

Legislative Assembly.

Thursday, 16th October, 1941.

| | PAGE |
|--|------|
| Questions: Pigs, as to prices | 1247 |
| Phosphate and copralite, Dandarragan deposits | 1247 |
| Defence, camp sanitary arrangements | 1247 |
| Mining, vermiculite | 1248 |
| Western Australian War Industries Committee, as to release of report | 1248 |
| Bills: Marketing of Eggs Regulation, 1s. | 1248 |
| Law Reform (Miscellaneous Provisions), 1s. | 1248 |
| Supply (No. 2), £1,200,000, all stages | 1248 |
| Wills (Soldiers, Sailors, and Airmen), 3s. | 1282 |
| Death Penalty Abolition, 3s. | 1282 |
| City of Perth Scheme for Superannuation (Amendments Authorisation), Council's amendments | 1283 |
| Potato Growers Licensing, report | 1283 |
| Government Stock Saleyards, Council's amendments | 1284 |
| Profiteering Prevention Act Amendment, Council's amendment | 1284 |
| Industrial Arbitration Act Amendment, Com. | 1285 |

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

QUESTION—PIGS.

As to Prices.

Mr. BERRY asked the Minister for Agriculture: 1, Is it considered that primary producers in this State are receiving fair treatment in connection with their pig sales? 2, Does he know whether at a recent sale at Ballarat, backfatters or choppers made up to £10, while at Katanning at the same time prime pigs dressing between 300 and 400 lbs. sold for about 45s.? 3, Does he know whether Ballarat baconers were sold for £5, while Katanning baconers ranged from 45s. to 60s.? 4, Do the same firms or any of them operate in all States? 5, Would he consider installing weighing scales at necessary country centres and arrange by legislation, or through the Price Fixing Commissioner, for pigs to be sold at so much per lb.? 6, Does the Government take over and pay for practically all export pigs at the same price per lb. in all States?

The MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE replied: 1, The sudden changes in advice consequent upon alterations in the terms of contract with the British Government have made the position difficult. In view of the rapidly changing policies the market has been unstable and at times flooded with unsuitable pigs. The Department of Agriculture considers that buyers have endeavoured to mete out very fair treatment. 2, Reports from Victoria indicate that prices

of 4d. to 4½d. per pound are being paid for backfatters; corresponding prices in this State range from 2¼d. to 2¾d. per pound. In Victoria a good market exists for this type of pig as large contracts for canned sausages have been let. 3, I have been unable to obtain any information regarding the particular market referred to by the hon. member, but the most recent quotations available are as follows:—Brooklyn (Melbourne)—Prime baconers, 6½d. to 6¾d. per lb.; export baconers, 6d. to 6½d. per lb. Midland Junction—Baconers suitable for export and local market, 6½d. per lb. It is probable that the variations referred to have been due to the difference in the quality of the pigs that have been submitted for sale. 4, Only one firm—Foggitt Jones Pty., Ltd., operates in both Victoria and Western Australia. 5, Foggitt Jones Pty., Ltd., installed scales at several country sidings some years ago, but owing to the desire of farmers to submit their pigs for sale by auction all these scales, with the exception of one, have since been removed. 6, The conditions and price paid for pig meat acquired under the terms of the contract with the British Government are the same in each State.

QUESTION—PHOSPHATE AND COPRALITE.

Dandarragan Deposits.

Mr. SEWARD asked the Minister for Industrial Development: 1, Have any tests been made of the phosphate and copralite beds at Dandarragan? 2, If so, what results were obtained?

The MINISTER FOR INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT replied: 1, Yes, a survey has been made. 2, The survey indicated the extent and quality of the deposit were below expectations, and did not warrant development.

QUESTION—DEFENCE.

Camp Sanitary Arrangements.

Mr. NORTH asked the Minister for Health: Does the State Health Department assume any responsibility regarding sanitary arrangements at—(a) the Swanbourne forts; (b) the camp at Claremont?

The MINISTER FOR HEALTH replied: The Public Health Department assumes no direct responsibility for sanitary arrangements at Swanbourne forts or the Claremont camp, unless appealed to by the military authorities or the local health authority, which has control in its own district. The Swanbourne forts are situated in the Nedlands road board district. The Claremont camp is in the Claremont municipal health district.

QUESTION—MINING, VERMICULITE.

Mr. KELLY asked the Minister for Mines: 1, Does the quantity of vermiculite produced in Western Australia in 1940 represent the total demand for local requirements? 2, Does a market for the expansion of the industry exist, and if it does, to what extent? 3, Is there a treatment plant for the manufacture of vermiculite in Western Australia? 4, If not, where is treatment carried out within the Commonwealth?

The MINISTER FOR MINES replied: 1, It did in 1940, but new uses for the mineral are developing. 2, The market is an expanding one, particularly in view of the prohibition of imports by the Commonwealth into Australia of vermiculite. Such prohibition was the result of representations by this State, which is at present the one commercial producer in Australia. 3, Yes. Messrs. Banfield and Sons of Perth. 4, Replied to by answer No. 3.

QUESTION—WESTERN AUSTRALIAN WAR INDUSTRIES COMMITTEE.

As to Release of Report.

Mr. BERRY (without notice) asked the Premier: Has he received any further intimation from the Federal Government of its intention to make public the report of the Western Australian War Industries Committee of which Senator Collett was chairman?

The PREMIER replied: I was in touch with the then Prime Minister two or three weeks ago about this matter, but owing to the disturbed political position I was not optimistic about securing a decision at that stage. With the change in the Federal Government I have communicated with the present Prime Minister and hope to receive a reply within a day or two.

BILLS (2)—FIRST READING.

1. Marketing of Eggs Regulation.
Introduced by Mr. Cross.
2. Law Reform (Miscellaneous Provisions).
Introduced by Mr. McDonald.

BILL—SUPPLY (No. 2), £1,200,000.

Standing Orders Suspension.

On motion by the Premier, resolved—

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

Message.

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

In Committee of Supply.

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

THE PREMIER (Hon. J. C. Willecock—Geraldton) [4.36]: I move—

That there be granted to His Majesty on account of the services of the year ending the 30th June, 1942, a sum not exceeding £1,200,000.

The purpose of the Bill about to be introduced is to grant a further supply pending the passage of the Estimates and the Appropriation Bill. The first supply Act of this year provided from Consolidated Revenue Fund £1,850,000, from General Loan Fund £350,000, and from Advance to Treasurer £300,000. The expenditure for the first Supply granted has been, from Consolidated Revenue Fund £1,781,674 and from General Loan Fund £183,891.

Hon. C. G. Latham: How long will this Supply last you?

The PREMIER: To the end of next month, November, and let us hope that the Appropriation Bill will have been passed by then. As the Estimates are now under discussion and members have full opportunity to deal with the various votes, the second Supply Bill will not require any further explanation, being the measure customarily introduced at this time of the year.

MR. SEWARD (Pingelly) [4.38]: I regret having to speak on this Bill, but owing to the reply given to me by the Premier yesterday, when I asked—

The **CHAIRMAN**: This is the resolution, not the Bill itself. At the same time, the hon. member can speak at this stage.

Mr. SEWARD: Yesterday I asked the Premier whether he would make an opportunity for the House to meet in secret session, so that our knowledge of the war position might be enlarged and members enabled to express their opinions on Western Australia's war effort. I regret that the Premier could not see his way clear to do that. I fully recognise that it is a difficult matter in view of the circumstance that the new Federal Government has just taken over, but we have to face facts. I do not think any member of this Chamber or of another place can view the present position with any feeling of either satisfaction or comfort. If a member can do so, he has a very different outlook on the war position from mine. Members of Parliament moving about the State are constantly being asked their opinions about the war and what progress this State is making to fulfil its duty in that respect. I do not wish to speak for other members, but speaking for myself I will say that all I can do, in reply to such questions, is to reiterate what I see in the daily Press. We do not know what has been going on at the various Fronts, and in my opinion the time has arrived when we must get down to business in that respect.

A week or so ago I had a request from a man who desired employment in the munitions factory about to be set up in Western Australia. Upon making inquiries I was told that there were something like 4,000 applications for about 1,500 positions, but that in any case work would not be started until the end of January. If we are to go along in this haphazard, go-as-you-please way, the first question to be asked is how long the war will last. Where are we going to be at the end of January? Our responsible duty is to see that every possible man is put to work on the erection of that factory so as to have it completed in the shortest possible space of time.

The Premier: That has been done, has it not?

Mr. SEWARD: I do not know, and I would like to have an assurance that the largest possible number of men shall be put

on that work. Again, work should not be going on for five days a week and seven hours a day, but every day including Sunday from sun-up to sun-down. There should be no stoppage of that work. What would it matter if eventually we had to destroy thousands of pounds' worth of munitions after we had won the war, compared with being short of the requirements of the men at the Front? I have been talking with some of the men who have returned from the war, and my first question to them has been, "Why is not something being done with all the men on the Fronts?" I do not wish to say these things in the House, but I am forced to do it. The replies of the returned soldiers are to the effect that "we have not been doing anything in Africa because we have no munitions for our men." How long is that position to exist?

I think the Premier should make available an opportunity for members to discuss the matter. I do not want it ventilated in the Press. I care not if people call me a pessimist. I would far rather have that than be called an optimist without any grounds for optimism. And there are no grounds for optimism today. The member for Kalgoorlie (Mr. Styants) recently made a statement which we are entitled to regard as most serious. The hon. member has been in camp, and he comes here and tells us there are not the munitions in the camps for the training of the men. Meantime all employers are being seriously inconvenienced by reason of men being called into camp. The employers do not mind that inconvenience, which they regard as part of their share of the war effort; but they have strong grounds for objecting to men being simply called into camp when they cannot undergo the full training they ought to undergo.

These are matters which I think we should discuss. I have had application after application made to me to get men released for the shearing and the harvest. The next batch of trainees going into camp is going there for six months. This means that they will be absent from some of the harvesting and some of the seeding operations. Then, of course, there comes the question of the expenditure of public money. The Premier has asked that a certain sum of money be made available to the Government. As has been pointed out by other speakers in the past, we do not seem to have the opportunity to discuss the expenditure of any money un-

til it has practically been allotted to different purposes. Our control is negligible. Our duty is to conserve as far as possible all our financial resources so that we may further our war aims, and relieve taxation upon the individual to the utmost extent possible. I have brought this matter before the House because I felt it was my duty to do so.

We should see that something is done to speed up the war effort, and that Western Australia and other parts of Australia do their utmost to change the outlook of the war. Let us consider the position in Russia! Where should we be if—and God forbid—Russia collapsed? The whole question is a vital one for us. It is no use people saying that the matter is one for the Federal Government. The matter is one for every Parliament in Australia to take up. Everything possible must be done by every responsible authority to see that the whole of the resources of this country are employed, regimented and used for the successful prosecution of the war.

HON. C. G. LATHAM (York) [4.52]: The member for Pingelly (Mr. Seward) has raised a very serious question, one that should not be too greatly discussed in public. I listened the other night to the statements of the member for Kalgoorlie (Mr. Styants). He is usually very careful in presenting his facts. From my knowledge of military affairs in this State I cannot, however, agree as to the experience he says he has had in camps. My experience is that at the Melville camp the men are being well trained, and considering all things are well equipped. Any one who has seen the parades that have taken place in the city will agree that the men must have been capably handled, and that the marches have demonstrated to the people in general that our soldiers have acquired a great deal of military knowledge whilst they have been in camp. To criticise is easy. I have refrained from repeating things that have been said to me, but it is difficult to get to the foundation of statements that have been made.

The people of this State to a certain extent are placed somewhat differently from people in the other States. Elsewhere in Australia a good deal of Commonwealth money is being expended on the manufacture of war material, much

more so than is the case in this State. As a consequence of that people over there see the work that is actually being done. A certain amount of work is, of course, also being done in Western Australia. We have not, however, as many large engineering works, outside those within the control of the Government, namely, the State Implement Works and the Midland Junction Workshops, as are found in Eastern Australia. Very few of our big engineering works are being utilised for war purposes, although many of our small works are being so used. If members were to travel about they would see that a fair amount of war work was being done in this State. At the technical college during the last 18 months or two years many partially-trained young men have been turned out and placed in various undertakings.

The drawback here is that we have so few trained men because their training has been restricted. There was no vocational training in Western Australia of any account. The number of apprentices is limited, because trade unions believe in keeping the trades short supplied with labour. I believe that to be so.

The Minister for Mines: No!

Hon. C. G. LATHAM: Artisans are coming to Western Australia from the Eastern States and from overseas, and as I have said before our own people are becoming labourers to those artisans.

The Minister for Mines: Dozens of our artisans are called over to the Eastern States.

Hon. C. G. LATHAM: There is now a shortage of labour in many trades. There is a shortage of bricklayers. All that has occurred in the last 18 months or two years. I admit we cannot expect our young men to be trained in five minutes. A man has to spend five years in training before he is qualified to take his proper place in an engineering shop. We cannot expect in so short a period as 18 months to have fully qualified men.

Mr. W. Hegney: The Arbitration Court lays down the regulations under which that is governed.

Hon. C. G. LATHAM: Some arrangement has been made between engineering unions and the Federal Government

whereby young fellows may be partially trained for munitions work.

The Premier: That is going on here, too.

Hon. C. G. LATHAM: I have instanced what is taking place at the technical college. Members might be better acquainted with what is going on if the Government took them into its confidence. That applies to both sides of the House. I do not know that much would be gained by the holding of a secret session of Parliament, but I feel that the Minister for Railways might invite members from both sides of the Chamber to see what is being done at the Midland Junction Workshops.

The Minister for Railways: We are making arrangements for that now.

Hon. C. G. LATHAM: I have been privileged in that respect because I have asserted myself. I have been through the works, and spent a whole day in seeing what is going on there. Probably I have no right to say what is being done there. That is not part of my duty.

The Premier: It would be doing a disservice to the war effort if you did.

Hon. C. G. LATHAM: I agree. I regret the member for Pingelly found it necessary to raise the question he did. Every member, however, is entitled to worry. We are all worried. We cannot view the situation as it exists today without being worried. If we have any respect for the freedom we have enjoyed in Australia, and the responsibility we have of handing down that freedom to those who succeed us, we must worry about the future. The position in Europe today is very serious. Probably even nearer home than that the position is serious. The question is whether we can do more than we are doing at present.

Mr. Triat: We are doing very little at present; indeed we may be said to be doing little or nothing.

Hon. C. G. LATHAM: I have tried to find means whereby we can do more. Plenty of work is available for us to do. I find myself pretty busy at times, and returned to Perth only at 4 o'clock this morning. There is plenty of work for the member for Mr. Magnet (Mr. Triat) to do. We could readily find a job for him.

Mr. Triat: In asking people to subscribe to the war loan? Anyone could do that.

Hon. C. G. LATHAM: That work has to be done.

Mr. Warner: You would require to have a tough hide to ask a pensioner to subscribe 10s. towards the war loan.

Hon. C. G. LATHAM: The difficulty is in getting people who are able to voice their opinions to stand up before others and ask for these loans. Members of this Chamber are trained speakers, and it is not difficult for them to carry out that sort of work. We have a duty to perform, and we should point out to those who are left behind what their responsibilities are. I have said repeatedly on the public platform that the public has no full realisation of what actual warfare means.

Many people are still spending money in directions where they could well refrain from doing so, without any injury to themselves. The money they save they could put into Government securities for expenditure on war materials. We must continue to find money for the various war works that have to be carried out. That is the big job of the entire community. The raising of loans was all right in days gone by when reserve funds were available. Today people have put a great deal of their money into Commonwealth stocks, and it is not now so easy to draw further supplies from that source. I should be very glad to see the member for Mt. Magnet go on a trip or two that will soon be arranged, so that he can assist in inducing the people to make their subscriptions to the current war loan.

Mr. Triat: I do not say that is easy.

Hon. C. G. LATHAM: It is a big job.

The Minister for Mines: People in my district are willing to give.

Hon. C. G. LATHAM: Some are very willing but some are not, and it is the unwilling ones we cannot contact. We cannot have information reaching our opponents that we are not backing our Government. I will make any effort I can in that direction. I do not know whether the Premier will say that he sees no justification for a secret session, and I do not know how a new Government will be in a position to help us. It will take some little time to acquire the information. Many of the Ministers have not held office previously, and they have to learn something of their responsibilities.

The Premier: One of them said to me over the telephone this morning, "I have not warmed my chair yet."

Hon. C. G. LATHAM: I do not expect impossibilities from them. The Premier might give us an opportunity to see what is actually being done in this State. The great trouble at the moment is to get the necessary machinery. I told a member of the Federal Government that as soon as a machine has to be made over in the East, an annexe is built. The result is that Western Australia does not get the machines to which it is entitled. I know works are being built at Welshpool. I raised the point with Mr. Essington Lewis that it is no use spending money building these places unless the equipment will be put into them. He said he did not know that he had any right to discuss the matter with me; that the Premier and Federal representatives of this State knew all about it.

The Premier: We do not know all, but we do know something.

Hon. C. G. LATHAM: The Premier does not know whether we will get the machinery over; he only hopes we shall. From the primary producing point of view this State is doing as much as is any State in Australia. We provide everything we can, and a great deal for which we cannot find markets. The matter comes back to the material required in actual warfare, and there we may be a little behind. We have demonstrated clearly what we can do with our small population and few engineering works.

MR. McDONALD (West Perth) [5.4]: This is a normal appropriation.

Hon. C. G. Latham: It is a Supply Bill.

