

numbers. This is an endeavour to force the rapacious landlord to take his share of the responsibilities arising out of the situation. I would also inform the Leader of the Opposition that many people cannot afford to pay for legal advice. He considered that when a tenant contracted outside the Act he merely entered into an arrangement with the landlord. When the document is signed, the power is taken out of the hands of the Commissioner to afford relief. I do not admit that this is retrospective legislation.

Mr. Sampson: Do you believe in retrospection?

Mr. NEEDHAM: It is not retrospective legislation such as is suggested by the hon. member.

The Minister for Employment: The hon. member did not hesitate to make the wages cuts retrospective.

Mr. Sampson: Never!

Mr. NEEDHAM: The Commissioner will be the man to determine the situation, and hold the scales of justice evenly. All the Bill seeks to do is to give every citizen who finds himself in difficulties an opportunity to appeal to the Commissioner and abide by his decision.

Mr. GRIFFITHS: I move—

'That progress be reported.

Motion put and negatived.

Amendment put, and a division taken with the following result:—

Ayes	..	..	..	..	13
Noes	..	..	..	..	16
Majority against .. .. .					3

AYES.

Mr. Griffiths	Mr. Sampson
Mr. Keenan	Mr. Seward
Mr. Latham	Mr. J. H. Smith
Mr. McDonald	Mr. Stubbs
Mr. McLarty	Mr. Welsh
Mr. North	Mr. Doney
Mr. Piesse	(Teller.)

NOES.

Mr. Cross	Mr. Rodoreda
Mr. Cunningham	Mr. F. C. L. Smith
Mr. Kenneally	Mr. Tonkin
Mr. Millington	Mr. Wansbrough
Mr. Moloney	Mr. Willcock
Mr. Munster	Mr. Wilson
Mr. Needham	Mr. Withers
Mr. Raphael	Mr. Lambert
	(Teller.)

Amendment thus negatived.

[33]

Mr. SAMPSON: I move an amendment—

That the following be added to the clause:—"Any person adversely affected by this section shall be at liberty to apply to a judge of the Supreme Court for an order exempting his contract from the operation of the Act."

The Minister for Employment: The Commissioner already has the right to do that, under the parent Act.

Mr. SAMPSON: In at least some instances large purchases of property would be involved, and Clause 2 might prove a difficult proposition for a man hard pressed, possibly a man purchasing a factory or a shop.

Mr. DONEY: Had not the amendment better read "Any person who considers himself adversely affected"?

Amendment put and negatived.

Clause put and passed.

Clause 3, Title—agreed to.

Bill reported without amendment, and the report adopted.

*House adjourned at 9.50 p.m.*

**Legislative Council,**

*Tuesday, 19th September, 1933.*

Question: Employment, trainee apprenticeship, as to introduction locally .. .. .	923
Sessional: Joint Select Committee, report presented	925
Assent to Bills .. .. .	925
Ministerial Statement: Financial Emergency Tax Assessment Act Amendment Bill .. .. .	928
Bills: Financial Emergency Tax, 2R. .. .. .	929
Southern Cross Southwards Railway, 1R. .. .. .	939
Tenants, Purchasers and Mortgagees' Relief Act Amendment, 1R. .. .. .	939
Industries Assistance Act Continuance, 2R., Com. report .. .. .	939
Mortgages Rights Restriction Act Continuance, 2R., Com. report .. .. .	940
Reduction of Rents Act Continuance, 2R., Com. report .. .. .	940
Miner Workers' Relief Act Amendment, 2R. .. .. .	940

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

## QUESTION—EMPLOYMENT, TRAINEE APPRENTICESHIP.

*As to Introduction Locally.*

Hon. A. THOMSON asked the Chief Secretary: 1, Has the attention of the Government been drawn to a statement that appeared in the "West Australian" of the 12th September regarding a new system, inaugurated in Sydney, of trainee apprenticeship to be introduced in the metal trades as a result of a decision by the Apprenticeship Commissioner (Mr. McIntyre) in order that youths might be employed under certain awards without articles of indenture, and at 15 per cent. above the rates for indentured apprentices? The employers state the new system will provide immediate employment for 1,000 boys. 2, In view of the grave difficulty parents are finding in obtaining employment for their boys, will the Government consider the inauguration of a similar system in Western Australia?

The CHIEF SECRETARY replied: 1, Yes. 2, The conditions of employment for apprentices are entirely under the control of the Court of Arbitration, which deals with each application for the various industries on its merits, and the Government do not propose to interfere.

## SECESSION—JOINT SELECT COMMITTEE.

*Report Presented.*

The Chief Secretary brought up the report of the joint select committee.

Report received and read as follows—

Your Committee has held four sittings. Your Committee recommended that the following gentlemen be appointed a Committee to prepare a dutiful address to His Majesty, the statement of the case of secession, and humble applications to both Houses of the Imperial Parliament to procure such legislation by the Imperial Parliament as may be necessary to effectuate the withdrawal of the people of the State from the Federal Commonwealth:—Mr. C. Dudley, Mr. J. Lindsay, Mr. A. J. Reid, Hon. J. Scaddan, Mr. J. L. Walker, Mr. H. K. Watson, and to submit the case for the subsequent approval of both Houses of Parliament. (Signed) P. Collier, Chairman.

On motion by the Chief Secretary, ordered: That the consideration of the report be made an Order for the Day for the next sitting of the House.

## ASSENT TO BILLS.

Message from the Lieut.-Governor received and read notifying assent to the undermentioned Bills—

- 1, York Cemeteries.
- 2, Returned Sailors and Soldiers' Imperial League of Australia, W.A. Branch, Incorporated, Headquarters Building.

## MINISTERIAL STATEMENT—FINANCIAL EMERGENCY TAX ASSESSMENT ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

**THE CHIEF SECRETARY** (Hon. J. M. Drew—Central) [4.38]: With your permission, Mr. President, I desire to make a brief statement in order to give some information regarding points raised by Mr. Miles during the recent debate on the Financial Emergency Tax Assessment Act Amendment Bill. Mr. Miles made a suggestion regarding the employment of men on the destruction of pests and I communicated with the Minister for Employment (Hon. J. J. Kenneally), from whom I have received the following reply—

In reply to your letter of the 7th inst. forwarding a suggestion made by the Hon. G. W. Miles regarding the employment of men in the destruction of vermin, we have already taken this aspect up with some local authorities, and particularly with the Beverley Road Board, who intend to submit a proposal by which the road board will carry out organisation work and probably add some money additional to the sustenance the men are receiving while employed in rabbit destruction. The basis of the discussion with the Beverley Road Board was to employ the men in this connection during the time they were standing down from Government relief works. Should the Hon. G. W. Miles have suggestions that similar work could be done by any other local authority, I shall be glad to receive particulars.

