

Mr. LAMBERT: I am not sarcastic. The Minister for Works knows that I am reasonably charitable. I hope that the party at present on the Opposition side will be able soon to go out into the highways and by-ways of the State and show the people what it is possible for this State to achieve.

Mr. Teesdale: There have already been two swan songs to-night.

Mr. LAMBERT: I hope the Government will consider the question of generating electric current at Collie for utilisation at Bunbury. This proposition is particularly attractive to me, because I know from my experience of other parts of the world what big facilities for establishing many secondary industries are offered by a port like Bunbury, situated in close proximity to big areas of coal measures. I do not say this out of regard for the member for Bunbury (Mr. Money); but if I were representing a district with opportunities for the establishment of industries so apparent, I should never allow this session to close until I had obtained from the Government some earnest of their intention to establish, either by State enterprise or by assistance to private individuals, the industries which should be operating here to-day. Soon the leader of the Opposition will be afforded an opportunity to outline a policy which should command the support of the people of Western Australia. The electors will be able at no distant date to signify whether the whole of their interests is absorbed in the broad acres of this country. Any man, in levelling criticism at the Government, should have no desire to depreciate the efforts put forward by the Premier to settle people on the land, but the Premier must recognise that agriculture is not the only industry in the State. We have other concerns which ought to be fostered. The Premier ought to know that we have derived nothing from Federation, but, on the other hand, we have made the greatest possible sacrifices of any State of the Commonwealth. In Western Australia, where there is no possible opportunity of inducing the capitalists of the Eastern States to establish industries, where there exist fields of limitless resources that could be exploited by capital and labour working hand in hand, there are opportunities which, if advertised in England, or assisted by the Government, would lead to the establishment of many important industries. Woollen mills and factories of many descriptions could be established here, and men and capital would be attracted hither as never before. If we are going to tell the people of the old world that we have merely broad acres to offer and nothing else, we shall not get them. The member for Roebourne (Mr. Teesdale) has told us that when he dared to mention in England one-half of the resources of this country, he was disbelieved. A small concern that I floated with a little capital over a year ago has actual realisable resources amounting to twenty millions of money, and I mention that in no boastful spirit. Responsible men representing the Imperial Government, men like Lord Morris and Earl Stanley have exclaimed, "Good God! Have you all these things in Western Australia? How is it that all these resources are undeveloped and almost unknown?" It is the duty of the Premier so long as he represents the people of this country to make known its resources.

I can only hope that side by side with the policy of settling the broad acres of the State, the Premier will see that the great mining industry, which has done so much for Western Australia and is capable of achieving very much more, receives that fostering care and assistance to which it is entitled. If this is done, the Premier will find that the mining industry will do much towards alleviating the financial position which exists to-day.

On motion by Mr. Underwood, debate adjourned.

House adjourned at 11:20 p.m.

Legislative Council,

Tuesday, 24th August, 1920.

	Page.
Question: Railway fares, freights and wages ...	221
Address-in-reply, sixth day ...	222

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

QUESTION—RAILWAY FARES, FREIGHTS AND WAGES.

The PRESIDENT: I would point out for the information of hon. members that the question appearing on the Notice Paper is scarcely in the form of a question so much as a request. I do not think that Parliamentary procedure contemplates requests. I suggest that, as a question, the Minister should be asked, "Will he lay on the Table of the House," etc. There is a distinct difference which I think the hon. member will appreciate.

Hon. H. STEWART: Yes. I might say that it was suggested I should put the question in this form; otherwise the Minister might answer it "yes" or "no," and go no further.

Hon. H. STEWART asked the Minister for Education to lay on the Table of the House: 1, A railway return showing the additional revenue obtained respectively from metropolitan and country traffic, under the headings of goods, live stock, passengers, and miscellaneous, the return to cover the period from the last increase in fares and freights until 30th June, 1920. 2, The extra amount paid in wages for the same period as the result of the award of the Arbitration Court.

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION replied: Answering the question in the form which you have suggested, Sir, the answer is "Yes."

The Minister laid the return on the Table.

ADDRESS-IN-REPLY.

Sixth Day.

Debate resumed from the 19th August.

