should not benefit similarly. The hon. member suggested that he would support the Bill in order to give it a trial, but did not advance any reason why it should not be applied to the metropolitan area. I hope that Opposition members, instead of giving the measure what I might term "compromised support," will approve of its provisions wholeheartedly. When the Bill reaches the Legislative Council, I hope that members there will deal with it on that basis and give it a trial. The measure protects the interests of landlords in assuring to them a reasonable return, and it should be passed so as to afford workers reasonable protection against landlords who are extortionate. I have pleasure in supporting the second reading.

Hon. C. G. Latham: Do not you think we should guarantee the payment of rents, too?

On motion by Mr. North, debate adjourned.

House adjourned at 10.4 p.m.

Legislative Assembly,

Tuesday, 6th September, 1938.

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

QUESTION—LICENSING ACT.

Trading Outside Licensed Hours.

Mr. STYANTS asked the Minister for Police: How many prosecutions of hotel proprietors in the Eastern Goldfields Magisterial District for trading outside licensed hours were instituted in the periods 1930-33 and 1933-36, respectively.

The MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE (for the Minister for Police) replied: For period 1930-33, nil; for period 1933-36, 18.

QUESTION—ALBANY ROAD.

Widening and Resurfacing.

Mr. RAPHAEL asked the Minister for Works: Does the Government intend to widen and surface Albany-road between Cannington and Armadale?

The PREMIER (for the Minister for Works) replied: This has been considered. At present there are other matters relatively more urgent.

ADDRESS-IN-REPLY.

Presentation.

Mr. SPEAKER: I desire to inform the House that, in company with Mr. Sleeman, the member for Fremantle; Mr. Tonkin, the member for North-East Fremantle; and Mr.

Fox, the member for South Fremantle, I attended upon his Excellency the Lieut.-Governor, and presented the Address-in-reply to His Excellency's Speech. His Excellency replied in the following terms:—

I thank you for your expressions of loyalty to His Most Gracious Majesty the King, and for your Address-in-reply to the Speech with which I opened Parliament.—(Signed) James Mitchell, Lieut.-Governor.

CONDOLENCE —LETTER IN REPLY.

Mr. SPEAKER: I have received from the widow of the late Mr. E. V. Brockman the following acknowledgment in respect of the resolution of condolence forwarded by me to her on behalf of hon. members:—

Nannup, 2nd September. Dear Sir,—On behalf of my family and myself, I sincerely thank the members of the Legislative Assembly for the very kind expressions of sympathy which your letter conveyed to us in our great loss. I sincerely thank you all for the tribute paid to my late beloved husband. Yours very sincerely, (Signed) D. Brockman.

BILLS (2)—FIRST READING.

1, Parliamentary Disqualifications (Declaration of Law).

2, Qualification of Electors (Legislative Council).

Introduced by the Premier (for the Minister for Justice).

MOTION—YAMPI SOUND IRON ORE DEPOSITS.

Commonwealth Embargo.

Debate resumed from the 1st September on the following motion by the Premier:—

That this Parliament of Western Australia emphatically protests against the embargo placed by the Commonwealth Government on the export of iron ore from Australia, in view of its disastrous effects upon the development of the State. We consider that the information available does not warrant such drastic action, and we urge the Commonwealth Government to remove the embargo.

THE MINISTER FOR MINES (Hon. A. H. Panton—Leederville) [4.37]: I do not think it necessary for me to labour this question, especially as Opposition members have decided to support the motion, although, as the Premier said, they have given it but faint praise. I am rather surprised at the attitude of Opposition members to the motion. Their judgment seems to me to be somewhat warped on this occasion by a party spirit. In fact, the member for Nedlands (Hon. N. Keenan) went so far as to say that he considered the motion to be an attack on the Prime Minister, Mr. Lyons. Any member who listened to the speech of the Premier when moving the motion and who read his statements that were published in the Press from time to time would, I think, at least give him credit for dealing with the matter purely from a national and a State, rather than from a party, point of view. I venture to say he would have adopted the same attitude had Labour been in office in the Federal sphere. I can also imagine the indignation of anti-Labourites and the many meetings of protest that would have been held had the embargo on the export of iron ore been imposed by a Federal Labour Government.

Hon. C. G. Latham: You are making it a political matter, if that is the attitude you are adopting.

The MINISTER FOR MINES: I am explaining what I think happened on the other side. Just as the hon. member voiced his opinion, so I presume I have the right to voice mine.

Hon. C. G. Latham: I did not say anything about that in my speech.

The MINISTER FOR MINES: The member for Subiaco (Mrs. Cardell-Oliver) endeavoured, and very successfully, too, to deal with the embargo from a moral point of view. The hon. member suggested throughout her speech—except when she was dealing with cattle—that it would be immoral to export iron ore from this State to be made into munitions. One fact that impressed me has been that when people begin to talk about the export of iron ore from Australia they immediately visualise mountains of guns and ammunition; but I venture to suggest that the quantity of iron ore used in the manufacture of guns and ammunition is very small in comparison with that used for industrial purposes. From the information I have gleaned, the greatest quantity of iron ore is used in constructing railway lines. As the member for Subiaco has travelled extensively, I think she will agree that most of the iron ore is used for industrial purposes—for the construction of ships, the manufacture of rails, and, now that steel is

so extensively used, for buildings also—rather than, as has been suggested, for the construction of guns and the production of ammunition.

Mr. Seward: Rails are almost as important as guns, in war-time.

The MINISTER FOR MINES: They are also important when there is no war, and the hon. member, being a farmer, will appreciate that fact. Throughout the world are hundreds of thousands of miles of railway lines, and in their construction and maintenance a tremendous amount of iron must of necessity be used.

During the debate the statement was made that the machinery for use at Yampi was to be manufactured in Japan. On the files of the Mines Department are advice notes showing where a large quantity of this machinery is being at least purchased, if not manufactured. Perusing the files, I discovered that in the United States of America £30,000 worth of the machinery was purchased, in Singapore £6,000 worth, and in London £24,000 worth. Those are the amounts incurred in the purchase of machinery and the notes indicate that it is not altogether accurate to suggest that the machinery is to be purchased from Japan.

The Leader of the Opposition also stated very definitely that in his opinion no serious attempt had been made to exploit the iron ore deposits, and that an application for the forfeiture of the leases had recently been made. But the hon. member will perhaps appreciate the fact that before any big industry can be undertaken considerable preparatory work is necessary. Particularly is that so in the exploitation of mineral wealth. Evidence of that fact is available when one considers the goldmining industry.

Hon. C. G. Latham: Three years have been spent in preparatory work.

The MINISTER FOR MINES: No, not three years.

Hon. C. G. Latham: From 1935 to date.

The MINISTER FOR MINES: The hon. member will appreciate the fact that Koolan Island consists of a large mountain of rock jutting out into the sea, with little or no beach to provide landing facilities. In consequence, he will realise that a good deal of preparatory work had to be undertaken before work on the deposits could be commenced. A landing stage had to be provided for the men, and for the unloading of machinery and stores, sites for the housing of the employees had to be selected, and other facilities that had to be provided were messrooms, store-rooms, workshops, wireless communication, foundations for the machinery necessary to carry out the preliminary work of preparing the foundations for the heavier machinery required in the actual mining of the deposits, and the construction of roads necessary for transporting the ore to the ships. Much of that work has been done. Subsequently the company blasted thousands of tons of rock in order to make a roadway. A mechanical shovel was installed.

Hon. C. G. Latham: A secondhand one.

The MINISTER FOR MINES: The company installed a mechanical shovel. I remind the hon. member that a good deal of excellent work has been done in the mining industry with secondhand batteries. The company constructed two wharves and provided a pumping station. Diamond drilling and contour surveys were carried out. According to the auditor's balance sheet, which we have in the office of the Mines Department, the actual expenditure on this work up till May last was £70,000.

Hon. C. G. Latham: How much of that went to the manager or the attorney?

The MINISTER FOR MINES: The information from the balance sheet indicates that all the work was accomplished at a cost of £70,000. In these days, I do not think that any company would allow the greater part of such an amount to go to a manager or anyone else holding an official position. Companies to-day want work done.

Hon. C. G. Latham: I should like to know how the money was distributed.

The MINISTER FOR MINES: I am endeavouring to tell the hon. member. If, instead of working on the file at his disposal, the Leader of the Opposition had come to the office of the Mines Department and consulted an up-to-date file, he might not have made the speech that he did. Probably he would have altered his mind considerably and given the motion a greater measure of support.

Hon. C. G. Latham: I had a great deal of trouble to get the file I did have.

The MINISTER FOR MINES: I can assure the Leader of the Opposition that he will not have any trouble in seeing me and obtaining any files he desires to peruse. The amount of £70,000 to which I referred was money actually expended on work up

till May last. Our advice notes indicate that thousands of pounds' worth of machinery has been purchased, and the bulk of it is lying at Singapore awaiting the provision of landing facilities at Koolan Island.

Hon. C. G. Latham: Did that machinery come from England?

The MINISTER FOR MINES: I have already informed the Leader of the Opposition that machinery to the value of £24,000 was purchased in England. In the United States of America £30,000 worth was purchased and in Singapore £6,000 worth.

Hon. C. G. Latham: It must cost a good deal to send machinery here from Singapore.

The MINISTER FOR MINES: I do not know. I am giving the hon. member the advice that we have.

Mr. Rodoreda: It is the usual method. Most of the machinery comes through Singapore.

The MINISTER FOR MINES: It is not coming here; it is going to Yampi Sound. The machinery is not going to be used in Perth or Fremantle but at Yampi Sound, which is a considerable distance up the coast. In my opinion the company has been very economical and has proceeded, too, in an orderly manner, firstly to verify by expert advice and report, the size and value of the deposits; secondly to provide facilities at and on the island for ships and for the housing of the men and the installation of machinery; and thirdly, to obtain the plant required to enable it to commence production. No company, with the problem that company had to face, could be expected to do any more than has been done. Mining engineers that have seen Yampi consider that the proper methods were undertaken. The company has had many setbacks. The hon. member spoke about the number of men that went to the island and later came away. He may not know that everybody does not like to live in an isolated locality, the consequence of that dislike is that the company had some difficulty in retaining the services of all the men that were engaged. The company had to face transport problems and has also had hanging over it the threat of a Commonwealth embargo on the export of iron ore. The officials of the department with whom I have discussed the matter consider that it would have been useless for the company to endeavour to mine ore unless the conveniences that I have mentioned were available.

The Leader of the Opposition referred to the forfeiture of the leases. The ground on which the application was made was that the men were not working on the leases themselves, but on the foreshore. In this connection the member for Nedlands (Hon. N. Keenan) rightly stated that the preparatory work had to be done, and that was the reason the men were not actually engaged on the leases, but were employed on the foreshore, getting ready for the work that was to be undertaken subsequently on the leases. The Leader of the Opposition made a definite statement that the leases were being held to prevent other people from exploiting them.

Hon. C. G. Latham: I believe it.

The MINISTER FOR MINES: Let me point out that the previous holders of this lease hawked it practically all over the world, trying to interest people in it, and endeavouring to get it worked, but they were unsuccessful. For a few years they managed to interest the Japanese in the lease, but they withdrew.

Hon. C. G. Latham: And the Queensland Government?

The MINISTER FOR MINES: The people that owned the lease made no attempt to work it; they merely hawked it and tried to sell it. When they were unsuccessful, somebody else stepped in. The Leader of the Opposition might be interested to know that a lease at Cockatoo Island is held by a company in Australia. It has been held much longer than Koolan Island has been held by Brasserts Ltd., and not nearly so much work has been done at Cockatoo Island.

Hon. C. G. Latham: Is not your department aware that there was another Japanese firm anxious to get hold of Koolan Island? You have mentioned nothing of that.

The MINISTER FOR MINES: I do not know what my department is aware of; I am endeavouring to reply to some of the points raised by the Leader of the Opposition.

Hon. C. G. Latham: That is one of them. I said there was another Japanese company anxious to get Koolan Island.

The MINISTER FOR MINES: Seeing that this is the first speech I have made on the floor of the House for five years, I think

the hon. member should refrain from interrupting.

Hon. C. G. Latham: But you are a past master at interrupting.

The MINISTER FOR MINES: Not so much of the "past." When perusing the file and considering the embargo and the circumstances that led to the embargo, I found some difficulty in understanding the attitude of the Commonwealth Government. Our information of the State's iron ore deposits, which are fairly extensive, has been published in various geological bulletins and reports, and over the years has always been available. The Commonwealth Government was supplied with all the information in March, 1937. In that month every bit of information we had about our iron ore deposits was supplied to the Commonwealth. In August, 1937, the Prime Minister issued a statement containing the following paragraph:—

In connection with the potential supplies of iron ore, a preliminary survey has been made, which shows very considerable deposits in sight, sufficient for all our requirements for a great many years ahead.