Mr. Miles also suggested that crude oil coaches should be used on the Government railways. I brought that matter under the notice of the Minister for Railways (Hon. J. C. Willecock), who was subsequently communicated with by the Commissioner of Railways (Mr. Evans) as follows—

The question of petrol and steam-driven cars has been submitted on many occasions as a means of overcoming the difficulty of providing an adequate passenger service at a small cost. At present we have a motor coach service running between Albany and Nornalup and a steam coach running between Perth and Armadale. If we could have funds for the purchase of, say, 20 steam or petrol-driven cars, a better

service could be given in the country districts at much less cost than steam trains. In South Australia there are 52 petrol-driven motor coaches and 29 trailers, which provide all the passenger services apart from suburban and through trains such as the Broken Hill express and the trans-Continental business. The average cost of running these coaches for the year ended 30th June, 1933, amounted to 14.93d. per mile, whilst in this State the steam coach was run for 9.98d. per mile and the petrol-driven coach—which is a very old standard—cost 16.20d. per mile. In Queensland there are 48 petrol-driven coaches and 61 trailers. Victoria has 35, with 34 trailers, and New South Wales 37. The cost of running per mile is not available, but in Queensland I have an idea that it is in the vicinity of 1s. per mile. It was never proposed that crude oil coaches be introduced. In fact, they are now in the experimental stages in other parts of the world, and I am afraid the capital cost would be far too heavy. As regards the fares, these were substantially reduced last July. The return fare to Fremantle is now 1s. The result of the reduction was that we carried 1,197,000 more passengers but received £926 less than in the previous year.

## BILL—FINANCIAL EMERGENCY TAX.

### *Second Reading.*

Debate resumed from the 14th September.

**HON. W. J. MANN** (South-West) [4.43]: The Bill is consequential upon the Financial Emergency Tax Assessment Act Amendment Bill. With other members, I have been wondering what is the position regarding that measure, and what good it is proceeding with the Bill before the House, so long as the Government adopt the policy, apparently, of dropping the assessment measure altogether. It is some days since that Bill left this Chamber and a reference to the Notice Paper in the Legislative Assembly will show that it is practically at the bottom of the Orders of the Day. Seeing that the acceptance of the amendments proposed by this House to the assessment Bill will vitally affect the passage of the taxing Bill before us now, I am at a loss to understand the attitude of the Government. They were complaining recently that it was essential this legislation should be passed as quickly as possible in order that they might derive some revenue from the financial emergency tax. I am wondering now whether the Government are actually in earnest about this legislation and whether they are not sorry that they introduced it. I am prompted to that thought

because, from what we can read and hear, the legislation is not very popular, not only amongst people who are not supporters of the Government, but among their masters—the members of the trade unions. I do not use "masters" in a derogatory or unkind sense: one can make such a reference in a kindly way. If members feel that I have said anything unkind, I withdraw it. At the same time let me quote a paragraph from this morning's "West Australian" having some bearing on the point. It is headed "Emergency Tax, Unions Hostile to Re-enactment," and reads—

Acting on behalf of the Shop Assistants', Tramways Employees', Furniture Trades and Transport Workers' Unions, the metropolitan council of the Australian Labour Party made representation last night to the State executive of the Australian Labour Party in opposition to the re-enactment of all financial emergency legislation dealing with wages.

It was decided to organise a deputation to wait on the Premier, who has promised not to introduce re-enacting Bills until the views of the State executive are placed before him.

So there is some justification for a doubt in one's mind when one sees the assessment Bill being dealt with in that manner. Regarding the Bill before us, it is interesting to go back to last session and refresh our minds with some of the arguments advanced against similar legislation by members who are now supporting it. If one desired to compile a vocabulary of terms of strong opposition, I commend him to a perusal of some of those speeches. They contain quite a number of very effective words of protest, and I think I am generous in describing them in that way. Not only did members of the Government, who are supporting this taxation, strongly oppose the tax at that time, but they did everything possible to bring about the defeat of the then Government's desires. In this House and elsewhere grave doubts were expressed about the Government's bona fides, particularly as to how the money would be used. It was suggested that the money would be used for purposes other than the relief of unemployment. I do not know that we have heard much to the effect that the proceeds of the proposed tax will be used for the relief of unemployment; there is nothing in the Bill to show that they will be. The great burden of complaint on the previous occasions was that the money about to be extracted from the people under the guise of assisting unemployment might

be used for something else. I am not going to be so unkind as to say that the present Government propose to do any such thing. I believe they are genuinely desirous of assisting the unemployed. They may not do it in the way I consider best, but I point out that there is a considerable difference in the attitude of those opposing this Bill and the attitude of those who opposed similar legislation last session.

Hon. C. B. Williams: To be consistent, you will have to support it.

Hon. W. J. MANN: Last year the strongest opposition came from the present Leader of the House. He moved an amendment to provide for an unemployment trust fund account, to be kept in the Treasury, and, subject to the payment to the Commissioner of the cost of collection, the amount for the time being to the credit of such account to be applied to the provision of work for unemployed persons. It may be said that we should insist upon a similar condition, but I do not consider there is any necessity for that. Much as we regret the necessity for the Bill, we have to recognise that the Government need some money, but, as I said on a previous occasion, I believe that the Government can do with less money than they propose to raise under this Bill. The Leader of the House referred facetiously to my suggestion that the tax be reduced to produce £200,000. I still hold that our faces should be set in the direction of reducing taxation, rather than increasing it. I am firmly of opinion that if the Bill, as proposed by the Government, be passed, it will bring in quite a lot more than has been estimated. For that reason I still hold that the Bill should be passed subject to suggested amendments to lighten the burden of taxation on the people. The Government, in their unemployment policy so far, have not carried out their pre-election pledge. It may be complained that they have not had sufficient time to do so. Well, they have been in power about four months and they have a Minister and staff dealing specially with unemployment. While I agree that they have gone some distance towards putting matters on a more satisfactory basis, I am rather perturbed at the change of front that has been made. Previous to the election and immediately after it, the unemployed were told that they were to have three months' work on full pay.

The Honorary Minister: Who said that?

Hon. W. J. MANN: Members of the Minister's party announced it from the platform during the election. I take it that they spoke with authority.

The Honorary Minister: The statement you are making is not correct.

Hon. W. J. MANN: The statement I have made is correct as I heard it.

Hon. J. Cornell: I, too, heard it.

The Honorary Minister: Not in those terms.

Hon. W. J. MANN: Yes, exactly as I have given it.

Hon. J. Cornell: And from the platform.

Hon. W. J. MANN: Not only was it stated in the part of the country where I was, but I am credibly informed that it was stated in other parts. Whether made with the concurrence of members of the party or not, I cannot say. If the Honorary Minister assures me that the statement was not made with the concurrence of the members of the party, I am prepared to accept his assurance. I am merely quoting what was said and what the public were led to believe.

The Honorary Minister: What your party led them to believe.

Hon. W. J. MANN: I am prepared to stand up to anything that I led the people to believe.

Hon. J. Cornell: Mr. Moloney made that statement in Subiaeo.

Hon. C. F. Baxter: It was said all over the State.

