

position. We can sometimes pass legislation that will destroy methods which have been in vogue, whether beneficial or inimical; for whilst the hire-purchase system may have resulted in malpractice on the part of some vendors—I do not say of all, for some have given fair and reasonable consideration to the purchasers—we must not forget that the hire-purchase system has been responsible for innumerable sales, thereby creating an increased circulation of capital, providing work and considerably augmenting the aggregate wages paid. So when we have one set of conditions on one side and another on the other side, we have to weigh those two and consider whether if the benefits which have been derived from hire-purchase were entirely eliminated, it would not be a loss to the community at large, despite the admitted defects of the system. I have heard of many instances that do not reflect credit on the vendors, and so I have sometimes thought we might pass a law that would remove hire-purchase dealings entirely. We could quite easily do that by the passing of a simple one-clause Bill making it unlawful for any person to sell or dispose of or hire goods under the hire-purchase system. But what would be the result? That in place of having the hire-purchase system, we would get the system which the Minister pointed out used to be in vogue before the hire-purchase system came into general use. That was that a man would purchase certain machinery required for his farm, would become the eventual purchaser of it. The vendor of that machinery would give the purchaser time for payment, in the same way as is provided by the hire-purchase system. But the vendor would say, "I will sell it to you and give you time for payment, but you must give me a bill of sale over it." The purchaser would become the nominal owner of the article, but a bill of sale would be created and he would be subject to the terms of that bill of sale. That, probably, would be the result of the passing of this Bill. So I think it would be worth while to make a close investigation into the position that would be created if the Bill were to pass, and at the same time consider whether the community would be benefited or prejudiced by the passing of such a measure. I am not extending any sympathy whatever towards any hire-purchase firm who have acted unfairly towards a hire-purchaser: on the contrary, I should like to

see them wiped off the slate altogether if that were possible: for the man or firm actuated by wrong motives is not worthy of much consideration. But I am regarding it from the standpoint of the interests of the general community, and I think a select committee would do a great deal towards clearing the atmosphere. I impress upon members that the passing of the Bill will not eliminate the existing evil in its entirety, for in all probability it will mean a reversion to the system of purchase under a bill of sale. As we know, to-day if a man purchases a house property, usually it is done by means of a deposit and deferred payment of the balance. Should the selling price of the house be £500, the purchaser may pay a deposit of £50 and give a mortgage for the remaining £450. We are all familiar with the power of a mortgagee. The holder of a bill of sale has exactly the same power, namely the right to seize and sell if the debt is not paid. There is the position. There are many considerations which would arise in an investigation such as I propose. I support the second reading, and I shall be pleased to hear whether Sir Charles Nathan at the proper time will move to send the Bill to a select committee.

On motion by Hon. J. M. Drew, debate adjourned.

House adjourned at 6.12 p.m.

Legislative Assembly,

Thursday, 11th June, 1931.

	PAGE
Questions: Aborigines and half-castes ...	3363
Forestry and Agriculture—1, Release of land; 2, Relative value of production ...	3368
Farming Industry, primage duty ...	3368
Wooroloo Sanatorium ...	3368
Leave of absence ...	3369
Bills: Workers' Compensation, Com. ...	3369
Special Lease (Esperance Pine Plantation) Act Amendment, returned ...	3409

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

QUESTION—ABORIGINES AND HALF-CASTES.

Mr. J. I. MANN asked the Chief Secretary: What were the numbers of aborigines and half-castes, respectively, in the magisterial district of York and the police district of Quairading on 30th June, 1930?

The CHIEF SECRETARY replied: In the York magisterial district, including the police districts of York, Beverley, Brookton, Pingelly, Corrigin, Quairading, Bruce Rock and Narembeen, approximately, 742; in the Quairading police district, 383.

QUESTIONS (2)—FORESTRY AND AGRICULTURE.

As to Release of Land.

Mr. SAMPSON asked the Minister for Forests: 1, Has he noted the remarkable success of Western Australian apple growers in the recent Imperial Fruit Show, particularly of Mr. Geo. Simpson, a grower of Karragullen? 2, In view of this and other successes and the advance in apple production being made through the hills districts, and particularly in view of the exceedingly long period required for the production of marketable jarrah, will he give more generous consideration to the release of country at present held for forestry purposes, but suitable for apple production?

The MINISTER FOR FORESTS replied: 1, Yes. 2, All applications for land considered suitable for cultivation in and around State forests, as well as other Crown land, receive very careful consideration, and I am satisfied that the departments concerned are making genuine efforts to work together in the best interests of the State as a whole.

Relative Value of Production.

Mr. SAMPSON asked the Minister for Agriculture: Will he confer with the Minister for Forests and submit a figure showing the approximate relative value per acre of production from (a) land suitable for fruit production and at present held for forestry purposes; (b) relative periods involved in the production of fruit and marketable timber; (c) position overseas in regard to Western Australian apples and timber; (d) whether present methods involving royalty payments make it possible for

Western Australia to compete overseas with other countries for the supply of timber?

The MINISTER FOR LANDS (for the Minister for Agriculture) replied: I will ask my colleague the Minister for Forests to give further consideration to the matter raised when formulating his forest policy. Owing, however, to the time and labour necessary to prepare the figures referred to I am unable to comply with this request.

QUESTION—FARMING INDUSTRY, PRIMAGE DUTY.

Mr. GRIFFITHS asked the Minister for Lands: 1, Has he any information as to the statement appearing in the Eastern Press that primage duty on cornsacks, super-bags phosphatic rock, sulphur and nitre amounting to £159,750 had been collected from the farming industry since the tax was instituted? 2, Is it correct that the Prime Minister has refused to refund this taxation on wheat growers? 3, The tax now being abolished, will the Government make the strongest possible protest against this burden on a bankrupt industry, and ask that the £159,750 be refunded?

The MINISTER FOR LANDS replied: 1, No official information has reached the Government yet. 2, Answered by No. 1. 3, The matter will be taken up with the Federal authorities.

QUESTION—WOOROLOO SANATORIUM.

Mr. THORN asked the Minister for Health: 1, How many men are employed in the boiler room at the Wooroloo Sanatorium? 2, Has any reduction of the staff been made recently, and when? 3, What was the reason for reducing the staff? 4, Is it a fact that overtime is paid? 5, If so, what amount of overtime has been paid during the last six pay periods?

The MINISTER FOR HEALTH replied: 1, Two—one man and one junior. 2, Yes. Since the introduction of oil burners the staff has been reduced from two men to one man and one boy. 3, The cause of the reduction of staff was the installation of oil burners in the boilers in place of wood fuel. 4, The men in the boiler room work seven days per week, and under the award the

receive pay at the rate of time and a half for Sunday work. This arrangement applied to the employees both before and after the installation of oil burners. No actual overtime has been paid. 5, Answered by No. 4.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

On motion by Mr. North, leave of absence for two weeks granted to the Minister for Agriculture, Mr. Ferguson (Irwin-Moore), on the ground of urgent public business.

BILL—WORKERS' COMPENSATION.

In Committee.

Resumed from the previous day. Mr. Richardson in the Chair; the Minister for Works in charge of the Bill.

First Schedule (partly considered):

Hon. S. W. MUNSIE: I move an amendment—

That after "requisites," in line 6 of paragraph (c) of the proviso to Clause 1, the words "(including crutches)" be inserted.

It is only fair that crutches should be included.

Amendment put and passed.

Hon. S. W. MUNSIE: I move an amendment—

That after "treatment," in line 7, the words "and the travelling expenses of the worker whilst proceeding to any place for treatment, together with the remuneration and travelling expenses of any necessary attendant" be inserted.

This is a necessary provision.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: I have a similar amendment to move later and will accept the hon. member's amendment.

Amendment put and passed.

Hon. S. W. MUNSIE: I move an amendment—

That in line 14 of paragraph (c) the words "fifty-two pounds ten shillings" be struck out with a view to inserting "one hundred pounds."

The Act provides for medical expenses up to £100. It has been alleged that some doctors have made a welter of the medical expenses provision, and there has been a general feeling that this has been the cause

of the increased cost of workers' compensation. In my opinion that is quite wrong. If there was extravagance previously, there will be the same opportunity for extravagance by providing £52 10s. I believe that the bulk of the medical expenses is made up of amounts ranging from £3 to £10. I agree that the Act should be tightened up, and I believe the Minister will get the reduction of cost he desires without reducing the amount provided for medical expenses. The Bill provides for the amount of £52 10s. being exceeded with the approval of the Minister. A strong argument for the retention of the £100 is that cases occur in which time would not permit of application to the Minister for an increase in the expenses allowed. On the second reading the member for South Fremantle mentioned a case where an aeroplane had been engaged to bring the patient to Perth for necessary medical attention. The waste has occurred in the smaller amounts, as the figures quoted by the Minister himself proved. In the majority of cases the expenses were less than £15 15s. The Minister said that 93 per cent. of the claims had been for minor accidents, and I repeat that it is in connection with these the waste has occurred.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: I stated to the House on the second reading that 93 per cent. of the claims made were in respect of temporary disablement, and that the average amount paid for temporary disablement was £8 1s. 1d. under the 1912 Act, and £8 18s. 9d. under the existing Act. I also stated that in connection with medical expenses for claims under the Second Schedule in the case of Government workers, the average under the present Act was £51. Although the Act specially limits the expenses, the State Insurance Office have asked me to approve of further expenditure in order to save payment of compensation for disabilities which should not exist. In one case the expenditure of £7 7s. additional saved the payment of an amount of £375 under the Second Schedule. That case discloses the reason for the saving clause in the Bill. I know that a man with a compound fracture of the leg cannot be cured at a cost of £52 10s. However, the British Medical Association when interviewing me said the £100 without a safeguard was a blunder in the Act, and that this maximum of £100 might without

hardship to anyone be reduced to £50. No Australian Act is as liberal as the Bill in this respect. The Minister would naturally give his approval for a larger amount than £52 10s. if the board recommended it. I have stated that Queensland allows no medical or hospital fees. That statement has been twice denied by the member for South Fremantle. I have therefore taken the trouble to telegraph to Queensland on the subject. Apparently I have to make my points on documentary evidence. As regards our Second Schedule, the average cost of medical and hospital expenses in the past has been £51, which amount would be additional to any payment under the Second Schedule. The following telegram was sent by Mr. Huelin, the Secretary of our Medical Department, to the Under Secretary, Chief Secretary's Department, Brisbane:—

Asserted here that hospital treatment in public hospitals Queensland free to all patients. Is this so, and does system apply to workers' compensation cases?

The reply received from the Under Secretary, Brisbane, reads—

Usual charge is 9s. daily. All patients admitted are required to pay according to their ability.

Thereupon the following message was sent from this end—

Thanks for your wire. Statement being repeated here in Parliament that workers' compensation cases your State receive free hospital treatment. Kindly state if correct.

I will now read a letter from Mr. Huelin, dated the 22nd ultimo and addressed to the Government Statistician—

With reference to your further inquiry this morning in regard to the Queensland practice relating to hospital charges, I have received the following further telegram from the Assistant Under Secretary, Chief Secretary's Department:—"No provision in Queensland law for making hospital treatment charge on workers' compensation. Hospital authorities collect charges whenever possible. Letter following."

The letter from Queensland stated—

With reference to your telegram of to-day's date, addressed to the Under Secretary, Chief Secretary's Office, asking for particulars of the procedure followed in this State with regard to the hospital treatment of workers' compensation patients, I have the honour, by direction, to inform you that neither the hospital nor workers' compensation laws of this State have any provision

making hospital treatment a charge on workers' compensation benefits. There is a practice which is followed in Brisbane and in other centres whereby the Hospital Board has an arrangement with the State Insurance Office or its local agent under which the hospital authorities are notified of the receipt or granting of claims for compensation in their particular districts, and are thereby enabled to take measures to obtain payment of the hospital charges. It may be mentioned that all hospitals have the statutory right to recover fees by legal process, and there is no recognised right to free treatment except with respect to those people who are unable to pay any portion of the prescribed charges. Many hospital authorities in this State have complained of the absence of some legislative provision whereby hospital fees will be a charge against workers' compensation benefits, and payable directly to the hospital authority. The method followed at present has the effect of enabling a certain proportion of the fees in respect of workers' compensation patients to be collected, but there are a great number who entirely escape their responsibility.

There is a good deal more of the letter which however I will not read. I may mention the letter states that last year a Bill was introduced into the Queensland Parliament providing for medical benefits, but was dropped at the first reading. I also have the regulations under the Queensland Workers' Compensation Act, and regulation 20 provides in respect of medical and surgical attendance and hospital treatment—

An employer authorised by the Commissioner may, on behalf of the Commissioner, make arrangements or agreements with any medical practitioner or any hospital or other institution for providing medical and surgical attendance, treatment, and aid to any injured worker out of the compensation payable to such worker. In cases of emergency where the Commissioner is satisfied that in the interests of an injured worker it was necessary that immediate action should be taken the Commissioner may ratify any arrangement or agreement made by the employer or his behalf for providing medical and surgical attendance, treatment, or aid to such worker out of the compensation payable to him.

The position is quite clear. Not only is there no free hospital treatment in Queensland, but there is no free medical treatment and the Queensland Commissioner has the right to deduct medical expenses from the compensation payment. Apart from New South Wales and the Commonwealth, no Australian State allows any medical or hospital expenses. New South Wales allow £25 for doctor, £25 for hospital, and £10s. for ambulance. I agree that in some cases £52 10s. is not sufficient to cover

those expenses. The presumption is that the fixing of the sum operates as a check, and that no doctor will be able to collect more than £25 without the permission of the commissioner. When we come to discuss the Second Schedule, let us realise the fact that the average amount which has been paid for medical and hospital expenses is £51, and that this is in addition to the amount payable under the Second Schedule. I hope the amendment will not be carried.

Mr. ANGELO: In moving his amendment the member for Hannans said he did not agree with the suggestion that the £100 standing in the present Act has been responsible for some of the high accounts of doctors. I have seen many accounts rendered by medical men in workers' compensation cases, and I have come to the conclusion that the £100 fixed by the Act has had a considerable effect on a certain section of the medical fraternity in the direction of increasing their bills. Older members of the House may recollect that a few years ago I read out numerous accounts which had been received by an insurance company from medical men. Quite a number of these accounts were for £99 and over. I remember one account for removing the tip of a finger, which ran to £99 16s. The Leader of the Opposition, who was then Premier, thanked me for bringing the matter before the House. I feel certain that if the provision for £100 were to remain in the Act, it would be to the detriment of the worker, because the medical charges paid would come out of the compensation he received subsequently.

Hon. S. W. Munsie: Certainly not.

Mr. ANGELO: The commission and the medical board will exercise supervision over the medical accounts that will be rendered, and in those circumstances I do not see why any particular amount should be mentioned in the Bill. I certainly prefer £52 10s. to the £100, and will vote against the amendment.

Mr. KENNEALLY: The amendment is essential if the interests of the workers are to be conserved. I can recall our experience in earlier days when we had to go cap in hand to employers to urge them to grant additional relief to men who were seriously injured.

Mr. Sampson: The opportunity for hospital and medical service is greater now than in those days.

Mr. KENNEALLY: The opportunity made greater because the amount available has been reduced!

Mr. Sampson: The Minister has power to excess the amount.

Mr. KENNEALLY: The injured man will have no knowledge as to whether the Minister will agree to excess the amount.

Mr. Sampson: It has been said often enough during the debate that the Minister will certainly excess the amount when circumstances justify him in doing so.

Mr. KENNEALLY: The worker may not know that the Minister will agree to that course until the stage has passed at which medical or surgical attention would prove beneficial to him, and he may in consequence be maimed for life.

Mr. Sampson: The Minister will be sympathetic.

Mr. KENNEALLY: But the Minister may not be there for long, and if we are to judge him by the way he has cut down the amounts in the Second Schedule, he may not prove sympathetic. If the provision for £100 were left in the measure, it would save the injured worker not merely physical suffering but acute mental strain. The Minister has not given us any particular reasons for the reduction he has suggested.

The Minister for Works: I read the letter from the British Medical Association, in which they advised that £52 10s. was enough.

Hon. A. McCallum: What right had the B.M.A. to determine that?

Mr. KENNEALLY: Did the Minister ascertain the injured worker's point of view? On the committee, of which he has spoken so much, various interests were represented, but not those of the worker.

The Minister for Works: That statement is not correct, and you know it.

Mr. KENNEALLY: If the Minister desired to be fair, he should at least have made provision for getting the worker's views.

The Minister for Works: I availed myself of the services of one gentleman to whom your Minister furnished credentials enabling him to make inquiries in all parts of the world.

Mr. KENNEALLY: I am not questioning that gentleman's qualifications at all; I understand he is a medical man of considerable experience and undoubted ability, but he does not represent the workers of the State.

The Minister fortified himself with the representations of the British Medical Association.

The Minister for Works: A deputation from that body waited upon me.

Mr. KENNEALLY: And so did a deputation from the Underwriters' Association. Both bodies were represented on the committee, but not the workers. Personally I want to be able to say that although there have been alterations made in the Act, Parliament has been humane in providing sufficient money to prevent an injured worker from having to worry as to how his medical and hospital accounts will be met. By suffering a reduction of wages by 50 per cent. and being able to draw up to £3 10s. only, during the period of incapacity, the worker is handicapped sufficiently already. I do not want this measure to say to the worker, "You are going to have a few medical expenses to meet when you have recovered from your injuries." So I hope the amendment restoring the £100 will be carried. It has been argued that the sum of £100 lends itself to exploitation. But the contention of the Minister is that these new provisions in the Bill will restrict opportunity for exploitation. I think they will. If so, if we have this safeguard against exploitation there is no need to cut down the amount allowed for medical expenses. After all, it is of little advantage that the Minister should have power to exceed the amount.

The Minister for Works: The Minister has no power to exceed it to-day.

Mr. MILLINGTON: The Minister, although he proposes to reduce the amount allowed for medical expenses from £100 to 50 guineas, still insists that the injured person shall have proper medical attendance. So his reason for reducing the amount must be that he proposes to put a check on the charges made by some members of the medical profession. The general impression is that the practice is to overcharge. In my view, extortionate charging is not confined to the medical profession. I could refer to other professions whose members charge extortionate fees. The medical profession, on the other hand, stands alone for benevolent and philanthropic acts. One cannot get free advice from the members of any other profession that I can think of, yet with members of the medical profession it is the usual practice that those who cannot pay must receive service free. Now we are told there

is to be a special check placed upon members of the medical profession and a certain amount of ignominy cast upon them. Records show that the overcharges for medical attention have not been made in the range between 50 guineas and £100. So the proposed reduction is not a safeguard after all. What relation would either £100 or 50 guineas have to the average workers' compensation case? Neither one amount nor the other would be a check on the medical charges, which are more likely to be less than £10. Since the fees charged by the medical profession are to be scrutinised, there is no need to reduce the amount allowed for medical expenses.

