ern Australia. There is nothing more dear to my heart than to have the best for Western Australia.

On motion by the Minister for Works, debate adjourned.

House adjourned at 10.30 p.m.

Legislative Council,

Wednesday, 13th August, 1919.

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

ADDRESS-IN-REPLY.

Sixth Day.

Debate resumed from the previous day.

Hon. J. E. DODD (South): In rising to make a few observations in connection with this debate, I desire to express my deep regret at the death of our late President, and I endorse all the sentiments that have been expressed in regard to him. I remember when I first came to the House knowing very little about it, the late Sir Henry Briggs was very kind indeed, and when I became a Minister of the Crown he often gave me hints which were helpful and useful, and I am sure it will be a long time before we become reconciled to his absence. I also wish to convey my congratulations to you, Sir, and I think we can fairly say you have won the position by reason of your knowledge of the Constitution by reason of your ability, and temperament, and I hope you will long live to enjoy it. I also wish to associate myself with the expressions which have been used in regard to Dr. Saw and Mr. Panton. The fact of these two gentlemen being in the House, both of whom have served their country on the battlefield, certainly enhances its prestige, and I sincerely hope that these hon. members' deliberations will be beneficial to us. Reference was made in the Governor's Speech to peace being proclaimed. Naturally we all agree with the sentiments expressed, and we all hope that the peace which has been signed by the Allies and our late enemies will be a lasting one. Despite the fact that there is so much turmoil in the world to-day, I think we can look forward to the future with some degree of confidence. I am inclined to think that the courage which has been exhibited on the battlefields of Europe by our men will be brought into being in connection with their lives in Australia. I am not one of those who think that because our men have been away fighting that they have returned brutalised, and are going to be a menace to the country. I shall never be afraid of what the soldiers in Australia will do, provided we give them a fair deal. We can take credit to ourselves as a race for the manner in which we have come out of the war, and I was interested in reading the other day a report of the speech delivered by General Smuts. There are a few lines in that speech which I would like to read to hon. members. General Smuts said—

> Before the war he and his friends had felt the might of the Empire, but one had to be at the Peace Conference to see what a part it played in the counsels of the world to realise not only its physical but moral preponderance. Whatever the past and whatever the future, the British Empire was far and away the most potent instrument for good or evil which ever existed in the world. The British Constitution gave the clearest clue and guidance as to the course to be pursued.

It is something that we can be proud of to think that a man in the position of General Smuts, who fought us tooth and nail during the Boer war—and I say it redounded to his credit that he did so—that after all these years he can say what he said the other day about the British Empire as it exists at the present time. I am proud to think that despite all the black spots that there are in our records—and there are some very dark ones—that we are to-day the greatest force in the world, and it is to the credit of the genius of our people that, whilst kings are falling and thrones are tumbling almost everywhere throughout the world, things are no worse in the British Empire than they are. Some people are inclined to think that things are very bad so far as industrial unrest is concerned. They are bad enough, but for all that I think the genius of our race will see us through, provided we get a little vision into our minds. I have spoken on one or two occasions with reference to the many war activities for good that were brought into operation during the four years which have just closed, and I would like to say a word or two with reference to that matter. While we stand appalled at the barbarism, at the horror engendered by the war, I think there is a contra account, and it is that I would like to see the Government and those who have an interest in our welfare try to take over. When we come to consider all the war activities brought into being to alleviate the horrors of war, the innumerable societies—Red Cross, Trench Comforts, and a hundred and one others, not only in one town and in one country, but in every village of the United Kingdom and the British Empire—when we come to consider that all these societies were brought into being to alleviate the horrors of war, and when we think that