Hon. W. J. MANN: Obviously, I was not the only one who heard it. The interjections of members should surely convince the Honorary Minister of the truth of the statement as I have given it. The Minister for Employment introduced a scheme, which is in operation at present, to provide so much full-time work and so much sustenance. The workers were given to understand that it was going to be a considerably better scheme than the previous one. If members go to the trouble to work out the figures, they will find it is not a better scheme, and that with one exception—a man with a wife only, over a period of 11 weeks is 2s. better off—the men and their families are worse off to amounts up to 22s. I have a scale contrasting the Collier Government scheme and the Mitchell Government scheme—

Collier scheme—Man and wife only, 4 weeks at £3 9s. 6d. (basic wage), £13 18s. 0d.; 7 weeks at 14s., £4 18s. 0d.: total, £13 16s.

Mitchell scheme—11 weeks at £1 14s., £18 14s.

So a man with a wife only would be 2s. better off under the Collier scheme.

Collier scheme—Man, wife and one child, 4 weeks at £3 9s. 6d., £13 18s. 0d.; 6 weeks at £1 1s. 0d., £6 6s. 0d.; total £20 4s. 0d.

Mitchell scheme—10 weeks at £2 1s. 0d., £20 10s. 0d.

That family would be 6s. worse off under the Collier scheme.

The Honorary Minister: Are you sure those figures are correct?

Hon. W. J. MANN: The Honorary Minister seems imbued with the idea that I am here to present untruthful statements and figures. I am not here with any such intention, never have been and hope I never will be.

The Honorary Minister: I am asking you whether you are sure the figures are correct.

Hon. W. J. MANN: I am sure that, for my purposes, they are correct. If I cannot convince the Honorary Minister, I ask him to present figures to show where I am wrong.

Hon. C. F. Baxter: He refused to give them to me.

Hon. W. J. MANN: My statements apparently hurt. It makes speaking worth while when one can compel the Opposition to sit up. Apparently they are doing so now.

Collier scheme—Man, wife and two children 4 weeks at £3 9s. 6d., £13 18s. 0d.; 5 weeks at £1 8s. 0d., £7 0s. 0d.; total, £20 18s. 0d.

Mitchell scheme—9 weeks at £2 8s. 0d., £21 12s. 0d.

Hon. E. H. Gray: Under the Mitchell scheme the men were working.

Hon. W. J. MANN: The figures are still hurting. The man with wife and two children is 14s. worse off under the Collier scheme.

Hon. G. Fraser: On paper.

The PRESIDENT: Order!

Hon. W. J. MANN: Mr. Gray, speaking the other day, said it would be right and just to insist that workers receiving relief should be members of unions. This is another popular topic—the fact of workers being compelled to contribute 25s. before they can get work. Mr. Gray said the contribution was charged for services rendered, but 5s. of the amount is for the “Westralian Worker.” Is that a service? Another 3s.

is for the A.L.P. I have not been able to analyse the balance to ascertain where it will go or who will get the benefit of it. When it comes to showing that under these two schemes the workers of to-day are worse off than they were under the Mitchell scheme, it is another story altogether.

Hon. A. M. Clydesdale: Tell us how many more men are at work.

Hon. W. J. MANN: I do not think there are any more; at any rate, there are very few more.

Hon. E. H. Gray: Hundreds.

Hon. W. J. MANN: Perhaps the hon. member will give us the figures later on.

Hon. C. F. Baxter: Private enterprise are employing them, not the Government.

Hon. W. J. MANN: Yes, that is the point.

Collier scheme—Man, wife and three children, 4 weeks at £3 9s. 6d., £13 18s. 0d.; 4 weeks at £1 15s. 0d., £7 0s. 0d.; total, £28 18s. 0d.

Mitchell scheme—8 weeks at £2 15s. 0d., £22 0s. 0d.

There we have a definite case of a man being 22s. worse off over a period of eight weeks' work. The present Government promised the people certain things, and those promises have not been carried out.

Collier scheme—Man, wife and 4 children, 4 weeks at £3 9s. 6d., £13 18s. 0d.; 3 weeks at £2 2s. 0d., £6 6s. 0d.; total, £20 4s. 0d.

Mitchell scheme—7 weeks at £3, £21 0s. 0d.

In that case, under the Collier scheme, the position would be 16s. worse. These figures call for some thought, and one can say with a fair amount of accuracy that the Government have not stood up to their obligations. When they ask us to pass emergency taxation, ostensibly—and they are not making much noise about it—they say they want it for unemployment relief: then the least they can do is to stand to their promises. They have not done so, and I will ask the Ministers, if he contends otherwise to answer the figures I have put up. The proper course for the House to adopt is to adjourn the further consideration of the Bill for a week or a fortnight to see what the Government propose to do with the assessment Bill. That is the line of action I would not hesitate to support. What the Government are doing in the way of handling this matter is beyond my comprehension. I hope I shall not be considered unkind when I suggest that they do not seem to be too anxious

about it; I still feel there is some reason for having doubts in that regard. I shall reserve my decision as to how I shall vote until I see what takes place in connection with this debate.

**Hon. J. CORNELL** (South) [5.5]: The discussion on this Bill appears to me to have taken rather a twist. The Bill we are discussing and the assessment Bill were introduced conjointly; they are closely interwoven. This House, it may be said, has a free hand on the assessment Bill inasmuch as it has the power of amendment and it can insist on its amendments, and if necessary bring the Bill itself to a conference of both Houses. The tax Bill now before us comes within a totally different category; this House has the power to request another place to make amendments, and that power only. In my recollection over a period of 18 or 20 years, I can recall only one Bill such as this going to a conference. On that single occasion the Bill went to a conference at its first reading and it was taken into consideration at the same time as the assessment Bill. The present Bill starts the tax on £104 for a person without dependants, and begins at £182 for a person with dependants. This House in its wisdom has said that the exemptions from taxation shall begin at a lower figure, that they shall be, in the case of a single taxpayer, £52 per annum, and in the case of a taxpayer with dependants £156 per annum. Now we are considering a Bill to impose a tax on incomes commencing, in the case of a man without dependants at £104, and in the case of a man with dependants at £182, in spite of the fact that this House has already said that the exemptions shall be the lower figures I have quoted. There is a margin of difference, and when the Bill reaches the Committee stage we shall have no procedure to guide us. I submit that if another place agrees to the exemptions as suggested by this House, there are one or two courses open to the Government. The first is to withdraw the tax Bill and submit another tax Bill, starting at the exemptions agreed upon by this House, and not the exemptions set forth in the original assessment Bill. There is another course, and it is within the province of Parliament to follow it. There is no reason why we should begin to impose the tax at the exemption figure. That is the course we are pursuing. We are discussing a Bill that does not propose to tax

