

visions of the Transfer of Land Act. From a cursory glance through the Bill, which I received only yesterday, I consider it will be advantageous, and it will enable us to reach a stage which will reduce costs, a very desirable thing from the standpoint of the general public. I have had instances during my years of practice where great difficulty has been experienced over land dealings, sometimes in connection with the bringing of land under the provisions of the Transfer of Land Act, when it has been subject to certain trusts, or was entailed, and where difficulties have arisen and heavy expense incurred. The difficulties I believe will be minimised and the expense reduced by a measure such as this. It is unnecessary to go into the details of the Bill at this stage, in view of the statement by the Minister that he had no wish to unduly rush the measure through. It is desirable, however, that a copy of the measure be sent, say, for example, to the Barristers' Board, and their opinion sought.

The Minister for Education: That will be done.

Hon. J. NICHOLSON: It will certainly be an advantage to have an expression of opinion from that board. Speaking generally, I believe they will endorse the principles of the Bill. I have pleasure in supporting the second reading.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

ADJOURNMENT—SPECIAL.

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION: I move—

That the House at its rising adjourn until Tuesday, 10th October.

Question passed.

House adjourned at 5.50 p.m.

Legislative Assembly,

Thursday, 21st September, 1922.

PAON

Questions: Wyalcatchem-Mt. Marshall railway Extension (No. 2) Bill	863
Railway Advisory Board, personnel	863
Witnesses and jurors' allowances	863
Lunacy Royal Commission report	864
Government Savings Bank, Leschen, C. F. J., personal file	864
Motion: Leschen, C. F. J., retirement, to inquire by Select Committee	864
Bills: State Trading Concerns Act Amendment, 1A.	868
Light and Air Act Amendment	878
Lighting of the Assembly Chamber	878
Motions: Industries Assistance Board, to inquire by Select Committee	878
Oil prospecting	881
Cost of living, to inquire by Royal Commission	882
Compensation, occupational diseases	891

QUESTION — WYALCATCHEM-MOUNT MARSHALL RAILWAY (EXTENSION No. 2) BILL.

Advisory Board's Report.

Mr. JOHNSTON asked the Premier:—1, Has any report been received from the Railway Advisory Board in regard to the proposed extension of the Mount Marshall railway, a Bill for which is now before the House? 2, If so, will he lay the report on the Table of the House? 3, If not, will he refer the proposal to the said board?

The PREMIER replied: 1, Yes. 2, Yes. 3, Answered by No. 1.

QUESTION—RAILWAY ADVISORY BOARD, PERSONNEL.

Mr. JOHNSTON asked the Premier:—1, Who are the members of the Railway Advisory Board? 2, When were they appointed? 3, Are Messrs. A. G. Hawby (Manager of the Agricultural Bank) and A. Despeissis, who were members of the Railway Advisory Board when the Narrogin-Armadale and Narrogin-Dwarda railways were recommended for construction, still members of the board? 4, If not, why not? 5, Is it the intention of the Government to endeavour to secure proper continuity of policy and co-ordination in new railway proposals by restoring to the board the experienced officials upon whose reports so many railways have been built?

The PREMIER replied:—1, The Surveyor General, Director of Agriculture, Chief Traffic Manager, and R. J. Anketell. 2, 3rd February, 1920. 3, No. 4, Mr. Hawby is not now available for this work, and Mr. Despeissis is not in the Service. 5, The constitution of the board as at present is satisfactory.

QUESTION—ALLOWANCES TO WITNESSES AND JURORS.

Mr. JOHNSTON asked the Premier:—1, Is it true that under the official "scale of allowances to witnesses and jurors," approved by the Governor in Executive Council, farmers are paid from 11s. to 15s. per day for loss of time attending court, whilst schoolmasters, bank managers, inspectors, auctioneers, commission agents, and others following similar clerical occupations are paid from 16s. to 21s. per day, under section (c) of the regulation? 2, Will the Government have the scale amended so as to place those who follow the occupation of farmer on at least the same plane of remuneration as the other occupations mentioned?

The PREMIER replied: 1, Yes, excepting where special loss or other extraordinary circumstances are shown, when the case is dealt with under clause 14. 2, The scale is now under review in the Department, and

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

when suggestions are submitted to the Minister this matter will be considered with others.

QUESTION—LUNACY ROYAL COMMISSION'S REPORT.

Mr. SIMONS asked the Colonial Secretary: 1, Is it the intention of the Government to print and circulate the report of the Lunacy Commission? 2, If so, when?

The COLONIAL SECRETARY replied: 1 and 2, Report already printed, and is now being distributed.

QUESTION—GOVERNMENT SAVINGS BANK.

Personal file, C. P. J. Leschen.

Mr. SIMONS (without notice) asked the Premier: Will he lay on the Table of the House the personal file of C. P. J. Leschen, late manager of the State Savings Bank?

The PREMIER replied: Certainly.

MOTION—GOVERNMENT SAVINGS BANK, MANAGER'S RETIREMENT.

To inquire by Select Committee.

Mr. J. J. SIMONS (East Perth) [4.37]: I move—

That a select committee be appointed to inquire into and report upon the circumstances attending the retirement of the late manager of the State Savings Bank, C. P. J. Leschen.

I move this motion believing that it should be the function of Parliament to make every effort to ensure that no servant of the Government is ever unjustly visited with punishment, or made the innocent victim of hardship. The matters relating to the officer under review represent an echo of the exciting times of the war. Under the pressure of popular feeling, certain action was taken by the two Governments in office during the war period, by which action a very old servant of the State was dismissed from his office, deprived of his emoluments, and refused what seems to me to be his undeniable right to a pension. The officer under notice joined the service in 1896, and during a period of two decades built up an unchallengeable reputation for industry, loyalty, integrity, and ability. The personal file of this officer was on the Table of the House during the greater part of last session, and is still available. A careful perusal of the records shows that in losing the manager of its Savings Bank, the State lost a servant against whom there was not one substantiated charge of wrong-doing. On the contrary, if we analyse the file we find many evidences from official sources of the loyal service this gentleman gave to his State and to his country. For example, when the position of manager of the State Savings Bank was open, a number of applicants were considered; and for the only time in the history of the State, candidates were examined by a board of commercial and financial men of this city. Mr. Leschen, after a most ex-

acting and analytical examination, was appointed to the vacant position as being the finest candidate offering. If we follow his career during the succeeding years we shall find that a bank which was in a state of chaos, the mismanagement of which was a subject of everyday reference, eventually was taken as the pattern on which the greater number of the savings banks of Australia were eventually remodelled. In other words, this officer originated and developed a system which became a pattern for the Eastern States. I, as an individual, can recall one of the reforms which he introduced, namely, the abolition of the old cumbersome method, operating before his term of office, under which it was necessary for a depositor to give the bank three days' notice before a withdrawal could be made. That restriction, naturally, placed the State Savings Bank in a very difficult position relatively to private enterprise. The reform in question is only one of many which we citizens may be able to recall as originating from Mr. Leschen. On reference to the file as far back as 1909, one finds a minute made by Mr. S. R. L. Elliott, Under Treasurer, in regard to this officer—

He has laboured unremittently to bring the Bank up to its present satisfactory position, and is deserving of every consideration.

Reading the personal file we find a letter from Dr. McNeil, from which it appears that this officer had to be laid aside owing to illness, which the doctor attributes to a disease due to overwork. I know some members of this Chamber have the idea that Government servants do not suffer from overwork, but here is medical testimony as to a very responsible officer being laid aside because of his conscientious discharge of duties, without regard to time or personal health. Reading further into the file we get some light as to his relationship with his staff. We find letters conveying thanks from the Post and Telegraph Association of Employees, from the Postmasters' Association, and from other bodies of public servants for whom he had performed good work. We find also letters from various organisations, including the board of directors of the Australian Natives' Association, all paying testimony to his excellent service. Then, when the Government of 1911 looked around for three of its most capable officers to constitute the Workers' Homes Board, the late manager for the State Savings Bank was one of the first to be nominated. I mention these things, without overstressing the case, in order to show what a splendid record, extending over 20 years, this officer had in relation to his service to the State. Of course a man holding such a responsible position could never carry out his duties properly without making enemies. There is no man holding a high position in this country, whether it is in the administrative section of government or in the Parliamentary section of government, who, if he is doing his duty, does not make enemies.

The Minister for Works: I know I do.

Mr. SIMONS: This man was pursued for some years, but without success. Then came the war. When the people of our country were carried away by enthusiasm, when some of us were probably carried away by hysteria and for a time our judgment was overclouded, when we lost our judgment, we looked for victims; and this man, I believe, is one of the innocent victims of the trying times between 1914 and 1918.

Mr. Mann: I do not know that anybody looked for victims.

Mr. SIMONS: An association was formed in Perth for the purpose of creating victims. There was here an association which gave the leader of my party the option of paying £50 or going to gaol for six months. One of the charges brought against Leschen was that he was a German. This has a very important bearing on the analysis of the position. Leschen was born in South Australia over 50 years ago. The family originated in Poland and lived there during the time of the Reformation, when one of the family progenitors, a bishop of the Roman Catholic church, went over to the reformed church and so had to leave Poland. The family, therefore, is of Polish origin, but later on were located in Holstein. Holstein-Slesvic became part of Germany, but was not German territory when the then head of the Leschen family left Denmark and came to South Australia in 1857. It was not until 1866 that that part of Denmark became German territory. In 1863 the then head of the family became a British subject. As one who knows South Australia very well, I can bear testimony to the high repute in which Leschen senior was held in Adelaide. It is true that Carl Leschen's mother was born in Hamburg, Germany. But she came to Australia in her 14th year. Neither the father nor the mother ever returned to the land of their origin, having accepted Australia as their country. Leschen was born in this country, and never knew any other country. Not by the wildest stretch of imagination can we regard him as being a German. However, there was here at the time an association which started what was called a Hun hunt. They singled out various members of the community and charged them with disloyalty. No less a person than the Minister for Mines, then Premier of the State, was placed on the rack by this gang of inquisitors, charged with being a pro-German, and was even howled down at a public meeting at His Majesty's theatre. The head of that association was a half-Christian, half-Mohammedan lawyer with a most unsavory reputation. The man who originated these charges against Leschen was a member of the executive of the All-British Association. That man had been dismissed by Leschen for incompetency. Using the favourable state of public opinion of the day, he endeavoured to snatch the vengeance for which he had waited for so many years. Let us for a moment

analyse some of the charges made against Leschen. I have gone through the police files very carefully—on that point the member for Perth (Mr. Mann) will be able to throw greater light than I—and although inquiries were set going from Fremantle to Meekatharra, although the whole of the excellent machinery of our police and Criminal Investigation Department was set in motion, not one speck of evidence against Leschen's honour or probity or loyalty could be adduced. One of the charges was that he was concerned in spiriting messages from Australia to Germany. When this charge was referred to the Military Department, the then secretary to the department, Mr. Trumble, replied in this way—

With reference to the transmission of letters from Western Australia to Germany, I am to refer you to the Foreign Office notice dated 27th February and published in the Commonwealth of Australia "Gazette" on 22nd May, 1915, in which it is notified that private letters are allowed to be sent to enemy countries.

Here is a man accused of doing something unlawful which, however, the British Foreign Office had specifically stated was not forbidden. By special despatch published in the Commonwealth "Gazette" it was laid down that there was no restriction whatever on private letters between the Commonwealth and Germany; yet one of the charges against Leschen was that he had been spiriting private letters from the Commonwealth to Germany. It shows how hysterical were some of the people who were lodging charges of this kind. In point of fact, there was not any proof that Leschen ever wrote to Germany during the currency of the war.