Hon. C. G. Latham: He also said something else.

The MINISTER FOR MINES: From August, 1937, to the time when the embargo was placed on the export of iron ore, the information about the State deposits had not been supplemented. I wish to emphasise the point that not a skerrick of information had been supplied to the Commonwealth between the time the Prime Minister made that statement and the time the embargo was placed on the export of iron ore. Therefore, it is somewhat difficult to understand the reason that actuated the Commonwealth, and one wonders just what the reason was. As a matter of fact, no particular reason has been given, except——

Mr. Seward: What!

The MINISTER FOR MINES: I have not yet finished what I was about to say.

Mr. Seward: You said that no particular reason had been given.

The MINISTER FOR MINES: And I was about to add, except that there was a likelihood of a diminution in the iron ore reserves of Australia. That is the only reason given and that is the only reason the department is aware of. We disagree with that statement because, in Western Australia particularly, no great survey has been made of the iron ore deposits. With the exception of casual surveys—and very casual at that—there has been no general survey of the iron ore deposits of Western Australia. Notwithstanding that fact, we know there are considerable iron ore bodies in the State, apart from the very high-grade deposits of Koolan and Cockatoo Islands. These other deposits are—

(a) Murchison: Wilgie Mia, in the Weld Range, a deposit estimated to contain between 26 and 27 million tons above the level of the plain. The deposit is of exceedingly high grade.

Gabanintha, east of Nannine, a deposit estimated to contain 1,300,000 tons of almost pure iron.

Mts. Hale, Taylor, Matthew and Yarramecdie, a range of hills remarkably prolific in iron-bearing schists. No estimates of the tonnage available have yet been attempted, but the description given at various times by our geologists indicate that the quantities are very considerable and of high grade. A grab sample taken just south of the summit of Mt. Matthew gave a result of 66.6 per cent. of metallic iron. Another sample from this vicinity, lodged with the Government by a prospector quite recently, assayed 67.91 metallic iron.

Mr. Stubbs: How far from the coast would those deposits be situated?

The MINISTER FOR MINES: A fair distance, but they are in Western Australia.

Mt. Narryer and Mt. Gould are also known to contain considerable tonnages of high class ore, but again no estimates of quantity have so far been made.

These localities by no means exhaust the list of probable iron ore deposits in the Murchison goldfields. Many other deposits have been reported but so far have not been examined.

Yalgoo: Mt. Gibson—contains an iron deposit reported to hold not less than 10 million tons of high grade ore.

Tallering Peak likewise is known to be a deposit of considerable extent, but never estimated as to quantity.

(b) Yilgarn: Mt. Caudan has a high grade deposit which has been intersected by bore holes at depths between 495 and 730 feet below the surface. It was found that the iron oxides exposed on the surface passed into iron carbonate and magnetic iron. Considerable quantities of high grade iron ore should be available here.

Koolyanobbing, in the North Yilgarn: Deposits have been previously estimated at 1,000,000 tons. A recent re-examination of the deposit by Geologist Ellis has been made, and he states that the earlier estimate is most conservative and that there are several

million tons, while further deposits in the vicinity have been located by his party.

It is interesting to note that this is only deposit that has been re-examined since the argument with the Commonwealth arose, and there, instead of having 1,000,000 tons, we have several million tons.

Hon. C. G. Latham: That was only a superficial examination.

The MINISTER FOR MINES: But sufficient to indicate that there are several million tons in that deposit.

Hon. C. G. Latham: You ought to hear what the Federal Minister said to-day about some of the estimates.

The MINISTER FOR MINES: Our geologists know their work.

Hon. C. G. Latham: He said it was a geologist that determined the quantity, and when the Commonwealth came to check it, there was not one-tenth of the quantity that had been reported.

The MINISTER FOR MINES: And one geologist estimated the quantity in a deposit without ever seeing it at all.

(d) Wiluna, Pilbara, Ashburton, Gascoyne, North Coolgardie and Phillips River also have deposits, and future examination, it is safe to say, will add considerably to tonnages at present known to be available.

The Commonwealth Geological Adviser, in reporting to his Government before he had examined the deposits, said that the estimates of the Yampi Sound tonnage assumed a depth of profitable mining that was almost certainly excessive in the existing economic conditions in Australia. When Mr. A. Montgomery was State Mining Engineer, he spent some time in examining the deposit, and estimated the tonnage above high water mark at 97 millions, most of which, he said, would be obtained by open quarrying. He proceeded to say that the quantity obtainable by mining must be enormously greater. I discussed with the present State Mining Engineer the question of mining for iron below the surface. He informed me that, as iron ore might easily be mined at a cost of less than 10s. per ton, he did not see why any hard and fast rule should be laid down concerning the depth at which, below the surface, it could profitably be mined. Some people assume that it would be too costly to mine iron ore below the surface, but our State Mining Engineer suggests otherwise. It is interesting to note that in 1935-36 not less than 30,985,501 tons of iron, being 38 per cent. of the total production of the United States, was derived from underground workings. Evidently, America is able to produce from various depths below the surface, 38 per cent. of the iron used in that country.

Mr. Seward: Some iron ore mines go down to 200 feet below the surface.

The MINISTER FOR MINES: The Leader of the Opposition referred to what the Commonwealth adviser had said. That official stated that the cost of transport to the coast of ore from other deposits rendered that ore valueless. Obviously the freight to the coast would add to the cost of delivering iron to the smelter. It is noteworthy that practically the only Australian production of iron ore at the moment comes from Iron Knob in South Australia. The ore is railed 30 miles to the coast, and shipped to the smelters at Newcastle, approximately another 1,500 miles. I do not know whether the Broken Hill Proprietary Company could profitably handle that ore if it had to be transported any greater distance. The fact remains, however, that the company made a very substantial profit on last year's operations. The embargo by the Commonwealth Government will indefinitely postpone any development of the iron ore deposits in Western Australia, regardless of whether those deposits can be said to be accessible. The development of our iron deposits will be deferred, and the State will be deprived of the benefit that would have accrued from employment in the industry, and international trade. It is absurd for anyone to attempt to predict what will happen with respect to iron ore in the ensuing 50 or 100 years. According to estimates we have sufficient accessible iron ore to meet our requirements for the best part of another 100 years. In view of the improved methods of transport, and all the scientific development that has taken place in mining over the last 50 years, he would be an optimist who would predict what will happen in Australia in respect of iron ore during the next 100 years. We know it is difficult to make such a prediction. In 1927 it was stated that American oil wells were running out; yet to-day there still seems to be plenty of oil there. Not many years ago some members predicted that Kalgoorlie would not last long, but it is still in existence. When reading over the report of the Transvaal Chamber of Mines for 1937 I came

across an interesting passage. This is contained in the Presidential address by Dr. P. M. Anderson—

By some political critics the view is again being expressed that, as mining in South Africa is a wasting asset, there will soon be only holes in the ground, nothing of the mining industry being left but an empty shell, and that salvation lies in replacing our declining mineral resources as rapidly as possible by developing some other unspecified asset which will maintain the population and sustain the economic fabric of the Union. One suspects that this picture is presented mainly with the idea of justifying a policy of high taxation and other charges not justified by budgetary requirements. While it is sensible that the country should seek to develop other national resources concurrently with its minerals, I suggest that it is fundamental to foster and encourage at all times the one industry which alone has made our national development possible and which alone can maintain our economic existence.

Minerals are of no value whatever until they are turned to account by the enterprise of those who contribute the capital, the labour, and foresight to exploit them successfully. The special advantage of mining as an industry is the rapidity with which its operations make for the accumulation of national wealth.

Beyond the areas now under exploitation or exploration there are still more known areas of gold, coal, base metals and minerals to maintain the mining industry of South Africa for generations to come. Who can tell what methods of prospecting may be devised to locate mineral resources as yet unknown? Many of the oldest countries of the world, after centuries of work, are still carrying on mining activity on a substantial scale. Why should not South Africa, in the ages to come, be doing the same?

This appeals to me as being very appropriate to Australia. It would be very difficult to predict what scientific methods of finding minerals are going to be applied in Australia or any part of the world during the next 50 years. Improved means of transport during the next 50 years might make apparently inaccessible ore bodies very accessible to those who wish to exploit them. Already we have had that experience in Western Australia. Only 38 years ago, when I came to this State, I thought Wiluna was one of the most inaccessible places I had ever heard of. I walked from Cue to Peak Hill, a distance of 175 miles, and just before I got there I found a road coming in from Wiluna. A notice on the post indicated that it was 185 miles away. Someone had walked the distance, because he wrote on the notice "Every inch of it." Thus less than 40 years ago Wiluna was a very inaccessible place.

Mr. Sampson: Lake Way, it was then.

The MINISTER FOR MINES: Yes, at that time. To-day Wiluna may be described as almost a thriving city, with railway and other means of transport including an aeroplane service. If that development can take place in less than 40 years, what may happen in the next 100 years with the continual improvement in transport and in scientific methods of dealing with refractory ores. It may be said that the price of gold was a factor in the development of considerable bodies of refractory gold-bearing ores in this State. The new methods that have been adopted, however, would have made it possible for mining people to work profitably much lower grades of ore than were previously handled. Without such methods it would hardly have been possible to treat all the dumps and tailings that are now being put through mining plants. What has happened in the matter of gold can easily happen with other minerals in the State. Western Australia is particularly rich in minerals. Some people say the minerals are inaccessible, and others declare that not sufficient is known about them. As Dr. Anderson, President of the Transvaal Chamber of Mines said, no one can predict what is likely to happen in that regard during the next 50 or 100 years. In fact, no one can predict what will happen with regard to iron ore deposits within the next fifty or a hundred years. I venture to say that nobody knows whether iron ore will be needed after the next fifty or a hundred years. Yet to-day we find ourselves with a huge body of iron ore which a country able to use the ore wants, and we are told that the only reason for the embargo is that the Yampi Sound deposits are not all they were thought to be. A general survey of all iron deposits in Australia is to be made. That survey has already begun in this State. It is to be a minute survey, occupying two or three years. During those two or three years, in my opinion, the development of Yampi Sound might well have proceeded. The records of our Mines Department leave no doubt that during the next two or three years it will be ascertained that Australian deposits of iron ore, accessible or at present inaccessible, are ample to supply Australian requirements for the next hundred years,

assuming that iron ore will be required throughout that period. During the two or three years in question, however, the Yampi Sound iron ore deposits will simply remain, instead of being utilised for the benefit of the people of this State; and at the end of those two or three years a fresh start will have to be made on the work that has been in progress during the last seven or eight months.

On motion by Mr. Rodoreda, debate adjourned.

BILL—UNIVERSITY BUILDING.

Second Reading.

Debate resumed from the 1st September.

HON. P. D. FERGUSON (Irwin-Moore) [5.13]: It is not conceivable that any objection should be raised to the Bill, which is the result of a good many years' work on behalf of people who are interested in the provision of laboratories and other facilities required for the purpose of investigation into the problems of our agricultural and pastoral industries. For some years now conferences on the subject have been held between representatives of the University, the Department of Agriculture, and farmers' and pastoralists' associations. The measure is the embodiment of various proposals agreed to at those conferences. It is designed to enable the University to spend £14,000 of its funds on buildings and equipment, and it authorises the Government to guarantee payment of interest on the amount expended and also to provide a sinking fund.

Numerous research problems are connected with the allied agricultural and pastoral industries. In many respects officers of the Council of Scientific and Industrial Research have done wonderful work in their solution. Particularly is this the case in the Eastern States, where laboratory facilities have been provided. It is only natural that the older and wealthier States should already have secured these facilities. As a result they have been enabled to take much greater advantage of the scientific work of officers of the Council of Scientific and Industrial Research. Because Western Australia has not possessed such facilities, the Council's activities here have been restricted. Many problems associated with agriculture are awaiting solution. Some are already solved; others it has been shown admit of solution. The officers of the C.S.I.R., with the officers of our Department of Agriculture, have achieved some marvellous results in the field of research, despite the meagre facilities that have been available in this State. However, as one problem is solved others arise. Probably there always will be problems calling for solution in connection with our agricultural and pastoral industries, especially problems relating to animal diseases and plant pests. As the industries grow older, such problems are likely to increase. Whilst I could have wished that research laboratories would be provided by the State in association with our Department of Agriculture, I realise the necessity for holding out both hands for such laboratories, appliances and equipment as we can secure. I believe that the facilities about to be established and in the first instance financed by the University will do what is necessary to meet a demand that has long been insistent in Western Australia. There is no reason why the proposals submitted by the Minister for Agriculture for the provision of buildings and facilities should not prove eminently successful. The Minister told us that there was and that there would be no conflict between the Department of Agriculture and the University, as of course there should not be. Friction must be avoided at all costs; and I believe it will be, because the officers of the University and those of our Department of Agriculture and of the C.S.I.R. realise that the best interests of the agricultural and pastoral industries and of the State generally, and their own best interests as scientific workers, will be conserved by the closest co-operation. Undoubtedly there is a large field in which the enterprise and energy of the agricultural scientists of Australia can be utilised. Agricultural and pastoral research, especially the training of students in all branches of these allied interests, are of vital importance to those who seek to make a livelihood in the industries concerned. That remark applies with the greatest force in these days when prices of primary products are at so low an ebb and when those engaged in the primary industries are experiencing tremendous difficulties in making ends meet.