at the exemptions suggested by this House. That being so, it is a matter of indifference to another place whether it accepts our amendments made to the assessment Bill or whether the Bill is lost. I submit that the Government should commence to tax at the figure in the old assessment Act, namely £52, in the case of a man without dependants, and £104 in the case of a man with dependants. There is nothing in the law to say that we must commence to tax at the statutory exemption. I contend we can only assume that it is the intention of the Government to proceed with this Bill and not bother about the other. I should like the Minister when replying to point out to the House whether it is unlawful to commence to tax at a figure above the statutory exemption. I submit it is not. We have the statutory exemption, saying that no person, for argument's sake, receiving under £100 a year, shall be taxed; but there is no obligation on any Government to say that they shall commence at that figure; they can commence to tax the man in receipt of £300 a year. All the other machinery of the Act would apply. Until this point is cleared up, it is futile for the House to go any further with the present Bill. We have an inherent right to know our exact position. It is actually suggested that when we reach the Committee stage we can proceed to square this Bill with the idea of the exemptions in the other, irrespective of whether another place has or has not gone any further with those exemptions. I refer members seriously to read Section 46 of the Constitution. There they will find that they are fairly well bound down in respect of the introduction of new matter, and that it is not within the province of this House to bring in any new set of taxpayers, and that is the meaning of the amendments we have sent to another place. It is, however, within the province of this House to keep within the exemptions and reduce the tax in all its ramifications. But beyond that, I submit the House is on dangerous ground. I want to warn members that the fight is not going to take place on the assessment Bill, that if there is to be a fight it will be on the taxing Bill, where our suggested amendments are hamstrung under Section 46 of the Constitution. I do not intend to discuss the proposed tax. The question of exemptions has already been discussed at great length in this Chamber, and we are no further forward now than we

were at the beginning, because another place has not even considered our amendments. The only discussion I would agree to admit is that the rate of tax set forth in this Bill should not be a graduated rate, but should be a flat rate.

Hon. V. Hamersley: Hear, hear!

Hon. J. CORNELL: I am not subscribing to that doctrine, for I voted against it on the last Bill, but I could argue that in all probability the incidence of the graduated tax is too light in places and too heavy in others, that the tax commences too high and cuts off too early, and that under the Bill the great bulk of the taxation is to come from those with incomes of between £300 and £500 per annum. In that regard the tax on the graduated basis is altogether too severe. To me it is somewhat contradictory in a Labour Government that they should be so solicitous for the citizens at both ends of the social scale; they are all solicitation for the fellow at the bottom of the ladder, and almost equally so in regard to the chap at the top of the ladder, that is to say the man who has a clear income of a substantial amount. For instance, a Cabinet Minister with a clear income—overlooking the financial emergency tax—in his Parliamentary salary of £1,500 a year is to be taxed on—

The Chief Secretary: That is not correct.

Hon. J. CORNELL: I specifically said, leaving out the financial emergency tax. Apart from that, a Cabinet Minister receives £1,500 a year, whereas the ordinary member of Parliament gets £600 a year, and they are both to be taxed at the same rate. In my experience more calls are made on the ordinary member of Parliament than are made on the Cabinet Minister, for the ordinary member of Parliament has fewer ways of dodging them than has the Cabinet Minister. I have gone into my constituency on the same train as Cabinet Ministers, whether Labour Party or Country Party, who had a railway coach and drew 25s. a day for expenses, whereas I had to pay my own expenses as I went. Cabinet Ministers, from the time they leave their offices to undertake a journey until they return, have a fixed rate of expenses to draw upon. Can it be said that a Cabinet Minister pays his own way?

Hon. G. Fraser: Very often.

Hon. J. CORNELL: When he is on his own business, perhaps. But if he goes down

to open a show in my constituency, he is not on his own business, and so he draws his expenses, while I, in the same train, have to pay my expenses. I do not wish to single out either Cabinet Ministers or members of Parliament, but they do afford an interesting comparison in this regard: the out-turn of the ordinary member of Parliament is in all the circumstances as great as that of a Cabinet Minister, but the in-turn is very much less, notwithstanding which the same rate of tax is to apply to the two men. That is not fair. I know it is argued that the man on the higher income pays the greater tax in other regards, and that there is a limit beyond which we cannot go with taxation; that beyond that limit there is very little left to tax. I do not come into contact with the individuals who enjoy those very high incomes, but I do come into contact with the average man on from £5 to £7 a week, and I venture to say that, having regard to his commitments and his obligations, his tax is such that at the end of the year he has nothing left for investment. In my view the tax should have gone up to £1,000, graduated all the way. It is said the only necessity for this tax is the existing depression. I submit that a man on £1,000 a year has much more to lose by our not getting out of the emergency, the depression, than has the chap on £5 or £6 a week. It is to the interests of the man on the higher income, just as much as it is to the interests of a man on a lower income, that we should escape from the depression. Summing up, I ask the House to take into consideration the facts I have dealt with: Is it worth while proceeding with the Bill until such time as we ascertain what it is intended to do with the exemptions?

Hon. G. W. Miles: The Government are trying to force us to proceed with it.

Hon. J. CORNELL: Secondly, we should ascertain whether it is the intention of the Government—apart from what may be eventually agreed upon by the two Houses in the way of exemption—to start at that exemption to apply the tax. If that understanding is not arrived at before the Bill is taken into Committee, we may have certain suggestions or requests made to another place in regard to starting the tax at a figure that may not be the figure in the existing Act nor in the amending legislation as finally agreed upon after the dispute between the two Houses. Therefore I ask where is the necessity for going further with this Bill,

until such time as we have received back the one we sent to another place for consideration?

**THE HONORARY MINISTER** (Hon. W. H. Kitson—West) [5.26]: I find it very hard to understand the attitude of certain members of the House. It was agreed when Assessment Bill was introduced into this Chamber that members should deal with both Bills at the same time, the one Bill being to a great extent dependent on the other. We have already dealt with the assessment Bill and amended it. Some members have said they have no wish to embarrass the Government, and are quite prepared to let the Government have as much money from this form of taxation as the previous Government had. But so far they are refusing to indicate to the Government what they are prepared to do in regard to this Bill.

Hon. J. Cornell: On a point of order. I submit that the hon. member is putting on my remarks an interpretation quite different from that which I intended. I intended to say that the nature of the dispute will be as to what is to be the starting point of this tax, whether it is the tax in this Bill or the amendment as agreed upon in the assessment Bill.

**THE HONORARY MINISTER**: I was not referring to any remarks of the hon. member. Unfortunately he has been absent for two or three days, and probably has not yet read in "Hansard" the remarks of previous speakers on this measure. I repeat that some members have already indicated in their speeches that they are prepared to let the Government have as much money from this form of taxation as the previous Government had, but they have also agreed to an amendment in the assessment Bill, reducing the exemptions. That must necessarily make an alteration in the rate of tax in the Bill before us. Also they have said they are not prepared to consider that phase of the question until another place has dealt with the amended assessment Bill.

Hon. J. Cornell: This House cannot amend this Bill.

**THE HONORARY MINISTER**: This House can indicate what their intentions are in regard to the rate of tax, and that is the main point in the Bill. Various members have given expression to divergent views on the rates of taxation, and on the various graduations of tax, from the exemption that

they have already agreed to, to the higher rates of income. We have not got to bed-rock as to the intentions of this House. We have the Leader of the Opposition in this Chamber—

Hon. G. W. Miles: There is no Leader of the Opposition here.

**THE HONORARY MINISTER**: He was described as the Leader of the Opposition.

Hon. W. J. Mann: By whom?

**THE HONORARY MINISTER**: By one of his own colleagues.

Hon. C. F. Baxter: No one has been referred to in this House as the Leader of the Opposition. I heard no reference to it.

**THE HONORARY MINISTER**: Let us say the Hon. Mr. Baxter. He said when speaking he had no objection to the proposed exemption for married men. On the Notice Paper he has an amendment to bring that into line with the taxation Bill of the previous Government.

