

titled to recover in any court any fee or charge in connection with a contract unless the contract is for less than £1,000. Consequently the striking out of the Institution of Surveyors would prevent a surveyor from suing for fees in a court of law unless the contract was for less than £1,000.

Hon. H. S. W. Parker: No. The measure applies only to construction of buildings.

Hon. J. J. HOLMES: I would suggest that the reason why these institutions have been included here is that they have torn the Bill to shreds and pointed out the fallacy of the whole thing. They are now included with a view to keeping them quiet.

Amendment put and passed.

Hon. C. F. BAXTER: I move an amendment—

That in subparagraph (i) the words "the Australasian Institution of Mining and Metallurgy" be struck out.

I cannot see any justification for the inclusion of this organisation.

Amendment put, and a division called for.

The CHAIRMAN: Before tellers are appointed, I shall cast my vote with the ayes.

Division taken with the following result:—

Ayes	12
Noes	12
A tie	0

AYES.

Hon. C. F. Baxter	Hon. G. W. Miles
Hon. J. Cornell	Hon. J. Nicholson
Hon. E. H. H. Hall	Hon. H. S. W. Parker
Hon. V. Hamersley	Hon. O. H. Wittenoom
Hon. J. J. Holmes	Hon. H. J. Yelland
Hon. W. J. Mann	Hon. E. H. Angelo (Teller.)

NOES.

Hon. L. B. Bolton	Hon. W. H. Kitson
Hon. A. M. Clydesdale	Hon. R. G. Moore
Hon. J. M. Drew	Hon. H. V. Piessie
Hon. C. G. Elliott	Hon. H. Seddon
Hon. J. T. Franklin	Hon. C. B. Williams
Hon. G. Fraser	Hon. E. H. Gray (Teller.)

The CHAIRMAN: The voting being equal, the question passes in the negative.

Amendment thus negatived.

Hon. H. S. W. PARKER: I move an amendment—

That subparagraph (ii) be struck out.

One has only to read the paragraph to see how absurd it is. The words are quite unnecessary.

The CHAIRMAN: When speaking to the second reading, I said that this was a Bill that Jack built. It looks like it.

Hon. L. B. Bolton: It might be better for me at this stage to ask the Committee to report progress.

Progress reported.

House adjourned at 9.25 p.m.

Legislative Assembly,

Tuesday, 22nd October, 1935.

	PAGE
Bills: Supply (No. 2) £1,500,000, all stages ...	1223
Health Act Amendment, 3A. ...	1224
Divorce Amendment, 3A. ...	1224
Electoral, report ...	1224
Financial Emergency Tax, 2A. ...	1224
Supply (No. 2) £1,500,000, returned ...	1225
Traffic Act Amendment, Council's amdt. ...	1225
Annual Estimates, 1935-36, Votes and Items discussed ...	1227
Child Welfare and Out-door Relief ...	1227
Unemployment Relief, Council of Industrial Development ...	1253
Public Works and Buildings ...	1253
Labour, Arbitration Court, State Accident Insurance Office ...	1253

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

BILL—SUPPLY (No. 2), £1,500,000.

Standing Orders Suspension.

THE PREMIER (Hon. P. Collier—Boulder) [4.33]: I move—

That so much of the Standing Orders be suspended as is necessary to enable resolutions from the Committees of Supply and Ways and Means to be reported and adopted on the same day on which they shall have passed those Committees, and also the passing of a Supply Bill through all its stages in one day.

Question put and passed.

Message.

Message from the Lieut.-Governor received and read recommending appropriation for the purposes of the Bill.

Committee of Supply.

The House having resolved into Committee of Supply, Mr. Sleeman in the Chair,

The PREMIER: I move—

That there be granted to His Majesty on account of the services of the year ending 30th June, 1936, a sum not exceeding £1,500,000.

Question put and passed.

Resolution reported, and the report adopted.

Committee of Ways and Means.

The House having resolved into Committee of Ways and Means, Mr. Sleeman in the Chair,

The PREMIER: I move—

That towards making good the supply granted to His Majesty for the services of the year ending on 30th June, 1936, a sum not exceeding £1,200,000 be granted out of Consolidated Revenue, and £300,000 from the General Loan Fund.

Question put and passed.

Resolution reported, and the report adopted.

Bill introduced, etc.

In accordance with the foregoing resolutions, Bill introduced, passed through all stages without debate, and transmitted to the Council.

BILLS (2)—THIRD READING.

1, Health Act Amendment.

2, Divorce Amendment.

Transmitted to the Council.

BILL—ELECTORAL.

Report of Committee adopted.

BILL—FINANCIAL EMERGENCY TAX.

Second Reading.

THE PREMIER (Hon. P. Collier—Boulder) [4.44] in moving the second reading said: This is a necessary measure, arising out of the Budget. The present taxation Act expires on the 31st December. Last year when this legislation was under consideration an assurance was given by the Acting Premier, Mr. McCallum, that the rates of the tax would be carefully reconsidered this year. That has been done and, with every desire to reduce taxation, I regret that finances will not permit us to do so. On several occasions recently the suggestion has been made that we should reduce taxation,

which is regarded as too high. Actually our State taxation is well below the average of all the States, and is, in fact, the lowest in the Commonwealth, except Tasmania. I shall quote some figures extracted from the report of the Commonwealth Grants Commission to justify that statement. In the year 1931-32, our taxation per head of population was £3 6s. 4d., in Tasmania it was £3 3s., and the average over all the States was £4 19s. 6d. All these figures are per head of population. In 1932-33 the taxation collections in New South Wales represented £6 19s. 4d., in Western Australia £3 11s. 10d. and in Tasmania £3 10s. 9d., while the Commonwealth average was £5 12s. 6d. For the financial year 1933-34 the taxation collections in New South Wales were £5 8s. 8d., in Western Australia £4 3s. 4d., in Tasmania £3 17s. 1d., and the average for the whole of Australia was £5 2s. 8d. It will interest members to have the details regarding all States, which are as follows:—

Taxation Collections per Head of Population.

Year	New South Wales.	Victoria.	Queensland.	South Australia.
1931-32 ...	£ s. d. 5 15 9	£ s. d. 4 5 6	£ s. d. 5 1 10	£ s. d. 5 6 8
1932-33 ...	6 19 4	4 11 6	5 19 2	4 14 4
1933-34 ...	5 8 8	4 12 9	6 1 6	5 0 5

Year.	Western Australia.	Tasmania.	Average.
1931-32 ...	£ s. d. 3 6 4	£ s. d. 3 3 0	£ s. d. 4 19 6
1932-33 ...	3 11 10	3 10 9	5 12 6
1933-34 ...	4 3 4	3 17 1	5 2 8

Taking the average of income taxation paid for all the States as 100, Western Australia's taxation represents 85 on account of income from personal exertion and 72 for property income. I think those figures should be taken into consideration by those who are inclined to criticise what they allege is the heavy and excessive taxation imposed in this State. They should be taken into consideration by those who refuse to pass Bills because they allege we are a heavily-taxed State. That assertion is entirely contrary to the facts. I would like to be able to take some members of another place and, perhaps, some in this

Chamber, who criticise our rate of taxation, to a meeting of the Loan Council, and there have to defend our position as a tax-paying people in comparison with the position confronting the taxpayers in the other States. In their inquiry in 1934, the Commonwealth Grants Commission made an exhaustive examination respecting the taxation paid in all States in 1932-33, that being the year for which the latest reliable figures were available. In their report they stated—

We, therefore, think it is safe to infer that South Australia should be enabled to reduce severity of taxation by 5 per cent.; that Tasmania could, without hardship, increase taxation over the 1932-33 level by 5 per cent.; and Western Australia by 30 per cent.

That is where we get to. That statement was extracted from their summing up respecting the task allotted to them. Not only did they suggest that Western Australia could, without hardship, increase taxation over the 1932-33 level by 30 per cent., but, in their recommendations, they deducted £400,000 from the grant proposed for this State. Had Western Australia been on the same level per head of population as the other States, our grant would have been in the vicinity of £400,000 greater than that which was recommended by the Commission. In effect, on the basis of their own calculations as set out in their report, the Commonwealth Grants Commission deducted £400,000 from the grant for this State because they considered, after investigation, that we were 30 per cent. below the average taxation level of Australia.

Hon. C. G. Latham: They would have found another excuse if we had taxed our people.

The PREMIER: That may be so, but these are the figures on which they based their report, and they are worthy of examination. I mention the point here because it is a matter in which so many are interested. Many are inclined to say—this applies to some newspapers as well—without an examination of the facts, that Western Australia is a heavily-taxed State. We are heavily taxed, but not at all in comparison with other States. All things are comparative. At meetings of the Loan Council, if I ask for a certain amount to be provided for this State, whether other members of the Loan Council will agree or disagree to the request, will depend largely

upon the question, "Has your State taxed your people up to the same limit as we have taxed our people?" For instance, it could not be expected that the Premiers of Queensland, New South Wales and the other States, whose taxation level per head of population is considerably above that of Western Australia, would agree that a certain amount of money should be raised to meet the requirements of the State during the ensuing year. After all, let us understand just what the Loan Council means. The Council meet to raise the necessary funds required to finance the States and the Commonwealth during the year. That covers deficits in the State budgets, as well as loan funds required to carry on public works. It is useless for any Premier to tell the Loan Council that he wants just so much. All the facts and figures disclosing the financial position of his State must be clearly set out before the council, the members of which know more about the details of the State finances than the vast majority of members.

Mr. Sampson: Still, there is greater developmental work to be undertaken here, and additional taxation would be most unfair.

The PREMIER: Of course; but does not the hon. member realise that if that point were raised, the Premiers of the other States would say, "Yes, but we are carrying on developmental works, too." The facts as they exist have to be faced.

Mr. Sampson: But the older States are more developed.

The PREMIER: The trouble is you are talking with younger men who do not trouble much about the older men and what has happened in the past. It is all very well to make such a point, but the hon. member must realise what reply we could expect from the representatives of the other States. I am afraid that argument would not carry much weight although, in principle, it may be quite correct. However, I have pointed out that because of the taxation level in this State, the Commonwealth Grants Commission deducted £400,000 from the grant for Western Australia arising out of the considerations I have indicated. Since then, Western Australia has increased the financial emergency tax collections. Nevertheless, our taxation on income is still well below the Australian average. I make

that point for the information of critics who suggest that Western Australia is overtaxed. In their most recent inquiry, the Grants Commission examined the rates of taxation paid in all States. They found that, taking 100 as the average for all States, the Western Australian figure was 87.

Hon. N. Keenan: Does that include the Commonwealth figures, too?

The PREMIER: No, only the States.

Hon. C. G. Latham: What was Victoria?

The PREMIER: Victoria was the lowest with 86, one point below Western Australia. Those figures, as I have pointed out, are calculated on the rates of taxation, so they are not affected by the fact that for 1933-34, the financial emergency tax did not operate for the full year. Working from this basis, the Commission deducted £267,000 from our grant on account of our low taxation. These figures show clearly that our taxation by comparison with that in other States is on a low scale. That is worth bearing in mind, for we have deputation after deputation waiting on Ministers and complaining about our taxation; in fact, everybody complains about it. Yet actually our taxation is on a low scale as compared with that of other States. There is a tendency to make it appear that we are taxed out of our lives, that we are overtaxed, and even some of the newspapers hold that opinion. But my greatest task at Loan Council meetings has been to try to convince them that we are taxing our people somewhat up to the measure that other members of the Council are taxing their people. Unless I can show that, they will not agree to loan moneys being provided for this State where we carry on at a low scale of taxation while the other States impose heavy taxation. The financial position of the State was fully set out in the Budget. The taxation under this Bill is expected to return £685,000 for the current year. Last year the collections amounted to £684,000, and it is not expected that there will be any great variation this year as against last year. So on that estimate it is impossible to reduce the collections from this source for the present. It may be argued that the £200,000 to be received this year from the Commonwealth Government for disabilities should enable us to reduce taxation. I have no doubt that contention will be put forward by some. But because of a reduction of £98,000 from the special grant for the deficit last year,

we shall really receive only £102,000 more from the Commonwealth than we received last year. And we shall still be left with a deficit, notwithstanding the increased grant. Anyway, a reduction in taxation would have a double-barrelled effect on next year's Budget, for not only would we lose revenue as the result of the reduced taxation, but we would be penalised by the Grants Commission and any further grant would be reduced by a corresponding amount. The Bill accordingly provides rates identical with those that operated last year. I do not wish to take up the time of the House in discussing this rate of taxation, but certainly this tax compares more than favourably with any other tax of its kind in Australia. I could submit figures proving that this tax is not an undue hardship on the people called upon to pay it. In every State except South Australia there is in existence a tax of this kind. However, that does not mean that South Australia does not pay this tax, for it is imposed under the income tax; as a matter of fact, the most drastic income tax that has been produced in Australia since the depression struck us is in South Australia. Ours is the lightest and fairest tax in Australia. It may be urged that this tax should be amended in the direction of increasing its exemptions. But to-day under the existing Act everybody on wages up to the basic wage is exempt. I do not think any fault can be found with that. When we took hold of the Act the rate of tax was 4½d. in the pound upon practically everybody. It was a flat rate, and so the man on £2 per week paid his 4½d. in the pound. But this Government altered the Act to exempt all those up to the basic wage from that tax, and then graduated it up above that mark. In the tax that we superseded, the man on a higher salary paid only the same rate of tax, namely, 4½d. in the pound, as did the poor man on £2 per week. We have already altered all that, and the finances of the State will not permit us to go any farther at present. For my part, and I am sure I voice the opinion of the Opposition also—

Hon. C. G. Latham: You had better go carefully about that.