The Bill provides that the University erect the buildings and instal the neces-

sary equipment within two years. I understand that the work is well under way and before long will be completed. The total cost should not exceed £14,000. The Government will pay 4 per cent. per annum interest on the cost, and also provide a sinking fund at the rate of 10s. per cent. per annum to be paid until the total cost shall have been refunded to the University. I do not know over what period these payments will need to extend, but the point is not vital. Interest and sinking fund will continue to be paid until the entire cost has been met by the State. Under these arrangements, I believe that both the building and the equipment will be cheaply obtained. The State requires these facilities and their provision will enable problems that confront us to-day to be solved effectively. Individual farmers and pastoralists are not capable of securing that end by their own efforts. The work that will be carried out will prove of tremendous value to Western Australia. In the long run I imagine that the method adopted will prove the cheapest and most economical that the State could follow in order to provide the necessary facilities. Had the Government endeavoured to provide them by any other means, I doubt very much whether they would have proved equally efficient or capable of rendering such a valuable return, not only to the State itself but to its industries, as we can look forward to from the University, with the assistance of the officers of the Department of Agriculture and the Council of Scientific and Industrial Research. What we require is results, and the facilities to be provided will enable Western Australia to secure results similar to those that have proved of inestimable benefit in other parts of the Commonwealth where laboratories have already been provided.

Mr. SPEAKER: Will the member for Irwin-Moore resume his seat? I would like to suggest to members that some of the conversations that are proceeding around the Chamber should cease. There are just a few too many going on at the one time. The hon. member may proceed.

Hon. P. D. FERGUSON: Western Australia has contributed its share towards the cost of the work of the Council of Scientific and Industrial Research, in common with other States of the Commonwealth, and is entitled to a fair share of the results of the labours of the expert officers engaged in that branch of the Commonwealth service. Just as we pay our proportion towards the cost of that work, so are we entitled to receive benefits. Unless Western Australia is prepared to provide the necessary facilities, the Council of Scientific and Industrial Research, as it has pointed out to us on several occasions, will be unable to furnish the assistance we desire. That assistance can be furnished only when the State provides the facilities required. Therefore, the Government will be well advised to make that provision so that the State and those associated with industry here will derive some of the benefits accruing from the undoubtedly efficient services rendered in other States by the officers of the Council of Scientific and Industrial Research. I have much pleasure in supporting the second reading of the Bill.

MR. McDONALD (West Perth) [5.23]: I support the second reading of the Bill. Nowadays it is not necessary to make out a case for the application of science to industry, whether the latter be secondary or primary. Other countries have exerted every endeavour to encourage the minds of the scientists being brought to bear on the problems of industry. The more we are able to work in that direction, within, of course, reasonable limits, the better it will be for Western Australia because in the battle for markets and in the matter of costs, the dominating factors are not only good seasons, favourable soil, and efficient farming or manufacturing. Those factors contribute to a successful result, but that objective can be aided by the advice and direction of men of science. Apart from this indication of my support of the Bill, I wish merely to add that the measure authorises a departure from a trust made in favour of the University of Western Australia. Parliament should at all times be careful when dealing with legislation that affects trusts. We expect people to establish trusts and provide endowments for the protection of their families, and we recognise those people as good judges of what the trusts should cover and what provisions should apply. On the other hand, we also encourage people to provide endowments—and I hope there will be more of them as the wealth of the State increases—that will be of benefit to the public through encouragement given to our institutions of learning and of charity. We want such people to feel that if they establish en-

dowments by which money is to be expended in certain directions in which the persons concerned have taken a deep interest during their lives, their intentions will not lightly be interfered with by legislative action. I think it proper to make these observations, although I do not intend to connect them up with the Bill now before the House. Bearing in mind the intention of the founder of the trust, I think the Bill may be said fairly to be within the scope of his intentions when providing the funds out of which this building is to be erected. The Bill is one that we can justifiably support insofar as it involves a departure from the terms of the trust, for it is a measure that may be of great importance in assisting the State and in helping to increase the prosperity of those engaged in its industries.

MR. SEWARD (Pingelly) [5.27]: I do not wish to say very much in support of the Bill, but having approached the Government several times during my short career in this Chamber, to establish laboratories for the purposes outlined in the Bill, I am naturally pleased to know that the work is to be undertaken. The provision of these facilities will be of the utmost value to Western Australia. I was not present when the Minister moved the second reading of the Bill, but I notice that he said precautions were being taken to prevent overlapping. That is most satisfactory. That difficulty has been advanced in past years when anything of this description was mooted, and the likelihood of the efforts of the University overlapping those of the Agricultural Department was stressed as a difficulty to be faced. I am pleased that that phase has been overcome. I join with the Minister in paying a tribute to the exceedingly valuable work carried out by the officers of the department in past years despite the adverse circumstances under which they were expected to attend to their duties. Those departmental officers include highly capable men, and it is a tribute to their ability that they have been able to carry out such effective work despite the trying conditions under which they have to labour. I hope that the facilities shortly to be available to them will enable those officers to carry out their work under more favourable conditions, and that the laboratories at the University will prove of great advantage to them in their varied tasks. I notice the Minister indicated that there would be on account of this building, an annual charge of £630 against Consolidated Revenue. The Premier interjected that the payments would be extended over 57 years. That would represent a total cost of about £40,000 to the State. I do not know whether that is the estimated cost of the building and equipment. The amount seems very large, and I draw attention to the point in the hope that it will be cleared up by the Minister. The Minister mentioned another particular phase to which I desire to refer. He was not in the House when I spoke on the Address-in-reply debate. He remarked on the possibility of training students in veterinary work at the University laboratories. If he is in favour of that being done, I can assure him that he is heading for failure.

The Minister for Agriculture: There is no suggestion of that.

Mr. SEWARD: I am glad to have the Minister's assurance. The School of Veterinary Science at the Melbourne University has been closed. It was found that there was a lack of adequate support and that to draw the prospective students from the metropolitan area and from positions in the city represented a hopeless proposition. As I indicated, if such a school were established either at Narrogin or at another agricultural college, where students drawn from the farms and keenly interested, could give the work their attention, we would accomplish the desired end. This is a field that must be explored for our future veterinary surgeons. As the Minister has stated that there is no intention to engage in that work at the University, I need say no more. I am pleased to give my support to the Bill and trust it will go through.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

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

BILL — GERALDTON SAILORS AND SOLDIERS' MEMORIAL INSTITUTE (TRUST PROPERTY DISPOSITION).

Second Reading.

Debate resumed from the 1st September.

MR. THORN (Toodyay) [5.35]: Listening to the Premier when he introduced the Bill the other evening, I gathered from his re-

marks that the returned soldiers of Geraldton and the trustees associated with them desired to dispose of their old home known as The Hostel and to devote the proceeds to reducing the overdraft on Birdwood House. In March last I had the privilege of visiting Geraldton as the official representative of the State executive of the returned soldiers' movement, and while at that town I inspected Birdwood House for the first time, and the old premises as well. The returned soldiers of Geraldton are very fortunate in having such a wonderful home as Birdwood House. The appointments are excellent although, in comparison with Anzac House, they are on a smaller scale. Members can safely accept the statement made by the Premier and agree to the Bill without dissent. It is a wise move to dispose of the old premises, which are not revenue-producing to any extent, and the maintenance charges on which would be expensive. It is far better for the trustees to dispose of that building and use the proceeds for the reduction of the overdraft, which, I believe, stands at £3,300. Really, it is very good business to do what is proposed by the Bill, and seeing that those associated with the movement, and the civilians who have done so much in the past towards assisting the returned soldiers to acquire the new home, are in agreement with the proposal, and that it is also the desire of the Premier, who represents the district in this House, it gives me pleasure to support the second reading.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

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

BILL—STATE GOVERNMENT INSURANCE OFFICE.

In Committee.

Resumed from the 1st September.

Mr. Sleeman in the Chair; the Minister for Employment in charge of the Bill.

Clause 9—State Government Insurance Office to be deemed to be an approved incorporated insurance office for the purposes of the Workers' Compensation Act, 1912-1934 (partly considered):

Mr. WATTS: The Minister mentioned he would bring forward an amendment which might obviate the necessity for making other amendments. I shall be glad to know what the Minister has done.

The MINISTER FOR EMPLOYMENT: Consideration was given to the suggestion made by the member for Katanning (Mr. Watts), but the object he seeks to achieve *cannot be attained in this Bill.* Clause 9 provides that the State Insurance Office, when legalised, may receive approval under Section 10 of the Workers' Compensation Act. That would place the State Insurance Office in the same position as that in which incorporated insurance offices are now placed under Section 10 of the Workers' Compensation Act. Provision cannot be made in this Bill for the State Insurance Office to receive approval under that Act. To frame a satisfactory amendment of the clause in the way suggested would be difficult. In my opinion, therefore, the clause should be passed as printed. The question can very well be considered when the Bill to amend the Workers' Compensation Act is under discussion. The only assurance that I can give on the point raised by the hon. member is that consideration will be given to it when the State Insurance Office is in a position to receive equal consideration with all the other insurance offices.

Mr. McDONALD: When the Workers' Compensation Act was passed, the State Insurance Office was not in existence. For sound reasons Parliament provided that persons insuring against loss under the Workers' Compensation Act must insure with an approved, incorporated insurance office. The idea was that control could be exercised by the Ministerial head to make certain that insurance business of that kind was not carried on by offices which had insufficient reserves or funds to meet the obligations that they might incur. At that time, there was no doubt that all insurance offices would receive equal treatment; each would be viewed in the same light by the Administration. Since then, however, the State Insurance Office has become a factor in the insurance world. This Bill, which I have not opposed, is designed to legalise the State Insurance Office so as to enable it to carry on business in a certain part of the insurance field, the important part dealing with workers' compensation, sickness, personal accident and disease, and past transactions are being reo-

tified. The position in future will be that the State Insurance Office will be catering for workers' compensation insurance business in competition with other insurance offices. The present Minister may not always be in power and his successor may have a partiality for State institutions. The approval that has been spoken of is a Ministerial power, not a Parliamentary power, and a Minister's partiality might lead him to approve of the State Insurance Office and not to approve of the private insurance offices. If the State Insurance Office is to carry on this branch of the insurance business, Parliament should make it clear that there must be no discrimination between the State Insurance Office and the private insurance offices. That point should be made clear by legislation, not by a statement of the Minister in diplomatic terms that every consideration will be given at some future date to the question of approving private offices. This objective can be attained in two ways, by an amendment of the section now before the Committee, or by an amendment of Section 10 of the Workers' Compensation Act. The latter alternative would probably be preferable. I suggest the Minister should make a choice of either of these alternatives. Perhaps consideration of the clause could be deferred until the House has dealt with Section 10 of the Workers' Compensation Act. The two provisions could then be made complementary to each other. Such a course would make it clear that Parliament intends there shall be no monopoly by private offices or by the State office, but that all the offices shall be allowed to compete on fair and equal terms. The clause provides that the State Insurance Office shall be capable of being approved by the Minister within the meaning and for the purposes of Section 10 of the Workers' Compensation Act, 1912-1934. I move an amendment—

That the following proviso be added to Clause 9:—"Provided that the State Insurance Office shall be entitled to such approval only if and so long as the like approval is extended to all other incorporated insurance offices carrying on insurance business in the State."

If the Minister would like to achieve the same purpose by amending Section 10 of the Workers' Compensation Act, this clause could be postponed until such amendment was brought before the House.

The MINISTER FOR EMPLOYMENT: Approval for insurance offices is provided for in Section 10 of the Workers' Compensation Act, which sets out the source from which approval is to come, and the class of insurance office to which it can be given. This clause does not provide for approval to be granted to any insurance office, not even to the State Insurance Office; nor would it be proper to provide in the Bill for approval to be given to any particular office in view of the fact that legislation is already in existence in the form of the Workers' Compensation Act, which sets out the method to be adopted in the granting of approval and the class of insurance office to which such approval shall be granted. I shall be glad, therefore, to have the Chairman's ruling as to whether there can be included in the Bill a provision that has the object of granting approval to private insurance offices in the event of the Minister taking action under Section 10 of the Workers' Compensation Act to grant approval under that Act to the State Insurance Office or, for that matter, any other office.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I rule the amendment out of order.