Mr. Mann: I think you ought to make that point clear. Is there any evidence that he did write?

Mr. SIMONS: I have perused the file carefully, and I can say there is no evidence, police or civil, that he ever wrote to Germany at any time during the war. Another charge was that he spoke German in his own home. To that charge I suppose he has to plead guilty. But I know that in my own district in South Australia, where 30 per cent. of the population was of German origin, a boy went out and won the military cross, won it fighting on our side, went out of a home where nothing but German was spoken. The secretary of the Returned Soldiers' League in my own town, a man whose parents were both German, also went out and covered himself with glory fighting for our side. At that time the German language was in the curriculum of every high school in Australia. If a parent, because he had knowledge of another language, took the opportunity to speak it in his own home in order that his children might become familiar with two languages, was that a crime? German at one time was spoken in the palaces of England, notwithstanding which the owners and occupants of those palaces fought, and fought

well on our side. If the speaking of German had been an offence, 30 per cent. of the officers of the whole of the British army would have been adjudged guilty of treason. Another charge, put up by a Government servant, against Leschen was that he employed none but German girls as servants in his own home. From 1896 to 1916, during the greater part of which time he was never without domestic help, he had German girls in his home on only three occasions. One was for a few weeks in 1906, and another was in April, 1914, just before the war, the third occasion being when he took in a hungry girl, chased from pillar to post because of her nationality, and gave her shelter for a few weeks. But he took this safeguard: he went to the district commandant's office and reported that he was sheltering a girl who, because of her nationality, was on the verge of committing suicide. That was not the action of a man impelled by any motive other than that of humanity to a girl in serious difficulty. Yet his humane act has been cited as an act of treachery to our people. If we are to take an unbiassed view regarding the services of Leschen, I am sure every member of the House will accept as an officer of very high repute the Public Service Commissioner, the late Mr. Jull. Mr. Jull wrote a very definite minute in regard to proposals then being put forward that Leschen should be sacrificed. Dated August, 1916, the minute runs—

I am distinctly of opinion that Mr. Leschen's case is entirely different from the cases of Gloe and Bennecke, naturalised Prussians, and although it may be necessary in deference to the state of public opinion to remove him from the control of such a public institution as the Savings Bank, I doubt whether it would be just and right to throw him entirely on his own resources. I base these views on the two following facts and opinions: (1) He is a British-born subject, and I am of opinion he is a loyal subject of the Crown. (2) He has successfully built up and controlled the State Savings Bank of which he has been an officer for 20 years, during which time he has been manager for 13 years, and I am of opinion that the public feeling which is now set against him is the result in great measure of his having from time to time to charge some of his officers with offences which resulted in their dismissal. The late case of Bremner is one in point, as I know they hoped to influence a jury if they could get the case before one, playing on Mr. Leschen's presumed nationality. Having regard, therefore, to all the circumstances of the case, I think it would be unjust to ignore the past good, and I believe loyal, service rendered to the Crown, and treat him, a British subject by birth, no better than we treat others of enemy birth and merely naturalised. A man might seek to be naturalised for ulterior reasons, but this cannot be said of a man born a British subject.

Then comes this important addendum—

You may know that Mr. J. G. Hay, who was on the staff of the All-British Association, was once on the temporary staff of the bank and was paid off by Mr. Leschen because he was unsuitable. That bears out the point I have already mentioned, namely, that this charge was largely promoted by a dismissed officer looking for vengeance and using the cry of loyalty to the British Empire in order to sacrifice a man who had parted with his company because of inefficiency. The whole file is crammed with evidence of that kind. Let us look at the other side of the picture and examine the file for evidence of Leschen's loyalty—I want to say he was a member of the British Overseas Club formed in Perth about 1909 for the purpose of promoting a closer union between the different dominions of the British Empire; Leschen was one of the officers of that body, and was one of its founders. On the 17th September, 1915, before the All-British Association had demanded his body, this letter from him appeared on the file—

I can assure you no man can possibly be more sincerely loyal and attached to the land of his birth than I and mine are. For Australia and what Australia stands for, I am prepared to stand or fall. Australia's enemies are my enemies. That is signed "Carl Leschen."

Mr. Richardson: What was his object in writing that?

Mr. SIMONS: Because it expressed the sentiments of his heart.

Mr. Richardson: Was there no charge against him then?

Mr. SIMONS: There never has been.

Mr. Richardson: Then what led him to write it?

Mr. SIMONS: Somebody wrote sympathising with him in the unfair treatment to which he had been subjected. Before his retirement he wrote again, and the letter appears on the file as follows:—

I court the fullest inquiry into any and every rumour in circulation. I fear nothing. I am a natural born Australian, and as such claim my right to serve my king in a civil or any other capacity as one of his most loyal subjects.

Those are written statements by a man whom nobody can say was a hypocrite. The case was referred to the Solicitor General, a man known for his calm, cold and dispassionate judgment. In Clause 7 on page 84 of the file the Solicitor General says—

There is a suggestion on the file of Mr. Leschen's pro-German sympathies. He, however, maintains that he is a loyal British subject. Proceedings with a view to dismissal on the ground of disloyalty would mean suspension, an inquiry by the Commissioner and an appeal to a board. There are not in my opinion sufficient grounds to justify such action.

That is the opinion of the Crown Solicitor, and I prefer to accept his opinion to that of

raving jingoes who never have, nor will have any status in this community of ours. We come to the manner in which Leschen's services were dispensed with. First of all in response to the pressure which was brought on the Government, Leschen was granted three months leave on full pay. An officer in one of the departments, who had made up his mind to remorselessly pursue Leschen, shifted his ground as the file indicates, and finally put up a charge that because of the unpopularity of the manager consequent upon his supposedly German origin, something like a run had taken place on the Savings Bank. I do not wish to weary the House by going into details relating to that charge, but it is important that it should be referred to, because stress was laid on that phase, and the Government of the day, believing that the charge was justified, asked Mr. Leschen to take leave for three months. Then at the conclusion of that period, he was asked to take a further term of three months. The statements regarding the depreciation in the deposits of the Savings Bank are not uncontradicted, but even admitting that such a charge was correct, I ask hon. members whether the punishment which has been inflicted upon this man is in proportion to the injury his presence was supposed to have done to the Savings Bank. A man who has served the State for 20 years, it seems to me, has the right to expect that he will have some sort of tenure of office, and he has the right to expect that he will pass on to that period of his life when through old age he will be able to retire, and that he may make his plans accordingly. In this case without any definite charge being made, and without being given the opportunity to defend himself, a succeeding Government took the responsibility of compulsorily retiring him. They have punished him in this way: that after 20 long years of service he is deprived of those emoluments he had the right to expect. He is denied the right to receive a pension which was considered an integral part of the terms of his employment. In addition to that he has had put upon his forehead the stigma of being a traitor to the country which bore him, and he has never been permitted the opportunity to deny that accusation. That is a stigma which will not disappear with the passing of Leschen; it is a stigma which will go on to his children, his grandchildren and his great-grandchildren. I ask hon. members whether they think it is fair, whether they think it is British justice or Australian fair play to do this kind of thing to a man without giving him the chance to reply. The position is this: If we assume this man to be a German—and his eyes have never beheld any other part of the world but Australia, he has never inhaled the atmosphere of any country but ours—have we the right to de-naturalise him? I submit we have no such right, neither a man-made right nor a

divine right to de-naturalise him, and declare that he has no country. If he is not an Australian, what is he? Even suppose he was a German, which he is not, are we to say that a public servant, because the land from which his parents came 60 years before, declared war on us, is to be deprived of his rights, remembering too that he has given 20 years of faithful service. There is no one who can defend such an action. Let us take for example the Chief Electoral Officer who lately retired. Mr. Stenberg, too, was a faithful and a loyal officer. Suppose Sweden, the country from which he came, had come into the war against us. What would he have had to do with bringing Sweden into the war? He had no more to do with keeping Sweden out of the war than Leschen's mother had in bringing Germany into it. At the present moment we are on the eve of troublous times, and we are not sure on which side the French nation will be found fighting. Are we to say, therefore, that young men born of French parents, are to be denied the right to be called Australians in consequence of that? Picture where that will lead us if we accept it as a reason. If to-morrow France took up arms against the British Empire, would the Government of Canada with its four million French-Canadians, born in Canada, say to those people, "You have no country"? See what a ridiculous precedent we are attempting to establish, even though there are some who will persist in saying that Germany was the native land of Leschen's parents. I do not wish to take up more time except to say that by carrying this motion we shall not be affirming reinstatement, nor affirming compensation; we shall merely be affirming the advisability of giving this man a trial, holding an inquiry into the circumstances surrounding his dismissal, and giving him an opportunity of removing the stigma which unfairly has been placed upon him. If we do that we shall be following the precedent of acting up to the noblest chivalrous traditions of France at the time when serious charges were made against the soldier Dreyfus. We all remember how Zola day after day and year after year fought for Dreyfus, until finally the French Parliament gave the man wrongly condemned a chance to appear before a tribunal to explain exactly where he stood. That is all that we ask in this case. I do hope that hon. members will not stand for any dismissal and will not stand for the sacrifice of any man upon the altar of unreasoning prejudice without giving that man a chance to appear before his countrymen so that he may clear himself and his family of the stigma which has been placed upon them as an act of vengeance. I hope hon. members will review what this unfair sentence has meant to Leschen who spent the whole of his young manhood in qualifying to administer a department of State, and who is suddenly thrown on to the

world, branded in such a way that no firm would dare to employ him for fear of being charged with giving work to one who had been branded as a traitor. Imagine, too, the sufferings of this man who, though physically unfit, has been driven to manual labour, eking out an existence, well sinking, clearing, and fencing, in an effort to provide for those he loves, and who to-day, exhausted, is an invalid in a convalescent home at Cottesloe, with three doctors to attend to him. I do not believe there is one member in this House who can justly say to himself that Leschen did anything in his career to deserve punishment of this kind. At least, therefore, a select committee should be given the opportunity of determining the question whether Leschen deserves the terrible punishment which the State has inflicted upon him. I am only asking that the select committee be appointed so that it may be decided whether the humiliation he is undergoing to-day is punishment he deserves.

On motion by the Premier debate adjourned.

BILL—STATE TRADING CONCERNS ACT AMENDMENT.

Received from the Council.

Mr. SPEAKER: I have received a message from the Council transmitting a Bill to amend the State Trading Concerns Act. Has any member been asked to take charge of the Bill?

Mr. O'Loughlen: Throw it out. It has no father or mother.

Mr. A. THOMSON: I will take charge of it. I move—

That the Bill be now read a first time.

Question put and declared negatived. Division called for.

Point of Order.

Hon. P. Collier: I rise to a point of order. I must enter my protest against the procedure that has been adopted. You put the motion, Sir, and declared it lost and no request came from any hon. member—

Mr. Mann: Yes.

Hon. P. Collier: Disputing the fact.

Mr. Speaker: I put the question again.

Hon. P. Collier: The question was put in an ordinary way and you gave your decision. After a lapse of a few seconds a request was made by a member on the cross benches, and the question was put a second time. This was giving a privilege to members to which they were not entitled in the circumstances. When you gave your ruling in the first case no division was called for at the moment.

Mr. Speaker: When I read the Message I was not aware who was going to take charge of the Bill. I therefore paused. Apparently no arrangement had been made for any member to take charge of the Bill. I put the question, and I noticed a murmur amongst members indicating that they did not realise

what the Message was. I put the question again and decided in favour of the "Noes." Some member said something about dividing. I, therefore, put the question again for the benefit of members. I gave my decision in favour of the "Noes," which I thought were predominant. A division was then called for and in the circumstances it must proceed.

