Legislative Council,

Wednesday, 4th September, 1935.

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

LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

On motion by the Chief Secretary, leave of absence granted to Hon. T. Moore (Central) for three consecutive sittings on the ground of urgent private business.

MOTION—MINES REGULATION ACT.

To Disallow Regulation.

Debate resumed from the previous day, on the following motion moved by Hon. J. Nicholson:—

That Regulation No. 17a made under "The Mines Regulation Act, 1906," as published in the "Government Gazette" on 8th March, 1935, and laid on the Table of the House on 6th August, 1935, be and is hereby disallowed.

HON. C. F. BAXTER (East) [4.37]: My objection to the regulation is not very strong except as to one portion of it. Mining in this State has had a wonderful impetus in the last few years. It, therefore, follows that there are not available enough of the type of men required for these particular positions. The regulation is going to make the situation more difficult, inasmuch as many men who have been engaged in mining for several years and already hold positions as shift bosses and in other capacities underground, would be called upon to undergo an examination if they left their present positions and sought similar jobs on other mines. I know many underground bosses. They are very competent men in their work underground, but if they were asked to pass an examination it would have to be so simple as to be useless as a test. That is my objection to the regulation. The Chief Secretary said that men in charge of underground workings should pass the same examination as an inspector is called upon to pass. A mines inspector has duties outside those that are expected of a shift boss. In my opinion, the examination of men who have held important underground positions for many years, and have shown they are competent to fill them, should be waived. At any rate, they should not be called upon to pass an examination if they leave one mine to go to another. A man may desire to leave a mine and take a similar position elsewhere at a higher wage. I know of one man who is in charge of underground workings who could not possibly pass anything but the simplest examination, and yet it would be impossible to find a man more fitted for the post. Five years is a long time in which to expect a man with technical training and considerable ability to become efficient for the work. A period of two years on underground work, together with the necessary technical training, should be quite sufficient. There are many young and energetic men working in mines to-day. These young fellows are attending studies at night in order to fit themselves to take positions as they become vacant. We do not want to interfere in any way with the appointment of shift bosses; otherwise there is likely to be a shortage of men competent to fill those positions. The Government should withdraw the regulation. Men who have been in charge underground for many years, who are thoroughly reliable, and have proved their ability, should not be asked to undergo this examination. When we passed the dental legislation we provided that it should automatically take in all those who were operating at the time. I presume this particular regulation is meant to apply principally to men who have had very little experience. It is necessary that underground bosses should be thoroughly competent, but we do not want to make it more difficult for men to take such positions. New mines are constantly being opened up, and we do not want those in charge to find it difficult to secure men to take over the underground workings. I trust the Government will withdraw the regulation and alter the conditions applying to the five-year term.

HON. A. THOMSON (South - East) [4.43]: I was very much impressed by what Mr. Elliott said last night. We cannot

amend regulations in this House. If it were possible for us to do so, and to have the period of five years reduced to two, I believe the House would pass the regulation.

Hon. J. Nicholson: Mr. Elliott overlooked that fact.

Hon. A. THOMSON: I am in sympathy with the hon. member in his desire to safeguard the men who are working underground. I am afraid, however, the regulation will debar young men from occupying the position of supervisor or shift boss for a period of five years. That is going to make it very hard for those young fellows. If the regulation is enforced, we shall be condemning them to carry on with pick and shovel work for five years before they can take positions as foremen. I recognise that we should endeavour to provide every safeguard for those engaged in the mining industry. The figures quoted by the Chief Secretary regarding the toll of the industry on human life and health makes one wonder whether the present prosperity in connection with gold mining is really so profitable to the State. When we find that the State is involved, under the provisions of the Miners' Phthisis Act, in an expenditure of approximately £80,000 a year for the relief of those who have contracted miners' complaints, the effect of the industry upon our manhood is apparent. I have every regard for the views expressed by Mr. Elliott, particularly as he has worked underground, but nevertheless I think it wrong to require men to serve a period of five years underground before they can become eligible to hold the positions affected by the regulation. If those men can become qualified within two years, that period should be sufficient, particularly as they work under the control of managers. The departmental officials can see to it that the men hold the required certificates of competency.

Hon. H. J. Yelland: Could those men become qualified in less than five years?

Hon. A. THOMSON: Personally, I think they could, and the position would be safeguarded because they would be required to hold certificates of competency. That in itself should be sufficient safeguard. I do not like the idea of condemning young men who are entering the mining industry, to a period of five years before they can take the positions under review. To my mind, the absurdity of the regulation is disclosed when we find that if fewer than 12 men are engaged underground, anyone can take a position as shift boss without the necessity of complying with these regulations. Although I am inexperienced in gold mining operations, I have a practical knowledge in other directions, and I should say that where 12 men are required, the conditions should be relatively better than were necessary where two or three men only were employed. I assure members who represent mining provinces that, in voting against the regulation, I do so not because I do not realise the necessity for making provisions for the safety of the workers underground, but because I think that a shorter period than five years would be ample respecting men who desire to become shift bosses.

On motion by Hon. R. G. Moore, debate adjourned.

BILL—PLANT DISEASES ACT AMENDMENT.

As to Reinstatement of Order.

THE CHIEF SECRETARY (Hon. J. M. Drew—Central) [4.51]: I move—

That, as requested by the Legislative Assembly by message, this House resume the consideration of the Plant Diseases Act Amendment Bill, and that, the Bill having been read a first time on the 13th December last, the second reading be made an Order of the Day for the next sitting of the House.

Question put and passed.

BILL—NORTHERN AUSTRALIA SURVEY AGREEMENT.

Second Reading.

THE CHIEF SECRETARY (Hon. J. M. Drew—Central) [4.52] in moving the second reading said: In November, 1933, Cabinet agreed to a proposal of the Commonwealth under which an exploratory survey of the economic resources of Northern Australia would be undertaken. The purpose of this Bill is to ratify that agreement insomuch as it relates to the northern portion of this State. The proposal was primarily for a systematic investigation to be made as a co-ordinated effort by the Commonwealth, Queensland, and Western Australian Governments, into the mineral wealth of the north of Western Australia, the Northern Territory, and north-western Queensland, by means of aerial, geological and geophysical surveys. Under the agreement made, the Commonwealth was to bear half the cost,

and Queensland and Western Australia the other half. The estimated total cost was £150,000 and the cost to this State would thus be £37,500. A committee, consisting of the Federal Minister in charge of Development (Senator McLachlan) and the Ministers for Mines of Queensland and Western Australia (Messrs. Stopford and Munsie) was appointed to control the investigation. An executive committee, consisting of Sir Herbert Gepp (Chairman) and the Government Geologists of Queensland and Western Australia, with Mr. P. B. Nye, as executive officer, Dr. W. C. Woolnough as technical adviser and Mr. J. M. Rayner as geophysical adviser, was also appointed. The work is already in active operation in Queensland, the Northern Territory and Western Australia, and it is expected that it will take three years to complete. Active work is being proceeded with in this State on the Pilbara Goldfield, at Bamboo Creek, McPhee's Patch, and Marble Bar, and it is expected that operations will be commenced at Nullagine within the course of a few weeks. The express objective of this comprehensive survey is the development of Northern Australia by the location of payable ore bodies. It is considered that a survey of this description will be of value in locating ore. But the success of the operations will depend, not on vague recommendations as to favourable areas for prospecting, but on the actual results achieved by the additional quantity of gold, copper, or lead which may be produced from the areas selected as a direct result of the survey. The necessary aerial work is to be carried out by the Royal Australian Air Force. The Mining Development Act authorises the State to spend money for the performance of mining development, but that Act applies only to operations within the State, and does not make provision for a joint scheme, such as the one I have just described. It is necessary, therefore, to have the requisite authority to extend the provisions of the Act so as to embrace such a scheme, and for that reason, this Bill is now submitted. Several hon. members have recently indicated their desire to see some active measures undertaken, preferably with Commonwealth assistance, in an endeavour to develop the northern portion of this State, and I think that the action I have indicated should meet with their approval. The location of payable ore bodies would induce settlement and the commencement of active mining operations. The natural corollary would be increased population, and a consequent improvement to the struggling industries of the northern portion of our State. The Government Geologist has prepared for me some notes explaining briefly the process in connection with geological surveys and geophysical methods. He states—

> The use of aerial photographs and geophysics is not a direct method of locating gold or other mineral deposits, although it appears to be a strong public belief that such is the case.
>
> Photographs taken from the air do not indicate in themselves whether the area photographed is likely to carry metalliferous deposits. They do, however, show up in strong contrast, features which are often invisible from an examination at ground level, but when once revealed on the photograph are then easily traced by the geologist by a ground examination. Such features are the strike and dip of rock outcrops, faults, shears and folds, and are revealed on the photograph due to differences in soil colour or tone, or by the alignment of trees or other growth on the surface. Broadly speaking these are the only features revealed directly by an aerial photograph. In practice they are used by the geologist as a detailed map of the country he is examining, and the geology as observed by him by ordinary field methods, in conjunction with any features directly revealed by the photographs, is sketched directly on to the face of the photograph in pencil, and finally when the examination is complete, the lines are inked in and a finished plan produced by making a tracing from a large number of adjoining photographs fastened together in the form of a mosaic.