for the first time in their lives that for thousands of people the opportunity presented itself to do good—if we take that theme and try to harness it, we shall come out on the right side. Even in Perth we find that a large number of people who have never had the opportunity to do good before the war occurred availed themselves of it. Before the war it never seemed to strike them that they should take an interest in anything that was likely to be of use. We saw men and women night after night, and day after day, devoting the whole of their energies to doing something to ameliorate the horrors of war. If we do not continue to do something on these lines the international and national class hatred, which is worse, is likely to land us somewhere from which it will be difficult to get away, and sometimes I am rather appalled at what may occur. I suppose there has been more criticism in connection with the manner in which the war has been managed than there has been over anything else during the past four years. But when we consider that the population of this State, which is something like 300,000 people, amounting to in reality only three brigades of the Army, and then consider the immense organisation which is required to run the State on a civil basis in order to keep 300,000 people going, and most of them children, we must agree that it is a mighty organisation which went into the war and which came out of it as well as it did. When I think of all that and think of what we can do if we go about it in the right manner I can only conclude that there must be some hope for the future. Let me point out what has taken place to bring together the different classes of the community. When in England in 1915 I saw individuals and parties brought together for the first time, parties that no one, prior to the war, would have ever dreamed of seeing working in unity. Wealth, intellect, and representatives of Labour were brought together with the one idea of doing good, and I was astonished to see the different individuals in charge of various societies. The same thing has happened here. If this sort of thing can take place in war time, why cannot we encourage the same feeling in time of peace? The very highest of talent was devoted to the services of those who were fighting, or who had been injured at the war. Our best singers, to hear whom one would have had to pay a guinea before the war, were singing free to entertain those who were fighting in France. This applies all round, in many instances to our doctors and surgeons, and we should do everything possible to keep that feeling alive in times of peace. I recently read an extract from a letter written by a young captain, entitled by birth to place "honourable" before his name, to his sister, just before he was killed at the war. It ran—

> You know this war makes one a socialist. You are thinking continuously about the comfort and welfare of your men. Consequently one sees their many grievances and sympathises with them. If this war has done nothing else, it has brought men into touch with the people below them in the scale, people with whom they would never have mixed and understood but for the war. It has welded the folk of our great England together more than they have ever been before.

The war brought about wonderful changes in industry. The industrialism of war has been far better than the industrialism of peace. The factories established during the war have been better than the factories established during peace. There are better conditions, better means of working, more leisure for recreation and, in the old country, much more has been done in the way of ventilation. We would be wise to get away from the old idea that men and women will always be content to have their wages regulated on a purely animal basis. I am sorry the idea has been fostered, not only by the employer, but by the unions. It is a principle I have always opposed. I could never see why, when men went to the Arbitration Court, they should seek to build up a case purely on the cost of living. That seems to be placing the worker on the same basis as a race-horse; give him simply enough to enable him to live and do his work. I hope the unions will see their way clear to base their citations on something higher than the cost of living.

Hon. A. H. Panton: That is the fault of the present Act.

Hon. J. E. DODD: The industrial problem is the most important matter we have to deal with. We have been told we are between two extremes, and I believe that is so. We are between the extreme profiteer and the extreme violent socialist—I will not say red-ragger, because the profiteer is as much a red-ragger as the socialist. These extremes are in a minority, and a very small minority at that, and if the rest of the community will sit down and allow these two sets of individuals to run the country, they deserve all they get. They can alter it if they like, and the sooner they get to work, the better. The Labour party in 1916 missed the greatest chance of their life to knock out profiteering in Australia. I am not one who is wise after the event. I gave several addresses at the time, drawing attention to the fact that, unless the Government took the whole of the war profits, there would be no end to profiteering. Those words have come true. If we took 75, 80, or 90 per cent. of the profits, the profiteers would still thrive. In England, the Government took 75 per cent. of the profits, but still the profiteers made a hundred times more than before the war. The Labour party in 1916 had the right and power in both Houses of Parliament to take all the profits if they desired, but they failed to do so. Consequently we are suffering to some extent from their failure. I have a few instances of war profits in Australia. I find, from answers to questions asked of the leader of the House, that the number of persons in receipt of incomes exceeding £5,000

a year has nearly doubled during the war period. In two years the number increased from 54 to 103. Where did this money come from? It must have come from the people. I do not know whether the pastoralists are responsible for this increase; I have not been able to ascertain from the return, but it shows that undoubtedly there has been profiteering in this State. Taking figures from the "Primary Producer," we find that the profit on blankets and flannels, serges and tweeds in Australia in two years was £1,197,095. This is pretty solid when we consider the protection afforded these industries by the tariff. The profits run from 13 to 25 per cent. for the four-year period of the war. In Victoria ten firms showed from 10 to 17 per cent., and in New South Wales five firms up to 25 per cent. profit. I do not know whether firms in Western Australia have made similar profits, but I think the profits in New South Wales and Victoria are larger, because all Australia is being bled to keep up their two cities. Figures from the inter-State Commission's report in regard to companies show that in 1916 Huddart Parker and Co. made £75,000 profit, but in 1918 they made £308,000. The Adelaide Steamship Company's profits advanced from £173,000 in 1916 to £395,000 in 1918; the Melbourne Steamship Company's from £176,000 to £228,000.