Debate resumed.

The House divided with the following result:—

Ayes	26
Noes	13

Majority for 13

AYES.

Mr. Brown	Sir James Mitchell
Mr. Carter	Mr. Money
Mrs. Cowan	Mr. Pickering
Mr. Davies	Mr. Piesse
Mr. Durack	Mr. Richardson
Mr. George	Mr. Sampson
Mr. Gibson	Mr. J. H. Smith
Mr. Harrison	Mr. Stubbs
Mr. Hickmott	Mr. A. Thomson
Mr. Johnston	Mr. J. Thomson
Mr. Latham	Mr. Underwood
Mr. C. C. Maley	Mr. Mullany
Mr. H. K. Maley	(Teller.)
Mr. Mann	

NOES.

Mr. Angwin	Mr. McCallum
Mr. Chesson	Mr. Munzie
Mr. Collier	Mr. Simons
Mr. Corboy	Mr. Walker
Mr. Heron	Mr. Willcock
Mr. Lutey	Mr. O'Loughlen
Mr. Marshall	(Teller.)

Question thus passed.

Bill read a first time.

Mr. A. THOMSON (Katanning) [5.19]: I move—

That the second reading of the Bill be made an Order of the Day for the next sitting of the House.

Hon. P. COLLIER (Boulder) [5.20]: I move an amendment—

That the words "the next sitting of the House" be struck out and "this day six months" inserted in lieu.

I do not think we should take up the time of House over this Bill.

Mr. Mann: Let it go at that.

Hon. P. COLLIER: It is much better to waste an hour or two considering it now than waste days later on in the session.

Mr. Underwood: It is just as well to have a clear discussion on the question.

Hon. P. COLLIER: The House should not allow this Bill to be considered, having regard to the manner in which it was sent here. It was the product of a private member in another place. I have no doubt we should not have had it at all but for the fact that the

member who introduced it in another place has had a good deal of leisure time on his hands during the last four weeks. Having a desire to be employed on something, he has filled in his time in the preparation of this Bill. It apparently came here without the knowledge of any member. When the message was first read no one undertook to accept any responsibility for it. It was merely an act of charity, as it were, and a desire to father an orphan, that prompted the member for Katanning (Mr. Thomson) to sponsor the Bill.

Mr. Underwood: It was an act of courtesy to another place.

Hon. P. COLLIER: I am opposed to the Bill occupying a position on our Notice Paper. I understand it deals with some provision of the Act governing the existence and control of our State trading concerns. If any action is taken in this direction it should emanate from the Government. The question of the sale or retention of our State trading concerns should be one of policy. It is a matter of the utmost importance. It is not one that should originate from a private member and, having originated in that way, we should not give it any consideration. The time of the House should not be occupied in dealing with it.

Mr. A. THOMSON (Katanning—on amendment) [5.23]: I trust the House will not accept the amendment. The matter has been discussed for some time. The Minister for Works recently threw out a challenge to members to the effect that if the House wanted to debate the question, a private member should introduce a measure and give the House an opportunity to discuss it. It is in the interests of the State that a matter of policy of this sort should be decided.

Mr. SPEAKER: I cannot allow any debate on a Bill of which I know nothing and of which the House knows nothing. The hon. member must confine his remarks to the amendment, and to the question as to whether the second reading of the Bill shall be made an Order of the Day for the next sitting of the House or set down as an Order of the Day for this day six months. The principles or merits of the Bill cannot be discussed.

Mr. A. THOMSON: I accept your decision. I was simply following the lines of the speech of the Leader of the Opposition. I trust the House will not agree to the amendment, but will give members an opportunity to discuss the merits of the Bill.

Mr. UNDERWOOD (Pilbara) [5.25]: I oppose the amendment on the ground demonstrated by the member for Katanning (Mr. A. Thomson). If it is a question of policy, as suggested by the Leader of the Opposition, this House should have every opportunity of discussing such policy. In advocating that we should consider the Bill, I am not suggesting that I am in favour of disposing of the State trading concerns. I am not in favour of doing so.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member cannot discuss that point.

Mr. UNDERWOOD: I am not discussing it, but am stating that the House has the right to do so later on. If we carry this amendment we shall be depriving the House of that right. We have not seen the Bill, and should be allowed to read it and decide upon the provisions contained in it. I rely upon the common sense of the House to do what is right when the question is fairly and squarely before us. It is not before us now. If we do not like the Bill when we see it, we will cast it out.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS (Hon. W. J. George—Murray-Wellington) [5.30]: The member for Katanning (Mr. A. Thomson), said that I had stated that private members should not introduce a Bill. What I said was that those who are opposed to State trading concerns should have the courage of their opinions and get someone to deal with the matter.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! The hon. member cannot discuss that.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: I do not intend to. I suggest to the Leader of the Opposition that his amendment should be withdrawn. The feeling of members is clearly that a matter that deals with high principles should be the subject of an open debate. If it were decided to stop that debate to-day, a great wrong would be done. I suggest that from his point of view the better course would be for him to withdraw his amendment.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN (North-East Fremantle) [5.31]: I hope the Leader of the Opposition will not withdraw his amendment. This is a question of dealing with a Bill brought in by a private member in another place, without having made any arrangements with an hon. member of this Chamber to take charge of the Bill for him here.

The Minister for Agriculture: How do you know? He may have made an arrangement with some hon. member who is not present to-day.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: The fact remains that he is not here. The private member in another place could hardly have made arrangements with a member here, because the Bill has not been disposed of by another place for more than 24 hours.

The Minister for Agriculture: It is possible that he could have made arrangements with a member here.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: But evidently he has not done so.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! That matter is not under discussion.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: Perhaps he is like the Minister and has not the courage of his opinions.

The Minister for Agriculture: How do you know that?

Hon. P. Collier: As Leader of the Country Party, you should accept the instructions of your conference.

The Minister for Agriculture: Or the instructions of Mr. Lovekin?

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: There is no necessity for any right to discuss the question to be provided by means of a Bill. It can be done by way of a motion. That would not debar discussion by any means.

Hon. P. Collier: It could be done on the Estimates.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: I took it when the Minister for Works interjected, that he referred to the Bill. I thought he referred to a private member introducing a Bill and taking the matter of policy out of the hands of the Government.

Capt. Carter: That is only a fine distinction.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: There is a very big distinction.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. Money: One is operative and the other is a discussion.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: There is a difference between the two.

Capt. Carter: You might get somewhere arising out of this proposal.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: There is the question of the policy of the Government.

Mr. Pickering: Are they not pledged to dispose of the State trading concerns?

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: I do not know whether they should be. I know they are not pledged to dispose of them at a sacrifice of the interests of the country.

Mr. Latham: They are not asked to sacrifice them.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: The member for York would sacrifice anything he could get. This Bill has been introduced, not to carry out a policy in the best interests of the State, but to force the hands of the Government to do something not in the best interests of Western Australia.

The Premier: But we have not seen the Bill!

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! The House cannot discuss the merits of the Bill.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: I do not know what is in the Bill.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! The hon. member cannot assume what is in the Bill for the purposes of this debate.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: I can assume that the Bill deals with State trading concerns. The motion is for the second reading of the Bill to be fixed.

Hon. P. Collier: No legislation is required to deal with the State trading concerns.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: None whatever. If I were to introduce a private Bill in this Chamber and I wanted it dealt with in another place, before the Bill had passed the second reading stage here I would go to some member in the Upper House and disclose to him the contents of the Bill. I would inform that member of my object in introducing the measure. I would do that so as to ascertain from him whether he would take charge of the Bill in another place. In the present instance, what is the position? A Bill has come

down to us and the Speaker announced it. When he did so, not a solitary member of the House was prepared to take it up.

Mr. SPEAKER: That is not the question before the Chair.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: I am giving reasons why the Bill should not be read a second time at the next sitting of the House. Why was no hon. member prepared to take it up? Because they did not know the contents of the Bill.

Mr. Piesse: Out of courtesy to another place we should agree to the motion.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: I am pleased the hon. member raised the question of courtesy. Would it not be an act of courtesy on the part of the member in another place for him to arrange with a member here to take charge of the Bill?

Mr. Piesse: Admittedly.

Mr. Harrison: Two wrongs do not make a right.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: That is so, but it appears to me that the person introducing the Bill, by not making proper arrangements for the Bill to be dealt with in this Chamber, showed that he had little confidence in his own Bill. He was afraid to discuss the question with any member in this Chamber, so apparently he said, "I will send the Bill down to the Legislative Assembly on the offchance that someone will be foolish enough to take it up." After Mr. Speaker had allowed some time to elapse, eventually one member took up the Bill. He did it in a very half-hearted manner. He knew it was necessary to move a further motion so that it could be dealt with. I ask hon. members if this House is prepared to deal with a question like this in times like the present?

Capt. Carter: Why not?

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: The hon. member will know that very soon.

Mr. Mann: We take that as a veiled threat.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: The hon. member can accent it in any way he likes.

Mr. SPEAKER: The motion before the Chair is that certain words proposed to be left out shall stand part of the question. It is not a matter of discussing the Bill.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: I am giving reasons why we should not discuss it. I must give justifiable reasons if I think something is to be brought before this Chamber which is detrimental to the State, otherwise I cannot debate the question at all. I honestly believe that by agreeing to the motion, we will be doing something that is detrimental to the State. We will, however, do something that will be beneficial to the Eastern States and detrimental to Western Australia if we agree to the motion. We will do something beneficial to the commission agents, and detrimental to the workers. We try to encourage local manufactures!

Mr. Wilson: We want work for our unemployed.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: We have now a Bill which is intended to affect concerns which are providing for thousands each year.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! The hon. member cannot discuss the Bill.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: I am not discussing the Bill. I do not know what is in it.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member is making a statement concerning the Bill. I will not allow a discussion on the merits of the Bill. I do not know what is in it. The question before the House has reference to the fixing of the date for the second reading of the Bill.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: Any measure dealing with State trading concerns affects the policy of the State, the workers of the State and our manufactories. It affects the industries producing articles in Western Australia, which otherwise would have to be imported from other parts of the world. I am not dealing with the Bill at all. I do not know whether the Bill says we should sell these trading concerns or whether we should keep them.

The Premier: Why not see what the Bill contains?

Point of Order.

Hon. T. Walker: On a point of order. I submit the whole discussion is irregular and the question is not before the House in any form. I will refer the Committee to Standing Orders 259 and 263. Standing Order 259 reads as follows:—

The member having leave, or the Committee appointed to bring in a Bill, shall prepare a draft of such Bill, with the necessary blanks to be filled up in Committee of the whole House, and shall present a fair copy thereof to the House at an early day. Mr. Speaker: The Bill is here. That has been complied with.

Hon. T. Walker: The first reading of a Bill is not usually discussed. A Bill can be discussed at all stages.

Mr. Speaker: I think I can put the hon. member right.

Hon. T. Walker: As a preliminary we should have the Bill before us. We should be able to refer to it and ascertain whether it is worthy of being read a first time. I take it that Mr. Speaker himself should, once the Bill is received, glance through it to ascertain what it is proposed to submit to the House. It may be a matter that should not be entertained for a moment. The Bill may be out of order. I presume Mr. Speaker knows what is in the Bill. If that be so, Mr. Speaker knows if it is a Bill dealing with public expenditure in connection with State trading concerns.

Mr. Speaker: The Bill is before the House, and I think I can put the hon. member right.