The Government Geologist brought to my office this morning a number of photographs which had been taken by this method. He stated he had already marked certain localities which, in the interests of the State, demanded investigation.

> Aerial photography is not a new, all-revealing method to replace geology, it is simply a method of rapidly producing a map on which the geologist can work with the added advantage on ordinary maps that, many features invisible from the ground are clearly revealed, and that every detail occurring on the ground is shown on the map, and not as on ordinary maps, roads, houses, rivers and prominent hills. By the use of aerial photographs, geological examinations which by ordinary ground methods might take six months, can be completed with much greater accuracy and detail in about a quarter of the time.
>
> It is a widespread popular belief that gold and other mineral deposits can be located directly by the use of geophysical methods. The genuine geophysicist cannot and does not claim to be able to locate gold or other minerals, but he can indicate the presence of shear zones or sulphide bodies in which gold or other minerals may or may not occur, and it is left to

the usual more prosaic methods of prospecting, namely, shaft sinking, trenching, and diamond drilling to say whether the indications revealed by the geophysicist carry metalliferous deposits or not. Geophysics is like aerial photography, only a new tool, and a very valuable one, to be used by the geologist and mining engineer to assist them, and add to the usefulness of their usual methods of investigation.

The geophysical methods most widely used in the search for metalliferous deposits are the electrical and magnetic. Causing an electric current of known strength to pass through the ground in the vicinity of a suspected shear zone, quartz reef or lode channel, the geophysicist notes with the use of suitable instruments, the strength of these currents at various places, and is able thereby to trace and mark on the ground features such as shears, ore bodies, etc., in which metalliferous deposits of commercial value are likely to occur. The magnetic methods of investigation are very similar, except that instead of noting the varying strength of electric currents, the geophysicist in this case notes the changes in strength of the earth's magnetic field, brought about by the presence of hidden features such as a magnetic sulphide body which might be connected with payable ore bodies.

A geophysical survey is not conducted by starting anywhere in a district and looking haphazardly for places which give possible indications of ore bodes. A new area is first of all covered by the geologist with the aid of aerial photographs in the usual way, during which existing ore deposits are examined and their relation to geological structures in the vicinity is worked out. The final result is a recommendation by the geologist of areas in which he has discovered favourable geological structures. The use of geophysics then comes in as a means by which the observations of the geologist at the surface can be extended to some depth, without costly shaft sinking and boring. If the geophysical examination confirms the opinion of the geologist, then there is justification for the expenditure of money in boring, trenching or shaft sinking to finally prove the presence of an ore body.

I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

On motion by Hon. G. W. Miles debate adjourned.

BILL—INDUSTRIAL ARBITRATION ACT AMENDMENT.

Second Reading.

Debate resumed from the previous day.

HON. E. H. GRAY (West) [5.6]: I support the second reading of the Bill, the objects of which have been very ably explained by the Honorary Minister. It has received the support of Mr. Corbell and other goldfields members who have had experience of the working of industrial arbitration, and should also have the support of every member of the House. The intention is to make smooth the working of the court, and as Mr. Moore stated, it will facilitate the approach of unions to the court. This in itself must have the effect of smoothing out industrial troubles. I was very much surprised at the attack made on the arbitration system by one or two members, particularly Mr. Holmes. The younger members of the community and members of Parliament not acquainted with the part the A.W.U. has played with regard to industrial arbitration, may believe the statements published in the daily Press by the writer for the National Party each week. Those statements obviously show a lack of knowledge and experience, but when we find members of this Chamber attacking industrial arbitration, the effect can only be to bring ridicule on this House. Mr. Holmes went out of his way to make statements which cannot be justified. He said that if the Act were wiped off the statute-book there would be a decent living for everyone in the State. I should like to tell him that in countries where unions do not exist and where there are no arbitration courts, conditions are very much worse than they are in Western Australia. It is difficult to understand rash assertions such as those made by the hon. member. Those who are familiar with industrial history in the Commonwealth must be aware that the A.W.U. has been the biggest champion of industrial arbitration in the Commonwealth. This body has always stood for arbitration. Members of this House must know that before arbitration came into existence, there was always industrial strife. We can recall the big shearers' strike and the shipping strike of the 'nineties and until organised Labour decided to stand for industrial arbitration, there were always industrial upheavals, and intense suffering was experienced by the workers and enormous losses were suffered by employers because of strikes and lockouts. The arbitration system was adopted to avoid that, and history has proved that it is a great improvement on the method in existence prior to its introduction, the method of settling disputes by strikes and arguments between employers and representatives of the unions.

The workers of the Commonwealth owe more to the A.W.U. for straightening out industrial troubles than they do to any other organisation. The A.W.U. has always stood for arbitration, and the leaders of that organisation have always been ready to argue in the courts for industrial peace. They know by experience of the folly of impetuous lockouts and strikes. Mr. Holmes, in the course of his remarks, went so far as to drag into the argument the Jubilee Appeal for Youth and Motherhood. I am sorry that he is not here to-day.

Hon. G. W. Miles: Say what you want to say.

Hon. E. H. GRAY: It was not right on his part to drag into the debate the Jubilee Appeal because it was distinctly unfair to the honorary director of the campaign. Mr. Perry is not connected with Labour, and does not take any interest in politics.

Hon. J. Cornell: How do you know?

Hon. L. B. Bolton: He is a good citizen, so leave it at that.

Hon. E. H. GRAY: Mr. Perry has given his services in an honorary capacity in connection with the appeal, and is making a success of it. Mr. Holmes's opinion of the appeal is that it is a political stunt. I contend that if the Government had refused to take part in the appeal they would have been howled down in this Chamber and classed as disloyal.

Hon. G. W. Miles: Quite right.

Hon. E. H. GRAY: It was unfortunate that it should have been dragged into this debate by Mr. Holmes, because some people may take a similar stand. The amount of money that will be collected will be the deciding factor as to what will be done with it. The question of apprenticeship was mentioned, and I was very much impressed with the remarks of Mr. Thomson. We, as trade unionists, are proud of the apprenticeships that have been built up; but we have employers continually complaining that the system is unworkable. We have to listen to the clarion call of young people for a place in industry. The time has come, I submit, when something more should be done than has already been done. We, as organised workers, claim that the system is good, but employers declare it is not. There is, however, something wrong, and the time has arrived when there should be a comprehensive inquiry. Take the shipping repair shops and foundries at Fremantle, and this is the position that employers have put up to me: There may be hurried repair work to be done in or for a ship. An apprentice, for example, with two years' experience may be engaged in doing a particular repair job on a vessel in port in company with skilled tradesmen. The apprentice may have to give notice to his employer at 11 a.m. that he has to go to a school for the rest of the day. This may be particularly awkward and expensive to the employer, and the apprentice may be gaining valuable experience which he could not obtain at a technical school. It seems to me wrong that apprentices should have to leave such jobs for the purpose of visiting technical schools, frequently to be taught things they should have learnt before leaving school.

Hon. L. B. Bolton: Is not the present position due to the fact that the lads failed to attend at night in their own time?

Hon. E. H. GRAY: I do not think so. Fremantle employers have seen me about this matter, and have pointed out the flaw in the existing system. My personal view is that there is room for inquiry into the reason why there are not more apprentices absorbed in our industries. It has been stated here that a shortage of skilled workmen exists in the metropolitan area. When the depression came upon the State, industry flagged and apprentices could not be put on. The gap will have to be filled. Apart from that aspect, however, there is something wrong with the apprenticeship system of Western Australia. The Government would do well to hold an inquiry into the subject.

Hon. A. Thomson: I support that view strongly.

Hon. E. H. GRAY: The unions contend that they have a complete organisation of apprenticeship which has proved very successful. The employers maintain that the system is unsatisfactory. The public say that the proof of its being unsatisfactory is to be found in the lack of apprentices in our industries

Hon. A. Thomson: The trouble is that employers have no continuity in this respect

Hon. E. H. GRAY: I do not agree with the remark made by one hon. member that a trade can be taught in two years.

Hon. A. Thomson: The length of time, of course, depends on the nature of the trade.