Hon. J. A. Greig: Are they net profits or gross income?

Hon. J. E. DODD: It does not state. The Union Steamship Company's profits advanced from £553,000 in 1916 to £723,000 in 1918, the Colonial Sugar Refining Company's from £630,000 to £1,121,000, the Swan Brewery's from £188,000 to £206,000, and the Carlton Brewery's from £243,000 to £552,000. These are fairly startling figures, which show that there has been a very large amount of profiteering, especially when it is remembered that in this State we had 20,000 to 30,000 fewer men during those years. We seem just now to be blest with a crowd of individuals who are simply out for notoriety. Although I have not the slightest sympathy with the shipping companies in the predicament they find themselves in, I think if the companies had any insight at all or any common sense they would have endeavoured to meet the shipping trouble. When we consider the conditions under which the seamen are working, one wonders that the men have tolerated them for so long. Most of those who have travelled have at times looked into the seamen's quarters, and seen what they have to put up with. I have travelled in all classes, and God help the individual who has to travel steerage, even at the present time. But the steerage accommodation is palatial compared with the seamen's quarters. It is a marvel that the seamen have tolerated the conditions so long and, to those who have been trying to bring about a better state of affairs, it is rankling to think the employer rarely makes an advance towards better conditions but has to be fought and forced to do so. This ought not to be the case. There are some employers who have shown foresight and improved the conditions of their employees very materially. Mr. Hancock, of the Wallaroo mines in South Australia, is one of these. I remember, when I started work on those mines as a boy of 13, the conditions were terrible, but since then Mr. Hancock has made wonderful improvements. Recreation grounds have been provided, and a scheme of town planning has been put into effect, which makes the place worth living in. At Port Pirie an area of ten acres was reserved, and the Broken Hill Proprietary Company provided the money necessary to establish one of the most up to date recreation grounds in the Commonwealth. The company provided the money and the men did the work, and the whole of the rough work was done in a day. Quite a number of employers have realised what is coming, and have tried to meet the new conditions. If the Government of this State had a little vision and realised the conditions under which the seamen work, they would endeavour to improve them. When the "Kangaroo" was launched I happened to be in Glasgow, and I went along to see the launching. It was found, however, that the construction had been held up in order that the men's quarters might be altered so as to comply with the Australian conditions. I do not know what the men's quarters are like to-day, but I know what they were like then. Compared with the officers' quarters they were only shells. Why should there be these distinctions? That is the sort of thing that causes industrial unrest. Having said so much, however, I have not the slightest time for those who endeavour to hasten on a revolution in Australia and elsewhere, or for the man who will not obey his own laws and rules and Constitution. When a man goes about defying the Government of the country, as Mr. Walsh has done, and defying the people of the country as well, endeavouring to lead everything to ruin, it is time steps were taken to alter the position. Mr. Walsh is the architect of ruin, as Edmund Burke said of some of the French revolutionaries at the time of the Revolution. I have an interesting extract here which seems to me very applicable to the position in Australia to-day. Cardinal Manning, speaking on the French Revolution, said—

> It had destroyed private initiative. Centralisation was death. Paris dominated France. People had become used to tyranny, and awaited orders before taking action.

That sums up Australia to-day. We have become used to the tyranny of Melbourne and Sydney, until we take no action on our own account, not only as regards strikes but in other respects. By to-day's newspaper I see that Mr. Baxter is going to Melbourne again on Friday. Let us consider what is happening in regard to all our industries in respect of relations between the States. Time after time it means going to Melbourne. Take our unions and societies: everything is done in Melbourne or Sydney. With one or