The Minister for Works: The B.M.A. are doing that now.

Mr. MILLINGTON: If a rapacious medical man knows that his account is to be subject to examination by men who will immediately detect an overcharge, it will be a deterrent against excessive charging. Without the proposed scrutiny, the reducing of the amount to 50 guineas would not be a deterrent to a medical man inclined to high charges. There should be some means of determining whether workers' compensation cases are charged more than ordinary cases. I see no reason why a worker should be charged more because he is secured, than if he were paying for medical services privately. In the past there has been on the part of certain medical practitioners a disposition to get the full amount available under the Act. In future, no doubt, there will be much stricter supervision over those accounts, which in itself will be a check or exploitation. Moreover, in view of the general economic depression, a special effort will be made to keep all expenditure within bounds. The Minister should devise means for an examination of accounts, and the drawing up of a schedule beyond which doctors cannot go for an ordinary attendance. Now that the premiums will be less and strict economy will be practised in respect to the fund, members of the medical profession will have to fall into line. It would be just as necessary to spend £100 in some cases as three or four guineas in another case. The reduction of the allowance to 50 guineas will certainly not constitute a check upon the wastage that has occurred in the past.

Hon. M. F. TROY: If there has been an exploitation of the workers' compensation

scheme by the medical profession, surely the Minister can quote some instances of this. To reduce the amount allowed in the schedule to 50 guineas will be an injustice to a large number of people in this country. In many cases it will be wholly inadequate to meet the charges it will be necessary to incur, and the balance will have to be paid by the worker. Sometimes it is necessary to rush a specialist to a country case by aeroplane. It surely cannot be expected that the £52 10s. would also cover that. The Bill does not go as far as the Act it attempts to replace. Apparently, the Minister's view is limited to what has been done elsewhere. He instructs a clerk to send a telegram to find out what has been done in some other State.

The Minister for Works: I did that in order to reply to certain statements made here.

Hon. M. F. TROY: Because certain things are done elsewhere, there is no reason why we should do them here. The allowance of £100 has been available for three or four years and has proved very beneficial. Grave risk will be incurred by hundreds of people in the country if they are denied the help they should get when they meet with an accident in a centre where there is no medical or hospital aid.

The Minister for Works: The Bill provides for reasonable travelling expenses quite apart from the 50 guineas.

Hon. M. F. TROY: What if the accident occurred on a station 300 miles from Perth, and an aeroplane had to be requisitioned to convey a specialist to the spot?

The Minister for Lands: That would be deemed a reasonable expense.

Hon. M. F. TROY: The board might determine otherwise. There has been no agitation for a reduction in the amount. What induced the Minister to do this? He has no practical experience of any exploitation of this fund. Who asked him to make the reduction? It was certainly not made an issue at the last general elections. We are summoned to a special session and we are told this is the important measure for us to deal with, but Government supporters during the elections did not breathe a word regarding it. The Minister has not conceded anything; he is taking something away, and it will do much harm to a deserving section.

Mr. PANTON: I am rather surprised at the Minister's obstinacy, if I may use that word.

The Minister for Works: No, that is not right.

Mr. PANTON: Perhaps it is the incorrect word to use, now that I come to think it over. But the Minister must realise, with the machinery in this Bill, that there is little or no chance of any of the alleged exploitation we hear so much about taking place. Surely if the Medical Board are going to be worth anything at all they will supervise the charges made by the medical fraternity. If there is to be a full-time man on that board, it will be one of his jobs. The seven per cent. of cases that came under the Second Schedule and numbering 13,200, which the Minister told us about, were State Insurance Office cases, and we know that that office had insured practically the whole of the timber workers. It was from this section that all the complaints came.

The Minister for Works: Millars and Bunning's were self-insured.

Mr. PANTON: It was from the timber mills that most of the complaints came, and it was urged that if the amount were reduced below the £100 there would not be so many of those cases. That is absurd because any reduction will not prevent people so inclined cutting off their toes. My advice is that of some 800 accounts that were scrutinised by the British Medical Association very few, if any, were found to be overcharged. I am advised also that medical practitioners impose their charges in accordance with what the individual would be earning, and not because of the fact that he was entitled to so much. Therefore I fail to see where all the agitation, about which we have been told, has come from. Under the existing Act the Minister has all the machinery he requires to control the charges. It seems to me that the accusations that have been made against the profession have been taken very seriously by this Parliament; in fact, Parliament has come to the conclusion that those accusations have been proved. If the amount is reduced, that, in effect, is what we shall be saying. I do not think the Minister has any intention of publishing such a thing to the world at large. Rather should we say that the medical profession has given us a fair deal and will continue to do so in the future.

Mr. HEGNEY: The Minister told us that he was not so keen on the subject of the provision for medical expenses, and we find that at the conference he had with members of the British Medical Association, Dr. Anderson stated that this particular provision in the 1925 Act was the major blunder of that measure. It has been proved that only in a very few cases were the medical charges excessive. Consequently the provision in the Bill we are now dealing with is absolutely contrary to the Minister's own statement, and not in accordance with the facts of which we are aware. The workers are now to be penalised, not because of their own extravagance, but because of that alleged against the medical men. I have in mind the case of a man who met with an accident to his foot and he was for over two years trying to get it right again. He exceeded the full amount of £100, and after having been treated at one hospital he went to the public hospital where it cost him £28. The man was unable to pay the account. Five specialists said that they could not cure the foot, and some of them wanted to amputate it. Others also declared that the foot would not get better. In that case the amount of expenses exceeded considerably the £100. There are many such cases. There is no warrant for the proposed reduction, even on the Minister's own admission. Workers received a measure of justice under the existing Act, whereas previously they suffered injustice because of the inadequate provision made for them. Now it is intended to reduce the amount and again penalise them. In very few instances has the provision been exploited, and the law should not be altered to meet a few exceptional instances. To reduce the amount would be a retrograde step for which there is no warrant.

Hon. J. C. WILLCOCK: I am surprised that the amount should have been reduced. The cost of workers' compensation has been high, and it has been alleged that the medical expenses were partly responsible for the high cost, but other steps have been taken to keep down the cost and there is no need to reduce the medical expenses. A medical board will be appointed to whom the commission responsible for making payments can refer each case. When a bill of legal costs is presented, it can be taxed by the Master of the Supreme Court to check overcharging. Similarly any tendency by doctors to overcharge under this measure can

be dealt with by the medical board, who will be able to make an intelligent decision. In the past there may have been justification for reducing the amount and requiring the Minister to approve of any excess, but now that the work is to be taken over by the medical board, there is no need for the Minister to interfere.

The Minister for Works: The Minister would do as the board recommended.

Hon. J. C. WILLCOCK: Then why make the alteration? The board will ensure that there is no exploitation. In cases it may be necessary to exceed the 50 guineas. I assume that the Minister would be guided by the experts. That being so, why not allow the £100 to stand? With a medical board to safeguard the position the amount is not of great importance. Is there to be any tentative authority with regard to exceeding the amount?

The Minister for Works: The words "with the approval of the Minister" should come out, so that the matter will be left to the board.

Hon. J. C. WILLCOCK: If it is left to the discretion of the board to allow expenses to any amount—

The Minister for Works: That is what the Bill provides.

Hon. J. C. WILLCOCK: Then why insert a particular amount? Undoubtedly the Government will appoint a board in whom we have confidence and, that being so, there should be no need to stipulate the amount. No one would question the decision of the board on the matter of a costly operation. If the average cost has been £51, many cases must have cost much less, while a fair number must have cost as much as £60, £70, £80 or £90.

The Minister for Works: A lot have cost £100.

Hon. J. C. WILLCOCK: Perhaps, with the limit of £100, a fair charge in some cases would have been £125, but the doctor, to avoid circumlocution, may have reduced it to £100. The board would challenge any charge that was too high.

Sitting suspended from 6.15 to 7.30 p.m.

Mr. MARSHALL: My electorate, more than any other in the State, will be affected by this provision, because of the long distance that injured workers will have to travel in order to reach the city. The Minister says this is the most liberal of all medical

allowances within the Commonwealth, and he has referred to the Eastern States in order to build up an argument for the reduction of the amounts, whereas he could have found innumerable excuses to increase them. He has stated he wants to prevent the exploitation of these medical expenses, and his Bill bristles with provisions to that end. Notwithstanding these safeguards, he has reduced the amount to 50 guineas. There can be no possible chance of the fund being exploited once this Bill is in operation. What more does the Minister want? I am inclined to think the statements concerning exploitation by members of the medical profession have been exaggerated. I suspect the Minister has been influenced by outside propaganda. Under the Bill, all expenditure of this kind will be controlled by the medical board, and even the smallest accounts will be reviewed. There can be no necessity to reduce the allowance on the score of exploitation, and I hope it will be restored to the £100. If the amount is left at 50 guineas, the injured worker will never know whether the board will exceed it, and may hesitate to incur that expense which will be necessary to restore him to health. We should not always be a body of copyists waiting for other countries to give us a lead. Could we expect the United States or Canada, or the small, thickly populated countries, to adopt similar laws to ours? Our laws would not be applicable to their conditions. In thickly populated countries medical and hospital facilities are always at hand. But a man injured in the Kimberleys or at Wyndham would have to travel thousands of miles to Perth for treatment. Our position cannot be compared even with that of any of the Eastern States. The Minister should allow the amount appearing in the present Act to appear in this Bill.

Mr. CORBOY: I do not agree with either the clause as drafted, or with the amendment, though I support the amendment as the lesser of two evils. On the Minister's own arguments, what is the need for altering the existing law? He says he will have a medical board to prevent robbery of the funds, and yet he fixes the maximum of £52 10s. I care not what the amount may be, there is no necessity for a limit. If by the spending of money on transport to another centre or on the service of a specialist a

life can be saved, the necessary expenditure should be incurred, even if it amounts to £300 instead of £52 10s.

Mr. Angelo: The Bill allows that.

Mr. CORBOY: No.

Mr. Angelo: With the approval of the Minister.

Mr. CORBOY: I am not prepared to accept the hon. member's assurance. It surprises me that the hon. member, coming from an electorate as remote as my own, should make such a suggestion.

Mr. Angelo: Earlier in the evening I suggested that there should be no limit.

Mr. CORBOY: While the member for South Fremantle was the Minister administering the Workers' Compensation Act, an accident occurred in the south end of my electorate, and the only doctor available demanded that fifty guineas should be telegraphed to Southern Cross before he left for the locality of the accident. Thus the whole amount proposed by the Bill was at once wiped out. The same sort of thing occurred at Hopetoun. The doctor at Katanning refused to leave for the purpose of attending a case until he got fifty guineas by telegraph. The man was dead ten minutes before the doctor arrived at Hopetoun. The position as regards these accident cases is complicated by a multiplicity of causes. First of all, the local hospital at Southern Cross, because of the action of the Minister for Health, is no longer a hospital available for residents of the district in the sense of dealing with cases that would come under this measure.

The Minister for Lands: Of course it is.

Mr. CORBOY: It is not available. That hospital, which is ostensibly a Government hospital, is leased to a nurse and run as a private hospital under her sole jurisdiction, for her to do as she likes.

The Minister for Lands: No. She is under an agreement.

Mr. CORBOY: I am talking of what the facts are, not of what the Minister thinks they ought to be. For some two years now the hospital has been open only to maternity cases, out of which the nurse is assured of at least a fiver. The Southern Cross doctor, who is a decent chap, has repeatedly gone to the expense of taking to the Merredin hospital, by his own car, cases which could not obtain treatment in the Southern Cross hospital.

The Minister for Lands: I will see that a copy of your speech is sent to the matron in charge of the Southern Cross hospital.

Mr. CORBOY: I am delighted to hear it. The lady is a pal of mine, and she will be pleased to read the speech. For the benefit of the Minister, may I add that she is a dear lady and nursed me at the war. She is a charming woman, but under her agreement with the Minister she is fully entitled to do what in fact she is doing. The nearest hospital, that at Merredin, is over 70 miles away. On the other side, the Kalgoorlie hospital is 130 or 140 miles distant. To transport accident cases to Merredin or elsewhere, and to do all that the Bill specifies, is absolutely impossible with an allowance of £52 10s.

The Minister for Lands: Travelling expenses are not included in that amount.

Mr. CORBOY: Of course they are. Surely the Deputy Leader of the Government knows the details of a Government Bill. The clause provides that there shall be supplied to the worker in respect of his injury medicines, medical or surgical requisites (including crutches now), and medical or surgical attendance on and treatment of the worker (including first aid and ambulance or other service to carry the worker to a hospital or other place for treatment), hospital charges for treatment and maintenance not exceeding 10s. 6d. per day, and also including treatment by specialists when their services are found necessary, and the provision of artificial limbs. All these things are to come out of the £52 10s.! As regards my electorate, that provision is absolutely stupid. The £52 10s. might be absorbed in cost of transport to a hospital. There is no ambulance in those places, and the disturbance caused to the business of a motor hiring garage in carrying out such a trip justifies a high charge. Moreover, the doctor frequently has to go out 50 miles into the bush to meet a case coming in. During the time I have represented the electorate, there have been two cases south of Southern Cross and Marvel Loch in which a man's life was saved by the fact that he was left in the locality where the accident occurred until the doctor arrived to bring him in. So long as the Minister has the control over expenditure which he says the Bill gives him, there can be no need for any limit. Another objectionable feature is that in the event of its being necessary to incur an expenditure of more

than £52 10s., the consent of the commission, with the approval of the Minister, must be obtained.

The Minister for Works: You can cut out the reference to the consent of the Minister.

The Minister for Lands: Even so, the hon. member must know that an adjustment would be made afterwards, not before.

Mr. Panton: Yes, after the death of the injured worker!

Mr. CORBOY: I said that this would mainly affect grave cases, and certainly the unfortunate individual would be in his grave before any such adjustment could be made. Would anyone take the risk of spending £30 or £40 on the off chance of gaining the consent of the Minister to the expenditure?

The Minister for Lands: Of course you know that, if it were a question of saving life, that risk would be taken.

Mr. CORBOY: In view of the provisions in the Bill, no one would take that risk.

The Minister for Lands: It is not a question of money at all, when a man's life is in the balance.

Mr. CORBOY: Of course, the question of money does enter into the matter. I have already quoted one instance about a doctor.

The Minister for Lands: What doctor was that?

Hon. A. McCallum: Do not give the name.

The Minister for Lands: We might ascertain whether that doctor was paid a subsidy by the Government.

Mr. CORBOY: At any rate, I do not think I should disclose the name. Not even a senior officer in the Public Service would be prepared to incur heavy expenditure in the circumstances, let alone a private individual. For my part, I do not think it necessary to specify any amount, seeing that sufficient safeguards are provided to see that expenditure is kept within reasonable limits.

Hon. A. McCALLUM: We are dealing with one portion of the Bill that was featured in the Press propaganda, paid for by the insurance companies, in connection with which articles appeared in the "West Australian" so frequently.

Mr. Corboy: Consider the dictatorial article in yesterday's issue, for a start!

Hon. A. McCALLUM: The insurance companies adopted that attitude in order to draw attention away from their own actions in increasing insurance costs themselves. They set out to create prejudice and foment

the right atmosphere, in the midst of which Parliament might be called upon to deal with this question. They saddled the medical fraternity with the charge of having made a welter of the £100 provision. The Press articles always included an appeal to the worker, who was advised that the medical men had got the benefit of the £100, not the workers. There was never any intention to provide money for the workers under this heading, but merely for the payment of services rendered. I do not contend that some doctors have not received more money under this heading than they were entitled to. I know there have been such instances, and that some workmen have acted in concert with the doctors in order to secure their ends. On the other hand that does not furnish an adequate reason for reducing the amount. The offer that I made previously on behalf of the Opposition that we would help the Government to tighten up control and to secure such better supervision as would make abuses impossible, still stands. On the other hand we will not agree for one moment to the proposal to decrease the amount available. Why have not the Government set out to formulate a scheme that would secure better control and prevent such abuses as I have referred to? I have cited instances to show that, for the mere want of a few pounds to pay for operations when they were necessary, there are men maimed and crippled to-day who are an economic burden not only upon their families but upon the State as well. The Minister himself has proved that £52 10s. will not be sufficient, because he said the average had been nearly £51, and that the majority of the cases cost less than £10. That means to say that the few that involved greater expenditure, were the serious cases. The object of the Bill should be to make such provision as will enable an injured worker to recover as soon as possible so that he may again take his place as a producing unit in the community. There should be no limit set for the amount available for expenditure in that direction. I have already referred to the accident to the lad on a station in the North-West when his skull was fractured as the result of a kick from a horse, and an operation was necessary within 48 hours in order to save his life. The amount provided, £52 10s., could not possibly cover the expenses involved in dealing with such an accident. The practice in the past has been for the manager of

the station where the accident occurs to guarantee payment to W.A. Airways for aeroplane services, and that was done because of the knowledge that £100 was available to cover such expenses. The provision of £52 10s. will entirely alter the position, and station managers will not be able to give such guarantees. I have interviewed pastoralists, and have also consulted W.A. Airways. The company informed me that no aeroplane would be able to leave Perth on such missions in future until the company had been guaranteed payment for the services rendered. It could not be expected that the company would act otherwise. Parliament has no right to call upon station owners, W.A. Airways, or anyone else to make workers' compensation a charity stunt. People are entitled to be paid for services rendered, and we must expect reasonable business precautions to be taken in that direction. In many instances if a doctor has to go from a town to an out back station he must engage an aeroplane if one is available. When the doctor decides that a patient must be taken by aeroplane to Perth for an operation within 48 hours, before that can be done a telegram must be sent to Airways, they have to find out where the money will come from, and then the commission has to be approached. The commission, seeking information, will wire to the doctor, the doctor will wire back to the commission, whereupon the commission, if they are all in town, may agree. Then they have to get the Minister's approval, after which they have to notify Airways to send up the plane and get the patient. That is the procedure that will have to be followed, and it will mean a minimum of from two to three days before all that can be done. It means that an injured man who must be operated on within 48 hours, will not be given a fighting chance for his life. Last night, when discussing the waiting time, the Minister said, "Here is the latest Commonwealth Act. Let us adopt that." The very law he was quoting last night, the Commonwealth Act, provides for £100. Why, then, does not the Minister, since he wanted us to follow that Act last night, agree to be guided by it to-night? The Minister read out correspondence between his officials and Queensland in an attempt to disprove the statement I made that under the Workers' Compensation Act injured men were treated without charge in the Queensland hospitals. My statement was made on the authority

of a man who was a member of the Queensland Government that passed their existing law. Recently I was in Sydney with him, when we discussed the provisions of his Act and he gave me all the details. I have not any doubt that the information he gave me is a correct interpretation of what actually happens.

The Minister for Works: In Queensland they are all charged 9s. per day, but if a man cannot pay, the money cannot be collected.