The PREMIER: I shall say only such things as I am sure the Opposition believe in. For my part, and for the Opposition's part, we all regret the necessity for such taxation at all.

Hon. C. G. Latham: We will agree to that.

The PREMIER: It was the depression that came upon us, bringing the troubles of the world, that forced Governments to introduce this form of legislation. I go farther and say that the Opposition have agreed with us that if the financial circumstances of the State were such as would enable us to abolish the whole thing, we should be very glad.

Hon. C. G. Latham: We may have to do that later.

The PREMIER: But there it is; the circumstances are such that we have to carry on, and have to get some money with which to carry on, and there is no possibility that I can see of getting increased revenue from any other source of taxation. It may be suggested that we increase the income tax. But of course one can do that to such an extent that one does not get very much result in point of revenue, and yet one cripples those who are carrying on industries. So I submit the Bill to the commonsense judgment of the Assembly. Having regard to all the circumstances, we feel that the Act should be continued for another year. I should like very much to be able to cut it out, but it must be borne in mind that we are subject to the Loan Council for money necessary for the carrying on of the affairs of the State, and so I hope the House will agree to pass the Bill. I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

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

ANNUAL ESTIMATES, 1935-36.

In Committee of Supply.

Debate resumed from the 17th October on the Treasurer's Financial Statement and on the Annual Estimates: Mr. Sleeman in the Chair.

Department of Employment, Child Welfare and Industrial Development (Hon. J. J. Kenneally, Minister: Hon. J. C. Willcock in charge of the Votes).

Vote—Child Welfare and Outdoor Relief, £127,139:

THE MINISTER FOR JUSTICE (Hon. J. C. Willcock—Geraldton) [5.15]: Since the Government took office the problem of providing employment has been treated as

one of first-class importance and I think that more time has been spent in dealing with matters concerning employment than on any two or three departments covering other activities of the State. I do not want to traverse what has occurred during the last four or five years, but I do want to draw some comparisons between the position to-day and that which prevailed last year. The report of the Child Welfare Department has been tabled and members have been able to study the activities of the department during the last 12 months. One or two items, however, might be mentioned. The department have had a difficult, but satisfactory year. On the 1st July last the number of children under the care of the department was 4,896, they being either maintained, supervised or assisted. On the same date relief was being given to 1,182 cases where mothers were caring for their own children. Of the former total 587 were maintained in institutions and 425 were boarded out in 266 private families. Close investigation has been made into the circumstances of the applicants, and the pressure brought to bear on maintenance defaulters has been a feature of the year's work. This has reacted to the financial benefit of the State. The amount of revenue collected last year was £11,423, which was the highest on record. The employment provided for the parents of children previously assisted by the department has greatly eased the demands on the Government. Indigent people not eligible for the old-age or invalid pension, numbering 182, have also received assistance. Probation work by officers appointed for the purpose, apart from resulting in a financial saving to the State, is proving most effective in reforming boys and girls and allowing them to continue their home life. Street trading by children has been strictly controlled. At the 30th June, 1935, 239 licenses had been issued. The Revenue Estimates provide for an anticipated expenditure of £127,139, as against the expenditure for the previous year of £125,957, an increase of £1,182, which is due mainly to an altered procedure on incidental items. The expenditure in 1934-35 for salaries was £12,190 and the estimate for this year is £12,939, an increase of £749. The adoption of children is treated as of paramount importance by the department. It is estimated that 85 per cent. of the total adoptions in Western Australia are dealt with by the Child Welfare De-

partment. A total of 94 children were dealt with in that way last year. As I said, I shall not discuss details of the ramifications of the department. The report is available to members, and any activity on which they desire information will be found in the report or may be given during the discussion of items. The present Government have treated the matter of employment as of first-rate importance. We have scoured the country to discover work of a character which would enable us to spend the maximum amount of money available on wages. Unemployment in severe form has existed for four or five years, but while it was comparatively easy several years ago to find jobs in which the proportion of money expended on wages was high, this class of work is decreasing, and the necessary works that now have to be put in hand require much greater expenditure on materials and other things. As an example I might mention the big work at Harvey where the expenditure on wages was about 80 per cent. of the total expenditure. But we have had to alter the class of work being done by undertaking more reproductive work necessary for the development of the State, and consequently the proportion of material to wages cost has increased so that it is now more expensive per head of the population to find relief work than it was four or five years ago.

Hon. P. D. Ferguson: But money spent on local material would provide further employment.

The MINISTER FOR JUSTICE: A proportion of the cost there has to be spent on material, some of which has to be imported. We are reaching a stage where it is not easy to find work involving a high percentage of labour cost. It is estimated that on the current year's programme of works we shall have to find £600,000 extra in order to provide work for the number of men employed a couple of years ago. Of course we could spend all the money we have on roads or on other works which involve comparatively high labour cost, but there are jobs necessary in the interests of the development of the State, and to undertake them entails greater expenditure on material and therefore to find work for an equal number of men is relatively more expensive. If we spent all the available money on road work, 90 per cent. of it would represent labour cost.

Hon. C. G. Latham: You would not get very much interest from it.

The MINISTER FOR JUSTICE: No, and it is questionable whether very much increased production would result from the transport facilities provided.

Mr. Raphael: You have wasted hundreds of thousands of pounds in that way already.

The MINISTER FOR JUSTICE: There is something to be said of the effect of fast motor transport on road surfaces not covered with bitumen, because they do not give value for the money expended.

Mr. Patrick: They also necessitate heavy maintenance costs.

The MINISTER FOR JUSTICE: That falls on the Government or on the local authority in whose district the road is situated.

Mr. Raphael: What about Prince's Highway which cost tens of thousands of pounds to build? The money was squandered.

The MINISTER FOR JUSTICE: At the commencement of the previous financial year the employment position was as follows:—

Relief work	10,003
Sustenance	1,238
Total	11,241

Sustenance at that period cost £1,750 per week. At the present time the position is as follows:—

Relief work	8,305
Sustenance	784
Total	9,089

Sustenance is now costing £1,173 per week. Those figures indicate that the total number of cases has been reduced by 2,154 in the last 15 months. If there are 2,000 fewer men being employed directly on relief work and sustenance, is it not possible further to improve the position of those so employed, seeing that we have a somewhat similar amount of loan money available? That is apropos of the question I have been discussing regarding the increased proportion that it is now necessary to spend on material as compared with labour. Sustenance payments have been decreased by about £600 per week. When the present Government took office 36 per cent. of the people assisted were on sustenance and 64 per cent. were working. In July, 1934, the Government were providing work for 89 per cent. of the cases on the books. At present 91½ per cent. of the people eligible for relief have work and 8½ per cent. are receiving sustenance.

Mr. Raphael: Most of them came from the Eastern States to the goldfields.

The MINISTER FOR JUSTICE: People who come here from the Eastern States are not eligible to receive sustenance of any kind during the first six months of residence.

Mr. Raphael: Three months.

The MINISTER FOR JUSTICE: Six months.

Mr. Raphael: No, three months.

The MINISTER FOR JUSTICE: The hon. member might have in mind a particular case of hardship, such as somebody at starvation point, who received relief after being here only a month or two, but relief on the scale laid down and permanent relief are not provided until one has been resident here for six months. The progress made towards reaching a solution of the unemployment problem is indicated by the fact that when the depression was at its peak 20,000 persons were in receipt of sustenance. Of that number 17,000 were not employed on any relief work, but were receiving sustenance, and the annual cost was £644,000. I mention that not by way of criticism, but as a fact.

Hon. C. G. Latham: The total was down when you took office.

The MINISTER FOR JUSTICE: Yes, it was down by about 6,000 when the Mitchell-Latham Government relinquished office. Government and other activities had brought an improvement. The position has progressively improved, until the number of men now on relief is just over 9,000. It is not expected that sustenance payments for the current year will exceed £63,000. During the financial year 1934-35 unemployed relief under the State Labour Bureau cost £92,445. The anticipated total expenditure for the current financial year is £83,000, showing a decrease of about £8,500. The revenue in 1935-36 from unemployed relief is expected to be £1,100, and from the Labour Bureau £5,500—a total of £6,600. Revenue from unemployed relief is derived from recovery of sustenance advances pending completion of compensation claims, recovery of sustenance advances received by other men, and recovery of assistance granted to prospectors and others. Collections of revenue last year from these sources totalled £1,134. The revenue of £5,500 secured through the Labour Bureau under the headings mentioned was practically all re-

covered in the form of repayment of advances for railway fares to men desiring to proceed to work in country districts. Last year's recoveries represented 83 per cent. of the advances for fares that had been made. It says much for the calibre of the men who proceed to take employment in various parts of the State that when they do obtain employment and the time comes for them to make repayments, 83 per cent. of the total amount advanced for railway fares is obtained. Some black sheep, as I may term them, have to be chased up, and pressure has to be put on some of them; but considerably over 60 per cent. of the money advanced for fares is repaid without any effort being required from the department: the money is remitted to the Labour Bureau by the debtors. The total expenditure of the department for the past year was £92,000, and the total revenue £6,900, representing a net expenditure of some £85,000. For the current financial year expenditure is estimated at £83,922, and revenue at £6,600, showing a net expenditure of £77,322. The Government's policy of providing employment for relief workers is responsible for the reduction in expenditure. At the beginning of the past financial year approximately 300 men were, through various channels, performing work for sustenance. Some were employed by the State Gardens Board, some by the King's Park Board, and some, I believe, by the Zoological Gardens Board. Others again were found work by the Forests Department. Thus the men were removed from sustenance work and were brought under the better conditions obtaining under the relief work scheme. Hon. members will be aware that practically all the money provided for relief work represents loan expenditure. If we can provide work for people from loan funds, the departmental revenue from sustenance payments is correspondingly decreased. It is the aim of the Government that men who desire to be given relief work under conditions enabling them to receive considerably more money than the ordinary sustenance rate of 7s. per week should be enabled to do so. Although we have not yet been able to attain our chief object of finding full-time employment for men on relief work, we have been able to extend the system whereby men receive liberal periods of full-time employ-

ment at award rates, together with margins for skill, holiday pay, and camp and other allowances. While there are fewer men on Government relief works now than formerly, the major works at present in hand have carried a higher cost for material than have previous works. I have the figures bearing on that aspect. Compared with a little over 12 months ago, the cost of wages and material per man per week has increased from £4 2s. 9d. to £5 15s. 6d., which represents an additional expenditure of over £600,000 per year on the reduced number of men at present employed; so that the objective of the Government of full-time work is made all the more difficult of achievement. Against the increased expenditure for material, these major works compare more than favourably with some of the other works, from a reproductive viewpoint. In those circumstances, had we been able to carry out works bearing the same ratio of wages to employment as previously, we would have been able to effect a greater improvement in the condition of men on part-time. However, the altered nature of the work—reproductive work with increased rates of wages—prevented us from increasing the earning power of the bulk of these men as much as we desired.

Hon. C. G. Latham: That applies to the sewerage works particularly, does it not?

The MINISTER FOR JUSTICE: Mostly; and then there is the big job of pipes for the Canning dam, and there are also water supply works which call for considerable expenditure on account of material. Further, railway alterations and improvements are being carried out. As regards the lower-paid workers, during the year improvements have been brought about for three classes of men, known as the 14s., the 21s., and the 28s. per week men. A man with only a wife, termed a 14s. man, receives that amount per week; the man with wife and one child is a 21s. man; the man with wife and two children is a 28s. man. An examination of the earnings of all relief workers indicated that those three classes have lagged behind other classes in general improvement of conditions. The earnings of those three classes have now been increased by 7s. 6d., 4s., and 3s. per week respectively. The man who was receiving 14s. per week is now allowed to earn £2 1s. 6d. weekly. During last year it was

decided that additional work would be allowed to men, to the value of expenditure in fares in excess of 2s. 6d. per week incurred during the process of working for their sustenance. If the fares cost more than 2s. 6d. per week, they were allowed sufficient work to meet the increased expenditure. In the matter of medical examination, the problem of physically unfit men has not been overlooked. It was found that with such large numbers of men to be employed, a proportion of them were not 100 per cent. physically efficient. A Government medical officer therefore attempted to determine what percentage of physical fitness these people could be passed as possessing, and the nature of the work at which they were capable of being employed. The Government provided as much employment as possible for men who were termed "C" or "D" class. Some of the men on relief work, although genuine triers and possibly having domestic responsibilities equal to those of other men, were found unable to stand up to the strain of laborious toil; and it was thought desirable to give such men an opportunity of earning something extra rather than keep them on the dole for the rest of their lives simply because they were not able to perform heavy work adequately. During the year the medical officer examined 903 men. In some cases, as a result of this medical examination which indicated that the men are not capable of performing even the lightest work, application has been made successfully for the invalid pension. In 72 instances pensions were granted, representing a saving to the department at the rate of £1,296 per annum.

Hon. P. D. Ferguson: Had those men been refused invalid pensions previously?

The MINISTER FOR JUSTICE: Some of them thought they were not eligible for invalid pensions. Others believed they were not within the very strict requirements of the invalid pension—total and permanent incapacitation for work. However, it was found as the result of the State medical examination that 72 men were eligible for the invalid pension, and those 72 men are now receiving it.

Mr. Doney: How do you deal with men whose applications for invalid pensions have failed?