Hon. J. E. DODD (South) [4.34]: In locking over the Governor's Speech I find that reference is made to the visit of the Prince of Wales, followed by a statement that His Royal Highness's visit has done much to consolidate the bonds of Empire. Last year, in speaking on the Address-in-reply, I drew attention to what one of our former enemies had said with regard to the British Empire. I wish to make one or two remarks in regard to the same matter, because there appear to me to be two classes of people in the country. There is one class who think the country can do no wrong, no matter what might be done by the Government or by those in power; and there are those people who think that the country is never right. During the four or five years of war we were, fortunately or unfortunately, blessed with a large number of people who thought the Empire could do no wrong whatsoever, and to-day we seem to be blessed with a great number of people who think nothing good can come out of the Empire. Last session I quoted what General Smuts, one of our late enemies in the South African war, had said, namely, that the British Empire was the greatest moral and physical force in the world. To-day I want to quote what a very prominent Labour man, Mr. George Barnes, is credited with stating. Mr. Barnes was a member of the Imperial War Council during the war, but he severed his connection with the Cabinet at the time the Labour party decided that they would remain no longer in the Government. I give this quotation because at a time like this it is well for all public men, if they possibly can, to show the people, especially in view of the unrest prevailing, that the Empire is not altogether bad. Mr. Barnes in a very illuminating article, a copy of which was published in the "Westralian Worker," mentions Britain's example to the world, and adds—"Anyone who has taken the trouble to study the history of the world Labour movement is sure to be struck by the contribution made to it by this country." Our contribution is by no means ended. We are on the point of solving many knotty problems. The question of the minimum wage, I think, will be settled on the basis of a minimum wage for each trade. In solving such questions as this, we are not only trying to put our own house in order but to give the world at large an example which they might copy. We might well place on record some of the

utterances of individual men with regard to the example that Britain has placed before the world, and I am glad to have this opportunity of quoting what Mr. Barnes thinks of Britain's attempt to solve the problem of Labour unrest. I might also direct attention to what the leader of the Labour party in Tasmania said at a banquet given to the Prince of Wales. He remarked—

We believe in the Empire and we want to see it grow in strength and power and influence, and embody the realisation of the grand principles I have named, the principles of equality, fraternity, and liberty.

Despite the tremendous inequality which exists in Great Britain as well as in other countries, and despite the terrible record which we have had at times, we have a great deal indeed to be proud of. I for one shall always do my utmost to prevent any efforts being made to undermine the solidarity of our Empire. At the present time we are confronted with two problems, the high cost of living and industrial warfare, two problems which are very closely allied. It has been rather a pity that that magnificent spirit, which permeated the people during the war, has not been exploited to the extent it should have been. If we could only visualise the dangers of peace in the same way that we visualised the dangers of war, we would be doing very much more and making things very much better than they are. The trouble is that, in times of peace, we do not see the armies or the submarines or all the paraphernalia of war, but there are dangers equally as big and, if we could only see them, we should endeavour much more rapidly than we are doing to bring about means to encourage a better feeling. It is doubtless the desire of every man and woman in the world to see every individual happy. We all desire happiness. Every member in this House desires that every other individual in the community shall be happy. But it is the method by which we are to bring about such happiness which is to-day a world difficulty. When we consider the high cost of living, I think there is very great reason for the unrest in the world, despite the terrible war through which we have passed. I do not think the high cost of living to-day is justified, despite all the loss of treasure and loss of production brought about by the war. I do not say that the war has had no effect on the cost of living. It has; and a very big effect too. But the cost of living is too high, even considering what we have suffered. The cost of living in Western Australia has gone up 88 per cent., and that is the lowest percentage for any State in the Commonwealth. It is our duty to look around and find where the leak is, and whether our legislation is causing living costs to mount higher. In my opinion our legislation is having this effect. It seems to me that our legislation in Australia is

merely devoted to building up the cities, principally Melbourne and Sydney. When we consider that everything we eat, everything we produce, and everything we wear is taxed almost to the uttermost, and that such taxation is passed on, we can understand why living costs soar. Almost all our legislation tends in the direction of allowing taxes and costs to be passed on. In this House I have frequently mentioned that even the income tax is passed on. The income tax is a very much better tax than a large number of other taxes and is called direct taxation, but almost all the income taxation is passed on to the individual at the bottom, who consequently suffers. Then there are the taxes on receipts, cheques, drafts, and all instruments of exchange. One of the most glaring is the tax on receipts in connection with insurance companies. These companies openly add the tax to the premium; they do not attempt to conceal it. We pass legislation here to provide for a tax on receipts, and the insurance companies and other companies simply pass on the amount of the tax to the insured. Therefore it seems to me that we are legislating in the wrong direction. The people's pleasures may be a more legitimate form of taxation than others, but even in connection with picture shows and races we find that the taxation is passed on quite openly. The proprietors say quite openly that those who patronise the shows must pay these taxes. If we build a house we are taxed for the building. If we put up an extra room we are taxed for our enterprise in putting it up. All tools and materials for building houses are taxed. We are fined because we build. I have previously drawn attention to the property in Hay Street, known as the late Lord Forrest's. Now that property is subdivided and a number of people are going to put up business premises on it. The buildings to be placed on that land will pay very much more in taxation than the late owner did. These people are to be taxed for circulating money and giving employment. We are taxed on the use value of land, not on the site value. The better we build, the more we are taxed. That method of legislation seems to me utterly wrong. It cannot possibly result in anything but an increased cost of living. The owner of vacant land pays almost nothing in taxation, but immediately he puts a building on that vacant land he is taxed up to the hilt. Again, I have drawn attention to the land known as Perry's land, which the City Council acquired some time ago. They paid £18,000 for the land, and consequently the ratepayers of Perth are paying almost £1,000 a year interest on the purchase price of that land. I find now that there is a proposal before the City Council that some of the land shall be sold again for soldiers' homes. Can there be a more glaring instance than this of what I am trying to drive home? Here is land upon which the late owner has spent little