Hon. A. McCALLUM: The Queensland Act provides that where total or partial incapacity for work is the result of an accident to the worker, a sum not exceeding £1 per week during incapacity shall be paid, with such necessary medical comforts and medicine as the commission may consider reasonable. They get that. Will the Minister deny it?

The Minister for Works: Read Section 28. Here is the Act.

Hon. A. McCALLUM: I am reading from the Act. Then the Minister said the New South Wales Act provides for £52 2s. But that is only part of the case. Another section of the Act provides that if a worker is a subscriber to a public hospital and so entitled to treatment for the amount of his subscriptions, or if he is a contributor to any local medical fund and is entitled by reason thereof to treatment in a public hospital, it shall not affect the liability of an employer under the scheme. So the injured worker gets the benefit of that provision in addition to the £52 2s., whereas under our Act he gets no such advantage. If a man is treated under a local medical fund, he can get nothing under our Act, but in New South Wales the injured worker gets the benefit of treatment under the local fund in addition to the £52 2s.

The Minister for Works: So it is here.

Hon. A. McCALLUM: Nonsense! Our workers get no such advantage. If they are paying into a medical or hospital fund, they cannot be recouped under our Act. Any member representing an outback district with a local fund will confirm that. So what is the use of the Minister saying that injured workers in this State have all the advantages to be derived in New South Wales? Treatment under a local fund is never recouped under our Act.

Mr. Marshall: That is quite correct. Under our Act no liability has ever been

paid to the funds at Wiluna and Meekatharra.

The Minister for Works: They have never been charged.

Mr. Marshall: Of course they have been charged.

Hon. A. McCALLUM: Miss Holman was on my doorstep day after day in reference to the local funds at the timber mills. Quite recently I have had a letter from Collie asking how the local fund was to operate under the new Bill. On another occasion I went to Nannup to enlighten the people there as to the operation of their fund. So it is of no use the Minister putting up that argument. When it suits the Minister he wants the latest Commonwealth Act, but when he finds that the Commonwealth Act provides for £100, he does not want that provision. Many countries follow the idea expounded by the member for Yilgarn and set no limitation whatever upon the cost of the treatment accorded the injured worker. Owing to propaganda, the people of this State have become convinced that our £100 is exceptional, that nowhere else is so liberal a provision made. We boast of Australia's being in the van of social progress.

Mr. H. W. Mann: Would it not be wise to consider the position of the Australian States?

Hon. A. McCALLUM: I have quoted the Commonwealth Act, and New South Wales makes better provision than we do.

The Minister for Works: I do not agree with that.

Hon. A. McCALLUM: Either the Minister cannot or will not see the point. The Minister's statement last night should decide the question. Which is the latest Act? It is a Commonwealth Act, which makes provision for £100. It is necessary to know the attitude of hospitals. If a man received free hospital treatment, he would not be provided for under this legislation. Who would regard the Balkans as ahead of Australia?

Mr. H. W. Mann: We do not know the conditions there.

Hon. A. McCALLUM: Judging by the Bulgarian workers who have come here, we would regard them as people who would accept conditions much below ours. Yet in Bulgaria a worker is treated until his injury is healed. In British Columbia provision is made as long as and whenever re-

quired to cure and heal the injury. The amount of £100 is neither exceptional nor unreasonable. Consider the items to be charged against the 50 guineas—medicine, medical and surgical attention, requisites, treatment including first aid and ambulance, and the cost of transport to the place of treatment. A single operation might exhaust the 50 guineas and, to exceed that sum, the approval of the Minister must be obtained. Cases in the outback country that should command our greatest sympathy will be penalised by the limitation. It is a soul-less proposition. The amount should be unlimited, as it is in many other countries.

The Minister for Railways: Like this debate.

Hon. A. McCALLUM: It has not been very long as yet.

The Minister for Railways: I do not like the "yet." Is that a threat or a promise?

Hon. A. McCALLUM: We have not occupied more time than was necessary. It is a rotten proposition. The Bill has been brought down in a session when we were to deal with unemployment, finance and allied problems, and by a Government pledged not to interfere with industrial conditions. The Government have been 12 months in office and have not a proposal to deal with the financial or economic position. Last session their principal Bill was an amendment of the Arbitration Act to deprive workers of benefits.

The CHAIRMAN: The hon. member must adhere to the amendment.

Hon. A. McCALLUM: This Bill is in keeping with the Government's other acts to lower the conditions of the workers. The Government have no idea, programme, policy or suggestion to deal with unemployment or finance. The best they can suggest is to beat down the injured worker by £50. To meet the economic needs of the State, they would take benefits from the men most in need of help. There will be little inducement for men to work in the back country if such conditions are to prevail. Before Parliament met, propaganda in favour of the Bill was carried on and was well paid for.

The Minister for Works: How do you mean paid for?

Hon. A. McCALLUM: I am not suggesting that the hon. member had anything to do with paying for it, but he can rest assured it was not done for love of the work.

It was done for substantial return. The public have been led to believe that the £100 medical expenses represented a terrific impost on industry and that it was the one blemish on the existing Act. I would have liked to assist the Minister to tighten up control of the medical service. The Minister said the Bill would give effective control. I cannot believe that it will.

Mr. Corboy: If that is so, he does not need the limit for medical expenses.

Hon. A. McCALLUM: No; he should exercise power through the medical board to prevent any excessive charges being imposed. This proposal may lead to loss of life and to men being maimed, bent and crooked and a burden to the country for the rest of their lives instead of being cured and returned to industry.

Mr. RAPHAEL: The Minister told us on the second reading that the doctors would be prevented from robbing the workers.

The Minister for Works: I did not say they were robbing the workers.

Mr. RAPHAEL: That is my interpretation of the Minister's remarks. The Minister led us to believe there was no loophole in the Bill. The amount of £100 was provided, not so much for the worker in the metropolitan area, as for the worker in the outback parts of the State. The Minister has gone all over the world for examples.

Mr. Millington: He has searched the world for bad examples.

Mr. RAPHAEL: And has found them. No amount can be too great for the rehabilitation of a worker injured in industry. We are told that 50 guineas should be sufficient. I know a boy who got a grain of sand in the ear. It led to double mastoid and pneumonia, and the expenses for doctors and hospital were in the vicinity of £200. That was the sum I had to pay out myself. For the Minister to suggest that £52 10s. would be sufficient for a man who had been badly smashed up in a mining accident is absurd. He said not one man in the Labour movement had been taken into the Government's confidence in respect to the contents of this Bill. That is so. Had we known what it contained we should not have been wasting all this time and putting the country to so much expense.

Mr. Panton: Speak for yourself.

Mr. RAPHAEL: The Minister is establishing a medical board to review all the expenditure and keep it within bounds, and in the same breath he is cutting down the allowance by practically half. His attitude is wholly illogical.

Mr. SLEEMAN: A most convincing case against the Minister's proposal has been put up from this side of the House. I am only sorry private members opposite have not had anything to say on the question. The sum of fifty guineas is wholly inadequate to cover the expense involved in a serious accident, and it is unjust to the worker that the allowance should be cut down. The Minister said party politics would be set aside in connection with this Bill. I now ask members opposite to adopt that suggestion and to vote honestly as they feel they should vote on this question.

Mr. WITHERS: This reduction in the medical allowances is undoubtedly directed at the medical profession the members of which will be the only people to benefit from it, seeing that the worker will get nothing whatever. The Minister is creating a medical board by which all accounts will be carefully scrutinised. That being so, there is no room for argument in favour of reducing the amount. If any exploitation has occurred, it has been over small sums up to £15. The machinery of the Bill will enable all expenditure to be fully controlled, and will also prevent malingerers on the part of any worker. I wish to stress the necessity for reverting to the original sum of £100 so that the interests of the injured worker may not suffer.

Mr. CORBOY: The principle of dispensing with any limit whatever operates already in many countries. I have found no fewer than 21 of them.

The Minister for Works: But in some of them the worker contributes to the fund.

Mr. CORBOY: I am aware that the method of organising the fund varies in different countries. There is no limit in Bulgaria. In Canada the various provinces have their different methods, but largely the same thing applies. In Alberta the amount is at the discretion of the Workers' Compensation Board. In British Columbia and Manitoba the duration of treatment is "so long as and whenever required to cure or relieve the effects of the injury," and

there is no maximum expenditure. New Brunswick and Ontario have the same provision as Alberta. Denmark treats the injury until healed. The same thing applies in France, where, moreover, treatment is repeated if subsequent review shows it to be necessary. Treatment is also renewed in Germany.

The Minister for Works: But in Germany the worker contributes.

Mr. CORBOY: That has nothing to do with the limit.

Hon. A. McCallum: The German fund covers not only accident, but unemployment and sickness.

Mr. CORBOY: Great Britain gives treatment until the injury is healed, with subsequent renewal of treatment if necessary. In Hungary the position is the same. Even Japan treats its industrial casualties until they are healed, irrespective of cost. Many minor European countries have the same provision, and so have the Netherlands, Norway, Poland, Czecho-Slovakia, Sweden and Switzerland. Surely it is not too much to ask the Minister to agree to a provision enabling us to treat our industrial casualties until they are healed, irrespective of cost. Surely the worker has the right to demand that. The Bill proposes that not more than £52 10s. shall be expended in putting right, as far as may be, even a man who has lost a limb. I hope the Minister will take a more reasonable view of the matter.

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

Ayes	16
Noes	19

Majority against 3

AYES.

Mr. Corboy	Mr. Panton
Mr. Hegney	Mr. Sleeman
Mr. Johnson	Mr. Troy
Mr. Kenneally	Mr. Wansbrough
Mr. Marshall	Mr. Willcock
Mr. McCallum	Mr. Wilson
Mr. Millington	Mr. Wither
Mr. Munsie	Mr. Raphael

(*Tell.*)

NOES.

Mr. Angelo	Mr. Parker
Mr. Barnard	Mr. Patrick
Mr. Brown	Mr. Piesse
Mr. Doney	Mr. Sampson
Mr. Griffiths	Mr. Scaddan
Mr. Latham	Mr. J. H. Smith
Mr. Lindsay	Mr. Thorn
Mr. H. W. Mann	Mr. Wells
Mr. J. I. Mann	Mr. North
Mr. McLarty	

(*Tell.*)

PAIRS.

AYES.

Mr. Collier
Mr. Lamond
Mr. Walker
Mr. Cunningham
Mr. Coverley
Miss Holman

NOES.

Sir James Mitchell
Mr. Davy
Mr. Ferguson
Mr. J. M. Smith
Mr. Teesdale
Mr. Keenan

Amendment thus negatived.

Mr. KENNEALLY: I understood the Minister to say that he was prepared to delete the words "subject to the approval of the Minister." However, we cannot go back.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: The matter referred to by the member for East Perth will be arranged later. I now move an amendment—

That the following be added to paragraph (c) of the proviso to Clause 1 of the Schedule:—"Provided that, in so far as any medical expenses claimed under this paragraph exceed what, in the opinion of the commission, would have been charged against a worker in a similar case to which this Act did not apply, such expenses shall be disallowed and shall not be payable under this paragraph."

Although, as I have already explained, the British Medical Association have agreed to this provision, some doctors practising in Western Australia do not belong to that association. Moreover, the Government have had to pay 10s. 6d. per day in respect of workers' compensation patients while private employers have secured the same accommodation for 7s. 6d. per day.

Hon. S. W. MUNSIE: I agree with the addition proposed by the Minister, but wish to be assured on one point. Suppose a doctor attending an injured man who is entitled to expenses under the Workers' Compensation Act refuses to accept less than the amount of the bill rendered, would the commission only pay a proportion of the bill and would the worker have to pay the balance?

The Minister for Works: The man does not pay it; the commission pays it.

Hon. S. W. MUNSIE: But what power is there to say that the doctor shall not be entitled to what he charges?

The Minister for Works: That is why I want the power here.

Hon. S. W. MUNSIE: But this does not give you the power to say that the difference shall not be payable. It merely says that the commission shall not pay.

Mr. Parker: The commission will engage the doctor, not the injured worker.

Hon. S. W. MUNSIE: That is not so. In most instances, the family doctor will be called in after an accident and the commission will not enter into it until an operation is necessary or experts are required. The proviso will certainly prevent the payment of excessive charges by the commission, but it will not prevent a doctor accepting payment of a portion of his account from the commission and suing the worker for the balance.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: The doctor will have a claim on the commission. What is sought to be provided for is really the practice to-day. The British Medical Association has a committee to whom the State Insurance Office and the private insurance companies refer medical accounts that they regard as excessive. I know of two instances in which the accounts have been cut down by 50 per cent. There is no redress against the worker.

Hon. A. McCallum: You cannot stop a doctor taking action against a worker under the proviso.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: If the commission refused to pay a bill because it was excessive, would any court of law order the payment of the balance?

Hon. A. McCallum: But the worker might be called upon to incur legal expenses if action were taken against him.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: Then why do not the doctors take action to-day? I have pointed out that the B.M.A. committee have cut down doctors' accounts in many instances.

Mr. Pantou: But that is merely a matter of moral suasion, not legal.

Hon. A. McCallum: There are a few cases pending now.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: I do not anticipate any trouble with doctors outside the ranks of the B.M.A.

The Minister for Lands: Surely a doctor cannot claim from one body and then sue someone else.

Mr. MARSHALL: I am with the Minister in his attempt to prevent exploitation, but I am afraid the proviso is not clear enough. It should be altered so as to make it clear that the commission will not pay, on the advice of the medical board.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: The British Medical Association have a scale of charges that their members are prepared to accept and those charges are 25 per cent.

lower than those ordinarily levied. The commission will have those rates before them, and therefore I do not think the alteration suggested is necessary. At a later stage, I intend to move an amendment relating to the medical board.

Hon. A. McCALLUM: The position will be much the same as that obtaining now. The injured worker will call in his doctor, who will subsequently send his bill to the worker, who will pass it on to the commission. Should the commission decide that £15 was a reasonable charge instead of the £20 claimed by the doctor, the worker will either have to pay the extra £5 or incur legal expenses in defending any action taken by the doctor against him. The clause should be amended to provide that no action shall lie against the man in such circumstances.

Mr. H. W. Mann: That would not prevent a doctor commencing an action.

Hon. A. McCALLUM: What doctor would commence an action that he knew could not succeed?

The Minister for Works: You need not continue. Move your amendment on my amendment.

Hon. A. McCALLUM: I move an amendment on the amendment—

That at the end of the proviso the following words be added:—"and no action shall lie against the injured worker for any payment in addition to that admitted by the commission."

Amendment on the amendment put and passed.

Mr. PANTON: I am glad to note that the Government have started on a price-fixing campaign and have dealt with the medical fraternity as a start.

Hon. A. McCallum: And affecting a State enterprise, too.

Mr. PANTON: The Government are doing very well indeed. I want to know on what the commission will base their charges. As in other professions, so in the medical profession, charges are made according to the status of the doctor concerned.

Hon. J. C. Willcock: No, the charges are according to the state of a man's banking account.

Mr. PANTON: That has not been my experience. My bank account has always contained nothing, but that has not affected my doctor's bills.

Mr. Marshall: That is all right. The doctor has got nothing, so it does not matter.

Mr. PANTON: No doubt the doctor got as much as is in the member for Murchison's head.

Hon. J. C. Willcock: But the doctors do a lot of honorary work.

Mr. PANTON: This is not honorary work. If a suburban practitioner, who has not been long in practice, is asked to operate, his bill may be for £10. If a specialist from St. George's-terrace is asked to do the same operation, his bill may be anything from £25 to £40. Does the Minister expect the commission to base their fees on what would be charged by a specialist in St. George's-terrace, or by what a suburban doctor would charge? If a man were hurt somewhere in the city, he would be rushed to the nearest doctor, who might be one of our most expensive specialists. In that event, will the commission base their allowance on the specialist's fee, or on the fee that would be charged by a suburban doctor?

The Minister for Works: I would expect the chairman of the commission to have a little commonsense.

Mr. PANTON: The medical profession do not have fixed prices, like those in a grocer's shop. According to the doctor to whom the injured man is taken, so will the fee be.

The Minister for Lands: Provided he charges what he would charge if the injured worker were not under the Act, it will be accepted.

Mr. PANTON: Then if the victim of an accident be taken to a suburban doctor who charges a fee of 7s. 6d., that is what the commission will allow, whereas if he be taken to a specialist who will charge two guineas, that will be the commission's allowance. In those circumstances I hope the injured man will always be taken to the very best specialist. If the Minister himself were going under an operation the fee would not trouble him very much, he would go to the best specialist. Still, I do not think there should be a differentiation in the medical expenses allowed.

The Minister for Works: The B.M.A. have agreed to the scale of fees.

Mr. PANTON: Will the scale be subject to the proposed 20 per cent. reduction which we are told is to be applied to every-

thing? If there is going to be any differentiation in fees, it will be very unfair to injured workers.

The MINISTER FOR LANDS: The amendment will prevent any medical man from increasing his fees simply because the injured worker is under the fund. The ordinary reasonable doctor will not be affected by it, but if we should get a doctor who is determined to work the fund for all he is worth, this will prevent him from doing it.

Mr. KENNEALLY: I favour the principle contained in the clause, because it is necessary to have some control over people who make unduly high charges. I am not concerned about the differentiation in fees, for I hope that the workers will get the best of medical attention. But if the amendment be passed in its present form, it will in effect prevent a doctor from being paid anything; if the fee he charges is too high the whole of his claim will be disallowed. The amendment should be made to read that only the claim so far as it is excessive should be disallowed.

The Minister for Lands: It would mean exactly the same thing.

Mr. KENNEALLY: No, for under this if an excessive bill were put in, nothing at all would be paid. I suggest to the Minister that his amendment will not get him where he wants to go, unless he insert the words "excess expenses." We do not want to penalise the doctor by refusing to pay any part of his excessive claim.

Mr. SAMPSON: The hon. member is quite wrong. If he reads the amendment carefully he will see what is intended. What is to be disallowed is that part of the claim which exceeds what the Commission considers reasonable.

Mr. Marshall: What surprises me, is that you should be right.

Mr. SAMPSON: So long as the hon. member thinks I am wrong, I am pretty safe.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: The member for East Perth wants me to amend the amendment at a point which we have passed. The chairman would not permit it.

Mr. Kenneally: No, I merely want you to undertake to have the amendment made at a later stage.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: I think the word "excess" should be inserted. I will have inquiries made, and if I find it is so I will provide accordingly.

Amendment, as amended, put and passed.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: In paragraph (d) there is a typographical error. I move an amendment—

That in line 5 of paragraph (d) "he" be struck out and "it" inserted in lieu.

Amendment put and passed.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: I move an amendment

That after "may" in line 5 of paragraph (d) the words "with the concurrence of the chairman of the medical board" be inserted.

That will give the chairman a say in it.