Mr. McDONALD: In those circumstances I invite the Minister to postpone further consideration of the clause until he can bring down an amendment to Section 10 of the Workers' Compensation Act. I do so not because I am taking any trivial objection to the clause but because I am seeking to establish a principle of some importance: namely, that no Minister should be given power to create a monopoly. Unless a provision is inserted in Section 10 of the Workers' Compensation Act, or the amendment to this clause is accepted, the Minister will be able to create a monopoly in favour of the State office. I am not suggesting that he or the present Government would do so, but I do not intend that that power shall be vested in any Minister. In Queensland, similar power was given to a Minister and it was exercised to create a monopoly or to exclude private offices also in the insurance business. The question was brought before the courts, and taken to the Privy Council; but Parliament had placed the decision in the hands of the Minister and he had legal power to exercise his authority. If this clause is passed, and Section 10 of the Workers' Compensation Act is not amended, any Government will be able to grant approval to the State office only, and withhold approval from all private offices; in other words, to grant a

monopoly to one institution. That is a power Parliament should not grant to any Government or any Minister. If the Minister is not prepared to postpone the further consideration of the clause until he brings down an amendment to the Workers' Compensation Act to ensure there will be no monopoly, I shall vote against the clause, because the principle is important—just as important to the Government side of the House as to the Opposition. Parliament should state in clear words whether it desires a monopoly to be granted. If not, it should clearly be stated that there shall be no monopoly.

The MINISTER FOR EMPLOYMENT: I see no necessity to postpone consideration of the clause. We could do nothing under this provision to achieve what the member for West Perth has in mind. Whatever might be decided when the Workers' Compensation Act Amendment Bill is discussed cannot affect this provision. All that the clause seeks to do is to place the State Insurance Office on a footing similar to that now occupied by the private insurance companies. Every private insurance company has a right to obtain approval, and the State Insurance Office will not possess that right until it is legalised. Because the State Insurance Office has never been in a position to obtain approval under Section 10 of the Workers' Compensation Act, no private company has been approved under that section. Members opposite were in power from 1930 to 1933, and could easily have granted approval to any one company or any number of private companies under Section 10 of the Workers' Compensation Act. Such approval was not granted evidently because the Government of the day was not in a position also to give approval to the State Insurance Office. When the Bill to amend the Workers' Compensation Act is discussed, the question whether some words should be inserted in Section 10 to prevent the granting of a monopoly to any office can be debated and decided. At present Section 10 allows absolute discretion to the Minister. He has power to deal with private insurance offices individually and to approve or disapprove of any one of them. That discretionary power, given from the outset, has been retained because Parliament felt that certain companies might not merit approval. When the clause bearing on Section 10 of the Compensation Act is before us consideration will be given to the representations made, and it might be possible to meet the objections raised and ensure that other insurance companies shall receive consideration.

Hon. N. Keenan: Not consideration, but equal treatment.

The MINISTER FOR EMPLOYMENT: That point could also be considered, but obviously it cannot be considered under this Bill. Nothing would be gained by postponing consideration of this clause.

Mr. MARSHALL: If we considered the burden of insurance on industry we would be doing something worth while.

Hon. C. G. Latham: It is far in excess of the benefits.

Mr. MARSHALL: Yes. The member for West Perth was not in Parliament at the time his party supported a monopoly of workers' compensation insurance. A Bill to give the State Insurance Office a complete monopoly was brought down.

Hon. C. G. Latham: Nothing of the sort.

Mr. MARSHALL: The Bill was defeated in another place because it gave that monopoly. To-day there is a change of face on the part of the Opposition. Members opposite have no objection to private companies enjoying a monopoly of all other forms of insurance outside employers' liability insurance. Every Bill the Government has introduced making it lawful for the State Insurance Office to transact forms of insurance, apart from those of employers' liability and workers' compensation, has been defeated. The argument is lopsided. With incorporated companies there is no such thing as competition as to rates. The only competition engaged in is for the business itself.

Mr. McDonald: They do compete with each other.

Mr. MARSHALL: Their rates are adjusted by the Underwriters' Association.

Mr. McDonald: Only in part.

Mr. MARSHALL: That is the part which is most vital to industry. We know the tactics of private insurance companies. The State Insurance Office should be given a monopoly so that premiums on industry might be reduced. Insurance is a heavy obligation upon all forms of industry.

Mr. McDonald: Are you letting the cat out of the bag?

Mr. MARSHALL: When the State Insurance Office was established, the private companies informed the then Minister for

Labour that they did not propose to quote for third schedule business, and that the State office could have it all. In the mining industry insurance becomes an extortionate and almost a strangling liability. If the business is divided amongst all the companies in operation, and the administrative costs are correspondingly increased, the premiums on the industry must rise, and gold mining will go out of existance. The State Insurance Office can never be an incorporated body. All we want to do is to give it status as such a body. When we ask for that, members opposite raise their hands in horror lest the State Insurance Office should get a monopoly of the so-called unprofitable business. I approve of the clause, but feel that we ought to embody in the Bill something to relieve the enormous financial obligation cast upon industry. We shall never give that relief if we spread the business over dozens of companies. They will have their pound of flesh, no matter who suffers.

Sitting suspended from 6.15 to 7.30 p.m.

Mr. MARSHALL: On scores of occasions we have permitted clauses containing such words as "the Minister may at his discretion" and "the Governor may by proclamation" to go through without discussion. Why should the Committee hesitate to give the Minister the power now desired, seeing that the State Insurance Office can never become an incorporated body? Under Section 10 of the Workers' Compensation Act the Minister has already power to approve or disapprove of companies. In connection with this clause, however, the member for West Perth wants a guarantee that in no circumstances shall workers' compensation insurance be confined to the State. The clause is a generous effort to give effect to the select committee's report. Seemingly there are persons who want to make quite sure that certain commercial bodies shall not be excluded. The Opposition has not criticised the clause fairly.

Hon. C. G. LATHAM: I shall vote against the clause. The member for Murchison says the clause gives no preferential right to the State Insurance Office; but it does, of course. The clause is linked to Section 10 of the Workers' Compensation Act. If there had been an approved company under Section 10, insurance would have been compulsory. The clause is all right if intended to give a monopoly to the State Insurance Office.

Ministerial members: Oh!

Hon. C. G. LATHAM: If my reasons for saying so are desired, I shall not hesitate to state them. We should do now something similar to what was done in 1931. I agree with the member for Murchison that workers' compensation is far too heavy a burden on industry. The amounts granted by way of compensation are not too heavy, but the incidental cost is. The Minister said that we, when in office, made no attempt to amend the Workers' Compensation Act. However, we did; and we tried especially to lessen the cost. We could not have done anything except approve of every company. The State Insurance Office had some workers' compensation business at that time, though illegally. This clause is an attempt to legalise all the workers' compensation business transacted by the office since it came into existence. If Parliament does not by some means control the charges of medical men and, in some cases, the charges of hospitals, not much good can result. I am not prepared to grant a monopoly to the State Insurance Office. While I did not question your ruling on the amendment, Mr. Chairman, this clause does refer to Section 10 of the Workers' Compensation Act. Would not by far the better course be simply to provide that the State Government Insurance Office shall be regarded as an insurance company capable of being approved by the Governor in Council?

The Premier: You agree with that principle?

Hon. C. G. LATHAM: I do, if other companies are to be approved as well.

The Minister for Employment: You cannot bring them in under this Bill.

Hon. C. G. LATHAM: You could have approved of those companies before.

The Minister for Employment: And so could you.

Hon. C. G. LATHAM: I have pointed out what the position was when we were in power. It would have been necessary to introduce a Bill to deal with it, and that might have upset the whole of the arrangements regarding the risks that were carried at that time. We know what can happen when legislation is passed without proper consideration. If we agree to the clause as it stands, the Minister will be able to approve of the department as an incorporated

insurance office to be approved by the Minister for the purposes of Section 10 of the Workers' Compensation Act, to the exclusion of the private companies.

The Minister for Employment: And the Government could also approve of the other companies, and exclude the State office.

Hon. C. G. LATHAM: But the Minister has made no such attempt. During 13 years of Labour Administration and three years of National-Country Party Administration, no effort has been made to approve of those other companies.

The Minister for Employment: By either your Government or by Labour Governments.

Hon. C. G. LATHAM: We endeavoured to pool all the premiums so as to provide adequate and fair compensation at much less cost than is apparent to-day. I agree with the member for Murchison that the Government should hold an inquiry to ascertain the necessity for such high costs. I read the other day of an instance of a man jambing his fingernail. After walking about for two or three days, he was told he had better see a doctor. The man did so, and the doctor sent him to a hospital, called in another doctor to administer an anaesthetic, and then removed the fingernail. The State Insurance Office had to pay. If the Minister were to jamb his fingernail, he would probably put a bandage on it and wait till the nail came off.

Mr. Cross: That is a slander on the doctor concerned.

Hon. C. G. LATHAM: It is the truth! I know the facts.

Mr. Patrick: The doctors themselves resent such practices.

Hon. C. G. LATHAM: It is known that the fund has repeatedly been exploited by some doctors, and the medical profession as a whole is anxious to prevent the practice. I shall vote against the clause.

Mr. McDONALD: Parliament is now in this position: As the law stands, with Section 10 of the Workers' Compensation Act, and with the clause, under discussion, if passed, the Minister may give a monopoly to the State Insurance Office, or he may adopt the contrary view, refuse to approve of the State Insurance Office for that purpose, and allow private companies to enjoy the sole privilege of dealing with work in this particular sphere of insurance.

The Premier: Or he may approve of some of the companies.

Mr. McDONALD: That is so. The Minister may grant approval to the State Insurance Office and to all private insurance companies operating in this field, if they are in a position to meet their obligations. I suggest that Parliament should state what it means, what it wants, what it decides. It may be decided to give the State Insurance Office a monopoly. If that is the position, let Parliament say so.

The Minister for Employment: That could not be done in the Bill before members now.

Mr. McDONALD: It could be done in the two Bills that are now before Parliament. The right of the State office to conduct that insurance business can be definitely decided in the Bill now under discussion, and in the Workers' Compensation Act Amendment Bill, which is also under consideration. In those two Bills, Parliament should say what it intends regarding the approval of the State Insurance Office and outside companies. If we decide that the State shall have a monopoly, let us say so. Parliament may decide that the State office shall not be approved for this particular purpose, and if that is the decision, let us make our intention clear by means of legislation. This question is of sufficient importance to require Parliament definitely to declare its will, and not leave that function to any Government or to any Minister. I do not refer to the present Government, but to any Government. The importance of the matter is fundamental, and Parliament should make its own decision. The Minister has made statements that are so vague as to leave an impression that he has not made up his mind. He told the Committee that the matter could be debated, that it was a subject for the consideration of members. That is altogether too ambiguous. Parliament should make up its own mind. As a matter of procedure, and in fairness to those people who have been encouraged to invest their money here and to participate in the sphere of insurance, let us say what we mean. The Minister could postpone the further consideration of the clause and submit an amendment to Section 10 to be incorporated in a Bill now before the House so that all concerned shall know exactly what is the position. If the position is to remain highly ambiguous, I shall vote against the clause.

The MINISTER FOR EMPLOYMENT: Some members opposite are participating in a discussion that could more properly take

place during the consideration of another Bill.

Hon. C. G. Latham: But that Bill does not deal with this particular point.

The MINISTER FOR EMPLOYMENT: The clause under discussion simply provides that the State Government Insurance Office shall be deemed to be an incorporated insurance office capable of being approved by the Minister for the purposes of Section 10 of the Workers' Compensation Act. Every private insurance office in Western Australia is now in that position and is entitled to be approved. The clause will merely place the State Insurance Office in the same position. Surely there is nothing unreasonable about that! The suggestion is not true that the clause has been deliberately drafted and included in the Bill with the object of giving a monopoly to the State Insurance Office.

Mr. McDonald: I did not suggest that.

The MINISTER FOR EMPLOYMENT: There was no justification whatever for such a charge being made. It is desirable that discussions shall take place in this House and in the Legislative Council regarding the methods that should be adopted for the approval of insurance companies to transact insurance business under the Workers' Compensation Act. Logically, that debate should take place when the Bill to amend the Workers' Compensation Act is under discussion, because that Act sets out the method to be followed in approving insurance companies. We only confuse the issue by arguing now the merits or demerits of giving approval to all offices, or to one or any of them.

Hon. C. G. Latham: But the Workers' Compensation Act does not apply to this matter at all. The Chairman will not allow us to discuss something that is not before the Committee.