Hon. T. Walker: Does the Bill deal with the sale of the trading concerns?

Mr. Speaker: The member for Kanowna has raised a point of order and has quoted Standing Order 259. The Bill is before the House complete. On the second question raised by the hon. member Standing Order 263 reads—

The first reading of every Bill shall be proposed immediately after the same has been presented.

That has been followed. The Bill did not originate here; it came from another place. The procedure is for the Minister or member to take up such a Bill and move that it be read a first time, because it is in my possession. If the motion is carried, the Bill is read a first time. No leave is asked to introduce it, because it is transmitted by message from another place. On the first reading there is no debate. The Bill contains only one clause, which seeks to amend a section of the Trading Concerns Act. I did not read the section.

Hon. T. Walker: But you must. The House must be in possession of it.

Mr. Speaker: Standing Order 265 reads—

When any Bill shall be presented by a member in pursuance of leave granted, or an order of the House, or shall be brought from the Governor or Legislative Council, the question "That this Bill be now read a first time" shall be decided without amendment or debate.

That question was decided. The question now is that the second reading be made an Order of the Day for the next sitting of the House, to which the Leader of the Opposition has moved an amendment that "the next sitting of the House" be struck out and "this day six months" be inserted in lieu.

Hon. T. Walker: I now take it that the Bill is in possession of the Chamber.

Mr. Speaker: Yes.

Hon. T. Walker: Therefore I have a right to look at it.

Mr. Speaker: On the second reading the hon. member will have that right. He knows the procedure.

Hon. T. Walker: What is the meaning of the words in Standing Order No. 263 "after the same has been presented"? It does not matter whether the Bill comes from another place or is moved by a Minister or private member here. The Bill is presented to the House for the House to be cognisant of it, and therefore I am entitled to know what the Bill proposes.

Mr. A. Thomson: You get that on the second reading.

Hon. T. Walker: No; how can we tie our intelligence to vote for the first or any other reading of the Bill unless we know what the Bill is? We have no right to further entertain the Bill, because it is out of order.

Mr. Speaker: On what ground?

Hon. T. Walker: I shall state it if you do not get angry. I ask you to let me see the Bill.

Mr. Speaker: There is no objection to the hon. member seeing the Bill, but it is not the custom.

Hon. T. Walker: I care not whether it is the custom or not. Some people might neglect—

Mr. Speaker: It is not neglect at all.

Hon. T. Walker: I have a right to see the Bill. I find the Bill states—"The State Trading Concerns Act, 1916. is amended by omitting the proviso to Section 25."

Mr. A. Thomson: Is not this a departure from the usual procedure of the House?

Mr. Speaker: Is the member for Katanning rising to a point of order?

Mr. A. Thomson: Yes. Are not we departing from the procedure of the House by permitting any member to see the Bill at this stage? Standing Order No. 266 states—

After the first reading, a question shall be put "That this Bill be printed" and the second reading made an Order of the Day for some future day.

That does not permit of the Bill being submitted to the House for discussion. I submit that it is out of order for the Bill to be discussed at all. The question before the House is that the second reading be made an Order of the Day for the next sitting of the House and the amendment that the second reading be this day six months. I maintain that the member for Kanowna is not entitled to see the Bill.

Mr. Speaker: There is nothing to prevent the member for Kanowna from seeing the Bill. Ever since I have been in the House, a period of nearly 22 years, we have followed a certain procedure, which I have explained. When I looked at this Bill I saw it contained one clause, but it conveyed nothing to me beyond that it sought to amend a section of the Trading Concerns Act. The question before the House is the amendment moved by the Leader of the Opposition. The Bill is before the House, but we cannot discuss it. The almost invariable practice has been not to put copies of Bills before members until the Minister or member in charge rose to move the second reading.

Mr. A. Thomson: That is my point.

Mr. Speaker: During my experience no member has ever asked to see a Bill at this stage.

Hon. T. Walker: I have no right to debate your direction, but there is a full answer to it. What I want to point out is that the Bill is out of order and that we cannot consider it or carry it any further on the ground that it deals with a matter affecting revenue. Such a Bill must be introduced into this House by a Minister and by message.

Mr. Speaker: What is there in the Bill dealing with revenue?

Hon. T. Walker: The provision regarding Parliamentary approval for the sale of State trading concerns.

Mr. Speaker: That is not in the Bill before the House.

Hon. T. Walker: That is the Bill before the House. Its object is to amend a revenue section of an existing Act.

Mr. A. Thomson: How can you say that until you have seen the Bill?

Hon. T. Walker: I have seen the Bill.

Mr. A. Thomson: It is not before the House.

Hon. T. Walker: It is before the House; it has been read a first time. Have common sense! My point of order is that a matter dealing with the finances of the State must be

introduced by a member of the Government and must originate in this House.

Mr. Speaker: The Bill reads—"The State Trading Concerns Act, 1916, is amended by omitting the proviso to Section 25." That does not indicate what Section 25 of the Act is.

Hon. T. Walker: It does, if you look at the proviso.

Mr. Speaker: Section 46 of the Constitution Act Amendment Act, 1921, reads as follows:—

Bills appropriating revenue or moneys, or imposing taxation, shall not originate in the Legislative Council; but a Bill shall not be taken to appropriate revenue or moneys, or to impose taxation, by reason only of its containing provisions for the imposition or appropriation of fines or other pecuniary penalties, or for the demand of payment or appropriation of fees for licenses, or fees for registration or other services under the Bill.

This House passed that amending legislation last session. Subsection 5 of the same Act reads—

Except as provided in this section, the Legislative Council shall have equal power with the Legislative Assembly in respect of all Bills.

The Bill we are now considering is not contrary to that section. That is my ruling.

Hon. T. Walker: The real point has not been touched upon. The Bill as you have read it proposes to omit a proviso in the State Trading Concerns Act. The proviso, therefore, must be read in conjunction with the Bill.

Mr. Speaker: When the second reading of a Bill is moved its principles are set forth by the mover. I, as well as hon. members generally, am then in a position to know the facts concerning it. That is the time for me to decide such a question as this; not now.

Hon. T. Walker: I shall be obliged to move to dissent from your ruling.

Mr. Speaker: I have ruled that the Bill is in order at present.

Dissent from Speaker's ruling.

Hon. T. Walker: I move—

That this House dissents from Mr. Speaker's ruling.

You have ruled that at this stage—

Mr. Speaker: That the Bill is in order.

Hon. T. Walker: You have ruled that we cannot raise the point as to whether the Bill is in order or not by reference to the matter contained in the Bill.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member knows my ruling.

Hon. T. Walker: I am not very clear that I do. I might object to your ruling on the ground that Section 46 of the Constitution Act Amendment Act does not affect my point of order. On the other hand you have

held that the House cannot consider the proviso that this Bill proposes to delete.

Mr. Speaker: I have ruled that the Bill is properly before the House under the Constitution Act Amendment Act, 1921.

Hon. T. Walker: I disagree with you, and I will ask hon. members to disagree with you, in the interests of the House. Section 46 of the Constitution Act Amendment Act says—

Bills appropriating revenue or moneys, or imposing taxation, shall not originate in the Legislative Council.

There is no objection to that. A Bill cannot be taken to appropriate revenue or moneys, or to impose taxation, by reason only of its containing provisions for the imposition or appropriation of fines, or other pecuniary penalties, or for the demand of payment or appropriation of fees for licenses, or fees for registration or other services under the Bill. The point I have raised does not come within the scope of that. This measure deals with the actual revenue set forth in our Estimates as the revenue of the State, in this instance revenue from State trading concerns. It does not deal with taxation or the imposition of fines or appropriation of fees, etc. It is only the first portion of Subsection 1 of Section 46 of the Constitution Act Amendment Act that has reference to this Bill. By this Bill we are asked to deal with one of our largest revenue producing avenues. The proviso in the State Trading Concerns Act is as follows:—

Provided that possession shall not be given to an intended purchaser or lessee under a contract of sale or agreement for lease until the approval of Parliament has been obtained.

Are we going to delete that? We are asked to take away Parliamentary control of this portion of our revenue producing concerns. The Bill touches vitally our finances, and is a violation of every constitutional principle. Such a Bill should originate in this Chamber, and should be introduced by a Minister of the Crown.

The Premier: Do you suggest the Bill should have come down by Message?

Hon. T. Walker: A Bill taking away the rights of Parliament, and dealing with our revenue, must originate in this Chamber.

The Premier: Because it is a money Bill?

Hon. T. Walker: Because it deals with our revenue. If ever there was a case of a Bill being out of order on the score of wrong origination this is one.

Sitting suspended from 6.15 to 7.30 p.m.

Hon. T. Walker: My motion to dissent from your ruling, Mr. Speaker, reads—

That this House dissents from Mr. Speaker's ruling, "That the Bill to amend the State Trading Concerns Act, 1916, does not appropriate revenue or moneys or impose taxation, and that although it originated in another place and was not intro-

duced by a Minister, it is properly before the House," on the ground that the said Bill deals with one of the principal sources of revenue of the State, and has no other purpose save that of depriving Parliament of its control of such revenue.

Mr. Speaker: I have ruled that the Bill to amend the State Trading Concerns Act, 1916, is properly before the House under Section 46 of the Constitution Act Amendment Act, 1921-22. To that ruling the member for Kanowna has moved a motion of dissent—

That this House dissents from Mr. Speaker's ruling, "That the Bill to amend the State Trading Concerns Act, 1916, does not appropriate revenue or moneys or impose taxation, and that although it originated in another place and was not introduced by a Minister, it is properly before the House"—

Hon. T. Walker: That is your ruling, Sir.

Mr. Speaker: That is not my ruling. I never said anything about a Minister. What I have said is that the Bill is properly before the House under Section 46 of the Constitution Amendment Act, 1921-22. That is my ruling under that section. Now the hon. member has put words into his motion of dissent—

Hon. T. Walker: But, Mr. Speaker, those are points I raised.

Mr. Speaker: They are points the hon. member raised; they are not mine.

Hon. T. Walker: I raised them as my points of order, and you ruled against them, Sir.

Mr. Speaker: The motion to dissent says—"does not appropriate revenue or moneys or impose taxation"—

Hon. T. Walker: That is under Section 46.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member's motion continues—

"and that although it originated in another place and was not introduced by a Minister, it is properly before the House." That is the hon. member's argument. Am I to understand that?

Hon. T. Walker: I understand that you ruled against me on that, Sir.

Mr. Speaker: I ruled that the Bill is in order under the section I have named and under the Act which I have mentioned twice.

The motion to dissent proceeds—

on the ground that the said Bill deals with one of the principal sources of revenue of the State, and has no other purpose save that of depriving Parliament of its control of such revenue.

Motion put and negatived.

Debate resumed.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: I have already suggested that the proper method of dealing with a motion of this kind is to table a motion asking for an expression of opinion from hon. members, instead of introducing a Bill making definite alterations in the law at present governing State trading concerns.

Mr. SPEAKER: I do not think I can allow the hon. member to discuss the merits of the Bill.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: I am not doing so, Sir. Surely I have a right to give reasons why I object to the Bill being set down for second reading at the next sitting of the House.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member is discussing the merits of the Bill.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: I am not doing anything of the kind.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member may proceed, and we shall see.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: I am surely allowed to give reasons why I consider the Bill should not be dealt with. I am dealing, not with the Bill, but with the general principle of State trading concerns.