Amendment put and passed.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: Now I wish to add a proviso dealing with the proposed panel of doctors. I move an amendment—

That the following proviso be added to paragraph (d):—"Provided that the medical board shall, if required so to do by the worker, furnish such worker with the names of three medical practitioners from whom he may choose one who shall be substituted in place of the practitioner chosen by the commission."

I think that meets the wishes of those members who have suggested the panel.

Hon. A. McCALLUM: The amendment meets the objection I raised on the second reading. I suggested five, but three will be acceptable.

Amendment put and passed.

On motions by the Minister for Works, Schedule further amended by striking out of line 2 of Clause 10 the word "mutual"; by striking out of paragraph (c) of Clause 14 the word "commissioner" and inserting "commission"; and by inserting after "commission" in line 3 of Subclause 1 of Clause 15 the words "acting on the advice of the chairman of the medical board."

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: I move an amendment—

That the following proviso be added to Subclause 2 of Clause 15:—"Provided that the right of the worker to compensation shall not be affected by such refusal unless it can be proved that his physical condition was prejudiced or aggravated or his recovery seriously retarded thereby, or that the risk of such treatment was inconsiderable."

The proviso is based on Regulation 29(d) of the Queensland Act. If a worker will not accept the advice of the specialists on the medical board and a panel of three doc-

tors to have an operation, and if it can be proved that his condition has been aggravated by such refusal, he should not receive compensation.

[*Mr. J. H. Smith took the Chair.*]

Hon. A. McCallum: Who will hear the case?

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: The onus of proof will be on the board and the case would be decided in a court. The worker would be well protected. There must be some control because an operation costing £30 might restore a man to health, whereas his refusal to undergo an operation might involve compensation to the extent of several hundred pounds.

Mr. RAPHAEL: I oppose the amendment. The Minister does not know what he is doing.

The Minister for Works: I would not go to you to find out.

Mr. RAPHAEL: Perhaps I could inform the Minister. The widow of a deceased worker might have to prove the case in court. The worker is not given a chance. It is a disgrace to suggest such an amendment. Many men have refused to have an injured limb amputated, despite surgical advice, and have been glad that they did not follow the advice.

The Minister for Works: The board would have to prove that they were right.

Mr. RAPHAEL: The board will be on the right side because they will have the medical profession behind them. The board can say to a worker, "Either do as we would have you do or be shot down." What chance has an injured man in a hospital to prove his case.

The Minister for Works: He would have to be well enough to attend the court.

Mr. KENNEALLY: In so far as the amendment deals with medical and surgical treatment, it will improve the measure, but I shall later move to add a proviso to distinguish between surgical treatment and surgical operation. If the Minister will agree to that, I shall support his amendment. A man should not be compelled to undergo an operation involving the loss of a limb.

The Minister for Works: The commission have to prove that he was wrong in not allowing the limb to come off.

Mr. KENNEALLY: The period when the worker would have to make the decision

would have passed. The risk of treatment would be inconsiderable if it meant binding an arm that was broken. The onus should be upon the man himself to prove that this was not the right thing to do. I give to no man the right to say to another, "You must have that limb off."

The Minister for Works: We do not want that right; but if a case is aggravated by a man's refusal to have a limb off, the fund should not be called upon to pay. The man himself must take the risk.

Mr. KENNEALLY: I want to protect the man when he reaches the stage of being ordered to undergo the operation. He should be able to say whether he will take the risk of dying, of carrying a limb that may not be of much use, or taking the chance of ultimately having a good limb for the rest of his life. Some doctors have been quite wrong when they have declared that if a limb did not come off the patient would die. The worker should have the right to keep his limb if he wishes to take the risk.

The Minister for Works: That is right.

Mr. KENNEALLY: I therefore propose, if the Minister's amendment is carried, to add words to the effect that nothing in the Act shall limit or suspend the worker's right to compensation by reason only of his refusal to submit himself to or undergo any surgical operation.

The Minister for Works: An operation may mean many other things than taking a limb off.

Mr. KENNEALLY: I was referring to amputations.

The Minister for Works: I might accept that if it applied to amputations.

Mr. KENNEALLY: I will make the alteration.

Amendment put and passed.

Mr. KENNEALLY: I move an amendment—

That the following words be added to the subclause:—"Provided further that nothing in this Act shall limit or suspend the worker's right to compensation under this Act by reason only of his refusal to submit himself to or undergo any surgical operation necessitating amputation."

Amendment put and passed.

Hon. S. W. MUNSIE: Subclause 3 of Clause 15 provides a penalty for non-compliance with Subclause 1. The amendment which was inserted after paragraph (d) in the preceding clause is necessary here.

The Minister for Works: That amendment has already been made.

Hon. S. W. MUNSIE: In another clause; and if it was necessary there, it certainly is necessary here. I move an amendment—

That the following be added to Subclause 3 of Clause 15 of the schedule:—"and shall, if the worker objects to the medical practitioner chosen by the commission, nominate three medical practitioners from whom the worker may select one, who shall thereupon be substituted for the practitioner chosen by the commission."

Amendment put and passed.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: I move an amendment—

That in line 2 of Clause 16 of the schedule the word "employer" be struck out, and "commission" inserted in lieu.

The employer does not enter into this Bill at all.

Amendment put and passed.

Hon. A. McCALLUM: I move an amendment—

That the following be inserted to stand as Clauses 21, 22, and 23 of the First Schedule:—

21. Where the amount of compensation under this Act has been ascertained, or any weekly payment varied, or any other matter decided under this Act by agreement or any agreement, whether purporting to be made under this Act or not, has been entered into whereby a worker agrees to compound for any claim or right to compensation under this Act, a memorandum thereof shall be sent, in manner prescribed by Rules of Court, by any party interested, to the clerk of the local court, who shall, subject to such rules, on being satisfied as to its genuineness, record such memorandum in a special register without fee, and thereupon the memorandum shall for all purposes be enforceable as a local court judgment: Provided that—

(a) No such memorandum shall be recorded before seven days after the despatch by the clerk of the court of notice to the parties interested:

(b) Where a worker seeks to record a memorandum of agreement between the Commission and himself for the payment of compensation under this Act, and the Commission, in accordance with Rules of Court, proves that the worker has in fact returned to work and is earning the same wages as he did before the accident, and objects to the recording of such memorandum, the memorandum shall only be recorded, if at all, on such terms as the magistrate, under the circumstances, may think just:

(c) The magistrate may at any time rectify the register:

(d) Where it appears to the clerk of the court on any information which he con-

siders sufficient, that an agreement as to the redemption of a weekly payment by a lump sum, or an agreement as to the amount of compensation payable to a person under any legal disability, or to dependants, ought not to be registered by reason of the inadequacy of the sum or amount, or by reason of the agreement having been obtained by fraud or undue influence, or other improper means, he may refuse to record the memorandum of the agreement sent to him for registration, and in that case shall refer the matter to the magistrate, who shall, in accordance with Rules of Court, make such order (including an order as to any sum already paid under the agreement) as under the circumstances he may think just:

(e) The magistrate may, within six months after a memorandum of an agreement as to the redemption of a weekly payment by a lump sum, or of an agreement as to the amount of compensation payable to a person under any legal disability, or to dependants, has been recorded in the register, order that the record be removed from the register on proof to his satisfaction that the agreement was obtained by fraud or undue influence or other improper means, and may make such order (including an order as to any sum already paid under the agreement) as under the circumstances he may think just.

22. An agreement as to the redemption of a weekly payment by a lump sum if not registered in accordance with this Act shall not, nor shall the payment of the sum payable under the agreement, exempt the Commission from liability to continue to make that weekly payment; and an agreement as to the amount of compensation to be paid to a person under a legal disability or to dependants, if not so registered, shall not, nor shall the payment of the sum payable under the agreement, exempt the Commission from liability to pay compensation, unless, in either case, it is proved that the failure to register was not due to any neglect or default on its part.

23. From and after the commencement of this section, no agreement to which section twenty-one of this schedule is applicable shall be binding on or enforceable against the parties or admitted to be good or valid unless it is registered as provided in that section.

This long amendment is lifted bodily from the existing Act. The Minister has advised me that he will accept it. It simply continues the practice of the existing law with regard to lump-sum agreements.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: Originally the Parliamentary Draftsman thought these provisions unnecessary. Since then it has been found that the work entailed in slight. Therefore the amendment may as well be inserted.

Amendment put and passed.

Schedule, as amended, agreed to.

Second Schedule:

Item, Loss of one leg near hip, £600:

Hon. A. McCALLUM: On the second reading I drew attention to the very substantial reductions which the Second Schedule makes in compensation payments as compared with the existing Act. In some cases those reductions amount to hundreds of pounds. A feature of the debate which absolutely surprised members on this side of the Chamber was the emphatic nature of the challenges made by the Minister for Works and the Attorney General that we should express our intention of voting against the second reading. Our objective is to get back to the money payments provided in the schedule to the existing Act. Those set out in the schedule in the Bill are not regarded as fair or equitable. The latest Workers' Compensation Act passed in Australia is the Federal Workers' Compensation Act of 1930. It was a substantial testimony to the schedule in our Act that the Federal Government lifted our Second Schedule bodily and incorporated it in their Act. The Minister said that the schedule in the Bill was based on scientific reasons. So was the schedule in our Act. A conference of medical men considered the whole position and the schedule I refer to was the result. In New South Wales and Queensland, their schedules are practically the same as ours, although there are a few items that differ. The schedule in the Bill has been considerably lengthened because a new system has been introduced of payments for parts of limbs, whereas formerly the payment was for the limbs as a whole. In those circumstances, it is rather difficult to amend the schedule because we cannot strike out items relating to payments for parts of limbs. For that reason, I have picked out a few items in respect of which test votes will decide the position regarding other items. I have accordingly chosen Item 7, which provides for a payment of £600 for the loss of one leg near the hip. I move an amendment—

That the words "near hip" be struck out.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: In the course of his earlier speeches, the member for South Fremantle said that a conference of medical men that sat in Melbourne, had decided the rates set out in the Second Schedule in the Act. I endeavoured to find

confirmation for that statement, but there is no file in the department dealing with that conference, nor do any of the officers know of any such gathering. There was certainly a conference on industrial hygiene in Melbourne, but that had nothing to do with the Workers' Compensation Act schedule. The hon. member said that the New South Wales, Queensland and Commonwealth Acts were the same as ours.

Hon. A. McCallum: I did not.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: The hon. member did in his second reading speech. The next day he made a personal explanation to the effect that there were some items that were different. The Queensland Act was passed in 1916, which was a long time before the supposed conference that was held in Melbourne. Our Act was passed in 1924, the New South Wales Act in 1926 and the Commonwealth Act in 1930. I gave members some information regarding the Queensland position, but I did not go far enough. I compared the premiums paid in Queensland with those paid in Western Australia, but I did not point out that Queensland covered men in receipt of up to £525 a year, whereas our Act covered only those receiving up to £400 a year. Therefore, that makes more difference than I suggested earlier. I have the Queensland schedule here, and I want to compare the items with those in our schedule.

Hon. A. McCallum: We are dealing with one item. Are you going to discuss the schedule as a whole?

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: If the member for Fremantle will not allow me to deal with the matter fully, I know I must deal with the one item. Under our Act, the compensation for the loss of a leg is £600, whereas in the Queensland schedule the amount provided is £562 10s. The member for South Fremantle quoted from discussions that had taken place in America regarding the permanent disabilities schedule, and it will be noted that after a long investigation it was decided there that the loss of a leg at the hip, or an arm near the shoulder, should be compensated at the rate of 50 per cent. of the maximum amount allowed. That is the provision in America and Canada to-day. On that basis our schedule should provide for £375. In dealing with workers' compensation, we have already committed ourselves to heavy liabilities compared with those operating in the other States of Australia. The figures in-

cluded in the schedule are on the basis of percentage disabilities. If the total amount is much higher, the percentage will have to be higher as well. The Bill was founded on Borradel ideas, Dr. Borradel being recognised as the greatest expert in the world on workers' compensation. So I think I can say this schedule has a scientific basis. Let me indicate how it compares with the Second Schedule in the Queensland Act. For limbs and arms the Queensland average is £122, whereas the Western Australian average is £246. So, too, in a number of comparable items the same difference and even wider differences obtain. One of the real reasons for our difficulties is the very large amount that has been paid for the loss of small joints. A number of the Australian States pay nothing whatever for the loss of joints of the toes. Certainly I cannot accept the amendment.

Mr. KENNEALLY: The Minister has not yet given any reason why he should make such drastic amendments in the schedule. Although there is no drastic cut attempted in the item under consideration, yet if the item were accepted by the Committee, it would postulate the idea that we are prepared to accept a number of further items in which drastic cuts have been made. Why should we say that if a person loses a leg, unless he loses it from near the hip he will not get compensation? The Minister has quoted from various reports, in one of which it was suggested that in some instances the loss of a leg near the hip has been compensated at half rate.

The Minister for Works: That is the consensus of opinion of the experts.

Mr. KENNEALLY: Evidently those experts have not made their influence felt in Australia.

The Minister for Works: They are making it felt now.

Mr. KENNEALLY: The Minister proposes to put Western Australia in the van in that respect. Whenever any expert comes along with a proposal to reduce the conditions enjoyed under industrial legislation, the Minister is prepared to put Western Australia in the van. But the Minister is not prepared to rush into the lead when it is proposed to improve those conditions. The schedule is one long list of proposals to take away benefits from the people. The Minister when moving the second reading said

this was a workers' measure, not an employers' measure.

The Minister for Works: I have heard that 122 times.

Mr. KENNEALLY: And the Minister is going to hear it many more times, both here and outside. On that occasion he went on to say further that this was a measure to lift the burden off industry, but not to take from the compensation payable to injured men. As a matter of fact, the Minister does propose to take away altogether the amount previously payable for the loss of the first joint of certain toes.

The Minister for Works: Western Australia and New South Wales are the only two States that pay for the loss of joints of toes.

Mr. KENNEALLY: Despite the fact that the Minister declared he would not reduce the compensation payable, we find his every move is in the direction of reducing the benefits previously enjoyed by injured workers. If we leave in these words "near hip," we shall indicate that if the leg is not lost near the hip, some lesser amount will be paid in compensation.

The Minister for Works: Yes.

Mr. KENNEALLY: That is my objection.

The Minister for Works: A man having the hip joint would be better off than one without it.

Mr. KENNEALLY: To slice up the limbs of a worker as the Minister suggests should not be supported by the Committee. It is wrong to provide that an inch of flesh more or less shall be compensated more or less.

Mr. SLEEMAN: I support the amendment. This is the worst part of the Bill. It has a flavour of Chicago about it. One would think it was an extract from "The Jungle." A worker who tumbled into a barrel of lard would be provided for, but not a man who lost portion of a finger which went into a sausage machine. If the definition be retained the Minister should stipulate the number of inches from the hip.

Mr. MARSHALL: I support the amendment. Most of the burden to industry has been due to the cost of administration, and not to the compensation paid for injury. Looking at the schedule, one would con-

clude that if a worker lost his leg near the hip joint, he would receive £600. That is not so, because there would be deductions for weekly payments. The injured man might be incapacitated for a long time before the payment of a lump sum was considered, and probably would get only £200 or £300. The idea underlying the schedule is wrong. If a worker loses a leg immediately above the knee, he is no better off than if it were amputated near the hip. The artificial limb is attached to the body, and there is no advantage from the balance of the limb so long as the hip joint remains. Yet the schedule discriminates between "near the hip" and "just above the knee" to the extent of £125. It will be difficult to decide to which rate of compensation an injured worker is entitled. The medical board will probably have to decide how many inches of leg must be sacrificed in order to save £125. I protest against the reductions. The Minister, when introducing the Bill, said there would be no interference with the benefits. If the Minister gets his way, the workers will lose a great deal as compared with the existing law. I oppose the schedule lock, stock and barrel. It reeks with anomalies, inconsistencies and injustices and will seriously prejudice the interests of those affected. There will be more amputations just above the knee than just below the hip because of the possibility of saving £150 in each case. Every move of the Government tends to deprive this section of the community of the few benefits that have been secured for it during the past few years.

Mr. PANTON: The schedule is a disgrace. We have arrived at the business of selling workers' legs at so much per pound. It must be obvious to the Government that it makes very little difference whether a leg is taken off just above the knee or just below the hip so far as its usefulness is concerned. A man cannot get much use from an artificial leg, because of the constant trouble that occurs with the stump of his own leg. In these cases men are constantly having to go into hospital for an operation of some kind, and most of the time they have not the full use of the artificial limb. The arguments of the Minister are fallacious. Doctors have told me that fully 8 inches of the original leg must be left in order to ensure the proper use of an artificial limb. They agree

that only rarely does a stump heal sufficiently to enable the artificial leg to be permanently worn. In most cases, too, the patient is suffering all the while and is unable to follow any occupation. He will have drawn his compensation, and although he is continually in hospital, he will have no money left. If a leg comes off anywhere above the knee, the injury should be treated as if the entire leg had gone. Once a leg is off above the knee the position is impossible for the man affected.

Hon. A. McCALLUM: This is a system of paying for a man's leg according to inches. The Minister said the schedule was based on a scientific division of the leg into upper thirds and lower thirds, each of the six sections being paid for differently. The Queensland Act simply provides £562 compensation for the loss of a leg. The New South Wales Act says, "Loss of a leg, £600." The Commonwealth Act is the same as our existing Act in this respect, "Loss of a leg, £600." The Commonwealth Act is the latest measure, having been passed at the end of last year. These Acts have not been passed without expert advice. I know the origin of the schedule under discussion, and the basis from which it has been derived. Not another Workers' Compensation Act divides the leg into six different pieces to be paid for at different rates. Under the schedule, if a man in Western Australia loses his leg somewhere above the knee, he will receive £200 less compensation than elsewhere in Australia. In Queensland the compensation for the loss of the full leg is £37 10s. less than here, but when one gets down below the knee the amounts here are considerably below the Queensland compensation—as low as £475, £450, and £390. Yet the Minister says this is a Bill which does not take away benefits from the worker. We are as much as £200 below New South Wales and £162 10s. below Queensland. The leg is a vital limb, and in many industries as important as the arm. The unskilled labourer in particular will feel these reductions keenly.

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

Ayes	15
Noes	19

Majority against	4
					—

AYES.

Mr. Corboy
Mr. Hegney
Mr. Johnson
Mr. Kenneally
Mr. Marshall
Mr. McCallum
Mr. Millington
Mr. Munsie

Mr. Panton
Mr. Sleeman
Mr. Troy
Mr. Wansbrough
Mr. Willcock
Mr. Wilson
Mr. Rapbael

(Teller.)

NOES.

Mr. Angelo
Mr. Barnard
Mr. Brown
Mr. Doney
Mr. Griffiths
Mr. Latham
Mr. Lindsay
Mr. H. W. Mann
Mr. J. I. Mann
Mr. McLarty

Mr. Parker
Mr. Patrick
Mr. Piesse
Mr. Richardson
Mr. Sampson
Mr. Scaddan
Mr. Thorn
Mr. Wells
Mr. North

(Teller.)