Hon. E. H. GRAY: I cannot imagine an apprentice learning a trade in two years. As industry becomes more complicated, the technique of trades becomes more difficult. There is a clamant demand for young men to be heard and to be given a place in industry. However, there is another side of the question. During the North-West trip I was astonished to learn that pastoralists in the North who are looked upon as good employers cannot get the men they need, although there should be many young men willing and eager to go North. I can understand young men being afraid to take work in some districts, because bitter experience has shown that they will have a rough time there. On the other hand, when reputable pastoralists cannot obtain the men they need, there must be something wrong; and that aspect should be investigated. The time has arrived when all the arguments bearing on the subject should be sized up by an independent Royal Commissioner. The cost involved would not be great. If a Supreme Court judge is not available for the purpose, we have stipendiary magistrates of sufficient ability and impartiality to present the Government with a report showing where the fault lies in our industrial system. I am in a position to state that in our community there are large numbers of young men who, unless something is done to improve the position, must grow up without a trade and without prospects, and so become a menace to society. As the years roll by, that danger may increase. Governments cannot afford to ignore the demand of these young men that their grievances should be heard and remedied. Accordingly I support the Bill, believing that it will tend to smooth the working of the Arbitration Court. I trust that my remarks with regard to the young men of Western Australia will be listened to and will result in action being taken by the Government.

HON. E. H. H. HALL (Central) [5.22]: I had not intended to take part in the debate, but after listening to two interesting speeches yesterday, from Mr. Baxter and Mr. Bolton, followed by Mr. Gray's remarks, I desire to say a few words. Mr. Gray referred to observations made concerning the A.W.U. All is not well within the ranks of the A.W.U. It is a matter of common knowledge that the mining section of the A.W.U. is taking steps to separate itself from that organisation. Mr. Gray's comments on references made by goldfields members to the A.W.U. therefore require some further explanation. There does not appear to be unanimity among the members of that fine and powerful union. Mr. Bolton's observations were heard with pleasure and interest by most members. He gave utterance to certain ideas which he is entitled to make known. This afternoon Mr. Gray expressed disagreement with some of Mr. Bolton's remarks, and Mr. Gray is perfectly justified in doing so. These facts merely show the difficulty of solving such a question. Mr. Gray had most, if not all, of the members of this Chamber with him in remarking on the necessity for some statesmanlike action in regard to apprenticeship. How can the Parliament of this country expect to hold the place it should hold in public estimation if it allows years to go by without taking strong measures to deal with so vital a problem? Mr. Gray has thrown out suggestions and expressed the hope that notice will be taken of them. I share that hope. Yesterday Mr. Bolton said that we cannot have wages boards. Perhaps the hon. member meant to say, "Why cannot we have wages boards?" Dissatisfaction has been expressed with the Industrial Arbitration Court, which has been functioning for years and has served a highly useful purpose, even if it has not given one hundred per cent. satisfaction, which no human institution can be expected to do. However, why not try to improve our system of industrial arbitration? It is high time action was taken to refer industrial disputes to men possessing a practical working knowledge of the trades concerned.

Hon. G. W. Miles: Refer them to wages boards.

Hon. E. H. H. HALL: Why cannot we have wages boards? If an unfortunate decision is given by the Arbitration Court, the men are faced with the dilemna of either breaking the law or else complying with something they consider wrong. It is constantly asserted in this Chamber and in the Press that the Government are taking no action to settle industrial disputes. Let us be fair and face the facts. The same criticism applies to all Governments—Labour and anti-Labour alike. They are

all equally to blame. It is high time that the subject was placed on a more satisfactory footing. The Youth and Motherhood Appeal initiated by the Prince of Wales is in the nature of a thank-offering for the privileges which we enjoy as members of of the British Empire. I was sorry to hear it stated that the movement has a political aspect. I speak as one who has canvassed for subscriptions in the Geraldton district. Notwithstanding suggestions that the money would be spent in Perth—than which nothing more condemnatory can be uttered in the Geraldton district—the quota has just about been raised. During my canvassing for subscriptions I had it brought home to me forcibly that there is a great deal of dissatisfaction among people to whom attention should be paid, on the score of the unwillingness of our young men to go out into the country, a matter already mentioned by Mr. Gray. But is it any wonder that they are unwilling to go out? Has not the whole of our legislation for some years been in the direction of making things easy and comfortable for the people in cities and towns? "Go out on the land, young man," is said, and the young man replies, "That is all right, but try it yourself." While the cities and towns have all the advantages and attractions, the same feeling will persist. It has been stated to me by men in Geraldton that they would sooner be out of work in Geraldton or Perth than go out in the country to work. Generally speaking, everyone knows what he will receive for his work except the man who goes outback. That man has to take pot luck. Whilst we have legislation tending that way, I think we shall have people, especially in these days, who say they are not prepared to go outback and put up with isolation and other hardships, and with no certainty as to what their remuneration will be. I will vote for the second reading.

Hon. V. HAMERSLEY: I move—

That the debate be adjourned till Tuesday next.

Motion put and negatived.

HON. V. HAMERSLEY (East) [5.31]: In asking for the adjournment I merely desired to give opportunity for another member to be present. It will be impossible for him to be present either to-day or to-morrow. Speaking to the Bill, I feel I am quite at liberty to vote for the second reading but, like so many similar measures, it seems to carry but little persuasion for me, because of the many measures—right from the inception of arbitration in this State—we have had and the promises and efforts that have been made by Parliament to bring about a better state of affairs in the work of carrying on various trades, and large works which have been necessary for the development of the country. Yet time after time we seem to have been baulked in arriving at any satisfactory solution of the many troubles that crop up from time to time. We were warned in the very early stages that we were tracking out on wrong lines, that it would be better if we adopted the system of wages boards, by which amicable arrangements might be made between employers and employees. But there was the voice of Labour constantly insisting that they could not trust the employers, and so Parliament was persuaded to try arbitration. In my opinion, it has been quite contrary to the suggestions of Mr. Gray this afternoon, because we have had one long line of trouble, whether in the mines, in the railways, or on the waterfront. There seems to have been one general scheme of wrangling, if not in one quarter then in another. Time and time again we have come to the House to be met with further amendments of the Arbitration Act with a view to overcoming these difficulties. However, I have lost faith and I no longer believe that those difficulties can be overcome by the mild amendments now proposed to provide further facilities for some of these organisations or unions to get before the court. It seems to me they do not mind much whether they get before the court or not, for if they want to strike they go out on strike.

Hon. C. F. Baxter: They are the ones that suffer the most.

Hon. V. HAMERSLEY: Probably so. The unfortunate thing is that the development of Western Australia, which requires so much capital and requires people to come into the country to spend their own money so that the Government do not make themselves responsible for all the money used in the development of the country—unfortunately that development has to be held up. Those moneyed people coming from over-

sea are not bringing their capital here to put it into industry in this State. People from overseas laugh at the idea of putting their money into industry in Western Australia since there are so many better fields for the embarkation of capital. They know only too well that to embark capital here means losing control of it. It is to me almost preferable that the Government should come to the House and say they want to repeal the whole of the Arbitration Act, except those sections dealing with amicable relations between employer and employee. The employer who wants to enter into arrangements with a large number of men probably would prefer to treat directly with those men than through the court. Neither employer nor employee wishes to lose any time; they prefer to get on with the job, and so they object to having to refer to others outside their avocation. It is on that account that Mr. Gray and others have referred to the Youth and Motherhood Appeal now in progress. In the past we have been asked to pass Bills by which money for charity would be raised so as to do away with the idea of letting our young people go out collecting. A few weeks ago I arrived home and found two little girls calling at the house begging for more charity. There is nothing more appalling to me. How the parents can allow little children to go from house to house collecting for some appeal, I cannot understand.

The Honorary Minister: What were they begging for?

Hon. V. HAMERSLEY: For money.

The Honorary Minister: But for what purpose?

Hon. V. HAMERSLEY: For the Youth and Motherhood Appeal. It is appalling to think of people bringing up children to do that kind of thing; yet the appeal is brought out by the Government of the day, and this after we have passed measures to stop that kind of thing. We have passed Acts so that small children shall not be asked to go out holding up young men and begging for a shilling. It is a deplorable thing to ask our daughters to go out collecting from all and sundry, when they are running a danger all the time, and much more so the tiny tots going out in the evening to carry on their collecting. How can they know what risks they are running? Yet, as I say, all this is being done in spite of the fact that we have passed legislation to prevent this sort of thing. We have our hospitals tax, and our Lotteries Commission, and our financial emergency measures, and it seems to me this Youth and Motherhood Appeal is still one more method of appealing to the people, and the Government hasten to put this sort of thing over us. To a large extent I blame the Arbitration Court for having brought about a state of affairs in which, while we have better working conditions and higher wages, there are not sufficient jobs to go round. Even without our Arbitration Court we have many youths who cannot find work, while people in the country are looking for hands. Another result is that people trying to run homes in the country and finding it impossible to get the necessary help, move into the city or into country towns and take flats although, granted the necessary help, they would much prefer to remain in their own homes. We hear talk of hardship inseparable from country life; but the hardships experienced in the country nowadays are nothing at all to those with which the early settlers were confronted. Just the same, city dwellers are not prepared to face the music out in the country areas. On the other hand, unionists in comparatively good positions in big centres have thrown up their jobs to go out on all sorts of strikes. Today there is a strike in the Queensland sugar industry and we are having to foot the bill because of this wonderful industry of sugar. To-morrow probably that strike will be settled, but immediately afterwards it will be followed by another, perhaps on the waterfront. Only the other day our coastal shipping was held up. Then primary production in this country has to pay very much higher freights than are demanded in any of the New Zealand ports; simply because the workers in this country have got out of hand and arbitration comes to nothing. That being so, I cannot see that the amendments in the Bill will do very much good; probably they will only continue doing the harm that has for so long been done by the Arbitration Court. If men want to go on strike, they will take no notice of the court, and therefore we are only beating ourselves against a stone wall when we think we can get any real remedy by further tinkering with the Arbitration Act, and think it is going to help us in the development of the country. I will support the second reading, but I am convinced that if the Bill is amended in Committee, it will matter very little.