The MINISTER FOR EMPLOYMENT: The appropriate time for a debate such as we have had on this clause is when the Workers' Compensation Act Amendment Bill is before the House.

Hon. C. G. Latham: But I am referring to the subsection it is proposed to add to Section 10 of the Workers' Compensation Act.

The MINISTER FOR EMPLOYMENT: When that Bill is before us we shall be in a position to amend any portion of it.

Hon. C. G. Latham: We will not. You put us off in that way.

The CHAIRMAN: Order!

The MINISTER FOR EMPLOYMENT: I appeal to members to pass the clause as printed, as it cannot be amended in the direction suggested. If the clause is not passed, we shall legalise the State Insurance Office, but, by failing to include this provision in the Bill, we shall take away from the office the power to carry on the business in question.

Mr. WATTS: I have been trying to convince myself that the proper time to discuss this point is when the Workers' Compensation Act Amendment Bill is before the House, but I find I cannot see eye to eye with the Minister in this respect. He stated he would favourably consider an amendment of that statute so as to provide that some unincorporated insurance offices would be able to conduct workers' compensation insurance business in common with the incorporated insurance offices. If he amends the Workers' Compensation Act to achieve this purpose, then, so far as I can see, this Bill must also be amended, because provision has been made in the State Government Insurance Office Bill for the State office to be capable of being regarded as an incorporated insurance office. If the Minister intends to include some other provision such as has been suggested and partially agreed to by him——

The Minister for Employment: No.

Mr. WATTS: I also suggested that insurance companies which had complied with the Commonwealth insurance law should be capable of being approved. The clause must be amended if it is to be passed now. The request of the member for West Perth should be granted; he observed that the Minister's reply was rather vague, and that leads one to think the Minister is unwilling to declare his policy. If we hold the view that the State Insurance Office should not, in the present circumstances, have a monopoly of this insurance business, it is our duty to raise the arguments we have advanced. It would be simple for the Minister to give us a definite undertaking that if other insurance companies applied for approval they would obtain it, but apparently he is unable to give us that assurance. I hope I do not misjudge him, but it does seem there is a suggestion that a virtual monopoly might be created. The Minister is laying himself open to that charge. I think that is at

the bottom of the discussion that has taken place on this clause. Members on this side of the House are of the opinion that the present system of conducting State insurance is not a proper one. The select committee said so, and added that social insurance should be put on a different basis. The Minister has told us why the inquiry suggested by the select committee was not made, and I have no quarrel with him on that point. The member for Murchison argued that the State should have a monopoly of insurance business. He said the other companies had a monopoly of fire insurance. That is not so. There are over 60 companies, most of which are members of the Fire Underwriters' Association, but five or six companies are still outside the association and are, strictly speaking, competitors. How can there be a monopoly when the business is divided amongst 60 companies? We have the opinion of the Solicitor-General that under a similar clause in the last State Insurance Bill the Minister alone could have granted a virtual monopoly to the State Insurance Office. We have asked the Minister to remove that suspicion from our minds. Had he done so, this discussion would not have taken place. He has declined to do so and we must accordingly oppose the clause.

Mr. HUGHES: I cannot understand all the objections raised to this clause. I have been informed by insurance company managers that their companies do not want workers' compensation insurance business. They all tell me it is unprofitable. That is so, because if members will refer to page 66 of the Auditor-General's report, they will find that in ten years the State Accident Insurance Office received in premiums the sum of £744,000, and paid in claims £742,000.

Hon. C. G. Latham: And loaded the civil service with fairly high premiums to do it.

Mr. HUGHES: That left only £2,000 to cover administration expenses, which amounted to £36,000. Unless there is a charge made against the industrial diseases fund to make good the expenses, some day the State Government Insurance Office will have to meet a big deficit. Eleven years' experience of the State Government Insurance Office proves conclusively the truth of what the insurance company managers said, that workers' compensation insurance business is unprofitable. It is unfortunate that the State is going to enter the insurance business, in the same way that the Agricultural Bank has entered the banking business. The bank secures a poor type of business and does not obtain good business to balance it. That is what will happen with regard to the State Insurance Office. The office will undertake unprofitable business and will not secure profitable insurance to balance the loss. But what is the use of passing a Bill to legalise the State Insurance Office unless we make provision for the office to be approved under the Workers' Compensation Act? By hook or by crook, we should have an approved office because there is nothing so pathetic as an uninsured man—this happens repeatedly—meeting with an injury. When one seeks to collect compensation for him, the employer proves to be a man of straw and nothing is available for the victim. Nothing can be done for such a man because there are no registered insurance offices and the employer cannot be prosecuted. If we are going to have a State office to transact workers' compensation business, the natural course would seem to be not to make it an office of which the Minister may approve, but to make it straight out an approved office by omitting certain words from the clause; otherwise, the clause will nullify the whole issue. I do not think the clause has one chance in a million of becoming law; but it is necessary for us to have an approved office. I am no friend of the State Insurance Office because I have the misfortune to have to go to that office with workers' compensation claims and I know how hard and unsympathetic its officials are. It is the worst insurance office I know.

Mr. Fox: Have you ever dealt with the Queensland Company?

The CHAIRMAN: Order!

Mr. HUGHES: The other companies do not seem to want this business, and if the State office is given a monopoly, it will be at the expense of the State; because, on the figures, the more of this type of business that is transacted, the greater the loss, and ultimately the general revenue will have to make good the deficit, unless the charges to be made for industrial diseases are sufficiently high to cover the deficiency. As we have decided to pass the Bill, we should let the clause stand. I intend to support it.

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

Ayes	18
Noes	13
Majority for	5

AYES.

Mr. Coverley	Mr. Millington
Mr. Cross	Mr. Needham
Mr. Fox	Mr. Panton
Mr. Hawke	Mr. Raphael
Mr. Hegney	Mr. Rodoreda
Mr. Hughes	Mr. Willcock
Mr. Lambert	Mr. Wise
Mr. Leahy	Mr. Withers
Mr. Marshall	Mr. Wilson
	(Teller.)

NOES.

Mrs. Cardell-Oliver	Mr. Seward
Mr. Ferguson	Mr. Shearn
Mr. Latham	Mr. Thorn
Mr. McDonald	Mr. Watts
Mr. McLarty	Mr. Willmott
Mr. North	Mr. Doney
Mr. Patrick	*(Teller.)*

PAIRS.

AYES.	NOES.
Mr. Troy	Mr. Boyle
Miss Holman	Mr. Stubbs
Mr. Collier	Mr. Keenan
Mr. Styants	Mr. Mann
Mr. F. C. L. Smith	Mr. J. M. Smith
Mr. Tonkin	Mr. Warner
Mr. Nulsen	Mr. Welsh

Clause thus passed.

Title—agreed to.

Bill reported without amendment, and the report adopted.

BILL—WORKERS' COMPENSATION ACT AMENDMENT.

Second Reading.

Debate resumed from the 30th August.

MR. WATTS (Katanning) [8.9]: One finds it difficult to oppose the second reading of the Bill because much in it is definitely worthy of support. At the same time wholehearted support is not easy because the Bill contains certain provisions that, if passed, are likely to increase the cost of workers' compensation insurance which, as has already been mentioned this evening by the member for Murchison (Mr. Marshall), is in many respects far too great a charge upon those engaged in industry. One of the items I refer to is the increase from £400 to £500 in the remuneration of those entitled to claim compensation under the Act. I do not know that there is any great demand for that increase; nor have I been able to gather what its actual effect on premiums would be, which remark applies to other items in the Bill. I therefore trust that the Minister will not take the Bill to the Committee stage this evening, to the end that opportunity might be given to obtain further information that is being sought, so that if there is not going to be, as one is inclined to fear, a considerably greater burden upon industry, one might be able to consider the suggestion for the increase, thus bringing in a considerably greater number of workers, without bias. If we could arrive at the conclusion that the increase in the amount is not going to burden to any appreciable extent those who have to pay for insurance, we could view the proposal in a light very different from that in which we would have to regard it if we were of opinion that the insurance cover is likely to be considerably greater.

There are also provisions in the Bill for an increase of the amount of compensation, in certain cases, to £750. Here again the same argument and the same fact arise, that information as to the likely increased cost has not, at least so far as I am concerned, been obtained, and consequently I am not in a position to say whether the probable increase to those people employing workers is going to be sufficiently great to deter members from supporting the proposal. As to the £750, arguments apply that are rather different from those bearing on the increase to £500 in the annual remuneration. Admittedly there are times when the maximum of £600, or the calculation under the existing schedule of the Act, would not be sufficient. There are times when I should like to see, possibly, a far greater amount than £750 paid, but however generous may be our feelings in the matter, we are always forced back to a consideration of the position of those who have to pay the charges and what effect the increase will have on their competition against industrialists elsewhere who are not obliged to expend so much on insurance, and whether or not the net result of the increase will be greater employment and greater satisfaction amongst the workers concerned. I do not think we can cavil at the increase at all provided we are able to satisfy ourselves that the burden will not be too great. In a number of instances increased compensation would be more than justified.

Another provision of the Bill brings the clerk of courts into the question, requiring

him to determine whether a lump sum payment is likely to be adequate compensation for the injuries received. I find no difficulty in supporting the principle. Cases have come under my notice in which, as it were, indecent haste on the part of one party or another has resulted in a totally inadequate sum being paid to the worker for injury received, but the worker being in financial difficulties for the moment and being offered a lump sum that at first sight appears tempting, is inclined to and does accept it. The necessary agreement is filed, lodged with the clerk of courts and duly recorded, and as there has been no fraud or undue influence that could be proved, but simply indecent haste or excessive zeal, proceedings cannot be taken to set the agreement aside, though, in the ultimate show-down, the worker has been hopelessly underpaid, because he has not recovered from the injuries sustained in the period during which recovery might have been expected.

I doubt whether the clerk of courts will have a very satisfactory experience, especially in the larger centres of population, in endeavouring to unravel the problems that assuredly will be submitted to him. The principle is good, but I question whether this duty should be placed upon the clerk of courts who, in many instances, is already burdened with many other duties that would possibly prevent his giving to these matters the time and attention that they would deserve. Again, he is bound to experience considerable difficulty in arriving at an answer as to whether the amount he is to certify is an adequate one or not. Sometimes the worker has received expert advice. For sound and financial reasons, he has accepted the amount offered to him, and in such cases the work of the clerk of courts might be utterly futile. In other cases, such as the one I mentioned just now, the worker has received no advice at all, and a great deal of evidence, both medical and otherwise, would be required before the clerk of courts could arrive at a decision. I am wondering whether it would be a reasonable proposition, in the larger centres of population, to provide some special officers to deal with these matters that have not the multiple duties devolving upon a clerk of courts.

Last year we dealt with the matter, also included in this Bill, of making provision for various artificial aids that we discovered, and I think all agree, could be provided without any additional premium having to be paid by those who require insurance cover. No one, in those circumstances, could object to the clause. I feel inclined, without occupying further time of the House, to support the second reading, but I hope the Minister will afford a further opportunity, before he takes the Bill to the Committee stage, to get information to guide us on the more important points to which I have referred. I for one do not wish to oppose any part of the Bill unless there is justification for it. At present I am not able to satisfy myself whether I should be right or wrong in supporting the clauses I have mentioned —the first two in particular. Therefore I trust that additional time will be given for the consideration of the Bill.

MR. McDONALD (West Perth) [8.19]: This is a Bill not without importance. It is very different from the measure introduced into this House last year. That Bill was almost entirely acceptable to all members of the House. It dealt with matters that would effect an improvement in the workers' compensation law of the State, and did not involve any radical departure from or extensions of the workers' compensation law as then existing. This Bill goes very much further, since it proposes to effect some amendments that may be of advantage from the machinery point of view, and also extends the benefits that are at present conferred upon injured workers. I doubt whether the Minister realises how far-reaching the extensions may be on the construction of the words contained in the measure. I shall not oppose the second reading, because any Bill affecting workers' compensation is one that the House should always examine. All members desire to see the best possible conditions provided for the relatives——

Mr. SPEAKER: I draw the attention of the member for East Perth (Mr. Hughes) to Standing Order 124, under which he is not permitted to read a newspaper in the Chamber. I suggest that he put the newspaper away.