Mr. McDONALD: I do not propose to make any comments on it. The member for Pingelly (Mr. Seward) has, in a very timely manner, raised a question of such importance that our normal Supply Bill pales into complete insignificance. No one could have read the mid-day edition of today's "Daily News" without a sense of profound disquiet. We have to consider whether we are not now embarking upon the real period of war and the real testing time of the Empire, and all parts of it. It is said that the defence of Australia is the province of the Federal Parliament—the National Parliament. So it is! It is said that the defence of our country is not the province of the State Parlia-

ment. In one sense that statement is true, but I am inclined to think that it is not entirely true. The defence of the country is very much a matter for this Parliament, not in the sense that we have any legislative or administrative powers, but in the sense that we may have a great deal of influence as the representatives of the people in our State legislature. We are possibly relying too much on the Federal Government and the Federal Parliament.

Are we expecting the war effort of Australia to come by a drive from the top? Should there not be more of a corresponding drive from beneath? If we expect the driving power to come completely from the Federal Parliament, are we not going to diminish by a very great extent the potentialities of Australia? Is not this Parliament able to generate driving powers in defence matters? Our State, as the Leader of the Opposition said, has done more, and always does more, than has any other State to meet the obligations of war. We may yet do an immense amount more. In other countries would they spend, as the member for Pingelly stated, months and months in building a munitions factory before installing machines to make the munitions? Would not every man and perhaps woman of suitable strength, who could be spared from any walk of life, be out there in any spare time—at night, Sundays or Saturdays—helping in that work, much of which does not require a great deal of skill? Would not that factory, in some of our enemy countries, be put up in as many weeks, or almost days, as we take months?

Mr. Triant: That is a fact!

Mr. McDONALD: Time is the absolute essence of the contract in winning this war. It is very difficult for a public man, even one who occupies a position of comparative obscurity in public life, to say very much about the war. It seems somehow to be unpatriotic to tell people that this war must be won and will be won only by tremendous exertion and sacrifice. I do not know that we, as public men, make that known sufficiently. It is, however, a profound truth. The news in our daily Press reveals the need for a searching examination of ourselves individually, and of our organisation in this State to see if we cannot do more.

What has been said this afternoon is not confined to Western Australia. It is far more applicable to the other States where,

at present, they are spending money on amusements, and in various other ways, on a scale beyond anything that obtained in peace time. No doubt in many respects they are working very hard, but whether they have a realisation of the task before them is open to doubt. The Premier and the members of his Government, as the leaders of the State, carry a tremendous responsibility. They, even more than we, are accountable to the people in disaster as well as in prosperity. I would like the Premier to consider whether he, together with the members of his Government, could not do something more through this Parliament to increase the driving force of the State towards the tremendous task lying ahead.

MR. TRIAT (Mt. Magnet) [5.11]: I support the remarks of the member for Pingelly (Mr. Seward). Since I have been a member of the House, and since war has been declared, I have held the opinion that not sufficient energy is put behind the war efforts in Western Australia. I still have to be convinced that much has been done in Western Australia. I have been from one end of the State to the other and have made searching inquiries. I find we have done something, but not of any consequence. There is not much war effort or war conscience in Western Australia today. I do not feel a bit different from what I did when war broke out. I am not called upon to do anything except subscribe money. If I have no money I do nothing. That is the position of a man who is physically fit. I can do something in a country like this for a war effort, and I am only one of thousands who have not been asked to do anything, except speak over the wireless to ask people to subscribe to a war loan. I would like to examine the factories where the manufacture of munitions is carried out. What activities of real warfare are carried out in militia camps? Militia men will tell us that they have an anti-tank rifle in Western Australia made out of wood—a dummy. That is all they have for training purposes. They have not a Bren gun.

Buildings are being put up for munition factories, but why cannot we manufacture the instruments to be used? Have we not men able to manufacture these instruments? Our engineers should be able to fabricate them. We should not have to wait for the Eastern States to supply them. All the

material is in the State, and we must have the brains here. If we had the plans submitted to us we could fabricate the machines, but it is not being done. The munitions factory at Welshpool has been in course of erection for four months, and I would like members to see what has been done. After four months of activity, members would be surprised to find just what has been done there. A lot of men are rushing about and are not doing anything at all.

The Premier: I would not say that.

Mr. TRIAT: In effect they are doing nothing. At any rate what they are doing is not worth twopence.

The Premier: We have the buildings.

Mr. TRIAT: The buildings alone are not any contribution to the war effort. Let us get the machinery. That is what we want. All over the country there are lathes that are not being used, and men who are qualified to work them are leaving the State. The position is serious. The member for West Perth (Mr. McDonald) told us that the news in tonight's paper should bring something home to us. Have we ever had a paper that told us of a British victory—a real substantial victory?

Mr. North: Yes. In September of last year in Britain!

Mr. TRIAT: What was that victory, the blocking of the invasion?

Hon. N. Keenan: There was Sidi Barrani.

Mr. TRIAT: Whatever we have gained has very soon been taken from us. True, our troops made a very fine advance in North Africa, but we were deprived of the fruits of that victory.

The Premier: What happened to the Bismarck?

Mr. TRIAT: It went down, but what about the hundreds of thousands of tons of shipping being sunk each week?

The Minister for Mines: Not so much tonnage as during the other war, according to the newspapers!

Mr. TRIAT: Are we winning the war? No, we are sitting idly by. I say that definitely. If anybody can tell me anything we have been asked to do, apart from subscribing our money, I should like to know what it is. I am not a warmonger but I say that if we are in the scrap, let us be in it in real earnest. If we are not, let us get out of it. In matters of war, there can be no half measures; we must be either

in or out. What we have done is not deserving of recognition. I am not blaming the State Government entirely for that condition of affairs because it has not the power, but why not get the Commonwealth authorities to provide the material for making the machines?

The Premier: They will not.

Mr. TRIAT: Then let us expose them. We are here as representatives of the people and it is our duty to make the facts known. If the Commonwealth authorities will not provide the material, let us tell the people exactly where the trouble lies. Why should we hide the facts? As responsible members it is our duty to tell the people exactly what is happening. The member for Pingelly (Mr. Seward) told us that he is frequently approached by people desirous of getting information. If he has no more information than I have, he knows nothing beyond what he reads in the Press. The people regard members of Parliament, not as being superior, but as having inside knowledge. Whenever I meet a Federal member I ask for information, but in most instances I am told that the member has no more information than I have.

We are on the wrong track entirely if we think to win the war in this way. I hope something will be done. I hope the Minister for Railways will arrange for members to visit the Midland Junction Workshops and will then explain, "This is what we are doing, but keep your mouths shut about it." If I can be convinced that we are doing something, I shall be able to tell people when they inquire of me. Unless I am so convinced I cannot tell them, and until I am convinced I shall continue to say that we are doing nothing. From my experience we are certainly doing very little. Twelve months ago I made the statement that a mob of niggers armed with bows and arrows could take Western Australia.

Mr. Cross: They could, too!

Mr. TRIAT: And I say that applies to day, so little in the shape of war supplies have we manufactured in this State.

Mr. Thorn: We could throw stones at the enemy.

Mr. TRIAT: To beat the Germans we have to do something better than throw stones. Until we get action in this matter, we shall not be doing justice to the people or to the country. I trust an opportunity will be provided for members to view the work that is going on, and if it is not all it

should be, let us have the right to criticise. Then we might achieve something. If we are going to leave these things until it is too late, we might as well shut up shop and allow the Japanese to walk in.

MR. BERRY (Irwin-Moore) [5.20]: I share the apprehension expressed by the member for Pingelly. It is not a question of optimism, pessimism, or any other 'ism. The problem we have to face is, how are we going to beat Hitler?

Mr. Cross: And the Japs presently, too.

Mr. BERRY: Every step that Hitler advances in Russia brings him a step nearer to Australia. If he conquers Russia he will conquer Asia and with it Singapore.

The Premier: I would not say that.

Mr. BERRY: I am saying it because I come from that part of the world.

The Premier: It will take him a long time.

The Minister for Mines: He was going to conquer Britain and then he was going to overrun Russia in nine days.

Mr. BERRY: In spite of those intelligent interjections, Hitler still forges ahead, and, as the member for Mt. Magnet pointed out, we are doing practically nothing. The reason for this is attributable to our unfortunate apathy, because we live in such security in Australia. That has been our trouble. We are not war-minded because war has never come to these shores. Pray God that it never does, but that is our trouble.

We have heard much of what we can and what we cannot do. The Leader of the Opposition has pointed out that we can contribute money, but that in itself is not enough. I venture to suggest that some of the voluntary contributors have not received much encouragement from the Federal Government that recently went out of office. I hope there will be a change now. I am chairman of the Spitfire Fund. That fund had perhaps the lowest cost of any collection raised in Australia. The amount collected was £10,000 and the cost of collecting it was less than £180. We proceeded to send that money to Britain for the purchase of a Spitfire. After we had sent part of it, the Federal Government, perhaps rightly, stepped in and said, "You must not send any more money to England because that prejudices our oversea credit, but we would

like you to continue your activities and send the money to the Commonwealth Government for a similar purpose." We agreed.

In a practical sense there is not much difference between providing munitions of war in England or in Australia. If it is of equal advantage to keep that money in Australia as to send it to England for the purpose of winning the war, then it must be kept in Australia. At any rate, we agreed and requested the then Federal Treasurer permission, each time we subscribed £5,000, to name a fighting machine for which we were helping to pay. To our amazement we were told that the proposal was not acceptable to the Federal Government. The least we could send with the expectation of being able to name a machine was £15,000. At that time we had £5,000 in hand and did not know what to do with it. I was not at the bottom of what happened; it was one of the occasions when I did not go mad over nonsense.

The members of the committee met recently and resolved to wind up the fund. They were indignant at the attitude of and the correspondence, lettergrams, telegrams and absolute hokey that came to us from the then Commonwealth Government. I admit that later, after a meeting, we received a letter from Mr. Curtin in which he made certain very happy suggestions, which we appreciated. Of the men I have met in my contacts in a small way with the war effort, I take my hat off to the present Prime Minister. That was our experience when collecting patriotic funds to provide Spitfires. The apathy came, not from the State Government, which had nothing to do with the matter, but from the Commonwealth Government. I suggest that if we had in Canberra more brains and fewer jellyfish, we would be better off. I trust that such a change has now come.

Mr. J. H. Smith: It is worse now for everybody.

The Minister for Mines: Now we are getting something!

Mr. BERRY: That has not been my experience to date; there have already been two or three happenings from Canberra that have pleased me beyond measure. Let me now pass to the shipbuilding business. I discovered that the R.A.A.F. required patrol boats, bombing scows and other small craft to the number of 17 or 27, I am not sure which. I interviewed the

people concerned and eventually received from the Eastern States specifications for the tenders being called for the work. To my astonishment I found that it would be quite impossible to build any one of those vessels in Western Australia, not because we did not have suitable men or suitable materials, but because the specifications definitely stipulated that the materials to be used must come from the Eastern States. It was specified that the hulls must be of Huon pine, while for other structural parts certain timber from New South Wales and Queensland mahogany must be used. Nobody in Western Australia could possibly submit a tender acceptable to the Commonwealth under those specifications.

It was stated that, if a tenderer wished to use other materials, he would have to give specific reasons for so doing. To lodge a tender providing for the use of Western Australian timbers somebody would have had to go to the Eastern States and explain, probably unsuccessfully, that jarrah was as suitable as any other timber. In time of war, if we can build ships as well of jarrah as of other timber, or even almost as well, so long as it will serve the purpose, for the love of God let us do it! The apathy, stupidity and folly being displayed have caused the member for Mt. Magnet to speak as he has done today, and his remarks have my full endorsement. I would not say that the State Government has done nothing, because that would be untrue, but I do say that our Government and other Governments in Australia have not done enough because they do not realise how much there is to be done.

I hope we will get ahead with this business. The time is long overdue for taking a serious view of the position. One member stated that every effort must emanate from the people, but time is passing and the less our effort now, the greater the effort that will be needed later on. But I do not despair of the English-speaking people if only they will wake up. But who is going to wake them up? That is the difficulty. In April of last year a Western Australian War Industries Committee was appointed to report on matters of importance to the war effort in Western Australia. Tonight members heard the

Premier's reply to the question I asked without notice. We have not yet got that report.

The Premier: Many of the things mentioned in the report have been done.

Mr. BERRY: I am pleased to hear that. I am not criticising the State Government for having done nothing.

The Premier: The Federal Government has that responsibility.

Mr. BERRY: I am merely pointing out a view, shared by other members, that we have not done enough. Not only have we not done enough, but the people do not know what we have done.

Mr. Abbott: Or how much!

Mr. BERRY: Or how much, it does not matter.

Mr. Abbott: Why should we tell them?

Mr. BERRY: The criticism I am offering is not my own. I am voicing the criticism offered to me in the city. People ask, "What have you done?" Echo answers, "What?"

Mr. J. H. Smith: That applies not only in the city, but all over the country.

Mr. BERRY: Yes. Personally, I will do whatever I can to assist the Government to make a really big effort to beat Hitler.

MR. SHEARN (Maylands) [5.32]: I did not intend to speak on the Bill, as I know the Premier is anxious to get it through, because without it the Government cannot proceed. But I remind members that I raised this point on the Address-in-reply. I pointed out then that I—and I felt sure every member of the House except the Ministers—had not any idea of what was being done, what was intended to be done, or what we were capable of doing, to help the war effort. I am inclined to think, however, that some of the speakers this afternoon have almost created an atmosphere of unnecessary hysteria. It is hardly conceivable that all the statements made here this afternoon can be borne out by facts. Other members beside myself have no doubt had extravagant statements made to them as to inefficiency and apparent lack of equipment for the troops but from my own meagre experience I am aware that some of those statements are not in accord with facts.

I am reminded by an interjection made by the member for North Perth (Mr. Abbott) of an important point. He asked, "How much have we done?" Reference was made to the holding of a secret session of this Parliament. I would suggest to the Premier and to the House, however, that a small committee of members, representative of all parties, could more expeditiously and more satisfactorily inspect what is being done in the Government workshops, in private factories and elsewhere to help the war effort in this State. That committee could then make reports to members upon what is being done and whether the work should be speeded up or new methods introduced. The committee could also make recommendations. Members would thus have an opportunity to appreciate what is being done and would be in a position to judge whether the recommendations, or some of them, were possible of accomplishment. I would prefer that to the holding of a secret session. I realise, as was pointed out by the member for West Perth (Mr. McDonald) that it is not the responsibility of this State, or of this Government, to direct the war effort; nevertheless, every citizen of Western Australia should shoulder some responsibility.

With the member for Mt. Magnet (Mr. Triat), I am convinced that every member of this House will accept that responsibility and do his utmost to help. But we must first learn just how and where we can help. Until members know that, they are justified in saying that they feel they are not doing their part in trying to bring about victory in this titanic struggle, which threatens the existence not only of Western Australia but of the Commonwealth and the whole British Empire. I put that humble suggestion to the Premier in the hope that such a committee would perhaps be able to relieve the Premier and the members of the Government of some of their burdens. In any case, it would obviate the holding of a secret session. I hope something along those lines may be possible of accomplishment, so that the people of this State may know that members are sincere in their desire to assume responsibilities and take a lead in the war effort in this momentous hour.

MR. ABBOTT (North Perth) [5.37]: Admittedly, it is not the responsibility of this House to deal with matters of defence. Even in the responsible Parliament it is

not possible to disclose information generally which might be of benefit to the enemy. We are constantly being warned: "Be careful what you say." I therefore presume the authorities consider it possible that information can be got from Australia to places where it may be of use to the enemy. I suggest it would not be possible for confidential figures to be given even in the Federal Parliament, much less in this Parliament.

The Minister for Mines: Or even in the House of Commons!

Mr. ABBOTT: Yes. I have no doubt that the responsible head of this State has at the present moment a great deal of intimate knowledge of the war effort, but it would be extremely indiscreet of him to disclose that knowledge to the House. When we have won the war, and the history of Australia's effort is known, the world will be astonished at what we have accomplished. I am not suggesting for a moment that more has not yet to be done; nor am I suggesting that mistakes have not been made. We do know, however, because it has been published in the Press and I presume it is correct, that we are sending from Australia such munitions as 25 lb. guns.

It has also been published, although I cannot vouch for the accuracy of the report, that large quantities of small munitions have been sent from Australia. If the member for Mt. Magnet (Mr. Triat) would care to take a stroll through the city he would find many factories in full production. I can inform him that in this State munitions are being manufactured which are not manufactured elsewhere in Australia. We have been criticising severely those who until lately have been responsible for our war effort; that criticism has been made without a knowledge of the facts and without those responsible having an opportunity to defend themselves, and that criticism I say is unreasonable.

MR. RAPHAEL (Victoria Park) [5.41]: I do not desire to discuss Commonwealth matters at this stage, but I definitely desire to bring under the notice of the Government the undue hardships that are being in many cases inflicted upon the wives of our soldiers fighting overseas. I refer to the lack of housing accommodation for these women and their children, who are day by day being ejected from houses they occupy. Only

yesterday a woman was served with a summons at 8 o'clock in the morning to appear at the court at 10.15. When she got to the court she was told the case would not be heard that morning and that she must return at 2.15. On attending court at that time she was told that the case would not be heard that day and that she was required to attend the court next morning. This young woman weighs about 6 stone 7 lbs. She has three children, one of whom has a broken arm. This child she has to take to hospital for treatment every other day. Mr. Wallwork, out of the kindness of his heart, told the woman to return the next day at 10.45. I myself had made every effort to secure a house for her, but eventually she got one herself. The rent was 7s. 6d. a week more than she had been paying and that extra amount was a big deduction from the meagre income with which she has to provide for herself and her children.

The Premier: Could not she pay the rent? What was wrong?

