

this end or to Esperance. That, however, is a small item. I hope this request on behalf of the turned-down men, who deserve the very best we can give them, will be taken seriously into consideration by the Government and granted. I could growl concerning other matters for another hour, but I do not think at this stage much notice would be taken. I will, therefore, suspend the growling for to-day. I hope all the matters to which I have referred will be seriously considered. I do not think any of them would be difficult of accomplishment, but I assure the House they are all of an urgent nature.

MR. RAPHAEL (Victoria Park) [4.2]: I formally second the motion.

On motion by Hon. C. G. Latham, debate adjourned.

ADJOURNMENT—SPECIAL.

THE PREMIER (Hon. J. C. Willecock—Geraldton) [4.3]: I move—

That the House at its rising adjourn until Tuesday next at 4.30 p.m.

Question put and passed.

House adjourned at 4.1 p.m.

Legislative Council,

Tuesday, 9th August, 1938.

	PAGE
Chairmen (temporary) of Committees	18
Questions: Betting fines	18
Youth employment	18
Motions, Condolence: The late Hon. S. W. Munsie, M.L.A.	18
The late Hon. C. G. Elliott, M.L.C.	20
Address-in-reply, second day	21
Bill: Supply (No. 1) £2,500,000, 1r	31

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

CHAIRMEN (TEMPORARY) OF COMMITTEES.

The PRESIDENT: I desire to announce that in accordance with the Standing Orders

I have appointed the following members to act as temporary Chairmen of Committees during the current session, namely, the Hon. J. Nicholson, the Hon. V. Hamersley and the Hon. G. Fraser.

QUESTION—BETTING, FINES.

Hon. C. F. BAXTER asked the Chief Secretary: 1, Have all fines imposed by the courts since the 1st July, 1933, in connection with starting-price betting been paid? 2, If not, how many convicted persons have defaulted since that date? 3, What is the total amount of fines still unpaid?

The CHIEF SECRETARY replied: 1, No. 2, None, but in ten instances the fines are wholly or partly outstanding. 3, £242 2s. 6d.

QUESTION—YOUTH EMPLOYMENT.

Hon. L. B. BOLTON asked the Chief Secretary: 1, Since the taking over by the Government of the work of placing youths in employment previously carried out by the Boys' Employment League what were—(a) the number of applications received; (b) the number of youths placed in positions in both the metropolitan area and the country; (c) the rates of wages paid? 2, What is, or are, the name or names of the officer or officers allotted to this work, and what other positions, if any, do they fill?

The CHIEF SECRETARY replied: 1, (a) 539. (b) 246 in metropolitan area, 90 in the country. Of the remainder, 178 youths have not re-applied, and presumably have obtained employment, leaving 25 unplaced. (c) Where an industry is covered by an award of the Arbitration Court, the award rate is paid. In cases where there is no award, the wages range from 10s. to 30s. per week. For country work the wages range from 10s. to 30s. per week, plus keep. 2, Mr. J. C. A. Hodgson, an officer of the Department of Employment.

MOTIONS (2)—CONDOLENCE.

The late Hon. S. W. Munsie, M.L.A.

THE CHIEF SECRETARY (Hon. W. H. Kitson—West) [4.45]: I move—

That this House desires to place on record its sincere appreciation of the public services rendered to the State by the late Hon. S. W. Munsie, member for Hannaus in the Legisla-

tive Assembly and Minister for Mines and Health at the time of his death, and to express its deepest sympathy with the members of his family in the irreparable loss they have sustained by his death; and that the President be requested to forward the foregoing resolution to Mrs. Munsie.

Since last session the Government and Parliament have suffered grievously. I refer to the irreparable loss the State has sustained through the death of the late Mr. Munsie. Few who have gone before laboured so unsparringly, or to such effect, in the service of the State and their fellow citizens as the late Minister, whose services extended over a period of something like 25 years. His enthusiasm for the advancement of the State found, I think, its fullest scope in his work as a Minister of the Crown, and while today we can appreciate the results of his wise and capable administration, I suggest that the full worth of his labours will not be truly assessed until the years to come. As with many other efforts on the part of public men, it is often very difficult indeed to assess at its true value the work carried out at the time it is performed. Only long afterwards is that possible, and I think this applies to the work of Mr. Munsie particularly. My statement will be endorsed by anyone having an appreciation of the work that that gentleman accomplished. Mr. Munsie came to this State as a young man and first of all found employment on the Eastern Goldfields as a miner. There he laid the foundations of his public career as an active worker in trade union circles, achieving distinction both as general president of the Federal Miners' Union and as president of the Eastern Goldfields District Council of the Australian Labour Party, to which party he had belonged practically the whole of his life. In 1911 he first entered Parliament as member for Hannans, and 13 years later he was entrusted, as an Honorary Minister, with the administration of the Health Department. It was peculiarly fitting that the health services of this State should have been the first to engage his talents for administration, because I believe—and I think every person who knew him will agree with me—that his strong humanitarian ideals bent his interests with particular enthusiasm towards endeavours to better the lot of the sick and needy. His vision and determination as Minister for Health are perpetuated in improved health services throughout the State. In 1927 Mr. Munsie was raised to full Cabinet rank, with

the portfolios of Health and Mines. As Minister for Mines, Mr. Munsie was tireless in his advocacy of the State's gold mining areas, and as a result of his efforts and encouragement, with, of course, the assistance of others, many hundreds of men found employment at a time when our economic life was at a low ebb. I think it can truthfully be said of him that he had always at heart the welfare of the workers, and his determination to effect necessary reforms in that direction found expression in both administrative and legislative actions from time to time. He endeared himself to all sections of the community, and while his passing represents a great loss to the public life of this State, his loss is felt most keenly by his bereaved family. We sympathise with them in their sorrow.