THE HONORARY MINISTER (Hon. W. H. Kitson—West—in reply) [5.45]: The introduction of this Bill has given rise to a debate which has covered very many points in association with the system of arbitration that are not really relevant to the Bill. For instance, discussion has ranged from the employment of youth and apprenticeship conditions to the total repeal of the Act. I do not think there is anything in this Bill that one can claim is really associated with those particular points.

Member: A pity there is not.

The HONORARY MINISTER: Many speakers have referred to peace in industry. They have used that phrase repeatedly and have affirmed that their desire is that we shall have peace in industry as far as it is possible to obtain it. I am just wondering, after listening to their remarks in association with that phrase, whether they really understand the subject with which we are dealing. After all, whether we are to have an Arbitration Court or a wages board system, or any other system of a similar kind, the whole object is to achieve peace in industry. As to one or two members, I must admit frankly that from their remarks they have no knowledge whatever of the subject. I consider that we in Western Australia have every reason to be proud of our record. I do know that some of the other States in the Commonwealth are very envious of our position in that regard. We certainly have had a few industrial disputes, one or two of them of a rather serious character, but looking back over the last 10 years, is there one member who would claim that our record is worse than the record of any other State of the Commonwealth? Is there one member who can deny that our record is much better than that of any other State of the Commonwealth?

Hon. H. S. W. Parker: Do not forget that we had a National Government for some time.

The HONORARY MINISTER: I am not concerned with the political complexion of the Government. Take any period since the war: we have had our share of industrial disputes, but if members will be impartial, they must admit that our experience has been much better than that of any other State.

Hon. L. Craig: Our wages rates have been very much higher.

The HONORARY MINISTER: In some respects our wages have been higher, but that does not mean that the employees have been better off.

Hon. L. Craig: It helps.

The HONORARY MINISTER: It may help, but it cannot be taken for granted that because wages are higher, employees are better off than where wages are lower. It is a fact that in many respects our wages have been higher, and I think I can admit freely that as regards Arbitration Court decisions, the award rate provided by the Federal court as compared with the State court is distinctly in favour of the State court.

Hon. H. S. W. Parker: We are the chopping block for the Eastern States associations.

The HONORARY MINISTER: I do not know that we can say that, but even if it were so, it does not alter the fact that we have every reason to be satisfied when we compare Western Australia's position, in the matter of industrial disputes, with that of any other State of the Commonwealth. I do not know whether I can claim in its entirety that this state of affairs is the result of the operation of the Arbitration Act, but in my opinion the Act has been an important factor.

Hon. G. W. Miles: Workers' compensation has had an effect, too.

The HONORARY MINISTER: It may be that both employers and employees look upon these matters in an entirely different way from the viewpoints taken elsewhere. Whatever the reason may be, the Act has had a big influence in that direction.

Hon. V. Hamersley: It is mostly Government employment here.

The HONORARY MINISTER: It does not matter whether it is Government employment or not. The reason why it is mostly Government employment in Western Australia is because private enterprise is not in a position to find employment.

Hon. V. Hamersley: Of course private enterprise cannot find employment.

The HONORARY MINISTER: And the hon. member is as keen as other members in advocating from time to time that the Government should find employment for those who unfortunately are without work. We as a Government have accepted that responsibility as far as possible, and I claim we have done so with a considerable amount

of success, so much so that there again we need not be afraid of any comparison drawn between this State and the other States of the Commonwealth. I do not consider that I am called upon to reply to all the statements that have been made during the debate, but there are a few that I feel I should answer. Mr. Thomson raised the question of the employment of youth, and also the question of the conditions of apprenticeship. I should like to point out that those problems do not apply to Western Australia alone; they apply throughout the whole of the Commonwealth and throughout the whole of the civilised world.

Hon. A. Thomson: Do not you think we should try to improve the position?

The HONORARY MINISTER: We have tried to improve the position so far as we have been able where opportunities have been offered to us, and I think we have succeeded up to a certain point. We should continue in our efforts to improve conditions until we reach a stage when the complaints made in this Chamber and elsewhere could not be continued or would not bear examination.

Hon. E. H. H. Hall: I take it that that was Mr. Thomson's idea.

The HONORARY MINISTER: I am not criticising Mr. Thomson's statement in any derogatory way, but he raised the question and I am replying to him. Let us take first of all the question of apprenticeship. We have established an Apprenticeship Board to deal with that matter. We know that the Arbitration Court, in its various awards covering various industries, has laid down certain conditions under which apprentices may be taken by employers in those industries. The whole object of those conditions is to ensure that where a youth is apprenticed to an employer, he shall have every opportunity to become an efficient tradesman within a given time. I do not think anyone will cavil at a condition of that kind. The court has even gone so far as to declare the number of apprentices that shall be allowed.

Hon. A. Thomson: That is one objection I have, and we cannot appeal against it.

Hon. L. B. Bolton: A lot of other people have objection to it also.

The HONORARY MINISTER: We have established a board to ensure that the interests of the boys shall be safeguarded to such an extent that, when they shall have served their time, whether it be three, four, five or six years, they will be efficient tradesmen. Mr. Thomson went so far as to say that the position was becoming so bad in this State that before long we would have no locally-trained tradesmen at all, and that we would have to rely upon importations from other States of men who were supposed to be trained, but who were not as thoroughly trained as they should be.

Hon. L. Craig: The position is certainly very acute at present.

The HONORARY MINISTER: It is acute. I do not know whether I have quoted the exact words used by Mr. Thomson.

Hon. A. Thomson: No; I suggested the adoption of the improver system that operates in Victoria.

The HONORARY MINISTER: There are points for and against that system. I can only say that both the Apprenticeship Board and the Arbitration Court have done what I consider is a very good job, but I cannot say the same of employers generally.

Hon. A. Thomson: There is no appeal against the decision of the Apprenticeship Board.

The HONORARY MINISTER: I hope there will never be an appeal against a decision of the Arbitration Court. If appeals were allowed, proceedings would be unending and would give rise to disputes such as we have not had in this State for many years.

Hon. A. Thomson interjected.

The PRESIDENT: Order! I ask the hon. member not to interject but to allow the Honorary Minister to proceed without interruption.

The HONORARY MINISTER: In these matters it is necessary to reach finality at some time, and experience has shown that, in the great majority of cases, even though employers or organisations of employees might not be satisfied with a decision in its entirety, they are, generally speaking, quite prepared to accept the decision for the period for which it is given. Of course they retain the right to endeavour to secure alterations to those judgments when the time allowed under the Act arrives. Of that we cannot complain. All said and done, if there is anything wrong with the apprenticeship system, it seems to me we have to look a little further afield than to the mere fact that certain conditions are laid down by the Arbitration Court or the

Apprenticeship Board. I have heard it stated on numerous occasions that there are some industries in this State in which it would be quite possible, if employers were willing, to absorb a large number of apprentices, but for various reasons those employers have refused to take apprentices. I understand from statements made in this Chamber that the real reason behind it is that employers feel they cannot carry out the conditions laid down. For one thing, we are told, there is difficulty in providing continuity of work by one employer. I believe that one of the conditions laid down for apprentices is that, where an employer has not the continuity of work that he probably expected or had reason to expect, an apprentice can be transferred to another employer, provided another employer is prepared to take him.

Hon. A. Thomson: That is the difficulty.

The HONORARY MINISTER: Have not we to consider the interests of the boys as well as the interests of the employers? Is it right that a boy should be apprenticed to a particular trade and, after a period of six or 12 months, be informed by his employer that he has no further work? Probably he was bound for a period of five years, and suddenly he finds himself out of employment. Has not the boy some rights?

Hon. A. Thomson: Of course he has.