Mr. McDONALD: Any provisions by which better conditions can be given to workers who have been injured, or to the dependants of workers who have been killed by accident, will always be sympathetically considered by the House. The Bill before us, however, involves considerable extensions

in workers' compensation insurance. It proposes to extend the range of workers from those receiving £400 to those receiving £500 a year, to give increased medical benefits, and increased compensation to those who come within the terms of the Act as amended. We would find it very pleasant if, instead of giving the worker a maximum of £750 for injuries received, we could give him £2,000, and if, instead of the Bill embracing all workers receiving £500 a year, it embraced all workers receiving £1,000 a year. There is a limit to the benefits that can be conferred by this class of legislation, and that limit is governed by what industry can bear. That is the deterrent which has made the Minister stop at the point where he has stopped in the Bill. Every additional obligation cast upon the employer, in the case of an accident to a worker, means an additional cost to the employer through insurance, and an additional burden upon industry. Every additional cost to industry means that goods are priced so much higher to the consumer. It is that consideration that makes the Minister stop at the point at which he has stopped, for by going further he may be imposing a bigger burden of costs than industry can bear, and doing more harm to the workers, and the people as well, a procedure that would outweigh the benefits conferred upon those who would receive added advantages in the case of injury. It is a matter for serious consideration whether industry can afford——

Mr. Hughes: I rise to a point of order. May I draw your attention, Mr. Speaker, to Standing Order 124, which says that no member shall read from a printed newspaper or book the report of any speech——

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! There is a proper time for the hon. member to raise such a point. He should not interrupt an hon. member unless it is to refer to that hon. member's speech. If the point of order has no relation to the remarks of the member for West Perth (Mr. McDonald), the member for East Perth can raise it at another stage of the sitting.

Mr. Hughes: You improperly ruled me out of order, Mr. Speaker, and quoted Standing Order 124. I have taken the first opportunity to read that Standing Order and——

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! The member for East Perth can take the point of order at a later stage. The member for West Perth may proceed.

Mr. Hughes: If you do not allow me to take the point of order now, Mr. Speaker, I shall move that your ruling be disagreed with.

Mr. SPEAKER: Will the member for East Perth resume his seat, and I will explain the position. He can take a point of order if it has relation to the remarks being made by the member for West Perth, but he cannot interrupt the hon. member to raise a point of order on something foreign to the subject matter under discussion. If the hon. member desires to raise any point, he can do it under privilege when other members are not speaking. He has no right, neither can I permit him, to interrupt any speaker unless the point of order raised is relevant to the subject matter under discussion. The member for West Perth may proceed.

Mr. McDONALD: The House will have to consider, in relation to this Bill, whether the added burden in the way of costs on the industries of the State will perhaps more prejudicially affect the people than it will add to the benefits to be obtained by injured workers under the terms of this legislation. I propose to vote for the second reading.

Mr. SPEAKER: Will the member for West Perth please take his seat? I have already informed the member for East Perth (Mr. Hughes) that he must not read newspapers in the Chamber. If he continues to offend, I shall be forced to take drastic action. I do not desire to do that, but I must have the Standing Orders observed. Neither will I permit the member for East Perth to interrupt a speaker, as I have already said. If he persists in that action, it will be my duty to see that the privileges of other members are adequately protected.

Mr. Hughes: May I draw your attention, Mr. Speaker, to Standing Order——

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member will not discuss the Standing Orders. He must observe them. He will also resume his seat immediately.

Mr. Hughes: This Standing Order does not allow——

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! I have ordered the hon. member to resume his seat. If he does not obey, I will leave the matter in the hands of the Premier.

Mr. Hughes: Surely——

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! I have ordered the hon. member to resume his seat. I have

already explained—I am not going to do so again—that he has no right to interrupt a member during the currency of his remarks. The Standing Order definitely states that no member shall read from a printed newspaper. The hon. member must obey the Chair. If he refuses to do so immediately, I will take drastic action.

Mr. Hughes: Very well. I will take the first opportunity to question your decision, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member can raise the point under privilege, but he must not interrupt a speaker to do so. The member for West Perth may proceed.

Mr. McDONALD: I propose to vote for the second reading of the Bill, so that an opportunity may be given to members to examine its various provisions. Portions of the measure may be found worthy of acceptance by the House. I have not yet had an opportunity to ascertain the extent to which costs in connection with workers' compensation will be increased by the added benefits imposed under the Bill. That is a material factor, material not only from the point of view of the employers—least of all from their point of view—but very material from the point of view of the workers, because it all comes to a question whether the costs of industry in this State are such as to allow our manufacturers, and still more our primary producers, to carry on as compared with manufacturers and primary producers in the Eastern States. As the Minister for Employment said recently, it is our duty to build up our State manufactures, and to do that by a demand from our people for things produced in this State; but we cannot do it if our costs, compared with the prices of Eastern States goods, are so high that our goods cannot compete. Here we have a basic wage which is, on the whole, greater than the Federal basic wage in any other State. That is reflected directly in the matter of workers' compensation, because the amount of compensation paid for disability is based upon the amount of the basic wage. Therefore, although it may turn out that the total of our compensation may be less than the total fixed in one or more of the Eastern States, yet the cost of compensation based on the basic wage is just as high here as it is in any of the Eastern States. We have, as compensation, half-wages and a certain amount for each child: and in some instances the total is more than the full wage which the worker would draw if in employment.

Mr. Fox: One State pays two-thirds of the wages by way of compensation.

Mr. McDONALD: Whether the State which pays two-thirds by way of compensation also pays the same amount in respect of children is a matter of importance in determining the amounts of compensation given to injured workers in the two States.

There are some features of the Bill to which I desire shortly to refer before concluding my remarks. The first is that the Bill aims to take in all employees who draw up to £500 a year, whereas the present figure is £400 a year. This means that the area covered by workers' compensation will be considerably enlarged, and that the comparative benefits will be considerably enlarged in the case of employees drawing the higher pay between £400 and £500 a year.

Another clause provides that the worker may have an option to claim workers' compensation from the employer or to sue his employer for the civil remedy in case the circumstances give rise to a civil remedy. This part of the Bill I think may be an improvement on the terms of the existing Act. A further provision is that any sum paid during total incapacity to a worker who becomes entitled under the Second Schedule shall not be deducted from the figures set out in the Second Schedule. At present the Second Schedule payments are fixed payments for loss of limb or portion of a limb, loss of eyesight, and various conditions of that kind, and they are in substitution for the ordinary payments that are made in the case of accident which does not involve any amputation or any loss of those portions of the body referred to in the Second Schedule. But the proposed amendment will give to the injured worker who comes under the Second Schedule not only the full payment he receives as set out in the schedule but also the amounts he draws during the period of incapacity pending his recovery from the accident which involved the amputation or other injury coming under the Second Schedule. I am not satisfied that this will be an advantage to the Act, for the reason that the Second Schedule is something that has an arbitrary application in any case. One man may lose an arm without its affecting at all his power to earn a living. He may be a clerical worker and may lose a left arm without his power to earn a

living being affected at all. Another man who is a manual worker may lose a left arm and that means that he is disabled from following his calling. Yet the two men receive exactly the same compensation under the Second Schedule. So the schedule in any case is arbitrary in its application, and cannot be looked upon as really a just measure for giving compensation in cases of that description. I would prefer to see the schedule overhauled altogether, so that people disabled by some injuries in certain cases may receive more compensation, and that those to whom the injury suffered does not mean very much—say, clerical workers—may receive less compensation, because they do not need so much compensation.

Mr. Raphael: Are you going to leave the matter to the doctors?

Mr. McDONALD: Doctors do not enter into it.

Several members interjected.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. McDONALD: Provision is also made that where a worker suffers an injury in the course of his employment by reason of the negligence of a third person, and also has a right to receive compensation from the third person, he may receive compensation under the Workers' Compensation Act from the employer, and the Bill then goes on to say that if the injured worker recovers damages or compensation from the third person he shall refund to the employer the amount of compensation he has received under the Workers' Compensation Act. If I may give an illustration, a man is injured and may be entitled to £500 compensation under the Workers' Compensation Act. He may have been injured by the negligence of a third person, whom he sues and from whom he becomes entitled to £1,000 damages. Under the Bill, on receiving the £1,000 damages from the negligent third person he then refunds to the employer the amount he has received as compensation under the Workers' Compensation Act. That is obviously fair, as otherwise the worker would be paid twice in respect of the same damage. But the clause as drawn in the Bill means that unless the worker who has recovered judgment against a third person receives the whole of the damages awarded he is under no liability to repay the amount of workers' compensation received. In the illustration I gave, if the worker received judgment for £1,000 against a wrongful third person and recovered £950 he would be under no obligation to refund any part of the compensation he had received; and there would be, as I read the Bill, every incentive to him not to recover the full amount against the third person, because so long as he is short of recovering the full amount he is under no obligation to refund the amount of workers' compensation he has received. I am sure that is not the Minister's intention, and I am drawing his attention to that clause with a view to having it made clear.

Further, by the Bill it is provided that any sum paid to the worker during the period of total disability shall be in addition to any sum he may be entitled to receive under the Second Schedule. Again I do not think the Minister intended what will, as I read the Bill, be the effect of that clause. As I read the provision, it means that a man who sustains a total disability, say by total loss of eyesight or substantial loss of eyesight, becomes entitled to £750 as a lump-sum payment. Under the Bill he would also be entitled to receive £750 for total disability. That means to say he would be entitled, in respect of the damage to his eyesight, to receive £750 under the First Schedule and, under the provisions of the Bill now before members, another £750 under the Second Schedule. I do not think the Minister intended that to be the position, and I direct his attention to the draftsmanship of that portion of the Bill. I am sorry that a clause, which was included in the Bill of last year, to empower a magistrate or clerk of courts to exercise some supervision over a compensation payment by way of a lump sum, has not been incorporated in the Bill now before members. I regarded that provision in last year's Bill as some guarantee against improvidence or extravagence, and as a safeguard for the individual during his period of ill-health or disability, and I would be pleased if the Minister could see his way to include a similar provision in the Bill under discussion. These are the observations I wish to make at this stage. When I have been able to obtain from those who will be affected by the legislation, some estimate of the cost that will be added to industry in consequence of its passage, and also some guidance as to the incidence of the Bill, I hope to have something further to say on the various clauses during the Committee stage. I hope the Minister will permit that stage to remain over until Thursday to

enable business interests to study the Bill, which is of great importance to them as well as to the workers. If those interests are not able to complete their study of the measure and its effect by Thursday, I trust the Minister will allow the Committee stage to remain in abeyance until the following Tuesday.

Mr. HUGHES: On a point of privilege, Mr. Speaker——

Mr. SPEAKER: I will follow the usual procedure and state the question.

THE MINISTER FOR EMPLOYMENT (Hon. A. R. G. Hawke—Northam—in reply) [8.44]: If no other hon. member desires to discuss the Bill, I wish to deal with the two speeches that have been delivered on the Government's legislative proposals. The provision in the Bill to raise the amount receivable by those totally dependent upon a worker who has died through injuries, will not impose such a heavy burden upon industry as might be supposed. The present payments in such circumstances range from a minimum of £400 to a maximum of £600. The Bill provides for a flat rate of payment of £750. It may be thought that in future the dependants will receive almost double what could be paid to them if the existing provisions in the Act were not altered. There is that possibility, but nevertheless fatal accidents in industry, fortunately, are few in number. Although the proposed increase in the amount receivable by people dependent upon a deceased worker appears at first glance to be a substantial additional burden upon industry, that impost will not be great because, as I have indicated, fatal accidents in industry are rare. The proposal to bring under the operations of the Workers' Compensation Act an additional group of workers by raising the amount of the wage or salary receivable from £400 to £500 per year is not likely to have any serious effect upon industry. The group of workers receiving that range of salary or wage usually occupy positions of a fairly safe description. Such positions are not so subject to frequent accidents or accidents of a serious nature as are those held by workers receiving less than £400 a year. Thus the proposal to include the group of workers receiving from £400 to £500 a year under the Act will deal with a section no doubt regarded as fairly safe from the point of view of insurance risks. The contention may be advanced with safety that the proposal is not likely to prove a serious burden upon industry. At the same time, an essential advantage will be conferred upon the group of workers I have specified. The other points mentioned by the member for Katanning (Mr. Watts) and those referred to by the member for West Perth (Mr. McDonald) can be better discussed during the Committee stage than at the present juncture. Some of the matters will require investigation prior to the Committee stage. I will obtain "Hansard" proofs of the speeches made by those hon. members in order that the points they raised may receive the consideration to which they are entitled.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Mr. Withers in the Chair; the Minister for Employment in charge of the Bill.

Clause 1—agreed to.

Progress reported.

Newspapers in the Chamber.

Mr. Hughes: In accordance with your directions, Mr. Speaker, I have read Standing Order 124 and would like to direct your attention to what it says—

> No member shall read from a printed newspaper or book the report of any speech made in Parliament during the same session.

You, Sir, were in error when you said I was committing a breach of that Standing Order, because I was not. As a matter of fact, I was not reading a speech made in this Parliament during any session. I was studying the photograph of Mr. H. D. Moseley.

Mr. Marshall: What proof have we that you were not reading a speech?

Mr. Speaker: Order!