Hon. C. F. Baxter: I am not amending the exemptions for married men.

**THE HONORARY MINISTER**: I think the amendment on the Notice Paper does so.

Hon. C. F. Baxter: I would rather see the exemption increased for married men.

Hon. G. W. Miles: He was only speaking for himself.

**THE HONORARY MINISTER**: The hon. member has indicated his views in that amendment. Other members have voiced opinions which are at variance with the hon. member's suggestion.

Hon. A. Thomson: Showing that he cannot be the Leader of the Opposition.

**THE HONORARY MINISTER**: Consequently, we do not know what the real intentions of the House are.

Hon. R. G. Moore: You have the amendments which have been carried.

**THE HONORARY MINISTER**: This Bill has not yet been amended.

Hon. R. G. Moore: I refer to the assessment Bill.

**THE HONORARY MINISTER**: There are amendments on the Notice Paper dealing with the rate of tax. The House should indicate to the Government what its intentions are. When speaking on the previous Bill I pointed out that unless these measures were passed with very little delay the Government would incur a serious loss, which they could not make up during this financial year without resorting to other forms of taxation.

Hon. G. W. Miles: Why are the Government delaying the assessment Bill?



The HONORARY MINISTER: I am trying to point that out, if the hon. member will only listen. The delay that is taking place means that the Government are losing approximately £30,000 a month. Unless that money is made up by this measure or some other we shall finish the financial year so much worse off than was anticipated. Then I suppose members of this Chamber will declare that the Government told the country that they could conduct the affairs of State with a deficit of only £750,000, but that it had reached a million pounds or some other sum. An attempt will certainly be made to blame the Government.

Hon. G. W. Miles: The Government will be responsible.

The HONORARY MINISTER: This House will have to take its share of the responsibility.

Hon. G. W. Miles: We did not put the assessment Bill at the bottom of the Notice Paper in another place.

The HONORARY MINISTER: Mr. Miles, who is having so much to say, has argued on numerous occasions that this and other Governments should balance their Budgets.

Hon. G. W. Miles: Certainly.

The HONORARY MINISTER: They should take every step to see that the Budget is balanced. Other members, including Mr. Mann, have suggested that this tax will bring in something more than is needed.

Hon. G. W. Miles: I did not say so.

Hon. W. J. Mann: I said, more than you stated it would bring in.

The HONORARY MINISTER: More than is necessary. The Premier has already given an undertaking, as members are aware, that he will keep his deficit within £750,000 for this financial year. If the Government have the good luck to get in £100,000 from this tax more than has been estimated, the only effect that would have would be to reduce the deficit.

Hon. H. Seddon: Will the Government undertake to reduce their deficit by that amount?

The HONORARY MINISTER: Members will probably find that will be the position.

Hon. J. Cornell: If they have it by the end of the year.

The HONORARY MINISTER: Returns from taxation are most difficult to compute. There is nothing of a concrete character on

which to base an estimate. We have done the best we can, and accepted the advice of the Commissioner of Taxation. When he advises the Government that in order to raise this particular amount of money it is necessary, in accordance with the exemptions we desire, that the rate of tax should be as set out in the Bill, we have no right to doubt the position. It may be that more, or less, money will be received than was estimated. It is only an estimate, and we have done our best with the position as we see it. During the recent elections, certain promises were made. The Premier delivered his policy speech in Perth and on the gold-fields. He undertook to do certain things if returned to power, and he and the members of his Government are endeavouring to do them notwithstanding the statements made by Mr. Mann.

Hon. W. J. Mann: You are taking a long time about it.

The HONORARY MINISTER: He did not undertake to do all these things within six months. No Government could do that. When Mr. Mann says, with his tongue in his cheek, that this argument will do for his purpose—

Hon. W. J. Mann: I said no such thing.

The HONORARY MINISTER: The hon. member did. He said it suited his purpose to use this argument.

Hon. W. J. Mann: I take exception to that statement. I did not say it suited my purpose. I said it was to illustrate what I was endeavouring to point out, not to suit my purpose. The Honorary Minister should withdraw what he said.

The PRESIDENT: I am certain the Honorary Minister will accept Mr. Mann's statement.

Hon. W. J. Mann: I also take exception to the Honorary Minister's suggestion that I said these things with my tongue in my cheek. I hope I have not got down to that level.

The PRESIDENT: I am sure the Honorary Minister will withdraw the remark to which Mr. Mann objects.

The HONORARY MINISTER: I will withdraw the statement and will proceed to show that the hon. member was incorrect in the remarks he made.

Hon. W. J. Mann: That is different.

The HONORARY MINISTER: That may satisfy the hon. member. In the statement he made this afternoon Mr. Mann re-

peated allegations, which have been refuted many times during the last few months, and he knows that well. He referred to three months full time employment for the unemployed. He would give the House to understand that the Government promised the unemployed three months work, followed by three months on sustenance. That was his idea of the position.

Hon. W. J. Mann: The general idea.

The HONORARY MINISTER: That statement has been contradicted on many occasions by the Premier, by the Leader of the House, and by every member of Cabinet. We have no wish to retract from anything we said during the elections, and propose to carry out everything we said we would do.

Hon. J. Cornell: You would be hard put to it to explain away a lot of what some of your candidates said.

Hon. W. J. Mann: That was what I was referring to.

The HONORARY MINISTER: I am not talking about what the candidates said. It would be easy to talk about what certain other candidates had said, those who were not associated with the party to which I belong. I object to a wrong construction being placed on the policy of the Labour Party as enunciated by the Premier. It would be the endeavour of the Government, the Premier said, to provide a measure of full-time employment for the unemployed. He suggested as an example that they would be employed for "Say three months on full time work," and then would be stood down for a period on sustenance. Mr. Mann knows it would not be possible to provide full time work for all the unemployed at the one time. If that were so, under the scheme which has already been enunciated by the Minister for Employment, we would have all the men employed for one month, and none of them employed for the next month. The scheme is in operation, notwithstanding Mr. Mann's statement to the contrary. Even if his statement were correct, that the Government had stated it would find three months full time work for the unemployed, followed by three months on sustenance, I would point out there are many unemployed on a better wicket than that, even when compared with that which Mr. Mann read this afternoon. That scheme provides for certain classes of men being employed four weeks on full time, and being stood down for three weeks on sustenance. During the

course of a year they would be on full time work for more than 50 per cent. of the period. That is going one better than the so-called promise referred to by Mr. Mann.

Hon. W. J. Mann: It is so-called.