or nothing, and for which, thanks to many of the people going out into the wilderness to make farms and to establish stations, and find mines, and thanks to the expenditure of public money, he received £18,000. And now there is no land upon which to build soldiers' homes, for which reason the City Council are offering some of this property to the Government. The soldier will be compelled to pay enough for the land to cover the purchase price and also the interest and every charge on the land, though the late owner did absolutely nothing. I do not like to be personal, but I saw a summing up in regard to the purchase of this land by the City Council, in the course of which it was stated that more was likely to be done with the land now that the owner had passed away and the property was in somebody else's hands. We should make inquiry into these things and see where we stand. Last year this House carried at my instance a resolution stating that in the opinion of the House the interest charges of our railways should be a charge upon land owners. That resolution was carried in a property House. I suppose no other property House in the world would have carried a motion of that kind in favour of land values taxation. What has happened? Immediately Parliament went into recess, the Government absolutely ignored this House so far as that resolution is concerned. In that respect this House might never have been in existence. The Government placed taxation to the extent of £250,000 per annum on the people in increased railway freights. I am very sorry to see that the Country party, who previously had the principle of land value taxation in their platform, or at least cherished it as a pious wish, have now decided that they will have nothing to do with land values taxation for the time being. The all-powerful Executive of the Farmers' and Settlers' Association state that they have written to Professor Atkinson for his opinion on land values taxation in order that they may know where they are. All those who read Professor Atkinson's addresses when he was here must surely be convinced that if there is one man in the world who cannot give an opinion on a question of this kind it is Professor Atkinson. I could bring along two or three men in Perth to-day who have forgotten more about this question than ever Professor Atkinson knew—men who know the State and men who would have been prepared to give the Country party the benefit of their knowledge. Yet we find the executive of the Farmers' and Settlers' Association stating that they have written to Professor Atkinson for information on land values taxation. Again, the Country party will have nothing to do with land values taxation; and I presume that they will influence the Government. The Country party also stated that they would have nothing to do with increased railway freights, that they strongly objected to increased railway

freights. May I ask, who will pay them? May I ask, where are we going to get the money that we need? Are we to have some system of legislation that will pass on these increased railway charges still further? Will the Government or the Country party enlighten us as to what is to happen? Again, I find Mr. Angwin saying that there must be still further increases in railway charges. Mr. Collier is advocating land values taxation without remissions. Where do we stand amidst this multitude of counsellors? Land values taxation, to my mind, is always a system of substituting taxation which is going to relieve burdens. If we are going to have land values taxation and protection and increased railway freights, the farmers may just as well get out at once and the mines close down. If the pastoralist can stand these things, he is about the only man engaged in the primary industries who can. We might do a great deal towards reducing the cost of living by more and better organisation. I am very pleased to know that the Minister for Education has been interesting himself in regard to the city's milk supply. No doubt he was moved to do so by the report tendered to this House by yourself, Mr. President, and Mr. Duffell and Mr. Millington some time ago. I am sure that if the Government would organise on the lines of that report, though not in the direction of extreme socialism, a great deal of good would result. It has been my unfortunate privilege to sit for a great number of weeks or even months on a verandah, and there it has come home to me with tenfold force what a lack of organisation there is in regard to everything that relates to our daily life. I have been struck by the number of milkmen who have passed up and down the street. Coming into my street is a milkman from Victoria Park, and another from South Perth; and I suppose there is a milkman going from Wanneroo to Victoria Park and South Perth. I think I am right in saying that almost every house in my street has a different milkman. The same thing applies as regards bakers. There are three bakers who generally meet once a week opposite my house, and sometimes give one another bread, or exchange bread. There they go, the one going back the way the other came, and so on. I know of course that this is a very old contention which I am advancing, but at the same time I think the community has reached that point when something must be done in the direction of organisation, though not perhaps in the direction of extreme socialism. I for one could never subscribe to the ideals of extreme socialism. Although members of this House have, almost to a man, passed over to extreme socialism, I could never follow the socialist ideal right out. I do not believe that ever emulation is going to take the place of orderly competition. But surely there is a medium, and the sooner the Government get to work in this direction the better. I would prefer seeing the milk supply municipalised to seeing it nationalised.