HON. C. F. BAXTER (East) [4.51]: I desire to support the remarks of the Chief Secretary. The passing of Mr. Munsie was a severe blow to the Government. Mr. Munsie, in his capacity as Minister for Health and Minister for Mines, was untiring in his efforts to further the interests of the State. To the Mines Department he brought a strong feeling of confidence, and assisted greatly in encouraging the progress that was experienced during his period of administration. After all the Minister for Mines can give encouragement and assistance to the industry in many ways, and the late hon. gentleman never wearied of doing it. Although Mr. Munsie was not of robust constitution, he sacrificed himself in his administration of the Health Department. In fact, he never studied himself. Many a long trip I have made with him through the country districts in furtherance of his efforts to provide succour for the suffering. There are many country districts that will always revere the name of the Hon. S. W. Munsie for his work in the interests of those districts. Great as has been the loss to the State generally, it is but a small loss compared with that sustained by his widow and family. Mr. Munsie was a model husband and the family had every reason to appreciate his wonderful qualities as husband and father. Unfortunately, such losses will occur, but every member, I am sure, realises the severity of the loss occasioned by the death of our friend.

HON. A. THOMSON (South-East) [4.53]: As one who had close association with the late Mr. Munsie, I desire to support the motion of condolence moved by the Chief Secretary. It is fitting that we should place on record our sense of the high esteem in which we regard his services to Western Australia. His death certainly came as a great blow to his friends and was no less a distinct loss to the State. As one who has been associated with the Country Party since 1914, I consider the late Mr. Munsie was one of the most sympathetic Ministers that ever administered the Health Department. Speaking from the point of view of country residents, I can say that he gave us all possible assistance and met our requests most sympathetically. I think it can truthfully be said of Mr. Munsie, as of many other public men, that he gave of his best to the State. I am pleased that this House is about to place on record the services of a man whom, though we were opposed to him in politics, we can appreciate for honesty and integrity in his service to the State.

HON. J. NICHOLSON (Metropolitan) [4.55]: It is only fitting that tribute should be paid on this, the first occasion after the opening of the session, to the memory of one who has played such an important part in the affairs of this State. No Minister could have been more untiring or earnest in his devotion to duty than was the late Mr. Munsie. I sincerely endorse all the remarks that have been made concerning him. The record of his work, I believe, will always stand as a great monument to a good and honourable man.

HON. E. H. ANGELO (North) [4.56]: As one who had the privilege of sitting in the same House as the late Minister for nearly 16 years, I should like to add a few words in support of the motion. Mr. Munsie was one of the keenest Parliamentarians that ever occupied a seat in the Lower House. He was highly respected and was implicitly trusted by members on both sides of the Chamber. The State has lost an able Minister of the Crown and members, one and all, have lost a staunch friend. I sincerely regret the necessity for the motion, but I endorse every word that has been uttered in support of it.

THE PRESIDENT [4.57]: I, too, had a very long association with the late Mr. Munsie. He and I spent a great part of our lives on the Eastern Goldfields. We were associated before he became a member of Parliament, and I well remember how interested he then was in public affairs. When he was first elected to Parliament, more than a quarter of a century ago, he set himself earnestly to work to fit himself for his duties as a legislator and an administrator. How well he succeeded in that undertaking is reflected in the record of his public career. I knew him well; I always respected him; I always entertained a high opinion of his personal integrity, and I always appreciated that the object of his life was to do his utmost for the betterment of his fellows. We could have hoped that he might be spared for many more years to carry on the work in which he was engaged. However, it has been otherwise decreed, and the public life of this State is consequently the poorer. I ask hon. members to indicate their approval of the motion by rising in their places.

Question passed, members standing.

The late Hon. C. G. Elliott, M.L.C.

THE CHIEF SECRETARY (Hon. W. H. Kitson—West) [5.1]: I also desire to make reference to the demise of one of our fellow members. It is with sincere and deep regret that I recall the passing of Mr. C. G. Elliott mid-way through the recess. This House had the benefit of Mr. Elliott's services for a period of only four years, but during that time we had opportunities to appreciate his worth both as a capable and conscientious member of this House and as a public-spirited citizen. It is well to own that, in matters relating to the goldmining industry, we had the benefit of knowledge gained by the late hon. gentleman in the course of 40 years' practical experience. That knowledge gave a special value to his utterances on legislation affecting his Province. His views were always listened to with the greatest respect. I desire also to recall that for 12 years prior to his election to this Chamber the late hon. member found scope for his energies in other activities for the public good, more especially as a member of the Kalgoorlie Municipal Council. At the time of his death he was also chairman of the Amalgamated Prospectors of Western

Australia. I think we can all bear witness to the great efforts he put forth on behalf of the members of that association, whom he helped to the utmost of his ability. By his passing we have lost a respected colleague, and his constituents an able representative and firm friend. Our deepest sympathy goes out to those who were nearest and dearest to him, and I move—

That this House desires to place on record its sincere appreciation of the public service rendered to the State by the late Hon. C. G. Elliott, who at the time of his death was a member for the North-East Province, and to express its deep sympathy with the members of his family in the irreparable loss they have sustained by his decease; and that the President be requested to forward the foregoing resolution to Mrs. Elliott.

HON. H. SEDDON (North-East) [5.4]: I wish to associate myself with the motion moved by the Chief Secretary. Mr. Elliott was my colleague here for some four years, and during that time he showed himself keenly interested on behalf of the men with whom he had worked and been identified for so long. His close interest in miners' phtthisis and in the provision made for men suffering from their association with the industry was appreciated throughout the Province. Mr. Elliott's death is a distinct loss not only to the North-East Province but also to this House and to the State as a whole.

HON. C. F. BAXTER (East) [5.5]: We had only a few years' experience of Mr. Elliott in this Chamber, but in those few years we learned to know him for his worth. Mr. Elliott was president of the association of prospectors, and he was heart and soul with the wonderful band of men who have done and are doing so much for the State. In season and out of season he was never tired of doing all in his power to relieve the position of the prospectors. Further than that, he was ever ready to help the gold-mining industry, not only by his efforts in this Chamber, but also from the standpoint of those engaged in the industry. That was a highly laudable object. The late hon. gentleman sincerely held strong views; but, after all, he generally made sure of the correctness of his opinions before taking a stand. All those associated with him during the four years he sat in this Chamber listened to him with respect whenever he rose to speak. The loss to the House is a

severe one. While we feel his loss severely, how much more is it felt by those near and dear to him! I add my few words of support in the hope that the passing of the motion may mitigate, even in ever so slight a degree, the sorrow experienced by the late gentleman's widow.