The HONORARY MINISTER: Mr. Mann also made a comparison, which has been made by other members and has also been contradicted. Its incorrectness I will show by stating that Mr. Mann has not taken into consideration an important factor, because it did not suit his purpose to do so. When quoting his figures, he assumed that under the regime of the previous Government, men were employed all the year round. He knows that very few were employed for a lengthy period. The previous Government did the best they could, as they saw the position at the time. They provided work for men for certain periods, but did not pay them in many cases the amount of money they actually earned. The men had to stand down for a period during which they were paid at the rate of their sustenance, plus £1 a week. Large numbers of men had to stand down for extended periods, when they received nothing more than the sustenance to which they were entitled. If we take the whole year, the great majority of these men were a long way worse off than they are to-day. The hon. member suggests we are feeling the criticism. I welcome fair criticism, and am prepared to meet it at any time. I do object to a false impression being created by statements which do not give the whole of the facts. Whether this House proceeds with the discussion on this Bill or not, it will not affect the final position. The delay that has already occurred will be an expensive one for the Government, unless they can bring down some other form of taxation to make up the amount that has been lost. In view of the fact that from every platform in the State during the last elections the policy of the Government on this question was expounded, and that they were returned with a very large majority, consequent upon which they can claim to have a mandate from the people to alter and amend the emergency taxation in the form in which we have it before us, I claim this House is endeavouring to take out of the hands of the Government the right they possess as a result of the last election. As I pointed out, we have amended the assessment Bill, and it is up to us to indicate to the Government just what we propose to do if the Government, for the

sake of argument, agree to the amendments we have already made in that Bill.

Hon. J. Cornell: But we cannot do that.

The HONORARY MINISTER: We can give such an indication to the Government.

Hon. J. Cornell: Not under the Constitution.

The HONORARY MINISTER: We can. We have done it before, and I suppose we will do it again.

Hon. J. Cornell: We have not done this before.

The HONORARY MINISTER: I suggest that instead of arguing round the Bill, as we have been doing—one member or at most two speaking on it during each sitting—it is time we got down to bedrock and gave the Government an indication of our intentions in regard to this measure. I support the second reading of the Bill.

**HON. J. NICHOLSON** (Metropolitan) [5.47]: I am sure hon. members feel with me that the main issue before us has been somewhat side-tracked by the rather heated discussion which has taken place as to the policy enunciated by the present Premier during the recent election campaign. In my opinion, if we direct our attention for a few minutes to the Bill before the House, without considering side matters, we probably shall arrive at a better and wiser understanding of the position. The Bill is one which necessarily is linked up closely with the assessment Bill. In fact, as has been stated, the one measure is dependent upon the other, because without the assessment Bill there would not be authority for the tax Bill. It is a fact that this House in its wisdom—and, I claim, under the authority competent to it—did make certain amendments in the assessment Bill. The measure passed through its various stages here. In Committee it was altered, and recommitted and further amended, being finalised in Committee about the 7th September. It passed the third reading and was returned to another place on the 12th September. The Honorary Minister has told us the Government feel that they have a mandate from the people to bring forward the Bills they have brought forward, but he has not told us what is the main consideration for us as a House of review; namely, that when this Bill was brought before us we as a House of review had not had an opportunity of considering the Annual Estimates and deciding whether we were justified in passing the measure

which has been sought to be passed. From the remarks of the Honorary Minister I felt that somehow or another we as a House of review were being blamed for delaying the passage of the measure.

Hon. G. Fraser: So we are delaying it.

Hon. J. NICHOLSON: I protest against that view most strongly. I declare my desire, as other members have declared theirs, to assist the Government in passing measures as expeditiously as possible. But we desire information. Were we asking anything unreasonable when we sought for information? If the Estimates had been before us and we had known exactly what the Government's commitments were, we would have been in a better position to judge whether the legislation sought to be imposed by these taxing measures was rightly claimed and was justified. We were working in the dark. We showed our willingness to consider the Bill despite the fact that the Estimates were not before us. We passed the assessment measure on to its third reading stage, but we amended it.

Hon. G. Fraser: Made a new Bill of it!

Hon. J. NICHOLSON: We simply amended it in a way which we thought more beneficial. In doing so we were exercising no more than our rights as a House of review. Had we not exercised those rights, I claim, we would have displayed a lack of appreciation of our position here.

Hon. J. Cornell: We were not denying the money, but the manner in which it was proposed to be raised.

Hon. J. NICHOLSON: Precisely. I do not wish to delay the Government in getting their tax measures through, but I claim that the Government are showing a lack of interest in pushing those measures which it was indicated to us previously were essential for carrying on the government of the country. It has been mentioned that the assessment Bill passed on by us to another place on the 12th September is still lying at practically the bottom of the Notice Paper in that other place. That being the case, it seems to me that the Government are not in such need and in such haste to pass that measure. Otherwise they would undoubtedly have dealt with it as a matter of considerable urgency, and would have indicated to this Chamber whether or not they acceded to the amendments made here.

Hon. G. W. Miles: That is the point.

Hon. J. NICHOLSON: Had they done that, we would have been free to go ahead

with still greater expedition in connection with the passing of the Bill now before the House. I want to impress upon hon. members that we would not be justified in rushing forward the tax Bill until such time as we know what another place intends to do with the assessment Bill.

Hon. G. W. Miles: That is just the point, and the sooner the Government appreciate it the better.

Hon. J. NICHOLSON: I stress this because whilst, as Mr. Cornell has pointed out, we cannot amend the tax Bill, yet we can make suggestions.

Hon. J. Cornell: Within certain limitations.

Hon. J. NICHOLSON: Within the limitations laid down in the Constitution. But what is the good of making suggestions even at this stage unless we know that the amendments embodied in the assessment Bill are such as meet with the approval of another place? If we could arrive at some understanding on that point, we would know exactly where we stood, as we can only make in the tax Bill such amendments as are consistent with those we have made in the assessment Bill. Mr. Baxter has given notice of certain amendments in the present tax Bill. That hon. member has been alluded to as Leader of the Opposition in this Chamber. I do not know of any Leader of the Opposition here, and I disclaim that I am an adherent of any Opposition. I am here to consider the welfare of the State, just as I hope every other member of this Chamber is.

Hon. J. Cornell: The hon. member is sometimes the sole Opposition.

Hon. J. NICHOLSON: I sometimes speak in opposition to measures, but merely speaking against a Bill does not create one either a Leader or a member of an Opposition. The opposition sometimes expressed here to Bills might even be regarded by the Government as beneficial to them. They might recognise some wisdom in the opposition to measures brought here. I have stated that some amendments in this Bill have been suggested by Mr. Baxter. The other House, we are told, is waiting for the Bill. With the assessment Bill before another place, hon. members there have a fairly good indication of our attitude towards the present measure, especially in view of the remarks made by so many members of this Chamber on the tax Bill. Personally, when I spoke on the assessment Bill, I indicated that I preferred

to keep the Bill in its original form, namely as proposing a flat rate. However, the House in Committee decided on the graduated tax. That principle was maintained, following exactly on the lines of what the Government themselves introduced, namely a graduated tax; but it was sought in another place to reduce the amounts. Mr. Baxter's amendments aim at keeping the taxing Bill as far as possible in line with the amendments made here in the assessment Bill. Those amendments, and the views expressed by hon. members, should be sufficient indication to enable the Government to appreciate the exact position. The Government should also appreciate this highly important fact, that if we did consider the tax Bill now, pass it through Committee and let it go back to another place, our opportunity of making amendments which would make this Bill harmonise with the assessment Bill would be gone for ever. It would never do, I claim, to pass the tax Bill at this stage until we know what is to be done with the amendments made by us in the assessment Bill. If the Government accept those amendments—

Hon. J. Cornell: Then they would have to withdraw this Bill.