The MINISTER FOR JUSTICE: If they are practically unable to do any work, they are just granted sustenance in the

ordinary way. Some of these less-efficient men, who were able to do 70 or 60 per cent. of the full day's work, were classed as "C"; others were classed as "B"; the 100 per cent. men are classed as "A." "C" class men have been employed at Wooroloo and by the Forests Department on piece-work, so that they would not have to strain themselves unduly, so that they might work just as long as they liked or were able, thus having the opportunity to get into better physical condition and ultimately perhaps become enabled to do full work. They became what I may term work-minded, and benefited from the free and open life in the bush while engaged on clearing, in their case not very severe work. For the first few weeks some of them worked three or four hours a day, taking perhaps a week to earn the £2 they were entitled to earn. As a result of their undertaking this comparatively small amount of work daily, they acquired a better industrial outlook on life. They now know from experience that they can do work. Numbers of "B" and "C" class men have now entered the "A" class. Some who originally were unable to do eight hours work in a day, have continuously improved until they have attained the point of physical efficiency at which they can undertake the ordinary work of employees under the relief scheme, though not extremely laborious work.

Mr. Sampson: Many of them have never been permitted to learn a trade, and that is the trouble.

THE MINISTER FOR JUSTICE: Because of the fact that they could not at that stage do a full day's work they were turned away. Consequently they deteriorated, and developed a bad outlook. There are quite a number of instances of men remaining on sustenance, probably to the end of their days. But since the system to which I have referred has been inaugurated, it has met with considerable success. The Government are anxious to continue the "C" class work. We are endeavouring to find more work which can be given to "B" and "C" class men in the hope that some of them may eventually develop into "A" class men.

Mr. Raphael: There are certainly any number of "C" class men.

THE MINISTER FOR JUSTICE: There are plenty of "C" class men for whom we could find work if money were available. It is not right to pay sustenance to "A" class

men who are capable of doing full-time work, and spending money on "C" class men who cannot do the work that "A" class men are capable of performing. Of course, "C" class men are entitled to their share of the work that is going, and we are entitled to improve their physical condition and their industrial outlook. Then when work is offering, there will be an incentive to those men to take it. An appeal board is in existence to deal with piece-work rates, and cases of dispute regarding the value of work performed. Previously we had considerable trouble regarding rates for piece-work, and now the board, which consists of an independent chairman, a representative of the department, and a representative of the men, deals with disputes or discontent regarding remuneration. Since the appointment of the board we have had no trouble. Single men on relief work in remote parts of the State are allowed to earn a credit up to £9 before being told to stand down. For instance, if we sent a man to Meekatharra or Laverton on road work we would not give him four or five weeks' work, to which he was entitled, and then tell him to stand down for three or four weeks. We allow him to work until he has accumulated a credit of about £9, and with that money at his disposal he is told that he can, while standing down, look for private employment, or if he so desires, go back to the place from which he was originally sent. In quite a number of such cases we never hear of those men again.

Mr. Stubbs: That is a sound policy.

THE MINISTER FOR JUSTICE: It is. I suppose every member of this House has been approached by men who have said, "I am willing to work; where shall I go?" It is not much use sending those men to the country. We do not do that; we find work for them, and allow them to earn a credit of £7, £8 or £9, a sufficient sum to keep them for a reasonable period, and tell them to go where they like in search of work. Although the earnings of relief workers are in accordance with Arbitration award rates, concessions are granted in special cases. For expectant mothers, pre-natal assistance is given on production of medical evidence and after reviewing the financial position of the family. To sustenance cases this assistance is usually granted by means of allowances for milk or other forms of prescribed foods. To relief workers additional work

is allowed in approved cases. Firewood is also supplied on an adequate scale to sustenance families during the winter. Single men employed on relief work, upon production of medical evidence that either optical or dental attention is needed by them, receive additional work to enable them to obtain that attention. Every case in which the concession is requested is considered on its merits and assistance is given when help is justified and deserved. With regard to review and inspection, the reduction of the number of cases receiving sustenance has enabled the inspection staff to give closer attention to the investigation of the circumstances of applicants for relief. Inspection is necessary to ensure that assistance is restricted to cases of genuine distress. It is not the obligation of the Government to make work or sustenance available to persons who are able to provide for themselves, but it is the duty of the Government to investigate all cases and to establish the fact that assistance, either in the form of sustenance or relief work, is genuinely needed. During the year 11,440 inspections were made. Those inspections led to many adjustments, and the value of working time saved on Government relief works amounted to £5,845 for the year. This saving, of course, was effected by the improved position of the relief worker. There were some instances where men declined to take work offering, and during last year this represented a maximum saving in sustenance of £3,835. The inspection staff has assisted the Labour Bureau in the recovery of outstanding fares resulting in the collection of £1,000 during the year from persons who could not previously be traced, and who owed the money for long periods. Employment upon Government relief work is governed by finance, and in order that the money available may be used to provide employment for the greatest number and to the maximum extent, the earnings of relief workers during their standing-down periods must be checked and verified. When necessary, adjustment is made in the next period of relief work. The Government do not discourage private work; in fact they encourage men to search for employment during their standing-down term by permitting them to earn amounts according to their family responsibilities without affecting their earnings as relief workers. At the basic wage operating in the metropolitan area—exclusive of margins and allowances

—the average weekly earnings of relief workers are—

		£	s.	d.	
14s. men	...	2	3	6	per week
21s. "	...	2	8	6	"
28s. "	...	2	12	0	"
25s. "	...	2	15	0	"
42s. "	...	3	1	0	"
49s. "	...	3	4	0	"

For men in private employment when standing down, the rate of allowable private earnings in addition to earnings from relief work permits the following incomes to be received:—

	Average Weekly Relief Work Earnings.	Permissible Private Earnings.	Permissible Total Income per Week.
	£ s. d.	£ s. d.	£ s. d.
14s. men	2 3 6	1 16 0	3 19 6
21s. "	2 8 6	1 9 0	3 17 6
28s. "	2 12 0	1 7 0	3 19 0
35s. "	2 15 2	1 5 0	4 0 2
42s. "	3 1 0	1 3 0	4 4 0
49s. "	3 4 0	1 1 0	4 5 0

With such a liberal scale of permissible earnings it is the duty of the department when a worker is able to earn in excess of the scale, to see that adjustment is made in the amount of relief work provided. While investigation is undertaken with the object of protecting expenditure on sustenance and relief work, the system embraces the checking of relief work pay rolls to ensure that there is an equitable distribution of work in accordance with the family responsibilities of the man. Working times, rates of pay and amounts earned are checked to prove that men receive work to which they are entitled. Investigation will continue to be an important feature of the work of the department. By this means, the Government will be assured it is not maintaining a person who is in a position to care for himself and that every individual approved for relief is receiving assistance commensurate with his family responsibilities.

Mr. Doney: Are you finding that the amount of private work that can be obtained is increasing?

The MINISTER FOR JUSTICE: Yes.

Mr. Doney: How long has this system been going on?

The MINISTER FOR JUSTICE: It has been in operation for some time now. I could discuss the ramifications concerning employment, the various identifications which have to be dealt with, and the many

different situations that crop up in the course of the administration of the department, but that which I have given will serve as an illustration of the principles that are adopted. I would stress the fact that it is comparatively difficult to find work where the percentage of labour cost is as high as it was originally. We desire as far as possible to carry on works of a reproductive nature. There is not much point in paying a man to shift sand and do work of that type, for that does not lead to the creation of new work. Certain jobs have to be done at this stage of our development. Water supply and sewerage represent reproductive works which will pay interest and sinking fund, and in the future provide further employment for still more people. Such works will show a definite improvement in the amenities of the lives of the people of the metropolitan area. It is work that is in every way desirable, compared with other work which has had to be done before. When the depression hit this country with a sudden blast, in order that men might be allowed to earn a living, all sorts of comparatively useless work was carried out. Local authorities, for instance, employed men to clean up the footpaths, the recreation reserves and parks. Such work could not by any stretch of the imagination be called reproductive, nor would it repay those concerned for the amount of money spent in labour. I do not know that sewerage works are reproductive in the sense that they enable the State to create more wealth, but the money that is expended in that direction will certainly be repaid to the State without loss.

Mr. Doney: It might be reproductive also to the extent that not the same outlay would be required to recoup the health of the people.

The MINISTER FOR JUSTICE: That is an indirect benefit. We are justified in considering indirect benefits as well as direct benefits. There are some items of work that are definitely reproductive works that will undoubtedly be for the welfare and benefit of the State. Let me quote, for instance, the work that was commenced a few days ago in connection with the installation of a new unit of electricity at the Government Power House. That will eventually create considerable wealth and provide additional power for industrial purposes. In turn that will lead to further employment for our

people, as well as the development of our secondary industries. If we could transmit current, for instance, into the Swan electorate it would be possible to reticulate water here and there, and greatly increase the production of many of the holdings in the hills. There have been constant demands from settlers in the hills for electric power. The member for the district (Mr. Sampson) has been persistent in his endeavours to secure an extension of electric power to that area so that the settlers might be able to increase the productive capacity of their holdings, as undoubtedly they would be able to do by this means to the extent of 60 or 70 per cent.

Mr. Sampson: It would change the whole outlook for them.

The MINISTER FOR JUSTICE: It is proposed to spend on these additions to the power station the sum of approximately £500,000. Of this amount £350,000 will go towards the importation of the necessary plant and machinery. This is definitely a reproductive work and it is well that it should be carried out. As the Government have to spend approximately £370,000 outside the State, and there is left only a sum of about £130,000 to spend on labour, it becomes increasingly difficult for the Government to employ the same number of people we were employing previously with the same amount of money. I now come to the Council of Industrial Development. In the matter of salaries, £1,434, there is an increase of £107 over the figures of last year. This increase is due to the provision of the Financial Emergency Act, which allows for a full 12 months' relief, whereas last year provision was necessary only for six months. In addition, an allowance has had to be made for further contemplated exemptions as from the 1st January next. Owing to the financial stringency the council was compelled to take an extremely conservative viewpoint concerning all applications for loans, but considerable attention was paid to extending assistance to secondary industries in other directions. The most notable instance was the Albany woollen mills. This establishment has been working at so great a disadvantage owing to its unbalanced plant that it became extremely doubtful whether, without radical alteration, it could overcome its difficulties. I understand that the plant was originally designed so that one portion of

it could do a certain amount of work, another portion could only do half that amount of work, and a third portion could do double the amount of work. There was therefore a weak link in the chain. Because of the layout, portions of the establishment could not be worked to full capacity without overburdening another portion. Following a change in the directorate it was decided to make an exhaustive examination of the plant to see what could be done to improve the situation. It was found that £30,000 additional capital was required to finance the purchase of the necessary additional machinery. With the co-operation of the Government the directors determined to invite the public to subscribe this amount. I am pleased to say that the full quota has now been raised, and an order for the machinery has been placed, and should be executed early in the new year. The importance of this industry, not only to the State, but to Albany in particular, can readily be realised. When the alterations are effected the mill is expected to provide full-time employment for approximately 140 operators, instead of the 120 now engaged. The department has held a number of exhibitions of goods manufactured in Western Australia. These have been held in the city, Fremantle, various suburbs, and many country centres. An exhibition has even been held as far away from Perth as Wiluna. Some people have been inclined to discount the value of the exhibitions, but the manufacturers believe that the increase in employment in their establishments, and the increase in the output of the factories, is directly attributable to these exhibitions.

Mr. Doney: Do the manufacturers make any contribution towards the expenses of these exhibitions?

The MINISTER FOR JUSTICE: They provide samples and advertise, and are generally of great assistance to the department.

Mr. Doney: Do they make financial contributions towards the cost?

The MINISTER FOR JUSTICE: They are contributing to an advertising campaign on behalf of local products, and I understand this year they are putting up £3,000, some of which is already in hand.

Mr. Doney: What is the cost to the department?

The MINISTER FOR JUSTICE: It does not cost the department much. There is not a big staff engaged. Various firms assist in arranging the exhibitions, and they provide the necessary material. At the suggestion of the Commonwealth Government, the department formed an advisory committee to consider questions affecting the development of overseas trade, particularly with the Dutch East Indies, Malaya and the Far East. Together with similar committees in other States, the local committee has been consulted concerning the appointment of trade commissioners in the Netherlands, East Indies, China, Japan and Egypt. It has been instrumental in making contacts between the commissioners and Western Australian interests, thus ensuring to our exporters the opportunity of sharing in any trade that may develop as a result of these appointments. Arising out of the action taken by the local committee to investigate the possibilities of increased trade with India, the Commonwealth Government have arranged for a trade delegation of three persons to go to India, representative of Australia's commercial interests, secondary industries, and primary industries.

Mr. Marshall: Does this State incur any expense in its co-operation with the other States? I hope not.

The MINISTER FOR JUSTICE: Ours is purely an honorary body, and is doing most valuable work.

Mr. Marshall: Is this State financially responsible to any other State?

The MINISTER FOR JUSTICE: No. It is entirely a Commonwealth responsibility. The Commonwealth Government have consulted the various States. The consultative body in this State is the Economic Council.

Mr. Doney: Who advanced the idea of a trade delegation going to India?