Mr. SPEAKER: The general principle of State trading concerns is not before the House. The question before the House is whether the words proposed to be struck out shall stand part of the question. The question before the House is that the second reading of the Bill be made an Order of the Day for the next sitting of the House, and the amendment. One cannot discuss the principle of the Bill under that.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: According to your ruling, Sir, all I can do is to get up and say, "I object to the second reading of the Bill being put down for the next sitting of the House." Am I not allowed to give reasons why I object? I am dealing precisely with the question before the Chair, which is that the Bill be read a second time at the next sitting.

Mr. SPEAKER: No. The question before the Chair is that the words proposed to be struck out stand part of the question.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: I would have come to that, Sir, if you have given me time. I am trying to show reasons why the words should be deleted. Surely I am entitled to do that. If I am of opinion that certain legislation about to be introduced into the House will be detrimental to the best interests of the State, I am not worthy to be here unless I oppose such legislation on the first and on every other occasion of its being brought forward. My opinion is that the effect of the proposed legislation will be to drive to the Eastern States work which now provides employment for our people here. Surely to goodness everybody in the State knows that what we require here is more population, more workers, more factories, more industries of every kind. That being so, I think one is quite safe in saying that a Bill of this description should not be introduced, as it has been, by a private member. It is a child that has no father in this House. No member of this House was asked to take charge of it.

Hon. P. Collier: It is an illegitimate child.

Hon. T. Walker: Picked up on the kerbstone.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: I did not know before tea, but I have learnt since, that no member was asked to father the Bill in this Chamber.

Mr. Pickering: That is not correct.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: It is correct. If there was a little game on before tea, it cannot be played now. Discourtesy has been shown to this House, because no arrangement was made for any member here to father the Bill. I do not know what was the reason of that.

The Colonial Secretary: Perhaps another place trusted to the merits of the Bill.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: That may be so; but there was great hesitation in this Chamber before the measure was taken charge of. It was done in such a mild way that the hon. member was almost ashamed of it.

Mr. A. Thomson: I am not ashamed of it at all.

Mr. Lutey: It would take more than that to shame him.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: The member for Bunbury (Mr. Money) said there was considerable difference between an expression of opinion, as suggested by the Minister for Works, and legislation. The Minister for Works said that if any hon. member had the courage of his opinions he could bring the matter forward in the House. That was by way of a motion.

The Minister for Works: I challenged them!

Hon. P. Collier: And it was a most heroic thing to do.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: It is no use the member for Katanning trying to put it on to the Minister for Works. It shows that he was so ashamed of the position, that he endeavoured to put it on the shoulders of someone else. He wanted the Minister to carry the baby.

Mr. A. Thomson: I will carry it myself.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: There is another reason why we should not consider the Bill. It deals with a matter that is a source of revenue to the Government and which assists in the development of the State. The Government must admit that some of these works assist greatly in the development of the State and I am surprised, therefore, that the Government should take part in assisting to set down the second reading of the Bill for the next sitting.

The Premier: We have not seen the Bill.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: I am the more surprised because, if such a Bill were necessary, it should be dealt with by the Government and not by a private member, more particularly by a private member in another place.

The Minister for Works: You cannot govern that man, whatever you try to do.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: I do not want to do so.

Hon. T. Walker: He wants to govern us.

Hon. P. Collier: He is laying down the policy.

Mr. McCallum: He is trying to govern the country himself.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: The Government should not allow a private member in another place to dictate a matter of policy.

Mr. Pickering: The Government threw out the challenge.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: The Minister merely suggested a motion that could be brought forward in this Chamber. If the Government father a Bill of this description, in all probability some action will be taken regarding other Bills under consideration. I can realise very clearly why hon. members are anxious that this Bill should come forward at an early stage.

Mr. Pickering: It was too late in the session last year.

Mr. McCallum: It will be a late session this time before you get through with this Bill.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: I can understand that some members are instructed as to what they shall do in this matter. I also realise that some of the people who have instructed them are commission agents.

Mr. Pickering: To whom are you referring?

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: I also realise that many of these persons who issue these instructions have no interest in Western Australia—

The Minister for Works: Except what they can make out of the State.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: The Minister for Works should let me make statements of that description. If he makes such statements, they will get him into trouble with others outside.

The Minister for Works: You need not worry about those outside.

Hon. P. Collier: The Minister has been rated for his attitude.

The Minister for Works: I have been sacked according to some people.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: These people do not care whether the population of Western Australia increases or decreases so long as they get their commission.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member is getting a bit wide of the question. He can discuss those matters when the Bill reaches the second reading stage. The hon. member must confine himself to the amendment.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: If I were dealing with the Bill, I would treat it in a different manner. I would deal with the State trading concerns as they affect the State and refer to the benefits derived from them. I am not doing that.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member must confine himself to the amendment.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: I would like to be shown how I can confine myself to the amendment. The matter to which the Speaker is trying to confine me is the amendment that certain words should be struck out. The question of the reading of the Bill this day six months has not been moved and therefore is not before the Chair.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member must speak to the amendment.

Member: Give him a little latitude.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: When you stated the question from the Chair, Mr. Speaker, you

said that the hon. member had moved that certain words be deleted with a view to inserting "this day six months." The amendment referring to this day six months has not been moved. I was trying to point out that I could not discuss that aspect.

Mr. SPEAKER: There is no necessity to endeavour to point out that you cannot discuss a question not before the Chair.

Hon. T. Walker: I will deal with a point of order.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: I do not know how I can discuss a matter of three words.

Mr. SPEAKER: Hon. members are not going to make a farce of this Chamber while I am in the Chair.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: I have no intention of doing any such thing.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order!

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: I have been in this House sufficiently long to know that I am not doing that, and I have been here too long for you, Mr. Speaker, to tell me so.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member must keep to the amendment.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: I have been trying to do that all the time. I have been giving reasons why the Bill should not be read a second time, and I have not been ruled out of order yet.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member must confine himself to the amendment.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: I am trying to give reasons and I will not be gagged.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order!

Hon. P. Collier: The amendment gives wide scope. He cannot confine himself to three words; it is ridiculous.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member must confine himself to it.

Hon. P. Collier: Well, rule him out and we will disagree with your ruling.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member must not threaten the Chair.

Hon. P. Collier: The hon. member has no intention of threatening the Chair.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order!

Hon. P. Collier: He is not going to be gagged.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order!

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: As to the matter before the Chair, I was endeavouring, without any disrespect for the Chair—I never show disrespect for the Chair if I can avoid it—to give reasons why the Government should have dealt with a Bill of this description and not a private member.

Mr. Pickering: You tied me down the other night.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: I did not. The question is very wide indeed. I have never before seen a Bill introduced in such a way as this one came before us to-day. I have never known a Bill introduced here without some member being made acquainted with its contents and the reasons for the Bill.

Mr. A. Thomson: I know the contents of the Bill.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: You were not asked to take charge of it. The hon. member was ashamed of it when it came here. It is an act of discourtesy to this Chamber in not having the Bill brought down in a proper manner. I myself have taken up Bills from private members in another place, but I have always been made acquainted with their contents and their purposes before they were handed to me. Suppose the Standing Orders had been suspended when this Bill came along! It might have been put through in one sitting, without any member here knowing anything of the nature of the Bill. In my opinion the Bill is framed, not in the interests of the people of Western Australia, but in the interests of commission agents and of those in other States who are endeavouring to bleed this State white. That being so, I hope the amendment will be carried.

Mr. McCALLUM (South Fremantle) [8.3]: I have grave objections to the second reading of the Bill being taken at the next sitting. If a Bill like this is to be read a second time at all, it should be as a measure brought down by the Government. At every election since the Labour Party initiated State Trading Concerns, our friends opposite have made a public outcry against those concerns. It was one of the cries on which they were returned to power. Yet they are not game to stand to their guns. Ministers are trying to look very innocent, but I doubt whether they are altogether innocent about the coming of this Bill.

The Minister for Works: How could we stop it?

Mr. McCALLUM: Why did not you take action yourself, instead of allowing a private member of another place to bring down a Bill vitally connected with the Government policy? Where shall we get to if the House is to let the Government sit back while private members bring down Bills in support of the Government policy? Of course it means considerable advantage to the Government, because if the people take exception to anything which is done by these means, the Government can declare it was not their doing, that it resulted from the action of a private member. Why should the Government permit a private member to take the business out of their hands?

The Premier: We cannot prevent members from introducing Bills.

Mr. McCALLUM: But a Bill like this should come from the Government, instead of from a private member. The Notice Paper contains 26 good reasons why the second reading of this Bill should not be made an Order of the Day for the next sitting of the House. If it were so made an Order of the Day, it might be put ahead of the 26 Orders already on the Notice Paper. I will give some reasons why each of those 26 Orders should take precedence over this Bill. Let me start with Order of the Day No. 1.

The Minister for Works: What about No. 10?

Mr. McCALLUM: No fear, let us deal with No. 1 to-night. Probably it will occupy our attention for the whole of the sitting. If so, we can proceed to take No. 2 at the next sitting. Order of the Day No. 1 is a motion for a select committee to inquire into the working of the Industries Assistance Board. Is the second reading of this Bill to take precedence over so important a motion, involving millions of money, the credit of the people and possibly the stability of the Agricultural Bank?

The Premier: The object of the proposed inquiry is to abolish the Industries Assistance Board.

Mr. McCALLUM: No; this party established that board, and we are proud of the good work it has done.

The Premier: We will give you all the credit for its establishment. Will that satisfy you?

Mr. McCALLUM: No, I want to give reasons why the second reading of this Bill should not have precedence over the motion for a select committee.

The Premier: You do not know what the Bill is.

Mr. McCALLUM: Then it has no right to be under discussion here. However, we do know all about it.

The Premier: Well, let us get it on the Notice Paper, where it will be dealt with on its merits.

Mr. McCALLUM: You cannot say that. Hon. members opposite are not allowed to express their opinions.

Mr. Mann: Whom do you include in that?

Mr. McCALLUM: All members of the Country Party. None of them has a free mind. If they fail to carry out the instructions of Monger and the rest of the heads, it will be the end of their political lives.

Mr. Pickering: Can the hon. member discuss the Primary Producers' Association on this motion?

Mr. SPEAKER: No, the hon. member is not in order.

Mr. McCALLUM: It would be different if we were satisfied that the Country Party would deal with the matter on its merits, or were permitted to exercise their judgment and give a free vote. When they are controlled by an outside junta meeting in a little back room in St. George's terrace—

Mr. Pickering: On a point of order, I ask whether the hon. member is in order in discussing the Primary Producers' Association.

Mr. Lambert: Sit down!

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member is not in order.

Mr. McCALLUM: I was replying to an interjection by the Premier that the matter should be discussed on its merits. The Premier should read that lesson to his friends on the cross benches. I could go on speaking for a considerable time, but I have said sufficient to indicate what will happen if members persist in forcing this Bill through. I protest against an individual member taking out of the hands of the Government legislation in-

volve a question of policy, the responsibility for which should be shouldered by the Government.

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

Ayes	15
Noes	24
Majority against				9

AYES.

Mr. Angwin	Mr. Marshall
Mr. Chesson	Mr. McCallum
Mr. Clydesdale	Mr. Munroe
Mr. Collier	Mr. Simons
Mr. Corboy	Mr. Willcock
Mr. Heron	Mr. Wilson
Mr. Lambert	Mr. O'Loughlin
Mr. Lutey	(Teller.)

NOES.

Mr. Angelo	Mr. Mann
Mr. Carter	Sir James Mitchell
Mrs. Cowan	Mr. Money
Mr. Davies	Mr. Pickering
Mr. Durack	Mr. Plesse
Mr. George	Mr. Richardson
Mr. Gibson	Mr. Sampson
Mr. Harrison	Mr. Stubbs
Mr. Hickmott	Mr. A. Thomson
Mr. Johnston	Mr. J. Thomson
Mr. Latham	Mr. Mullany
Mr. C. C. Maley	(Teller.)
Mr. H. K. Maley	

PAIR.