Hon. J. NICHOLSON: I, at least, would be only too glad to give every assistance in my power to put the measure through. But I feel that we would place ourselves in an entirely wrong position, and would be doing an injustice to the people of Western Australia, were we to pass the tax Bill at the present time. There is only one course to be taken, and that is to let reason and wisdom animate everyone concerned. I believe that such reason and wisdom dwell at least to a large extent here. There is no spirit of animosity towards the Government in this Chamber at all. Members are desirous of helping the Government, and I hope Ministers will realise that whatever comments have been made during the debate on the tax Bill, have not been uttered in a spirit of hostility or opposition to the Government in carrying through their taxation proposals. The Government themselves are largely to blame for the position because of the introduction of the emergency taxation Bills before the Estimates were submitted. At the same time, I think members are anxious to give ready assistance to the Government in the difficulties they are bound

to experience in collecting taxation in these days. I have no wish to block the Government in any way, and I hope it may be possible as the result of more expedition on the part of members in another place in dealing with the assessment Bill, to reach a stage that will enable us to make rapid progress with the tax Bill. At the present stage, I prefer to see the consideration of the tax Bill further adjourned until the assessment Bill is dealt with in the Assembly.

**Hon. V. HAMERSLEY** (East) [6.3]: I move—

That the debate be adjourned.

Motion put, and a division taken with the following result:—

Ayes	..	..	..	..	13
Noes	..	..	..	..	6
					—
Majority for	..	..	..	..	7
					—

**AYES.**

Hon. C. F. Baxter		Hon. J. Nicholson
Hon. J. Cornell		Hon. E. Rose
Hon. J. T. Franklin		Hon. A. Thomson
Hon. V. Hamersley		Hon. Sir E. Wittenoom
Hon. W. J. Mann		Hon. H. J. Yelland
Hon. G. W. Miles		Hon. H. Seddon
Hon. R. G. Moore		(Teller.)

**NOES.**

Hon. A. M. Clydesdale		Hon. W. H. Kitchin
Hon. J. M. Drew		Hon. C. B. Williams
Hon. E. H. Gray		Hon. G. Fraser
		(Teller.)

Motion thus passed; the debate adjourned.

**BILLS (2)—FIRST READING.**

- 1, Southern Cross Southwards Railway.
  - 2, Tenants, Purchasers and Mortgagees' Relief Act Amendment.
- Received from the Assembly.

**BILL—INDUSTRIES ASSISTANCE ACT CONTINUANCE.**

*Second Reading.*

Debate resumed from the 14th September.

**Hon. H. SEDDON** (North-East) [6.9]: The Bill comes up every year with never-failing regularity. I notice from the report of the Industries Assistance Board that further losses have been incurred. The gross amount of the loss on last year's operations

is set down as £67,000, the net loss being £31,000. Once more we find that the interest charged against the Industries Assistance Board by the Treasury exceeds the amount the board received from their clients. The Treasury has charged the board with interest amounting to £105,000 and the clients have been charged, roughly, £82,000, showing a loss of interest of £23,000. As long as the Act is continued, so long may we expect to incur these losses, thus adding to those that have been recorded since the inception of the institution.

**Hon. H. J. Yelland**: If the Act were not continued, the losses would be transferred to the Agricultural Bank.

**Hon. H. SEDDON**: Quite so. This is one of the institutions responsible for showing losses every year, and yet we continue its operations. The accumulated loss of the Industries Assistance Board amounts to £873,000 to date.

**Hon. J. Nicholson**: If that amount were forthcoming, it would go a long way towards reducing the deficit.

**Hon. H. SEDDON**: That is so, but I do not think there is much chance of that being accomplished. Some of the clients have been carried by the Industries Assistance Board for the past ten or more years, and it is time their position was revised. I notice that the operations of the board have been extended to cover certain settlers in the Southern Cross area. Those men were placed on the land in that district after they had been taken out of the mines at Kalgoorlie, in which they had become dusted. The conditions under which they were settled on their farms were most generous and considerate. Largely as a result of the depression, and from crop failure, the settlers have had to be taken over by the Industries Assistance Board. I am afraid we shall have to continue facing losses in connection with their operations because, unfortunately, the health of many of the men is still adversely affected. Many of them are becoming incapacitated for hard work. There is one phase of the operations of the Industries Assistance Board that I must confess is not very fair. I refer to the handling of the proceeds by the board. Very often the country storekeeper suffers in the process. In many instances, the storekeepers have advanced a certain amount of credit to the farmers, only to find that they were unable to collect their dues. That has placed many

of the storekeepers in an awkward position. That is indeed a hardship to them, although it is very often to those storekeepers that the settlers look for assistance in their farming operations. Unfortunately there seems to be no opportunity of discontinuing the operations of the Industries Assistance Act. If we were to attempt to do that, it might result in greater losses being sustained by the State, whereas there is a chance of saving something by the continuation of the operations of the board, although, at the same time, we incur additional losses each year. In the circumstances, I have no option but to support the second reading of the Bill.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

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

*In Committee.*

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

#### **BILL — MORTGAGEES' RIGHTS RESTRICTION ACT CONTINUANCE.**

*Second Reading.*

Order of the Day read for the resumption from the 14th September of the debate on the second reading.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

*In Committee.*

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

#### **BILL—REDUCTION OF RENTS ACT CONTINUANCE.**

*Second Reading.*

Debate resumed from the 14th September.

**Hon. V. HAMERSLEY** (East) [7.34]: This is part of the emergency legislation comprising the scheme entered into with the other States. Probably many people are sheltering under this legislation, which is somewhat of a stumbling block to some landlords who find it difficult to deal with their

tenants. On the whole, though, I suppose it is necessary to continue the Act somewhat longer, at any rate until conditions generally improve. I believe there has been a remarkable improvement—gold production and prices show an improvement and the increased wool prices are encouraging. We can hope to find ourselves speedily out of the rut and look forward to the time when legislation of this kind may be allowed to lapse, probably at the end of the next 12 months.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

*In Committee.*

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

#### **BILL—MINE WORKERS' RELIEF ACT AMENDMENT.**

*Second Reading.*

Debate resumed from the 13th September.