Mr. RAPHAEL: She had paid her rent, but the landlord owned two houses and sold the one in which he was living. He then decided to shift into the house occupied by this woman, who was kicked out of her home.

Mr. Abbott: She could not have been kicked out if she had paid her rent.

Mr. RAPHAEL: She had paid her rent.

Mr. Abbott: Then the landlord could not eject her.

Mr. RAPHAEL: When she came to me she was almost frantic. Eventually she secured a house at 25s. a week, but when Mr. Fennell of East Perth discovered that she had three children he immediately said that she could not have the house.

Mr. Hughes: You should have reported that to me.

Mr. RAPHAEL: This Government should immediately bring down legislation providing that persons owning houses shall not have the right to say "Yea" or "Nay" to people with children desiring to rent their houses. This State is clamouring for population. What is the attitude of those who own homes? They will not let people rent them if the prospective tenants have children. The Perth City Council is giving a lead to people by issuing permits to syndicates and others to erect flats, and thereby in effect asking the Australian race to commit suicide by refusing to rear children.

The example of the Perth City Council has been followed by different property owners in the State who deny people the right to occupy houses if they have children. The Government should introduce legislation immediately to deal with this aspect.

A penalty of £25 should be imposed on a man who refuses to let a house to people because they have children. This country needs children, but because this woman to whom I have referred has children, she will probably in a week's time be ejected by a bailiff, with the support of the police, from the house she is occupying. Surely we as a Parliament are not going to stand idly by and see her and her children tipped into the street while her husband is fighting overseas! Is it fair and just that we should allow a magistrate to sit in a comfortable position and tell a soldier's wife that she has to get out of the house she is living in?

Mr. Hughes: Why blame him?

Mr. RAPHAEL: Her husband has been away at the war for a long time and his brother is away with him. She has about £2 18s. a week with which to feed and clothe herself and her children, a magnificent sum! However, I am not so much concerned about that at the moment as with the fact that the wife of a soldier fighting overseas should be faced with ejection from the house she is occupying.

Hon. C. G. Latham: You are arguing against the basic wage, you know!

Mr. RAPHAEL: I am not! I am arguing against the principle that a soldier's wife who meets her commitments and pays her rent and does everything she is asked to do, and whose husband is not there to protect her but is fighting our battles overseas as well as hers, can be tossed out into the street! That is not the only case in Victoria Park that has come under my notice. A certain land agent in my district named Thorogood is claiming £20 damages from a tenant who did not quickly enough vacate premises. The name of the man concerned is Andrews. He received a fortnight's notice to quit because the owner had sold the property. The man has been unable to secure another house. In the meantime the person who bought the property is said to have had to store his furniture and pay rent elsewhere for a house, and in consequence of that a claim for £20 is being made against Mr. Andrews. This sort of thing is of frequent occurrence, and it is

time the Government introduced legislation to ensure protection for these people who are all members of the working class. Protection is needed for women whose husbands are fighting overseas and who are unable to defend themselves.

During the depression years we had a tenants' relief Act. Cases brought before the court under that measure were heard by Magistrate Moseley whose decisions were always fair and just. He did not say to a woman, "You will have to get out at the end of six days," but gave her a month or six weeks. The Premier must realise, as all other members realise, the acute shortage of houses for renting purposes in this State. That shortage is probably not confined to Western Australia but exists in every metropolitan area throughout the Commonwealth. Wives of men who have enlisted from country areas have come to live in the city. They cannot be blamed for that because they are entitled to a certain amount of social life and to live with or near their relatives. The result, however, has been to accentuate the shortage of houses in the city and suburbs.

The Workers' Homes Board has authority to borrow money, and it should undertake a much more extensive programme. I realise the position with which the Government is faced on account of increased costs and shortage of labour, but a move must be made to ensure that soldiers' wives who meet their commitments are given total protection. No landlord, whether he wants his property or not, should have the right to sell it over the heads of such women and throw them into the streets. Many people who have come from the goldfields and other places have been able to put deposits on houses, and the number of houses sold recently is enormous. I admit that it is not desirable to strangle business and to tell people they may not sell houses, but a soldier's wife is entitled to all possible protection.

Mr. Abbott: You are joining the Opposition, are you?

Mr. RAPHAEL: Not at all!

Mr. Hughes: You are the Opposition!

Mr. RAPHAEL: I am the opposition when it comes to ensuring that women are not tossed into the street without any house being provided for them while their men are fighting overseas. Another matter to which

I desire to refer concerns the munitions factory at Welshpool about which some discussion has already taken place.

Mr. J. Hegney: That is in the Middle Swan electorate!

Mr. RAPHAEL: A certain portion of it is in the Victoria Park electorate.

Mr. J. Hegney: A very small portion.

Mr. RAPHAEL: The better part! I listened very attentively to the member for North Perth (Mr. Abbott) who said he could take members to many local factories that were engaged in the production of munitions. I have been to quite a number of these small establishments. There are a few that have one or two machines and lathes at work on munitions. They have had orders for a couple of thousand pounds worth of munitions, but those orders will not take very long to fulfil. Members of the former Commonwealth Government assured us that the munitions factory at Welshpool would be in production by Christmas.

I had great faith in the promises made by Mr. Menzies and Mr. Fadden in this connection, but I do not think that either they or the other members of their Cabinet made allowances for the mistakes of the draftsman who drew up the plans for the construction of the factory. I do not think that the powers that be are aware of the fact that the railway line is in the wrong place in relation to the factory, or that the cyelets to the main sewer that have to be inspected from time to time have been placed under the different sheds and buildings used in the production of munitions. Some of the men of the sewerage department engaged on the work told me that either the sewage installation would have to be removed or the buildings would have to be shifted. These plans were drawn up in Melbourne where everything of this nature appears to have been done. People desiring to travel to the Eastern States on private business have had their passages cancelled to make room for people being sent to Melbourne for training. Why could they not be trained here?

Hon. C. G. Latham: Have you finished dealing with the Welshpool munitions works?

Mr. RAPHAEL: I am pointing out how much is done in Melbourne and how little is done in this State.

Hon. C. G. Latham: Give it a breeze! Get on with the debate!

The CHAIRMAN: Would the hon. member kindly pay no attention to interjections?

Mr. RAPHAEL: I am dealing with what has happened in this State and with the unfair deal we have received from the Eastern States. There is no reason why we cannot train men in Western Australia just as efficiently as they are trained in the other States. We could display as much efficiency in munition making as is shown in the Eastern States if we were given an opportunity.

Mr. Styants: We need equipment before we can train men.

Mr. RAPHAEL: I will deal with that a little later on. The member for North Perth very kindly invited us to join him in an inspection of the different factories producing munitions in this State.

The Minister for Mines: You would have to get a permit.

Mr. RAPHAEL: Perhaps! I saw a couple of them without having a permit! In discussing the different methods of manufacturing munitions, I inquired into the allocation of contracts to firms on the cost plus system. I was talking to one man who wanted to leave his job. He was probably a little more loyal than the man for whom he was working. It was galling to him to be working about two hours a day on the Commonwealth job and the other six hours on the boss's own private work. I make that statement advisedly.

Hon. C. G. Latham: Was the cost charged against the Commonwealth job?

Mr. RAPHAEL: The cost is definitely charged against the Commonwealth job.

Mr. Abbott: That would not be correct.

Mr. RAPHAEL: Some of the hon. member's statements are not correct.

Mr. Abbott: Yours very often are not.

The CHAIRMAN: The hon. member must address the Chair and not pay any regard to interjections. I ask hon. members to cease interjecting.

Mr. RAPHAEL: The hon. member said I was telling lies.

Mr. Hughes: Did he have to?

Mr. RAPHAEL: I am stating facts. I hope, with the change of Government in the Commonwealth Parliament, that the cost plus system will go by the board. It is no wonder we have been paying the taxes that have been levied, and no wonder such suggestion of heavy borrowings is made.

Mr. Hughes: Would you substitute the contract system for the cost plus system?

Mr. Styants: You will not get the quality in the armaments under the contract system.

Mr. Hughes: Is not the cost plus system, day labour?

Mr. RAPHAEL: I stand for day labour provided the labour is given to the work paid for. I do not stand for day labour when it is to benefit the boss for so many hours per day paid for by the Commonwealth.

Mr. Abbott: That is fraud.

Mr. RAPHAEL: I know.

Hon. C. G. Latham: Such cases ought to be investigated.

Mr. RAPHAEL: Some of the firms producing munitions under this system seem to know approximately to the hour—I will not say to the minute—when the inspector will be around. Another small matter is the method adopted to ascertain the bodily health or physical structure of universal trainees forced to train to be the defenders of our country. I wish to quote one case, and I do not mind the Commonwealth, or the enemy, or anyone else knowing these facts, because I think it is definitely wrong. Men who are not physically fit to stand the strain of a military camp should not be forced to lose their businesses by undergoing a period of compulsory training, and coming out to find themselves a glut on the labour market.

In one case a man was called up for three months' training. He was a young barber working at home and helping his family. He works with a stool under his feet a good part of the time. He has had 22 operations on his leg for osteomyelitis, although he has not had a breakdown for some years now. That disease affects the marrow in the bone, and this young man is so affected that he could not do the marching. The authorities decided to make him a signaller and put him on a motor bike. His leg would not stand the strain of riding a motor bike so they put him to waiting on table. We have been told that we have 250,000 men to defend this country. This man has been told that he is not fit to do the job, but he has been ordered to go back into camp and presumably, be a waiter on the tables once more. There is another case of a young man totally blind in one eye, and he cannot see too well out of the other.

The Minister for Mines: An East Fremantle barracker!

Mr. RAPHAEL: That chap did not volunteer. He came to me to get out of it. He said to me, "Of what use am I? A waste of public money!" I think he was right. This other man has a hole in his leg in which one could place one's fist. His leg is about as good as that of the Minister for Mines, which has a machine gun bullet in it and is not worth two bob. This man's leg is withered, but he is to be one of the Aussies to defend Australia, and will be trained to wash dishes and wait on the sergeants' mess. The man-power officer was asked to release him, but refused. As some of my other remarks quickly went to one of the Federal Ministers, and I had replies—

Hon. C. G. Latham: Are you referring to the Premier of Queensland?

Mr. RAPHAEL: No, that is out of date now. As some of my remarks in this present session went over to the Commonwealth Government, so will the necessary action be taken to see that our claim is for a standing army of only 200,000; and the people will be told the truth, the whole truth, and not portion of it. Why should the militia take a man blind in one eye or a man with legs so injured that he could not walk a mile? These men are not fit to stand up to the requirements of soldiering. The medical authorities who have passed such men as fit should be called to book or, if they have been told to pass them regardless of physical ailments, those who gave such instructions should be hauled over the coals.

I hope that our munition factories will be in production within the next two years. There does not seem to be much likelihood of that happening, but I have great hopes that by the time the war is over we shall have machinery installed there capable of adaptation for turning out secondary manufactures. In view of the present muck-up, those factories will not be of much use for the production of munitions for the present war.

A matter that has caused me considerable concern was the suggestion for the enrolment of various people for war work. Something like 2,000 people, imbued with the idea of doing something for their country, applied for work. That was about six months ago. Those people have been placed in a false position. Many of them have since enlisted for service abroad. The other day a man came to me who had been engaged in munition work during the 1914-18

war. He had excellent references, and I sent him to Mr. Smith in order to get a job. He has been waiting for two years to help in this way, and now he is going to be permitted to start at some time within the next two years. Why are those people held up? Why cannot we find work for them?

What is the position today? We cannot help Russia because we have been mucking around for so long that we have not the requisite arms and munitions to permit of Britain invading France or Germany. There is altogether too much red tape. This also applies to the military forces. Because a man has been in the military forces for three or four years he is given preference, and ability does not count twopence.

Mr. Doney: I think you are wrong there.

Mr. RAPHAEL: I know I am right. Let the hon. member make inquiries for himself.

Member: That does not apply to the Air Force.

Mrs. Cardell-Oliver: On a point of order, is a member allowed to make disloyal statements under the protection of this Chamber?

The CHAIRMAN: No disloyal statement has been made in this Chamber since I have been in the Chair. The member for Victoria Park may proceed.

Mr. RAPHAEL: I object to the hon. member's saying that I made a disloyal statement.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The hon. member will proceed with his speech.

Mr. RAPHAEL: I object to the hon. member's statement. I have said nothing disloyal.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The hon. member will proceed along other lines. I do not want any reflections whatever.

Mr. RAPHAEL: I tried to enlist during the 1914-18 war when I was only 16 years of age, and I tried to enlist for service with the A.I.F. in this war. That was nearly two years ago, and I am still prepared to enlist if the authorities will take me.

The Minister for Mines: Why skite about it?

Mr. RAPHAEL: I will not have it said that a disloyal statement was made by me.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The hon. member will disregard that, and proceed with his speech. Otherwise we shall make no progress with the debate.

Mr. RAPHAEL: I was making the point that ability should be recognised. The Imperial authorities set an example by retiring

many of the older military officers and replacing them with younger men, and I am complaining that a similar course was not adopted in Australia. If that is good enough for the English army, it should be good enough for the Australian army. I bring these matters forward with a view to letting the present Commonwealth Government know what the position has been and still is, and having voiced these complaints I hope some endeavour will be made to rectify the position.

MR. TONKIN (North-East Fremantle) [6.13]: I have no desire to prolong the debate, but I wish to direct the Premier's attention to the matter of army equipment. I noticed by the paper that the Minister for the Army has been in consultation with the State Commandant for Queensland, General Durrant, and has ascertained that Queensland is miles behind the other States in the matter of army equipment. From my own knowledge, I am certain that Western Australia would be as far behind Queensland as Queensland is behind New South Wales and Victoria. I suggest that the Premier get into touch with the Minister for the Army and ask him to interrogate General Durrant regarding the equipment in this State. If it were pointed out that Western Australia's position was worse than that of Queensland, we could expect some improvement to be made. In order to indicate the situation here, I may inform the Premier that as yet there is not sufficient clothing for the men undergoing training. Many of the men have only one working suit. When I was in camp recently I could not get an issue, and had to wear my service dress because I did not have a working suit. I suggest that the position here is worse than in Queensland.

Sitting suspended from 6.15 to 7.30 p.m.

MR. CROSS (Canning) [7.31]: I would not have taken part in this debate but for the pessimistic tone of the speeches earlier in the evening. In point of fact, I am of the opinion that Russia will not be beaten even if Moscow and Leningrad should be lost.

Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. CROSS: Various members seem to have overlooked the fact that the area of Russia comprises one-sixth of the land surface of the globe. I have consulted a

book in the library on the armies of Europe, written by Max Werner, which gives a mass of figures collected by him when he was in Russia on behalf of Germany. It also gives information of that type with respect to Japan. Whilst reading the book I checked up some of the figures given, and found them pretty well correct. The author points out that only two countries in the world had their industries on a war footing when war broke out, and that as a rule it takes a country three years to transfer its industries to a war-time footing. He also quotes figures showing that in 1933 Russia spent only .3 milliards of marks on armaments, and that by 1939 that expenditure had increased two-hundred fold. The army had been increased and reorganised three or four times, and as much as seventy-seven milliards of marks had been spent on it.

The author compares the manpower of Russia with that of Germany. He gives details of the new planes the Russians had. He quotes statistics of tank construction. Anyone who had a notion that the Russian army is now as it was in the first world war is utterly mistaken. The author points out that in the last war Russian batteries were frequently limited to firing four shells per day because ammunition was lacking, and that millions of men were then sent to the front without rifles.

Realising the menace from Germany, the Russians in 1936 decided to remove their ammunition factories from near the German frontier in the Ukraine to near the Ural Mountains, 800 miles from the German border and right away from bombing attacks. When war broke out that task had been only half completed, but it is safe to assume that since the beginning of hostilities Russia's almost unlimited manpower has achieved far more in those factories.

I firmly believe that even with the setbacks Russia has suffered she will hold up the German war machine. It ill becomes members because of a slight defeat in one direction to get their tails down and start to cry out about defeat. If Hitler had heard this debate he would have been delighted. It is just what he wants. In the past Britain might have lost a dozen wars had she not kept on and won the last

battle. I suppose the British Empire has had the worst reputation for muddling of all Empires that ever existed, but Britons never gave in and never talked about defeat. I do not think members of Parliament should talk defeat. Some members expressed the opinion that this war would be over in six months. I was one of the first members of this Chamber to express a different opinion. Going over to the Council end one day with Sir John Kirwan and a few other members I said that the war would be fought out largely in the Middle East. I have repeated that statement on various occasions. Oil is the decisive factor in this war. Unless Germany can break into Iran or the Caucasus oilfields, Germany will not last long. That is where I believe the greatest drive will come. If the Germans get there and get the oil the war may last a long time, but even then Britain will not be defeated.

In some ways I am pleased that this debate is taking place, but I think members should assist to keep up the morale of the people. It was failure of the German morale that finished the last war. A similar failure may finish this one too. We know about the privations suffered by various people in the British Empire. We know that some things they used to have are absent from the markets. But many more things have disappeared from the factories, the shops and the homes in Germany. As long as fifteen months ago we read in our daily Press the statement of a man who had been in Hamburg and who said, "There is talk about the bombing of England, but in Hamburg you can go for a mile without meeting a tram or a taxi or being able to get a cup of tea. For the space of a square mile there is not a building standing of any size, and the city is being bombed every night!" He had also been in Hamm and he said the place was a shambles. All this was published here in Perth. The Germans are not getting it all their own way.