The MINISTER FOR JUSTICE: The Government of this State put up a proposal to the Commonwealth Government that the State steamer "Kangaroo" should be made available, fully loaded with goods from Western Australia, to go to Bombay to test the possibilities of trade between India and this State. We were unable, however, to reach finality. Arrangements of this sort have to be made a long time ahead. The project fell through. Be-

cause, however, of our interest in it Western Australia has been specially considered. The Commonwealth Government appointed a delegation of three persons, who passed through Fremantle yesterday on their way to India. The State Government were asked to nominate the representative of the primary producers on this delegation. We thereupon consulted the Economic Council, whose nomination was Mr. John Thomson, general manager of Westralian Farmers, Ltd. He left the State yesterday with the other delegates. Mr. Thomson possesses an extensive knowledge of primary production in this State and knows a great deal about the various commodities we produce and manufacture, that could be exported. When he arrives at his destination and finds out what goods or products are likely to interest the people there, his experience and knowledge should prove of considerable benefit to Western Australia. I have in mind such things as fruit, wheat, barley, export lambs, beef, and various other products and goods, with all of which Mr. Thomson will be quite familiar. It is hoped that the result of the visit of the delegation to the various places to which he is proceeding will be beneficial to Western Australia. We are in a specially advantageous position to trade with India. We are the last port of call, and when it comes to doing business we should be in a better position than the other States.

Mr. Rodoreda: Did not the manager of the State Shipping Service put up some valuable information to the Commonwealth authorities?

The MINISTER FOR JUSTICE: The Minister in charge of State Shipping had various consultations with the manager, who had himself visited the Eastern countries. The manager also developed his ideas with both the Economic Council and the Commonwealth Government. The Commonwealth paid a compliment to this State, because it had in a sense initiated the project, by selecting as their primary producers' representative, Mr. John Thomson.

Mr. Thorn: Was it that the Commonwealth Government acted on the State's initiative?

The MINISTER FOR JUSTICE: I do not want to go into details. The Commonwealth Government announced some time ago that they were considering the appointment of trade commissioners for various parts of the world. The suggestion with re-

gard to sending a trade delegation to India was put up by the manager of the State Shipping Service. That gentleman was very interested in this question, and supplied a great deal of valuable data, which certainly impressed the Commonwealth Government that it was desirable to send a trade delegation to India. The original programme, I understand, comprehended a trade delegation to India, Japan, Singapore and China.

Sitting suspended from 6.15 to 7.30 p.m.

The MINISTER FOR JUSTICE: I was dealing with the Economic Council prior to the tea adjournment and was giving the Committee some indication regarding their policy with reference to the overseas trade delegation. I will leave that phase to discuss another of their activities and will indicate to members what the Economic Council have done in an endeavour to stimulate trade. To a great extent they have concentrated on the stimulation of the building industry, and the encouragement of the use and consumption of goods produced in Western Australia. It is very evident that it is through these channels that progress may be made in relieving unemployment. The small loans scheme, which the Council recommended the Government to finance, has proved most successful. In 191 separate contracts the expenditure represented was £23,570 and in 14 additional contracts that are pending approval, the amount involved is £1,148, or a grand total of £24,718. Owing to the marked improvement that has taken place in the building industry generally, no great effort has been made to increase the number of applications, but the demand could be quickly fostered should the necessity arise. There has been no indication of a falling off in the building trade, but should it show that tendency, applications can be stimulated and more money found to carry on operations along those lines. The increased activity in the building industry is clearly indicated by statistics. In 1931-32, buildings and additions in the metropolitan area were valued at £595,672. During the next 12 months, the value increased to £731,695, during the following year to £987,738 and for the year ended the 30th June last building activities were valued at £1,354,107, or more than 50 per cent. greater than the 1931-32 figures. The indications are that even this total will be increased during the current year. The

factures, including motor cars, are starting. Because of the fact that local production and manufacturing has increased to the extent I have indicated, the net increase has been not more than £1,000,000, but about £700,000, so that our increased local production has reduced the figure by about £300,000. Another phase of the activities of the Economic Council with regard to the stimulation of the local products campaign is indicated by the council getting in touch with various bodies, organising lectures and holding meetings at which shop assistants and the proprietors of retail establishments were urged to support the campaign in favour of local products. As a result of these activities, it can be said with every degree of confidence that the increased sale of local products is due to the fact that they have been pushed by shop assistants and retail traders, who have been imbued with the idea of assisting the State by creating a demand for local products. The experiment of bringing representatives of all sections of the community together, so that they may confer as to the best means to be adopted in solving the unemployment and other problems, has been more than justified. We have a body of enthusiastic, energetic people who are prepared to give their time, and, in many instances, their money, to support the campaign which, I think, can be said with every confidence to have proved beneficial to the economic and industrial life of the State. Our experience with the Economic Council would seem to justify the Government in forming other bodies to deal with various problems and so get the whole of the people working together to assist the State, particularly in respect of matters that affect our economic life and aid the development of the State. I have nothing more to say in introducing the Estimates, except to express my regret that circumstances have placed me in charge of them. I would have preferred, and I think members of the Committee share the opinion with me, the Minister who has been in charge of the department for the past 2½ years to place the Estimates before members personally. Members will agree that the Minister for Industries (Hon. J. J. Kenneally) displayed great energy, application and driving force in his capacity as Minister controlling the department, and we must all agree that, to some extent, the time he spent on the work has taken some toll of his health. No doubt members are inter-

ested in Mr. Kenneally's welfare, and will be glad to know that the latest reports are that he is much better and expects to be in the House within the next few weeks.

MR. STUBBS (Wagin) [7.43]: The Minister has dealt with many matters of interest in introducing the Estimates and I shall not delay the Committee for more than a few minutes. There are very few members of the general public who appreciate the wonderful work carried out by the officers of the Child Welfare Department. Every member of the Country Party has had experience in that respect and has knowledge of the manner in which the officers handle the numerous cases in which women have been left without their breadwinners and have had to support their families, some of which comprise upwards of half-a-dozen children. They know that the money that has been made available by the department not only keeps the wolf from the door, but enables those women to refrain from the necessity to beg from outside sources. The officers in charge of the department are admirable men and I desire to pay a tribute to them. Then there is a very efficient officer in charge of the Dental Institute. I have been in touch with him in regard to one or two widows who have had to have their teeth extracted, and have not had sufficient money from the child relief fund to enable them to get sets of artificial teeth. In consequence, the department have supplied the material and the local dentists have done the work gratis. The thanks of all those who have benefited by that method of treatment are due to the department. We also have a very efficient set of men in charge of unemployment relief, who assist men unable to find work, especially married men, in every possible way. I wish to pay a tribute to the officers of that department as well, and also to the Minister for his good work in seeing that every man, single or married, gets a share of the work that is going. The thanks of all are due to the efficient staff and to the Minister in charge of the department.

MR. J. H. SMITH (Nelson) [7.47]: With other members, I regret that the Minister for Employment is still absent owing to illness. It was a great pleasure to

me to hear the assurance of the Acting Minister that Mr. Kenueally will return to the House in a short time. We owe a debt of gratitude to the Acting Minister for the time and patience he has given to these Estimates and the case he made out for the Departments for Employment, for Child Welfare and for Industrial Development. It is pleasing to know that in the Economic Council we have a band of enthusiasts assisting the Government in industrial development, and the Motherhood Appeal and other appeals. We ought to pay a tribute to the members of that council. I am not going to castigate the Government very severely this evening, although one could do so if he set himself out for the task, and that with every justification. The unemployment position to-day is far from being satisfactory, is indeed very acute. For evidence of that, we do not need to go any further than to the conference held in Perth last week, a conference of delegates representing every industrial organisation in the State. That conference thought fit to castigate the Government very severely and to tell them they were falling far short of the required mark in carrying out their election promises.

The Minister for Justice: Who said that?

Mr. J. H. SMITH: Those delegates not only asked the Government for the right to work, but went further and asked for the right to live. That is the position to-day. The Minister, in introducing the Estimates this afternoon, drew a comparison between what happened in 1932-33 and what is happening to-day. The Leader of the Opposition asked did the standard of to-day compare with the standard of 1929, and the Minister replied that it was far short of it.

The Minister for Justice: I did not say "far short of it."

Mr. J. H. SMITH: So there is not much to boast about. The Minister for Employment some time ago asked the people to eat more of Western Australian products. I agree with that, but we have not the same number of people employed in secondary industry that we had in 1929-30. At the last elections the Government told the people that if they were returned to power they would appoint a full-time Minister to deal with unemployment, and that he would be so employed until we had no more unemployment in our midst. Unfortunately, the Minister for Employment was stricken

down, and so we find that other Ministers, already up to their eyes in their own work, have had to carry on this important job. There has not been a week or a month in the year but some Minister has had to be absent on certain duties, notwithstanding which, when this most important job becomes vacant owing to the Minister for Employment being stricken down, other Ministers have had to take it on. It is of no use boasting of the improvement in the unemployment position, because to-day there are nearly 10,000 people on sustenance.

The Minister for Justice: No.

Mr. J. H. SMITH: At all events, there are 9,000 on part-time employment, and another 1,000 or so on sustenance.

The Minister for Justice: No.

Mr. J. H. SMITH: But it is so. There are nearly a thousand receiving sustenance and, in addition to those already on sustenance, there is another 10,000 or 15,000 who should be on part-time work. Truly there is a great deal of unemployment in the State, and no one can deny it. Everybody, including Ministers, seem to lose sight of all the boys and girls between the ages of 14 and 20 years who want work and cannot get it. That is the problem that confronts, not only the Government, but all the people of the State, the problem of the boys and girls growing up without opportunity for employment. That is the problem confronting us all. We should find some solution of it and get those young men and women into avenues of permanent employment. If the Government were sincere—and we shall have time and place for using this later on; I am not uttering any threats—if the Government were sincere in their desire to solve the problem of unemployment, it would be their duty to use every effort. It may be that a man will be required in an administrative capacity at a later date, in which case one or another of the bright young men on the Government cross benches ought to be able to carry on the duties of the Minister for Employment until that gentleman is restored to good health. But the Government are just carrying on, waiting for opportunity, and unemployment is still rife. The secretary for unemployment is a fine man and does his job well. But what is his job to-day? A single man who has been on sustenance finds an opportunity

to go to work, and so he withdraws from the sustenance list. Then, when he has completed the job, and makes application to get back on to sustenance, he is told that there is any amount of work in the wheat belt, where he can find a job. That actually occurred in the Bridgetown district only the other day. We know that on the wheat belt to-day the crops are a failure, so what is the use of sending a man up there to find work?

The Minister for Justice: How long have you known of that instance?

Mr. J. H. SMITH: I saw a letter that the man received the other day from the local policeman in Bridgetown; so I am not speaking without my book. Only the other day this man made application to be reinstated on sustenance, and that was the reply he received. I have also had a letter from the goldfields. I do not wish to interfere with the affairs of my friend, the member for Kalgoorlie (Hon. J. Cunningham), but the position up there is very bad, and the Government are falling down on their job on the goldfields. There is there a great number of men unemployed and receiving no sustenance at all. They have even appointed an unemployment committee and are depending on the restaurants and other stores for their food. Yet the Acting Minister for Employment comes along and says that everything in the garden is lovely and that the position is improving from day to day. However, I shall not be satisfied while we have any unemployment remaining in the State. The Government have fallen down on their job.

Mr. F. C. L. Smith: What about the unemployables.

Mr. J. H. SMITH: In every country there are people who are unemployable.

Hon. J. Cunningham: What do you suggest to improve the position?

Mr. J. H. SMITH: I have several solutions, but I am not going to reveal them at the present time. We all have to pay a tribute to the Child Welfare Department, for it has always done wonderfully well. However, the department is short of money and cannot do all that it would like to. I cannot understand why the Government cannot continue to employ men on forestry work. I heard at Manjimup the other day that the Forests Department are putting off their workpeople in the forests. What are they to do? Go up to the wheat belt to find work?

The Minister for Justice: How many have been put off?

Mr. J. H. SMITH: One gang have been put off and are out of employment at present. I think the Government could do a great deal more than they are doing for the unemployed.

Mr. Moloney: Of course you do.

Mr. J. H. SMITH: And the hon. member could assist them. Instead of his lauding the Government on every possible occasion he would be more respected by those who sent him here if he got up and told the Government exactly what is occurring, and that there were in Subiaco people on sustenance or part-time work who should be on full-time work. Clouding the issue will get no one anywhere. Let the hon. member advocate work for all, such as this conference did when they said they did not want the right to work, but wanted the right to live. And the conference carried that resolution. There were present at that conference from 150 to 200 delegates representing every industrial organisation in the State, and they told the Government they wanted to be true and faithful to them, but that even more urgently did they want the right to live. I maintain that every man has a right to live, and every man has a right to work, and the Government I supported did their best, considering that they were seriously hampered by lack of funds owing to the depression. It was impossible for them to do more than they did, but they did succeed in establishing a basis of employment which the present Government adopted. Thus the path was made easy for the present Government. The machinery had been put into operation, and the present Government adopted it. True, the present Government appointed a full-time Minister for Employment, but the foundation had been already laid, and the Federal Government provided the money with which to carry on. I cannot understand why the Government, with £200,000 of additional money, with increased revenue from the financial emergency tax amounting to £600,000, and with other revenues totalling £900,000, have not used it to solve this problem of unemployment. I dare say many thousands more could be added to the £900,000. The Government, if they made an effort, could put all those people into full-time work to-morrow. Here we have 9,000 people appealing to the Minister for additional work for the Christmas season in order that they might be able to earn

a few pounds extra to buy necessities and bring a little cheer to the children's hearts.

The Minister for Justice: That has been done.