If something can be done to municipalise the milk industry, or something that will do away with the enormous waste going on day after day, the waste of horseflesh and of material and of wages, something will have been done to reduce the cost of living. I suppose each one of us could, if he desired, put up a speech on the tremendous profits being made in various directions; but I do not know that that would carry us much further. We know that very high profits are being made. There are just one or two instances to which I may direct attention in view of the ocean freights which are being charged. The profits of the Steam Packet Navigation Company last year were £953,000, those of the Oceanic Company £1,467,000, and those of the Royal Mail Company £1,341,000. When we remember that these companies are boycotting the Commonwealth line of ships, we can realise what is behind the high cost of living to some extent. To me it seems a sad state of affairs when life to a great many people is no more than a mere existence, while to others it means that they find themselves in the lap of luxury. All that we can do in the direction of minimising the evils arising from such a state of things, I think we should do. But let me say again that class hatred is no remedy. When I see a number of individuals going forth to preach the doctrine of class hatred and class warfare, I say they are proceeding on utterly wrong lines. We have had industrial warfare, I suppose, almost since man began. I was searching the other day for the beginnings of industrial warfare, and it seems to me that for this purpose we cannot do better than look back over the history of Moses. I realise that there is no necessity to direct the attention of hon. members of this House to the study of Scripture; I know they are always devoting themselves to that pursuit. But on referring to the history of Moses we find that he was one of the greatest strike leaders that ever existed in the history of the world. The similarity between these times of ours and the times of Moses, as regards negotiations for the settlement of industrial troubles, is striking. We find where Moses negotiated with Pharaoh, and for quite a long time he negotiated to see whether or not he could settle a trouble which had arisen. They were asked to make bricks without straw and the end of it was that Moses established a blockade for quite a long time. He tried in every way to induce Pharaoh to come to terms and decided to leave Egypt and get out. When he did leave he did not go in for arbitration or conciliation, he went in for direct action and the direct action ended Pharaoh's negotiations altogether in the Red Sea. If we follow the history of Moses we find that his fate was similar to that of scores of other strike leaders. After he crossed the Red Sea and put the Israelites on the right track, he was not even allowed to visit the Promised Land. If we pass on some two or three thousand years after, and look at the history

of the Apostles, we find that Paul went to Ephesus and preached the doctrine of one Omnipotent God. A factory owner named Demetrius made a living by manufacturing little gods, especially images of Diana. Paul's doctrine would have ruined his business, so he called the craftsmen together and they went about shouting "Great is Diana of the Ephesians." We are told they went to the theatre, something like the civil servants did here the other day, and when Alexander tried to explain the position to them they would not allow him to speak. They did not shout out anything about Bolshevism or "Profiteering," but "Great is Diana of the Ephesians." Then we learn that the town clerk came along and told them what ought to be done, and he winds up in this way, "Wherefore if Demetrius and the craftsmen which are with him have a matter against any man, the law is open and there are deputies, let them implead one another. . . let it be determined in lawful Assembly." The town clerk's plea is what we have been trying to embody in our arbitration legislation. The most interesting strike of all is one that occurred last year in India where coolies in the service of one of the Rajahs struck because they said a son and heir had been born to the Rajah and they wanted in consequence a holiday which the Rajah would not give. After they were told that no son and heir had been born they still decided to take their holiday. The question of settling by negotiation is one which is giving us a great deal of concern to-day, and although I have always battled and fought for and believed in arbitration, I must say that the meteoric increase in the cost of living has almost made the court useless. We must have means for effecting speedier settlement. The cost of living has gone up so quickly that no one court in Western Australia can possibly deal with the great number of cases that come before it. I am pleased to see that in this direction there is an inclination to further extend round-table conferences. I believe that the Industrial Peace Bill which Mr. Hughes has brought forward will go a long way to further the holding of these conferences and bring about industrial peace, although I am much concerned about the tremendous cost which is likely to be incurred by the number of these councils. There is the aspect about it that we are continually increasing the number of individuals who, if not in the civil service, are in Government employment, and I am afraid that this is what will happen under the Industrial Peace Bill. There will be many councils formed and the cost will be great indeed. During the whole of the time I was secretary of the miners' union in Kalgoorlie, we had only one Arbitration Court case. We always settled our troubles by round-table conferences, and I think almost every other union or industry on the fields settled their troubles in a similar way. I think that the case which will come before