The HONORARY MINISTER: The conditions of apprenticeship laid down from time to time have been formulated with a view to covering those particular points. I am not contending that they have been the success they should have been: it may be there is room for some material alteration. Nobody would be more pleased than I if I could report that there was a considerable increase in the number of boys being apprenticed to trades, rather than being engaged in what I term dead-end employment. That brings me to the question of youth employment. I believe it is a fact that at present a larger number of youths are employed in industry in Western Australia than ever before.

Hon. L. Craig: There are still a lot who are unemployed.

The HONORARY MINISTER: It has to be remembered that every year a new batch of youths are leaving school and looking for employment, and that private employment of labour in this State, outside of our primary industries, is so limited that even the most optimistic of us could hardly anticipate that in the near future, at any rate, there will be an opportunity to absorb all those boys in private industry. Even if we could do so, what would be the result? This serves to show where lie the real difficulties we are up against. There has been an increase in the number of factories established in the last year or two, and to a very great extent the increase has taken place in certain directions. I could mention the manufacture of foodstuffs. That is an industry particularly suited to the employment of junior labour. Large numbers of boys and girls are to-day engaged in that and allied industries. Unfortunately when they reach the age of 18 or 20, the employer considers they are too old for that particular class of work.

Hon. L. Craig: You mean he wants cheaper labour?

The HONORARY MINISTER: That may be so. The employer may say that the particular class of work is fitted rather for a junior, and is not worth the additional money he would have to pay to a youth of 19 or 20. In order to carry on his business, the employer must have hands to do the work. He therefore discharges the youths of 18 or 19, and engages the boys of 15 or 16. The older lads are thrown out of employment. They have no trade at their fingertips, because they have not been learning a trade, and they find it difficult to get any form of employment other than that of a labourer. That is one of the difficulties we have to contend with. I know of scores of young men and women who have gone through that sort of thing. They have had employment for three or four years, and then have become too old for that kind of occupation. They are thrown out of work, and the young fellows have to accept manual labour even though they may not be physically fitted for it.

Hon. V. Hamersley: Someone has to do it.

Hon. A. Thomson: That is the tragedy of the position.

Hon. L. Craig: Are things any brighter in the country? I have seen advertisements in the papers from employers in the country, but they are unable to get the boys they want. The opportunities in the country are greater than they are in dead-end factories,

but young people will not go into the country to those positions.

The HONORARY MINISTER: Many of our farmers are not in a position either to pay the wages or offer the conditions that are acceptable to youths.

Hon. V. Hamersley: One cannot get cooks to go into the country.

The HONORARY MINISTER: A youth is not a cook.

Hon. V. Hamersley: How can youths be fed unless employers have cooks?

The HONORARY MINISTER: I agree there should be plenty of opportunities in the country for youths. On the other hand most of the farmers are not in a position to pay the wages or give the conditions that a youth might think he deserves. There are exceptions to this, of course.

Hon. L. Craig: There are many exceptions.

The HONORARY MINISTER: In the case of exceptions there should be no difficulty in filling the positions.

Hon. C. F. Baxter: There is a difficulty. One cannot get the boys.

The HONORARY MINISTER: Why that should be so, I cannot say. When I was associated with the Unemployment League numbers of young men did take on positions in the country. They often returned to town soon after, either without receiving the wages to which they were entitled, or with a sad tale of the conditions under which they had to work. In some instances I was able to verify their statements, and I was unable to blame them for taking up the attitude they did.

Hon. H. V. Piesse: There was only a small percentage of such cases.

The HONORARY MINISTER: It was not a small percentage of those with whom we were dealing. The fact remained that the position had the effect of deterring many other youths in the city from taking similar jobs.

Hon. L. B. Bolton: Our records in the Boys' Employment League do not support that view, either now or previously. Only a small percentage of such cases is known. You ought to be fair.

The HONORARY MINISTER: I am endeavouring to be fair. Many such cases were brought directly under my notice, and these certainly had an effect upon other boys and youths who were seeking employment.

Hon. J. Cornell: I know of a number of cases myself.

Hon. J. Nicholson: Does that not indicate a lack of inquiry into the positions to which these boys are being sent?

The HONORARY MINISTER: In some cases the organisations concerned did make inquiries before hand, but in others they were unable to do so. The Boys' Employment League might this morning have received a request for a boy of 17 or 18 years of age, with wages at 10s. or 15s. a week and keep, to be sent to a certain farm by to-night's train. The employer may not be known to the organisation, and there would not be time in which to find out anything about him. All that the secretary of the organisation knows is that he has a dozen boys who want positions, and he sends one of them to that place.

Hon. L. Craig: He need not catch the train the same night. An employer should not want a boy at a few hours' notice.

The HONORARY MINISTER: This is what happens.

Hon. L. Craig: It ought not to happen, and if it does it ought to be stopped.

Hon. H. J. Yelland: It may be that employers, because they are bad employers, cannot get boys in their own district. It may be that only the worst of the employers make these applications at such short notice.

The HONORARY MINISTER: That is going a little too far.

Hon. H. J. Yelland: It may be that the best employers are getting the local lads, and the others have to go elsewhere for their workers.

The HONORARY MINISTER: I am inclined to think that the local lads are not available.

Hon. J. Cornell: Many of them would have gone to the goldfields.

The HONORARY MINISTER: It may be that the local lads do not like the work that is offering locally, because they are not prepared to accept conditions they know so well.

Hon. H. J. Yelland: The local lads are in the best jobs, and the others have to take what is left.

Hon. A. M. Clydesdale: The Mayor of Bunbury said last week that the local lads would not work in the town, but had gone to the city.

The HONORARY MINISTER: The more we examine the problem the more complex it becomes. It is hoped that if sufficient money is subscribed through the Youth and Motherhood Appeal, ways and means will be found very largely to solve the problems of youth employment.

Hon. G. W. Miles: If a few hundred persons were trained as cooks they could get jobs to-morrow.

The HONORARY MINISTER: I am afraid many of the youths would not be suitable for such work. We must have some regard for the capabilities of these people. Some members have found fault with the industrial arbitration system. They have suggested that the substitution of wages boards would solve the problem. We claim that the Industrial Arbitration Act is the equal of any similar legislation in the Empire. It has proved itself over a period of years.

Hon. J. Nicholson: I thought it was said to be the best Act of its kind in the Empire.

The HONORARY MINISTER: There are Arbitration Acts in the other States, and there is a Federal Arbitration Act. In Victoria they have the wages board system. We hear complaints in this State about our Act. In Victoria the industrial organisations, speaking generally, declare that if only they could get away from the wages boards and work under the West Australian Arbitration Act they would be satisfied.

Hon. J. Cornell: Distant fields look green.

The HONORARY MINISTER: Other people say, "If only we could get away from the Federal Arbitration Court and go to the West Australian Arbitration Court, how much better off we would be." It does not matter whether we have an arbitration system or a wages board system, we shall never give satisfaction to everyone. There is provision in our Act for the formation of industrial boards, which would fill the same functions as the wages boards in Victoria fill. It is open to both employers and employees to take advantage of the industrial board system, if they desire.

Hon. J. Cornell: They did so at Collie.

The HONORARY MINISTER: It has been done in many cases. The organisation with which I was associated had numerous boards appointed for sections of the union, and the system worked satisfactorily. Other sections went to the Arbitration Court and got an award. It is not the fault of the Act that the wages board or industrial board system, which some members favour, is not brought into general operation here. It is open to those concerned to utilise that portion of the Act. There is no need for me to reply to more of the statements that have been made. Some were so foolish that were it not for the fact that they have received publicity outside this Chamber, one could absolutely ignore them. The Bill deals with two questions. First of all, there is the question whether provision should be made in the Act whereby the Arbitration Court may validate the registration of a large number of unions, whose registration is now questioned by the President of the Court. The validity of their registration has not before been challenged, but, arising out of a particular case that occurred a few months ago, we now find that the employers, through the Employers' Federation, when cases are being heard in the court, are taking advantage of the position that the registrations are challengeable on account of certain facts. All that the Bill will do is to give these organisations the right to approach the court and have their registration validated. By so doing they will avoid the possibility of being thrown out of court when they approach it for an award, or for an amendment or variation of an existing award. There can be no argument against that portion of the Bill. It is something the unions are entitled to. Almost every organisation that is registered under the Act is in that position. There should be no opposition to that part of the measure. The second portion of the Bill lays down the procedure to be adopted for the future. This deals with organisations which may desire to amend their constitution, either in regard to the particular persons who shall be eligible to belong to the union, or in regard to the district over which the union proposes to operate. There can be no objection to that. I do not propose to deal now with Mr. Baxter's suggested amendments, except to say I cannot accept the principle involved in them. When the Bill is in committee, I shall be pleased to give reasons why I cannot accept them. I do not propose to take the Committee stage to-night, but we are

anxious to get the measure through as early as possible.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

Sitting suspended from 6.15 to 7.30 p.m.

BILL—FACTORIES AND SHOPS ACT AMENDMENT.