HON. G. B. WOOD (East) [5.7]: I desire to associate myself with the motion. During the whole of the time I have been in the House I sat alongside the late Mr. Elliott, and therefore had opportunities to learn what a sincere man he was. During those four years I learnt a great deal about the mining industry from him. On many occasions he put me right when it was a question of doing something for the industry and especially for the miner, the under dog. I feel that the people of the goldfields have lost a staunch friend in Mr. Elliott.

THE PRESIDENT [5.8]: The late Mr. Elliott was also a lifelong friend of mine. I first met him in the days when he was prospecting, when he was one of the band of men who went out into the bush and opened up the gold-mining industry. He was one of those responsible in that way for rendering a great service to the State of Western Australia and to Australia generally. Only those whose memory goes back to the early days know what an immense benefit to the whole continent resulted from the efforts of men who, at great risk to themselves, and often at the cost of considerable suffering, were able to unearth the golden riches of Western Australia. Mr. Elliott was for four years in this House; and, as Mr. Wood and other hon. members have said, we know what services he rendered here as one who was an authority on questions relating to prospecting and mining generally. We all deplore his loss, which is an especial loss to this Chamber.

Question passed, members standing.

ADDRESS-IN-REPLY.

Second Day.

Debate resumed from the 4th August.

HON. C. F. BAXTER (East) [5.11]: Before dealing with the subject of the Speech I desire to congratulate two members newly elected to this Chamber. Mr. W. R. Hall has already given us a taste of his

quality, and we are sure that he will make a name for himself in the political world of Western Australia. Mr. Dimmitt has yet to break the ice here, but as he is a commercial man of wide experience and high standing I feel sure he will prove an acquisition to the Legislative Council. At the same time, as is only natural, members of the House regret the loss of Mr. Clydesdale. After our association with that gentleman, we all feel his loss. Whilst we bow to the will of the electors, yet we experience sorrow at the breaking of association with fellow-members. Besides myself, the honour of being re-elected unopposed was bestowed by the electors on yourself, Mr. President, Mr. Holmes, Mr. Nicholson, Mr. Piesse and Mr. Moore. It speaks volumes for this Chamber that six out of 10 members seeking re-election were returned unopposed. The fact proves the confidence electors have in their representatives and, generally, in the work of the Legislative Council. Personally I cannot but feel flattered at being returned unopposed for the sixth successive time by the electors of the East Province. The fact is something to be proud of, and I heartily thank the electors of the East Province for bestowing the honour upon me. Sometimes a member who is re-elected unopposed may be told, "It is all very well talking; you had no opposition." However, it must be borne in mind that if a representative were not held in high esteem by the electors of his Province, he would very soon encounter opposition. Therefore it follows that the six members returned unopposed, including myself, have satisfied their constituents to such an extent that they do not desire a change.

As regards the Speech, it is hard to find in it anything either new or important. Its most striking feature is its length. Except for the second paragraph appearing on the fourth page, the Speech contains nothing but what we have heard time and again. That paragraph deals with the emergency tax, and reads—

The continuance of the financial emergency tax is a matter which has received close attention. It is recognised that the form of the tax, while it could be justified during an emergency such as the recent world-wide depression, is not one that can be continued indefinitely without some radical alteration. My Government will submit proposed legislation combining the financial emergency and income taxes, which, while embodying the

system of collection at the source, will provide for the assessment of the tax on the basis of ability to pay.

Personally I have for the last five years advocated amalgamation of those two taxes, but I am made rather fearful by the reference to "some radical alteration." To what extent will that radical alteration go, and in what direction? Again, at the end of the paragraph there is a reference to "ability to pay." It seems as though the measure to be brought forward will contain exemptions up to the limit for certain people and that the bulk of the taxation will be imposed on one small section of the community. However, that will be revealed when the Bill comes forward. Regarding the remainder of the Speech, 28 subjects are dealt with under headings. So far as I can judge they extend from the provision of a five-day working week for the Civil Service to sewerage. One can pass them over, because there is nothing in them. It is the same old thing. We know what it is; something has to be put forward for use when election time comes. That applies also to Item No. 29 in the Speech under the heading "Legislation." Here again we have the same old friends. We are told that we will be asked to give consideration to measures dealing with fair rents, firearms and guns, industrial arbitration, workers' compensation, the Municipal Corporations Act, the Navigation Act, the Land and Income Tax Act, State insurance, superannuation, University buildings (Agricultural College), the Scaffolding Act, a profiteering prevention Act, a Bureau of Economic and Industrial Research, and the Workers' Homes Act. Measures relating to fair rents, industrial arbitration, workers' compensation, the Municipal Corporations Act and State insurance have been presented over and over again. The question arises whether, in bringing forward these subjects, the Government is not merely acceding to wishes expressed first by the Trades Hall council and secondly by what is called the Young Labour League, which stated that industrial Bills would be put up for the Council to defeat, thereby providing material for the next election. In due course these will go into a Blue Book—

Hon. J. Nicholson: That is what is called a little window-dressing.

Hon. C. F. BAXTER: Not a little, but a great deal.

Hon. G. Fraser: You were not game to pass the measures.

Hon. C. F. BAXTER: I do not know what the hon. member means. If he refers to the passing in this House of Bills that would be detrimental to the industries of the State, I tell him that the House is more sensible than to pass such Bills.

Hon. G. Fraser: We never asked you to do that.

Hon. C. F. BAXTER: That is the opinion of the hon. member. One has only to make a review of the Bills concerning industrial arbitration, workers' compensation, factories and shops and fair rents to know whether we have been asked to do anything detrimental.

Hon. G. Fraser: They were very necessary measures.