Mr. J. H. SMITH: But only in a slight and modified form. If the Government are going to live up to their reputation, if they desire to be returned to power—I do not think they will be—why cannot they take the bit in their teeth? Why do not Ministers say to the Premier that they require another £100,000 for unemployment? I believe they have only a few more months to live politically, so why not make a splash, even in the dying hours of the Parliament, and put the unemployed in work? Would it not be a great gesture on their part?

The Minister for Agriculture: What would you say if we did?

Mr. J. H. SMITH: I would applaud the Government; I would say that at last the Labour Government had lived up to their promise. I urge them to adopt that course; otherwise their prospects at the forthcoming elections will be black. Let me point out how the Acting Minister for Employment could do some wonderful work. He said it was difficult to find money for reproductive work.

The Minister for Justice: No, I did not.

Mr. J. H. SMITH: The Minister said that men had been employed to remove grass from the streets. Many works are being undertaken that probably are reproductive, but the Government might well set aside a sum of money and employ a large body of men on the work of regrading railways.

Mr. Cross: They are doing it.

Mr. J. H. SMITH: But not where it is necessary. It is true the Government are constructing four miles of roadway. I do not know whether that is going to solve the unemployment problem, or whether it is merely a sop to the member for Canning. If the Government undertook the regrading of railways in the south-western part of the State, which is badly needed, the work would pay for itself in a few years. I am grateful to the Minister for the pains he took to explain the vote. On the general discussion I remarked that the Premier had been a very fortunate man. Indeed he had everything in his favour and was enabled to show a good Budget. Still, I must point out that the problem of unemployment has not been solved. The Government were returned to solve that problem, and yet we still have 9,000 men on part-time work.

Mr. Moloney: You fed the men instead of providing work.

Mr. J. H. SMITH: But to-day there are boys and girls who are not even being fed, but are dependent on fathers in part-time work.

Mr. Clothier: What do you propose to do?

Mr. J. H. SMITH: I would propose what any sensible man would suggest; namely that girls should follow their natural calling so that the boys would be able to get employment and marry the girls. What this State needs is population. Everybody knows the weakness of the present system. That, however, is not the problem of the Government; it is a problem for every member of Parliament to tackle, and some solution of it must be found. The time is approaching when we will bring the shortcomings of the Government before the attention of the people, and the people will decide whether the Government have fallen down on their job, or whether they deserve the laudations so lavishly showered upon them by their supporters.

MR. SAMPSON (Swan) [8.8]: I join with other speakers in expressing appreciation of the work of the department and of the principle adopted many years ago whereby, in place of rations, money was provided. No doubt the officers of the department are very sympathetic where sympathy is justified, and anyone who speaks fairly could not say otherwise. With other speakers I regret that sustenance or relief work should still be necessary. I believe that the problem of unemployment could be solved in another way. When our men returned from the war they were given an opportunity to learn various trades. A number of men were enabled to learn bricklaying, carpentry, plastering and other branches of the building trade. There are various trades that men of 18 to 21 and upwards could be taught, and in a little time they would be able efficiently to engage in the work. Some time ago I told the Chamber of a man who undertook the highly skilled work of linotype operating, and in 15 months he was adjudged 100 per cent. efficient. From that time he has never had one day's shortage of work. The same principles that the Department of Repatriation adopted could be employed in order that men might be

taught trades, and thus gradually the number of unemployed would be reduced. Classes could be established, tuition could be imparted, and in a little while the men would become efficient. At present there is a shortage of tradesmen in many avenues. There is a dearth of bricklayers, stonemasons, plasterers, carpenters and other tradesmen. What is the reason? The number of boys permitted to learn those trades is unduly restricted, which is most unfair. If the boys were treated justly, we would not have the overwhelming number of unskilled workers who become a burden on the Government. We are reaching a stage when Ministers take the flattering unctious to their souls that they are doing something virtuous when they provide part-time work for the unemployed. It is nothing of the sort. If an attempt were made to do justice without endeavouring to protect the Government, we would have to admit that young men should be given an opportunity. But no, year after year the trouble continues. No member will disagree that if the lads did have a trade, we would not have the problem of unemployment confronting us today.

Mr. Needham: Your Government did not introduce it, and did not even provide part-time work.

Mr. SAMPSON: The hon. member says that some previous Government did not find part-time work. That is not the only job of the Government. Their real duty is to see that an opportunity to learn a trade is given, and that could be done. I do not know why Governments, with the great power they possess, do not attack this problem and achieve something. The number of unemployed could be reduced. I do not blame the present Government in particular. All Governments seem obsessed with the idea that they must have a number of men clamouring for part-time work, unemployment relief or sustenance. Such a policy, however, is the very limit of despair. It gets us nowhere. In fact, it brings the country to poverty and denies to our girls, as a member mentioned just now, the opportunity to get married. The young men would soon marry if they were in a position to do so, but while they have no opportunity to engage in skilled work, the present state of affairs will continue.

Mr. Raphael: Are you advocating the Douglas Credit System, or socialism?

Mr. SAMPSON: In the vicinity of my home a hotel was advertising this morning for a barman, and I was surprised at the number of applicants. I was told that at least a couple of hundred men sought the job. There may be a little skill in it, but not much. If skill were required, there would be few, if any applicants. Someone known to me advertised recently for a linotype operator and a compositor. Practically, neither class of worker is available.

Mr. Raphael: Didn't you pay your last man?

Mr. SAMPSON: There is an over-plus of unregistered dentists, and of loud-mouthed non-thinkers who persist in obstructing the work of this Chamber. Beyond that and including unskilled workers I know of no overplus. There is certainly no overplus of the type that one would welcome here or elsewhere. Now, there are many men physically incapable of taking up unskilled work. It is no solution of the problem to decide that a man shall have a certain number of weeks at work and that then he shall be off for a certain number of weeks. I appreciate the Minister's sympathetic viewpoint, and I know he is doing his best according to his lights; but, if he will pardon my saying so, he is looking at the matter the wrong way. The only way in which this trouble can be solved is to give the men the opportunity to become qualified to do work for which there is a demand. For unskilled workers there is no great demand; the place is littered with them. If one advertises for an unskilled worker, one is overrun in the rush. Let me join with other members in expressing pleasure at the news that Mr. Kennelly is returning. I support with all sincerity the suggestion of the member for Nelson as to the advisableness of appointing an Honorary Minister during the present shortage of portfolio Ministers. Being a Minister is a killing job. I do not wish to be personal, but it is time that the Government advanced one or two of those who at present are termed floor members. One word more regarding unemployment. We must not come to a decision as to the number of men who want work. The number of unemployed is the number of unskilled workers. That is the number. And there are many of them who would rather suffer than ask for help.

They still have the spirit of independence, the spirit of self-reliance, and I hope the Minister will do all in his power to enable them to retain it. But they cannot permanently retain it unless given an opportunity to learn a trade whereby they can earn a living.

MR. CROSS (Canning) [8.18]: Last week I made some reference to burial of destitute persons, and the Leader of the Opposition asserted that I was speaking to that item under the wrong Vote. I wish to take this opportunity of correcting some figures I gave hon. members last week, but the correction really makes the case I presented a good deal stronger. I said last week that for the right to pick up bodies, premiums of as much as 7s. 6d. were being paid by undertakers. I find now that premiums up to £2 3s. 6d. are being paid. Undertakers pay up to £2 3s. 6d. for the right to bury a destitute person, on the off chance that the person may have a relative with sufficient money to pay for decent burial. I hope the Minister will take action to stop the practice of premiums, and also that he will make a larger amount available for burial of the destitute. The maximum amount at present allowed is £3 10s.—not £4, as I stated last week. Out of that amount of £3 10s. the undertaker has to pay the cost of advertising. It is time a larger amount was made available, so that the unfortunate destitute may be buried with common decency. I agree with the member for Wagin that in the Child Welfare Department we have some remarkably sympathetic and good officers. I regret the fact that Mr. Brodribb, who has been secretary of the department for the past few years, has been compelled to retire on account of reaching the age limit. Mr. Brodribb is a most sympathetic and lovable man. During the past year I have known of various occasions when it has been necessary for inspectresses of the Child Welfare Department to visit urgent cases of distress outside working hours. They have done it willingly. With reference to one case I would like to pay a special tribute to Inspectress Allen. I am also in a position to state that on three occasions she has visited urgent cases in her own car, paying for her own petrol in doing the department's work. I hope the Minister in charge of the department will see that a more liberal petrol allowance is granted to inspec-

tresses and inspectors. The present allowance is certainly not large. I observe in these Estimates mention of expenditure on numerous homes for children. The departmental report pays a tribute to Sister Kate Clutterbuck, who used to be at the Parkerville Home. I do not see in these Estimates, however, any provision for assistance to Sister Kate, who has now opened at Queen's Park a home for coloured children. I do not know whether the department intend to make her any allowance, but certainly one should be made, as Sister Kate has some 30 to 40 children in her charge. I am in a position to state that certain ladies are paying amounts out of their own pockets towards the maintenance of the home. Is not some provision to be made for helping Sister Kate in her good and necessary work? I hope she will be assisted by the Government. When the member for Nelson was speaking about unemployment, he claimed that the Government should do something towards regrading of our railways. It surprises me that the hon. member has not taken the trouble to read the report of the Commissioner of Railways. He cannot have done so, or he would not have made the complaint he did against the Government. I would point out to the hon. member that last year on the Dumbleyung-Kukerin line an amount of £7,300 was spent in regrading, and on the Mullewa-Cue line £23,900 also for regrading. On the Goomalling-Wyalcatchem line £7,200 was spent last year, and on the Brunswick Junction-Collie line £2,500. The departmental report states that on deviations and regrading about £183,000 was spent during the year. In view of these figures, the remarks of the member for Nelson are distinctly unfair. Now I have something to say about the employment of "C" class men. The Minister said to-night that the department had practically been responsible for obtaining some 70 invalid pensions. Numerous unfortunate individuals classed as "C" are to-day in a most invidious position. They are classed by the State doctor as being totally unfit for work. I believe many are totally unfit. When they apply for an invalid pension, however, the Commonwealth medical referee states that under the Invalid Pensions Act these men are ineligible for pensions. I know some

of the cases, and am prepared to state the names and addresses of the doctors concerned, so that hon. members, if they so desire, can interview the doctors. One man, living not far away from my home, has not been fit to work, and has not worked, for nine or ten months. His condition is such as to necessitate his attending the Perth Hospital every day. It is not likely that the man will be able to work for 12 months to come, if ever again. The Perth Hospital doctors say he will never work again. He applied for an invalid pension, but he is left a charge on the State because the Commonwealth medical referee cannot agree that he is totally and permanently incapacitated. That is one case. Another case lives at Como, and is known to half the Ministers in this Chamber. An Australian-born, he has been a good citizen, but has now become incapacitated owing to cardiac trouble. A South Perth doctor who attended the man was interviewed by me relative to the case, and stated definitely that the man will never recover his health. He added, "The man is so bad that I have notified his wife that if he has a turn now I will come when sent for, though I know I will never be paid." The Pensions Department refuse to entertain the application for an invalid pension in this case because, they say, he might get better. The truth is that the man at present can hardly walk about, and is in bed half the time. He is not likely ever to recover. I hope the Minister will take notice of this aspect, and that when the Premier goes to the Loan Council in a week or two he will take the opportunity of interviewing the Prime Minister on the subject, with a view to obtaining an amendment of the Invalid Pensions Act, for there are several cases in the same category. Hon. members know it is the duty of the Federal Government to look after the invalids of the State and because of the present unsatisfactory nature of the Act they allow those people to be cared for by the States. It is no joke for those who are in the unfortunate position to which I have referred, and I should like the Minister in charge of the department to give some of those cases special consideration. Take a man with a wife and child, the maximum payment which can be given to him by the Sustenance Department at Mar-

quis-street is a guinea a week, and everyone knows that it is impossible for them to live on that. In the genuine cases certified by their own doctor, a special allowance might be made to enable them to pay rent and carry on. I sincerely hope the Government will take some notice of the question I have raised in relation to invalid cases, those cases on which the Commonwealth medical referees cannot agree. It is possible that they may recover in a year or two and so there should be granted temporarily invalid pensions which could be subject to review every three or six months. I have put up these cases to the Deputy Commissioner who is very sympathetic, but he is tied down by the provisions of the Act. If, as I suggested, temporary pensions were given, the cases could be reviewed every few months, and if there were signs of recovery the pensions could be lifted. Some of the people I have in mind have pioneered the State and it is not fair that they should be treated so shabbily.

MR. DONEY (Williams - Narrogin) [8.34]: My remarks on these four Votes are likely to be brief. I had intended referring at length to the problem of work for young folk between the ages of 14 and 20, but the members for Nelson and Swan have anticipated me. I should, however, like to associate myself with those two members in the plea they put up to the Minister, and I submit to him that just about the most important and pressing problem facing the department whose Vote we are discussing is this same problem to which I have made reference. Other than that, there are three questions I should like to put up to the Minister and, in respect of these, maybe he will make some reference when later on he is replying to the general debate. According to the Minister, payment in regard to unemployment relief last year was £72,500 whilst this year there has been a big drop to £63,000. That is a fairly substantial decrease and one would naturally have expected that the salaries paid with regard to the smaller disbursements would also have shown a decrease. Instead I am rather surprised to find that there has been an increase of from £13,000 to £14,000.

The Minister for Justice: I explained that when introducing the Estimates.