Second Reading.

Debate resumed from the previous day.

HON. L. B. BOLTON (Metropolitan) [7.30]: The proposed amendments to the Act appear to me a little more drastic than those embodied in the Bill that was before members last session. Although I intend to support the second reading of the Bill, I suggest to the Honorary Minister that he should agree to amend Clause 2, under which Section 4 of the parent Act is to be affected, by deleting the reference to "less than four persons" and inserting in lieu the words "two persons or more." That was the amendment moved by Mr. Mann when last year's Bill was dealt with in Committee, and I think it would have met with the approval of members had not Mr. Holmes moved his unkind motion that had the effect of making the Chairman leave the Chair. If he would agree to that alteration, the Honorary Minister would, I think, overcome the main objection that has been taken by members to the Bill on the ground of its interference with the liberty of the individual. Much has been made of that point by members who have opposed the Bill, and while I do not think advantage would be taken of the position by the present Minister so that he might declare "an individual to be a factory," I believe it would be just as well not to provide the Minister with power that would enable him to do so. If the amendment I suggest were agreed to, the effect would be that anyone who employed labour would be brought within the scope of the legislation and that, in my opinion, is most necessary under present-day conditions. It would force such people to observe the same working conditions as those imposed upon the larger factories, and that is not so at present, notwithstanding the statement of one hon. member. I am afraid opponents of the Bill are confusing liberty with license, and under the plea of preserving liberty, they are giving license to the smaller man to work under conditions that are not available to those controlling larger factories and workshops. During the last few days I have made it my business to interview several furniture manufacturers who assured me that the unfair competition of the so-called backyard factories is just as acute to-day as it ever was, and they would welcome an amendment along the lines I have indicated. Mr. Baxter stated that if the Bill were agreed to, it would force 90 per cent. out of business. To whom did Mr. Baxter refer, and to what class of business? Mr. Baxter did not tell us. If he suggests it would force 90 per cent. of the backyard factories out of business, I would agree with him, even if he were to make it 100 per cent., because I hope the Bill will have that effect. It is wrong to say that these backyard factories have sprung up since the depression. They have been in existence for many years, and have always been a menace to the fair trader. It has been suggested that the business I control to-day was probably started in the same small way. It certainly was, but in those days we had no trading or labour conditions such as exist at present, and large and small shops worked on the same footing. It was always the boast of my late father who founded the business I control to-day, that he was the first employer in Western Australia to introduce the eight-hour day. It has been stated that reduced exports from the Eastern States were probably due to the extra production of the small shops and factories. That statement is entirely wrong. The main cause is probably the awakening of our own people to a sense of their responsibilities regarding the purchase of locally-produced goods, thereby helping to relieve unemployment. Unfortunately our import figures are moving up again, and those relating to goods actually manufactured in the Eastern States and imported here during the last three years, are shown as follows:—

Year ended 30th June—	Value.
	£
1933	8,021,000
1934	8,903,000
1935	9,528,000

Those figures disclose an increase of £1,500,000 within the last two years.

Hon. E. H. H. Hall: Shame on us!

Hon. L. B. BOLTON: That is so. As a matter of fact, I can only hope that this in-

crease is due more to the additional spending power of the people. I would not like to think that because trade is improving, we are forgetting all about our own manufacturers.

Hon. E. H. Angelo: Your figures, I presume, include motor cars.

Hon. L. B. BOLTON: No, they refer to goods wholly manufactured in the Eastern States. I thought that the increase in our population might have some bearing on the increased imports, but I am afraid the effect would be very slight. The increase from 440,360 in 1933 to 444,091 in 1935 is small and could have but little effect.

Hon. G. W. Miles: Have you the import figures for 1929?

Hon. L. B. BOLTON: No, I have not, but I can assure the hon. member that in 1929 the imports represented about £9,500,000, so that we are practically back to the old days.

Hon. L. Craig: In fact, that would mean we are actually importing more, because prices were much higher in 1929.

Hon. L. B. BOLTON: That may be so. When a similar measure was before the House last session, I instanced many cases in confirmation of the unfair competition from these free and easy, backyard shops and factories. I do not propose to repeat them now, because I am certain every member has some knowledge of their existence. I feel, however, that I should instance one case that was brought under my notice within the past week. In a certain industry an employer was anxious to get an employee to work in a factory, where he would be engaged on day work. He offered the man an increase of £1 a week over the award rate, but he was promptly told by the man that he was getting more than that, but in order to earn it he had to work practically every night in the week, on Saturday afternoons and sometimes on Sundays. Despite that fact, the man did not draw any overtime whatever! I acknowledge, and commend, the stand taken by Mr. Macfarlane in sinking self-interests in the matter and indicating his intention to vote against the second reading of the Bill on that account. I would prefer him to adopt the attitude I propose to follow, and consider the other fellow's interests as well. There are numbers of large factories in his province and they are suffering from the effects of this unfair competition.

Hon. J. M. Macfarlane: Is not the big man who is better equipped with the machinery able to compete against the one-horse power manufacturer?

Hon. L. B. BOLTON: Quite so, but in those small concerns long hours are worked and no overtime is paid. I agree with those who suggest we should do everything possible to prevent sweating and I consider the amendments embodied in the Bill will materially help in that direction. With reference to the proposed new Section 41A, much has been said regarding persons found on the premises after working hours. I am quite in accord with the proposal, for my experience is that when work is completed, the employees are quite satisfied to leave the factory and if any do remain on the premises, it is probably in order that they may complete some work, for which they will be paid overtime. At any rate, that will be done in any decent factory. Reference was made to the time occupied for meals. Surely that reference means the full time provided in the award for the meal hour.

Hon. C. F. Baxter: It does not say so.

Hon. L. B. BOLTON: Who would suggest anything else? If the hon. member suggests it means merely the time occupied by the worker in eating his meal, that is absolute nonsense. The clause does not worry me as an employer of labour, and I am content to support it. Regarding Clause 7, I am afraid I cannot support the proposed new Section 128A unless I can procure from the Honorary Minister clearer information showing that it does not mean what it appears to mean, namely, to prevent tuition in a building that may already be occupied by a hairdresser. Probably when the Bill is dealt with in Committee, the Minister may be able more fully to explain the position. Generally I am in favour of the amendments to the parent Act, with the modifications I have suggested. Therefore I shall support the second reading.

HON. G. FRASER (West) [7.43]: I commend the attitude of Mr. Bolton in supporting at least the greater portion of the Bill. On the other hand, I cannot follow him in his commendation of Mr. Macfarlane's attitude. Mr. Macfarlane should have a fairly extensive knowledge of what is happening in the manufacturing indus-

tries in the metropolitan area, and I think that knowledge should convince him that he should support the Bill.

Hon. J. Cornell: Surely the hon. member does not pit his judgment on such matters against that of Mr. Macfarlane!

Hon. G. FRASER: I may even do that.

Hon. J. Cornell: One is a business man and the other was a letter carrier.

Hon. G. FRASER: I suggest Mr. Macfarlane's extensive knowledge of industry in the metropolitan area in itself should warrant him in supporting the Bill.

Hon. J. M. Macfarlane: That is, from your point of view.

Hon. G. FRASER: I am not pitting my knowledge of the manufacturing business against that of Mr. Macfarlane, but, at the same time, his knowledge is limited to a certain industry whereas I have a general knowledge of all industries.

Hon. J. Cornell: At what industry has the hon. member ever worked?

Hon. G. FRASER: It is not necessary that I should have worked in any particular industry to have a general knowledge such as I suggest.

Hon. J. M. Macfarlane: Cannot I also have that general knowledge?

Hon. G. FRASER: I do not suggest for one moment—

The PRESIDENT: I think the debate can be carried on without any personal references to industries in which any particular member may be engaged.

Hon. G. FRASER: I trust that Mr. Macfarlane will reconsider his decision not to support the Bill. I have been rather struck in the course of the debate with the great attention some members are prepared to give certain persons who, they say, will be affected by the Bill. Widowed mothers and daughters have, during the debate, been flogged to death, and those who have survived the flogging have been drowned in the crocodile tears shed by those members. To me it appears that most of the clauses in the Bill are absolutely needed to place industry on a sound footing. We have heard some extreme views expressed as to what ought to be done to a Bill of this nature. I do not recollect a debate in this Chamber in which such extreme interpretations have been placed on the various clauses. Quite recently, in order to gain a little more knowledge in connection with this particular measure, I examined a number of applications for positions in industries covered by the Bill, and while I admit that the particular applications I examined were already covered by the Act, I obtained an idea of the danger we were running by having the Act as it stands at present. I examined 40 applications for apprenticeship to the tailoring trade. All members are aware that one of the stipulations, when the applications go before the apprenticeship board, is that the persons applying must have their eyesight tested. No one with defective eyesight is permitted to work in this trade. It rather surprised me to find that of the 40 applicants, only four were passed by the optician as having perfect sight. No fewer than 36 were compelled at least to have glasses. That is a very high percentage, and it shows what can happen to the women and lads who are engaged in most of the industries this Bill will cover.