PAIRS.

AYES.

Mr. Collier
Mr. Lamond
Mr. Walker
Mr. Cunningham
Mr. Coverley
Miss Holman

NOES.

Sir James Mitchell
Mr. Davy
Mr. Ferguson
Mr. J. M. Smith
Mr. Teesdale
Mr. Keenan

Amendment thus negatived.

[Mr. Richardson took the Chair.]

Item, Loss of one leg at or just above knee, £475:

Hon. A. McCALLUM: I move an amendment—

That “£475” be struck out and “£600” inserted in lieu.

If the amendment be agreed to, it will bring the rate a little nearer to what we desire. If a leg is lost near the hip, £600 is provided, whereas if the leg is taken off just above the knee the unfortunate worker will receive £125 less. He has to lose that amount merely for the sake of a few inches that may be of little use to him. For a corresponding loss under the Queensland Act, £562 is provided, while in the New South Wales Act and the Commonwealth Act, the compensation provided is £600. This differentiation is assessing the value of a man's leg by inches with a caution.

Mr. SLEEMAN: I hope the Minister will agree to the amendment. Although the Bill provides for the payment of £475 for the loss of the limb just above the knee, it has to be remembered that after spending a long time in hospital and then procuring an artificial limb to attach to the stump, he will lose a large proportion of the compensation provided. He may not net more than £250, if as much as that.

Mr. MARSHALL: I do not think there is any justification for so marked a differ-

ence in the compensation because of the loss of a limb just above the knee as compared with the loss of the limb just below the hip. At the same time, I congratulate the Minister on his consistency because he is adhering to his advocacy of payment by results. If the leg is taken off just above the knee, the man gets £475 whereas if taken off just below the hip, the amount is £600. In neither case is the portion of the leg that remains of much use to the man. That is borne out by the experience of a number of returned soldiers. One man who may be seen walking around the streets of the city on crutches, has two artificial limbs but he can wear neither of them on the stump of his leg. The cost of treatment and so forth will leave very little of the £475. I object to any reduction on the existing schedule. Surely to God the Minister should be satisfied with his Bill, for he has got all he has any right to expect. I look upon the whole schedule with a great deal of disgust.

Mr. KENNEALLY: The material available for present-day writers seems to be ample for a re-writing of the “Merchant of Venice.” We have an excellent Shylock ready to take part in the production, and he is supported by a number of others prepared to deal with human flesh. All that is required is someone to come to judgment with a verdict that will give satisfaction to the Committee. It is seriously proposed by Shylock that if there is a couple of inches difference in the length of the stump of a lost leg the present compensation shall be reduced by £125. That is the position in which the Minister places himself by clinging to the proposed schedule. For the difference of a few inches in the length of that stump there is to be a difference of £125 in the compensation payable.

Hon. A. McCallum: About £18 per inch.

Mr. KENNEALLY: Even our farmer friends will not say that meat is worth that much.

The Minister for Works: It would be a good thing if sheep were that price.

Mr. KENNEALLY: What opportunity has a man minus a leg to earn his living? If a man with a family of three or four loses his leg he goes into hospital, where he remains for many months using up most of his compensation money, and then comes out of the hospital to face the world with

but one leg and tries to maintain his family. Are we to be prepared to deal in human flesh in a manner that proves we have no consideration for the welfare of the injured worker? The Committee, by their decision on this item, are going to give an answer to that question.

Mr. Brown: The injured worker may be able to have an artificial leg fixed more satisfactorily because of the extra bit of stump.

Mr. KENNEALLY: Then why not say to the victim, "You have lost your leg and been crippled in industry, but industry is giving you a reasonable amount of money with which to embark upon the task of keeping your family going." I do not want to see an injured worker beggared in the way the Minister desires. I will support the amendment.

Hon. M. F. TROY: I hope the Minister will agree to reinstate the £600. That is the figure under the Acts of New South Wales and the Commonwealth, while in Queensland, which has a Government similar to ours, the amount is £502. I cannot understand the mentality of people who approve of legislation of this kind. The Minister said the Government desired to relieve industry. If the item were reduced by £125, by what fraction would industry be relieved? Would one man more be employed as a result? Not one. Not many workers lose a leg. Suppose 20 lost a leg, would the reduction affect industry? It would have no influence at all.

Mr. Kenneally: Perhaps it is thought they have been chopping off limbs as a pastime.

Hon. M. F. TROY: I have not heard of 20 accidents in this State involving the loss of a limb. Consequently, industry cannot be burdened by the compensation, and there can be no saving worth considering. Is £425 sufficient compensation for the loss of a limb?

The Minister for Works: Ten thousand pounds would not be sufficient.

Hon. M. F. TROY: Yet, in view of that admission, the Minister proposes to reduce the amount from £600 to £475. What a logical outlook! He allows himself to be used by the Employers' Federation to reduce this miserable amount. I hope he is proud of the proposal. Does the Minister realise that we are giving considerable time and attention to people who are coming to the

State, not for their health but for financial reasons. We have been dealing with legislation to protect farmers from their creditors. The people whom the Minister represents are asking for security. For what? To secure their homes and livelihood. If a worker loses a limb, he is to be passed out into the world with £425. It is amazing that members opposite will lend themselves to such paltry and contemptible legislation. In 99 per cent. of the occupations, a worker who loses a leg is handicapped for life. All he can do is to walk about Perth until his compensation is exhausted, and then nothing remains but misery for him and his family. His ambitions in life are entirely frustrated. Returned soldiers who lost a leg in the war have approached me for work as caretakers. When Minister for Lands, I got a job for one man, but he had to do some lifting and one night he slipped and fell. He was handicapped even for that job. This part of the session, when we should be considering finance and unemployment, is being devoted to further limiting the opportunities of workers injured in industry. The only thing the Government are doing is to penalise some unfortunate who has been injured by an accident. The Minister will be able to go to the cockies of Wyaleatchem, Goble gutting, and Benjaberring and say, "Look what I did: I reduced the burden on industry."

The Minister for Works: Do not call them cockies.

Hon. M. F. TROY: Well, wheat farmers.

The Minister for Works: Goble gutting is not in my electorate.

Hon. M. F. TROY: If some unfortunate cripple walked into the hall the Minister could say, "I took £225 from that man's compensation." He may not survive very long, but it can always be said of the Minister, "That is the man who reduced workers' compensation." Instead of giving benefits, he has taken them away. This will be his great achievement in life, though it will be something of which he cannot be proud. The relief to industry, however, will be infinitesimal. When he came to Parliament he used to make speeches at Country Party gatherings, taking his colleagues to task for not giving the farmers better treatment. Now he is seeking opportunities and privileges for his own people, but taking away the rights of the sick and injured workers. The credit he will get for

this will never give him any satisfaction. He will know he has accomplished nothing. The Government have no authority what-so-ever from the people to bring down this legislation.

Mr. PANTON: What is meant by "just above the knee"? Does the Minister refer to the bone or the flesh? How much per pound of flesh or bone will this compensation represent? Will the leg be measured by the flesh or by the bone? This is a matter of pounds, shillings and pence to the worker. If we are going to deal with this matter in poundage of flesh or inches of bone, why should there be only four divisions from the hip to the knee at the rate of £25 for each division? Let us divide the leg into an eighth or a sixteenth of an inch. The Minister said the schedule was scientifically based. I presume that the scientist or genius who suggested this to the Minister advised him also whether the loss of the leg just above the knee is to be computed from the point of the flesh or from the point of the bone. It makes all the difference. We ought to have a new set of amendments altogether, a set based on half inches. I do not at all approve of the Minister's scale. It provides less money for the loss of two bones than for the loss of one. I fail to understand how members opposite can silently vote on such questions. Is any farmer opposite able to tell me how a man with only one leg is to plough?

Mr. Sleeman called attention to the state of the Committee.

Quorum formed.

Mr. PANTON: Obviously, Ministerial members do not want to hear anything on this subject. Legislation which values parts of a man's leg is indeed extraordinary legislation. I have never yet seen a man who could last more than a week or two on an artificial leg, which incidentally costs about £27. After that, he had to go into hospital or resort to crutches until the stump healed again.

Mr. PIESSE: I am deeply impressed with the arguments of hon. members, particularly those on the Opposition side, as to this schedule. It seems to me that the arguments used on the present item might have been applied to earlier items. Most of the speakers have overlooked the fact that the amounts payable under the schedule do not provide compensation in full. We are

deeply sympathetic towards workers' compensation.

Mr. PANTON: The workers do not want sympathy, but help.

Mr. PIESSE: The Bill does not attempt to provide full compensation. How could £750 be regarded as full compensation for the loss of both eyes?

Mr. PANTON: Let us make the amount £1,000.

Mr. PIESSE: Seeing that discretionary power has been given to the medical board as regards hospital fees, it does not seem illogical to suggest that the Minister might consider giving the board discretionary power, on a percentage basis, to deal with cases which may be more deserving than others under any particular item. I entirely agree that that £475 is not adequate compensation for the loss of a leg. I do not want to embarrass the Minister and it would be wrong for me, as a private member, to accept the responsibility of moving to increase the amount without being backed up by skilled scientific authorities. Government members are anxious to provide the fullest compensation possible to injured workers, but we cannot forget that for a long time past there has been a keen desire to secure relief to certain industries, particularly the primary industries, from the overburdening cost of workers' compensation. The primary industries have been passing through difficult times.

12 o'clock (midnight).

Mr. PANTON: And the workers have not.

Mr. PIESSE: Unfortunately they have suffered, too. It must be remembered that if we kill the goose that lays the golden eggs, there will not be the wherewithal to provide compensation. Everyone will admit that the amounts specified for compensation are not nearly enough. Unless the Minister can see his way clear to increase those amounts, I am afraid they will have to stand.

Mr. KENNEALLY: The member for Katanning has no desire to embarrass the Minister or the Government.

Mr. Piesse: Or industry either.

Mr. KENNEALLY: Apparently he has no compunction in embarrassing the injured workers. He admits that the compensation provided is not enough, but yet he is anxious that the Minister shall not be ruffled.

Mr. Piesse: You know that the Workers' Compensation Act is responsible for hundreds of men being out of work to-day.

Mr. Sleeman: Nothing of the sort.

Mr. Piesse: You know it is.

Mr. Sleeman: I suppose if wages were reduced you would employ fewer men.

The CHAIRMAN: Order!

Mr. Sleeman: How can I keep order in view of such statements?

Mr. KENNEALLY: The compensation provided is not enough, yet the member for Katanning will vote to reduce the amount under the item before the Committee by £125! I want to make it clear to the Committee that if the class war that has been carried on regarding the Bill and others we have dealt with, continues to the extreme limit, I hope the necessary action will be taken promptly to restore the position of the workers when members of the present Opposition take over the reins of Government. If the Government force through this class of legislation, let them look out for what they will get when they are on the Opposition side of the House.

Hon. M. F. Troy: They got on the Government side of the House by unscrupulous means.

Mr. KENNEALLY: The present Government have passed more class legislation than any other Government that have been in power in this State.

Hon. M. F. Troy: That is quite correct.

Mr. KENNEALLY: If Government members stand firmly behind the Government in their support of legislation of this type, they need not squeal when they experience similar treatment by present Opposition members. If they openly declare class warfare here and intend to go to extremes, let them do so. Once we get into power again, we will know what to do. Apparently we are making Parliament a class-war tribunal. If that is what Parliament is to be converted into, let it be understood. Above all, the member for Katanning does not desire to do anything that will ruffle the feelings of the Minister!

Mr. Piesse: You can pay only what industry can afford.

Hon. A. McCallum: Industry here pays less than industries anywhere else in Australia.

Mr. Piesse: Our industries are earning less.

Mr. KENNEALLY: The member for Katanning should book himself off for a week and find out where he stands. He was returned to Parliament largely by the votes of workers on a distinct promise that he would protect their industrial conditions. Now he intends to vote to reduce the amount of compensation by £125, although he agrees the compensation fixed is not enough. The hon. member ought to consider how he stands in relation to what he promised the workers at the elections.

Mr. Piesse: There is not one item in the schedule carrying sufficient compensation for the loss sustained.

Mr. KENNEALLY: Yet the hon. member is prepared to sit there and vote for reduction, in some of the items, to the extent of 33 1/3rd per cent. As for the Minister, he deserves to be tormented by the ghosts of crippled workers.

Hon. A. McCallum: They will dig him up when he goes down to Karrakatta.

Mr. KENNEALLY: I feel at times that I should like to see some people in the position of the cripples from whom they propose to take compensation.

Mr. Marshall: They would be great red-raggers then.

Mr. KENNEALLY: The Minister proposes to rob the people who fall by the wayside in industry. There has been no argument advanced as to why we should vote for a reduction in this compensation. However, that will not matter much to members who, like the member for Katanning, think the amount provided is not sufficient but nevertheless propose to vote to reduce it.

The MINISTER FOR LANDS: I move—

That the Committee do now divide.

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

Ayes	18
Noes	15
					—
Majority for	3
					—

AYES.

Mr. Angelo	Mr. Parker
Mr. Barnard	Mr. Patrick
Mr. Doney	Mr. Piesse
Mr. Griffiths	Mr. Sampson
Mr. Latham	Mr. Scaddan
Mr. Lindsay	Mr. J. H. Smith
Mr. H. W. Mann	Mr. Thorn
Mr. J. I. Mann	Mr. Wells
Mr. McLarty	Mr. North

(Teller.)

NOES.

Mr. Corboy
Mr. Hegney
Mr. Johnson
Mr. Kenneally
Mr. Marshall
Mr. McCallum
Mr. Millington
Mr. Munsie

Mr. Panton
Mr. Raphael
Mr. Sleeman
Mr. Troy
Mr. Wansbrough
Mr. Willcock
Mr. Wilson
(Teller.)

PAIRS.

AYES.

Sir James Mitchell
Mr. Davy
Mr. Ferguson
Mr. J. M. Smith
Mr. Teesdale
Mr. Keenan
Mr. Brown

NOES.

Mr. Collier
Mr. Lamond
Mr. Walker
Mr. Cunningham
Mr. Coverley
Mr. Withers
Miss Holman

Motion thus passed.

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

Ayes	15
Noes	18

Majority against	3
------------------	----	----	---

AYES.

Mr. Corboy
Mr. Hegney
Mr. Johnson
Mr. Kenneally
Mr. Marshall
Mr. McCallum
Mr. Millington
Mr. Munsie

Mr. Panton
Mr. Raphael
Mr. Sleeman
Mr. Troy
Mr. Wansbrough
Mr. Willcock
Mr. Wilson
(Teller.)

NOES.

Mr. Angelo
Mr. Barnard
Mr. Doney
Mr. Griffiths
Mr. Latham
Mr. Lindsay
Mr. H. W. Mann
Mr. J. I. Mann
Mr. McLarty

Mr. Parker
Mr. Patrick
Mr. Piesse
Mr. Sampson
Mr. Scaddan
Mr. J. H. Smith
Mr. Thorn
Mr. Wells
Mr. North
(Teller.)

PAIRS.

AYES.

Mr. Collier
Mr. Lamond
Mr. Walker
Mr. Cunningham
Mr. Coverley
Mr. Withers
Miss Holman

NOES.

Sir James Mitchell
Mr. Davy
Mr. Ferguson
Mr. J. M. Smith
Mr. Teesdale
Mr. Keenan
Mr. Brown

Amendment thus negatived.

Item, Loss of one leg just below knee, £450:

Hon. A. McCALLUM: I move an amendment—

That the words "one leg just below knee £450" be struck out, and the words "the lower part of a leg £562 10s." inserted in lieu.

The Minister proposes to make a reduction in this item of £112. It is a substantial and amazing reduction, especially coming from a Government who gave it forth

that there would be no reduction in the benefits to workers. We are getting far below what is provided in other parts of Australia. This is the first time an attempt has been made to divide up arms and legs as has been done in this schedule. The New South Wales Act has been in force since 1926, and though a Nationalist Government amended it in 1929, the schedule was not altered. The Commonwealth as late as August last adopted our Second Schedule *holus bolus*. The Commonwealth had the schedules of all the States and the advice of experts, and must have been satisfied that our schedule was fair and equitable. It has been urged that industry must be relieved and that insurance costs more here than in the other States. In New South Wales considerably lower premiums are charged than here, but that State pays more than £100 in excess of what the Minister proposes for this particular injury. Consequently it is not on the items of compensation in this schedule that the local premiums have been fixed. There is no doubt the rates have been fixed by people with ulterior motives and without regard to the risks. I know the Minister will not listen to reason. He is determined that the schedule shall be passed. It is a repulsive and repugnant schedule, providing that every inch of a man's leg or arm shall make a difference to the compensation. The leg is divided into eight parts, four above and four below the knee. One would think that no other Act had been submitted to the opinion of experts. Will the Minister claim that this one of all the measures is right? This schedule will result in a great deal of dissatisfaction, discontent, and argument, as to the particular part under which a particular injury will be brought. The existing schedule has worked well and very few law cases have occurred on account of its lack of ambiguity.

Mr. KENNEALLY: If the amendment is not carried the injured worker will suffer to the extent of £112 10s. This schedule will ultimately become known as the schedule of diminishing flesh, under which every Shylock will get his pound of flesh. The Minister has omitted all reference to the loss of blood. Could he not have divided that up as he has divided up the flesh of the leg? Could he not adjust the compensation according to the amount of blood a man loses? Even the farmers

who are supposed to be crying out for relief from this burden of compensation will, I am sure, turn against this proposal.

Hon. M. F. TROY: Does not the Minister propose to give some reason for the rejection of this amendment?

Mr. Kenneally called attention to the state of the Committee.

Quorum formed.

Hon. M. F. TROY: I would point out, Mr. Chairman, that the House was not complete because all the members in the Chamber were not in their places. I ask you to refer that point to the Speaker.

The CHAIRMAN: It is evident the Speaker counted the House, for he declared that a quorum was present.

Hon. M. F. TROY: I ask you, Mr. Chairman, to call the attention of the Speaker to the point I have taken. Members who came into the Chamber did not take their seats, but stood at the back of the Chamber. I know it has been the custom for members to enter in a languid sort of way and for the Speaker to say, "I see a quorum present."

The CHAIRMAN: I am afraid I cannot accept the hon. member's suggestion. I regard it as quite outside my province as Chairman to carry such a suggestion to the Speaker after he has counted the House and satisfied himself of the presence of a quorum.

Mr. SAMPSON: Perhaps the member for Mt. Magnet would agree to let the matter stand over until a quarter of an hour has elapsed. The opportunity can then be taken. His suggestion places the Chairman of Committees in an awkward situation, as the Speaker is the Chairman's superior.