two exceptions, all the conferences are held in Melbourne or Sydney. That is the position as regards the seamen's union. Here we have a man proclaiming himself the only true blue democrat in Australia. Consider the tyranny of his actions. All the seamen are called out without being asked whether or not they believe in the conditions which Mr. Walsh is seeking to impose. Is there any justice or democracy in that? I ask my friends of both sections of the Labour party whether they are going to stand behind a thing like that. What right has Mr. Walsh—who took his position as secretary of the seamen's union only in January last, and in spite of a protest that he was not qualified to do so—to call out all the seamen in Australia without any ballot being held first? I have here an extract in regard to what has taken place in some unions in the matter of the ballot. I find that the Port Adelaide workers took a ballot as to whether or not they would go to the Arbitration Court, and 1,417 members of the union registered their views. In favour of the court were 1,106, and against 304. I am as confident as that I stand here that if a ballot had been taken in the seamen's union the majority in favour of arbitration would have been bigger. Yet Mr. Walsh knew perfectly well what he was doing. When he brought the men out, he knew they would not go back, if they could help it, except on his terms. Mr. Walsh did his utmost to get into prison because he knew the men are loyal to those whom they consider their leaders. Now here is a telegram from Johannesburg, South Africa, of comparatively recent date, saying that it was certain that the miners' ballot had gone heavily against a sympathetic general strike with the builders and that the miners' large membership made this the deciding factor. And so it did. Again, I find that in Sydney, on the 11th February, there was a dispute at the Cockatoo Island works, and the works were shut down. The Government thereupon placed certain proposals before the men, and a secret ballot was taken, with the result that the men decided to return to work. Again, in Queensland, at the Biboohra meat works, the men decided by a majority of three to one to continue work in accordance with the arbitration award. A secret ballot was taken owing to the arrival of extremists in the district, who urged a strike; and that was the result of the ballot. I am sure that had a ballot been taken at Fremantle in 1917, it would have gone ten to one against coming out on strike. The Fremantle men were asked from Melbourne to strike. They had no say or voice in the matter. They simply struck because Melbourne advised them to strike. I am well acquainted with a large number of the Fremantle lumpers, and I say they are as good a body of men, on the whole, as any working men in Australia. A large number of them have come from the goldfields. As for disloyalty, I am sure that the overwhelming majority of them have not the slightest tinge of it. They simply struck in obedience to orders issued to them from Melbourne. If the State Government had only had a little initiative in regard to the Fremantle trouble, if they had only moved ahead a little bit at the time of the armistice, the trouble might then have been settled, and settled amicably. I do not think any one of us will contend that it was a fair thing to say to men that because they had made a mistake in 1917 they were to be penalised for all time. I do not think that was right. I think that when the armistice came, there was a chance for the Government to say to the lumpers, "Now the war is over, we are going to try to stop international quarrels, and we are also going to try to stop quarrels here and endeavour to bring the two sections together."

Hon. A. H. Panton: The shipping combine would not have allowed the Government to do it.

Hon. J. E. DODD: I am pleased to see the Government have decided to bring down a Control of Trade Bill again. I do not know whether the measure will be along the same lines as that rejected by this Chamber in 1915. I hope it will be a better one. Though I agree with Mr. Lynn's statement that there are not too many commodities we can regulate in this State, still there are a considerable number which we might attend to with good results; and I trust the Government will endeavour to make the measure effective. As regards our friend Mr. Walsh, let me say that a man who states he can get money from Germany and Austria in order to carry on a strike in Australia, is a man who should be sent to either Germany or Austria. Mr. Walsh made that statement, and such a man is no friend to Australia or Australian soldiers, or to the unionists of Australia. As regards the stringing up of Ministers to lamp-posts, may I draw attention to what happened something like 125 years ago during the French Revolution. There was a man named Marat, who called himself "The Friend of the People," and who strung up, or guillotined, a great many of them; but in the end he suffered too. There were also Danton and Robespierre, and several others, who went on the same lines, and in the end they all suffered. When a man starts those commotions, he never knows where they will end. Those who are out in a country like this, where every man and woman has a vote, to evade the Constitution and the laws will, I think, come out badly in the end. Some reference has been made in the debate to White Australia and compulsory military training. Prior to the war I went out on a campaign against compulsory military training for boys. I am still opposed to compulsory military training for boys. Before the war I sent circulars on the subject to almost every Labour body in Western Australia, and did not get one solitary encouraging answer. One prominent man told me that he had got my circular, but that he considered compulsory military training was good for the boys. In those days the boys had to do the whole of the training in