Hon. C. F. BAXTER: Probably so in the minds of those influenced by party politics, and in the minds of the unsophisticated, but not in the minds of people looking to the future development of the State. I was pleased to hear our new member (Hon. W. R. Hall), in his speech, refer at some length to a fine body of men in this State. I regret that he did not go into the matter even further, because I felt that he knew something of the position. He said, "No prospectors, no mines." How very true! Money comes for the opening up of mines only after the prospector has found gold existing there. But what has that man gone through, that man representative of a body of men? You yourself, Mr. President, know something of those men. I was on the fields for many years and was acquainted with those men, some of whom I financed. I visited the places where they were working, and saw what a wonderful type they were. The average prospector has undergone great hardship and deserves all the encouragement that can be given him. It is to be regretted that in the past so much of the country was locked up in reservations, and that in this way the prospector was retarded in his endeavours to locate fresh gold. I observe there has been a diminution of reservations. The size of some has been reduced and some should be reduced even more.

As regards the treatment of prospectors generally, a scheme has been in existence for several years. The scheme was inaugurated in 1931 or 1932, to aid people to prospect.

A small amount of 15s. per week was granted by the Government to assist such men. Quite recently the Government has been good enough to increase the amount to £1 a week, but considering the value of the prospector and in view of the enormous amount of wealth that he brings to the State out of seemingly unproductive country, the amount could well be increased. The prospecting scheme is worthy of support. It was initiated during the time of the Mitchell-Latham administration when the Government hardly knew where to look for a penny with which to carry on. The Government was impoverished; but that was the time when money was found for this scheme—a scheme that has been given wonderful encouragement by the present Government, and could be given more encouragement by an increase in the small amount allotted to prospectors up to, say, 25s.

Hon. G. Fraser: You are window-dressing now.

Hon. C. F. BAXTER: That is not window-dressing. I have been a supporter of the prospector and have found money for him. I realise what the prospector means to Western Australia. Where would we, in this State, have been in the last few years had it not been for the goldmining industry?

I know that the Government recently has done a little more for prospectors by its decision to pay the extra 4s. 11½d. on the cyanidation of gold, making the total £4 4s. 11½d. Yet I do not say I appreciate that as being a very generous gesture, because for some time that has been money belonging to the prospectors but withheld from them. It is money that should have been paid to them long ago—and not only that, but the premium on it as well. Every bit of money is highly important to the prospector; merely a few shillings a week makes a difference to him. Of the cyanidation scheme to which I have referred, let us take a wide view and see how the prospector fares. First of all, there is allowed 90 per cent. of the ore crushed. Then on extraction there is a 25 per cent. deduction. In the third place a premium of 2 dwts. 8 grains is charged. Those are the charges under the cyanidation process. By nearly all Government plants ore is purchased by measurement at the rate of 22 cubic feet per ton, and I have no doubt that the people at the bat-

tery see that they are well protected. The assays are made and the tailings paid over by weight. Figures will bear out that the department has no difficulty in making a profit of 10 per cent. As regards the second point—the deduction of 25 per cent. for extraction—there is much room for criticism, especially when a comparison is made with private mines. In this connection it must be remembered that the department reserves the right to reject any ore of a refractory nature or such ore as is not amenable to cyanidation. In my opinion, the commercial plant that could not get better results than those I mentioned would have to do one of two things—either change its methods or its management; or both.

The treatment charge of 2 dwts. 8 grains was arrived at by a specious process of reasoning that is hard to follow. Originally a charge of 10s. 6d. per ton was made, but owing to the decline in the value of gold the charge was reduced to 7s. per ton. That price applied until 1929 when the then Minister for Mines, the late Hon. S. W. Munsie, altered it to the present charge of 2 dwts. 8 grains. With the rise in the price of gold, prospectors were told that that amount equalled 7s. This was arrived at by allowing £4 per ounce and 75 per cent. extraction, thus permitting the department to collect the premium on 4s. 4½d. as well as the 2 dwts. 8 grains and more than doubling the price considered fair a few years before.

Hon. H. Seddon: Allowance has to be made for gold not up to standard.

Hon. C. F. BAXTER: That is allowed for, too. Bearing that in mind, it has to be realised that the cost at privately-owned mines is only 7s. On the basis of present gold values, the charge of 2 dwts. 8 grains works out, with the cost of cyanidation, at 22s. per ton. With 10s. 6d. for crushing added, the total is 32s. 6d. per ton. That seems very costly. It makes one wonder what is the matter with the State Batteries. At Wiluna the cost is only 19s. per ton. To show exactly how this works out with the tailings, I have two sets of records revealing the tremendous profits made by the State Batteries. First I will give particulars of payments for tailings and returns from Halley's Comet Mine supplied by the State Battery for three crushings at Marble

Bar State Battery. The particulars are as follows:—

Crushing No. 772: June, 1936.

Plate yield 2 ozs. 8 dwts. 9 grains per ton.	
Tons treated, 71½; tailings allowed 6¼ tons.	
Assay, 88 dwts. 14 grains per ton.	
First payment	£831 4 8
Premium	£899 4 7
Total	£1,730 9 3

Crushing No. 789: August, 1936.

Plate gold 3 ozs. 15 dwts. 18 grains per ton.	
71 tons crushed; 64 tons allowed.	
Assay, 88 dwts. 20 grains per ton.	
First payment	£830 8 0
Premium	£993 15 2
Total	£1,724 3 2

Crushing No. 830: November, 1936.

260 tons crushed, 234 tons allowed, assay 117 dwts. 2 grs. per ton.	
First payment	£4,027 14 6
Premium	£4,332 12 6
Total	£8,360 7 0

That is what was paid to the prospector. The following table shows the total gold content of all tailings from crushings at Halley's Comet Mine:—

No. 772.

71½ tons, assaying 88 dwts. 14 grs. = 316 ozs. 13 dwts. 17 grs. at £4 4s. 11d. per ton ..	£	£
Premium at 107 per cent. ..	1,413	
		2,758

No. 789.

71 tons, assaying 88 dwts. 20 grs. = 315 ozs., at £4 4s. 11d. per oz. ..	1,339
Premium at 107 per cent. ..	1,431
	2,770

No. 830.

260 tons crushed, assay 117 dwts. 2 grs. = 1,522 ozs., at £4 4s. 11d. per oz. ..	6,456
Premium at 107 per cent. ..	6,908
	13,424
Total value of 402½ tons	18,952
Total payments by State Battery ..	11,813
Total deductions	£7,137

Hon. G. Fraser: Do you think that is a fair example to take?