The further they get into Russia, the further they will have to cart all their munitions. That will be their trouble. Members who have read books issued in the last two or three years will know something of these matters. A book on Russia by the photographic artist James Abbe—one of the best journalistic photographers in America—re-

produces numerous photographs the taking of which was prohibited and which he had to smuggle out of Russia. That book gives a great deal of information. Any member who considers that the Russians are at the end of their tether should consult the book and that of Max Werner. Then he will realise how far the Russians are from being at the end of their tether. This however, does not detract from the fact that the British Empire is engaged in what Hitler said would be a total war. With some previous speakers, I regret that this country has not done all it should have done. I do not know how many people realise that we are opposed to a nation that is dishonest and carrying on a total war. I believe we should make a total effort to fight our enemy, which commenced organising for war in 1933 and so had seven years' start of the British Empire. Those members taking an interest in the subject and noting the alterations and the changes in the work done not only in this State but throughout Australia must be aware that a very much greater amount of work has been done in the Eastern States. The books of experts should convince us that the change-over in Australia in only two years of war has been remarkable. But that should only spur us on to greater effort.

More work should be done in this State than has hitherto been done. I do not know whether other members have visited the factories at Welshpool. These are not constructed of brick, but of wood. In the Eastern States similar factories are built more solidly, thus conveying the idea that they will be used after the war, whereas those built in Western Australia will probably be the first to go. We ought by this time to have the new munitions factory in working order. We should be turning out some of the equipment which it cannot be denied our military authorities say they are short of today. In my opinion, members are entirely wrong in disclosing an alarmist spirit merely because of what might turn out to be a temporary defeat. I hope that in the near future we shall receive news that will cheer up their—

Mr. J. Hegney: Depressed spirits!

Mr. CROSS: Their flagging spirits. I am not an alarmist. I have realised all along that we are faced with a gigantic task and that the war would last for a long time. I believe it will be decided in the

Middle East. Before the war has proceeded much further we shall have an army fighting in Iran, which is a large country. If Great Britain, with the help of Russia, can prevent the Germans from getting through to the oilfields of Iran and the Caucasus it will shorten the war.

THE MINISTER FOR MINES (Hon. A. H. Panton—Leederville) [7.43]: The debate this evening on the Bill gives a fair idea of what we might expect if we had a secret session. I have listened with a good deal of amusement tonight—

Mr. Doney: That is a wrong attitude to adopt towards the debate.

The MINISTER FOR MINES: I do not want the hon. member to tell me whether I am right or wrong.

Mr. Doney: I am telling you just the same.

The MINISTER FOR MINES: It goes in one ear and out of the other. The hon. member has not the brains to stop anything from doing that. I repeat, I have listened to the debate with a good deal of amusement.

Member: And amazement!

The MINISTER FOR MINES: Yes. It reminds me of the last war and the war before that, and the number of arm-chair critics we had during those two wars. It has always seemed extraordinary to me that, notwithstanding that we have highly skilled military experts and highly skilled administrators, the man in the street knows more than they do.

Mr. Warner: Kerbstone Kitcheners!

Mr. Doney: The point is that he is entitled to express his opinion.

The MINISTER FOR MINES: Will you, Mr. Chairman, tell me when it is my turn? Let us take our minds back to the last three or three-and-a-half years. The British Empire was a pacifist empire; there is no doubt about that. I think we must all agree that the whole Empire, including Australia, has done a remarkable job in that time. I had an opportunity to observe what was being done in the Eastern States towards our war effort. I join in the regret that Western Australia has not received as many orders for munitions as we would like to get, but I am enough of an Australian to know that, irrespective of whether we are Queenslanders or Western Australians, Australia has done a wonderful job.

At the munition works in Victoria and in New South Wales, tens of thousands of pounds worth of munitions are being manufactured. These munitions are essential for the use of our troops in the Near East, as we term it. We have every right to be proud of Australia. A member may get up in this House and quote an individual case, or even two or three cases, in respect of which our huge organisation may perhaps be criticised. Two or three weaklings may have got into the A.I.F., but surely our authorities should not be blamed for that. During the 1914-18 war over 400,000 men enlisted. Some of those who got to England were found to be unfit for service; but they got there simply because they were enthusiastic and anxious to help; like good Australians, they wanted to get there. Surely, that was no great detriment to our military authorities who organised the first A.I.F. What happened in the 1914-18 war in that respect may have occurred in this war. I am not sure whether this debate is an attack on the Federal Government or the State Government.

Member: It is not an attack.

The MINISTER FOR MINES: If it is not an attack, then I do not know what it is.

Mr. McDonald: There is serious need for co-operation to do more to help the war effort.

The MINISTER FOR MINES: If that is what this debate intended to accomplish, it cannot by any stretch of imagination be said to have been achieved. There is room in this State for every man and woman to do something to help the war effort. It is useless for the member for Mt. Magnet (Mr. Triat) or anybody else to complain that he has not been asked to do anything. I have not been asked to do anything. Would to God I was younger; I would go to this war, but I am not younger and cannot go. Even if I could go, I would not because I appreciate that I would be a menace to my comrades.

Hon. C. G. Latham: You would be a handicap, not a menace.

The MINISTER FOR MINES: I would be a menace to my comrades; the Leader of the Opposition is aware of that. But that does not prevent me from helping in other ways. There are scores of opportunities for men to help who are unable to take up a rifle and fight. There is no

argument about that. In common with the members of this House, excluding the Premier, I do not know what has been done at conferences in connection with the war effort. I know what has been published in the Press. I am no more informed on the matter than are members opposite or than the man in the street. Like the man in the street, I do not know what is in the Federal Government's mind, and, like him, I have to take what I read in the Press. I remember one statement made by Mr. Menzies, and I have no reason to disbelieve what he said. He pointed out how many aeroplanes and tanks we had made. We had to erect factories to do that and get tools from oversea and manufacture similar tools for ourselves. When men in authority tell us things like that, we have a duty to believe them. I do not think there is anything to be doleful about. I remember coming from the North-West on the "Koolama" the night that France threw in the hat. We were listening in. Mr. Miles and a few more were looking serious, and of course it was a serious matter. However, I said, "Thank God we still have a navy!" I was chided for being frivolous but I repeated the remark. What is more, we still have a navy and still have command of the seas. The fact that Russia is hard up against it today gives us some indication of the menace with which we would have been faced if Germany had not attacked Russia. I admit with the member for Canning (Mr. Cross) that another great man once reached Moscow, but came back in a different spirit from that in which he went there.

Mr. Cross: I have a photograph of the bedroom he slept in, too!

The MINISTER FOR MINES: Like Napoleon of old, there are lots of people who have looked across the channel to Great Britain and wondered how they were to get across. People are still wondering! So long as the British Navy is in command and we are producing airmen of the present calibre, and machines are being provided for them to fly, we shall be on top. While there is nothing to be pessimistic about, there is a reason for everybody to stand behind Australia's war effort. That is what this Government has done and what the people of Australia generally want to do.

It is no use talking about what the man in the street says, and it does not matter what we in this House say. We have elected

a Government—good, bad or indifferent—to handle the country's affairs, and, until we have proof that the Government is not doing its job properly, it is our place not to be carpingly critical but to be up and doing something to assist it. The Government will tell us what it wants us to do and, when we are told what to do, our job is to obey and not run about criticising this one and that one and finding fault with somebody who has not gone oversea and who we think should have gone. There are scores of men in camp today at whom in other times people would have laughed. Three weeks ago a man came into my office who was in the South African war with me. He is fairly well known to some members. He is 68 years of age. He came to me and said, "I want to get into the army; you must get me in somehow." It was a pretty big job to undertake on behalf of a man of 68! However, I gave him a letter of introduction to a friend of mine in Francis-street and he came into my office in uniform.

Mr. Hughes: That shows what a bit of influence can do!

The MINISTER FOR MINES: He is doing a particularly good job because he is looking after the cookhouse and thus relieving a younger man for other duties. He was proud of himself. At that age! Previously he had submitted his papers for an old age pension but today he said, "I do not want your old age pension; I have a job helping my country." Someone will say, "I met a little old fellow of 68 and they have put him in uniform." Of course they have! He is doing his job and releasing a younger man who can do another job a lot better. I have mentioned that to show there is a job for everybody irrespective of age and it is not necessary to get into uniform, either! I hope we will not have so much carping criticism of Governments. Secret sessions will not help us. I suppose I am as much in the know as other members of the Government and I am sure none of us has any knowledge that could be released at a secret session. When secrets—if there are any—have to be released, those in authority will know when to release them. It would be foolish for them to divulge secrets that should not be made known.

MR. DONEY (Williams-Narrogin) [7.55]: The Minister for Mines has entirely misinterpreted the debate and misjudged the temper of the House.

The Minister for Mines: No, I have not.

Mr. DONEY: He plainly disclosed that fact. He spoke of carping criticism. It is not fair to members who have expressed themselves in a proper way to sum up their attempt to help the position by terming them carping critics.

The Minister for Mines: Very well, let us see how you get on!

Mr. DONEY: The Minister mentioned that there had been criticism of the Government. There was criticism of no one at all. He was not even sure whether it was this Government or the Federal Government that had been criticised. I do not think anybody was specifically picked out to carry the blame for things that have gone wrong.

Hon. C. G. Latham: They picked out the previous Government.

Mr. DONEY: The Minister seems satisfied with things as they are. In that respect I think his contribution was harmful rather than otherwise. The same may be said of the speech of the member for Canning (Mr. Cross). He drew some solace from the fact that the Old Country had always managed to muddle through. We will agree that that has been so in the past. The point is that the Old Country may not have the opportunity of running true to form in that regard in the future. Germany being the amazingly strong force we know her to be, a policy of muddling through is not going to succeed against her today. Criticism of the type—if criticism it be—we have heard from the member for Canning and the Minister for Mines does not help in a debate like this.

Say what we will, no one surely can doubt that we have not in Western Australia a real live concentrated war effort. Everybody of course will admit that here and there an attempt is being made—a brave attempt in many directions particularly with regard to Red Cross and Camp Comfort efforts—but the point is that all those attempts are of a loosely-knit nature. There seems to be no cohesion in these various efforts. There is no central driving force, no effective control. There is certainly enthusiasm but all too often it is misdirected because there is no dominant assertive leadership, as there ought to be. I desire to express my satisfaction that this debate should have taken place.

Hon. W. D. Johnson: It would have been better on the Estimates.

Mr. DONEY: I express my satisfaction that at long last, and for the first time since the outbreak of hostilities, the House has been wise enough to have a more or less set debate on the war position. I hope the Premier will not think there is anything in the nature of an organised attempt at putting him on the spot. That was the underlying suggestion in the speech of the Minister for Mines.

The Minister for Mines: Nothing of the sort!

Mr. DONEY: Such an idea was not in the minds of members of this Chamber. That would be entirely unfair. Whatever complacency exists, we are all, both inside and outside this Chamber, equally culpable. There has been a demand not from recent speakers but from those who took part earlier in the debate for some declaration of war policy from the Premier. I realise that the Premier cannot, on the spur of the moment, set before this House a war policy suited to the situation which exists on account of the admittedly bad conditions in Russia, but I do suggest to him that over the week-end he and his Cabinet might give very deep and careful thought to this matter, so that on Tuesday whilst not exactly setting down a programme he may at least make some remarks to this Chamber that will indicate the Government's desire to be a guiding force along firm and effective lines with respect to our war outlook.

While the Premier is not to be put upon the spot I do not absolve the Government from the duty of setting the example to which I refer. It is easy for members of the Cabinet to say it is no legal responsibility of theirs. If we in this State set the example other States, rather than be left behind, will be glad to follow suit. That in the aggregate will have a very beneficial effect on the Federal Government. The question of what has been the foundation of this discussion has arisen.

Hon. W. D. Johnson: It has a foundation, has it?

Mr. DONEY: The hon. member's particular form of sarcasm suits him admirably. Even if he treats this debate as a joke, the majority of members do not. The imminence of trouble, of a nature we have not faced until tonight, has put us upon our toes. Interpreted that means fear. There is a greater driving force resulting from fear than ensues from any-

thing else. Just prior to the debate members had been reading tonight's "Daily News" and saw what was set out there in respect to the danger to Moscow. That frightened them. It will not do the people of Australia much harm. It is a pity they have not been frightened before.

Others would salve their consciences by saying that we, in Western Australia, on a per capita basis, are doing more than is any other State. I believe that is so, but after all, that is mighty little of which to be proud. To say that we are doing more than New South Wales, for instance, is no cause for pride. To me the happenings in the industrial world of New South Wales are nothing short of a national scandal. It has been stated that we are, in this State, only half a million people, and that we are, consequently, on a population basis of but little significance. Although few in numbers we are, nevertheless, a good sample of Australians; and the Australians in general are the finest shock troops in the world. The Minister for Mines should know that. If we do not employ ourselves for that purpose we are not doing our job. I could say a great deal more and perhaps to some beneficial purpose, but I am hopeful that other members, instead of being in a sense apologetic for the prolongation of the debate, will feel inclined to take some part in it. We should deal with matters here in the order of their urgency and importance, and I do not think a more worthy subject for free discussion could be found.

MR. HUGHES (East Perth) [8.5]: I am interested in this debate, first, because of the statements of the member for Victoria Park (Mr. Raphael) concerning the eviction of a woman from her house. I do not think he was fair in attacking the magistrate, because the magistrate has to administer the law as we provide it. There must be some mistake in the facts of the hon. member. In the first place, we passed an Act, No. 45 of 1939, called the "Increase of Rents (War Restrictions) Act." Section 12 states—

No order for the recovery of possession of land to which this Act applies, or for the ejection of a tenant therefrom, shall be made so long as the tenant continues to pay the standard rent, or the fair rent as determined under

this Act, and performs the other conditions of the tenancy, except on the ground that the tenant has committed waste, or has been guilty of conduct which is a nuisance or an annoyance to adjoining or neighbouring occupiers, or that the premises have been sold by a mortgagee under the power of sale contained in the mortgage, or that the premises are reasonably required by the landlord for the occupation of himself or some other person in his employ, or in the employ of some tenant from him, or on some other ground which may be deemed satisfactory by the court making such order, and where such order has been made but not executed before the passing of this Act, the court by which the order was made may, if it is of opinion that the order would not have been made if this Act had been in operation at the date of the making of the order, rescind or vary the order in such manner as the court may think fit for the purpose of giving effect to this Act.

Mr. Raphael: The owner wanted the place.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I remind the member for East Perth that in Committee of Supply discussions on matters involving legislation, or appertaining to necessary legislation, are not permitted.

Mr. HUGHES: The magistrate, Mr. Wallwork, has been attacked for having evicted—

The CHAIRMAN: Will the hon. member kindly resume his seat?

Mr. HUGHES: I cannot think of any greater pleasure.

The CHAIRMAN: While in this Chamber the hon. member will pay due regard and every respect to this Chair.

Mr. HUGHES: I can assure you of that.

The CHAIRMAN: The hon. member will do so, or his contribution to the debate will be cut particularly short. In "May" on page 538, will be found these particular words—

The Committee of Supply does not afford the proper opportunity for discussing from which House of Parliament a Minister should be chosen, or whether he should be in the Cabinet or not. The administrative action of a department is open to debate, but the necessity for legislation and matters involving legislation cannot be discussed in Committee of Supply.

The member for East Perth will understand that and proceed.

Mr. HUGHES: Do you, Sir, rule that I am not permitted to answer the specific facts of this eviction as brought forward by the member for Victoria Park?

The CHAIRMAN: The hon. member can proceed with his remarks and I will inform him when he is out of order.

Mr. HUGHES: I must say that is not very satisfactory.

The CHAIRMAN: I would remind the hon. member that I have not such a wonderfully retentive memory that I can recall all that has been stated in the debate. I can, however, tell the hon. member when he is out of order.

Mr. HUGHES: May I remind you then, Mr. Chairman, of this: During this debate the member for Victoria Park dealt with an eviction that took place in the Perth Police Court today, and made some disparaging remarks about the magistrate for having made the order. I desire to reply to that statement.

The CHAIRMAN: The hon. member may make a reply to those statements. I am merely informing him that under our procedure he cannot deal with necessary legislation or matters involving legislation, but he may deal with administration, which includes the actions of the magistrate.

Mr. HUGHES: The conviction was the outcome of legislation. I think the member for Victoria Park was astray in his facts. In the first place, I understand that Mr. Wallwork was presiding in the police court today when the eviction was ordered. If that is so, the tenant could not have been evicted except for arrears of rent, because the only eviction order that can be made in the police court is one under the last section of the Distress for Rent Abolition Act. The only ground upon which an eviction can be ordered is if the rent is in arrears for seven days. In that event the landlord may apply to the court of petty sessions and get an eviction order. The landlords have acquired that power from the member for Canning. That was his Act.

Mr. Cross: They had it before under the old Act.

Mr. Raphael: You know as well as I do that they will not accept the rent.

Mr. HUGHES: I know that some landlords have refused to accept the rent with the object of bringing this Act into operation. I advised a tenant, "Go along on every rent day and tender your week's rent, and let the landlord bring an action for eviction and see how he gets on." No landlord to my knowledge has brought an action for eviction if the tenant has continued to tender the rent.

Mr. Fox: I know of one case, and he lost it in the court.

Mr. HUGHES: How could a landlord refuse to take the rent and then ask the court to evict the tenant because the rent was in arrears?

Hon. C. G. Latham: He might do so if he wanted to harass the tenant.

Mr. HUGHES: This is the distinction. In the court of petty sessions the landlord can get an order under the legislation promulgated by the member for Canning. I admit that the law is very harsh against tenants.

Mr. Cross: But the landlord could do that before my Bill became law.

The CHAIRMAN: Order!