their own time; now they do only half. But even in those days I could not get the slightest help in my campaign from the Labour bodies. The only two public men who came on the platform to help me were Mr. Lynn, at Fremantle, and Mr. Duffell, at Subiaco. When war was declared, the boys of Australia who had been trained, commencing with the boys born in 1894, and not one of whom was 21 years of age at the outbreak of war, were conscripted and sent away to the most dangerous spots in Australia, wherever it was thought a German warship might come. Prior to the war I addressed about 20 meetings in the metropolitan area on this subject of compulsory military training for boys, but I did not get the slightest help from the Labour movement. Mr. Panton says he is not in favour of making anyone drill who has not a vote, but Mr. Panton would not help me in my campaign.

Hon. A. H. Panton: I have learnt by experience.

Hon. J. E. DODD: I am inclined to think that the opposition to compulsory military training that is making itself felt now is due to the fact that the trainees have grown up and got votes. I think that is the explanation of the opposition now evinced towards compulsory military training for boys. Some reference has been made in the Speech to education. I believe the Government of the Commonwealth would do far better if they spent on education the money they now spend on compulsory military training for boys. I should like to draw the attention of the Minister for Education to the necessity for teaching our scholars something about citizenship. Hardly one scholar under 14 in our schools knows anything about the country we live in, about our laws or about our Government. If more attention were paid to the teaching of citizenship—not politics; God forbid that they should do that—and of the duties of citizenship, we should not hear so much about juvenile depravity. Sir Edward Wittenoom referred to the farmers getting 5s. per bushel for their wheat. I entirely agree with those who are seeking to secure protection for the farmer. If he can get 5s. per bushel, good luck to him. I go farther and say that we should give protection to our goldminers.

Sir E. H. Wittenoom: Gold has a fixed price.

Hon. J. E. DODD: It may almost be said that wheat has a fixed price in the open markets of the world. We should give proper protection to every industry in Australia. Why should a man who manufactures boots get a bonus, while the man who raises wheat gets no consideration at all? We give something to the bootmaker, something to the maker of woollen goods, and in my opinion the farmer and the goldminer have just as much right to special consideration as has the manufacturer. Mr. Kirwan referred to the question of base metals. There again we see the absolute tyranny of the East over the West, and the great fallacy of protection. In order to force every ton of base metals to the East, they actually closed down the mines producing base metals in Western Australia. Mr. Gregory, when speaking on the subject in the Federal Parliament, was asked would he rather see our base metals go to Japan than to the Eastern States. His reply was, "Yes, a thousand times rather than see the mines closed down." If we could send the base metals to Japan or some other allied country for treatment we should have a large number of men winning those metals in this State.

Hon. H. Stewart: If we sent them to England, we would still save £20 or £30 per ton.

Hon. J. E. DODD: In regard to the cost of living, I find that Mr. Tudor is asking for more protection for all the industries of Australia. At the same time he declares that manufacturers have made millions out of the workers. I am not singling out Mr. Tudor because he is Mr. Tudor, for Mr. Hughes is in exactly the same boat as Mr Tudor. They are asking for more protection for the people of Australia, and at the same time are commenting on the high cost of living. Mr. Corser, of Queensland, said that the jam manufacturers of Tasmania were getting twopence per tin on their product, while on the other hand the jam makers were complaining about the price of sugar. It is only when we find those people fighting each other that we see how the consumers of Australia are being robbed. I was interested in a remark made by Mr. Lynn in regard to the House. He stated that when Mr. Panton had been in the House a little longer he would begin to see that members gave all the attention they could to legislation, that they were tolerant of each others' opinions—which they are—and that Mr. Panton would begin to agitate for the abolition of the Assembly rather than of the Council. I cordially endorse all that Mr. Lynn said. When I look round and see all the stern uncompromising socialists in this Chamber, I begin to think the other House should go and that we should remain. I have often said that this Chamber could achieve immortality if it liked. If we could only go on the Esplanade in relays and preach the socialistic gospel which we preach here, I am sure the people of Western Australia would never agree to abolish this Chamber. Let me recall one instance which Mr. Lynn, probably from a feeling of modesty, neglected to draw attention to. We, in the Labour party preach the gospel of equal opportunity to all. I have been taught ever since a child that we should try to give everybody an equal opportunity. But Mr. Lynn and Mr. Ewing go ten times farther than that; they go to equal opportunity to coals. Last year a strike occurred with a view to forcing the coal from several mines upon the Government. We in the Labour party have never been taught to regard butters and jams as equal, but the men from Collie, employer and employee alike, came out on strike in order to force coal from four or five mines upon the Government. I