Mr. DONEY: I listened carefully to the hon. member's remarks, though perhaps I may have been out of the Chamber for a

moment when he made reference to that particular matter. I do not wish it to be implied from my remarks that I consider the officials of the Unemployment Department are wasting their time; on the contrary, whenever I have been to the offices of the department either in Marquis-street or in Barrack-street I have always found the staff busily employed. I also take this opportunity of saying that any questions I have referred to the officials have been dealt with expeditiously and sensibly. I notice that there is debited to the Council of Industrial Development the sum of £567 paid as salary to the secretary, Mr. Macartney. I am in agreement with those members who have referred to Mr. Macartney as being an excellent officer, but the point I desire to make is that I cannot quite understand why, having regard to the fact that Mr. Macartney puts in most of his work on the unemployment side of the department, no portion of his salary is debited to the Unemployment Vote. Perhaps the Minister will explain that and at the same time maybe he will explain the reason for the appearance on this year's Estimates of £567 for an inspector. I do not quite understand who the inspector is or what his work may be. I notice that last year there was no such inspector and no such Vote provided. I had intended to make some reference to the collections from sustenance men for the A.W.U. political funds, but since that is a matter that concerns Mr. Kenneally I have decided not to make other than this brief allusion to it. I should like to associate myself with the Minister and other hon. members in expressing the hope that Mr. Kenneally will very shortly be back in the House to carry on once more his accustomed work.

MR. F. C. L. SMITH (Brown Hill-Ivanhoe) [8.38]: The problem of unemployment will never be solved by misrepresenting it and neither will the means of overcoming the difficulties arising from it be contributed to by speeches such as were made this evening by the member for Nelson (Mr. J. H. Smith). We all know that unemployment is a world-wide problem, that it has come upon us since the war with a magnitude that was never experienced before the war. The British Government, when it introduced the national insurance scheme in 1911 for the purpose of providing certain contractual rights for those who contributed to that scheme when they be-

came unemployed, considered as a result of their estimates that they made on that occasion, that if they provided for the Treasury to make loans available from that fund to the extent of £3,000,000 to meet the calls upon it by the incidence of unemployment in special circumstances where those calls became a little abnormal, that amount would be sufficient. But since the war, we know as a result of our reading and our knowledge, that it has not been possible to reduce unemployment below tolerable limits, the limits which existed before the war. Unemployment has extended not only in Great Britain, but in other countries of the world.

Hon. C. G. Latham: Great Britain has found employment for a considerable number of men this year.

Mr. F. C. L. SMITH: Not only has unemployment extended in other countries to a great degree, but in Great Britain it had extended so much by 1931 that the MacDonald Government in that year introduced an amendment to the National Insurance Act to make provision for the Treasury to extend loans to the fund amounting to 60 millions sterling, or twenty times the amount of the original estimate. We are faced with two problems, that of unemployment itself and the means of combating it and curing it, and the problem of in some measure relieving those who have become victims of it. We know that if this State had at its disposal funds to enable it to solve the problem of unemployment, the State would immediately be flooded by unemployed from the other States.

Hon. C. G. Latham: That was not what you told us when you were on this side of the House.

Mr. F. C. L. SMITH: We know that that is so, and therefore we are aware that if ever this country is to solve the problem of unemployment it will only be solved upon a Federal basis and through the activities of the Federal Government. But that Government, of course, are not attempting to solve it; all they are trying to do is to extend some measure of relief in their own particular territory to the victims of unemployment. Otherwise they are throwing the responsibility upon the States. It is upon the extent to which the present Government have contributed to the relief of unemployment that I congratulate them. When the Premier made his policy speech at

Boulder in 1933 he made no attempt to misrepresent the position. He did not cry, "Work for all." He said if his party were returned, they would endeavour to ease the burden of unemployment.

Hon. C. G. Latham: Are you sure you have the correct statement?

Mr. F. C. L. SMITH: Yes.

Mr. Thorn: You have put it very nicely.

Mr. F. C. L. SMITH: Those were the Premier's own words. The Government have redeemed the promises made on that occasion, particularly with reference to easing the burden of the unemployed. This question is looming so large in our social system that State Governments have not sufficient funds at their disposal to take any important step in solving the problem. They must confine their activities to those who are the most needy amongst the victims of unemployment, those who have qualified for assistance, those who, if not afforded some measure of relief, do not know where their next feed is coming from. That is the section to which the Government have to confine their attentions. We know from the figures of reporting trade unions that there are many more unemployed persons than are represented amongst the relief workers. Amongst the relief workers who have qualified for sustenance there are so many to be provided for that the funds at the disposal of the Government are insufficient to furnish them with full-time work. I suggest to the member for Nelson, and others who have made extravagant statements suggestive of the fact that if another Government were returned to power they would provide work for all, that neither this nor any other State Government with the funds at their command could attempt to solve the problem of unemployment. The best any of them can do is to endeavour to extend some relief to those who have become the victims of unemployment. The figures submitted this evening by the Acting Minister for Employment indicate the measure of relief that has been extended since the present Government came into office. In 1933 over 17,000 persons were on Government relief works and in receipt of sustenance, and nearly one-third of them were in receipt of rations, whilst the remainder were on relief works. To-day those numbers have been reduced to 9,000, with only about 750 on sustenance. That indicates the extent to which this Government have eased the burden on our unemployed workers.

Mr. Moloney: And those workers had to pay emergency tax as well.

Mr. F. C. L. SMITH: That comes under a different heading. Members opposite must admit that the Government, through the Minister for Employment, have set up an organisation whereby the funds at their disposal have been used to the best advantage in the way of finding relief work. A large number of those who had previously existed merely on sustenance and rations have been transferred to relief works, and their condition very much improved in consequence. The amount paid for part-time workers has been increased considerably compared with the scale in operation when the previous Government were in office. The present Government have made allowances for margins for skill, for holidays, and have made camp allowances which were not made by the previous Government. Although some of these allowances were made by the previous Government, the allowable earnings were not increased, and consequently the workers derived no benefit from them. The present Government have nothing to fear from fair criticism concerning the whole question of unemployment as it affects this State. They have nothing to fear from any criticism of the organisation they have set up for the relief of the victims of unemployment. They can face any body of electors with confidence on these issues. Reference has been made to unemployment on the goldfields. I know it exists there, as it does in the city and elsewhere, amongst those who are not included in the relief workers and those on sustenance. The Commonwealth figures for the second quarter of this year, as they apply to the reporting trade unions, show that there are 17.8 per cent. of the workers unemployed amongst these particular organisations. The figures are exclusive of the workers who are on part-time employment. Those people are considered to be employed so far as these figures are concerned. The figures indicate that unemployment is still a big factor, and that we may expect to find unemployed amongst the members of reporting trade unions in all the big centres. In the mining industry there is a big turnover of labour. On the various mines one can attend the respective shifts, and see the men who are waiting to be employed. Whilst I was in Kalgoorlie recently I inquired into the possibility of getting work for a young man who could do

nothing else besides bogging and trucking. I made inquiries of several managers. They all told me they could do nothing. They said they had lately been easing the position, and had been standing a few men down. When they began to re-employ men, as they would shortly be doing, they said they would have to give preference to those who were standing down. That position has existed for the last 30 years. There has always been a considerable follow-up on the mines. It has been the policy of the companies to endeavour to keep the labour market well supplied in those districts. Apart from those who follow the avocation of mining, there are others who have migrated to the fields and helped to swell the number of unemployed. Unfortunately they have been attracted by the glowing accounts of the prosperity that is supposed to prevail there. They appear to feel some resentment after experiencing the conditions, and finding out that there are many local people who will probably receive preference of employment on the mines. Things are not as bright as they anticipated them to be. I know some of them are pretty hard held, but they cannot be very hard held when they can turn down the offer of the Minister for Mines of 15s. per week under the prospecting scheme. There is no excuse for any single man on the goldfields to be hard held, to be visiting the hotels and restaurants for a "hand-out," when they have this offer of 15s. a week. Any man of spirit would accept that offer in preference to going to hotels and restaurants for a "hand-out."

Mr. J. H. Smith: That is a dreadful offer. How could they go into the bush on 15s. a week?

Mr. F. C. L. SMITH: They have the opportunity to do something.

Mr. J. H. Smith: But they have no chance of getting anywhere.

Mr. F. C. L. SMITH: Of course they have. Did Bayley and Ford get 15s. a week when they went out first? Did the men who blazed the country receive that weekly allowance? They did not even know where the next water was coming from.

Mr. J. H. Smith: Tell them that at Kalgoorlie.

Mr. F. C. L. SMITH: I told them that at a meeting of the unemployed in Kalgoorlie the other day. I do not go behind them. The men who blazed the country did not receive 15s. a week when they went prospect-

ing. I am not speaking of married men with responsibilities but of single men who have turned down the proposition, and yet they will go to hotels and restaurants for a "hand-out," as the member for Nelson said.

Mr. Moloney: The member for Nelson put them at Blackboy Hill.

Mr. J. H. Smith: I did not.

Hon. C. G. Latham: It was better to put them at Blackboy than have them sleep on the Esplanade.

Mr. F. C. L. SMITH: I have a word to say about the Labour Bureau. When I was in Kalgoorlie last week I visited the Labour Bureau to ascertain how many people were registered. The total number of registrations was 36, of whom 19 men had registered in the previous month. A number of the unemployed complain that it is not of much use to register there. It is said that no job ever came out of the Labour Bureau in Kalgoorlie. I should like the Minister to inquire whether a job ever does come out of that bureau. I know the mining companies do not go to it when they want men, because they always have a supply following the avocation of mining, men who attend each shift. I can understand the position of the unemployed man who registers there month after month and finds that no job is ever secured through the bureau. Such a man would naturally become downhearted and the tendency would be to consider it not worth while to register there. Consequently it may be said that the 36 men who registered at the bureau do not fairly represent the extent of unemployment in that particular district. At one time on the goldfields when a man with family responsibilities found himself hard up against it, his credit exhausted, and without knowing where his next meal was to come from, he could go to the clerk of courts, put his case before him and ask that his position should be investigated. The usual procedure was for a member of the police force to carry out the necessary investigations, and if it were found that the man's case was a genuine one, that he had tried his best and had got into his then unemployed position through no fault of his own, it was that man's right to go to the clerk of courts and secure from him necessary relief. That system has been set aside altogether, but I do not think there was any necessity for it to have been stopped. I presume it is essential to make

provision against misrepresentation, but legislation has been passed making misrepresentation of that description an offence. In addition, there is the fact that in no circumstances, under the old system, was any relief extended until exhaustive inquiries had been made to prove the genuineness of the application. There is no reason why that system should not be re-instituted to-day, because the man with dependants who can qualify for the receipt of sustenance would have his position thoroughly investigated. Men on the goldfields are of a rather independent type, and if they are in such straits that they have to make application for assistance, they must be flat out to it. Under existing circumstances, their applications must be sent to Perth and considered here, where the officials do not know the facts. A decision is arrived at, and usually the recommendation made is that those concerned shall receive sustenance work, of which there is none. Some alteration should be effected in that particular detail, and the clerk of courts should be given the right to extend assistance to genuine applicants to cover their requirements for about a fortnight until such time as the officials in Perth can consider the claims, if that course should be deemed necessary.

MR. TONKIN (North-East Fremantle) [9.5]: It is true, as the member for Nelson (Mr. J. H. Smith) said, that last evening the State Congress of the Labour Party substituted the "right to live" for its previous claim for the "right to work." That change is the result of a recognition of the fact that modern industry in its highly mechanised state has permanently displaced labour. There is no member of this House who will not concede the right to live to every person, but I do not know so much about members of another place.

Hon. C. G. Latham: It is very unfair to say that.

Mr. TONKIN: Members of this House are sufficiently advanced now, I think, to concede the right to live, but I interpret the right to live to mean the right to live in reasonable comfort. It is in that regard that I expressed my doubt as to members of another place. The term "reasonable comfort," of course, has an ever-changing meaning, because what was considered

reasonable comfort ten years ago would not be regarded as reasonable to-day.

Mr. Thorn: No, not enough feathers in mattresses.

Mr. TONKIN: As civilisation progresses, and industry makes it possible for people to obtain greater comforts, so our standard of living should rise progressively. That should apply not only to the man who is born with a silver spoon in his mouth but also to the man who is born, unfortunately, in very poor circumstances. A long period of low wages that a large number of men have experienced in this State has had a disastrous effect upon the community. If members have any doubt on that score, they can turn to page 15 of the report of the Child Welfare Department for confirmation. Therein they will find the following statement:—

The inspectors report that there has been more sickness in epidemic form than during any previous year, and they consider that this is largely due to malnutrition.

I do not doubt that at all; I am satisfied that that is exactly the position. After a long period of low wages, the physical health of the community has been so reduced that resistance to disease has been lessened, and that is why the various epidemics this year have taken a more severe form than previously. Surely we are not content with that position. We cannot blame men for agitating for an improvement in their conditions while they are not in receipt of full-time employment at wages that will guarantee them a living in a reasonable degree of comfort. If we need any further evidence that people are ill-nourished and ill-fed, we can turn to page 16 of the report, in which members will find it mentioned that had it not been for assistance received from the Lotteries Commission, destitution in a large number of homes could not have been relieved. It is a very sad commentary on our times that it is possible for destitution to be widespread, and it is evident from the departmental report that it is still existent to a very appreciable degree. In referring to the assistance received from the Lotteries Commission, the report states—

These welcome grants have been most helpful in assisting long-required improvements in the way of buildings, equipment, renovations, etc., to be materialised. In addition to the above grants, the commission has made available the sum of £450 during the year to enable destitute homes to be re-established.