Hon. M. F. TROY: You realise, Mr. Chairman, that when the Speaker comes into the House at the commencement of the sitting members are in their seats. The House is not properly constituted until members are in their seats. I hope the Minister will extend some courtesy to members on this side, and that when amendments are moved he will at least give reasons why they should be agreed to or should not be carried. The Minister apparently is too superior to reply.

Mr. Parker: What about the time?

Hon. M. F. TROY: What has the time to do with the subject? Did the member for North-East Fremantle promise his constituents that he would support this Bill?

The Minister for Works: What has that to do with the clause?

Hon. M. F. TROY: No hon. member would support the Minister on this subject.

The Minister for Works: I object to these personal remarks, and ask that they be withdrawn.

The CHAIRMAN: The Minister has objected to the hon. member's remark.

Hon. M. F. TROY: What remark?

The Minister for Works: That no hon. member would support the Minister.

Hon. M. F. TROY: I said that on this subject no hon. member would support the Minister.

The Minister for Works: I ask for a withdrawal.

The CHAIRMAN: The Minister has asked for a withdrawal. I must ask the hon. member to withdraw the remark.

The Minister for Works: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman. You have asked the hon. member to withdraw, and he deliberately flouts your ruling. I want to know why you do not make him withdraw.

The CHAIRMAN: I am sure the hon. member will withdraw.

Hon. M. F. TROY: I will withdraw if the remark is disorderly. I want you to tell me under what Standing Order the remark is disorderly.

The Minister for Works: It is a dirty insinuation.

Hon. M. F. TROY: I submit, Sir, that you cannot name me. It has happened in New South Wales that the Speaker named a member, and that action was taken and damages were given against the Speaker. So that, merely because the Minister demands—

The Minister for Works: On a point of order—

Hon. M. F. TROY: There is no point of order.

The CHAIRMAN: The Minister has risen to a point of order.

The Minister for Works: I want to know whether the hon. member is in order, after you have given your decision and asked him to withdraw, in talking to you about legal action.

The CHAIRMAN: The hon. member knows perfectly well it is the custom and usage of this House—I believe it has been the custom and usage for many years—that when an hon. member objects to any remark

made about him, for the hon. member who made it to withdraw it.

Hon. M. F. TROY: I would not like to embarrass you, Sir; but I have a perfect right to reply. It would be perfectly unreasonable on my part to withdraw something simply because another member said it was a reflection on him. I did not say the Minister was a dishonourable man. I said no hon. member would support him in this.

The CHAIRMAN: The Minister has objected to those words, and so as to maintain the decorum of this Chamber the hon. member should, I think, withdraw the remark.

Hon. M. F. TROY: If you say it is a matter of courtesy, I will withdraw; but if the Minister raises the question again—

The Minister for Works: I object.

Hon. M. F. TROY: Sit down! What business have you to object? You have no reason to object at all.

The Minister for Works: It is indecent.

Hon. M. F. TROY: The Minister is a little mediocrity from Gobblegutting.

The Minister for Works: Wait till I get you outside, you insignificant rat! I will show you when I get you outside.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I cannot allow this unseemly conduct.

The Minister for Works: Stop the hon. member! I will not take any lessons from him.

Hon. M. F. TROY: It is a perfect disgrace to hear the Minister. If he wants to hear his reputation outside, I will go to him in the country.

The Minister for Works: Surely business can go on without this kind of thing.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The hon. member must not reflect on the Minister.

Hon. M. F. TROY: Let him keep quiet.

The Minister for Works: You keep quiet.

Hon. M. F. TROY: The Minister has not the courtesy to stand up and reply to amendments moved, because he has behind him a majority who are prepared to support anything, who are never in the Chamber, who are outside, who come in and vote solidly and stubbornly for the Government and then walk out again. They vote for legislation which they promised they would not support. I would not feel so strongly about this if it were not taking away from injured people the compensation they now enjoy under the laws of the country. Why does

not the Minister get up and reply? Let him show what relief this legislation will provide. Of course he will prove it to the satisfaction of his own party. Just imagine £450 compensation for the loss of a leg! What a magnificent offering to men who are crippled for life! Does the Minister know that these injured men will for the rest of their days be most severely handicapped in life's battle? Does he know that they have wives and children dependent upon them, and that the whole family will be handicapped? Surely the Minister has some humanitarian feelings. He was a worker himself a few years ago, and he may be a worker again, in which event he may require the benefits of this legislation. Had the Government included in their policy their intention to amend the Workers' Compensation Act, I would not have felt so heated. I would respect them for carrying out their duty. On the other hand, this is quite contrary to their expressed policy. They promised that they would not introduce legislation to deprive the workers of the benefits they enjoyed. They secured office by means of unscrupulous promises, each one of which they have broken. Honourable men! Honourable fiddlesticks! Work for all! Money for all! Look at what they are doing! They look upon themselves as having been called to office by God Almighty.

The Minister for Works: You complain about my not fighting.

Hon. M. F. TROY: You are not capable of fighting. It passes my comprehension how any reasonable, decent-minded men could support a proposition for such paltry compensation. They regard it as something heroic, this depriving cripples of industry of £125. So the Minister sits there, stubbornly pushing through this miserable paltry legislation, and applying the gag to have his way. Apart from the Employers' Federation, no one has asked for this legislation. I am astounded that the Government should lend themselves to such a move. The member for Nelson will go down to his electorate and shed tears while he tells the timber workers how he sat up all night to deprive them of some of their compensation.

Hon. A. McCallum: Yes, taking £125 from crippled men!

Mr. Kenneally: Getting their pound of flesh.

Hon. M. F. TROY: Of all the Governments of Australia, only the Western Australian Government could do this sort of thing. This class war has been aggravated by the Government as never before in this Chamber.

Mr. Kenneally: Crucifying the workers.

Mr. SLEEMAN: The Minister is adamant, but I am optimistic enough to think that there will be sufficient members on the Government side of the House to help us to pass the amendment. I can imagine the howl that would be raised by the returned soldiers if they were to be told that they would receive £450 only for the loss of a leg below the knee. We can make a comparison between the treatment accorded those who went away to fight for their country and those who have been crippled in industry. A returned soldier who lost a leg at the war receives a pension of two guineas a week for life, his wife one guinea a week and 7s. 6d. a week for each child. The man who is crippled in industry should be treated equally fairly. I refuse to believe that returned-soldier members are likely to vote for any difference between the man crippled in industry and the man crippled in fighting for his country. The returned soldier, in addition to his pension, got free hospital treatment when his leg was amputated, and gets free hospital treatment again whenever there is any trouble in consequence of the amputation. Moreover, he gets his artificial leg free, but it is not so for the man crippled in industry. I believe the returned soldiers in the House will not follow the Minister on this occasion, but will see to it that the man crippled in industry gets a fair deal.

One o'clock a.m.

Mr. HEGNEY: The Minister ought to have submitted some figures as to the number of major cases dealt with during the past 12 months. On the second reading he said that 93 per cent. of the claims made were in respect of temporary disablement. That left 7 per cent. to be counted as major cases. Then in the statement which Dr. Holland made in conference with the Minister, he said that most of the cases were minor cases, and that the medical accounts ranged from £2 to £10. From all that, it seems clear that the major cases were but a very small percentage of the total cases dealt with. If the Minister would but sub-

mit figures giving full information to the Committee, he might possibly be able to prove his case. Undoubtedly the schedule means substantial reduction in compensation. The Government and their supporters when on the hustings declared they were not going to tamper with industrial legislation. If the thousands of workers who put the Government into office could be assembled here to-night, I am certain the fate of the Government would be sealed. The Minister has put up no case to warrant the reductions proposed in the schedule. On his own showing, only 7 per cent. of the cases dealt with last year were major cases. It is evident the Government are going to force these items through, and unquestionably the workers will suffer marked reductions in the compensation to be paid to those of them who sustain injury in industry.

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

Ayes	15
Noes	18

Majority against .. 3

AYES.	
Mr. Corboy	Mr. Panton
Mr. Hegney	Mr. Sleeman
Mr. Johnson	Mr. Troy
Mr. Kenneally	Mr. Wansbrough
Mr. Marshall	Mr. Wilcock
Mr. McCallum	Mr. Wilson
Mr. Millington	Mr. Raphael
Mr. Munsie	

(Teller.)

NOES.	
Mr. Angelo	Mr. Parker
Mr. Barnard	Mr. Patrick
Mr. Doney	Mr. Piesse
Mr. Griffiths	Mr. Sampson
Mr. Latham	Mr. Scaddan
Mr. Lindsay	Mr. J. H. Smith
Mr. H. W. Mann	Mr. Thorn
Mr. I. I. Mann	Mr. Wells
Mr. McLarty	Mr. North

(Teller.)

PAIRS.	
AYES.	NOES.
Mr. Collier	Sir James Mitchell
Mr. Lamond	Mr. Davy
Mr. Walker	Mr. Ferguson
Mr. Cunningham	Mr. J. M. Smith
Mr. Coverley	Mr. Teesdale
Miss Holman	Mr. Keenan
Mr. Withers	Mr. Brown

Amendment thus negatived.

[Mr. J. H. Smith took the Chair.]

Item. Loss of foot at ankle, £390:

Hon. A. McCALLUM: I move an amendment—

That the words "at ankle £390" be struck out, and "£525" inserted in lieu.

The Minister proposes a reduction of £135 on the existing item, which would make the compensation for this injury £60 less than is paid in Queensland and £135 less than is paid under the Acts of the Commonwealth and New South Wales. There is no doubt about the ruthlessness of the cut. This is further emphasised by the fact that later on provision is made for the loss of toes, which would really mean the loss of half a foot, as if it were merely the loss of a toe. What is the reason for paying a man who loses a foot in Perth £135 less than a man suffering a similar injury in Sydney? Two men might be working side by side on a road, one employed by the Telegraph Department and the other by the Main Roads Board, and if each lost a foot, one would receive £135 more than the other. Even the Nationalist Government in New South Wales did not attempt to reduce the schedule. I could understand some modification being suggested for minor accidents, especially on the information supplied to the Minister by the medical authorities, but those items have been expunged and the major items have been reduced. No man would wilfully chop off his foot. The Government are prepared to keep members here throughout two nights in one week in order to take this money from the victims of our industrial system. In the 10 years I have been a member, I do not think we have been called upon to sit up two nights in the one week.

The Minister for Lands: Because we always allowed your legislation to go through.

Hon. A. McCALLUM: This session was summoned for other purposes, but the only way in which the Government can suggest dealing with the economic position is to rob the maimed of some of their compensation. I hope it will not be long before we have an opportunity to restore the position to what it was. No one can say that the existing schedule pays a man for all that he loses; how much less does this new schedule do so? Is £750 equitable compensation to a man for the loss of his eyesight? Is there any reason why a man working in this State should receive less compensation for the loss of a foot than if he were working in New South Wales? We are told that the schedule is scientifically arranged. It is immeasurably below the standard of any other schedule of its kind in Australia. I am not prepared to accept the word of any medical man as to this being a fair way to

gauge the amount of compensation that should be paid for injury. Neither the workers nor the employers have been consulted. The schedule is more difficult to understand than any I have ever seen. In fact, not a good word can be said for it.

Mr. MARSHALL: I wish to enter a final protest against the proposed reductions.

Mr. Kenneally: Why final?

Mr. MARSHALL: Because I have come to the conclusion that words are wasted, particularly in view of the utterances of the member for Katanning, who indicated that he could not assess sums sufficient to compensate for industrial injuries, but could silently support the proposals of the Government. The hon. member's sympathy with injured workers can be compared to cemetery worms advocating cremation. The Minister quotes the legislation of other States in support of his proposals, but this schedule is hundreds of pounds below the corresponding legislation of other States and the Commonwealth. He does not even reply to arguments used in support of amendments. Ministerial members generally are silent. Although one of them shed crocodile tears over the insufficiency of compensation, yet he was willing to take something off the amount. Whenever burdens are to be removed from industry, it is the workers who must make the sacrifice. The member for Katanning knows the heavy burdens insurance and interest impose on industry, but he has no word of protest to utter in those respects. I may point out that the farming industry employs less labour than any other industry of equal importance.

Mr. KENNEALLY: This item proposes to take away £150 from an injured worker. That is the proposal of the Minister who said he was going to lift the burden off industry without reducing the compensation payable to workers. In addition to the pecuniary compensation proposed by the schedule, the worker is to have the sympathy of the member for Katanning. No doubt an industrial cripple nursing a joint from which a limb has been cut will feel greatly consoled by the sympathy of Ministerial members when he is unable to keep his family owing to the cutting-down of the compensation. The item under consideration proposes that £390 shall be paid for the loss of a leg. Do hon. members realise what the loss of a limb means, or how long it takes a man who loses a leg to recover from the wound itself? Do they realise that

while he is trying to recover from the wound, he receives only half wages? When the half-pay the injured worker will receive while he is laid aside and all the other expenses in which he will be involved are deducted from the £390 fixed as compensation, he will be expected to maintain his wife and family on the balance. It is quite conceivable that the whole of the amount will be eaten up before he is fit for work. This is proposed by a Government returned to power on a promise that they would not interfere with the benefits enjoyed by the workers. The Minister has reached out his rapacious paw to take money out of the pockets of injured workers. Those unfortunate individuals, however, will be able to rejoice in the fact that they have the sympathy of the member for Katanning who does not desire to ruffle the Minister.

Mr. Sleeman: And he calls himself an independent.

Mr. KENNEALLY: He was returned by the votes of the workers on the ground that he would not agree with any interference with industrial conditions. One is becoming hopeless of securing a vote that will protect the interests of the workers. The Minister said that £10,000 was not sufficient to compensate a man for the loss of his leg, yet now he says £350 is sufficient. He has not given the Committee any evidence to warrant such a reduction. He referred to persons who were prepared to lop off portions of their limbs in order to get compensation, but he has not furnished us with any evidence to prove that individuals have indulged in that questionable pastime. Even so, the Minister could not, on those grounds, justify the item under discussion.

The Minister for Works: When I attempted to, I was told I was making a second reading speech, and I stopped.

Mr. KENNEALLY: It is a pity the Minister has not stopped in his desire to take money out of the pockets of cripples. Apparently the interests of the workers and the maimed are of secondary consideration.

Mr. PANTON: The more I admire this scientific schedule, the more puzzled am I over the chart supplied for the information of members. I should like the Minister to tell us something about this chart. How is the end of a leg, as shown in the chart, to be fitted with an artificial foot?

It simply could not be done; the foot would have to be taken off a little higher up. The more I study the chart, the more convinced am I that the scientists have worked it out on a basis of pounds of flesh and inches of bone.

Mr. Kenneally: They have treated the bone as soup bones!

Hon. A. McCallum: And what about the marrow?

Mr. PANTON: I am sorry the Minister cannot explain this charge; he has ducked out of his seat so as to avoid it. The victim of an accident is taken into a private hospital, where he has to stop at four guineas per week until the doctors certify they can do no more for him. Then he has to get his artificial foot and painfully learn to use it. What I am trying to get at is how much of the £390 will be left for him after he has deducted the amount he has lost in half wages.

The Minister for Works: On an average, 14 per cent. of the total compensation paid goes in the weekly wages.

Mr. PANTON: That conveys nothing, because under the present Act we start with the first joint of a little toe and go right round to the first joint of a little finger—all are Second Schedule cases, minor cases of toes and fingers. But when it comes to taking off a man's foot or leg it will be interesting to know what it will cost him by the time he gets out of hospital. I am curious to hear from the Minister, for I can see quite a lot of questions that will be asked of members by their constituents. We are entitled to know why there should be a difference of £10 between the ankle and a few inches above.

Hon. A. McCallum: There are five different payments for amputations between the ankle and the knee.

Mr. PANTON: On the chart there are but three. So apparently the chart is wrong. It proves my contention that it is based on pounds of flesh and inches of bone.

Hon. A. McCallum: And pints of blood.

2 o'clock a.m.

Mr. PANTON: They are thrown in. Why not adopt more divisions? Surely the more a man loses, the more he is entitled to. Why adopt joints as a basis, as against flesh lost? I suggest to the Minister for Lands not to risk a stiff neck through look-

ing at the clock so much. It is all very well for members on the Government side to deplore the time occupied by the Opposition. We are here to represent the workers.

The Minister for Lands: You are doing it very well.

Mr. PANTON: I am sorry I cannot return the compliment. The member for Middle Swan said the workers had been responsible for putting members opposite into office. To that I would reply with a biblical quotation, "Forgive them for they knew not what they were doing." I had to get my leg bound up to-day and was informed that there is another surgical operation in store for me. I do not come under the Workers' Compensation Act.

Mr. Angelo: Next month you will be within the limit of remuneration.

Mr. PANTON: I have undergone some operations, and may have to face more, and I can imagine the feelings of a worker in industry when he meets with an accident. If I lost my leg even now, I should be in a much better position than the average worker who loses a leg. I appeal to the Minister to give reasonable consideration to injured workers.

Mr. SLEEMAN: I hope the amendment will be agreed to. Do members consider that £390 is adequate compensation for the loss of a foot? By the time the deductions were made, the worker would probably have nothing to collect. Ninety-five per cent. of the unfortunate workers who lose a foot are unable to return to their occupations. Years ago a miner lost a foot and has never since been able to work in the mines. He has had to get assistance from the Child Welfare Department. A man in Fremantle lost a leg, and the only job he has had for six or seven years has been as night watchman when sewerage work has been undertaken at Fremantle. As soon as the job was finished, he could expect no more employment until the sewerage work was resumed. If such a man were not given a reasonable chance by way of compensation to help himself, the Government would have to help him in some other way. He should not have to look to the Child Welfare Department for help.

Mr. HEGNEY: The main reason for reducing the compensation is to ease production costs. The Minister has tightened up the provisions relating to administrative costs.

The CHAIRMAN: The hon. member cannot discuss that.

Mr. HEGNEY: The Minister has also adopted provisions to prevent malingering.

The CHAIRMAN: The hon. member must confine himself to the amendment.

Mr. Panton called attention to the state of the Committee.

Quorum formed.

[Mr. Richardson took the Chair.]

Mr. HEGNEY: Under this provision the injured worker stands to lose £135. The number of such cases as these would be very small; that being so the individual concerned should not be asked to make this big sacrifice. I wish to enter my strong protest against the proposal.

Mr. MILLINGTON: It is most difficult to assess the value of a foot or of an ankle that may be amputated. If a man is thus deprived of the full use of his limbs, he is in most cases unable to follow his ordinary occupation. We can imagine the plight of the timber worker or miner who has lost his foot. Much of the amount of compensation set down in the schedule would be eaten up during the time he was recovering, and within 12 months there would be nothing left. Being unable to follow his usual occupation he becomes to all intents and purposes an industrial derelict, and a charge upon the State. Is not that the main factor in assessing the value of an injury? There have been allegations as to men deliberately maiming themselves. Has there been an instance of a man cutting off his foot in order to gain even the former amount of compensation? No one has suggested that the amounts at present granted are excessive. The Government should look round for some other means of economy. Industry is under no serious disability in providing compensation for men severely injured. The Minister knows that very rarely indeed can a disabled worker, especially one of mature years, acquire another trade by which to maintain himself and his family. The people most to be considered are those who through no fault of their own meet with a serious accident and are thereby debarred from earning their living.