Mr. HUGHES: One has to fight like a wolf-dog to protect tenants against this arbitrary piece of legislation under which a tenant may be turned out in seven days. Under that Act, the landlord cannot recover the house, even if he wants it for his own use. He can recover it only if the rent is in arrears. But there is another law on the statute-book, called the Increase of Rent (War Restrictions) Act, under which a tenant may be evicted if the rent is in arrears, but the tenant may also be evicted if the owner wants the house for his own use, or for any other of several reasons stated in the Act. An order under that Act cannot be obtained in the court of petty sessions; it has to be obtained in the local court. As no order can be obtained in a court of petty sessions on the ground that the owner requires the house for his own use, Mr. Wallwork was evidently sitting in a court of petty sessions. Therefore it seems to me that this unfortunate tenant must have been in arrears with the rent; otherwise the order is a nullity. In that event the hon. member should have objected to Mr. Wallwork's hearing the case.

Mr. Raphael: I should have sent the client to you.

Mr. HUGHES: I have had many briefs from the hon. member, but no brief has ever produced a shilling. I do not know where he sends the good briefs.

Mr. Raphael: You have had a few; I would not say many.

Mr. HUGHES: I do not think Mr. Wallwork would have made an eviction order unless compelled by law to do so, because he is a fairly lenient magistrate. In my opinion, he does not treat anyone harshly if there is any opportunity to exercise leniency.

Mr. Cross: He is a very fair man.

Mr. HUGHES: He would not have made an order to put a woman and three children out of a house unless he had felt he was bound by legislation to do so. There is a lot of trouble over these two Acts, because certain landlords are anxious to get tenants out of their houses in order to lease or let the premises at higher rents. The idea of refusing to accept the rent has been tried, but so far as I know it has not been tried successfully except perhaps where some tenant thought that if the rent were not paid he was automatically compelled to quit. The member for Victoria Park should make that plain to his electors. He, with me, has a lot of constituents who are not enjoying large incomes, and this is a day-by-day problem in such electorates as Victoria Park and East Perth.

Another point that interested me in the debate about the military administration was the fact that a man of 68 could not get into the military until he secured some influence from a Minister of the Crown.

The Minister for Mines: I object to that statement; I did not say anything of the sort.

The CHAIRMAN: There is nothing offensive or unbecoming in the statement.

Mr. HUGHES: I do not wish to misquote the Minister, and I accept his statement. I understood that the man had tried——

The Minister for Mines: No!

Mr. HUGHES: One of the complaints, I believe, is that there is something wrong with that branch of the administration, that too much attention is paid to recommendations from people occupying high positions. I know something about the administration; I have been in nearly every court martial during the last two years. The complaint is that there are men occupying positions because they had friends who were able to push them in. I think it very unfortunate that members of the forces, when they have a complaint, are not allowed to make it to members of Parliament, because we all know that a good deal of petty tyranny can occur in the naval, military and air forces.

Mr. Thorn: That would be bad for discipline.

Mr. HUGHES: I will give one illustration why I think it would be in the interests of discipline and would afford protection if the men were allowed to make a complaint to a member of Parliament. The position is that any member of either force who makes

a complaint to a member of Parliament may be dealt with by court martial. It matters not how unjust or how unfair his treatment by a senior officer may have been, he has no redress. This, in my opinion, is the classic case. We know that able-bodied men in the Air Force in this State were being compelled to act as domestic servants to officers' wives. Able-bodied men who enlisted with the object of fighting were ordered to go to the kitchens in the homes of married officers and wash dishes and saucepans for the wives. I am speaking now of the famous "slushy" case from Pearce. What was the position of that man? He could not complain to his commanding officer, because it was the commanding officer's wife's dishes that he had to wash.

The Premier: He could go above that.

Mr. HUGHES: Soldiers have plenty of legal rights. This man could have asked to be paraded before the Air Board. Legally, according to the regulations, he could ask to be paraded; but it is a big thing for a man in the lower ranks to go over the head of his commanding officer and complain to the Air Board.

Hon. C. G. Latham: He eventually got to the Minister, did he not?

Mr. HUGHES: He did not.

Hon. C. G. Latham: Look up the Federal "Hansard" and see if he did not!

Mr. HUGHES: One weakness of the Leader of the Opposition is to put everybody right. This case is one of which, if I may be permitted to say so, I have as much intimate knowledge as the Leader of the Opposition has. I refer to the "slushy" case.

Hon. C. G. Latham: Do you say it was not mentioned in the Federal Parliament?

Mr. HUGHES: I have not said anything of the sort. I said the man never got to the Minister. So that the hon. member will not make mis-statements about this case in future, I will tell him the facts. The man refused duty, and after refusing duty he was placed under arrest, and he resisted arrest. Then he was charged before a court martial. Being charged before that court martial he had the right to be defended by a solicitor. The charge of refusing duty of course could not be sustained, because the order was not a lawful order; but the court martial did sustain the charge of resisting arrest.

Hon. C. G. Latham: That was where he made his mistake.

Mr. HUGHES: Yes, and he did 16 days in close detention before the day of trial. The day of trial was the 18th December, and on the 20th December the man was still in close detention waiting for the promulgation of the decision of the court martial. He spent four weeks in close detention before the decision was given. Even then the decision would not have been given had I not wanted to go to the Eastern States for a fortnight's holiday, which caused me to wire to the Air Board. I will acknowledge that within 48 hours we had a telegram back in Western Australia announcing the decision; but if I had not wired the Air Board the man would probably have remained in durance vile for another month. My word, what a hornets' nest I stirred up for myself! As soon as I came into the Air Force office in Melbourne one man told me, "You wired the Air Board." I am not going to have recorded in "Hansard" what I said. When a civilian is bounced like that, what chance has a private in the ranks to go over the head of his commanding officer to complain? Members of Parliament should be permitted to represent the grievances of men in the lower ranks.

The Premier: Where the Parliament has jurisdiction, yes! We have no jurisdiction.

Mr. HUGHES: I consider that men in the lower ranks should be entitled to look to any member of Parliament, State or Federal, to represent any legitimate grievance. We may take it that as a general rule members of the State and Federal Parliaments have a sufficient sense of responsibility to refrain from making a fuss unless they feel that the complaint has some substance. The only person in Australia I have ever heard justify the "slushy" case, or say anything favourable about it, is the Leader of the Opposition. All other people thought it was a scandalous thing that an able-bodied man who had enlisted for service overseas should be ordered into a kitchen to wash dishes. If that man had known that he could appeal to the member of Parliament for his district and have his complaint submitted to a higher authority, there would not have been any court martial and he would not have had to suffer all the imprisonment he did suffer—nearly two months.

This kind of thing did not finish with the "slushy" case. Another soldier was ordered to go to an officer's flat, cook breakfast and wash the dishes, and then remain in the flat like a prisoner until lunch time, when he could cook another meal and wash more dishes. This man had resigned a permanent job at £6 per week to go into the Air Force at 36s. per week. When he refused to do housemaid's work he was court-martialled, and he had to engage a solicitor and bring all his witnesses to the court martial at 10 o'clock on the day fixed. There we sat like shags on rocks till half-past eleven, when we were informed that the convening officer had not arrived and consequently there would be no court martial. So we had to go away and wait a fortnight until the court was re-convened. Three weeks later it was decided to drop the charge against the man. In dropping the charge the authorities admitted that they were in the wrong. But they refused to pay his costs. He had to pay his own costs—inadequate as they were, I admit. The least that could have been done for the man, in the circumstances, was to reimburse the money that he was actually out of pocket.

Such things can happen in an institution like the military department. My personal opinion is that men in the lower ranks undoubtedly should have the protection that their Parliamentary representatives can make complaints on their behalf. If the member of Parliament thinks there is no justification for the complaint, he can drop it. That provides a safeguard. If the member of Parliament thinks there is justification for it he can make representations. In that way a safeguard would be provided. At that stage the position had become so acute that it was announced that if the airmen could have had their discharge, fifty per cent. would have walked out of Pearce. The publicity that was given to that slushy case put an end to the trouble; but only after two airmen suffered, one by going to prison for, I think, forty-two days altogether, and the other having to submit to be placed under arrest and to pay for a defence he did not have to make. We, as members of Parliament, ought to try to get the lower ranks the right to make a complaint to their members of Parliament. That is what struck me when I heard the Minister for Mines say

that he was instrumental in getting a man sixty-eight years of age into the military. If that man was suitable for military service, why could he not have got in by his own effort?

The Premier: The military authorities often ask for a certificate of character.

The Minister for Mines: You try to get into the Air Force without two certificates of character and see how you get on!

Mr. HUGHES: There has been too much class distinction in the Air Force. This is an experience I have had. I was asked to give one of my electors a certificate of good character and to state whether or not he would make a good pilot. That was a requirement on the printed form. Of course I thought he would.

The Minister for Mines: Naturally!

Mr. HUGHES: A month after signing that printed form the man came back to me saying that the Air Force wanted another certificate from me such as would be required by a commercial concern. I gave him a reference stating that he was of good character—exactly what I had signed on the printed form. Why, in the name of fortune, were two certificates required from the one person?

Mr. Withers: Perhaps the Air Force wanted to test your memory!

Mr. HUGHES: Yes, I do not think references should be required for the Air Force. They are not required for foot soldiers. I have never been asked to give a reference to a person joining the infantry. It is only the Air Force that requires references.

Member: And the Navy.

Mr. HUGHES: Yes. It is time there was some criticism of the military authorities. No person with his eyes open would deny that an enormous waste is taking place in this State. I do not suggest that we should hold a secret session, but I repeat that any person with his eyes open can see for himself how much waste is taking place. As representatives of the people we ought to have the right to draw attention to it. A debate of this kind does much good, because certain people then know that, after all, someone is in a position to check their actions. I know the need for criticism of some military officers, because during the 1914-18 war I was an inspector of the Commonwealth Audit Department. For three years I was detailed to do nothing except audit military accounts. I well recall the

reception auditors got by the military authorities. I know the reception I would have got had I not been a civilian. I could express my opinion to the officers without incurring a charge of breach of discipline.

It would be to the benefit of the military department if some authority, not subject to military discipline, could criticise the officers. I do not want it to be thought that all military officers adopt a tyrannical attitude. My experience is that most of them do not and are reasonable but occasionally one gets a swelled head, loses his balance and becomes a petty tyrant. He makes it very unpleasant for those who have the misfortune to be under his control. These people can only get redress if some person in a civilian capacity can stand up to the officers. Therefore, I think we ought to criticise and it is not right to say that those who do criticise are fifth columnists. A stupid officer, who was a lawyer, suggested to me that because I defended a person without first getting my costs I was a fifth columnist. He wanted to know if the man had paid his costs before the defence and suggested that, if he had not done so, I was anxious to tear up the whole Air Force. That was plain stupidity. As I said, a debate of this character will be given publicity and will put an end to the slushing. The Leader of the Opposition said he had succeeded in getting in touch with the Minister, but he did not do so.

Hon. C. G. Latham: The case got to the Minister.

Mr. HUGHES: It did not. It was dealt with by the Air Board and the man served his sentence. What happened was this: The matter was raised in the Federal Parliament and on the very day of the trial of the second man, Mr. McEwan, the then Air Minister, published a statement in every newspaper in Australia, including the "Daily News" and the "West Australian" that the men would be required to work for the officers before they were taken in, but that they were not obliged to do so afterwards unless they so desired. Those were the very issues to be tried that morning.

Immediately the statement was published I wrote to the "Daily News" and the "West Australian" pointing out how improper it was for the Air Minister to make a pronouncement on the two issues to be tried, and pointing out that both statements were incorrect. The newspapers would not pub-

lish my letter. I therefore went to the censor and pointed out to him how unfair it was for the Minister to make the statement on the morning of the trial, but the censor vetoed the reply; he would not allow it to be published. He did, however, allow me to telegraph to the Rt. Hon. Robert Menzies, who was then Prime Minister. I telegraphed him accordingly, and within sixteen hours I received a telegram in reply stating that the censor would allow the reply to be published.

The Minister for Labour: Influence?

Mr. HUGHES: Influence! No, I think the position was that Mr. Menzies is one of Australia's most eminent barristers, and he realised what a terrible thing it was for the Minister to make a pronouncement on the two issues that were to be tried. But if it had not been that he held that viewpoint the Minister would have been allowed to make his statement, and the man would not have been able to reply. That is the only connection the Minister had with the business and I do not think he ever withdrew the statement he made. That is why, I think, judging by those experiences, the new Federal Government would be well advised to alter the regulations to allow a private to make a complaint to a member of Parliament. I propose to put that to the legal representative of the new Government. I do not intend to do so before he has had time to become settled in his office, but in a few months' time, when he has settled down, I propose to make that suggestion to Dr. Evatt, who is another prominent lawyer, and point out to him the necessity for giving the lower ranks some protection against petty tyranny.

MR. J. HEGNEY (Middle Swan) [8.42]: All that has been lacking in this debate has been the presence of the Ministers in charge of the Army, Navy and Air Force! The debate would have been very interesting to them. They were not here, however, and consequently a good deal of what has been said, though much of it has been very constructive—and some otherwise—has not been of much use. Had those Ministers been present to hear what was said, it is possible they would have been moved to effect reforms in the directions indicated.

The contention was advanced by the member for Williams-Narrogin (Mr. Doney) that there was no assertive leadership in the

community. The fact is that such assertive leadership does exist. Under the Defence Act the State Government has no power to do anything in connection with the defence of the Commonwealth. The person in charge of defence activities in this State is the officer at the head of the Western Command. He is definitely responsible for the organisation of the military forces in this State and is answerable to his departmental head and to the Minister. To say that there is no assertive leadership in this community in regard to war activity is not in accordance with the actual facts.

Mr. Doney: I was referring to civilian leadership.

Mr. J. HEGNEY: We have a Commonwealth Government which is charged with the responsibility of doing things necessary from a defence point of view, and for looking after the welfare of civilians. It has power to legislate and does so. In its sphere the State Government does the same thing. The hon. member said there was no concentrated effort in this connection. He declared that some members salved their consciences by saying that we have done as much here as have people in the Eastern States. The Commonwealth Government has the responsibility. Commonwealth Ministers are responsible to the Commonwealth Parliament and administrative officers are appointed to the various States, such as the officer in charge of the Western Command in this State, and it is their job to carry out a concentrated effort.

In regard to enlistments, it is well known that Western Australia's manpower is being sadly taxed. The officer in charge of the military forces here would be acquainted with the facts. There has certainly been a concentrated effort in that direction! The same applies to the raising of funds for prosecuting the war. We know that excellent work has been done. The Leader of the Opposition is aware of what has been done in connection with war savings certificates. Western Australia's share is comparable with that of the Eastern States, which has a much wider field upon which to draw.

The hon. member's observations were quite unsound. He said there was no criticism levelled against the Government. I listened with a great deal of interest to criticism of every Government in Australia, both Commonwealth and State. Even the British Government, and the British military and

naval leaders were criticised for not establishing another front against the enemy somewhere in Europe. A good deal of criticism was levelled but unfortunately the proper authorities were not here to listen to it.

The Minister for Mines is in charge of civilian defence and that aspect of the war effort, and he has gone to the Eastern States from time to time. As a result of his visits we know that what is being done in this State is comparable with what has been done in Eastern Australia. That remark applies to A.R.P. activities and other essential work in connection with civil defence. Undoubtedly much more could be done. More funds could be made available to equip the various organisations for the very effective work they are doing, to stimulate enthusiasm and afford some encouragement to those men and women who are concentrating on this phase of defence. In the event of air raids, it is necessary to warn the people. We know that Eastern Australia is now being supplied with sirens designed and constructed in Western Australia. That is a feather in our cap.

There was criticism of activities associated with the production of munitions in Western Australia. In that respect I congratulate the Premier. Ever since war was declared I know, from reports submitted from time to time, that he has done his utmost to have as many munitions manufactured in Western Australia as possible. He has made representations to the proper quarter and has assisted financially in various directions. For instance, an annexe was established at Midland Junction at a cost of £50,000.

Hon. C. G. Latham: It cost £25,000.

Mr. J. HEGNEY: I understood the annexe cost £50,000, of which £35,000 was contributed by the State Government and £15,000 by the Commonwealth. The annexe has been built. It is an excellent building but stocking it with machines is the problem. There are machines in the annexe and they are turning out some very good work for defence activities.

Hon. C. G. Latham: Is that being done in the annexe itself?

Mr. J. HEGNEY: Yes. When Mr. Holmes, the British Labour Leader was here, I accompanied him, together with the member for Guildford-Midland (Hon. W. D. Johnson) and the Chief Mechanical Engineer of the State Railways, through the annexe in which they are doing some

excellent work. Good work is also carried out in the Midland Junction Workshops. Further, I have indicated that competent tradesmen in the workshops are anxious to do as much defence work as possible. The Commissioner of Railways and his Chief Mechanical Engineer, and other persons, have gone from time to time to Eastern Australia and done their utmost to get all the munitions work that Western Australia can possibly do. They may have been discouraged in some ways, but we have made progress.

The Premier has done all that he is able to do in the establishment of the munitions factory at Welshpool. The State Government is bearing the cost of the railway spur line, the sewerage work, and the laying of water supplies and such things. There is a good deal of building being erected, but such a workshop cannot be established overnight with facilities for qualified tradesmen. That takes months, but I hope the time is not far distant when machines will be installed and qualified and skilled tradesmen will be turning out essential munitions.

The same applies to foodstuffs. Western Australia has done a good deal in making foodstuffs and boots and clothing available, particularly for the services, and also for the needs of the civil community. There are difficulties ahead and we have a job, for those not in the military or other services, to maintain the morale of the civil population. Every member is willing to do what he can. Each member will, I am sure, if called on take part in any activities, such as Red Cross or Camp Comforts, in his own electorate. There has been a good deal of activity in the development of aerodromes throughout this State, and they are of value to us. The State Government is engaged in building its portion of a road connecting South Australia with Western Australia. That is a very essential work. Most of the men engaged on main roads work are now engaged on roads leading to munitions factories, or of a defence character, or the one now connecting Western Australia with South Australia. I understand the East-West road will be open for traffic about the end of this month.