the court shortly will be about the second or third only in the history of the goldfields. I do not know that we cannot extend the conference system, or that it would not be wise if the employers would only come forward with propositions or concessions—I do not like the word—in the direction of settling industrial disputes. I am satisfied that if they do not adopt this method, the time will come when they will be compelled to do it. If the Chamber of Mines in Kalgoorlie had agreed to the appointment of a standing committee representative of the managers and the men to deal with the working of the mines, it would have been much better for all concerned. If that course had been followed, many thousands of pounds would have been saved to the industry. There are a hundred and one things which workmen see in the course of their employment which they could bring under the notice of the management and which would have the effect of lessening the cost. If the employers do not willingly come forward and make some suggestion of this kind, I am convinced they will be compelled to do so in the not distant future. They are doing this in England and in America and in many other places, and I believe the system is a great success in the Old Country. When I was speaking the other day I stated that there was a great deal of indifference in regard to public affairs, and that the people did not seem to think for themselves in regard to elections, or in regard to the conduct of those affairs in which they are vitally interested. It is remarkable how the people will agree to the filching of their liberties. I suppose if we studied history and went back to the beginning of time we would find that it had been nothing but a continual giving away of liberty on the part of individuals. Even at the present time when we pose as such democratic people, we find attempts on the part of small bodies of men to hang up the whole of the industries of the State. Last year I drew attention to the seamen's strike which was one of the cruellest strikes, to my mind, that ever took place. It was cruel not only because of the suffering that it caused, but cruel because of the indifference with which the seamen allowed their liberties to be taken from them. They came out all right in the end but we gain a few shillings sometimes too dearly, and if we sacrifice our liberty, I do not care whether it be the individual or the union liberty, or any one else's liberty, if we give it away as we have been doing, we are going to land ourselves in difficulties. On a previous occasion I drew attention to a meeting of a thousand men in this State which was called to say whether or not they should leave work, or whether they should await the decision of a few men who were at the time sitting in Melbourne. That is a very sad state of affairs. I am pleased to see in connection with the shop assistants' trouble here—and may I congratulate Mr. Panton for the part he took in

it—that on three consecutive Sundays they took ballots to determine what action should be followed. It seems to me that is the logical and only democratic way of deciding whether people who are dissatisfied should or should not go out on strike. When an executive will declare a strike without reference to the individual unionists they are doing something which is as autocratic as ever any autocrat in the world did. The right of the ballot is something we have fought for in the past and something which we should not lightly give away. I am pleased to be able to congratulate Mr. Pantou on the assistance he gave in settling the shop assistants' trouble, and I believe also, in advocating a ballot. I remember a strike which occurred at Broken Hill in 1892, and the leader of the House will probably remember it also. I believe we had just cause for striking at that time if ever anyone did. We went on to the reserve, about 10,000 of us, on a Sunday afternoon, and while the meeting was in progress the smelters were running low. It was decided there by a show of hands that we should go out, and almost every hand went up. Mine was amongst them. But there was one man who had the temerity to propose a ballot. What happened? He was chased around Broken Hill. A large number of people went out on strike and the strike lasted for about 18 weeks. We fought to the bitter end and after the strike was over—we were beaten out of sight—hundreds of those same men who held up their hands were the men who execrated those who advised them to go out on strike. History has taught us that there can be just as much despotism amongst all ranks of the people as amongst the higher ranks, the kings and queens. If there is any event in history that teaches us that more than another it is the French Revolution. Who were the arrant cowards of this revolution? They were the men who guillotined thousands of others, men like Robespierre and others of his kind, who, when they had to meet their turn at the guillotine, were more abject cowards than anybody else when about to be arrested. One man shot himself and two others tried to do so. One tried to stab himself, but was not plucky enough to do it, and they all went to the guillotine half-dead. We have men to-day pointing to Russia and saying that the millenium is to come from Russia. I never believed all that has been said about the Bolshevik. I cannot believe much of what has been said about Bolshevism in Russia. Mr. Hickey tells us that people all over the world, including Russia, are looking for something more democratic. We are all anxious to see Russia succeed, and I think we believe that whatever the Bolsheviks have done in the way of atrocities, and despotism, they were well taught by the people who were in power before they took over. Five to ten years hence is time enough to consider what is taking place in Russia, and to express an opinion with regard to it. From what I read the other day, there are men in