Hon. J. Cornell: And the optician was not after business, either!

Hon. G. FRASER: Only four of the 40 were free to go into the business without having to wear glasses.

Hon. A. Thomson: How will the Bill affect that position?

Hon. G. FRASER: It shows that in a protected industry the health of the individual is to a large extent looked after. The other section of the trade we are endeavouring to cover, the section in which most girls go in for dressmaking and work of that description, does not call for examination of any kind. Applicants for positions therein are quite free to engage in the occupation. What would have happened if the 40 to whom I have alluded instead of going into the tailoring trade, went into another industry not covered by the Act? To me it is a very serious position from that point of view, and we have to recollect that in dressmaking, and other such trades not covered by the Act, employees run exceptionally grave risks because of the fact that they are not, from a hygienic point of view, protected in any way. Most of those who are engaged in trades not covered to-day have to labour in workrooms the condition of which would not be tolerated by any member of this House. The conditions mean the ruination of the eyesight and the breaking down of health. I view that aspect very seriously because most of the young people concerned are to be the future mothers of

the race. It is time, therefore, that we took steps to bring about the necessary alteration in the law that permits that kind of thing to continue.

Hon. J. Cornell: How does the Bill propose to remedy that?

Hon. G. FRASER: It will bring under the Act establishments that to-day are not covered by it.

Hon. J. M. Macfarlane: I am with you as far as those trades are concerned; satisfy those who are employed in them, but leave the others alone.

Hon. G. FRASER: Unless the Bill goes through, the existing condition of things will continue. I could quote a number of instances in the metropolitan area. Take upholstering. Of course there are a few exceptions, such as the factories of Boan's and Foy's, which come under the Act. There are a number of others, however, that do not, and in those factories teasing of kapok has to be carried out. That is a class of work that creates dust which is injurious to the health of the employees. I could name half a dozen factories in the metropolitan area that are exempted from the operations of the Act because only two or three employees are engaged. They have no machinery and consequently are free from restrictions.

Hon. A. Thomson: If there are three persons employed they are not exempt.

Hon. G. FRASER: I am taking three altogether, two in some instances, and three in a majority of cases. I know half a dozen such places. There are no conditions applicable to premises of that description, and when we have the opportunity, should we not do something to see that the employees there work under conditions enjoyed by employees in other factories? One could go on quoting a number of cases where what I have related is occurring. The time is long overdue when legislation such as we have before us should be put into force.

Hon. H. Tuckey: It would not suit the country.

Hon. G. FRASER: It would suit the country, and where persons are employed, the employer should be compelled to provide decent working conditions. It has been said in the course of the debate that because of laws of this description being passed, money is kept out of investment. It appears to me, however, that failure to have laws of this kind in operation is the real reason why money is not invested. It is the competition of the small places that has prevented people from investing money in large enterprises.

Hon. J. Cornell: All these arguments were used against Chinese gardeners, 30 or 40 years ago.

Hon. G. FRASER: The arguments against the Bill were also up to date 30 or 40 years ago.

Hon. J. Cornell: How do you know?

Hon. G. FRASER: I have looked up the records, and they are just as modern to-day as they were then. If all persons in the manufacturing business were put on an equal footing, I am convinced there would be a greater incentive to capitalists to invest their money in industrial concerns because they would then know that all were competing on the same footing. I should say that the unfair competition operating to-day is the real reason for people withholding money from investment in industrial enterprises. I am hopeful that the Bill will go through as we have it before us. It has been suggested that certain amendments should be made, but I consider that most of the clauses should go through as they are framed. I intend to support the second reading.

On motion by Hon. H. Tuckey, debate adjourned.

BILL—MORTGAGEES' RIGHTS RESTRICTION ACT CONTINUANCE.

Second Reading.

Debate resumed from the 27th August.

HON. H. V. PIESSE (South - East) [7.57]: I intend to support the second reading of the Bill because I consider it to be one of the most essential to be placed before members this session. There is no doubt it has been very helpful to the farming community, particularly those who unfortunately have had mortgages on their properties. Several members have stated that the Act should be amended. If I remember rightly, last year Mr. Nicholson, for whom I have the highest respect, seemed to be under the impression that a number of hardships had been suffered under the operation of the Act, particularly in connection with suburban properties and mortgages on houses purchased on time payment. I should like to tell the hon. member that if

such hardships were experienced in the city and suburbs, the Act has proved valuable from our point of view in the country. There are many instances I could place before the House, and one in particular was a mortgage held by a large company on a property in the Katanning district. This particular property was a rented building consisting of a number of shops, and the executor, in his wisdom, early in 1929 decided that he would spend some money with the idea of getting a larger income. He approached the mortgagee who agreed to advance £800. Improvements were carried out and the rents were increased by approximately £200 per annum. It would not have taken many years to repay the extra advance on the mortgage. The executor decided that it would be possible to return £50 per quarter and at his request this was inserted in the mortgage. The depression, as we know, struck us, and many of the shops which in 1929 were let at £3 per week, were then let at 5s. per week. The reason why they were so reduced was that the people having businesses in several of the shops could not pay their way. The landlord therefore came to the conclusion that it was better to keep the doors of the shops open rather than have the premises vacant and so possibly spoil the value of the building. Everything went nicely until the executor found that he could not continue repaying the £50 per quarter. Accordingly he advised the mortgagee to that effect. A reply came back from an Eastern States mortgagee, who I may add was not aware of this Western Australian legislation, that the executor must realise the conditions laid down in the mortgage, and that although the widow owning the property had had her income reduced by £5 per week the executor had no right to pay her £5 per week to live on, and that the whole of that amount should be paid in reduction of the £50 quarterly repayment. It was pointed out to the institution in question that the interest had never been missed for a single day during a period of 14 years, over which the money had been loaned by the institution.

Hon. J. Cornell: One swallow does not make a summer.

Hon. H. V. PIESSE: That does not matter. I wish to point out that if the principal Act had not been in force, the executor would have been compelled to pay that £50 quarterly and the widow would have been reduced to living on £50 a year, whereas her income from that property had formerly been about £10 per week. In this instance the widow was protected by the Act. The mortgagee was informed that whilst the Act remained on the statute-book of Western Australia, those quarterly payments would not be made until the executor found himself in a position to make them. Things have improved slightly, and in that particular estate a small proportion of the repayments will now begin to be made. But that is no reason why we should strike off our statute-book this Act, or amend it to meet individual cases. A few weeks ago I had a case where a lady had a mortgage on a farm. The interest on the mortgage had been paid for the last seven years, through times of serious depression: but last year the price of wool had fallen so considerably that the farmer could not meet his interest. He paid £20 towards it, and the lady holding the mortgage came in to see me and said she wanted to proceed against the farmer with a view to taking possession of the farm straight away. Again the Act protected the man, who had done his very best. No doubt the fresh increase in the price of wool this year, will enable him to meet the nine months' interest overdue as well as his present interest, and also to carry on. Had the Act not been in force, the mortgagee could have attacked the property under her mortgage. I know of a case in the Darkan district where in 1929 a young fellow entered into an agreement to buy 3,000 acres of land. Not being particularly financial, the young fellow had to pay his way by earning from outside sources sufficient to meet instalments on the property. However, his purchase agreement was a good one. He was a worker, and he had three years free of interest. He paid £100 deposit, and was to pay off the capital at the rate of £100 annually. He took possession and went on the property and cleared 400 or 500 acres. I should add that after three years free of interest he had to pay 5 per cent. per annum interest on the balance owing. He could not meet his capital payments or interest, but he cleared the property to the extent of about 500 acres during the years since 1929. Some little time ago the vendor gave him notice

that he had sold the property—at an increased value of 7s. 6d. per acre—because the man had not been able to pay his interest. Again this man was protected. He had worked and carried out improvements, with the result that 7s. 6d. per acre could be gained by the vendor on the previous purchase price of 10s. per acre. This proves that the property had been improved by the labour of the mortgagor. There are many instances of houses purchased on the basis of 50 per cent. cash. Undoubtedly many such purchasers have lost their positions entirely or have been reduced in wages or salary. At the same time they are faced with a drop of 33 per cent. in the value of their properties. That represents only a small allowance, because in many cases houses have been written down 50 per cent. In that well-known town, Katanning, only last week, I saw blocks of land, originally sold for £40 or £50, knocked down for a pound for overdue rates. It certainly happened to be a catch sale; but the figures prove that the value of land has depreciated.

Hon. L. Craig: In Katanning.