Mr. Hughes: I submit that Standing Order 124 refers to the reading from newspapers in debate. If you will take the trouble to look at the front page of the newspaper I was studying——

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member must put the newspaper away. Members are not permitted to read newspapers in the Chamber.

Mr. Hughes: You will see there is no speech the reading of which by me would be a breach of Standing Order 124. I was

looking at Mr. Moseley's picture and underneath it is something about Herr Hitler. Although I am anxious to bow to your ruling, and as you suggested I should read the Standing Order in question, I wish to point out that your ruling is wrong. If you do not wish me to read a newspaper in the Chamber, whether that is prohibited by the Standing Orders or not, I will not do so in deference to the Chair. For your guidance, however I point out that no breach of the Standing Order was committed.

Mr. Marshall: You are right.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The member for Murchison should know better. The member for East Perth is correct. The Standing Order I quoted was mentioned in error and hastily but the hon. member's duty is to assist the Chair by observing the rules and privileges of the House. The hon. member knows full well I was correct in ruling that newspapers should not be read in the Chamber. However, I quoted the wrong Standing Order. The hon. member is fully aware that the established practice, accepted by all members over a long period, is that newspapers may not be read in the Chamber, and I draw the hon. member's attention to the fact. Instead of taking the point he did and trying to interrupt debates because I happened to quote the wrong Standing Order, the hon. member should, as he agrees he will now do, observe the general practice of the House and not read newspapers in the Chamber during the period Parliament is sitting.

Mr. Marshall: It is not a matter for a ruling.

Mr. Speaker: I regret I misled the hon. member by quoting the wrong Standing Order.

Mr. Hughes: I accept your apology, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Marshall: It is not a matter of a ruling; it is a matter of decorum.

BILL—INDUSTRIAL ARBITRATION ACT AMENDMENT.

Second Reading.

Debate resumed from the 30th August.

MR. McDONALD (West Perth) [8.56]: I intend not to oppose the second reading of the Bill. Some of its provisions, in my opinion, might advantageously be passed by Parliament. Other provisions would be of a class that I do not think would be of advantage to the State if they became law. A somewhat similar Bill was introduced last session and Parliament, recognising the technical nature of the subject, referred it to a select committee. I feel that to deal with this Bill in any detail on the second reading debate would take more time than I would be justified in occupying at this stage. I therefore propose to refer to some of the salient provisions of the Bill, but not at great length. The Bill can perhaps be most usefully discussed clause by clause in Committee.

The Bill commences by altering the definitions of employer and worker. The present legislation, and, in fact, all similar legislation of the various States and of the Commonwealth, deal with an industry as being the subject of each award. The Arbitration Court looks upon the industrial life of the community as divided into a series of compartments. Each compartment is represented by an industry, and in each industry the people affected are the employers and the employees. When the Arbitration Court makes an award, it confines the effect of the award to the people engaged in that industry, having arrived at the award after investigating the features of the industry and after hearing the representatives of the employers and of the employees engaged in it. Under industrial arbitration legislation as I know it, Arbitration Courts confine their jurisdiction to the relationship between employer and employee. There are many other relationships in the life of the community. There are the relationship between principal and agent, the relationship between principal and contractor, the relationship between a person who directs services and those who voluntarily work in the execution of those services. So far as I know, none of these activities has been within the functions of the Arbitration Courts of Australia. Those courts have dealt with the position between the employer and the employee, between the employer and the worker that works for him in his industry in return for a wage or salary for his services; but looking through the Bill we find that it is proposed to extend to a considerable degree the jurisdiction of the Arbitration Court. Under the existing Act, an "employer" is a person, firm or company employing one or more workers, whereas the amending Bill proposes to bring within the

definition of "employer" any steward, agent, bailiff, foreman or manager acting on behalf of the employer. We observe, therefore, that not only would the employer be involved as a party to any award and be liable in consequence of a breach of the award, but under the definition any foreman or manager would also be an employer within the meaning of the Act, and, therefore, presumably liable to comply with the terms of the award, and also liable to any penalties that might be involved in a breach of the award. Where this would lead is not quite clear to me at present. A man might be a foreman, or agent or manager for a company, the company being the employer in the ordinary meaning of the word. Assuming that the employer commits a breach of the award for which the penalty of imprisonment is imposed, it is obvious that a company cannot be imprisoned; but a manager, foreman or agent could be. If such individuals came within the definition of "employer" as set out in the Bill, I presume, in the event of a breach, they would be liable to a fine, imprisonment or any other disability that might be imposed by the terms of the Act.

Mr Fox: Why should not they suffer as well as the workers?

Mr. McDONALD: Also, I presume they would be liable for wages that might not have been paid by their employer. For the sake of argument, if an employer cannot pay his employees, I presume his foreman would be liable to do so. If we are to be logical in this matter; if the foreman, agent or manager is to be included in the term "employer," and presumably is to be equally liable with the employer for the observance of the terms of the award, I suppose the Minister would also desire to include the secretary or president of an industrial union within the meaning of the term "union," so that if the union were guilty of a breach of an award and thus liable to any penalty, that penalty could be executed equally against the secretary or the president of the union, whether it be a fine or imprisonment. That is what would obtain if the same treatment were given to the agents of the parties on both sides. The definition of "worker" in the present Act is, in broad language, any person not less than 14 years of age employed by an employer to do work for hire or reward. The words "hire or reward" have been omitted from the Bill, which means that all people rendering voluntary services will presumably be workers within the meaning of the Industrial Arbitration Act if the Bill becomes law. That would involve, I take it, adherents of religious orders working in hospitals or for charitable organisations. Members of the Salvation Army, who are in one sense not working for hire or reward but are giving their services for sustenance only, would be covered, and the Act would also include other people—this is perhaps an extreme case, but by no means necessarily outside the scope of the Bill—who volunteer their services—

Hon. C. G. Latham: Even working bees to assist charitable organisations.

Mr. McDONALD: Yes; people perhaps belonging to organisations that, whether they give their services by night or day, are engaged in assisting some worthwhile work for the community.

Hon. P. D. Ferguson: People assisting at hospital picture shows might be involved.

Hon. C. G. Latham: People carrying tea at the Perth Hospital might be brought under the provisions of the Act.

Mr. McDONALD: I do not make these comments in a critical spirit. I make them in the interests of those engaged in industry, whether they be workers or employers. It is desirable that we should know exactly what effect the Bill will have, and that workers as well as employers should know where they stand.

Mr. Needham: It is not as ridiculous as you make it out to be.

Mr. McDONALD: The hon. member says it is not as ridiculous as I make it out to be; but I do not want it to be even partly ridiculous. While the person engaged in a working bee in the country might not be brought under the definition—that might be stretching the point too far—the definition will include all people who work without receiving any pay, because the words "for hire or reward" have been excluded from the Bill for the express purpose of bringing in those that are not in receipt of salary or wages, and will embrace those that are working voluntarily or in return for some other consideration for their services. The Bill provides that "worker" means any person of not less than 14 years of age employed or engaged by any employer in con-

nection with his business, trade, manufacture, handicraft, undertaking or calling. The Act deals with the worker who is employed. This Bill deals with the worker who is engaged by any employer in connection with his business, trade, manufacture, handicraft, undertaking or calling. What the word "engaged" may mean I do not know.

Mr. Withers: Could he be engaged without being employed?

Mr. McDONALD: Yes. A person might be engaged to be one's agent to collect rents. He would not be employed; he is given permission to collect the rents, and he does it when he likes and how he likes. All he has to do is to put in an appearance once a month with a cheque. He is engaged, not employed. I might engage a man to build a garage. I might not employ him; I might engage him possibly as a contractor. I could say to him, "I engage you for a lump sum of £50 to build a garage for me." That man is not employed; he is engaged. This clause might be wide enough to embrace agents and contractors. If that is so, the industrial arbitration jurisdiction of our court will be very greatly increased, going beyond the relation of employer and employee employed on salary and wages and including people whose relations are possibly those of principal and agent or principal and contractor. While the House may consider it desirable that arbitration should be extended as this Bill proposes—that is a matter for the House to determine—we should be aware how far we propose to go and what will be the probable effect on industry if the amendments are passed. The Bill proceeds to include in the definition of "worker" a domestic servant. That is an innovation.

Mr. Sleeman: This is not the first time it has been proposed here.

Mr. McDONALD: Not by any means. A great advantage would accrue to all concerned if the basis upon which domestic work is conducted was improved. In England that has been done recently by the Government through the medium of a series of voluntary agreements. A sort of standard form of agreement has been provided, and people who desire fair treatment as between the domestic and the employer become parties to the agreement.

Mr. Sleeman: Has such an agreement any legal standing?

Mr. McDONALD: Yes, it is the same as any other contract of service between employer and employee. Whether it would be wise to bring into our domestic life the adjudication of tribunals and the feeling sometimes involved when matters have been submitted to a court of arbitration or to any other court is a question upon which opinions may differ.

The Bill also provides for the inclusion as "workers" of canvassers for life and accident assurance or insurance whose services are remunerated wholly or partly by commission or percentage reward and whose services are wholly or substantially devoted to the interests of one company or society. This again represents a very great advance on the existing Act. The present law applies only to canvassers who are wholly and solely employed in the writing of industrial insurance or in the collection of premiums for industrial insurance.

The Minister for Mines: Do you know whether there are any such persons?

Mr. McDONALD: I am not concerned whether there are such persons or not. When the Government brought down an amendment to include those canvassers, evidently it thought that such persons could exist.

The Minister for Employment: That was the best the Government could get at the time.

Mr. McDONALD: If the Government brought down a provision to include fictitious persons, it was something unique. Whatever it did or did not do, the Act was confined to those persons engaged wholly and solely in industrial insurance as canvassers, and it is now proposed to include canvassers for life and accident insurance. So far as I can judge, the definition would cover canvassers who might be engaged in any other business or in a number of other businesses. True, their services would have to be wholly or substantially devoted to the interests of one particular insurance company or society, but there is nothing to prevent their being employed or engaged in any other class of work. A man in the country might be running a store and a post office and have a hundred-and-one other things, but if he devotes part of his time to canvassing for life or accident insurance, he becomes subject to the provisions of the Bill. I cannot believe that that is going to be of benefit to the community or to the people concerned. The effect would probably be

that many people who now do a little canvassing and earn a small but welcome addition to their income by canvassing would find themselves without that source of income. It would not be worth while for insurance companies to have those part-time canvassers or canvassers engaged in other businesses when the companies had no supervision over them—they could work for days in their other avenues of business—and yet the companies are to be subject to the limitations and penalties involved in being parties to an award. Those smaller people and perhaps poorer people would find this source of income cut off, and that would not be of benefit to them or to the community as compared with the present arrangements that they voluntarily make with the various insurance companies.

Having endeavoured to convey some idea of the increased area that would be covered by industrial arbitration under this Bill, I now proceed to deal with the next clause of importance, namely, the provision to register the Australian Workers' Union. On a number of occasions this union has been an applicant to the Arbitration Court for registration. The application has been opposed by other unions. After hearing witnesses, the court has refused to register the A.W.U. I have not read the evidence taken by the select committee last year, but I am informed that this clause, which provides for the registration by Act of Parliament of the A.W.U. as a union, was opposed before that committee by one or more witnesses, one at least of whom was, or had been, a union secretary. The matter could well be left to the court to deal with in accordance with what I understand are the views of the Government and its supporters. The court is able to investigate the circumstances, hear the different parties, and is in the best position to decide which union can be registered for the benefit of the workers. It is undesirable that Parliament should attempt, in this or any other field, to take upon itself the function of deciding which union should or should not be registered. Parliament is not in a position to form a proper view on such a matter. We have not the evidence before us, and we would not hear what any industrial union, opposing this clause might have to say. We are not in the same position as is the court to form a fair and useful judgment on the matter at issue. The question is one essentially for the Arbitration Court, and Parliament should not take into its own hands the right to determine it.

The next clause, one of outstanding importance, provides for an alteration in the whole framework of the arbitration system as we now have it. Under the present system we divide the working life of the community into industries. Each industry represents a separate department, and each industry is the subject matter of a separate award. If a man is in the boot-making industry, he will look at the award to ascertain the rights and liabilities of employers and employees engaged in that industry. The employees would have their functions provided for within the four corners of that particular award. The Bill, however, seeks to extend the operations of an award not only to those in the particular industry, but to all who carry on similar avocations in any other industry. Coachbuilders, for instance, come under the sawmilling award. They are given a margin of 18s. above the basic wage. In the wheelwrights and wagonbuilders' award there are also coachbuilders, who are given a margin of 24s. above the basic wage. As I read this particular clause, the award relating to coachbuilders in the sawmilling trade, and also the award relating to coachbuilders in the wheelwrights and wagonbuilders' industry, will apply to the coachbuilder. Thus the coachbuilder will be covered by both awards, because he occupies an avocation that is dealt with by both awards. As I understand the matter, under the system now followed, everything is comparatively simple. The coachbuilder engaged in the sawmilling trade does not require nearly the same skill as does the coachbuilder engaged in the wheelwrights or wagonbuilders' trade. The coachbuilder, who is more or less a rough artisan engaged in the sawmilling trade, receives 18s. above the basic wage, but the man employed in the coachbuilding trade requires to be a highly skilled worker and is given an award of 24s. above the basic wage. That is as it should be. If we extend awards outside the industry for which they are made, to cover avocations in whatever industries men may be employed, I am afraid we are going to create not only a chaotic state, but a state that will not do justice to the individuals concerned. To me it is an attempt to institute a system that will be

far less advantageous and far less just than the existing system under which the work done, and a fair reward for each worker in the industry, are assessed by the Court at the time the award for a particular industry is made.