Aye—Mr. Walker | No.—Mr. Underwood

Amendment thus negatived.

Mr. SPEAKER: The question is that the motion be agreed to.

Point of Order.

Hon. P. Collier: I rise to a point of order. The motion as stated by you several times is that the second reading of the Bill be made an order of the day for the next sitting of the House. Standing Order 266 reads—

After the first reading, a question shall be put "That this Bill be printed" and the second reading made an order of the day for some future day.

That is not the motion moved by the member for Katanning. I submit that under Standing Order 266 it is not competent for you to accept the motion.

Mr. Speaker: That Standing Order has been complied with, because the Bill was presented to the House printed, and there was no necessity to move that it be printed. The next procedure, therefore, was to move that the second reading be made an order of the day for some future day. I think the Leader of the Opposition is referring to Bills originating in this Chamber, the title only of which is available when the first reading is moved. The point of order cannot be sustained.

Hon. P. Collier: The fact that the Bill has come to the House printed does not affect the Standing Order.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member must dissent from my ruling if he wishes to discuss it.

Hon. P. Collier: May I direct attention to the fact that the procedure raised by my point of order is the procedure that is followed when Bills originate in this House? Usually we have only the title of the Bill and as it has not been printed, the House orders it to be printed.

Mr. A. Thomson: I rise to a point of order.

Mr. O'Loughlin: You will get all you want presently.

Mr. A. Thomson: Is the Leader of the Opposition in order in proceeding to debate your ruling?

Mr. Speaker: The Leader of the Opposition has risen to a point of order and I am patiently waiting for him to define it. The member for Katanning will resume his seat.

Hon. P. Collier: I was craving your indulgence to call attention to another Standing Order, No. 318, which reads—

Public Bills coming to the Assembly the first time from the Legislative Council shall be proceeded with in all respects as similar Bills presented in pursuance of orders of the Assembly.

Under that Standing Order I submit it is incumbent upon the House to deal with Bills coming from another place, be they printed or otherwise, in a similar manner to Bills originating in this Chamber. I maintain that it is necessary to include in the motion that the Bill be printed.

Mr. Speaker: I cannot uphold the point of order. The hon. member knows as well as I do that, when a Bill is introduced by a Minister or a private member, the motion for printing it follows the first reading. It is not incumbent upon us to follow the exact wording of Standing Order No. 318. If I kept to the letter of the Standing Orders I am afraid members' latitude would be curtailed.

Hon. P. Collier: I propose to dissent from your ruling if you rule me out on the ground that you are not keeping to the Standing Orders. You have made an extraordinary statement.

Mr. Speaker: Not on this, but on other matters of debate. The requirements of the Standing Orders as regards this Bill have been complied with. The Bill had already been printed, and there was no necessity to include directions for printing in the motion.

Hon. P. Collier: You have made a statement that if you kept to the Standing Orders—

Mr. Speaker: In ordinary debate.

Hon. P. Collier: I shall have to bow to your ruling, but I hold that the Standing Orders I have quoted support my contention.

Mr. Speaker: Does the hon. member dissent from my ruling?

Hon. P. Collier: No, the numbers are there.

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

Ayes	24
Noes	14
Majority for					10

AYES.

Mr. Angelo
Mr. Carter
Mrs. Cowan
Mr. Davies
Mr. Durack
Mr. George
Mr. Gibson
Mr. Harrison
Mr. Hickmott
Mr. Johnston
Mr. Latham
Mr. C. C. Maley
Mr. H. K. Maley

Mr. Mann
Sir James Mitchell
Mr. Money
Mr. Pickering
Mr. Piesse
Mr. Richardson
Mr. Sampson
Mr. Stubbs
Mr. A. Thomson
Mr. J. Thomson
Mr. Mullany
(Teller.)

NOES.

Mr. Angwin
Mr. Chesson
Mr. Clydesdale
Mr. Collier
Mr. Corboy
Mr. Heron
Mr. Lambert
Mr. Lutey

Mr. Marshall
Mr. McCallum
Mr. Munsie
Mr. Willcock
Mr. Wilson
Mr. O'Loghlen
(Teller.)

Question thus passed.

BILL—LIGHT AND AIR ACT AMENDMENT.

Received from the Council and read a first time.

The PREMIER (Hon. Sir James Mitchell—Northam) [8.33]: I move—

That the Bill be printed and the second reading made an Order of the Day for the next sitting of the House.

Hon. P. COLLIER (Boulder) [8.34]: I rise to a point of order. It is not necessary to have in the motion the words "The Bill be printed," according to the ruling you have just given in connection with another Bill received from the Council.

Mr. SPEAKER: When I stated the question I did not have the Bill that was before the Clerk. The Bill is printed in the same form as the other was. I accepted the motion as it was moved. There is no necessity to rule it out of order because the word "printed" is inserted in it. I cannot uphold the point of order.

Question put and passed.

LIGHTING OF ASSEMBLY CHAMBER.

Mr. SPEAKER: I desire to draw members' attention to the fact that there has been great difficulty from time to time with reference to the light-

ing of this Chamber. The present arrangements are supposed to be the last word in lighting, and have been on trial since Tuesday. It will have been approved or otherwise by the end of the week. I have heard no complaints from members so far, but if they have any to make I shall be pleased to hear them in my room after the House rises.

[The Deputy Speaker took the Chair.]

MOTION—INDUSTRIES ASSISTANCE BOARD.

To inquire by Select Committee.

Debate resumed from 31st August on the following motion by Hon. W. C. Angwin:—

That a select committee be appointed to make full inquiries into the administration of the Industries Assistance Board.

The PREMIER (Hon. Sir James Mitchell—Northam) [8.37]: I am not going to offer any objection to this motion. If hon. members want an inquiry into this matter I am willing that they should have it. The member for North-East Fremantle (Hon. W. C. Angwin) makes a good chairman of a select committee, and I am sure the inquiry will be a very thorough one. When the House is informed as to the results of it, it will know all about the Industries Assistance Board. The hon. member said the Act was a temporary measure and should now be abolished. I hope the inquiry will convince him that it has done good work, is doing good work, and will continue to do good work. Seeing that the State is being developed by people who in many cases have only a limited experience and capital, the work must be carried on in this way. We pay less for our agricultural development than any other State of the Commonwealth. The hon. member also says there is discontent throughout the State. That is entirely wrong. There are naturally a few discontented farmers. It does not matter how much they get, they will always grumble. The hon. member further said that there was a sum of nearly £1,400,000 owing to the board. That is quite true, but against that there is the crop from over 600,000 acres soon to be harvested. It cost a considerable amount of money to put that acreage under crop. Stock and implements bought by the board represent £700,000. The proceeds in respect of last year's crop were £664,430, and from previous pools £172,926. The clients of the board have paid to the Government over a million of money in land rents and interest, and on account of purchases of one sort and another. Since the inception of the board the total amount paid to the credit of its clients amounts to nearly £6,000,000. More than a fourth of the wheat produced in the State since the inception of the board has been produced by those clients. There must be some losses on these transactions, but the enormous amount of money

produced as the result of the work of those clients has been of great benefit to the State. The old creditors of the board's clients are still owed £320,000. When the board was established the amount was £670,000, so that £350,000 has been paid off. But for the board the capital involved in this respect would have been much greater. I hope the outstanding amounts will be paid before long. By permission of the Minister any of these creditors can sue any particular clients of the board. If a client has surplus assets which he will not part with, the creditor may sue him. That provision was inserted in the Act of 1919. It is not right that a man who can pay his outside creditors should be protected. All business is now on a cash basis, so that the trader runs no risk. The hon. member also said the board could only be guided by the reports of its inspectors. That is true. These reports are made by men who know their business, and after careful inquiry. The system of government under the Act is through the reports of the inspectors. He also said the State was making a big loss. There was a loss from the first day of the establishment of the board. A sum of £34,000 was lost through the importation by the board of fodder for the assistance of farmers. We do not hide the losses, but show them in our statements. The hon. gentleman said, too, that the reports do not disclose the true position of the board's affairs. There, also, the hon. gentleman is wrong. He is not often wrong, but as regards the board he has been wrong on several occasions. When he has all the papers, sitting as chairman of the select committee, he will be able to correct his errors. It would be a very simple matter to conduct a great scheme of agricultural development if every man assisted were a capable farmer, a good manager, and a good worker, with good land. It is the indifferent man on indifferent land who makes the position impossible. The trouble is seldom with the man who has been settled on fairly good country. On account of the 1911 drought a great many men took up light land, and they are the men who have given a good deal of trouble. However, they have been under close control for a number of years now. Generally the farmers on the board have done excellent work. A great many of them are free of the board—I think 1,100. About 900 soldiers have been brought under the operations of the board, as part of the soldier settlement scheme. Because of that fact, the figures are higher than they would otherwise be. But for the soldier clients the figures would, indeed, be comparatively small. I trust the House will realise the value of the board's work. Had it not been for the operation of the Industries Assistance Act, a great many of the clients of the Agricultural Bank would not be on the land today, after two bad seasons, and therefore would not have paid land rents, interest, and other charges to the Government. If we have lost something in money through the operations of the Industries Assistance Board, we have gained indirectly to a very

much greater extent. The land rents collected since the establishment of the board are very much greater than the losses of the board. From this fact alone it will be realised what the board has meant to the State. We have the land in occupation now, producing wealth and contributing to the revenue, and doing good in a dozen ways. If the select committee will take a proper view of the situation, and make the closest inquiry into the operations of the board, they will bring up a report which will satisfy the House not only that the board have done good work but work which ought to be continued.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: I did not say the balance sheets were incorrect.

The PREMIER: I understood the hon. member to say the reports were unsatisfactory.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: I said that we were four years without a report.

The PREMIER: I think the hon. member is wrong there, too. He has been wrong oftener in his statements on this subject than I have known him to be wrong during all the time I have been in the House. I do not know what has come over the hon. gentleman. To make three mistakes in a matter of this kind is, in him, unpardonable. The public have a regard for his knowledge and accuracy—so much so, according to one hon. member, that they believe all he says.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: I was too mild in this matter.

The PREMIER: It will be found that the operations of the board are amply justified, and should be continued in the interests of the development of the country and for the protection of the money lent by the Government for the clearing of land and the making of improvements. Hon. members representing the farming districts know full well what the board has meant to the State, quite apart from what it has meant to the individual farmer. There is no occasion for me to mention again how much revenue has been contributed to the railway system and other State departments owing to the establishment of the board.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: Yes, it is a very good thing we started the board.

The PREMIER: It is only a pity that no one else was there to start it. Every Government has to do its duty. I have no quarrel with hon. members opposite over the establishment of the board. I do not offer the slightest objection to the proposed inquiry, and I hope the House will discuss the select committee's report, in order that the country may be informed. I hope that the newspapers will be appearing again in the next few days, and that they will say something about happenings in Parliament, so that the country may learn that the member for North-East Fremantle made three mistakes in the course of his short speech on this motion.