Hon. J. C. Willcock: What difference will the proposed reductions make in the premiums?

Mr. MILLINGTON: I believe that economies can be effected, and that with board control the present schedule can be maintained without increase of premiums. By cutting down waste an unnecessary load will be lifted off industry. We are quite in accord with suggestions for obviating waste. To that extent the Government are right. But they are wrong in beginning their economies with the man who suffers, who is permanently disabled. Why this serious drop of £135? I do not think there have been complaints from any employer or insurance company. Would employers grudge paying the premiums required to maintain the old rates of compensation? I cannot believe it. The accidents here in view are not of a trifling character; then why whittle down the compensation? Nothing is worse than to deprive men of their hope in life. A man who has worked for a number of years in the mining industry, and owing to miners' disease becomes unable to earn his living in a mine, is like a fish out of water; it is most difficult to place him anywhere else. The same remarks apply to a timber worker or farm worker who is thrown on the world. As regards major accidents the schedule should remain as it was. If the Minister were asked to value the loss of his foot, I am satisfied he would not agree to accept £390. No one would deprive himself of his foot for the sake of even £525. If the Bill is passed the Minister will find, in view of the safeguards that are provided, that no one will impose on the funds by cutting off a portion of a limb for the sake of the compensation provided. Even the Federal and State Governments in their search for avenues of economy, have not suggested such a large proportion off workers' compensation. The Minister has out-Heroded Herod because he has suggested that the injured workers shall lose more than it is proposed the community shall relinquish in order to help Australia out of her present economic difficulties. We should consider the experiences of cripples themselves. I would prefer to permit them to assess the value rather than to accept the dicta of scientists, experts or actuaries. Even with the compensation provided for a man who loses his foot, after 12 months the money will have disappeared and the cripple will be thrown on the cold world. Rather than penalise maimed industrial derelicts, the load should be borne

by the community as a whole. Cannot the Minister consider a better way of accomplishing necessary economies by asking the people as a whole to bear it? If we do not provide reasonably for the derelicts of industry, they will simply become an added charge and burden on the Government. The Treasurer has to find at least £500,000 for sustenance for able-bodied unemployed men, and the Bill will simply mean that the cripples of industry will add to that burden. The Government are not far-seeing enough. Parliament is the custodian of the public purse and will be blamed if unnecessary expenditure is incurred. And here is a charge that can be shected home to the Government—"Why is it you are so anxious to relieve private employers of their responsibility to pay for the industrial derelicts when you know you will be saddled with their maintenance?" It will be a dereliction of duty if the Government by this measure relieve those who should pay of their responsibility, and take over the responsibility themselves. We will assist the Government in making economies; any scheme to relieve the Government purse will meet with the sympathetic consideration of this side of the House. But when I see the Government heading for additional expenditure, it has to be pointed out. I have never heard an employer complain that a man who loses his leg or meets with any other serious accident is overpaid under workers' compensation. Yet we find that the first action in this special session of members on the Government side is to whittle away payments to injured workers. I warn the Minister that this will damn his reputation. He will be known as the man who deprived injured workers of fair compensation for their injuries. I am determined it shall not be said the Minister did this unknowingly. Even though it may take some time, I believe that eventually the efforts we are making to save the Minister from himself will bear good fruit, and so this night will not have been wasted.

Mr. RAPHAEL: I am opposed to any specific amount being paid to an injured worker. It would be better to allot the incapacitated man a small pension, as in the case of returned soldiers.

The Minister for Works: Pensions will be cut down by 20 per cent., but this compensation will not be.

Mr. RAPHAEL: The Minister does not know what is going to happen. If a worker in the agricultural industry were to lose a foot, he would no longer be any good to the farmer. What, then, ought to be paid for the loss of that man's foot?

The Minister for Lands: I would pay a fair amount for the loss of a tongue or two.

Mr. RAPHAEL: If the Minister for Works would put some statistics before us, his proposals might receive more consideration from this side than they are getting. The Minister has had pushed on to him the rotten job of reducing the workers, but it is a pity he should have made an onslaught on all the items in the schedule. To reduce the whole of the schedule as the Minister has done—

The Minister for Works: The maximum is the same.

Mr. RAPHAEL: Well, the Minister has reduced practically the whole of the schedule. If the idea is to make the fund a success at the expense of the workers, it would have been more creditable to leave the whole business alone. Returned soldiers on the Government side know how serious it is for a man to lose a limb, and they should therefore insist upon adequate compensation being provided for an injured worker. For the Minister to adopt such a dogmatic attitude is intolerable. Members on the Government side should lend a willing ear to reasonable arguments. The Minister has given way on a few details, but he has refused to concede anything in hard cash. He might well unbend a little in the interests of the workers. The amendment would not cause a big drain on the fund. A man drawing compensation under this item would have little to collect after the deductions had been made.

The Minister for Lands rose to speak.

Mr. RAPHAEL: I point out, Mr. Chairman, that I have not yet resumed my seat. I appeal to the Minister to consider the wife and family of an injured worker.

Hon. A. McCALLUM: I hope the Minister will consider the point that the loss of the foot at the ankle would be as great a disadvantage to the individual as loss at the middle third. If the argument applies to the top of the leg, it must apply at the other extremity.

Mr. SAMPSON: The member for South Fremantle is wrong. The greater the portion of leg lost, the greater the shock to the

system and the greater the danger of tuberculosis of the bone supervening. The nearer the injury to the extremity, the less would be the harm done to the system.

3 o'clock a.m.

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

Ayes	15
Noes	18

Majority against 3

AYES.

Mr. Corboy	Mr. Pantou
Mr. Hegney	Mr. Sleeman
Mr. Johnson	Mr. Troy
Mr. Kenneally	Mr. Wansbrough
Mr. Marshall	Mr. Willcock
Mr. McCallum	Mr. Wilson
Mr. Millington	Mr. Raphael
Mr. Munle	

(Teller.)

NOES.

Mr. Angelo	Mr. Parker
Mr. Barnard	Mr. Patrick
Mr. Doney	Mr. Piesse
Mr. Griffiths	Mr. Sampson
Mr. Latham	Mr. Scaddan
Mr. Lindsay	Mr. J. H. Smith
Mr. H. W. Mann	Mr. Thorn
Mr. J. I. Mann	Mr. Wells
Mr. McLarty	Mr. North

(Teller.)

PAIRS.

AYES.	NOES.
Mr. Collier	Sir James Mitchell
Mr. Lamond	Mr. Davy
Mr. Walker	Mr. Ferguson
Mr. Cunningham	Mr. J. M. Smith
Mr. Coveley	Mr. Teesdale
Miss Hofman	Mr. Keenan
Mr. Withers	Mr. Brown

Amendment thus negatived.

Item, Loss of arm at or above elbow, £475:

Hon. A. McCALLUM: I move an amendment—

That the words "arm at or above elbow £475" be struck out, and "either arm or of the greater part thereof, £675" inserted in lieu.

This is a reduction of £200 on the existing rate. It is merely the pruning knife to cut off that sum. No reasons have been advanced why this is being done, or why the worker in this State should be £200 behind either the Commonwealth or New South Wales. This lifts the burden off industry with a vengeance, but places it on the individual. It is the largest reduction of any of the items in the schedule. What is the explanation of this amount of compensation being so much below the amounts granted by other States? Queensland awards £562, New South Wales £675: we offer £475. This

schedule will go down in history as the most iniquitous proposal ever inflicted on the workers. Its sole objective is to take away money from the injured worker so that someone else may benefit. The reductions in the schedule will not save much; it is in other respects that substantial savings will be made. Say 20 men lose the greater part of the arm in the course of a year, and that each of them is deprived of £200; how will that benefit industry when spread over all its branches? But the reduction means a great deal to the man who has suffered the loss of an arm. People are to be degraded and rendered miserable for the rest of their lives, without any particular advantage to anybody. Queensland allows more for a right than for a left arm, but does not draw these other distinctions. The Minister's second reading speech gave no hint to the people that £200 was to be taken from a man who lost an arm or the greater part of an arm. The fact of a small stump being left does not represent much advantage to the maimed worker. The bad feature of these proposals is that the workers in industry even now do not know of them. They have been misled by Press propaganda to the effect that compensation is not to be reduced. If the injured man became septic, the whole of his compensation would be cut out in treatment. America allows a period of convalescence extending over 388 days for such an injury as this. The Minister will simply force the schedule through, having the numbers to do it. All we can do is to enter our protest and let the people know what is happening.

Mr. Panton called attention to the state of the Committee.

Quorum formed.

Mr. SLEEMAN: What occupation could a man suffering from the loss of an arm expect to follow? He could not continue in the timber industry, nor as a seaman. There would be little for such a man on the wharf and a farmer's son suffering from such a disability would not be an efficient worker. Such men must become an added burden to the community. The compensation provided is not adequate to cover all the expenses the unfortunate worker will have to meet, let alone enable him to maintain himself and his family. Most of the discussion has related to male workers, but let hon. members realise what will be the position of females

who will be affected. Take a pretty girl 17 years of age who may lose her arm. Her matrimonial prospects will certainly be diminished. Every girl anticipates that at some time she will become a bride, and even should a girl realise her ambition, what a disability the loss of her arm must prove.

Mr. Marshall: At any rate, she could not throw the rolling pin at her husband so well.

Mr. SLEEMAN: This is no laughing matter! How would any hon. member feel if his daughter was brought home minus an arm? I appeal to the Committee to agree to the amendment, for the amount of compensation provided for the loss of an arm is £475 or £200 less than is provided for in the present Act, which was not unduly generous.

Mr. RAPHAEL: In most walks of life, it will be almost impossible for a man to continue his ordinary avocation if he loses an arm. The Government are only transferring their responsibility from one department to another. If the Minister is going to transfer that responsibility to the Child Welfare Department, he will find himself up against another Minister. The Government are committing a serious error in attempting to make this fund a success at the expense of the workers. The Minister that will even attempt to achieve success at the cost of the workers is not the right man for the job. When the Press were advocating a reduction in workers' compensation, they did not imagine the Government were going to take from the workers in order to bolster up the fund. If the insurance companies, with their huge administrative costs, have shown a small loss on workers' compensation business, the Government ought to be able to make a small profit, having regard to the substantially reduced administrative costs. Under this schedule of compensation, what does the Minister expect an injured worker to keep his wife and family on? But the Minister does not care about that; all that he wants to do is to hound down the workers.

Mr. KENNEALLY: I again ask the Minister how he is going to substantiate the statement that he would not take from the injured worker in an attempt to relieve industry of the burden of workers' compensation. When on the second reading the Minister said he was not going to reduce the compensation payment, he was making a statement which he knew to be incorrect. Only to-day when I was with some of the

unemployed in East Perth I was approached by one Boswell, a man from the group settlements who has had the misfortune to lose a hand. Under the existing schedule he received £600. After the accident he endeavoured to make good on the groups, but most of his money went west, and since then he has been trying to earn a living for his family. He has not been successful. Recently he had a job sweeping the streets in Perth on two or three nights a week, for which he was paid £1 7s. 6d. weekly. Now, however, he has had to be discharged, simply because of his disablement. He is begging the right to live. His children are being assisted by the State. Meanwhile, the Minister proposes to lift the burden from industry and place it on that man and his fellows. The same man was in the court the other day pleading with the magistrate to save him from being turned out of his home. Yet it is proposed to cut £200 off the inadequate amount that man actually received in compensation for his injury. One of the worst disablements a man can suffer is the loss of a hand, particularly the right hand. If I were drawing up a compensation schedule, I would place the loss of a right hand much higher than it is here. My experience in trying to put into employment returned soldiers is that the greatest difficulty is in finding a suitable occupation for a man who has lost a hand, particularly the right hand. What has become of the Minister's promise that the benefits to the workers would not be reduced? The Minister's statement to the House was entirely wrong. Almost every item in the schedule is being reduced. The member for Katanning has handed out quantities of sympathy and his attitude is evidently supported by the automatons on the Government side. I do not know what is going to happen to some of the workers who lose a hand if they have to live on £200 less than the amount which hitherto has proved insufficient. If any item calls for an increase, it is this one. On scarcely one item has the Minister attempted to justify the reduction. The effect of the Minister's proposal will be to relieve industry of portion of the burden and place it upon the people of the State. The existing Act provides £675 for this injury; the Commonwealth Act also provides £675, and now the Minister proposes to reduce it to £475.

There is something radically wrong when the Minister does not offer the semblance of an excuse for the reduction.

The MINISTER FOR LANDS: I move—

That the Committee do now divide.

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

Ayes	17
Noes	15
				—
Majority for	2
				—

AYES.

Mr. Angelo
Mr. Barnard
Mr. Doney
Mr. Griffiths
Mr. Latham
Mr. Lindsay
Mr. J. I. Mann
Mr. McLarty
Mr. Parker

Mr. Patrick
Mr. Piesse
Mr. Sampson
Mr. Scaddan
Mr. J. H. Smith
Mr. Thorn
Mr. Wells
Mr. North

(Teller.)

NOES.

Mr. Corboy
Mr. Hegney
Mr. Johnson
Mr. Kenneally
Mr. Marshall
Mr. McCallum
Mr. Millington
Mr. Munle

Mr. Panton
Mr. Sleeman
Mr. Troy
Mr. Wansbrough
Mr. Willcock
Mr. Wilson
Mr. Raphael

(Teller.)

PAIRS.

AYES.
Sir James Mitchell
Mr. Davy
Mr. Ferguson
Mr. J. M. Smith
Mr. Teesdale
Mr. Keenan
Mr. Brown

NOES.
Mr. Collier
Mr. Lamond
Mr. Walker
Mr. Cunningham
Mr. Coverley
Miss Holman
Mr. Withers

Motion thus passed

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

Ayes	15
Noes	17
				—
Majority against	2
				—

AYES.

Mr. Corboy
Mr. Hegney
Mr. Johnson
Mr. Kenneally
Mr. Marshall
Mr. McCallum
Mr. Millington
Mr. Munle

Mr. Panton
Mr. Sleeman
Mr. Troy
Mr. Wansbrough
Mr. Willcock
Mr. Wilson
Mr. Raphael

(Teller.)

NOES.

Mr. Angelo
Mr. Barnard
Mr. Doney
Mr. Griffiths
Mr. Latham
Mr. Lindsay
Mr. J. I. Mann
Mr. McLarty
Mr. Parker

Mr. Patrick
Mr. Piesse
Mr. Sampson
Mr. Scaddan
Mr. J. H. Smith
Mr. Thorn
Mr. Wells
Mr. North

(Teller.)

PAIRS.

AYES.	NOES.
Mr. Collier	Mr. James Mitchell
Mr. Lamond	Mr. Davy
Mr. Walker	Mr. Ferguson
Mr. Cunningham	Mr. J. M. Smith
Mr. Coverley	Mr. Teesdale
Miss Holman	Mr. Keenan
Mr. Withers	Mr. Brown

Amendment thus negatived.

Item, Loss of hand at wrist, £400:

Hon. A. McCALLUM: I move an amendment—

That “£400” be struck out and “£600” inserted in lieu.

This represents another loss of £200 to the worker, compared with the existing rate, the Commonwealth law and that of New South Wales.

Mr. HEGNEY: It represents a reduction of 33⅓ per cent.

Hon. A. McCALLUM: It is the second item in this schedule under which the worker will lose £200.

Mr. KENNEALLY: How much more useful is an arm taken off at the wrist than near the elbow? Is a worker better able to follow his ordinary occupation in the former case than in the latter? The Minister gave the House an entirely wrong impression in his second reading speech. The Bill is seriously affecting the interests of the worker and depriving him of much that he now possesses. This Bill is a result of the investigations of the Committee on which every other side but Labour was represented. Every move of the Minister is designed to take from only one section of the community—the workers. It seems more than a coincidence that on the committee mainly responsible for the schedule there was no representative of the workers.

The Minister for Works: The employers were not represented.

Mr. HEGNEY: I protest against the reduction proposed. As one goes down the list, the percentage of reduction increases. In the two previous items the reductions were 25.7 and 29.6 per cent.; here the reduction is 33.33 per cent. The Minister has not indicated the basis on which he reduces. Why are not the reductions on a flat rate?

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

Ayes	15
Noes	18
				—

Majority against 3

—

AYES.

Mr. Corboy	Mr. Panton
Mr. Hegney	Mr. Sleeman
Mr. Johnson	Mr. Troy
Mr. Kenneally	Mr. Wansbrough
Mr. Marshall	Mr. Willcock
Mr. McCallum	Mr. Wilson
Mr. Millington	Mr. Raphael
Mr. Niasie	(Teller.)

NOES.

Mr. Angelo	Mr. Parker
Mr. Barnard	Mr. Patrick
Mr. Doucy	Mr. Plesco
Mr. Griffiths	Mr. Sampson
Mr. Latham	Mr. Scaddan
Mr. Lindsay	Mr. J. H. Smith
Mr. H. W. Mann	Mr. Thoru
Mr. J. I. Mann	Mr. Wells
Mr. McLarty	Mr. North
	(Teller.)

PAIRS.

AYES.	NOES.
Mr. Collier	Mr. James Mitchell
Mr. Lamond	Mr. Davy
Mr. Walker	Mr. Ferguson
Mr. Cunningham	Mr. J. M. Smith
Mr. Coverley	Mr. Teesdale
Miss Holman	Mr. Keenan
Mr. Withers	Mr. Brown

Amendment thus negatived.

Item, Loss of forearm at upper third, £450:

Hon. A. McCALLUM: Under our present law the amount is £600. In Queensland the amount is £525, and in New South Wales £600. Under the Commonwealth Act the amount is £600. I move an amendment—

That “forearm at upper third, £450” be struck out, and “lower part of either arm, either hand, or five fingers of either hand £600” inserted in lieu.

Mr. KENNEALLY: No doubt it is a forlorn hope to ask the Minister to listen to reason. The manner in which the schedule is cut about does not permit of genuine comparisons being made. The schedule contains 43 subdivisions as against 21 in the old schedule, and this makes it difficult to identify the exact injury. Under our existing Act and under the Commonwealth law practically the same injury carries £600 compensation, as against £450 here proposed. Another £150 out of the pockets of the injured workers, and no apology from the Minister at all! We have not noticed any attempt on the part of the Government to take money out of the pockets of any other section of the community; it is always out of the pockets of one section. Then, when the Minister follows it up by calling conferences at which interests other than those of the workers only are present, he makes the position worse. If this is the class-biased attitude of the Govern-

ment, then as they give, so shall they receive.