Here we see that we have to depend upon money from the Lotteries Commission to re-establish destitute homes in the community, and that in the present year of grace! It would not appear that we have progressed very far. Further on in the report it is stated—

Grants of this nature, going directly into destitute homes, bring about better living conditions, and by improved environment create an uplift in the outlook on life by the respective families.

It behoves us to keep striving to make it possible for destitution to be relieved as the result of work supplied rather than to depend upon grants from the Lotteries Commission. I believe there is a direct obligation upon the State to give as much aid as possible where, through no fault of their own, the standard of living of the people has fallen below that prescribed by the Arbitration Court. I know that the assistance the Government are able to grant is limited by the financial accommodation available, but where it is possible to improve the standard of living of the people without additional cost to the State, that course should be pursued in every instance. We should endeavour to do as much as possible for people who are living below the standard, although I admit the limitation prescribed by the financial aspect. The Minister this evening mentioned that it was customary to advance fares to people to enable them to go to other districts to look for work, and that those people were required to repay the fares when they obtained employment. I cannot follow that arrangement. The railways are State-owned. We run trains every day and I suppose 99 out of every hundred of those trains leave the platform with room for additional passengers. It would not cost the State anything to grant passes to unemployed persons entitling them to travel by those trains when looking for work. That would be a means of improving their standard of life, indirectly, without any charge upon the State. We say we would like to do more for the unemployed but cannot do so because of lack of money. I agree, but where it is possible to help them without additional cost to the State, it should be done. Here is where I consider we could help them to a greater degree. If we require the person who is provided with a railway pass in order that he may seek work, to repay that money out of his earnings, we reduce that man's standard of living by taking away from him

certain money that he could have used to improve his standard of living. There is no necessity to do that, because the railways are State-owned, and it would not cost anything to give those unemployed persons their fares. We could protect the system against the overloading of trains by limiting the number of free passes per train. We could limit the number of passes for each day, and so we could ensure against the necessity for putting on extra carriages and increasing the running costs of the department. But where there is room on the train for additional passengers without any cost to the State, we could make the seats available to unemployed persons to enable them to go looking for work. There is no reason why that should not be done. If the Railways were privately owned and the Government had to pay the fares I could understand the position, but since we are running the trains in any case I can see no reason why we should not say to the unemployed, "You can travel on the trains free of charge if you are looking for work."

Hon. P. D. Ferguson: They are given passes only when they have a job to go to.

Mr. TONKIN: No, I myself have received passes for men who have not had a definite job to go to, but only a reasonable chance of obtaining work. I have secured the passes for them. It would not cost the State anything. We could give them the passes for nothing, and so we would be indirectly improving their standard of living. Suppose the fare were £3. If a man has been out of work for a long time he will have used up his reserves and his personal and household clothing and utensils will have become depleted. He goes looking for a job, and if successful he is asked by the Minister to repay his fare, the money for which he could otherwise use to improve his standard of living. I see no reason why the State, owning the railways, should require such a man to repay the cost of travelling. He is practically destitute when he starts his journey, and here is a way in which to assist him and which would cost us nothing. I hope the Minister will look into that proposal, and if it is found at all practicable that he will put it into operation, and so in future unemployed persons travelling to other districts in search of employment will be permitted to travel free. If there are any objections to that, I should like to hear them from the Minister when he replies to the debate. I know the de-

partment has been busy during the last few weeks endeavouring to complete a scheme for the employment of "C" class men who, no doubt, present a special problem. I hope the Government will push on with that scheme so they can get as many as possible of those men to work. I know quite a number of them who, through having been out of work for a long time, have in their heads the idea that they cannot work, cannot stand up to work and will never work again. On the other hand I have seen some men who have been on "C" class work and who are now anxious for it, despite the fact that they did not previously want it. It shows that the policy will bring out men by giving them the opportunity to do suitable work, and I hope that the Government will push on with the scheme so that as many as possible of the "C" class men may be furnished with work. It is not often that relief workers are given credit for the work they do. We frequently hear from public men criticism of them to the effect that they loaf on the job. I was very pleased to hear the Minister for Water Supplies mention a few days ago, when opening the reservoir at Buckland Hill, that that job had been completed for a sum below the estimated cost. That job was performed by men on relief work, and it was completed at a sum below estimated cost.

Mr. Cross: That is a general thing with relief workers.

Mr. TONKIN: It certainly goes to the credit of those men, who are only on part time employment and are not drawing a wage that will keep them up to A1 physical condition, that so willing were they to work that they completed the job, and the cost of it to the department was lower than was estimated. I agree with the member for Canning that this is pretty general with those men on relief work. I would not like to resume my seat without giving a meed of praise to the large number of foster parents who are doing a great service for the State in looking after the State wards that are boarded out. I notice from the report for last year that 552 children were boarded out with foster parents, and it says a lot for those foster parents that the mortality was only three deaths amongst the 552 children. Of those three that died, two died from pneumonia.

and one was accidentally killed. It shows that foster parents look after those children as well as real parents look after their own children, and it is pleasing indeed to think that there were only three deaths amongst 552 children. I notice the inspectors report very favourably on the results of their inspection. Members are apt to pass over this department without thinking of the good work of the foster parents, and I should like to take this opportunity to place on record our appreciation of the good work those people are doing for the State; because it is a State obligation to bring up those children and make decent citizens of them, and the foster parents are playing their part admirably.

HON. C. G. LATHAM (York) [9.23]: I hope the Minister will give consideration to any request for labour that might be received from the agricultural districts. I have just returned from a trip in the country. At one place I asked a farmer about the cutting of hay for chaff, and he said it was impossible to get the labour. He pointed out that chaff cutting necessitated quite a lot of labour, and he said he had great trouble in getting labour for stooking hay in the field. We have to be careful that the Government do not provide special employment for men when other avenues of employment are open.

Mr. Hegney: The men would have to take a chance of getting their wages.

Hon. C. G. LATHAM: The hon. member knows nothing at all about it. The farmers pay wages just as well as do other employers, for they are no more dishonest than is any other section of the community. The point is that the industry at present does not enable them to pay high wages. Still, a man taken by a farmer must be better off than he would be under half-time employment provided by the Government. I know the conditions under which the Government are providing work, as for instance 30s. a week for single men. Men employed on a farm ought to get 30s. a week and their keep, probably more than that. The Minister might ask his officials to ascertain from the agricultural areas whether there is any likelihood of employment being offered, and if so to see about making the labour available.

The Minister for Justice: We are glad to get applications from employers who desire labour.

Hon. C. G. LATHAM: Certainly something ought to be done.

Mr. Hegney: Do these men use the Labour Bureau?

Hon. C. G. LATHAM: I do not know. At all events it would be of no use to load "C" class men on to that work.

The Minister for Justice: Certainly not.

Hon. C. G. LATHAM: They have to be competent men, able to stand up to the work. I do not want the Government to say that the agricultural industry is not capable of absorbing any more men. I know the policy of the Labour Government, and I know their promises, many of which, of course, could not be fulfilled.

Mr. Moloney: Does the hon. member really know the policy of the Labour Party?

Hon. C. G. LATHAM: The hon. member is so far out of touch with Labour principles that he requires this side of the House to tell him what the Labour policy is.

Mr. Moloney: I have that speech of yours on my desk.

Hon. C. G. LATHAM: I do not care, for my speeches are always very sound, and I have due regard for what the State can afford to pay. One thing in which I did not assist the hon. member was in the putting of men into gaol because they told a lie in order to get a job. I hope the Government will not make relief work so attractive that men out of employment will not be absorbed in the agricultural industry.

Mr. Cross: Tell us how to make sustenance work less attractive?

Hon. C. G. LATHAM: If there is employment in better conditions to be found in other parts of the State, that objective will be achieved. In many instances this farm work would provide permanent employment for men now on sustenance.

Mr. Moloney: On the farm?

Hon. C. G. LATHAM: Yes. When our Government, the previous Government, gave a subsidy to farmers with which to employ labour, we found that quite a number of those who secured employment succeeded in making it permanent employment. As a matter of fact I know two of those men who now have farms of their own. So I

think we ought to give encouragement in that direction. Members sometimes publish statements that are not true.

Mr. Hegney: Those on your side do that.

Hon. C. G. LATHAM: No, the hon. member is one of the worst offenders in that respect.

Mr. Hegney: Will you apologise for the statement you made the other night?

Hon. C. G. LATHAM: The only thing I will apologise for is the hon. member's interpretation of what I said. He knows very well what was said.

Mr. Hegney: I read what you said.

Hon. C. G. LATHAM: Yes, but it was the interpretation the hon. member placed on it afterwards that was wrong.

Mr. Hegney: I can read plain English.

Hon. C. G. LATHAM: Members on this side will give just as much consideration to the Labour people as would the hon. member and in a much more practical way.

Mr. Cross: You did not do it.

Hon. C. G. LATHAM: Did we not? The hon. member complained about our having placed men in Blackboy Hill camp. We had to provide a shelter for them and that was the reason they were put there.

Mr. Cross: It was demoralising to the men.

Hon. C. G. LATHAM: It was better to have them housed at Blackboy than to have them running from place to place looking for shelter.

The Premier: You denied that York statement three weeks afterwards.

Hon. C. G. LATHAM: I denied immediately the interpretation that was put upon it. As a matter of fact, it took the Trades and Labour Council about a fortnight to find an interpretation that suited them. Then they said, "This is something on which we can win an election."

The Minister for Agriculture: It was a very unfortunate remark.

Hon. C. G. LATHAM: It was not.

The Premier: The unfortunate part was your delay in denying it.

Hon. C. G. LATHAM: No, it was a fortnight before the Trades and Labour Council could find an interpretation that suited them. Later on we will give them something on which to place an interpretation and see whether that will be advertised.

Mr. Moloney: Three weeks afterwards you embroidered it a little.

Hon. C. G. LATHAM: Embroidered it! I doubt whether the hon. member knows anything about the use of a needle.

The Minister for Agriculture: A very sound speech.

Hon. C. G. LATHAM: If it were not more sound than those of the Minister, I would not deliver it to the Chamber.

The Minister for Justice: You started the argument.

Hon. C. G. LATHAM: I did not; I objected to a wrong interpretation being placed on my remarks. If I desired to reduce wages, I would be honest enough to say so straight out.

Mr. Moloney: But you did say it.

Hon. C. G. LATHAM: I did not. I believe in the 44-hour week, but I believe in everybody having it.

Mr. Needham: At how much a week?

Hon. C. G. LATHAM: I do not mind how much the industry could pay.

Mr. Needham: Eighteen and ninepence?

Hon. C. G. LATHAM: The hon. member is a better judge of that than I am. I do not believe in selecting some sections of the community for a 44-hour week while others have to work longer hours to pay for it.

Mr. Moloney: Is that why you put the railway employees back on the 48-hour week?

Hon. C. G. LATHAM: I suppose the Arbitration Court did that. I am not aware that we ran the Arbitration Court. The only time we had anything to do with the court was when a measure was passed through Parliament.

Mr. Cross: You put them back without the court and you know it.

Hon. C. G. LATHAM: I think we are getting away from the Vote.

The CHAIRMAN: Yes, and I think you might address the Chair, too.

Hon. C. G. LATHAM: I am addressing the Chair.

Mr. Raphael: Occasionally.

Hon. C. G. LATHAM: Some members make a speech only by way of interjection. In that respect the member for Victoria Park is a bad offender. I rose to ask the Minister to provide labour for employment in country districts.

The Minister for Justice: Yes, and we would like to get applications for it.

Hon. C. G. LATHAM: I think it is the duty of the department to get into touch with the farmers.

Mr. Raphael: You should see that the cockies pay fair wages for labour.

Hon. C. G. LATHAM: I wonder if the hon. gentleman ever gets a headache through listening to his own voice. If the Minister will do that, I will do all in my power to get those desirous of obtaining men to communicate with the department.

MR. MOLONEY (Subiaco) [9.35]: I listened to the Leader of the Opposition in the hope of hearing something of a constructive nature, but was disappointed. Earlier in the evening we were regaled with an oration from the member for Nelson, but if anyone expected anything of a constructive nature from him, he was doomed to disappointment. The Leader of the Opposition practically reiterated what he said at York on that memorable occasion and blamed the Arbitration Court for doing an injustice that was actually committed by the Government of which he was a member. He was not game to stand up to the action of the Government.

Hon. C. G. Latham: I have never run away yet.

Mr. MOLONEY: I wonder what the other side would do if there were no Arbitration Court.

Hon. C. G. Latham: Appoint one for you.

Mr. MOLONEY: The workers of this country were subjected to a decision of the Arbitration Court as a result of expressed instructions by the previous Government.

Hon. C. G. Latham: There were no instructions by the previous Government. Whatever was done, Parliament did it.

Mr. MOLONEY: One can search the effervescing verbiage of the member for Nelson in vain for anything of a constructive nature and might equally look in vain for anything constructive from the Opposition.

Mr. Thorn: Then why repeat the dose?

Mr. MOLONEY: Remembering that 17,000 workers were on relief and that 4,776 could not secure a day's work—this will bear reiteration—I ask the member for Nelson to point out what his Government did. His statement was ludicrous. We are told that we must provide labour for the farmers. I have not discovered that the present Government are averse from providing labour for any legitimate work. But let members bear in mind that, according to a statement made by the Minister for Lands on the 22nd

August last, only 76 farmers paid income tax, and when we are told that we must provide labour for the farmers without any guarantee that the men will get their wages, I, for one, refuse to be an accomplice to it.