think Mr. Panton has never heard in the Trades Hall anything so extreme in the way of socialism as that. Again, I ask Mr. Panton whether he has ever heard so strongly socialistic a speech as that delivered by Mr. Nicholson the other evening. I knew perfectly well that Mr. Nicholson was leaning to socialism in connection with the amendments he moved in the Vermin Bill last year. When he made his speech here the other evening in regard to the necessity for establishing Government assistance and a sort of Government depôt for fruit, I realised that he had gone right over to socialism. I will defy any member but Mr. Sanderson to say he is not a socialist. Take Dr. Saw, and the speech he made at the opening of Parliament. He wound up a very interesting address with a reference to temperance, announcing his belief in the nationalisation of the liquor traffic. Then take Mr. Allen, who put up a brilliant speech last year in favour of the State control of the wheat stacks. Take Mr. Clarke, Mr. Rose, and Mr. Ewing: they all believe in State assistance to bacon factories and to canning factories. As for Mr. Holmes, what better socialistic speech was made than that he delivered last night in regard to State steamers, and freezing works at Wyndham? Apparently he did not clearly understand an interjection which I made. I asked what was the difference between selling a sheep and selling a sausage. Surely if it is proper to sell a bullock whole, it is equally proper to sell parts of a bullock retail. Yet when we started the State butchers' shops it was called socialism, while State traffic in bullocks in referred to as State enterprise. Then take the Government themselves; what greater socialists could there be than Ministers? Almost every Bill they bring down contains something in regard to socialism. As for the members of the Country party, they are out and out socialists. I have here an extract from the "Primary Producer" dealing with the State Implement Works. It is really the finest statement in favour of socialistic enterprise I have ever read. There are three headings, the first being "Why the individual farmer should welcome the advent of the State Implement Works." Under that heading is grouped a number of sufficient reasons, as for instance, "Because he can be sure of a fair deal." The next heading is "Why farmers as a community should welcome the advent of the State Implement Works," and the third heading is "What is the exact difference between State-owned works and private ownership?" And the answer given is—

> One aims at all the business it can get together, with all the profits possible, irrespective sometimes of the well-being of the purchaser; the other aims at all the legitimate business possible at the lowest profit, because it is not there to show handsome profits, but to give the best service to the general public.

Yet while the "Primary Producer" has published so brilliant a eulogy of the State Implement Works, the Country party turns out from office the Government administering those works. Sir Edward Wittenoom stands revealed as a socialist by his attitude in regard to the Gascoyne rabbit-proof fence. Indeed, last year the hon. member said that he would start a socialistic farm in order to train the soldiers. Mr. Duffell also has spoken very warmly upon the need for State fire insurance. I do not forget that even last session, when the select committee realised what harm the unorganised distribution of milk was doing, Mr. Duffell and yourself, Sir, with Mr. Millington, recommended that there should be a Government depôt for milk.

Hon. J. Duffell: That is a fact.

Hon. J. E. DODD: I never forgot the remark that he made in the debate on the whisky regulations. The last speech I made before going to England was for the purpose of showing how bad whisky was. You, Sir, said, I remember, "bad milk killed more people than bad whisky." I was pleased to hear a few years afterwards that when a member of the committee dealing with the question, you found yourself able, owing to the necessity of controlling the milk supply and the harm it could do, to advocate socialism. On the question of miners' complaint, I should like to read an extract from Dr. Mitchell's report on the Wooroloo Sanatorium. Dr. Mitchell says—

> In the list attached dealing with the occupations of those afflicted it is regrettable to observe the continued large number of those employed in the mining industry who have fallen victims to the disease, both as regards the number of miners attacked and the proportion of deaths resulting from this fell disease. I have found it practically impossible, in the great majority of cases of these men presenting themselves before me, at the Mine Workers' Relief Fund's office, Kalgoorlie, to persuade those who are obviously on the borderland to give up their work in the mining industry. Some observers have stated that given a condition of advanced silicosis, inevitably supervening tuberculosis results, and one's experience would certainly lead one to believe this. It is regrettable that some suitable outlet of employment cannot be found for such cases. Unless such employment can be provided, the number of sufferers is more likely to increase than to decrease.