Hon. C. F. BAXTER: Halley's Comet mine is very rich, but the figures will serve to show the extent to which deductions can be made. The figures I am now about to quote will make members wonder why the

State Batteries are not showing a better result; something must be wrong. The profits for the years 1932 to 1937 are as follows:—

	£	s.	d.
1937	9,202	6	3
1936	16,481	15	2
1935	9,911	14	5
1934	14,912	14	1
1933	29,375	10	7
1932	14,155	0	0
Total	£94,039	1	3

The total profit for the six years was £94,039 1s. 8d., but I am informed that no allowance was made for depreciation of plant and machinery, or for sinking fund. Where do the profits disappear? That is what puzzles me.

Hon. G. Fraser: Have you a record of the working costs?

Hon. C. F. BAXTER: No. I have not gone into that matter. To do so, would take up too much of the time of the House.

On the 28th April last the regulations made under the Native Administration Act were gazetted. The question of native administration is a burning one not only in this State, but throughout the whole of Australia. Each State seems to be in a quandary about the handling of natives. Well-meaning persons in all walks of life are concerned about the matter. They bring forward various schemes for the welfare of the natives, but more frequently complaints about the way in which the natives are treated. The more the native is looked after, the quicker is he going to disappear. We are interfering with the natural way in which he lives. It amuses me to hear people who know nothing at all about natives and who have never associated with them, expressing their opinion as to what should and should not be done. Parliament has recently passed an Act giving very stringent powers to the department controlling native administration. While I admit that the department has a very hard row to hoe at times, especially when interfered with by outside organisations, the officials are, by the gazettal of the regulations on the 29th April last, seeking to get more power than either Parliament intended they should have or than is good for the natives or the State. My intention is not to deal with all the regulations, but I shall refer to some of them

to show members the extent to which the department wishes to go. Regulation 39 provides—

All letters to and from the inmates of an institution shall pass through the hands of the superintendent or manager, who may in his discretion withhold them from transmission or return them to the writers.

Under the Act, "institution" means any mission, reformatory, or other institution for the benefit and protection of the native. I question whether that regulation will assist the native, but other regulations are even more severe. Paragraph (b) of Regulation 81 provides—

In all cases bedding, and mosquito nets and ground sheets, as required, shall be provided to the satisfaction of the Commissioner.

Where shall we finish? The native must now have a mosquito net. Very few white people in this State have mosquito nets. Mosquito nets are used in countries like India and Africa where the risk of malaria is bad.

The Chief Secretary: Are there not mosquitoes in the North-West?

Hon. C. F. BAXTER: I have visited the North-West much more frequently than has the Chief Secretary, and I have never used mosquito nets there. The regulation is ridiculous, especially when members bear in mind that Regulation 36 makes no reference to mosquito nets. Regulation 83 provides—

Wherever a general permit to employ natives is held by an employer, such employer shall keep and make available a sufficient supply of first-aid and medical necessities to the satisfaction of the Commissioner. . . .

I shall not read the whole of the regulation, but, among other things, it provides that where the number of natives employed exceeds six, the employer shall provide, free of charge, a hypodermic syringe, with hypodermic tablets, for example, morphia and strychnine. Is it right that morphia and strychnine should be provided by an employer of natives? What right has the Department of Native Affairs to authorise the use of morphia? How is the employer to obtain the morphia? I am not quite sure, but I understand that under the Police Act morphia cannot be supplied except in small quantities and then only on a prescription from a doctor. Such a prescription is good only for the particular supply at the time; no person could obtain a further supply of

the drug on the same prescription. Very great care is exercised, as, indeed, it should be, in the supply of those drugs. I cannot understand the department's reason for this regulation; apparently, a mistake has been made somewhere. The regulations will apply to all natives in the State, both in the south and in the north. That fact must be borne in mind by members. Regulation 85 provides—

The Commissioner may direct that the wages or part of the wages of any native shall be paid to him in trust for such native, in any manner he may think fit, and the wages shall be paid by the employer accordingly.

The native will not work unless he is paid wages. Natives have been in the habit of getting their wages, and it seems to me the Commissioner is going too far in arrogating to himself the right to demand that the natives' wages shall be paid to him. The native looks to his employer for his wages, and if he does not get them, he will not work. There are certainly some powers that the Commissioner should have, but this particular power seems to me to be ridiculous. Regulation 94 provides—

... the receipt of such wage shall be acknowledged in writing by the employee ...

I do not know how many natives can acknowledge the receipt of money in writing. One would think all our natives were educated; whether it is unfortunate or not, education does not seem to improve many of them. Regulation 96 provides—

... the employer shall obtain the receipt of the employee for any stores or goods ...

The same point arises here; how can an employer get a receipt in writing from a native who cannot write? The regulations need very careful revision. From the glance I have had at them—it has been but a glance—some of them certainly will have to be disallowed, because otherwise there will be interference with the natives in their employment.

I come to something now that is not of a very pleasant nature. On the morning of the 17th June, I noticed the following paragraph in the "West Australian" of that date, under the heading of "Labour Council. Crown Solicitor Congratulated."

At a meeting of the Metropolitan Council of the Australian Labour Party last night, a motion of congratulation to Mr. E. A. Dunphy on his recent appointment as Crown

Solicitor was carried. It was decided to refer to the officers of the council the question of making a suitable presentation to Mr. Dunphy in appreciation of his legal work on behalf of unionists. Mr. Dunphy was a vice-president of the council and a delegate to the State Executive of the party.

That report recalled to my mind an appointment of which I had not taken particular notice before. It made me wonder what was at the back of the appointment. I do not know Mr. Dunphy. He may be, and probably is, a very capable young man. He is only a young man; I understand his age is given as 32 years. There is no personal feeling on my part: as members know, I do not display feeling in political matters, especially political appointments, which this one appears to be.

The Chief Secretary interjected.