Mr. LAMBERT (Coolgardie) [8.53]: I do not see that any great harm can result from

having a thorough overhaul of the operations of the Industries Assistance Board. The scope of the proposed investigations, however, should be wider. As regards Part III. of the Industries Assistance Act, I think the Premier will agree with me that the position in this State is sufficiently serious to justify the Government in doing something to counteract the drift caused by imports into this State. No Government can be said to be doing their duty if they fail to realise the seriousness of such a position. To-day we are paying over £30 per head of our population by way of imports, and practically all imports of articles which could be manufactured in this State. Such a condition of affairs is simply deplorable. The sympathetic way in which the Premier has often listened to arguments for the establishment of secondary industries here has led me to expect from him some action in that direction. I believe that a quarter or half a million judiciously expended in the establishment of secondary industries in Western Australia would be well recouped. The sums I suggest are merely modest. I believe there are big avenues here for the profitable investment of money and labour in that respect. However, the organised industries of the Eastern States, with their organised distributing agencies in Western Australia, render it almost impossible for a small company or body of individuals to start a connecting industry here. Surely hon. members will agree that something is wrong when a small State like this imports 14 million pounds' worth of goods per annum, while thousands of boys here are unable to get work in any suitable avenue of employment, while our University is chockful of trained men, while our schools of mines are turning out some of the finest metallurgists in the world, and while our technical schools are producing equally good men. In such circumstances it is simply deplorable that parents should be compelled to send their children, who have received such high class education, away from Western Australia in order to obtain work. Surely the Government are not altogether helpless. Surely they must realise that no State like Western Australia can go on with a balance of trade of over two millions annually against it. Roughly, our imports are 14 millions per annum, against annual exports of 12 millions. Thus there is a debit balance of over two millions annually against this young State. We are in the grip of Federation, and apparently cannot get out, and therefore must meet the conditions. The only way to meet them, in my opinion, is for the Government to take a strong stand and assist the secondary industries in the same way as they have assisted agriculture. I hold that under Part III. of the Bill we could and should create a bureau of industries, with capable technical men as directors.

Mr. Davies: Have we not got that now?

Mr. LAMBERT: No. We have, as a matter of fact, a Council of Industrial Development; and I am not going to say anything

against the honorary work they have done and are doing.

Mr. Underwood: One could not say, any good of any of them.

Mr. LAMBERT: If I cannot say good of anyone, I do not say much harm. While the Council of Industrial Development may be attempting to do some good in an honorary capacity, prompted, like most of us, by a patriotic desire to achieve something for Western Australia, the problem before the State is altogether too big for the honorary services of three or four men.

Mr. Mann: The province of the Council of Industrial Development is too restricted.

Mr. LAMBERT: Creating an honorary body to deal with that problem is to send a boy on a man's errand. This problem represents the job of a big man, a man with big vision, big outlook, big range, and versatility. These qualities it would be hard to find in any one human being, but I believe we have men capable of directing a bureau of industries so as to do a considerable amount of good for Western Australia. I shall not particularise the industries, but surely it must appeal to the Premier that there is something wrong when we import practically all our jam, and a large proportion of our leather and leather goods, as well as all our linen goods. The fact that no linen goods whatever are made in this State discloses a deplorable condition of affairs.

Mr. A. Thomson: They intend starting woollen mills at Albany, at any rate.

Mr. LAMBERT: I hope the mills will be started.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: Very few will be started without Government money.

Mr. Underwood: None will start without Government money, because some have started and failed.

Mr. LAMBERT: If half a million were available for the starting of industries, with adequate protection for the Government interests, I believe our younger industries would develop to the same extent as in the Eastern States and elsewhere. I remember the time in Victoria when a school of political thought held that nothing could be made in Australia. Those times have been changed, however, by the organisation of capital and the aggregation of wealth following in the train of the successful establishment of industries. We cannot expect that stage in a young State like Western Australia. We will never be an industrial State until we have a man with a wide vision to handle the situation and provide employment for our boys and girls. If private individuals fail to provide for them, the responsibility should lie with the Government to deal with the matter. I hope the Premier will not be so circumscribed in his vision as to believe that the prosperity of Western Australia begins and ends with agriculture. Co-relative with that industry, are the secondary industries. If the Government are to be ever deaf to the constant

appeals made to them, Western Australia will make no progress with her secondary industries. Mr. Gray, the President of the Chamber of Manufactures, is reported in one of the Eastern States journals as saying that one of the things most responsible for the deficit in Western Australia and the general backwardness of her finances is that we are not balancing the exports with the imports. I feel inclined to move an amendment to the motion in order to extend the scope of the inquiry to deal with the application of the Industries Assistance Act to the establishment of secondary industries. I believe the Premier is sufficiently seized with the importance of this matter to have it thoroughly investigated. It is to his credit that he has been ever ready to assist in one or two small projects I have been connected with, but from the point of view of bigger things for Western Australia, I am impatient to see him move, and to have our secondary industries dealt with in the same organised way that agriculture has been treated. I believe it can be done, but so long as we hesitate and dilly-dally with the question, we shall not get anywhere. It is for Parliament to give a lead to provide a sound policy to govern the extension of secondary industries in this State. From conversations I have had with the Premier, I know that not only can he get money, but that he would make it available if the advances were under control, as they are under the Industries Assistance Act in relation to agriculture. It is no good Parliament continuing its hypocrisy and empty-handedness in dealing with this matter. The paramount problem confronting parents everywhere in Western Australia relates to the future of the boys and girls. I know of dozens of young chemists and others from the Technical School who are seeking positions.

The Colonial Secretary: We have to bring tradesmen from overseas.

Mr. Munsie: And now many of them are going overseas.

The Colonial Secretary: We have an insufficient number of our own people for the trades.

Mr. LAMBERT: The Minister may know something about the printing trade. I am dealing with secondary industries. Almost every student turned out by the Technical School has to go elsewhere for a livelihood.

Mr. Harrison: What is the cause of that?

Mr. LAMBERT: We have not the industries to absorb them.

Mr. Underwood: No; the technical schools are no good.

Mr. Harrison: The trouble is your unions will not permit them to be trained.

Mr. LAMBERT: For God's sake, don't go on croaking in that stupid manner! As a matter of fact, the hon. member knows, if he knows anything at all, that we have not the industries where we can place one-fifth of our boys and girls.

Mr. Harrison: What is the good of talking about the Technical School? Where are our apprentices and our journeymen?

Mr. LAMBERT: I am referring to the institutions for which Western Australia is paying, such as the University, the technical schools and the School of Mines. What is the use of barking in that semi-political style?

Mr. Harrison: The trouble is you will not absorb them.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! The member for Avon will have an opportunity later on. Let the member for Coolgardie state his case.

Mr. LAMBERT: I do not think there should be unreasonable restrictions regarding our artisans. It would be a deplorable and heathenish thing. I trust other members will speak on this question and impress upon Parliament the necessity for the encouragement of secondary industries for the successful absorption of capital and labour in Western Australia.

Question put and passed.

Ballot taken and a select committee appointed consisting of Messrs. Latham, Gibson, Angelo, Lutey and the mover (Hon. W. C. Angwin), with power to call for persons and papers, to sit on days over which the House stands adjourned, to adjourn from place to place and to report on 19th October.

MOTION—OIL PROSPECTING.

Order of the Day read for the resumption from 7th September of the debate on the following motion by Mr. Underwood:—

That in order to encourage prospecting for mineral oil, the House is of opinion that the Minister for Mines, in pursuance of the powers conferred upon him by Section 7 of "The Mining Act Amendment Act, 1920," should cancel all prospecting licenses which are not being efficiently worked, and that in future no prospecting license shall be granted for an area greater than 1,000 square miles.

The PREMIER (Hon Sir James Mitchell—Northam) [9.20]: I move—

That consideration of this motion be postponed.

Mr. UNDERWOOD: Can the hon. member move such a motion without fixing a date? Till when would he postpone it?

The Premier: Till next Thursday.

Mr. UNDERWOOD: Will it come at the beginning of next Thursday's business.

The Premier: I have no control over the Notice Paper in respect of private members' business. If I had, I would put this motion up again next Thursday. In the absence of the Minister for Mines, we cannot speak to the motion.

Mr. UNDERWOOD: I submit that on the practice of the House it is not right to postpone consideration of a motion. If the debate be adjourned the motion goes to the bottom of the list; but this is not an adjournment. If Ministers are to postpone motions in this way, members cannot hope

to get their motions through. This is against the practice of the House. Private members' business comes in its turn, and Ministers have no right to alter the order of precedence by moving the postponement. If it be postponed, it should be to a specific date, when the motion will take its place again at the top of the list.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: If the House carries the motion moved by the Premier this Order of the Day will go to the bottom of the list.

Mr. UNDERWOOD: I move an amendment—

That the words "till this day week" be added.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: The motion will still be placed at the bottom of the list.

Mr. UNDERWOOD: I do not wish to be offensive, but I have put this motion fairly before the House, and if I cannot get an opportunity to reply to the debate I will have to move in some other direction.

Mr. RICHARDSON: In the event of the amendment being carried, can we be sure that this motion will be discussed next week?

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: No.

Amendment put and passed; motion, as amended, agreed to.

MOTION—COST OF LIVING.

Tn inquired by Royal Commission.

Debate resumed from 7th September on the following motion by Hon. P. Collier:—

That in the opinion of the House a Royal Commission should be appointed for the purpose of ascertaining what sum of money is necessary to allow a reasonable minimum standard of living, having due regard for the obligation entailed in the maintenance of an average family.

The PREMIER (Hon. Sir James Mitchell—Northam) [9.27]: The hon. member in moving the motion necessarily referred to the Commission appointed by the Federal Government to inquire into the question of a living wage. I do not know that the Commission got very far, but I know that the judgment given in the Harvester case shows how speedily the conditions are changing. Almost from day to day do they change, and any wage arbitrarily fixed must of necessity be amended within a very short time. It would be a happy state of affairs if we could arrive at some solution of the difficulty. In this country we fix wages by the Arbitration Court.

Mr. Munsie: By the Harvester judgment—which is most unfair.

The PREMIER: The hon. member is wrong. The position has entirely changed since the delivery of that judgment. Each increase of wages necessitates an increase in the cost of living, which in turn is made the basis of application for increased wages. It is diffi-

cult by any inquiry to reach any fixed basis. I doubt whether it can be done. The Royal Commission sat for 12 months, and I believe at the end of that time did not really find what the basic wage should be.

Mr. Munsie: Yes, they did.

Mr. Corboy: They did, but it was not adopted.

The PREMIER: I do not think they actually reported what it should be. The Chairman of the Commission, a day or two after the report was sent in, reported that the wage suggested could not be adopted, because there was not enough money in Australia to meet the cost. The annual production would have been insufficient to meet the wages bill. I think we have built our wages on an altogether wrong basis. We take the cost of living. Of course we must have some regard to the cost of living, but it should be only a consideration in fixing the rate of wages.

Mr. Munsie: We want a commission to fix a fresh basis.

The PREMIER: We have to learn that wages can only be paid from the earnings of the people receiving them. It is impossible for long to pay wages from any other source. We must have regard to the value of the work done, quite apart from the cost of living. A man should be paid what he is worth; he should be paid a wage commensurate with his output or production. I do not know whether that is taken into consideration at the present time. I think the arguments in the Arbitration Court are based on the cost of living.

Mr. Munsie: The Arbitration Court insists on that.

The PREMIER: That cannot stand for any time; it is not fair to the worker. In this country we have high protection. In some instances industries are protected to the tune of 35 per cent. The other day there came under my notice a comparatively small order—the amount was about £3,500—and the duty was nearly £1,000. Yet the English manufacturer was able to land that order more cheaply at Fremantle than Eastern States manufacturers. I do not know how that came to be so; it did not seem to be at all right. We should have been able to beat the British manufacturer on that order. The idea of the hon. member is perfectly sound and good if it were only practicable. I do not think it is.

Mr. Munsie: Not to appoint a Royal Commission to inquire?