This is the most disastrous aspect of the industrial life of the State. It was suggested that we were rather stretching the difficulties in reference to this miners' complaint, but I assure the House that the number of those suffering from it to-day is absolutely appalling. It is one of the most saddening aspects of the industry that could be imagined. There are scores of men, and I am not stretching this, with whom I came in contact when secretary of the Miners' Union at the Boulder, who have passed away owing to the disease. If hon. members have not been to Wooroloo I advise them to go there and study the conditions for themselves, and

see the men who are there and how they are suffering. It is a slow lingering death. After men have devoted the whole of their lives to the mining industry that is all they have to look forward to at present. The conditions of mining here are such that only a few deep mines and the best payable can be worked. It is there that the men are reeking with this disease. Let hon. members not only go to Wooroloo, but to the goldfields. Let them see the mine managers there, and I am sure there is not one who would not do his utmost to show them how the men work down below. They are not so bigoted as to refuse to do that. Let hon. members also see the machinery which the men have to work, see the miners at their daily work in the midst of grime and smoke. The position is not altogether the fault of those in charge of the mines, but it is due to the modern conditions of mining that this disease is so prevalent. I draw attention to this not in any spirit of antagonism. I believe it is only by a spirit of co-operation that we shall get any better results. It is a disease which attacks everyone, not only the miner but every employee on the mine. It even attacks mine managers at times. I know of one man who worked his way up from a mill hand to be a manager. He was one of the finest characters I ever knew. Mr. Kirwan and other Goldfields members knew him well. I refer to Mr. William Martin. Had he desired he could have been a leader of the Labour party. If he had sunk his convictions and thrown in his lot with labour, there is no doubt Mr. Martin could have been a leader of labour in Western Australia. He passed out as a result of this disease. Quite a number of shift bosses and foremen have also contracted it. It is the men below and the men on the mills who get this disease in its worst form. Before 1904 the miners' unions were continually seeking to draw attention to the trouble. Owing to the prosperity on the goldfields and the indifference of a large number of the men in their prosperity, very little headway was made. In 1904 a commission was appointed, and before that commission not a single doctor on the goldfields in his evidence was prepared to say there was any miners' phthisis. These included Dr. Ellis. Four years afterwards Dr. Ellis delivered a lecture in Kalgoorlie before a brotherhood of which Mr. Martin was president. He spoke about the white death. There were 1,200 miners present and the figures Dr. Ellis quoted were startling even then, although four years before he had said the disease was not on the goldfields. Some time after that Dr. Cumpston's commission was appointed, and he made an examination of a considerable proportion of the men within the mining belt. He came to the conclusion that 33 per cent. of the miners on the goldfields were suffering from miners' phthisis in some form or other. Another commission was then appointed. This made certain recommendations and some of these have been carried out. A miners' relief fund was established, and only recently it had to take a ballot to decide whether the members would pay more money into the fund, because of the number of cases which were eating up all the money that was available. I am sure that as we go on it will be found that the fund will not be adequate. I draw the attention of the Government to the trouble, because I think they should take every step they can to deal with the cause of it by acting in co-operation with the unions and managers, and that they should also take every step they can to cope with the cause and effects of the disease. If the Minister for Mines could have got into touch with Mr. Heitmann, the latter might have been induced to stop at Johannesburg, on his way back, and find out what is taking place there. I have not heard from Mr. Heitmann since he went away, and no one has mentioned this matter to me. It only struck me the other day that he could go there. Mr. Heitmann has paid more attention to this subject than any other man in Western Australia. He has suffered personally a great deal from the ravages of the disease. In 1913 a great strike occurred on the Rand as a result of miners' phthisis. I think that was the strike in which the military were called out. I make this suggestion to the leader of the House that if Mr. Heitmann, if he has not already left the Old Country, could be induced to do the work he should break his journey in South Africa and make the necessary investigations. I do not suppose it would cost more than £100 at the outside, but he would be able to see what is being done there in regard to the disease. I have heard that they have made wonderful strides in coping with it since 1913. I am not seeking to make out that the disease is worse than it is, but I am only trying to point out the terrible ravages and agonies it is causing to-day. I hope that something can be done in the matter. I would like to deal with a statement made by Mr. Sedgbeer which appeared in the paper the day before yesterday in regard to the possibilities of trade with Java. The Government might take advantage of the report submitted by yourself, Sir, a year or two ago in connection with trade between this State and Singapore and Java, and pay a little more attention to it. If they would do so much might be done in this direction. Mr. Sedgbeer said much of what you have said in your report. He states that the Islands are simply crying out for Australian goods. Surely the Government might see their way clear to appoint a Commissioner as suggested to go into the matter. This might help the State out of its difficulties to a certain extent. I hope that in the future we shall try as far as possible to lessen that feeling which is running high at present. I should also like to refer to a statement made by Mr. Panton in regard to contracts and the Federal Government. He explained that in connection with the making of suits for soldiers, etc., the contractor had taken the