Hon. C. F. BAXTER: I may tell the Chief Secretary that I never indulge in personalities, although at times I may express myself very warmly. The reading of that report brought back to my mind the fact that during the last five years numerous political appointments have been made by the Government and the appointees have been supporters of the Government's political party. That made me look further into this present appointment than I would otherwise have done. Mr. Dunphy's appointment may be quite all right; he may be very suited to the position. It is a high position. The Crown Solicitor should be a person of great ability and much experience, because he is called upon to do much drafting for Parliament. The nature of that work is such that it requires a man of great ability and experience to do it.

The Chief Secretary: Mr. Dunphy has it.

Hon. C. F. BAXTER: I am glad to hear it, and I hope the statement can be substantiated. The Crown Law Department must be regarded as one of the most important of Government departments. I would like to know what experience Mr. Dunphy has. Is he experienced in parliamentary drafting work, with which he will be faced? What are his recommendations? Who were the other applicants for the position? Did the Public Service Commissioner recommend Mr. Dunphy for the position? Did the Under Secretary for Law, Mr. Gordon, recommend him? Was he recommended by anyone or was the appointment a political one made by the Government? I should like to quote

from the Minister's bible, the "Worker," dated the 29th July last. There appears in it a report of a presentation to Mr. Dunphy made by the Labour Council and other friends at the Trades Hall, and in the report this appears—

Mr. P. J. Mooney said he regretted that Mr. Dunphy's services would no longer be available to the unions. His advice had always been sound and the Labour Movement had never had a better friend. Mr. Dunphy had followed in the footsteps of his father who had at all times been willing to assist unions in their difficulties. Ted Dunphy was a Labourite of whom they could be proud, and he for one regretted that because of his promotion, his great knowledge of industrial law would not in future be available as it had been in the past. However, Labour's loss was the Crown's gain, and he heartily congratulated their guest on his appointment. The members of the State Executive and the Metropolitan Council felt they could not allow this important step in Mr. Dunphy's career to pass without recognition, so this gathering had been decided upon. Presenting Mr. Dunphy with a clock, Mr. Mooney said that the value of the gift was in no way comparable with the services given by their guest, but it would perhaps serve as a reminder of the esteem in which he was held by his friends on the State Executive. Mr. Mooney said that Ted Dunphy would be followed by Jack Dunphy who, he felt sure, would do his best, as his father and brother had done.

Several other Trades Hall officials supported the remarks of Mr. Mooney, and Mr. Dunphy, in responding, said amongst other things—

He was very pleased to have had the opportunity of serving the Labour Movement. He had never regarded his profession solely as a means of making money. He regarded his job in the way trade union secretaries regarded their jobs, and the satisfaction that came from doing one's best was the greatest reward. Industrial law was the most important of all for the decisions given in industrial cases did not affect only the parties in the case. Hundreds of pounds might be involved in a verdict representing only a few shillings. If he had done good work, the credit belonged to his father, who was a better friend of the Labour Movement than perhaps some of them realised. His father had taught him everything he knew, and it was because of him that he had grown up a Labourite. He would like it to be understood that although he would not be taking the active part that he had taken formerly, he was not lost to the Labour Movement. It would still be possible for him lawfully and rightfully to assist the movement. He had never attempted to hide the

fact that he was a Labourite, and if he had helped the movement, his feeling was one of pride and pleasure. He was grateful for what he had learned during his association with the movement, and this knowledge would prove valuable to him in the future. They had always known where he had stood in the past, and they would know where he intended to stand.

Hon. G. Fraser: What is wrong with that?

Hon. C. F. BAXTER: What is wrong with it is that a Government servant should be the last person in the world to take political sides, and the man who does take political sides, particularly when he is occupying a position like that of Crown Solicitor, is a very foolish man indeed. What we want in an office of that description is stability and experience. Mr. Dunphy, in the course of his remarks, told the gathering that it would still be possible for him lawfully and rightfully to assist the movement. Is Mr. Dunphy going to be Crown Solicitor or is he still going to represent the Labour movement? That is the position. He has accepted the post of Crown Solicitor and as a servant of the State he should cut himself adrift from everything else. He should not know any parties and should not even recognise them. What I want to know is by whom was he recommended for the position? Was he recommended by the Solicitor-General, the Under Secretary for Law or the Public Service Commissioner? In any case, as an old member of this House, I do not agree with a person accepting an important position under the Crown, and at the same time offering his services or allowing his services to remain available for any political section. We cannot get away from the facts, which are very plain indeed. Is it any wonder, after having read extracts from the "Worker," that I should ask to be supplied with more information about the appointment and the manner in which it was made? Were there other applicants of a status equal to that of Mr. Dunphy? For all we know, other applicants may have had higher qualifications. That is information that we are entitled to have. In any case, Mr. Dunphy was most indiscreet in making the statements that he did at the gathering to which I have referred. It is absolutely imperative that every civil servant, from the highest executive officer down, should be loyal to his employers.

There is another matter to which I wish to refer, and which has hit me rather hard—I refer to appointments made to the Fremantle Harbour Trust. An appointment was made some years ago, and the gentleman chosen was a representative of the producers of the State. Unfortunately, that gentleman passed away. It has been recognised, but not laid down, that the different interests served by the Trust should have representation. That objective was introduced in 1919. After the passing of the producers' representative, Mr. Taylor was appointed as representative of the Fremantle lumpers, and a very good representative he proved. While I was holding the office of Chief Secretary and was in control of the Harbour Trust, pressure was brought to bear on me at the time Mr. Taylor's period of office had expired to substitute someone else for Mr. Taylor, someone to represent shipping interests. I considered it unfair that such a course should be followed, because Mr. Taylor had served the Trust well and there was nothing against him. Consequently, I re-appointed him. I fully expected that subsequent Governments would follow the example I had set, but when a vacancy occurred the party in power selected Mr. W. C. Angwin. Mr. Angwin had shortly before then returned to the State. A good deal was said about the appointment, but nothing could be said against Mr. Angwin himself. We knew that he was a good chap.

Member: But he was over age.

Hon. C. F. BAXTER: Never mind that. The selection was made, and thus reasonable representation was denied to further sectional interests. Mr. Angwin was the choice of the Fremantle Trades Hall, and there was no thought of the producers. Is it any wonder, therefore, that I am voicing my opinions against political appointments? Why should not the producers have had continued consideration?