This is a large State with a small population of a little over 460,000 people. The manpower resources of the community are being severely taxed. I have met many qualified men who complain they cannot get

into the forces. Being qualified tradesmen they have to stay behind and do the job allotted them. It is our task to do the job allotted to us. The Commonwealth Government is charged with the responsibility of governing the Commonwealth and organising the defence resources to see that the country is properly defended, and it is our duty to see that we contribute our part and support them. When the Premier has gone from this State he has done a good job. He has done his utmost to get the orders essential to develop our State. It is unfortunate we are not closer to Eastern Australia, in which case, I have no doubt, we would share to a greater extent in the industrial activity taking place in Victoria and New South Wales.

The other evening the member for Irwin-Moore (Mr. Berry) mentioned that with the change of Government in New South Wales, Walsh Island was being opened up, and that our State Government was inactive respecting shipbuilding. As one who worked at Walsh Island during the last war, I say this: If we had a Walsh Island in Western Australia situated close to the supply of coal and essential steel plate, we would be able to do much. Walsh Island was not being used to the best advantage until the advent of the Labour Government in New South Wales. This State is not in the happy position of having an island equipped industrially as is Walsh Island in New South Wales.

Much of what has been said in this debate will be confined to the Assembly. The public will know very little of what has taken place, but, nevertheless, it gives members an opportunity to convey their opinions to the Premier and the Minister concerned, and they in turn can convey to the Commonwealth Ministers the opinions expressed here. Possibly some good may arise from this debate. I intervened because the new munitions works are being built in the Middle Swan electorate, although portion may be in another electorate. A great deal more activity will take place, and we are hopeful that a visit will be made to the Midland Junction Workshops to give members the opportunity to see what is being done there by skilled artisans. All we lack are machines. Whereas we previously depended on importing machines into the Commonwealth, today the Commonwealth is in a position to produce machines which, in turn,

manufacture the articles associated with defence requirements. As stated by a previous Commonwealth Minister, there has been industrial revolution in the Commonwealth, and as members of the Commonwealth we all appreciate that.

I regret that Western Australia is not closer to this activity and so able to participate in the enormous amount of industrial development. If that were so our population would, no doubt, be increased considerably. There would be much greater spending power. The difficulties of primary producers would possibly be softened and we would share in the prosperity at present enjoyed by Victoria and New South Wales.

MR. HILL (Albany) [9.0]: I have listened to the debate with considerable interest. I am inclined to think that we in Western Australia are prone to shut our eyes to our disadvantages and to neglect our advantages. Many people seem to think that Western Australia comprises only that small area abutting the Swan River. Twelve months ago I had the privilege of travelling to the Eastern States. I saw the site for the construction of a new dock in Sydney. I went through the Broken Hill Proprietary Company's steel works, and spent a few days in Adelaide. In that city, wonderful progress is being made and an enormous amount of money is being spent on munitions work. There are two facts responsible for this: One the geographical position and the other a sound policy of port administration and development that assists industry. Adelaide is without doubt the least vulnerable of all the capital cities of Australia. We have some idea of the defences that an enemy ship would have to pass along the eastern coast in order to reach Adelaide, and from the western side there would be considerable difficulty in getting to that city. If an aircraft carrier was used and it made a raid on Adelaide or Whyalla, its chance of getting away would be small.

I had the privilege of travelling down the Port Adelaide River with the general manager of the South Australian Harbours Board. In all industrial organisations, the two main factors are cheap power and cheap transport. The power station there is a wonderful concern. It has its own coal wharf where the coal is unloaded and power is distributed over a very wide range. Further down the river is to be seen evidence of

the advantage of cheap transport, combined with a proper policy of port development. In this State we have heard quite a lot of talk about shipbuilding. The preceding speaker mentioned it. I will tell members why ships are not being built in Western Australia. It is because our natural advantages have been neglected. I have before me a copy of the Tourist Guide, on page 12 of which appears a rather familiar picture. In September, 1908, I was on the harbour where there were anchored six battleships, six coal boats, two supply ships and a cruiser.

Mr. Needham: Where is that harbour?

Mr. HILL: I am surprised that the hon. member, who was once a Federal Senator, should ask such a silly question.

Mr. Needham: But where is it?

Mr. HILL: I was on board the United States battleship "Connecticut," and one of the Yankees, a fairly acute man, asked, "Where is this place they call Fremantle?" I replied, "About 300 miles around the coast." He looked around the harbour and said, "If we had this harbour we would darned soon use it." At about that time there was a proposal to build a graving dock in Western Australia. That work was abandoned after something like a quarter of a million had been spent on it. I was on parade at the Albany fort as company sergeant-major when Lord Forrest paid a visit with Lord Kitchener. Lord Forrest said, "You fellows have been neglected but a change is coming."

The change that came was a very unfortunate one for Western Australia and for the Commonwealth. There was a change of Government; Labour replaced Lord Forrest and his party. Fremantle became the centre on which attention was focussed and the people of Fremantle worked for the Naval Base at Cockburn Sound. All the available information was sent to Admiral Henderson at Colombo. When he arrived at Fremantle, he was met by Chief Gunner Mutton, then District Naval Officer in Western Australia, and Admiral Creswell. Chief Gunner Mutton asked Admiral Creswell, "Shall I go down to Albany with the Admiral, sir?" Admiral Creswell replied, "No, there is no need. This will be the place." Admiral Henderson made a flying trip to Albany, and he sent a telegram—"Albany in every

way suitable for the Naval Base; unnecessary to inspect Cockburn Sound."

Years later I was talking to the then Minister for Defence, Brigadier Street, and Colonel Collett came in and handed him a letter recommending the site for a naval base.

The Minister for Lands: It was not at Bunbury, was it?

Mr. HILL: I will deal with Bunbury presently. Brigadier Street read the letter, and exclaimed, "Henderson Naval Base!" and laughed.

Some months ago I had the painful experience of hearing our Minister for Works, who is also Minister for Harbours and Rivers, refer disparagingly to the muddy Port Adelaide River. A few days later I read in the "West Australian" a statement that three slips were being constructed on the Port Adelaide River to build ships up to 15,000 tons. I have seen the leading ports of Australia and discussed port problems with some of the leading harbour engineers, and there has never been any question about the natural advantages of the port of Albany. A few years ago the Premier told me I was a lucky man to represent the district with one of the finest harbours in the world. But what happened a fortnight ago? I asked a question about harbour expenditure. Did the Premier read out the answer, as is usual when questions are answered? He did not; he laid a return on the Table of the House. Since the Premier first became a Minister, as Minister for Railways in 1924, the port of Albany has had the huge sum of £13 spent on it.

The Premier: It is a natural harbour, one of the best in Australia.

Mr. HILL: Yet the Premier would sooner use his money fighting Nature than in working with Nature.

The Premier: Why try to improve on a perfect port? You have deep water for ships, and everything that is wanted is on the spot.

Mr. HILL: Let the Premier look at the picture in the Tourist Guide to which I have referred. What does he see there? At Fremantle what is the position? The guns there are constantly manned. At Albany what is the position? The guns there are constantly manned. One day we may wake up to find ourselves at war with

Japan. Suppose a ship calls to load wheat produced in the Great Southern districts, where does it call? At the port with the fortifications? No, at a port where the terminal stands out prominently and affords an excellent target, and where a ship loading would be at the mercy of any raider that came along.

Last week while travelling by train with the Minister for Lands I spoke to one of the railwaymen, who said, "I will give five years before they have to make a shallow-water port." The Minister reminded me of an interesting conversation that occurred a couple of years ago. When speaking to Brigadier Street I asked whether Sir Leopold Saville was going to Albany. He replied that Mr. Jacobs would come to Western Australia, and added, "There is no need to go to Albany. He has assured me that he knows that place backwards. Mr. Jacobs is a rather wonderful man. Wherever there is a possibility of a dock being constructed Mr. Jacobs knows all about that place." A week or two later Mr. Jacobs came to Western Australia and I had the pleasure of an interview with him. It was a most enjoyable opportunity, too. Although Sir George Buchanan is anathema to our Government, Mr. Jacobs had his report with him, and we discussed the various good ports in Australia which were neglected. Mr. Jacobs turned to me and said, "My word, you politicians have something to answer for! It is terrible to see how you neglect beautiful harbours and then spend money on places where there should never have been a port." A most peculiar coincidence was that on that very evening the member for Bunbury (Mr. Withers) was making a speech to a member who has recently interjected.

Mr. Cross: Bunbury should never have been a port.

Mr. HILL: During the last war the port of Albany was used for transports, wool appraisements, wheat and other purposes. Now it is being used for none of those things. Albany is one of the finest ports in the world, and one of the most neglected. Thank God we have the Commonwealth Government and its road policy! Our Minister for Works, when going round the country, expects us to go on our knees to him for a road.

Mr. Cross: You nearly always have a Minister in Albany!

Mr. HILL: The present Premier never has been there.

The Premier: Yes, I have been there.

Mr. HILL: Today our road transport requires bitumen roads. There is as much difference between a transport of the present day and a ship of 30 years ago as between a bullock dray and a railway train. By failing to equip the port of Albany the Government has badly fallen down on its job. I repeat, Albany is one of the best ports in the world, and situated right on the great trade routes, but it is not used because our Government has not followed expert advice. I am up against a wall. It would be interesting to hear from the Minister for Works or from the Premier why shipping facilities have not been provided at Albany. When Ministers go home tonight, they should pray that no enemy will take advantage of the opportunity offered him by the neglect of Albany! If a wheat ship loading at Bunbury is caught by a raider, our Government will be responsible for any loss of life. There is no sense in running the risks that we are running today. From the military standpoint, to my regret, I cannot say much; but I would like to refer Ministers to the speech I made on the Address-in-reply of last session. They might take that speech to our General and see what he says about it. I am not greatly in favour of a secret session. I have confidence in our leaders. I will do my part, and when there is an unnecessary risk being run I will draw attention to it for the sake of the State.

Personal Explanation.

Mrs. Cardell-Oliver: Before the debate closes I would just like to let the Committee know that in referring to the remarks of the member for Victoria Park (Mr. Raphael)—I am sorry he is not in his seat—I was not questioning his personal loyalty. I merely thought his remarks injudicious. I have to remind the hon. member and the Committee that we have about 10,000 soldiers oversea.

The Premier: More!

Mrs. Cardell-Oliver: I send away "Hansards," and I know that other people also send them, to soldiers who are interested in politics. Thus observations made here and intended only for members go out to the soldiers. When they read that our munitions factories will be finished only when the war is over, it might make them feel discouraged. Like the member for Victoria Park, I am sorry.

Committee Resumed.

THE PREMIER (Hon. J. C. Willcock—Geraldton—in reply) [9.14]: This debate is as a rule purely formal, but on the present occasion it has developed into a discussion on the war effort. While some members have endeavoured to exclude the State Government from any blame or criticism, others have implied that something is wanting in regard to our war effort. Yet other members have said that they feel they themselves are not able to do much to further the war effort. I well remember receiving the day after the war broke out a wire from the Prime Minister of the Commonwealth asking whether I could attend a conference in Melbourne to see what could be done towards a co-operative effort of all Australia in connection with the war. Members will recall that on the next day the House met and I attended here and stated briefly that so far as I and the Government were concerned, we were prepared to do anything we could to promote the war effort. That has been the Government's attitude, and I am pleased to say also the attitude of the House, in regard to any matter having to do with the war effort. I came to the House and had to rush away in a motor car to Chidlow's Well in order to catch a train that would enable me to attend the conference. I wished to be in this House at that time in order to express what attitude would be taken by the Government and how completely we would be on the side of the Empire, and what our policy would be right through the whole course of the war. We have never deviated from that policy for one instant.

First of all, in connection with this State's war effort, we did not think of making munitions the first week, or the first month, or even during the first six months in Western Australia. Our first efforts were to build camps and aerodromes and all the many appurtenances needed for the training of our troops. The Commonwealth Government had asked for our co-operation in that matter. The Prime Minister said, "We cannot get carpenters or materials. What can you do to help us?" The Minister for Works and the Architectural Division had between 200 and 300 men working for the State Government. These were transferred, every single man of them, to get on with work of military importance. From what I can gather, the work was done more expeditiously here than it was done elsewhere.

Hon. C. G. Latham: Those huts were put up wonderfully quickly!

The PREMIER: What was a rolling field of wheat became in five or six weeks a camp accommodating 5,000 or 6,000 men. While some people deprecate what is done in connection with the war effort and declare that the State is not doing very much, I can take the row of Ministers on the front bench and detail briefly what each of them is doing and what each of them has done to further the war effort. Then some people will say, "After all, there is some reason for congratulation on what has been done by the Government of Western Australia."

Let me take, for instance, the Minister for Mines, Hon. A. H. Panton, who is also Minister for Civil Defence. Mr. Panton has attended conferences in the Eastern States. As regard civil defence, a highly important aspect of the war effort, this State is as far ahead as any other Australian State, if not further ahead. After much effort in the passing of legislation, we have been able to publish in the Press this morning a regulation dealing with our effort. All phases of defence work are dealt with. The organisation is ready. Thousands of our people have enlisted in civil defence and are doing excellent work. They will if the necessity arises—and, of course, I am hopeful it will not—do wonderful work in regard to civil defence. They have been thoroughly trained and have had the use of necessary equipment in the course of their training. Some people ask what the State Government has done in regard to the war effort. One important point must be borne in mind; it is that the State Parliament has no jurisdiction over the war effort. The control of that effort is vested in the Commonwealth. We, as a State, can mould public opinion, but the real defence authority is the Commonwealth Parliament. All that appertains to the war is under the control of that Parliament.

I was sorry to note at the beginning of this debate the pessimistic tone of some of the speakers. In my opinion, we have nothing to be pessimistic about. A year or so ago we had every reason for pessimism. The war has passed through one or two stages already. The first stage was when there was a possibility, if not a probability, owing to the fall of France, of our Empire being beaten in this great struggle. We

passed that stage. It can be said we have passed the stage when we are likely to lose this war. I do not think we can be beaten, although that does not mean we must not make an even greater effort to win it. But there is another stage before we can achieve final victory. Every portion of the British Empire, including Australia, must exert every effort to win the war as quickly as possible.

Western Australia has achieved a wonderful record in the war effort, in enlistments, contributions to war savings certificates, contributions to funds for the assistance of soldiers' dependants, camp funds, Red Cross and other movements that have been inaugurated and carried on so successfully. It is commonly admitted that Western Australia has a better record in this respect than has any of the other States. I have received letters from people in the Eastern States indicating that they did not know to whom else to write and expressing their thanks for the wonderful time their sons and nephews had while passing through this State. A feeling of gratitude prompted those people to express their thanks. Without patting ourselves too much on the back or priding ourselves too much, I think there is general recognition that our State has excelled the other States in the war effort. Our enlistment record is better than that of the other States. We have had to arrange for the training and accommodation of our recruits. In that respect the State Government has been of great assistance to the Commonwealth, assistance which is much appreciated.

Apart from the Minister for Mines, who is in charge of civil defence, my colleague, the Minister for Works, has done excellent work in constructing roads, carrying out sewerage work and erecting buildings not only for the infantry, but for the Air Force. Even before the war started, the roads running up and down this State within 25 to 30 miles of Fremantle were in excellent condition for the speedy transport of troops should an enemy land anywhere within that distance. These roads were constructed by the State Government before the war commenced, because the Federal Government considered them necessary. I do not wish to speak about myself, but when I have had the opportunity of speaking on behalf of the State or doing anything on its behalf, I have always committed it as deeply as I

could to further the war effort. I have placed our railways and our engineering establishments at the disposal of the Federal Government. Should that Government ask me, as Premier, for this utility or that utility, without ado it will be placed at its disposal. I have committed the State to that help right from the commencement of the war.

My colleague, the Minister for Lands, has done excellent work in connection with surveys of our coast. We had had before the war imperfect surveys of many parts of our coast and inland districts. Because the Federal Government asked us to perfect the surveys, the Minister for Lands immediately took steps to do so, with the result that information as to the survey of thousands of miles of our coast has been supplied to the military authorities in case of an attack against our shores. Admittedly, an excellent job has been done in this respect.

So I could take each Minister in turn and tell the House what each has done. The Minister for Industrial Development has harnessed all the resources of public and private works in the State, so that they can immediately be placed at the disposal of the Commonwealth. The Board of Area management, which represents the Federal Government in regard to supply of munitions, has merely to ask for information as to any matter affecting munitions, foodstuffs, clothing, medical supplies, optical goods and scientific instruments—some of these are being made in Western Australia now—and the information is at once available. In many instances, such information has already been given to the Federal Government.

In this State there is perfect co-operation between the State and private employers in regard to mobilisation for the war effort. I can give the House instances of where the Railway Department has accepted contracts for various types of munitions and has parcelled out the work to as many as ten sub-contractors, all working together to achieve a common end. The Minister for Railways has taken a keen interest in the war effort. He has information regarding machinery and buildings required by the Commonwealth Government. The Federal Government itself has made a contribution of about £30,000 towards this work. That Government has also made arrangements for

the State at the conclusion of the war to take over the buildings at cost price, less 10 per cent. We can make use of them.