work at such a low price that he had to sweat the girls in order to carry it through. Then he made the astounding statement that he did not blame the contractor.

Hon. A. H. Panton: I think you are wrong.

Hon. J. E. DODD: I think the hon. member will find that in "Hansard."

Hon. A. H. Panton: The Federal Government set the price themselves.

Hon. J. E. DODD: It is just the same. What can be thought of a contractor who would take work at a price that he knows will mean the sweating of the girls who have to carry on the work?

Hon. A. H. Panton: And what about the Government?

Hon. J. E. DODD: My experience of some miners' unions is that if a man had a contract which did not pay him he was compelled to go on with it under certain penalties. If a contractor takes a contract where the prices are so fixed that he knows he will have to sweat the girls employed in order to carry it out, he is as much to blame as is the person who lets the contract.

Hon. A. H. Panton: The girls had to suffer on this occasion.

Hon. J. E. DODD: A man who takes work like that must be a kind of human vampire, and the sooner he gets out the better. I trust that in future we shall be able to get rid of our deficit. Of course we shall not do that all at once. I also hope that we shall get out of our difficulties before long.

On motion by Hon. J. Duffell debate adjourned.

House adjourned at 5.48 p.m.

Legislative Assembly,

Wednesday, 13th August, 1919.

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

QUESTION—DAIRY FARMING AND CHILD LABOUR.

Mr. PICKERING asked the Honorary Minister: His attention having been called to an article appearing in the "Sunday Times" of the 27th ult., will he please state whether, in view of the fact that the dairymen on the Stirling estate, in the Capel district, view the article in the light of a specific charge of child slavery to cows, he will cause an investigation to be made and report the result of such investigation to this House?

The PREMIER (for the Honorary Minister) replied: The article referred to is too vague to form the basis of a satisfactory investigation.

QUESTION—FARMS ABANDONED.

Hon. P. COLLIER asked the Minister for Lands: 1, How many farms are at present in possession of the Government through foreclosure of mortgage to the Agricultural Bank or Industries Assistance Board? 2, What is the total amount involved in the foregoing question? 3, How many such farms have been disposed of to returned soldiers?

The MINISTER FOR LANDS replied: 1, 927, of which 154 were the property of settlers who enlisted. 2, (a) Agricultural Bank, £310,035, including interest. (b) Industries Assistance Board, £96,847. 3, 54.

QUESTION—PUBLIC SERVICE INCREMENTS.

Mr. SMITH asked the Premier: What are the intentions of the Government with regard to paying civil servants (a) a further increment under the Classification from the 1st July last? (b) adequate living allowances to meet the increased cost of living?

The PREMIER replied: The matter has not yet been considered.

QUESTION—RAILWAY CONSTRUCTION, NYABING-PINGRUP.

Mr. THOMSON asked the Premier: In view of the statement that the Federal Government are providing money for the opening up of land for soldier settlements, will the Government take into consideration the question of the construction of the Nyabing-Pingrup railway, authorised in 1915, as the land in this district is suitable for that purpose?

The PREMIER replied: Yes.

QUESTION—SOLDIER SETTLERS.

Mr. JOHNSTON asked the Premier: In regard to the 647 soldier settlers to whom loans have been approved, will he please state (a) the number of such settlers who held their properties before enlisting? (b) the number of new settlers who have ob-