Perth suggesting that it only requires a man to rise up now in Western Australia to establish a Soviet Government, and we will have it here. We have only to read of the large number of workers that are being gulled by this propaganda, for us to find out where we are in regard to Bolshevism. The Soviet is elected in such a way that it is almost the antithesis of democracy. It is almost as hard to move those who are in the forefront of the Bolshevik element as it is to shift a civil servant under the Public Service Act. I should like to direct the attention of the House to what some of the most extreme socialists in the world are saying of Bolshevism. I wish particularly to refer to what Mr. Lloyd George said the other day in reference to Mr. Bertrand Russell. Mr. Bertrand Russell comes from the aristocracy of England. He is an out and out socialist and a pacifist. He was fined £100 and sentenced to imprisonment for a term during the war, so that his opinions would be all in the direction of favouring Bolshevism. Mr. Lloyd George quoted Mr. Bertrand Russell, as a socialist leader who had visited Russia, and who stated that the Soviet Government was neither socialistic, democratic, nor Christian, and that the working classes were in a condition approximating in many respect to slavery. That is the opinion of the man who went to Russia for the purpose of demonstrating to the people of England that Bolshevism was a grand thing. Mrs. Snowden, Dr. Guest, and Mr. Clifford Allen also went to Russia. Mrs. Snowden is known as an extreme socialist, and Dr. Guest is another. Mr. Clifford Allen served two or three years' imprisonment as a conscientious objector, and is in the first ranks of extreme socialism in England. These three people went to Russia and on their return reported that what had displeased the Soviet leaders most was the statement that Bolshevism had not the slightest chance of being implanted in England. Mrs. Snowden said—

I have returned home with the absolute conviction that we have nothing to learn or gain from Bolshevism. England is a very conservative country, but socialism has a better chance there than in Russia through Bolshevism.

I may also quote another well-known man, Prince Peter Kropotkin. This man was banished and exiled from Russia some 30 years ago, and is one of the foremost writers on reform work in the world. Two or three of his works are accepted as text-books by the socialists. He warns the western or British workers against taking any such line of action as they have taken in Russia. When we read extracts like this we must feel it is well to try and lead some of the workers to know the other side of Bolshevism. I have read everything I could lay my hands on about the Bolsheviks of Russia. I have read Professor Good's book, in which he almost portrays the millenium in Russia. We have throughout Australia, very strong propaganda going on in favour of Bolshev-

ism. Unless we are able to combat the arguments which they are using, I am afraid we may yet be landed in the throes of a revolution. I am anxious to see the Russian people come out on top, but surely, if there is one place in the world, or one people in the world, that has a higher and more democratic system of government, it is Australia and the Australian people with their government by the people, for the people, and of the people. Surely the Government established in the Commonwealth is the very ideal of that put forward by Lincoln long ago. If we want to alter our legislation we can do it through the Federal Parliament, and every man and woman has a vote. I do not think it is possible to get a higher form of government than that. We certainly might have some improvements made, in the way of proportional representation, and other ways, but if we set our minds to get that which we desire, and that which appeals to the public, we can get it through the system of government that we have. I am glad to see from the Speech that the Government have decided to introduce legislation dealing with the Mining Act and the Mining Development Act. I also believe they intend to deal with the tributating question. This is a matter which most urgently requires to be dealt with. When the Bill bearing on this question comes before us, I hope to have something to say. I am also glad to see that it is intended to bring up again the Shops and Factories Bill. As Mr. Panton stated, there is hardly any industrial law in Western Australia that can be administered. Almost all our Acts are out of date. If the Government bring down a Bill along the lines of that introduced in the Legislative Assembly last session, I think we can give our support to it. I am also pleased to see that the Government are bringing down a Bill to give women equality with men in regard to Parliament. I am sorry it has not yet been decided to introduce a Bill to amend the Workers' Compensation Act. If the cost of living continues to go up and wages to increase to the extent they have been increased, it certainly follows that the benefits under the Workers' Compensation Act should also be increased. Those who are suffering from injuries are less able to bear any increases in the cost of living than those who are not. It would be well if the Government could introduce a Bill to bring that Act more into conformity with the times. On previous occasions I have drawn attention to the mining industry, and shall continue to do so while I am in the House. A few weeks ago the Prime Minister said he was anxious to do all he could to stimulate the mining industry. I believe some proposal was made for getting English capital into the mining industry, and that the Prime Minister is going to appoint a commission, or some other body of persons, to see whether or not something can be done to stimulate the industry. The first method by which the Prime Minister

proceeds to stimulate the industry is to increase the tariff burden some 10 or 15 per cent. In the Governor's Speech the State Government have a paragraph as follows:—