The Minister for Works: You know, of course, that we have taken a lot out of the pockets of the insurance companies and the doctors as well.

Mr. KENNEALLY: The Minister has shown us that the private insurance companies made a loss of £73,000 on this class of business during four years.

The Minister for Works: Still, they are anxious to retain the business.

Mr. KENNEALLY: The Minister means that he is taking over the losses of those companies, apart from the State Insurance Office. That statement is on a par with another he made, that he would not relieve the burden of industry at the expense of the worker. Instead of industry looking after its cripples, the Minister's proposals mean that our charitable institutions will be called upon to undertake the task.

The MINISTER FOR LANDS: I move—

That the Committee do now divide.

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

Ayes	18
Noes	15
					—
Majority for	3
					—

AYES.

Mr. Angelo	Mr. Parker
Mr. Barnard	Mr. Patrick
Mr. Doney	Mr. Plesse
Mr. Griffiths	Mr. Sampson
Mr. Latham	Mr. Scaddan
Mr. Lindsay	Mr. J. H. Smith
Mr. H. W. Mann	Mr. Thorn
Mr. J. I. Mann	Mr. Wells
Mr. McLarty	Mr. North

(Teller.)

NOES.

Mr. Corboy	Mr. Pantan
Mr. Hegney	Mr. Sleeman
Mr. Johnson	Mr. Troy
Mr. Kenneally	Mr. Wansbrough
Mr. Marshall	Mr. Willcock
Mr. McCallum	Mr. Wilson
Mr. Millington	Mr. Raphael
Mr. Munsie	

(Teller.)

PAIRS.

AYES.	NOES.
Sir James Mitchell	Mr. Collier
Mr. Davy	Mr. Lamond
Mr. Ferguson	Mr. Walker
Mr. J. M. Smith	Mr. Cunningham
Mr. Teesdale	Mr. Coverley
Mr. Keenan	Miss Holman
Mr. Brown	Mr. Withers

Motion thus passed.

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

Ayes	15
Noes	18
					—
Majority against	3
					—

AYES.

Mr. Corboy	Mr. Pantan
Mr. Hegney	Mr. Sleeman
Mr. Johnson	Mr. Troy
Mr. Kenneally	Mr. Wansbrough
Mr. Marshall	Mr. Willcock
Mr. McCallum	Mr. Wilson
Mr. Millington	Mr. Raphael
Mr. Munsie	

(Teller.)

NOES.

Mr. Angelo	Mr. Parker
Mr. Barnard	Mr. Patrick
Mr. Doney	Mr. Plesse
Mr. Griffiths	Mr. Sampson
Mr. Latham	Mr. Scaddan
Mr. Lindsay	Mr. J. H. Smith
Mr. H. W. Mann	Mr. Thorn
Mr. J. I. Mann	Mr. Wells
Mr. McLarty	Mr. North

(Teller.)

PAIRS.

AYES.	NOES.
Mr. Collier	Sir James Mitchell
Mr. Lamond	Mr. Davy
Mr. Walker	Mr. Ferguson
Mr. Cunningham	Mr. J. M. Smith
Mr. Coverley	Mr. Teesdale
Miss Holman	Mr. Keenan
Mr. Withers	Mr. Brown

Amendment thus negatived.

Item 19, Loss of one eye by enucleation, £300:

Hon. A. McCALLUM: There is something startling here, a reduction of £375 on the existing schedule. No provision is made for the loss of an eye with serious diminution of the sight of the other eye. The best here provided is the loss of one eye by enucleation. The reduction of £300 is outrageous, the absolute limit. I move an amendment—

That "by enucleation, £300" be struck out, and "with serious diminution of the sight of the other eye, £675" be inserted in lieu.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: This deals with one eye only. In the event of anything happening to the sight of the other eye, it is duly provided for here. If both eyes were gone the compensation would be £750.

Hon. A. McCALLUM: The Minister is incorrect. The courts have held that if a man has lost the sight of one eye and the sight of the other eye is diminished, the second loss is far more serious than the first. That is why other Acts make provision in the schedule in accordance with my amendment. The foot-note was inserted for a specific purpose, and one only needs to ex-

amine it to appreciate the significance. I know the position because I have represented men in the courts and similar decisions have been given in other States. The foot-note operates only when one of two good eyes has been injured.

Mr. KENNEALLY: Surely the Minister will not contend that the foot-note, used previously with the then list of items, would apply now when an item has been omitted. The Commonwealth schedule contains a similar foot-note. Yet the Minister is relying on the foot-note to provide an adequate amount when there is an omission from the items. Owing to that omission, the loss of the sight of one eye and serious diminution of the sight of the other will be compensated at the rate of not £675 but £300. It is a serious reduction for the Minister to insist upon. It is little short of tragical that at this hour of the morning, when most members are paying no attention to the business, such serious inroads should be made on the rights of the workers.

Mr. Sleeman: They want to see the blind robbed.

Mr. KENNEALLY: If members were in the Chamber to hear the discussion, they would not be impervious to reason. The member for Middle Swan mentioned that the reductions mounted by an ascending scale to 33 per cent. This reduction rises to 50 per cent. Is it possible for the Minister to plumb deeper depths of repudiation and degradation? Surely £300 would not adequately compensate anyone for the loss of one eye and the serious diminution of the sight of the other.

The CHAIRMAN: The Minister's amendment appearing on the Notice Paper should be taken before that of the member for South Fremantle.

[Mr. J. H. Smith took the Chair.]

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: I move an amendment—

That after "loss of" the words "sight of" be inserted.

I want to make sure that it is the loss of the sight of the eye that is covered by this amount.

Amendment put and passed.

Hon. A. McCALLUM: I will now again submit my amendment. In this case the eye may remain but there is no sight in it,

and the extra £30 is given for the disfigurement. What is the Minister going to do about the case of a man having a serious diminution in the sight of one eye, and being left with only that much sight?

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: I do not understand why that is not already provided for. For the total loss of the sight of an eye the compensation in New South Wales is £375, Victoria £180, Queensland £300, South Australia £230 and Tasmania £180; and for the loss of the sight of one eye with a serious diminution of the sight of the other, in New South Wales the compensation is £675, Victoria £450, Queensland £562 10s., South Australia £525 and Tasmania £450. According to the foot-note, if the eye was half gone the worker would receive £450 and not £300. If the item is passed I will consult with the doctor on the subject.

Mr. KENNEALLY: I do not agree with the Minister's version of the foot-note. The extra money would be half of £270 and not half of £300. If one eye goes and there is a diminution in the sight of the other, the amount to be paid should be greater.

The Minister for Works: I have already agreed with that. It would be on the percentage of this schedule.

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

Ayes	15
Noes	17
Majority against					2

AYES.

Mr. Corboy	Mr. Pantou
Mr. Hegney	Mr. Raphael
Mr. Johnson	Mr. Sleeman
Mr. Kenneally	Mr. Troy
Mr. Marshall	Mr. Wansbrough
Mr. McCallum	Mr. Willcock
Mr. Millington	Mr. Wilson
Mr. Munroe	(Teller.)

NOES.

Mr. Angelo	Mr. Patrick
Mr. Barnard	Mr. Plesse
Mr. Doney	Mr. Richardson
Mr. Latham	Mr. Sampson
Mr. Lindsay	Mr. Scaddan
Mr. J. I. Mann	Mr. Thorn
Mr. McLarty	Mr. Wells
Mr. North	Mr. Griffiths
Mr. Parker	(Teller.)

PAIRS.

AYES.	NOES.
Mr. Collier	Sir James Mitchell
Mr. Lamond	Mr. Davy
Mr. Walker	Mr. Ferguson
Mr. Cunningham	Mr. J. M. Smith
Mr. Coverley	Mr. Teesdale
Miss Holman	Mr. Keenan
Mr. Withers	Mr. Brown

Amendment thus negatived.

Item, Complete loss of hearing, both ears, £450:

Hon. A. McCALLUM: If there is the slightest indication of any hearing whatever, the man may get no compensation at all. The Act speaks of loss of the industrial use of hearing. Under this Bill it is necessary to re-establish judicial interpretations which have been obtained at the cost of thousands of pounds. I remember a claim in the courts on the ground of complete loss of sight in one eye, and the judge ruled that because the claimant could just distinguish movement of the fingers of a hand held up before him, he was not blind. Insurance companies have no souls, and drive the hardest of bargains. They are out for all the profits they can make. I do not anticipate that the proposed commission would be as hard as the insurance companies. "Complete loss of hearing" is a phrase of which the meaning would have to be ascertained through the courts. Let us adhere to the old wording, which has been interpreted by the courts already. I move an amendment—

That the words "Complete loss of hearing, both ears" be struck out, and "Loss of hearing" inserted in lieu.

Later I shall move an amendment dealing with the amount.

5 o'clock, a.m.

Mr. KENNEALLY: The explanation advanced by the member for South Fremantle should appeal to the Minister. Even though he may not be able to agree to any alteration to the amount of compensation specified, the force of the argument regarding deafness must be recognised. Surely it is not the intention of the Minister that the worker must be unable to hear the loudest noise imaginable before he can be paid the full compensation!

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: If a person has lost his hearing completely, the compensation will be £450, but the First Schedule contains a provision for the payment of a percentage varying according to the degree of deafness.

Hon. A. McCallum: But that does not meet my argument regarding the degree of deafness for the purposes of a man's occupation.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: I realise that in some occupations, a worker will re-

quire to have better hearing than in others. The Medical Board will deal with the degree of deafness, and I think the position is clear.

Mr. SLEEMAN: It would be dangerous to leave the item as it is worded in the schedule. I know of one lady who cannot hear without the use of an ear trumpet, but once she is in a railway train, she can hear quite clearly without that artificial aid. What would be her position?

Mr. MARSHALL: Take the position of battery hands who frequently become deaf because of the nature of their occupation. The result is that in the mill those men can hear better than they could when their hearing was unimpaired.

The Minister for Works: I will accept the amendment.

Amendment put and passed.

Hon. A. McCALLUM: I move an amendment—

That "£450" be struck out and "£600" inserted in lieu.

Mr. KENNEALLY: The Minister should be prepared to listen to reason on this amendment. If a man is completely deaf, surely he has sufficient handicap. He will not have much chance in life if his compensation is reduced to £450.

The Minister for Works: It is very liberal.

Mr. KENNEALLY: The people of the community will scarcely agree with that. The amount is £600 in the Commonwealth Act, and for the last six years it has been £600 in this State. Is it not essential that a man or woman losing his or her hearing should be adequately recompensed, whether working for the Commonwealth or for the State? I hope the amendment will be agreed to.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS. Here are the figures in the other States for the loss of hearing: New South Wales, £600; Victoria, £300; Queensland, £375; South Australia, £350; and Tasmania, £300.

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

Ayes	15
Noes	18

Majority against	..	3
------------------	----	---

AYES.		NOES.	
Mr. Corboy	Mr. Pantou	Mr. Angelo	Mr. Parker
Mr. Hegney	Mr. Sleeman	Mr. Barnard	Mr. Patrick
Mr. Johnson	Mr. Troy	Mr. Brown	Mr. Plesse
Mr. Kenneally	Mr. Wansbrough	Mr. Doney	Mr. Richardson
Mr. Marshall	Mr. Willcock	Mr. Griffiths	Mr. Sampson
Mr. McCallum	Mr. Wilson	Mr. Latham	Mr. Scaddan
Mr. Millington	Mr. Raphael	Mr. Lindsay	Mr. Thorn
Mr. Munsie	(Teller.)	Mr. H. W. Mann	Mr. Wells
		Mr. J. I. Mann	Mr. North
			(Teller.)
NOES.		AYES.	
Mr. Angelo	Mr. Parker	Mr. Collier	Mr. James Mitchell
Mr. Barnard	Mr. Patrick	Mr. Lamond	Mr. Davy
Mr. Doney	Mr. Plesse	Mr. Walker	Mr. Ferguson
Mr. Griffiths	Mr. Richardson	Mr. Cunningham	Mr. J. M. Smith
Mr. Latham	Mr. Sampson	Mr. Coverley	Mr. Teesdale
Mr. Lindsay	Mr. Scaddan	Miss Holman	Mr. Keenan
Mr. H. W. Mann	Mr. Thorn	Mr. Withers	Mr. McLarty
Mr. J. I. Mann	Mr. Wells		
Mr. McLarty	Mr. North		
	(Teller.)		

Amendment thus negatived

Schedule, as amended, put and a division taken with the following result:—

Ayes	18
Noes	15

Majority for .. 3

Amendment thus negatived.

Item, Complete loss of hearing, one ear, £150:

Hon. A. McCALLUM: I move an amendment—

That "Complete" be struck out.

Amendment put and passed.

Item, Loss of other than great toe with metatarsal, £90:

Hon. A. McCALLUM: I move an amendment—

That "other than great toe with metatarsal" be struck out, and "a toe other than a great toe, or the joint of a finger" be inserted in lieu.

There is special provision for the great toe. In the schedule the toes and joints are so itemised as to be confusing and the poor "dago" who cuts off the top of his toes will get nothing at all now.

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

Ayes	15
Noes	18

Majority against .. 3

AYES.		NOES.	
Mr. Angelo	Mr. Parker	Mr. Corboy	Mr. Pantou
Mr. Barnard	Mr. Patrick	Mr. Hegney	Mr. Sleeman
Mr. Brown	Mr. Plesse	Mr. Johnson	Mr. Troy
Mr. Doney	Mr. Richardson	Mr. Kenneally	Mr. Wansbrough
Mr. Latham	Mr. Sampson	Mr. Marshall	Mr. Willcock
Mr. Lindsay	Mr. Scaddan	Mr. McCallum	Mr. Wilson
Mr. H. W. Mann	Mr. Thorn	Mr. Millington	Mr. Raphael
Mr. J. I. Mann	Mr. Wells	Mr. Munsie	(Teller.)
Mr. North	Mr. Griffiths		
	(Teller.)		
NOES.		AYES.	
Mr. Corboy	Mr. Parker	Sir James Mitchell	Mr. Collier
Mr. Hegney	Mr. Patrick	Mr. Davy	Mr. Lamond
Mr. Johnson	Mr. Plesse	Mr. Ferguson	Mr. Walker
Mr. Kenneally	Mr. Richardson	Mr. J. M. Smith	Mr. Cunningham
Mr. Marshall	Mr. Sampson	Mr. Teesdale	Mr. Coverley
Mr. McCallum	Mr. Scaddan	Mr. Keenan	Miss Holman
Mr. Millington	Mr. Thorn	Mr. McLarty	Mr. Withers
Mr. Munsie	Mr. Wells		
	Mr. Griffiths		
	(Teller.)		

Schedule, as amended, thus passed.

Third Schedule:

Hon. A. McCALLUM: I understand that the remaining amendments standing in my name cannot be embodied in the Bill because it is considered that they should more rightly be placed in the Health Act.

The Minister for Works: I am prepared to meet you on that.

Hon. A. McCALLUM: There are many different centres, particularly mining and timber, where the employer is responsible for both water supply and sanitation. If anything goes wrong with either of these things, any of these diseases may become

AYES.		NOES.	
Mr. Corboy	Mr. Pantou	Mr. Corboy	Mr. Pantou
Mr. Hegney	Mr. Sleeman	Mr. Hegney	Mr. Sleeman
Mr. Johnson	Mr. Troy	Mr. Johnson	Mr. Troy
Mr. Kenneally	Mr. Wansbrough	Mr. Kenneally	Mr. Wansbrough
Mr. Marshall	Mr. Willcock	Mr. Marshall	Mr. Willcock
Mr. McCallum	Mr. Wilson	Mr. McCallum	Mr. Wilson
Mr. Millington	Mr. Raphael	Mr. Millington	Mr. Raphael
Mr. Munsie	(Teller.)	Mr. Munsie	(Teller.)

prevalent. The Health Department desired we should include these diseases in our Act. I agree they more rightly belong to a health law, but as we have no health law into which they could go they should appear in this Bill. I move an amendment—

That an asterisk be placed against the following descriptions of disease:—

Arsenic, phosphorus, lead, mercury, or other mineral poisoning.

Anthrax.

Poisoning by benzol or its nitro and amido derivatives (dinitro-benzol, anilin, and others).

Poisoning by carbon bisulphide.

Poisoning by nitrous fumes.

Poisoning by cyanogen compounds.

Poisoning by carbon monoxide.

Chrome ulceration.

Compressed air illness.

Trade spasms and cramps.

Pneumoconiosis.

Miner's phthisis.

Ankylostomiasis.

Nystagmus.

Dermatitis.

Amendment put and passed; the schedule, as amended, agreed to.

New clause:

Hon. A. McCALLUM: I move—

That a new clause, to stand as Clause 18, be inserted as follows:—

48. (1.) Every employer shall forthwith send written notice to the Registrar of Friendly Societies whenever it comes to his knowledge that any worker employed by him is suffering from a disease mentioned in the third schedule to this Act, and such notice shall state the name and address of the worker and the time when the disablement began.

Penalty: Fifty pounds.

(2.) Whenever such notice as aforesaid relates to a disease, the name of which is marked with an asterisk in the third schedule, it shall be the duty of the Registrar to forward a copy of the notice to the Commissioner of Public Health.

(3.) It shall be the duty of every medical practitioner who attends a patient suffering from a disease mentioned in the third schedule, which he has reason to believe was contracted by reason of the nature of the employment, to notify in writing the Commissioner of Public Health.

Penalty: Fifty pounds.

(4.) Every employer shall forthwith send written notice to the Registrar whenever it comes to his knowledge that any worker employed by him has suffered personal injury by accident within the meaning of section thirty-six, and such notice shall state the name and address of the worker and the nature and cause of the accident and the time when it happened.

Penalty: Fifty pounds.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: I want to prevent as much duplication as possible. It would be desirable that the employer should give notice of Third Schedule diseases direct to the commission, who would then pass on the information to the Health Department.

New clause put and passed.

Title—agreed to.

Bill reported with amendments.

BILL—SPECIAL LEASE (ESPERANCE PINE PLANTATION) ACT AMENDMENT.

Returned from the Council without amendment.

House adjourned at 5.38 a.m. (Friday).

Legislative Council,

Tuesday, 16th June, 1931.

	PAGE
Questions: Education, secondary schools	3409
Arbitration Court, costs	3410
Canning stock route	3410
Leave of absence	3410
Bills: Farmers' Debts Adjustment Act Amend- ment, 2R.	3410
Traffic Act Amendment, 2R., Com.	3415
Hire-Purchase Agreements, 2R.	3420

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

QUESTION—EDUCATION, SECONDARY SCHOOLS.

Hon. Sir EDWARD WITTENOOM asked the Minister for Country Water Supplies: What was the cost to the Education Department of secondary education, which includes six State High Schools and a Modern School, leaving out all elementary schools, backblocks teaching, technical school, and training teachers, for the year ended 30th June, 1930?