The Minister for the North-West is looking after our shipping problems. In this respect there is hearty co-operation between the State and the Commonwealth. Other ships were chartered and shipping was diverted when there was immediate necessity for fortifications at Darwin. In fact, the Minister for the North-West was subjected to criticism by people at the ports between Perth and Wyndham because some cargo was shut out from the State ships, in order that the many necessary requirements to hurry on the fortification of what was considered to be a vulnerable part of Australia and was thought to be in danger from the Far East, or what is to us the Near North, might be forthcoming. All these Ministers who together make up the Government have had a very big hand in assisting to carry out the Government's policy and the policy of this Parliament in regard to giving every assistance in connection with the war effort. When we had reached the stage of having contributed as much as we possibly could in that direction we set out to ascertain what we could do in connection with munitions. I admit it was a very hard row to hoe.

The Federal Government was dominated by the people who occupied high positions in commercial life and said "We can do things easier, more cheaply and more expeditiously if they are done where similar work has been carried out previously. It is easier to undertake the task of extending an established factory than to set up another factory with a distinct organisation and personnel in another part of the country altogether." In the first twelve months annexes were added to established centres of production and it was only when there was considerable agitation from outlying States, and demands were made at Premiers' conferences and elsewhere that the other States should have a share in the production necessary for the successful prosecution of the war, that it was decided that munitions works should be established elsewhere.

Sarcastic remarks were made by the member for Victoria Park (Mr. Raphael) to which the member for Subiaco (Mrs. Cardell-Oliver) took exception, to the effect that the Welshpool factory might be making munitions in four or five years' time. I would

point out that not six months have elapsed since a decision was made in regard to the works. The Federal Government said "We must do something in Western Australia. What can you do as a State Government?" I replied, "You can write your own ticket. Anything required in the way of sewerage, water supplies, tramways, roads, railway communications, etc., the State Government will co-operate in providing." Four or five months ago this site had not been selected, and now we have to provide a quarter of a million pounds for a building, etc. That is a very large amount of money for a comparatively small population to find. It is to be spent in six months in erecting buildings and necessary appurtenances, creating an organisation, getting together a personnel and doing all those things that take a long time in a small place. This is not like the United States where there are 130,000,000 people in an area not much larger than Australia, with generations of experience in these matters. We have never before done anything in Western Australia like this. We have never attempted it, yet within six months of the day the site was selected and the word given to start, buildings will be erected.

But that is not the most important part. There is no hurry in regard to the building. It is the machines that are necessary. They are the important part of this munitions factory. The member for Victoria Park said that we should be working night and day. I suppose we could finish within five or six weeks but it is no use finishing if at the end of that time we have not the machines to do the work the buildings were designed to do. The buildings will be ready by the time the machines are ready. Some people deride Australia's efforts but I meet people of all sorts and conditions including some very representative people like Sir Alexander Roger who was selected by the British Government, as an expert in munitions manufacture, to advise what should be done in connection with munitions production. I would point out that the victorious advance of the Australian and British units in Bardia, Sidi Barani and Tobruk were made with the help of munitions manufactured in Australia.

Except for munitions from America under the Lease and Lend Act, almost the whole of the munitions used by our army in the Near East are provided by Australia.

Sir Alexander, who is the highest authority the British Government could get, came to Australia and said that the effort Australia had made was "amazing." That was the word he used. He is not a young enthusiastic man, liable to say silly things but a very staid, solid English gentleman with forty years' experience of munitions manufacture. He was delighted with what we were doing in Western Australia, but when he saw what was achieved in the Eastern States in regard to the development of munitions making he was amazed. Once we could not make motor cars in Australia. Taxation was imposed to the extent of a million pounds prior to the outbreak of war in order to subsidise the establishment of the motor industry in Australia, yet before the war had been prosecuted for ten months we were making aeroplanes which is a much more difficult task than is the construction of motor cars. We are now making aeroplanes at the rate of 18 or 20 a week.

Mr. North: The whole effort is far bigger than that which took place during the last war.

The PREMIER: We did nothing during the last war in regard to munitions except in the matter of rifles and small arms. The rest came from Great Britain, but now shells and bombs and all sorts of munitions are being manufactured in Australia. Moreover, Australia has sent hundreds of thousands of tons of steel to Great Britain. Britain, the home of steel manufacture, has had sent to it hundreds of thousands of tons of steel from Australia which could not do anything in the manufacturing line a few years ago.

Mr. Sampson: It would be a pity to be satisfied!

The PREMIER: I have said that we have reached a stage where it is quite wrong to destroy the morale of the people, and to cast doubts. We have every reason to be confident of our own effort, but every reason also not to be smugly complacent. We can be satisfied that we have done a good job but we should not be satisfied that that is all we need do. Every ounce of effort must be made by the whole of the people to enable us to emerge victorious from this conflict. Though it costs us millions of pounds, if we can win this war within from six to twelve months we will have been justified in concentrating every effort towards that end.

Some people say that every single person should be employed. I have said that to the Federal Government many times at conferences. I have told Federal Ministers that we have no right to have anybody unemployed at a time like this, that everybody should be doing something. I think we have reached the stage where almost everybody is employed, but I remind members that in Great Britain, which has suffered all the horrors of devastation due to bombardment and where it might be thought the people would be working fifteen hours a day to rebuild, there are tens of thousands of unemployed.

Hon. C. G. Latham: They cannot get materials.

The PREMIER: Are we in a better position to secure materials? There are some people who decry what has been done in Australia. I am not an apologist for the Federal Government in regard to what has been done. Every Government that undertakes a new task is liable to make mistakes, and if it does so it is the duty of those who perceive the mistakes to offer criticism as a result of which an alteration may be affected to improve the situation.

Mr. Sampson: It would be unwise to take as a compliment a statement made by a visitor. Such remarks are often made out of courtesy.

The PREMIER: This man had a very serious job to do. There was a meeting of representatives of all the countries south-east of the Mediterranean at which it was stated, "Great Britain has too big a job on hand and all she can do is to make munitions to defend herself and contiguous countries, and you people in the East will have to be responsible for the manufacture of your own munitions. You will have to assist to carry on the war with your own facilities." He was sent out to do that job and see what could be done. He said, in effect, that we are doing that job and it is an amazing feat. The report was published only a few days ago. He said the tremendous advance in production was amazing. We are making aeroplanes now. Who would have dreamt a few years ago that we would make aeroplanes at the rate of 30 a week in Australia. Probably many people do not know that we do manufacture aeroplanes at that rate.

Mr. Cross: They could not make them at that rate in Britain before the war.

The PREMIER: I do not suppose they did.

Mr. Sampson: Nonsense!

The PREMIER: Having got through the initial part of the organisation of the war—getting camps erected, soldiers enlisted and the necessary appurtenances for their essential training—we desire to do our share of munitions-making. We have made many protestations to the Commonwealth Government, and finally with the aid of the present Prime Minister, who was then Leader of the Opposition, and also of Senator Collett—I do not want the credit to be given to any one person particularly—the Commonwealth Government said, "You say you can do much in Western Australia; we will give you the opportunity of tendering evidence before a responsible committee, and we will then make a decision." This committee was appointed and I went East to the Loan Council about that time.

A Cabinet meeting was held and I said to Cabinet, "This is the most important job we, as the Government, have to do during this 12 months. We have to place proper representative evidence of what can be done in this State before this committee." Unfortunately the people do not know what evidence was tendered at that commission because the Federal Minister said he wanted the whole thing to be treated as secret, and not made public. It has not yet been made public, nor have the recommendations contained in the report, but the Leader of the Opposition has seen the report and so has the Leader of the National Party. So far as I am aware, there is not very much in the report which need not be published. It is a very valuable document and when effect is given to it, it will mean a lot to the advancement of this State.

Matters have not been allowed to rest just because the report was not published. As a result of one of the recommendations contained in this report, the East-West road is being constructed, and will be completed in five or six weeks' time. Another result is the establishment of the munitions works at Welshpool. Within four or five weeks of taking evidence a decision was reached, that if the State Government would co-operate in the way I stated, this

work would be carried out in Western Australia. These works will be ready for occupation about February of next year.

Mr. Sampson: The East-West road was approved last May.

The PREMIER: This evidence was given last April. When munitions works are being established, people without knowledge say, "We have the machines; we should go on making the munitions." But a constant supply of tools has to be available. They wear out.

The first thing is to have a properly-equipped tool room in which to make the tools to put in the machines to make the munitions. The tool room is well under way. Many of these things were mentioned in the evidence given before the Commission and several of them have now been given effect to—but not as many as I would like. It is not for want of representation or pushing on the part of the State Government that many more things have not been done. I know we could do more. Some people are of the opinion that all we are doing is the work at Midland Junction in making some shells. It may be a surprise to some members to know that in Kalgoorlie—a place in which one would not imagine much could be done in regard to munitions—because a big foundry is established there for the purposes of the goldmining industry they have machines capable of making some articles to a greater extent than has any other place in Australia. Some of the things made in Kalgoorlie are sent all the way to Brisbane. I wonder whether many people in Western Australia know that these things are sent from Kalgoorlie past Adelaide and Sydney and other industrial centres to assist with the munitions making in Brisbane.

Apart from the engineering plants of Hoskins, Tomlinsons, Hills, and Hadfields in the metropolitan area, there are many smaller places. The State Implement Works have contracts for £250,000 worth of munitions. The Midland Junction Workshops have contracts for more than that. They put up as good a marine engine job as do any engineering works in Australia. We have launched a ship with Western Australian engines, and it is now steaming and doing its war work. We were congratulated during the trial run on the excellence

of the engines. Members might think I am drawing the long bow and that the Government is satisfied. We can do twice as much, and we should have the opportunity to do it. The matter has been too long delayed. We do not want the work done in two years' time, but tomorrow.

While I am not complacent, or even satisfied with what we have done, I do think we have cause for congratulation on the efforts made and the good work done, not only by Government institutions, but by the many private engineering establishments, clothing factories, boot factories, and other factories which produce the goods necessary for the prosecution of this war. We have done our part, and done it well. People with the authority to give further orders should be encouraged by the fact that whatever we have undertaken to do, we have done to the satisfaction of everybody concerned. As was to be expected, when we entered upon this new line of business, delays were experienced. We had an order for machines for doing a job and had just started when we were told that an improved type had been evolved, and that we were to scrap the machines in hand and proceed with the manufacture of the up-to-date machines. In these days of highly mechanised warfare, it would not be of much use employing obsolete machines; the most up-to-date must be used.

Mention has been made of the Bren gun. Do members realise that 1,500 to 2,000 blue prints are necessary in order to make a Bren gun, and that it is a tremendous accomplishment to get a complicated machine like a Bren gun manufactured? The Bren is the simplest of machine guns, but in England it took three years to turn out the gun after the plans had been made available. We have had to do a much quicker job.

Hon. C. G. Latham: There are Bren guns at Northam, and they are being used, in spite of a statement to the contrary.

The PREMIER: Such guns have to be very accurate; it is of no use manufacturing a gun that may do the wrong thing. Tools had to be obtained from all parts of the world in order to make the machines that do the work, and this was no simple matter. Those who have seen what has been done in connection with the manufacture of munitions realise that the preparations take a long time.

Hon. C. G. Latham: It is much easier to talk about than to do.

The PREMIER: It is easier to say what we will do than to get it done. To evolve all these things necessarily takes a long time. The Minister for Railways has suggested that members will be given an opportunity to visit the Midland Junction Workshops—in the near future, I hope—in order that they may see what is being done. We have doubled the capacity for making shells, and in regard to engines—

Hon. C. G. Latham: And propellor shafts and propellers.

The PREMIER: Yes, I could go on enumerating various lines. I do not wish to discuss the matter further, but I felt rather concerned and disappointed at some of the earlier speeches. I feel that Parliament has a responsibility to discourage pessimism, to display confidence and help to maintain the morale of our people, which is a very important consideration. Therefore I desired to say sufficient to show that our confidence is soundly based. We have a very good reason for feeling confident regarding our war effort. If we feel we have done our part, we shall be in a much better position to maintain the morale of our people. I think it will come as a surprise to most people to learn that we have done so much. It is no mean effort that, within a couple of years of the commencement of the war, we should have established an entirely new industry in this State. If, two years ago, somebody had said that by now we would be making munitions to a value of well over a million pounds a year, people would have asked, "How will that be possible? How will you be able to get the plant?"

I have no objection to the debate that has taken place. So far from its doing any harm, I think it will clear the atmosphere and have a good effect. Further, I believe that the information that has been supplied regarding the many things we are doing will be appreciated. In dealing with this matter we can exclude all party considerations. We have done what could be done, and anything that may be asked by the Commonwealth of this Government will be done. The more we can do, the better pleased we shall be. There is no job too big for us to tackle. We are prepared to do whatever is required; we have the will to do it, and an absolute anxiety to be of the greatest possible assistance to the Commonwealth. By

so doing we, though only a comparatively small factor, shall be playing our part in the tremendous effort that will enable the Allies to win victory in the great struggle in which they are engaged.

Question put and passed.

Resolution reported and the report adopted.

In Committee of Ways and Means.

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

THE PREMIER (Hon. J. C. Willcock—Geraldton) [9.57]: I move—

That towards making good the Supply granted to His Majesty for the services of the year ending the 30th June, 1942, a sum not exceeding £1,200,000 be granted out of Consolidated Revenue.

Question put and passed.

Resolution reported and the report adopted.

All Stages.

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

BILL—WILLS (SOLDIERS, SAILORS, AND AIRMEN).

Bill read a third time and transmitted to the Council.

BILL—DEATH PENALTY ABOLITION.

Third Reading.

MRS. CARDELL-OLIVER (Subiaco) [10.2]: I move—

That the Bill be now read a third time.

MR. J. H. SMITH (Nelson) [10.3]: I oppose the third reading of the Bill. I had intended to speak on the second reading, but unfortunately, being out of the Chamber for a few moments, I missed my opportunity.

Mrs. Cardell-Oliver: It is a pity you are not out of the Chamber now.

Mr. J. H. SMITH: The hon. member should be broadminded enough to realise that we all have our individual opinions on the important subject of her Bill. I am

not trying to make any capital out of my opposition to the measure. I listened to her reply on the second reading debate, and the arguments she advanced in support of the Bill. I should add that I also listened to her when she was putting up her case in moving the second reading. I was not in the slightest degree impressed with either that speech or with the reply which she made. I was, however, impressed, and I am sure the Chamber as a whole was impressed, with the speech delivered by the member for Mt. Marshall (Mr. Warner). Evidently that hon. member had given the subject a great deal of attention and had done a great deal of research in connection with it. At the conclusion of his speech he was unanimously applauded on both sides of the Chamber. The member for Subiaco, in replying, said that the opposition of the member for Mt. Marshall to the Bill was due to his training. As he had formerly been in the police force, his mind, she suggested, was led in that direction.

Everyone must admit that the feature of the opposition to the Bill was the speech of the member for Nedlands—one of his many masterpieces. The hon. member's argument must have impressed everyone. The Bill would have had no chance of obtaining support here had not its subject appeared as a plank in a political platform. I will not delve into premeditated murders and other horrible crimes committed in Western Australia. I merely assert that while the death penalty remains on the statute book of Western Australia, we have a deterrent from murder. The death penalty is what is feared. The member for Subiaco declared that the speech of the member for Nedlands was only the result of a lawyer's training—a lawyer being paid either by the Crown or by the accused to get a verdict. While abolition of the death penalty is a plank of the platform of the Labour Party, yet it is a highly obscure plank. In all my years of Parliamentary life I have never heard that plank mentioned during elections. I am reminded of a remark made by the Minister for Lands, that the plank has become a very small splinter, and that one needs either wonderful vision or a superfine sense of smell to know what it is.

My belief is that the member for Subiaco has been persuaded by some crank organisation to bring the subject forward. She did so, knowing that members of the Labour

Party would either have to vote for the Bill or walk out of the Chamber. I repeat, I have never heard that plank of the Labour platform mentioned. In fact, I did not know until after the Bill had been introduced here that abolition of the death penalty was a plank of the Labour platform. I believe that many other members were in the same position.

The situation as I see it is this: Hundreds of thousands or even millions are being killed all over the world. The nations being in that frame of mind, shall we by carrying the Bill give a license to murder? That is what the measure means. I repeat, the death penalty while on the statute book is a deterrent. I for one shall not vote for the third reading of the Bill. If I can get one supporter I shall divide the House on the question.

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

| | | | | |
|--------------|----|----|----|----|
| Ayes | .. | .. | .. | 25 |
| Noes | .. | .. | .. | 10 |
| Majority for | | | | 15 |

AYES.

| | |
|---------------------|--------------------|
| Mr. Berry | Mr. Nulsen |
| Mrs. Cardell-Oliver | Mr. Pantou |
| Mr. Coverley | Mr. Rodoreda |
| Mr. Doney | Mr. F. C. L. Smith |
| Mr. Fox | Mr. Styants |
| Mr. Hawke | Mr. Tonkin |
| Mr. W. Hegney | Mr. Triat |
| Mr. Hughes | Mr. Willcock |
| Mr. Leahy | Mr. Wilson |
| Mr. Marshall | Mr. Wise |
| Mr. McDonald | Mr. Withers |
| Mr. Millington | Mr. J. Hegney |
| Mr. Needham | |

(Teller.)

NOES.

| | |
|-------------|-----------------|
| Mr. Hill | Mr. J. H. Smith |
| Mr. Latham | Mr. Thorn |
| Mr. Mann | Mr. Warner |
| Mr. McLarty | Mr. Willmott |
| Mr. Seward | Mr. Sampson |

(Teller.)

Question thus passed.

Bill read a third time, and transmitted to the Council.

BILL—CITY OF PERTH SCHEME FOR SUPERANNUATION (AMENDMENTS AUTHORISATION).

Returned from the Council with amendments.