Mr. Seward: Don't talk rubbish.

Mr. MOLONEY: We have been told about the subsidising of farm labour, and that some of the men so subsidised eventually obtained farms for themselves. Even the member for Avon, who sits on the Opposition side, deprecated the exodus from the farms during the regime of the previous Government. No fewer than 1,700 farmers vacated their holdings. Yet we are told that as a result of the subsidies, additional men became farmers. A statement of that kind carries no weight with me. The Opposition are now asking us to emulate them. I do not think any member of this Chamber, if he views the position calmly, would ask us to do what they have done. Provided an assurance were given that those men would receive sufficient upon which to live under the conditions obtaining to-day, all would be well served by putting them on the land. We do not want to send men on the land who will be subject to the scurvy treatment that is often meted out to them to-day. Apparently we must send big strong men to our farmers, not men who are physically incapacitated. No doubt we would have to subscribe to the standard set up by the Leader of the Opposition himself, send men with the physique that characterises that hon. gentleman. I understand that in days gone by the Leader of the Opposition was a veritable Hercules. No doubt what the farmers have in mind is a man like Frederick the Great at the time when he was building up Prussia. We must not send men to farms below a very high standard of physique. That is the type of sincerity that characterises members of the Opposition. It shows what workers may expect from them. We have heard the platitudes that have been mouthed by the member for Nelson. We can all remember the time when the unemployed paraded the streets of Perth. I remember, too, when they flocked outside this building, and Sir James Mitchell was asked to go out and placate them. Members opposite who will be seeking the suffrages of the people again are now making perorations pointing out all the advantages

to be gained by reinstating the previous Government. They talk about things being done so much better by the previous Government than they are being done by the present Government. We all know what the previous Government did with respect to the financial emergency legislation, whilst at the same time they talked of lifting the burden from the people. Every one of those poor devils who were working under those conditions was subject to a flat rate of emergency tax. When we tried to relieve them of the burden to the extent of an exemption at £3 12s. a week in the case of married men, the Opposition were adamant. The very people who to-day are voicing their solicitude for the unemployed were aghast to think that anything should be done to relieve the burden. When we desired to exempt single men at £2 per week, they opposed the proposition tooth and nail. They were successful in another place, but eventually a compromise was effected at 30s. a week.

The CHAIRMAN: Taxation does not come under this Vote.

Mr. MOLONEY: Those who were on the very lowest level were subject to taxation at the hands of the very people who now profess to be so solicitous in their interests. I regret that the member for Nelson is not in his seat. Possibly some of the features in regard to unemployment that I have referred to may serve as an instruction to him because of the many aspects he overlooked in the course of his criticism of the Government. Bad and all as the position is to-day, it is Heaven compared with that which existed when the previous Government were in office. I know the Government have been grappling with the position of "C" class men. I am not altogether satisfied that justice has been done to those men, but I am informed that every effort has been made to cope with the situation. Those men are being found work commensurate with their physical fitness to do it. The Opposition do not desire that "C" class men should be allowed within a hundred miles of any farm; we must therefore find something else for them to do. I understand that is now being done. The position is infinitely better than it was. Holiday pay is being given, as well as camp allowances and mar-

gins for skill. I hope in the near future full-time work will operate. The Government are faced with a Herculean task in financing all those works they desire to put into operation. I listened to the statement of the Acting Minister for Employment made at a congress meeting the other day. It is evident from his remarks that the Government are moving towards the desired goal, that of placing in full-time employment those men who are now on part-time. It is a question of finance, and as soon as that is solved, the consummation so much desired by the Government will be realised. I could speak at considerable length on this subject, but it has already been clearly put before the Committee by members on this side of the Chamber. In view of the absolute ineptitude displayed by members opposite in their attempted castigation of the Government to-night, I will confine myself to the few remarks I have just made.

Vote put and passed.

Votes—Unemployment Relief and State Labour Bureau, £83,922; Council of Industrial Development, £1,584—agreed to.

Department of Public Works and Labour (Hon. J. J. Kenneally, Minister; Hon. H. Millington, Minister for Water Supplies in charge of the Votes.)

Vote—Public Works and Buildings, £55,389:

THE MINISTER FOR WATER SUPPLIES (Hon. H. Millington—Mt. Hawthorn) [9.48]: I regret that the Minister for Works is unable to introduce his Estimates to-night owing to ill-health, and express the hope that he will speedily be restored to health. I propose briefly to deal with the activities of the department during the preceding year. The expenditure was as follows:—From revenue, ordinary public works and services in connection with works and buildings, £49,206; from revenue votes, for maintenance and other charges including interest and sinking fund, goldfields water supply, £128,369; other hydraulic undertakings, £47,095; from Loan funds, £1,104,420, a total of £1,329,090. In addition, £61,000 was expended by the department on works that were financed from funds not provided for on the Estimates

under my control. The main items of this expenditure are as follow:—

Hospitals from established hospital fund	£24,484
Rebuilding cottages after goldfields riot	6,000
Commonwealth grants, employment scheme	18,000
Minor works	12,516
	<hr/> £61,000 <hr/>

A comparison between the total figures and the total expenditure for the year 1933-34 from all sources, namely £1,372,093, shows an increase of £17,997. The principal works undertaken by the department last year were—Bunbury Harbour works, work in connection with improvement of existing accommodation and further dredging, £48,000; Fremantle Harbour works, continuation of permanent renewal work North Wharf and Victoria Quay, £94,000; Beadon Point jetty, reconstruction, £19,000; Geraldton Harbour works, continuation of improvement work, £65,000; Esperance new jetty, completion, £39,000; Swan River, improvements near Causeway, £18,000; Town water supply, Collie, completion of new reservoir, Mungallup scheme, £22,000; Geraldton, relaying gravitation main, £13,000. In connection with Goldfields Water Supply great progress has been made with the renewal of the main conduit, which serves the goldfields and agricultural districts, and a sum of £280,000 has been expended during the year in this necessary renewal. At this stage I propose to make a statement in connection with the Goldfields Water Scheme. I have just mentioned that last year renewals from loan funds account for an expenditure of £280,000 of loan money. Some people are under a misapprehension respecting the scheme. They have an idea that the scheme has been paid for by users of the water, and that consequently concessions can be given not only on the goldfields but also along the pipe line. Applications are continually being made for extensions, without any regard to whether it is possible for those who require the extensions to finance them, to pay a rate covering interest and sinking fund. Generally it is assumed that the scheme now stands to the credit of the Treasury. Actually the scheme was first inaugurated in 1897-98, about 37 years ago; and after four years' initial work it became earning to some extent. In 1902-3 the income was £24,133, but

the expenditure was £153,416. The greatest amount earned in any one year was that earned in 1913-14, a revenue of £255,076; but even in that year there was a loss of £46,955. Altogether the main loan capital invested in the scheme amounted to £2,376,908, and the supplementary capital invested in it was £615,876. Thus the total capital put into the scheme amounted to £2,992,784. The total earnings of the scheme over all those years amounted to £6,179,284; but the total annual cost over those years ran into £8,072,969. The net result—and it is just as well that this should be understood—of a scheme that is supposed to have paid for itself is that up to the present there has been expended a sum greater by £1,893,685 than that received from the scheme. I give these figures to dispel the erroneous impression that the scheme is paid for. I have already pointed out that the scheme is responsible for continual expense in the way of renewals. The revenue earned last year was £198,696, but nevertheless the loss was £8,235. Independently of that, a sum of £280,000 was spent on the scheme last year; and, further, it will be necessary to spend a large amount, which will be disclosed when the Loan Estimates are being discussed, on additional renewals in the pipe line. It is wrong to assume that when a scheme such as this has been installed, that is the end of the expenditure. There is continual expense year by year; and therefore, in spite of the great advancement made on the goldfields and despite the fact that we sold considerably more water last year than in previous years, the whole scheme still shows a loss throughout the agricultural districts supplied from the scheme. In many instances it is impossible to collect revenue from users of scheme water. I ask hon. members when requesting extensions of the scheme, and also hon. members representing districts along the pipe line when asking for concessions, to bear in mind that the scheme, instead of being in credit, has still to be supported by the Treasury, and that over the full period of years the revenue from the scheme has been exceeded by the expenditure on it to the extent of nearly £2,000,000. It is now proposed to extend the scheme from Coolgardie to Norseman, and the necessary temporary work for improving the supply will cost £5,000 this year. When Estimates dealing with the

Goldfields Water Supply section are put forward, further information will be accorded.

Mr. Sampson: About what capacity will the Norseman reservoir have? I suppose there will be a reservoir at Norseman, perhaps a small tank.

The MINISTER FOR WATER SUPPLIES: A large reservoir will not be necessary. The pipe is of 10in., reduced to 8in. after a certain distance. For the quantity of water required by Norseman such a pipe is considered sufficient, as well as for the quantities required along the track. A reservoir of a few million gallons' capacity will suffice as a sort of make-weight. With regard to agricultural drainage and irrigation works a good deal could be said, but I shall limit myself to a brief statement. Many works taken in hand last year have been completed. I would particularly refer to the Collie irrigation works, Wellington dam, which supplies irrigation water to the whole of the Collie irrigation and Roelands districts. The work was completed during last year at a total expenditure of £353,473—of which amount £12,000 was expended during that year. The Harvey River diversion, giving an outlet to the ocean, has called for an expenditure of £30,000 this year. The total expenditure on the diversion to the 30th June last was £311,555. The Waroona drainage and irrigation work cost £30,000 and further progress with the Harvey, Wagerup and Waroona comprehensive scheme for the drainage of those areas cost £20,000. Other general drainage works accounted for £29,000 and minor water supplies and drainage in agricultural areas, £21,000. The total expenditure in connection with public buildings, including new buildings, additions and repairs, was £97,000, while increased accommodation provided at the Midland abattoirs entailed the expenditure of £35,000. The expenditure on roads and bridges from Loan funds totalled £138,000, some of the larger works being—

	£
Chidlow-York-road	11,000
Nannup-Augusta-road	10,000
York-Bruce Rock-road	15,000
Clackline-Piawaning-road	15,000
King - Kalgan - road (Albany District)	11,000

In addition to these figures, I may incidentally refer to the fact that £506,000 was spent on reconstruction, construction and

maintenance of roads, the money for that purpose being taken from (a) the Federal Aid Roads Grant and (b) Traffic Trust Account, in accordance with the provisions of the Traffic Act. Of course that would be in addition to the expenditure from ordinary Loan funds. The money received from the Federal Aid Roads Grant comes from the petrol tax, the Federal Government allowing the State Government 2½d. out of every 7d. they collect on each gallon of petrol. The Traffic Trust Account represents the proportion allowed for main road purposes under the Traffic Act. Many of these matters that I have dealt with generally will be presented in more detail when the Loan Estimates and those related to Business Undertakings are dealt with. It will be realised that the Works Department carries out building and other structural work for other Government departments, and the expenditure involved is taken mainly from Loan funds. Apart from that, the activities of the department are not very great. It will be on the Loan Estimates that members will be able to discuss the real activities of the Department. I have pleasure in presenting the Estimates.

Vote put and passed.

Votes—Labour, £4,733, Arbitration Court £4,370, Town Planning, £1,367, State Accident Insurance Office, £7,643—agreed to.

Progress reported.

BILLS (2)—RETURNED.

1, Supply (No. 2), £1,500,000.

Without amendment.

2, Traffic Act Amendment.

With amendments.

House adjourned at 10.6 p.m.

Legislative Council,

Wednesday, 23rd October, 1935.

	PAGE
Question : Water consumption	1255
Bills : Financial Emergency Act Amendment, 2R. ...	1255
Electoral, 1R.	1263
Builders' Registration, Com., progress arrested	1263
Divorce Amendment, 2R.	1264
Reduction of Rents Act Continuance, 2R., defeated	1265
Mortgagees' Rights Restriction Act Continuance, 2R., Com. report	1266
Tenants, Purchasers and Mortgagees' Relief Act Amendment, 2R., Com. report	1266
Health Act Amendment, 2R.	1267
Workers' Homes Act Amendment (No. 3), 2R. ...	1268
Adjournment, Special	1280

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

QUESTION—WATER CONSUMPTION.

Hon. J. M. MACFARLANE asked the Chief Secretary: 1, Is the Minister aware that summonses are being issued for small sums of arrears for excess water used by householders since the commencement of this year? 2, Does he consider it reasonable that there should be given less than seven days' notice of the department's intention to prosecute, and the issue of a summons ten days later for small current rates for excess water? 3, Are summonses being issued to all householders for water consumed within the metropolitan area for—(a) amounts due as water rates, both in arrears and current; (b) current only; (c) if not, why not?

The CHIEF SECRETARY replied: 1, No. Summonses are being issued only for excess water charges accrued to 30/6/1935 where consumers have failed to arrange with the department for payment. 2, No. At least seven days' notice is given of intention to prosecute. Notice is not issued for at least 14 days after the account is rendered. 3, Answered by No. 1.

BILL—FINANCIAL EMERGENCY ACT AMENDMENT.

Second Reading.

Debate resumed from the previous day.

HON. H. V. PIESSE (South-East) [4.37]: I am pleased that the Government have decided to continue this portion of the financial emergency legislation, because in