court, and may be inspected by the judge who is to preside at the trial, by the Crown Prosecutor, by the accused or his counsel and, by leave of the judge, by any other person, and may be put in as evidence either for the prosecution or the defence; but if the report is so put in by either party then the other party may cross-examine any or every member of the board, who has concurred therein, or dissented therefrom, as if such member had given evidence to the effect therein set forth."

The court, that is the judge and counsel, etc., will be cognisant of the report, and the jury will have an opportunity to hear members of the board cross-examined, and will be able to weigh in their minds the value of the report from the evidence and the cross-examination. I take it there can be nothing more open and clear than evidence given in that form.

Amendment put and passed.

Mr. MANN: I move a further amendment—

That in Subclause 5 all the words down to and including "mind" in line 8, be struck out, and the following inserted in lieu:—"If the accused person is found guilty of an offence punishable with death, but the jury are of opinion that, by reason of his mental condition at the time when the offence was committed, the death penalty should not be inflicted upon him, they may add a rider to that effect; and in that case the judge shall make such order as he would make if such person had been acquitted on account of unsoundness of mind, and."

The Premier: Is that not done now?

Mr. MANN: Only in the case of persons of unsound mind.

Amendment put and passed.

Mr. MANN: I move a further amendment—

That Subclause (6) be struck out.

If it is allowed to remain I think it would hamper the operations of the board rather than assist them.

Amendment put and passed.

Mr. MANN: I move the following further amendments—

That in Subclause (7) all the words after "include" be struck out, and the following inserted in lieu:—"any mental defectiveness or unsoundness which, if existing at the time of the commission of the act charged against the accused person, would have been sufficient to render him incapable of forming a rational judgment on the moral quality of such act"; that in Subclause (8) the word "Act" be struck out, and "Section" inserted in lieu; and that the words "means a" be struck out, and "shall include any" be inserted in lieu.

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

Title—agreed to.

Bill reported with amendments.

*House adjourned at 9.40 p.m.*

## Legislative Council.

*Tuesday, 12th November, 1929.*

	PAGE
Questions: Migration Agreement ... ..	1440
Industrial Stabilisation ... ..	1440
Motion: Railway catering ... ..	1440
Bills: Hospital Fund, 1R. ... ..	1441
Vermin Act Amendment, Assembly's Message ...	1444
Land Tax, and Income Tax, 1R. ... ..	1444
Miner's Phthisis Act Amendment, 1R. ... ..	1444
Loan, £2,250,000, 1R. ... ..	1444
Sandalwood, 1R. ... ..	1444
Criminal Code Amendment, 1R. ... ..	1444
Cremation, report ... ..	1444
Agricultural Bank Act Amendment, 2R., Com. ...	1445
Licensing Act Amendment, 2R. ... ..	1445
Road Districts Act Amendment, 2R. ... ..	1446
Industries Assistance, Assembly's Message ...	1447
Electoral Provinces, 2R. ... ..	1448
Companies Act Amendment, 2R., Com. ... ..	1449
Mental Deficiency, 2R. ... ..	1450
Dried Fruits Act Continuance, Assembly's Mes-	
sage ... ..	1462
Reserves, Com. ... ..	1462

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

### QUESTION—MIGRATION AGREEMENT.

Hon. H. STEWART asked the Chief Secretary: 1, Under the £34,000,000 Migration Agreement how much money has been authorised for expenditure in Western Aus-

tralia to 30th September, 1929? 2, How has the money been allocated? 3, How many migrants have been received to the 30th September, 1929?

The CHIEF SECRETARY replied: 1, £5,117,886 approved, of which £4,345,562 has been drawn. 2, Drainage (Busselton), £205,000; farms (2,031), £2,031,000; farms, (300), £450,000; railways—Busselton-Flinders Bay-Margaret River, £260,000; Norseman-Salmon Gums, £225,500; Pemberton-Denmark, £475,500; Ejanding Northwards, £400,000; roads (group), £500,000; water supplies—Narembene, £76,197; Barbalin, £264,437; Norseman-Esperance, £80,000; preliminary expenses (3,500 farms scheme), £150,000; total, £5,117,886. 3, 35,970.

### QUESTION—INDUSTRIAL STABILISATION.

Hon. H. SEDDON asked the Chief Secretary: 1, Have the Government taken any steps to establish an industrial stabilisation committee? 2, If so, how has it been constituted, and what organisations or persons are represented in its membership?

The CHIEF SECRETARY replied: 1, Yes. 2, The following organisations have been requested to nominate one representative: the Employers' Federation, the Chamber of Commerce, the Chamber of Manufactures, the Metropolitan Local Governing Bodies Association, the Road Boards Association, the State Executive of the Australian Labour Party, four Government officers.

### MOTION—RAILWAY CATERING.

HON. H. STEWART (South-East) [4.37]: I move—

That all papers relating to the existing agreements for railway catering be laid on the Table.

I hope other members too will take this opportunity to express their opinions of the catering arrangements on the Western Australian railways. It has nothing to do with this or any other Government, but is entirely within the purview of the Commissioner of Railways. I can look back to my boyhood in Victoria when the population of that State was comparable with our population here to-day, some 412,000. The catering