Hon. H. V. PIESSE: Not only in Katanning, but in most country centres as well as in the city. I was struck with a remark made to me by a man some little time ago, to the effect that he had eight or ten mortgages out approximating in value between £300 and £400 each. Those mortgages were on excellent security. This man, a business man, had decided to go in for a further business venture. He called on the different mortgagees and suggested that he could find the whole of the money at 5 per cent. and give them a guarantee of a further five years if they would accept transfers of the mortgages. The reply was that they would not accept the transfers. I suggest to the Minister that the principal Act might be so amended that in the case of any person having a mortgage and in a position to find a five-years mortgagee, a transfer should be accepted and the original mortgagor should be liberated. I know of a case where a widow with eight or nine children had been left £1,000 by her husband. She had her own home. She came to me and said that she wanted to obtain a mortgage for £1,000 with a net return of capital of £100 per annum, because she considered that she could live on the £100 with the interest on the £1,000, which would be reducible by £100 annually. I arranged a mortgage for her to the extent of £800. In 1929, 1930, 1931, and 1932, though under the mortgage she had the right to call up £100 per annum, she did not do so because she did not require the money. In 1933, however, she decided to go in for a small business, and so she asked the mortgagor to advance her £300. That mortgagor, who was in a very unfortunate financial position, could not find the £300, though he was still paying 7 per cent. per annum interest on the mortgage debt. He informed the lady that the only way to deal with the matter was for him to find her the whole amount of £800. He inserted an advertisement in the Press, and one of our legal friends came to light with the £800 out of trust funds. The interest under the new mortgage was 6 per cent., or 1 per cent. less than the rate under the original mortgage. In that instance the whole of the principal was returned and the Financial Emergency Act was not resorted to. I agree that it is not often that kind of case occurs; but I do think that where a mortgagee can arrange for money to meet a mortgage that he has in hand the necessary power to transfer should be given him, and that if necessary an application could be made to the courts for the transfer of the mortgage. Surely to goodness the mortgagee is doing his part of the business, and there is no hardship if he can find the money which is owing by the tenant.

Hon. J. Nicholson: What you suggest would involve recasting the Act.

Hon. H. V. PIESSE: There are many cases where people can find the money.

Hon. G. W. Miles: Which party are you speaking of?

Hon. H. V. PIESSE: Of the mortgagee who wants to get his money back. There should be provision for that in the Act. I have been definitely informed that it cannot be done under the Act as it stands. Certainly a mortgage can be transferred under the Act, but the protection of the Act is lost to the mortgagee.

Hon. C. F. Baxter: You suggest power to contract outside the Act?

Hon. H. V. PIESSE: Yes. It is being done, but in most cases it is only with the consent of the mortgagor that the contract has been carried out. Mortgagors will not agree on account of losing their protec-

tion under this Act. The Honorary Minister, when moving the second reading of the Bill, stated that under the Act 78 applications had been granted, two refused, 45 adjourned, and 25 were pending, making a total of 148 applications. Mr. Craig then interjected that if only two applications had been refused, the Act did not seem to have a great deal of effect. However, I wish to point out to hon. members how many cases of hardship would have occurred had the Act not been in force.

Hon. C. F. Baxter: It is the moral effect.

Hon. H. V. PIESSE: Yes, it is the moral effect of this Act that has been so helpful and beneficial. The Act is one of the best ever placed on the statute-book for the protection of persons owing money under mortgage.

Hon. V. Hamersley: What about the mortgagee?

Hon. H. V. PIESSE: The mortgagee is all right. Mr. Parker, in speaking on this legislation last session, suggested that the Act should be altered so that the mortgagor could apply for protection.

Hon. L. Craig: Put the onus on the mortgagor, and not on the mortgagee.

Hon. H. V. PIESSE: First of all the mortgagee invariably is in the position of being financially strong, whereas the mortgagor has to find the interest, and carry on his home or property; and even if he is purchasing his house he has to find the interest just the same. Surely the man in the best position to approach the court is the man who has the money. I would not vote for any amendment such as that suggested by Mr. Parker. I will support the Bill, and I hope it will go through with at most only a few small amendments to meet the anomalies mentioned by Mr. Nicholson and Mr. Parker.

HON. J. CORNELL (South) [8.16]: The Bill is one of about six that form the financial emergency legislation brought down on account of the depression. Until this session these annual Bills for continuance of existing Acts have found their way into this Chamber through another place, but on this occasion two of them have been introduced in this House. At the outset I offer to the House the advice not to pass the second reading of either of these Bills until we see what becomes of the remainder. My line of reasoning is that in some of the Acts to be continued by these Bills, members of Parliament, judges of the Supreme Court, Ministers of the Crown and public servants were asked to make some measure of sacrifice. It was made. After the lapse of a certain period there was an attempt to restore to those least able to bear the sacrifice some measure of redress by giving them back something of what had been taken from them. I know of certain cases that have have been partially dealt with in this respect. And the Minister said, "Let them go to court." Well, why do not members of Parliament go to court and ask for similar redress? In effect Ministers say that the conditions which obtained on the passing of the original Bills obtains to-day, although restoration has been made to some of those who were called upon to bear the sacrifice.

The Honorary Minister: How can you say that any cases have been partially dealt with?

Hon. J. CORNELL: I say that after all the years the Act has been in operation, it may be said to be a permanent measure. But do not let us say that this emergency legislation should become permanent.

Hon. H. V. Piesse: What will you do with the trustee companies if you do not pass the Bill?

Hon. J. CORNELL: I suppose the close season is ending and the open season is upon us, when we shall be told we are round the corner.

Hon. C. F. Baxter: Round the corner on borrowed money.

Hon. H. V. Piesse: Round the corner without any money.

Hon. J. CORNELL: We are either in the depression or we are not. If we are still in it we should not have returned the money we have returned, whereas if we are not in it there is only one logical course to pursue in respect of mortgagees, namely to do what was done with the Commonwealth bonds, either to write down the rate of interest or alternatively write down the principal. But do not let us go under any two-faced method of saying the financial emergency has passed for one section, but not for another. That is the reasoning I take. Assuming for argument that the financial emergency legislation comes from another place, with full restoration of the salaries to what they were before the financial emergency, are we going to be so hypocritical as to accept that situation and not give easement to another section of the com-

munity, namely the mortgagees, but tell them that they are getting too much and have no right to expect the return of the money they lent in 1929. Mr. Piesse gave the Bill his benediction and blessing, but cited instances of benefit and of hardship. I wish he would tell the House how the Act passed in 1931 can logically be continued? That is the whole purpose of the Bill, notwithstanding which Mr. Piesse hopes it will be passed.

Hon. L. Craig: You cannot amend it.

Hon. J. CORNELL: I do not agree with that. I am not an accountant, trustee or executor, nor anything else that gives special qualification to deal with the Bill, but I think the course I have indicated to the House is a more open and straightforward one than the course suggested by Mr. Piesse, namely to continue the state of emergency. I cannot say, "Let us face up to the position," as the Commonwealth said when we all had to face up to the bonds. We should say the altered circumstances mean that for every £100 a man lent in 1929 he can only get £75 now.

The Honorary Minister: You have picked the wrong Bill for that.

Hon. J. CORNELL: The principle applies to all the emergency legislation, to the landlord and the mortgagee equally as another financial measure hits us. The position pointed out by Mr. Holmes was that if we lose control of this Bill and if another comes down restoring all the good things that were taken away from us in 1931, we shall have let this Bill go. If we pass the Bill and send it off to another place, that will be the end of it for us, after which possibly another financial emergency Bill making restoration of the salary cuts may come from another place to us.

The Honorary Minister: You will still carry this Bill.

Hon. J. CORNELL: We shall have carried it—that is the trouble.

Hon. G. Fraser: Can you do anything but carry it?

Hon. J. CORNELL: If we pass this Bill before the other comes down from another place, we shall have finished with this Bill: and if that other Bill coming from another place restores members' salaries to £600 per annum, what are we then going to do about this Bill which still keeps mortgagees under sacrifice, and which we shall have passed?

Hon. G. Fraser: Even if you hang up this Bill you will still carry it.

Hon. J. CORNELL: If it were left to me I would hang this Bill, like Mahomed's coffin, in a state of suspension, until the other Bill came down.

The Honorary Minister: You will still have the other Bill.

Hon. J. Nicholson: But the hon. member wants to see what is in the other Bill before he agrees to this one.

Hon. J. CORNELL: The Bill restoring £600 to members of Parliament may come down here after we have passed this Bill and sent it to another place. I like to think that this House would refuse to accept the £600 per annum if this Bill had already passed. I will oppose the Bill.

On motion by Hon. L. Craig, debate adjourned.

House adjourned at 8.28 p.m.

Legislative Assembly.

Wednesday, 4th September, 1935.

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

QUESTION—EDUCATION, PERTH TECHNICAL SCHOOL.

Mr. NEEDHAM asked the Minister for Education: 1, Do the Government intend to