These matters are receiving the attention of the Government with a view to ascertaining what steps may be taken towards keeping down the costs of the requirements of this, and other industries. The State Government also desire to help the mining industry by adding another £50,000 to the railway freights. On the one hand, in the Federal Parliament all parties with the exception of the Country party, are uniting to increase the burdens borne by the primary industries, and here in this State the Government propose to help the mining industry by putting on £50,000 to the railway freights. The miner and the farmer, and others engaged in the primary industries of this State, are carrying almost every burden of taxation. Unfortunately, although a great number of people can pass on their taxation and their increased burdens, the miner and the farmer cannot do so. The farmer at present is probably in a better position than he has been in for a long time, owing to the war, but that will not last. He is in a better position than the miner, because he has health which the miner has not. Everything the miner uses, the clothes he wears, the material for his home, his machinery, his explosives, and his stores, are taxed and doubly taxed. They are taxed by the tariff, and again they are taxed by railway freights. If we have still further increases—and I believe we shall have them—what is going to happen? Surely these people have enough to struggle under already without carrying additional burdens. I should be pleased to hear from the leader of the House in what direction the Government propose to help the industry. Let me point out a few facts in regard to the miner which are not generally known. First of all, the miner pays for all his hospital dues. This is not done in all industries. He helps to pay for the illness brought about by reason of his occupation; that is to say, he pays through the mine workers' relief fund. But his wages to-day are the same as they were 20 years ago, with the exception, I believe, of an extra shilling conceded by the mine owners. For long service leave he is sent to the sanatorium. He does not get long service leave, as a large number of other employees in the State do, and he gets no free passes. It will be found that a large percentage of the miners end their days at Wooroloo. I do not think I am exaggerating when I say that the gold miner, if he is not butchered to make a Roman holiday, is certainly butchered to make Sydney and Melbourne great. Every conceivable charge is passed on to the miner and the industry, who cannot possibly pass it on any further. We have all heard the lines entitled "The Man with the Hoe," the man carrying the whole world on his back. That

is largely altered to-day, and it is the miner who carries Australia on his back. If the mining industry is to be killed, let us kill it straight out, and put the men into some more healthful occupation. But if gold is to continue as a medium of exchange, if we are to carry on the industry, let us try to make the conditions as good as we can for those who are wasting their lives in it. I am going to make an appeal to the leader of the House to see whether he cannot recommend that a 50 per cent. increase be made in the subsidy to the mine workers' relief fund. At least the Government should bear double the cost they are bearing at the present time, and pay one-half instead of one-third of the maintenance of the fund. The benefits of that fund are not very large, yet it has done a tremendous amount of good for the miners and those dependent on them. But as years go on so the calls on the fund are becoming greater, and the miners and mine-owners have had to increase their weekly contributions from 3d. to 6d. The Government might well go a little further and agree to increase their share of the burden. I noticed only to-day that the Minister for Education has guaranteed £7,000 per annum towards the establishment of child study clinics.

The Minister for Education: That guarantee is for four States.

Hon. J. E. DODD: I think the highest amount the Government have yet paid in any one year to the mine workers' relief fund is £5,500. The amount guaranteed by the Labour Government when the fund was initiated was an annual expenditure up to £7,500. That was on the subsidy basis. But as time went on it was found that the fund could not possibly be administered on that basis. The Registrar of Friendly Societies is anxious to put the fund on an actuarial basis. I hope the Government will not agree to that. I have the utmost respect for the Registrar, who in my opinion is one of the best servants the Government have, but I hope the Government will never establish the fund on that basis. The leader of the House will remember the fund at Broken Hill, which was on an actuarial basis, with a reserve of £300,000 or £400,000, to provide for some improbable eventuality. We do not want that in a fund of this kind. We want, rather, a fund that can be operated on without having regard to some catastrophe which may never happen. I think that if I were to bring forward a motion asking the Government to increase their subsidy to this fund I could, with the cold hard logic of facts, convince every member of the House, with the result that the motion would be carried. I do not believe there is amongst us any member who would not agree to the carrying of such a motion, quite apart from sentiment; while if we were to appeal to the House from the sentimental point of view I am sure they would do all they possibly could to relieve the miners' fund. There is no other calling