BILL—POTATO GROWERS LICENSING.

Report of Committee adopted.

Hon. C. G. LATHAM: It is not very easy, without a copy of the Minister's amendment, to grasp the position, but I understand that notwithstanding the six months allowed under the Justices Act it is desired to begin a prosecution at any period during the operation of the Act. I do not propose to raise any objection.

Question put and passed; the Council's amendment, as amended, agreed to.

Resolution reported, the report adopted, and a message accordingly returned to the Council.

BILL—INDUSTRIAL ARBITRATION ACT AMENDMENT.

In Committee.

Mr. Marshall in the Chair; the Minister for Labour in charge of the Bill.

Clause 1—agreed to.

Clause 2—Amendment of Section 4:

The MINISTER FOR LABOUR: There is an amendment on the notice paper with which I do not desire to proceed, but wish to move another in its place. This clause contains a new definition of the term "worker," based on the definition of the term "industry" as it appears in Section 4 of the Act. It was thought that by making the definition of the term "worker" uniform with the definition of the term "industry" where applicable, the new definition of the term "worker" would be more satisfactory than the existing one. It is doubtful whether it would be and as a result of further consideration it is thought that the words in the old definition "employed or usually employed by any employer to do any skilled or unskilled work" were rather fuller in their application than the proposed definition in the Bill. In consequence I move an amendment—

That in line 2 of the definition of "worker" all the words after "or" be struck out and the words "usually employed by any employer to do any skilled or unskilled work for hire or reward and includes an apprentice and a domestic servant" inserted in lieu.

If the amendment is agreed to, the new definition will be no different from the existing definition except that it will include a domestic servant.

Mr. McDONALD: I agree with the Minister that it is advisable to revert to

the old definition as contained in the Industrial Arbitration Act.

Hon. C. G. Latham: That is the one inserted last year?

The Minister for Labour: No, in 1925.

Mr. McDONALD: The Minister is now reverting to the definition of "worker" except for the inclusion of domestic servants, which has been in the Industrial Arbitration Act for many years. Unless there is good reason to alter the definition, it is better to retain what the employers and workers know, the effect of which has been ascertained by many decisions and awards of the court. I support the amendment.

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

Clauses 3 to 7—agreed to.

Clause 8—Amendment of Section 90:

Mr. McDONALD: This clause proposes to do three things. The first is that the court, in addition to its existing power to vary or rescind an award, may also add to it. The second is that, where the court inserts in an award what may be termed experimental provisions, it may reserve leave to the parties to apply to have them varied. I agree with both these suggestions, but I disagree with the third proposal which, in effect, is that notwithstanding an award is made by the court to operate for a certain period and be binding on the parties for a certain period, they may, subject to the sanction of the court, enter into an agreement varying any of the terms of the award. The Act already contains provisions by which an award may, in certain circumstances be varied by the court. It is now proposed that the parties may make an agreement varying the terms of the award. This new provision takes away one of the chief reasons for industrial arbitration, which is that there should be finality and certainty in industry. Once parties come to the court after months, or sometimes years, of preparation, and argue the case fully and secure an award, that award should operate for its term. The employers and workers should go away feeling that for the period, which I think is one year, they know exactly where they stand. The result of this amendment is that the employers or the workers, who consider they have received the worst of the court's award can immediately

agitate and bring pressure to bear to force the other party to vary its terms during the period for which it was meant to operate. In the interests of both parties it is wise to retain the present provisions. I move an amendment—

That in line 10 of paragraph (b) the words after the word "order" be struck out.

The MINISTER FOR LABOUR: I oppose this amendment. Under the clause as it stands, conclusive action would only take place when the workers and employers agree to an alteration to an existing award or agreement, and the court itself when subsequently approached sanctions the alteration and agrees to its registration in the Arbitration Court. A serious industrial hold-up occurred in this State a few years ago in connection with the employees of passenger buses. The court issued an award with provisions difficult of operation. An industrial dispute developed, and the majority of both parties were agreeable to having the offending provisions amended. The law prevented that. The dispute, as a result, dragged on for many weeks. Had such a provision as this been in the Act the dispute would not have continued for so long. In view of the fact that both the employers and the employees have to agree and that the court has subsequently to give its sanction to any proposed alterations, this provision is desirable and also safe.

Mr. McDONALD: From time to time there may be special instances where an award may operate harshly, or at any rate not satisfactorily, from the standpoint of one or other of the parties concerned. The Minister mentioned one industrial dispute, but the worst that could happen would be that the award would have to continue for 12 months. If we agree to the clause in its present form we shall strike at the very root of our industrial arbitration system, the object of which is to secure peace and stability in industry. If we pass the provision I desire eliminated from the clause both employers and employees will know that, notwithstanding that an award has been issued by the court after months of consideration, one or other section may commence agitating the day after it is issued to bring pressure to bear to scrap the award either in part or as a whole. The amendment, if agreed to, will be in the best interests of a system we all uphold, one that is of benefit to both workers and employers.

Hon. C. G. LATHAM: I am sorry the Minister is in such a frame of mind that he will not accept the amendment. I endorse all that the member for West Perth has said. The main object to be achieved is to secure peace in industry, and the retention of the clause in its present form will not have that effect. We know there are agitators among the employers as well as among the employees; such people will be assisted by this provision to stir up trouble and force issues. Those associated with industry require to know where they stand. An employer may have a big contract, and a variation forced upon him in his industrial conditions may involve great expense. The Minister should be amenable to reason. We endeavour to assist him with his legislation and if he cannot secure all he wants, he can at least go a long way towards achieving his objective.

Mr. J. Hegney: This provision does not mean that the whole award may be set aside but merely a part of it.

Hon. C. G. LATHAM: That is not the position. This may result in setting aside the award in toto, provided both sides give their consent and the court sanctions the move. The Minister should be reasonable because, after many efforts, he has at last secured the inclusion of domestic servants.

Mr. TRIAT: I support the contentions of the Minister. My experience of industrial arbitration is that in most instances the court desires parties to arrive at an agreement on the issues before the terms of an award are settled. I see no danger in the provision to which the member for West Perth has taken exception. Both parties must agree before anything can be done. I know of one instance in which an industrial award embodied a most disastrous clause. It was necessary to experiment with it in order to demonstrate its effect before steps could be taken to alter it. The provision in the Bill will help to get over that difficulty. If an award should contain an objectionable provision I do not know why either side should suffer in consequence for even 12 months, if both parties are in agreement that it is not satisfactory. I strongly favour arbitration in connection with industrial matters.

Hon C. G. Latham: The trouble is that one or two employers, for instance, may agree upon a variation while other employers may be up in arms against any such suggestion.

Mr. TRIAT: I do not think there is much danger from that standpoint. Personally I regard arbitration as a safeguard in connection with all industrial effort.

Hon. C. G. Latham: I wish that applied a hundred per cent.

Mr. TRIAT: I think that is the position in connection with industry here. I would certainly not be keen upon inserting in the Act anything that would destroy the balance of fairness and decency in industrial arbitration.

Mr. McDonald: Then vote with us against the destroyer.

Mr. TRIAT: I do not think that in this instance the Minister is in any sense a destroyer.

Mr. SAMPSON: I am sorry the Minister is so insistent upon retaining the provision in the Bill.

The Minister for Labour: I must be right, now!

Mr. SAMPSON: He may be running true to form in that he is prepared to insist upon a provision that will have the effect of encouraging industrial trouble. A section of employers or of employees can get together and perhaps coerce the court in a manner that is undesirable. This may tend to upset the true spirit of arbitration. We know what has happened in the past. There was an instance in the bread industry. Employers and the union got together and decided to ask for certain amendments to conditions applying to the industry. They were not representative of the industry as a whole. Nevertheless they were able to achieve their wishes and eventually the Government introduced legislation that was ultimately approved. I am sure that in this instance the Minister's insistence upon the clause as it stands will engender trouble. Notwithstanding that the court has issued an award after careful consideration, the parties affected may at any time enter into an agreement to vary its terms, provided the sanction of the court is received. It does not require much imagination to visualise the parties explaining to the president of the court that both sides are desirous of certain alterations being effected. Provisions of this kind cause trouble and tend to break down the usefulness of the court. They encourage trickery and might induce the court to meet the wishes of a

mere section. If the Minister desires to preserve industrial peace, he will not insist upon a provision that is bad in principle.

Mr. W. HEGNEY: The fears of the member for Swan are entirely unfounded. I subscribe to the belief of the member for Mt. Magnet that the provision would tend to ensure industrial peace. I cannot imagine the court's being coerced, and to speak of trickery is an unwarranted affront to the workers' organisation. The first point is that the parties must agree to the variation.

Hon. C. G. Latham: But there might be only a small number.

Mr. W. HEGNEY: The amendment must have the sanction of the court. Nobody would suggest that the members of the court would be so devoid of a sense of responsibility as to sanction an amendment unless they were satisfied it was in order.

Hon. C. G. Latham: But the court is not infallible.

Mr. W. HEGNEY: Neither is the hon. member. We should do everything possible to encourage the principle of arbitration. There might be occasions when, owing to changing conditions, some clause in an award should be altered, but without this provision neither side could approach the court for 12 months. If an amendment is mutually agreed upon there should be authority to approach the court.

Mr. SEWARD: It is remarkable how some members can disregard practices that are resorted to. Years ago Mr. Justice Higgins remarked, when a certain matter was brought before him, that he could not believe such a thing would be done. The court has been established to settle differences between employers and employees. When an award is made—

Mr. Withers: If it is bad it has to operate for 12 months.

Mr. SEWARD: Yes, which after all is a short period.

Mr. Withers: And risk industrial turmoil all that time.

Mr. SEWARD: I have a better opinion of advocates than to believe that they could not foresee conditions a year ahead. After an award had been delivered, employees could agitate for an alteration, and the pressure might become so great that the other side, for the sake of peace, would give way. This will not give stability to awards and I am surprised at its being proposed.

Hon. C. G. LATHAM: We are providing that domestics shall be included as workers and they will need an organisation. As the member for Pingelly said, there will be no stability if a provision of this kind is adopted. At present, once an award is made, there is stability for 12 months.

The Minister for Justice: You think there should not be any elasticity at all, except through the Court?

Hon. C. G. LATHAM: That is so. An award is really a contract. If the Minister was letting a contract for a building, would he like to have it varied every five minutes?

The Minister for Justice: If I agreed to the variation it would be all right.

Hon. C. G. LATHAM: But the Minister would not want to be subjected to continuous agitation. The Minister's suggestion surprises me. An employer makes an agreement with his employees, and the parties go to the Arbitration Court and have it made an award, whereupon it will cover a great many people who have known nothing whatever about it. That is what worries me. If a copy of the agreement were to be served on all employers, the position might be different; but how are all the employers to be known when domestic servants are brought under the Act? We have an excellent condition of peace in industry; so why not let things remain as they are? A single agitator can cause endless domestic trouble. I know this, having been a unionist at one time. The Minister should be reasonable. If we hammer away at this, our friends elsewhere will know what our opinions are. In this State I believe, the greatest number of disputes has been between the Government and its employees. After the war we shall have to reconsider much of our industrial legislation.

The CHAIRMAN: I ask the Leader of the Opposition to confine his remarks to the amendment.

Hon. C. G. LATHAM: I fear that industrial unrest will result from the provision. Gratuitous trouble will be created.

Mr. STYANTS: I do not understand the opposition to the Government's proposal. The policy which has proved so successful in maintaining industrial peace here is the policy of conciliation and arbitration. In case of a dispute the Arbitration Court calls for a settlement of issues, so that the hearing of the case will not be unnecessarily pro-

longed. A clause in an industrial agreement may contain a condition unfavourable to both parties, which therefore should be eliminated from the award. Such elimination is objected to by the Leader of the Opposition, who points out that an award might cover a number of employers.

Hon. C. G. Latham: Who may not have been parties to the agreement.

Mr. STYANTS: Employers have a union, and have representation in the Arbitration Court, and also have a representative on the bench of that court. A reasonable and desirable alteration should not be resisted because of the proposed inclusion of the domestic servant section.

Mr. SAMPSON: This matter relates to an award when everything is peaceful, and then this wretched amendment is introduced by the Minister. What a caricature of legislation it is that when everything has been argued before the Arbitration Court and an award has been delivered some parties may get together and declare themselves dissatisfied! There is always some dissatisfaction, among employers and employees alike. The subclause represents a peculiarly obnoxious type of error to introduce into industrial legislation.

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

| | | | | |
|------------------|----|----|----|----|
| Ayes | .. | .. | .. | 9 |
| Noes | .. | .. | .. | 19 |
| Majority against | | | | 10 |

| AVES. | |
|---------------------|-------------|
| Mrs. Cardell-Oliver | Mr. McLarty |
| Mr. Hill | Mr. Sampson |
| Mr. Latham | Mr. Seward |
| Mr. Mann | Mr. Doney |
| Mr. McDonald | (Teller.) |

| NOES. | |
|----------------|--------------------|
| Mr. Berry | Mr. Rodoreda |
| Mr. Coverley | Mr. F. C. L. Smith |
| Mr. Cross | Mr. Styants |
| Mr. Hawke | Mr. Tonkin |
| Mr. J. Hegney | Mr. Triat |
| Mr. W. Hegney | Mr. Wilcoch |
| Mr. Leahy | Mr. Wise |
| Mr. Mullington | Mr. Withers |
| Mr. Nulsen | Mr. Wilson |
| Mr. Panton | (Teller.) |

| PAIRS. | |
|-----------------|-------------|
| AVES. | NOES. |
| Mr. Stubbs | Mr. Collier |
| Mr. Patrick | Mr. Needham |
| Mr. Phorn | Mr. Johnson |
| Mr. J. H. Smith | Mr. Holman |
| Mr. Boyle | Mr. Fox |

Amendment thus negatived.

Clause put and passed.

Clauses 9 to 12—agreed to.

Clause 13—New Sections:

Mr. McDONALD: The object of the proposed new section is to prevent employers from demanding a premium from a worker. In other words, an employer must not say to a hard-up man, "I will take you on at the ordinary wages, but you have to pay me £10 for the job." With that objective I am in sympathy, but the proposed new section might be sufficient to debar the activities of employment brokers, who are people that receive reward in connection with the engagement of an employee by an employer. I have accordingly drawn up a proposal which I think carries out the intention of the Minister. I move an amendment—

That Subsections 1 and 2 of proposed new Section 174B be struck out with a view to inserting other subsections.

The MINISTER FOR LABOUR: I do not oppose the amendment, although I desire the subsequent amendment by the member for West Perth to be altered slightly.

Amendment (to strike out words) put and passed.

Mr. McDONALD: I move an amendment—

That the following subsections be inserted in lieu of those struck out:—(1) No employer or worker or person acting on behalf of an employer or worker shall ask, demand or receive or pay or provide or offer to pay or provide any premium, payment or reward for or in respect of the employment or engagement of any worker in any industry which is the subject of an award or industrial agreement, or to which the provisions of the Factories and Shops Act, 1920-1939, are applicable, provided that nothing in this subsection contained shall apply to an employment or engagement through the agency of an employment broker acting in the ordinary course of his business under the Employment Brokers Act, 1909-1918.

(2) No person shall accept for publication or publish in a newspaper, periodical or otherwise any advertisement of an offer to accept or receive any premium, payment or reward of the kind referred to in the preceding subsection.

The MINISTER FOR LABOUR: Some doubt exists whether we can in the Industrial Arbitration Act provide what shall be done under the Factories and Shops Act. In any event, that Act contains a provision similar to the one it is desired to include in the Industrial Arbitration Act. That provision definitely prevents any employer or worker, or person acting on his behalf, from

asking, demanding, receiving or paying or providing any premium in respect of employment or engagement for employment. I suggest to the member for West Perth that he should strike out from his amendment the words "or to which the provisions of the Factories and Shops Act, 1920-1939, are applicable." I move—

That the amendment be amended by striking out in lines 8 to 10 of proposed new Subsection 1 the words "or to which the provisions of the Factories and Shops Act, 1920-1939, are applicable."

Mr. McDONALD: I am agreeable to the Minister's amendment.

Amendment on amendment put and passed.

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

Clauses 14, 15, Title—agreed to.

Bill reported with amendments.

House adjourned at 11.22 p.m.

Legislative Council.

Tuesday, 21st October, 1941.

| | PAGE |
|---|------|
| Assent to Bills | 1289 |
| Question: Government motor vehicles | 1290 |
| Paper: Farmers' debts adjustment Act, misappropriation of funds | 1290 |
| Bills: Distress for Rent Abolition Act Amendment, Assembly's Message | 1290 |
| Supply (No. 2), £1,200,000, In., Standing Orders suspension | 1290 |
| Wills (Soldiers, Sailors, and Airmen), In. | 1290 |
| Death Penalty Abolition, In., defeated | 1290 |
| Government Stock Saleyards, Assembly's Message | 1290 |
| Profiteering Prevention Act Amendment, Assembly's Message | 1290 |
| Employment Brokers Act Amendment, In. | 1290 |
| Potato Growers' Licensing, In. | 1292 |
| Income Tax, 2s., Com. report | 1292 |
| Supply (No. 2), £1,200,000, remaining stages | 1298 |
| Public Trustee, 2s. | 1299 |
| Increase of Rent (War Restrictions) Act Amendment, Assembly's Message | 1307 |
| Traffic Act Amendment, Assembly's Message | 1307 |
| Workers' Compensation Act Amendment, Com. | 1307 |

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

ASSENT TO BILLS.

Message from the Lieut.-Governor received and read notifying assent to the following Bills:—

- 1, Collie Recreation and Park Lands Act Amendment.
- 2, Water Boards Act Amendment (No. 2).