Hon. G. Fraser: How many party appointments did your Government make?

Hon. C. F. BAXTER: The Government with which I was associated always considered both sides. We even went to the extent of giving an appointment to one of the hon. member's defeated friends, Mr. Frank Rowe. Indeed, we always showed more consideration to our opponents than they ever displayed towards theirs.

Another burning question to which I wish to refer, is the recent sale of the motor ship "Kangaroo." I did not know that the vessel was to be sold until I read of it in the newspapers. Apparently, everything had been fixed up, and then the sale was announced. The price received by the Government for the vessel was £25,000, and I understand that only recently the vessel had been laid up and had had renewals effected at a cost of £14,000. Therefore, the "Kangaroo" realised only £11,000. There were buyers who were prepared to pay considerably more than the sum realised. My belief is that the engines of the "Kangaroo" at the time of the sale were in a much better condition than those of the "Koolinda," because the "Koolinda" has had its inside churned out. Moreover, the hull of the "Kangaroo," which is of the cruiser type, is wonderfully strong. Now certain arrangements have been made with the Blue Funnel Line regarding the trade with the Islands and a trade that was largely established by the "Kangaroo" is to be left in the hands of private enterprise. What I want to know is why was not the "Kangaroo" sold by tender? Why was the vessel sold privately without any notification of the impending sale being made? True, she was an old ship, but she was in very good order, and I will not say much beyond this that there was an organisation in Perth prepared to pay £40,000 for the vessel if tenders for the purchase had been publicly called. The people in question never got a chance to quote or have a say of any kind.

The Honorary Minister: That is only a fairy tale.

Hon. C. F. BAXTER: I will tell the Honorary Minister the name of the head of the concern that made the offer. I assure him I do not speak idly. That firm never got the opportunity to tender. It does a large trade with the Islands, and I was told that there was still good money in the "Kangaroo."

The Chief Secretary: You want to hear the other side of the question.

Hon. C. F. BAXTER: There can be no other side to the question when the sale was effected without tenders being called.

I notice in the Speech a reference to what the Government has done for education, particularly in country districts. What has been done in the country is mighty little compared with what has been done in the city and the promises of what would be done

in the country. Recently the Premier promised another school at Geraldton. No doubt one is required there, but there are many small places in other parts of the country that have not received even reasonable treatment. For years Merredin has been in a shocking condition for lack of proper educational facilities, and the school there remains overcrowded. Many efforts have been made to get improvements, but so far without success. The department has even reached the stage when it is asking people to build their own schools. One was recently built by voluntary effort about eight miles from an existing school. The department was asked to move the existing school to that locality, but very wisely, I think, declined to do so. The Government has been unwise in one particular respect. The chief executive officer of the Education Department, the ex-Director, Mr. Klein, assured Parents and Citizens' Associations in country districts that if they provided a building for manual training, so necessary in the country, or if people interested did so, the Government would provide the necessary furniture and tools with which to maintain manual training in the centre. Several of these organisations got to work and erected the required buildings, only to find that, despite the assurance from the executive head of the department that they would be supplied with the other requisites, there was no money available for the purpose. They had to await their turn during the current financial year, if it is satisfied even then. They have provided the timber and erected the building, and have already lost 12 months of the use of the building, which is now lying idle because the Government did not honour the assurance given by one of its executive officers, the chief man in the Education Department. That was very wrong. Mr. Craig had a case of that sort in his district. There were two youths who wanted another 12 months in which to finish their training and gain some experience in the manual section. As it was, they had to go out into the world this year without such training, notwithstanding that the parents had helped to provide a building for the purpose.

I notice that we are to consider the hardy annual produced session after session, namely the Industrial Arbitration Act. One wonders what will be done this time. Pro-

bably it will be something to please Trades Hall, something we cannot pass here. Members will recollect the endeavours of the select committee last session, when certain clauses were agreed to between the Houses, but finally were thrown aside. I understand from an interjection by the Chief Secretary that that was done because of the amendments I moved. When the Act was passed we were told that we would have no further industrial troubles. At the inception we were told that there would be no more hold-ups, no more strikes.

The Honorary Minister: Who told you that?

Hon. C. F. BAXTER: The sponsors of the Bill said so. We were told it by very substantial men in the party to which the Honorary Minister belongs. An amendment I put up provided that where the registrar or president reported a strike or an infringement of the Act or of the court's decision, the Crown Law Department should take proceedings against the offenders. One would have thought that, no matter what party was in power, it would have been pleased to accept such an amendment. I think it was actually an oversight that the Act did not make that provision. Why should the responsibility of taking action in a case of that kind be cast upon the Minister? When the law has been flouted, why should it be left to the Minister to take the requisite steps against the offenders? Why was not the Government sensible enough to see what was required to meet such circumstances? It should be an instruction to the Crown Law Department to take proceedings in the event of a strike or hold-up. That is what I provided in my amendment. When, however, such a provision was pressed last time, the Chief Secretary said it was the end of the Bill. All the consideration that had been given by this Chamber to the amendments to the Act went by the board, because the Government would not accept that one amendment of mine, which would have relieved the Minister and the Government as a whole of any responsibility in the matter.

The Honorary Minister: We want industrial peace, do we not?

Hon. C. F. BAXTER: We can never have industrial peace in anything with which the Honorary Minister is associated. His views

are too wild. Are we ever to have peace in industry and have sound work done under the Industrial Arbitration Act?

The Honorary Minister: Not until you improve it.

Hon. C. F. BAXTER: The attitude of the present Government towards the Act and the Arbitration Court is to encourage the unions of employees to ignore both and have recourse to direct action. Take the miners' strike that occurred on the goldfields. The mine managers were forced by the Government to agree outside the Arbitration Court, to the demands of the men, and gave them all they wanted, notwithstanding the fact that the court would not concede the demands. Of what use is it for Parliament to pass laws if they are not to be obeyed? The Government itself does not adhere to the laws of the country. We know what happened at Collie, when the strike occurred there. The "West Australian" reported a gathering of Trades Hall officials as follows:—

The settlement of the Collie dispute was discussed at a meeting of the State Executive of the Australian Labour Party on Monday night, and a resolution was agreed to in which the Executive expressed congratulations to the Minister for Labour (Mr. Hawke) and the Government on the stand they had taken in regard to the dispute.