on earth so badly paid as is mining, no other calling in which men are to the same extent giving up lives and health. It is most depressing to those who have been behind the scenes and know what is going on in the industry. I am not blaming anybody. I say again that I have no fault whatever to find with those controlling the industry. But while gold is the medium of exchange, and while we have the industry, the miner will always be subject to a number of the existing disabilities. I believe much more could be done to mitigate the conditions of the industry, and I believe much more will be done in connection with all new mines. But what we are most concerned about to-day is the effects of their environment on the men in the deep mines. It is appalling when we consider how those men are suffering and steadily dying out. The union of which I was secretary numbered 2,500 members when I left Kalgoorlie. It is saddening to me to see day after day published accounts of the passing of men I knew, men on the books of that union, men, some of them, of the finest type, falling victims to miners' plague. I hope something may be done to alleviate their distress. If miners' wages had advanced in comparison with the wages of all other employees in the State, the miner would now be receiving over £0 per week. If gold received the same protection as do boots, clothes, Nestle's milk, and other commodities, the mine-owner would be receiving over £5 per ounce for his gold. We are doing our best to cripple the industry and the men in it. I hope Ministers in this House may see their way clear to bring the matter before the Government. The Minister for Mines knows every aspect of the mining industry. No man in Western Australia is more competent to deal with mining questions than is he, and I believe that he is a large-hearted man. His family have suffered from miner's disease. I am sure that if Ministers in this House would talk the matter over with the Minister for Mines he would be agreeable to making some advance in the subsidy to the mine workers' relief fund. Let us just consider what is taking place for the benefit of Labour throughout the world. I draw attention to this for the reason that if we are to come out on the right side we must do something to combat the propaganda so frequently met with. In connection with the Peace Treaty, there was established an International Bureau of Labour. We do not hear much about it out here; our newspapers do not give these matters the prominence which they should. It was decided to establish an International Labour Bureau to deal with all matters affecting Labour in every country under the League of Nations. We are told that the League of Nations is simply a league of bankers, which is going to do something prejudicial to democracy and to the people of the world, notwithstanding that the league was brought into being by one of the finest idealists the

world has ever known, namely, Dr. Wilson. The first International Labour conference convened under the authority of the Peace Treaty was held in Washington on the 29th October of last year, and concluded its labours exactly one month later. The purpose of this organisation was to promote the regulation of international labour conditions. I have here a list of some of the questions referred to the conference.—1, The guiding principles above enunciated, that Labour should not be regarded merely as a commodity or article of commerce. 2, The right of association for all lawful purposes by the employed as well as by the employers. 3, The payment to the employed of a wage adequate to maintain a reasonable standard of life as this is understood in their time and country. 4, The adoption of an eight hours day or a forty-eight hours week as the standard to be aimed at where it has not already been attained. 5, The adoption of a weekly rest of at least twenty-four hours, which should include Sunday wherever practicable. 6, The abolition of child labour and the imposition of such limitations on the labour of young persons as shall permit the continuation of their education and assure their proper physical development. 7, The principle that men and women should receive equal remuneration for work of equal value. 8, The standard set by law in each country with respect to the conditions of labour should have due regard to the equitable economic treatment of all workers lawfully resident therein. 9, Each State should make provision for a system of inspection in which women should take part, in order to ensure the enforcement of the laws and regulations for the protection of the employed. These were some of the matters referred to the conference. Thirty-eight countries were represented, and a number of women were present. They agreed to the 48-hours week. When we think what that means, a 48-hours week throughout the world, and remember the long hours worked in such countries as India and Japan, we can realise what an immense improvement is going to take place through this International Labour Bureau established by the Peace Treaty. Exceptions were laid down in reference to Japan and India. For a certain time in some instances they are to be allowed to work more than 48 hours in one week. But when we realise that the improvement of labour conditions in one country is going to be the improvement of labour conditions in another country, we shall understand the importance of this conference to every worker throughout the world. Then, again, they made recommendations with regard to unemployment, reciprocity of treatment of foreign workers, the employment of women, the prevention of anthrax and lead poisoning, and also with regard to health matters. But the most important of all were the recommendations with regard to the employment of children. Those who have read the articles written by Mr. McCay, who went

to Japan, on the effect of the employment of children in Japan, children of even four or five years, can understand the immense advance which has been made. We begin to realise that something other than butchery has come out of the war. Improvement of the workers brings an improvement to all classes and, although we in Australia have not much to gain from the first labour conference, because almost everything carried there already exists in Australia, these conferences are to be held every year and we are likely to gain very much indeed from this international Labour movement. I would commend this matter to my Labour colleagues and ask them to study it and see whether, despite all the ills of the war, despite all the savagery and butchery and high cost of living, we are not going to get something which will be conducive to our well-being. I do not think that the only outcome of the war will be ill; I think we shall derive an immense amount of good. When I recollect what has happened over quite a number of years with regard to what is called the Internationale, a large number of labour and socialist men and women meeting on the Continent of Europe with Australian delegates sometimes in attendance, when I think of one section of the workers meeting and how futile were their accomplishments in the past, I begin to feel that after all the war is going to effect an immense amount of good in the status of the working classes. I hope something will be done in the direction of spreading abroad, through newspapers or even by Government pamphlets, accounts of what is being done in other parts of the world to improve the condition of the workers. If this is done, it will go far to allay many of the causes of industrial unrest. I sincerely hope that we may go along without reaping what some other countries are reaping, and that we may be able to bring forward legislation which will enable us to carry on without experiencing those terrible conflicts which are occurring in other parts of the world.

On motion by Hon. Sir E. H. Wittenoom debate adjourned.

House adjourned at 5.50 p.m.