The Bill also endeavours to do away with what are known as penalty clauses. The Arbitration Court, which is the best judge of what is necessary, has found it desirable to insert in awards a provision that if the workers break the terms of the award, they will lose certain benefits under it—certain holiday pay and so forth. The Bill proposes to do away with the penalty clauses provided under the award. That in my opinion, is a retrograde step. If the Arbitration Court thought this was necessary—and I do not think anyone can deny or should deny that it is necessary and salutary—the Court should be left free to impose any conditions of this kind. They do not affect the good man. They do not matter twopence to the man who obeys the award. They merely affect men who break the award and bring suffering not only on the employers but also on the fellow-workers. That is the view taken by the Arbitration Court. I hope the clause will be rejected, because the provision it seeks to repeal is not only salutary but very fair. Take one example. It is provided in some awards now that if a junior worker misrepresents his age, says he is younger than he really is, and the employer pays him according to the rate applicable to the age he stated, the worker can only recover wages according to the fictitious age stated by him. Prior to that, if a boy said he was 16 years of age whereas he actually was 18, the result was that when he had obtained employment on that representation, if after a couple of years his true age was discovered the employer would be liable to him, although he had made the misrepresentation, for a considerable amount of back pay. I do not think that would be endorsed by any fair-thinking person. That salutary provision would be nullified if the amendment were carried.

The Bill also provides that in certain cases the parties may, in effect, contract out of an award, that the parties bound by an award may at any time enter into an agreement varying all or any of the terms of the award, and that subject to the express sanction of the court such agreement may be registered by the court and shall be binding on the parties to the agreement. I consider the House should be careful in doing anything that tends to break down the principle of the finality of the award and the preservation of its full effect during the whole period of its operation.

At the present time, where a party is prosecuted in an industrial court and imprisonment is ordered without the option of a fine, or the fine imposed is £20 or more, there is a right of appeal to the Court of Criminal Appeal; that is, to a bench of judges of the Supreme Court sitting as a court of appeal. It is proposed by the Bill to limit this right of appeal to the Court of Criminal Appeal to cases where there is imprisonment without the option of a fine; so that where there is a fine imposed, as I read the Bill, whether the amount be small or large, there is no right of appeal to the Court of Criminal Appeal.

The Minister for Mines: The fine has to be over £20 at the present time.

Mr. McDONALD: Yes. That provision is being abolished. Even if the fine is £50, or whatever may be the limit under the Act, the right of appeal to the Court of Criminal Appeal is to be abolished. I hope that amendment will not be carried. A great many of the cases before industrial magistrates where prosecutions are made against employers are technical cases. There are cases where room for difference of opinion exists as to the interpretation of an award, and it is a matter of great importance not only to the employer concerned but to all employers in the industry that there should be an authoritative determination of the law on that subject.

Mr. Cross: If that is the case, application can be made for an interpretation.

Mr. McDONALD: The interpretation referred to by the member for Canning (Mr. Cross) is an interpretation by the Court of Industrial Arbitration. That court does, we know, from time to time give interpretations of awards; and that is a highly important function of the court. I am, however, referring to cases where an employer, or it might be a worker, is being prosecuted for an offence for which he may be fined or imprisoned, and where the interpretation of the law is therefore of particular importance not only to the defendant but also to all others engaged in the same industry. In the case of the Industrial Arbitration Court

the President, a man of very high attainments, is the only legally trained member of the court; yet on a matter of interpretation he can be over-ruled by the two lay members of the court, who are not, and do not pretend to be, trained in legal interpretation. That is not satisfactory to anybody. So when it comes to matters where a fine or imprisonment is involved, when it is a matter of prosecution, the parties concerned, whether workers or employers, should be given the ordinary right to have their legal position determined by a bench of judges —not merely one judge—sitting as a Court of Criminal Appeal. That is a right which is given under the ordinary law to every person accused even of a minor offence in any other court—a right to go to a court of appeal. In my opinion it would be a retrograde step to cut out the provision made in the existing Act. I prefer to see access to the court of appeal by every worker and employer made considerably easier.

On prosecution of an employer for enforcement of an award, the existing law provides that the court may, in addition to imposing a penalty for breach of the award, order that any party liable shall pay to the worker the difference between the amount actually paid and that which should have been paid under the award. That provision is permissive: the court "may" order the employer to pay the amount of any wages short-paid. The Bill provides that the discretion shall be taken away and that the court "shall" order that the employer pay any amount of wages which may have been short-paid to the employee. I hope that in this respect the Act will be allowed to remain as it stands. In many instances where wages are short-paid, the magistrate orders the shortages to be made good by the employers, but he does not always do this, because, having heard both parties, he realises the unfairness in certain circumstances of ordering such payments. At times, for instance, the employer is merely struggling to continue his operations. He cannot afford to pay full wages and he contemplates dismissing an employee. The man, however, says, "Don't dismiss me; I will continue to work for you at less than the award rate." The employer retains the services of the man really to assist him, for it would be much better and more profitable if the employer dismissed the man. Rather than do that and deprive the worker of his livelihood, the employer pays him as much as he can afford, so as to assist the man himself. I would be sorry if the magistrate, in the circumstances I have outlined, were compelled to impose a heavy burden on the employer who might have acted as he did merely to assist the worker. I trust that the discretionary power included in the Act will be retained.

I shall not add much more, although I could detain members for a long time in discussing various phases. I am endeavouring to deal only with the more salient provisions of the Bill. I propose to support some of the clauses, because I consider they will improve the machinery of arbitration, and we will do well to include them in our arbitration law. A new clause in the Bill is that which gives certain powers of entry to an officer of an industrial union of employees, thus enabling him to visit business premises for the purpose of interviewing workers. Members should consider whether such a provision is necessary. The Act already provides certain powers of entry upon premises with the object of ascertaining whether the terms of awards are carried out. Under the Bill, should an employer be made subject to various awards and the vocational principle be carried out, he would be liable to have representatives of heaven knows how many unions continually visiting him.

Mr. Hegney: Union representatives do not usually annoy the employers.

Mr. McDONALD: No, but they have the right to enter upon the premises and make their investigations.

Mr. Fox: And the employers in most instances do not object.

Mr. McDONALD: No, not when the union representatives make reasonable inquiries.

Mr. Hegney: Only the employer who breaks awards objects.

Mr. McDONALD: If the Bill be passed with that clause in its present form, it may be regarded as going beyond what is reasonably necessary for the protection of workers engaged in a business, particularly as the Act already contains powers by which any union representative, if denied reasonable access to premises, may secure the necessary authority from the court to enter upon the premises. The Bill contains clauses that are of considerable importance. I have analysed them as carefully as possible during the time at my disposal, but I shall not detain the House any further at this stage. I shall

reserve any assistance I can render till we deal with the measure in Committee. There are some clauses that can be usefully incorporated in our industrial law, and for that reason I do not propose to object to the second reading of the Bill.

On motion by Mr. Needham, debate adjourned.

BILL—MULLEWA ROAD BOARD LOAN RATE.

Second Reading.

THE MINISTER FOR WORKS (Hon. H. Millington—Mt. Hawthorn) [9.49] in moving the second reading said: This is a small Bill but it is necessary because of a mistake made by the Mullewa Road Board in connection with a loan. In the "Government Gazette" dated the 26th November, 1937, page 2030, the road board published a notice of its intention to borrow £1,200 for the purpose of bitumenising streets and footpaths, the construction of a roadway leading to the recreation ground at Mullewa, and the construction of fencing and improvements on the recreation ground. The amount expended on the recreation ground amounted to only £120. At the time the notice was published, the board's opinion was that the works would benefit a particular portion only of its district, namely, the central ward, and that the loan rate should be levied only within such portion. Through inadvertence, this opinion, although expressed at meetings, was not included in the published notice of intention to borrow. Section 245 (1) of the Road Districts Act requires that such opinion must be included in the notice of the board's intention to borrow money. The failure of the board so to publish its opinion made it obligatory to levy the loan rate over the whole district. The board has struck a loan rate of 2¼d. in the pound on the annual rental value of all rateable land in the central ward in connection with this loan. The Bill is introduced for the purpose of legalising that rate and all future rating for this particular loan. Obviously, it would be unjust to call upon the whole of the road district to contribute to this loan solely on account of a clerical omission.

Hon. C. G. Latham: The position might have been affected had a referendum been taken.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: The only way to overcome the difficulty is to pass an Act validating the rate. I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

On motion by Mr. Doney, debate adjourned.

BILL—PENSIONERS (RATES EXEMPTION) ACT AMENDMENT.

Second Reading.

THE MINISTER FOR WORKS (Hon. H. Millington—Mt. Hawthorn) [9.53] in moving the second reading said: This is another small, though necessary measure. Members will recall that in 1936 I introduced a Bill, which subsequently became an Act, to amend the Pensioners (Rates Exemption) Act to provide that ex-service men who, at any age, had become totally and permanently unemployable and whose cases were not accepted as war-caused, should be enabled to avail themselves of the benefits of the Pensioners (Rates Exemption) Act, in addition to those persons drawing invalid and old-age pensions. The Returned Soldiers' League has now pointed out that where the wife or widow of an invalid or old-age pensioner is in receipt of a pension, as well as the husband, and the house is in the name of the wife, the Act applies; but, although the wife or widow of a service pensioner also receives a pension of 17s. per week and the house is in her name, the 1936 amendment does not apply, the wife or widow not being a "member of the forces." The purpose of the Bill is to correct this anomaly and really to rectify an omission in the 1936 amendment. The amendment provided for in Clause 2 of the Bill takes the form of a repeal of Section 3 of the principal Act and the insertion of a new section in its place. It has been found necessary to deal with the required amendment in this way, because in Division 5 of Part III. of the Australian Soldiers' Repatriation Act, 1920-1937, the term "wife" in relation to a member of the forces has a special meaning, namely, the wife of a member of the forces who was married to him before the 2nd October, 1931. In proposed Section 3, it is made clear that the terms "wife" and "widow" have the same meaning as or bear the same relation to the term "wife" used in the Commonwealth Act. Under proposed Section 3, the wife or widow of a member of the forces,

in order to come within the section, will have to be a "wife" within the meaning of the Commonwealth Act, that is to say, she must have been married to the member before the 2nd October, 1931. Unless this provision is made, the section might be deemed to extend to wives or widows who married members of the forces after the 2nd October, 1931, and thus cause an inconsistency to arise between the proposed Section 3 and the Commonwealth Act. Briefly, the Bill merely excepts the pensioner or his wife or widow from the payment of municipal or road board rates, water rates and sewerage rates. As members are aware, this is a privilege extended to old-age and invalid pensioners. It was extended to service pensioners and was thought to apply to the wife or widow of a service pensioner. We find, however, that that is not so. The Bill will put the matter right.

Hon. C. G. Latham: It will be necessary to get the consent of the War Service Homes Commissioner.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: The Crown Law Department has drafted this clause, which we are assured will meet the position. I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

On motion by Mr. Doney, debate adjourned.

House adjourned at 9.59 p.m.

Legislative Assembly.

Wednesday, 7th September, 1938.

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

QUESTION—DAIRYING INDUSTRY.

Marketing Board, Organiser, Expenditure on Advertising.

Mr. DONEY asked the Minister for Agriculture: 1, What is the name of the recently appointed organiser for the Dairy Products Marketing Board? 2, Were applications for this position sought in the usual way per medium of advertisements in the Public Press? 3, Is the organiser a member of the board? 4, What remuneration does he receive? 5, If any definite sum has been set aside for advertising purposes, what is that sum?

The MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE replied: 1, T. H. Morgan to organise campaign to increase the sale of butter. 2, No. 3, Yes, and the appointment was recommended by the Dairy Products Marketing Board. 4, £4 4s. 6d. per week. 5, £750 set aside for the purpose mentioned in reply to (1).

BILL—HEALTH ACT AMENDMENT.

Introduced by the Minister for Health and read a first time.