It does not matter about the laws of the country so long as Trades Hall is pleased—

Delegates from Collie were present at the meeting, and it was stated that they expressed appreciation of the work of the Minister and the Government; that they were insistent that there was a great deal of discontent at Collie, and that they were emphatic in stating that had not the Government taken the action it did, industry in the State would have been paralysed as a result of a stoppage at Collie.

I do not believe that a stoppage of work was imminent. Even so, how can this country be controlled if the unions can strike whenever they wish? Why not scrap all the laws and let there be a free fight right through? The Government, by its action, is doing more to destroy the arbitration system than any other combination could do. In addition to the Arbitration Court, we now have industrial boards. Because the court did not accept all that an industrial board recommended, a commissioner was appointed at Collie. The commissioner occupied the position of mines inspector, and was called in to adjudicate on a matter that had been refused by the Arbitration Court.

The Honorary Minister: That is provided for in the Act.

Hon. C. F. BAXTER: This particular thing is not. I do not care what ruling may have been obtained from the Crown Law Department; I maintain that the action taken was not provided for in the Act, and was never intended to be provided for. As might have been expected, the commissioner made the necessary recommendations, but the court refused to acknowledge them. This appeared to be of small moment to the Government. Notwithstanding the court's position under the law of the land, the Government over-rode the Act and the court, and arranged immediately for the Collie miners to have their claims conceded. Where is the State going to finish?

Hon. H. S. W. Parker: He was brought from South Australia for the purpose.

Hon. C. F. BAXTER: I wish to deal also with another regrettable trouble that has arisen—every member who knows anything of the circumstances will regret it—the trouble in our mental homes. As an ex-Minister in control of that particular department, I sympathise with the Chief Secretary in his effort to keep the scales evenly balanced between the sections concerned. We have the executive section and the medical section, and there seems to be no end of trouble between them. There is something wrong somewhere. First of all we had the fight over Dr. Bentley. The charges made against him were of such an extraordinary nature that any civil servant who put them up ought to be asked to retire from the service. It was a case of slaughtering Dr. Bentley. Fortunately there was a way out of the difficulty through the Appeal Board, and that board, as I expected, exonerated the doctor. Now we have the trouble at Heathcote. There is no end of trouble at Heathcote. The question is how to clean it up. How will the patients fare meanwhile? One would have thought that Dr. Bentley, as head of the Lunacy Department, would be in charge of Heathcote and that the resident medical officer, in this case Dr. Webster, would be the responsible officer in control of that institution. Apparently, however, Dr. Webster was not under Dr. Bentley, but under the Under Secretary of the Chief Secretary's Department and perhaps the trouble arose from the interference of the Under Secretary. Some time ago the matron

was suspended, and an inquiry was held. Dr. Bentley, as Chief Officer, suspended the matron, but the Under Secretary promptly reinstated her. Next Dr. Webster suspended the matron. There was another inquiry, this time by the Public Service Commissioner, who immediately reinstated her. How in such circumstances can we hope to secure reasonable administration? What will happen to the patients, and where does the taxpayer come in while quarrels of this nature are going on? To overcome the difficulty Dr. Webster has been transferred to Claremont.

There is another point, namely, the treatment of the patients at Heathcote. Dr. Webster is particularly well versed in the cardiozol treatment, which has given such successful results. What will become of that treatment? Does the new man know anything about it? I understand there has been one death at Heathcote, but I am not attributing that to the new doctor. What may happen if treatment of this sort is entrusted to a man who does not understand it? I hope the Chief Secretary will clean up the whole trouble one way or the other. If some of the executive officers are wanting in their duties, let them be transferred. I hope the Minister will not leave things in their present unsatisfactory state. Everyone is dissatisfied. Something should be done to overcome the continual bickering and quarrelling that occurs. Suspensions are becoming almost a weekly occurrence. Let us put a stop to all this trouble and protect the patients in the institution. They deserve every protection. There are other matters that I could have dealt with but I will leave them till a later date. I trust my remarks will not be regarded by the Chief Secretary and Honorary Minister in any personal way. I have never indulged in personalities. I notice that the Chief Secretary is smiling.

The Chief Secretary: I was smiling at your colleague.

Hon. C. F. BAXTER: All my endeavours are in the direction of working unitedly with other political sections in Parliament for the benefit of the State as a whole. I support the motion.

On motion by Hon. H. V. Piessé, debate adjourned.

BILL—SUPPLY (No. 1), £2,500,000.

Received from the Assembly and read a first time.

House adjourned at 6.17 p.m.

Legislative Assembly,

Tuesday, 9th August, 1938.

	PAGE
Motion: Condolence: The late Hon. S. W. Munsie, M.L.A., and the late Mr. E. V. Brockman, M.L.A.	31
Questions: Mining—1, Reservations: 2, Men prohibited from working; 3, Workers' compensation payments	33-34
Water Supplies, hydraulic survey	34
Railways, Collié coal	34
Collié coal industry, Davidson award	34
Sitting days and hours	34
Government business, precedence	34
Leave of absence	35
Bill: Supply (No. 1), £2,500,000, all stages	35
Address-in-reply, second day	39

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

MOTION—CONDOLENCE.

The late Hon. S. W. Munsie, M.L.A., and the late Mr. E. V. Brockman, M.L.A.

THE PREMIER (Hon. J. C. Willcock—Geraldton) [4.34]: I move—

That this House desires to place upon record its profound sense of the loss sustained in the passing of the late Hon. Selby Walter Munsie, a member of this House and Minister for Mines and Health of the State at the time of his death, and that an expression of the sincerest sympathy of members be conveyed to his widow and family by Mr. Speaker; and that this House desires to place upon record its profound sense of the loss sustained in the passing of the late Mr. Edmund Vernon Brockman, a member of this House at the time of his death, and that an expression of the sincerest sympathy of members be conveyed to his widow and family by Mr. Speaker.

It is with deep sorrow I move this motion deploring the great loss sustained by the country in the death of the two hon. mem-