**Hon. J. CORNELL** (South) [7.37]: I shall concern myself with only one aspect of the Bill, and it occurred to me that the Bill might be referred to a select committee to consider that aspect. There is no legal right involved, but there is a great moral right and obligation. The parent Act was stretched to include men employed in the mining industry at the time of and for a considerable period previous to the passing of the Act. It has been found that the intention of the framers was not fully met, and that is the reason for the inclusion of a new type of contributor and beneficiary. The facts are known. Following upon an early medical examination of the miners of the Kalgoorlie and Boulder group, it was found that quite a lot of men were dusted to an appreciable degree, and the opinion of the examining authority was that the men, in their own interests, should leave the industry and embark upon some other venture. The adoption of that course would prolong their lives and would probably, in some instances, allow them to live the allotted span. The opening offered them took the form of an agricultural settlement. It was originally intended to locate the men south of Norseman, where there was a water scheme, constructed at a cost of about £36,000 that was

practically not used. I believe it was on the recommendation of the trustees of the Agricultural Bank that the McPherson Rock project was dropped. The men were located in the Southern Cross district. I wish it to be understood that the men for whom I am speaking are not confined to those in the Southern Cross settlement, but include others. Let us consider the history of why and how those men came to be in the miners' settlement at Southern Cross. At the instigation of the present Minister for Lands, one of the trustees of the Agricultural Bank went to Boulder and addressed the men, pointing out on behalf of the Government the inadvisability of their continuing in the mining industry, and urging them that, if they established themselves on the land, they would receive special consideration and assistance. There was no statute providing that, if they did so, they should leave the industry for good and all. When a man is suffering from miners' phthisis and has to leave the industry, he should quit it for good. They received special consideration not extended to other settlers. They were paid 30s. per acre for clearing the land if they did it themselves, or 5s. more than was paid to the ordinary settler. They received £250 to build a house, or £200 more than was advanced to the ordinary settler. They obtained advances up to £2,000, which is £500 more than an ordinary settler receives. It was practically a condition precedent that, when the men left the mines to embark on this venture, they left with the full intention of quitting the industry for good. What has actually happened? About half a dozen men fulfilled the moral obligation by quitting the mines for good, but the majority of the men did not do so. Not being tubercular, and being employed in the industry when the Miners' Phthisis Act was proclaimed and the laboratory examinations were instituted, they were not excluded from working in the mines, and being within the law, they became eligible for compensation for themselves and their dependants for 25 years afterwards. Mr. Williams can bear out my statement that many of them went back to the mines. Two Governments are concerned in this matter—the first Collier Government and the Mitchell Government. The men were known to be dusted and had no right to return to the mines. However, there is a bond of sympathy between miners. The

underground foremen engaged them for work for a week, a fortnight or a month, and thus they kept within the four corners of the Act, seeing that at no stage had they become tubercular. The half dozen to whom I referred did not do anything like that. They remained on their holdings and worked there. Others who did not go so far, we find are entitled to benefit under the Mine Workers' Relief Act. Unfortunately, the man who contracted tuberculosis, superimposed on miners' phthisis, cannot come under the old Miners' Phthisis Act. This House has always been sympathetic and I desire to ask that if it is possible, the Honorary Minister should consult with the Minister for Mines in the hope of bringing the half a dozen men under the aegis of the old Miners' Phthisis Act. I admit that Consolidated Revenue is carrying a big load and will continue to do so in respect of the miners or their dependants who come under the old Miners' Phthisis Act. In all the circumstances these men have a right to some favourable consideration, because boiled down it meant that had they been suspicious or selfish, they could have gone back.

Hon. G. W. Miles: Were they entitled to go back?

Hon. J. CORNELL: Yes, but they did not go back and when they left the mines, they left for good. Now they find themselves victims of circumstances and ineligible for consideration under either statute. Strange to say, there is an irony associated with the matter, since few of the men of whom I speak who would have come within the category, have died as the result of tuberculosis super-imposing on miners' phthisis. I hope the Minister will delay the passage of the Bill for a short period until the wishes of the Minister for Mines can be ascertained. I am satisfied that it was Mr. Scaddan's intention to draft a Bill to give the utmost consideration to all phases of the disease. I am aware that there is no one more sympathetic towards the tubercular miner than the present Minister for Mines, and I am satisfied that he will try to find a way out.

Hon. J. Nicholson: Was not the object of the Bill to cover those men?

Hon. J. CORNELL: I believe there will always be hard cases in heaven; this is certainly one of them. I have no wish to be drawn into a controversy respecting equally

hard cases. I will admit that probably there are 100 or 200 men in the State who in a sense could come within the category of the men on the Southern Cross miners' settlement. There is, however, a difference. One lot of men at Southern Cross were persuaded to leave the mining industry to embark on another venture with which I never agreed, because it was a strong man's job; but the other men, without inducement, quitted the mining industry for good. All I ask is that those men should receive proper consideration.

On motion by Hon. C. B. Williams, debate adjourned.

*House adjourned at 7.52 p.m.*

## Legislative Assembly,

*Tuesday, 19th September, 1933.*

	PAGE
Questions: 1, Unemployed single men; 2, Reconditioning abandoned farms ... ..	942
Railways, oil haulage ... ..	942
Secession: Joint Select Committee, report presented	943
Assent to Bills ... ..	943
Annual Estimates, Treasurer's Financial Statement ...	943
Bills: Southern Cross Southwards Railway, 3R. ...	943
Tenants, Purchasers, and Mortgagees' Relief Act Amendment, 3R. ... ..	943
Fire Brigades Act Amendment, 2R. ... ..	971
Government Tramways Act Amendment, 2R., Com. report ... ..	972
Fruit Cases Act Amendment, 2R. ... ..	972
Police Act Amendment, Com. ... ..	973
Goldfields Allotments Revestment, 2R., Com. report ... ..	976

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

### QUESTIONS (2)—UNEMPLOYED SINGLE MEN.

#### *As to Policy.*

Mr. DONEY asked the Minister for Employment: What is the policy of the Government in regard to the relief of unemployed single men in country districts?

The MINISTER FOR EMPLOYMENT replied: The policy of the Government is, wherever possible, to provide work for them, first attention being given to those in most need.

#### *Reconditioning Abandoned Farms.*

Mr. DONEY asked the Minister for Employment: Will he consider the placing of unemployed single men in the wheat belt districts at the work of reconditioning improvements on abandoned Agricultural Bank farms in those districts, in the same way as is now being done in the South-West on abandoned group holdings—such work to be distinct from the care-taking duties now allotted to married men?

The MINISTER FOR EMPLOYMENT replied: Where results would justify such expenditure, consideration will be given to the adoption of this principle.

### QUESTION—RAILWAYS, OIL HAULAGE.

Mr. NORTH asked the Minister for Railways: 1, What is the charge made by the Railway Department for hauling—(a) rail tank cars, (b) trucks carrying oil in drums, from the oil companies' sidings to the main line? 2, What are the distances of such haulage?

The MINISTER FOR RAILWAYS replied: 1, (a) and (b) Usual charge 2s. and 4s. per four-wheeled and eight-wheeled truck respectively, the distance being under one mile. Exceptions and distance: Mullewa—double the usual charge; tanks placed on loco. road (double shunt necessary); under one mile. Geraldton—Shell Co.; Wiluna G.M. Co.—2s. and 4s., minimum 10s.; about two miles. Geraldton—Wiluna G.M. Co. siding to municipal council siding; 2s. per ton, less 10 per cent., minimum 20 tons, plus 4s. per bogie; about two miles. Geraldton—Wiluna G.M. Co. siding to Fertiliser Co.'s siding, Bluff Point; 6s. 6d. per ton less 10 per cent., plus 4s. per bogie tank, plus 5s. for empty return; under four miles. Bunbury—tankers delivered to town council through loco. yard; quadruple ordinary charge; under one mile. Northam—Texas Co. siding; can only be shunted by up trains; in addition to ordinary shunting charge, freight Northam to East Northam is collected; under four miles. Southern Cross