The PREMIER: I do not know how the most perfect inquiry would be able to result in any lasting good. Some members might say that we should take Knibbs' figures. I do not know that members consider Knibbs always satisfactory.

Mr. Munsie: He has been absolutely wrong with regard to house rent in Western Australia for the last five years.

The PREMIER: I doubt whether members would take Knibbs always. How could we regulate wages on the finding of a com-

mission which must inquire and report on the conditions existing at the moment.

Mr. Munsie: As the purchasing power of a sovereign increases or decreases, so you could determine it.

The PREMIER: It is intended to determine the purchasing power of the sovereign?

Mr. Lambert: The shopkeeper determines it day by day by what he gives you for a sovereign.

Mr. Clydesdale: Or by what he does not give you?

The PREMIER: I would like to know how it is to be done.

Mr. Munsie: They do it to-day.

The PREMIER: Not in the way the hon. member suggests.

Mr. Munsie: I do not approve of the Harvester judgment. I want another basis established in lieu of the Harvester judgment.

Mr. Richardson: It might be worse.

Mr. Munsie: It could not possibly be worse.

The PREMIER: The experience of similar inquiries to date has not been very encouraging. The Arbitration Court apparently is unsatisfactory to a great many people. To-day there is a strike in the printing trade, and apparently the strikers will not go to the court to have their wages adjusted.

Mr. Munsie: They are having a little holiday.

The PREMIER: Yes, much to the annoyance and inconvenience of the public. The Arbitration Court does not seem to be entirely satisfactory. I do not know just what could take the place of the court. Some tribunal is necessary to fix wages.

Mr. Munsie: The Arbitration Court will do me if it is on a fair basis.

The PREMIER: I am sure the hon. member would advise all those who have any trouble to go to the court.

Mr. Munsie: Yes, if you will put it on a fair basis, but it is not on a fair basis to-day.

The PREMIER: Would it ever be on a footing which would suit everybody.

Mr. Munsie: It could be on a fair footing.

The PREMIER: It is on a fair footing now. It is a question of evidence produced before a judge.

Mr. Munsie: No, it is not.

The PREMIER: I do not see how it can be fairer. I would not mind assisting in passing any motion if we could get some lasting results. It is certainly wrong that we should have arbitration and strikes. It ought to be possible to regulate wages by some means or other in a way satisfactory to all concerned. I doubt if we can do that if we fix wages only on the cost of living, and there appears to be the cause of the trouble. It is ridiculous to think that anyone would be willing to take less than he

is getting to-day, no matter whether the individual concerned was an employer, a worker, a judge of the Supreme Court, or a member of Parliament. When reduction is mentioned, men of course will object. I do not know that industry can always pay the wages which might be fixed by arbitration or by other means.

Hon. P. Collier: Or the profits either. Profits as well as wages are drawn from the article produced.

The PREMIER: The production must be able to stand the weekly wages cheque. Naturally profits are affected. As the employer wants his profits, so the worker wants his wages, and the two should be able to arrive at some satisfactory basis. The Leader of the Opposition no doubt moved the motion with the idea that it would overcome some of the industrial trouble. We in this State have been fairly free from strikes, though not so free as we should like to be.

Hon. P. Collier: We have a very popular strike at present.

The PREMIER: I should say it was a very unpopular one.

The Minister for Works: We will settle it on Saturday.

Mr. Munsie: I hope it lasts until after the Federal elections. If it does we shall have a chance of getting justice.

The PREMIER: The absence of the newspapers is certainly a loss to the State.

Hon. P. Collier: It is a national service. People are now beginning to think for themselves instead of having the thinking done for them.

The PREMIER: It is a very serious loss to the community. If the papers were being published the electors of the member for South Fremantle might to-morrow have been able to read his speech and been greatly edified by it, but the papers are not being published because of the strike. We cannot regard lightly a strike of this sort. Can members suggest any way of averting strikes or overcoming the present one?

Mr. Munsie: Give us the commission.

The PREMIER: The present strike is not over the question of wages. I am afraid the appointment of a commission would not achieve what the hon. member thinks it would.

Mr. Munsie: I think it would.

The PREMIER: I do not see how it could do any lasting good. This House would certainly agree to the motion if it would have any good effect.

Mr. Munsie: I think it would have.

The PREMIER: I doubt it. The Leader of the Opposition made an excellent and exhaustive speech. I am not permitted to quote from "Hansard" of this session, but I must say that he put up a very good case. Experience, however, shows pretty conclusively that such an inquiry would not result in any great or lasting good. There are a great many people employed in the mining industry.

If an inquiry of any sort would result in the opening up of the mines at Kalgoorlie and of their producing all they are capable of producing, much good would be done, but is it contended that by these means we might be able to re-establish employment on the fields?

Mr. Heron: What about Gwalia?

The PREMIER: The same applies to Gwalia; the Lancefield Mine closed down. Could it by any means be re-opened? It would be a good thing if we could arrange that this and other industries might continue.

Mr. Heron: You had better inquire into the railway freights.

The PREMIER: The trouble is that the railway freights are due to increased costs, the cost of coal, the cost of commodities, salaries and wages. The people working for wages must have wages sufficient to cover the cost of living. The idea of the Leader of the Opposition is sound and good, but I doubt whether it will achieve any great results. Before the session closes, I hope the House will consider an amendment to the Arbitration Act. I have discussed it with representatives of all parties and I think they showed a very keen desire to get an improvement of the Act which will result in smoother and more satisfactory working. I do not suppose we can by any form of arbitration satisfy both sides all the time, but we can make an attempt by amending the Act. I hope the House will realise that the result expected of this commission by some members is not likely to be achieved.

Mr. Munsie: I think it is.

The PREMIER: If the hon. member can show just what can result from the inquiry, he will be doing a great service to the country, especially if by his method we can settle some of the differences which now exist. I doubt whether that is possible. The Arbitration Court should be far more effective.

Mr. Munsie: Appoint the members of the Arbitration Court as the Royal Commission and I shall be perfectly satisfied.

The PREMIER: With the ever-changing circumstances in the cost of living, the Arbitration Court is the best tribunal. The House must do as it pleases with the motion—

Mr. Munsie: You will not oppose it.

The PREMIER: I have pointed out that I doubt whether any good would result from passing it. I hope the member for Hannans will show what good will accrue, and how the commission might arrive at the satisfactory result he expects.

Mr. Lambert: Are you open to conviction?

The PREMIER: The question is well understood by every member and I am satisfied everyone is looking for a solution of the present industrial trouble. It is very difficult to ascertain when the prices of products are falling and the cost of living is not doing so quite as quickly.

[The Speaker resumed the Chair.]

Mr. MUNSIE (Hannans) [9.46]: There is no necessity for any member to say much in support of the motion. Those who know

anything about industrial conditions in Australia and the method that has been adopted, since the Harvester judgment was delivered, of fixing the wages paid to employees in this State, appreciate the fact that the system is not a fair one. The Premier has said that the Arbitration Court fixes wages on the evidence adduced before it as to the cost of living. That is a fallacy. The court fixes the rate of wages to be paid on the evidence adduced in accordance only with the Harvester judgment. It has been admitted quite recently by both Federal and State Arbitration Courts that they see no other method of delivering an award except to take the Harvester judgment as a basis, and Knibbs figures as to the variation in the purchasing power of the sovereign. We want a Royal Commission to show that the basis of the Harvester judgment is wrong. That will not be a difficult matter. It would give satisfaction to both employees and employers in this State if such a Commission fixed the basis on which the Arbitration Court could work. I should like to see the members of the court appointed to this Commission. They could then obtain evidence which would be of great assistance to them in settling industrial disputes. The workers are placed in an unfair position. In a case already cited before the court the workers have to find the money to prove that the Harvester judgment was wrong. That will cost them at least £500. The workers are not in a position to call evidence in the same way that a Commission can do, or to examine witnesses in the same way, but notwithstanding this they have to spend money in an endeavour to prove that the basis of the judgment is wrong. No endeavour has yet been made to prove that before the Arbitration Court in Western Australia. It will take at least four months to hear that case, in which the Harvester judgment is challenged, and practically the whole cost will fall upon the workers. The Premier thinks we should appoint a Royal Commission to make an investigation as to how much money a man wants. I want a Commodity Commission. I want a Commission to decide what necessary commodities a man and his dependents require in order that they may live in reasonable comfort, and what these commodities cost. There would be fluctuations as the cost goes up or is reduced. Even Mr. Justice Higgins, who delivered the Harvester judgment, has repeatedly stated that it is not fair to base the cost of living and the standard of wages to-day upon that judgment. He has repeatedly appealed to the Federal Government to appoint a Commission to arrive at a basis outside of that judgment, but nothing has been done. Just prior to the last Federal elections the Prime Minister at Bendigo told the people, if he was returned, he would immediately appoint a Royal Commission to find out what the living wage was for a man, his wife and two children in Australia. A Commission was appointed with Mr. Piddington as chairman and the inquiry lasted 12 months. Immediately the report was submit-

ted to Parliament the Prime Minister repudiated it, and point blank refused to have anything to do with it. He even directed the Commission to make a second report. This is in black and white. The excuse put up was that in fixing wages the commission had taken into account 20,000 children who did not exist.

Mrs. Cowan: It was much more than that; 45,000 I think.

Mr. Davies: It was for a man, his wife and three children, not two children.

Mr. MUNSIE: I want a Commission to fix a basis for a man, his wife, and three children.

Mr. Davies: Mr. Piddington dealt with the case of a man his wife and three children, but the average for Australia turned out to be two children per family, and there were thus more children provided for than actually existed.

Mr. MUNSIE: If that were so, how did the Federal Parliament obtain evidence by which they could refute that given before the Commission? Parliament took the statistics as they were published from year to year, but I do not know how it discovered that all these children did not exist.

Mrs. Cowan: There was a tremendous number of single men included.

Mr. MUNSIE: If a Royal Commission were appointed, I am satisfied that sufficient evidence could be adduced to enable the Arbitration Court to arrive at a different basis from the Harvester judgment. A case was heard in connection with the miners in Kalgoorlie recently. Mr. McKenney was advocate for the miners and addressed the court. He appealed against the system of fixing wages under the Harvester judgment. The judge said, "Unless you set up some other standard or some authority sets one up, I am compelled to accept the Harvester judgment." That is what all the judges do. Because of this the workers have to be humiliated. They have to tell the court the cost of every bit of apparel they and their families wear, and show what the cost is of everything they eat and drink. When, however, they want the employers to produce their books, and want to know how much profit the employers are making, and whether an industry can afford to pay more wages or not they are denied that right. All we want is a Commission to find out what commodities are necessary to enable a man's home to be kept in reasonable comfort, and the amount it is necessary to allow him for the purchase of those commodities. Surely no one will deny to any man or woman in this State the right to live in a reasonable standard of comfort. That is all we want. I admit we have not so much industrial trouble in Western Australia as there is in the other States. Much credit for this is due to the member for South Fremantle (Mr. McCallum). He has prevented more trouble than any other 10 men in the State. He has always battled in the interests of what he believed to be right, the interests of the workers. He has always had to fight the odds set

up by the Harvester judgment. It is time the Government made a move in the matter. Seeing that the Arbitration Court has to deal with all these questions, the members of that tribunal are the proper people to appoint for such an inquiry. They would then be in a position to arrive at a definite basis of wages. If this could be done the Premier would be able to boast of even less industrial trouble than hitherto.

Mr. DAVIES (Guildford) [10.0]: I would be delighted to give this motion my full support if I thought it would tend towards the object suggested by the last speaker.

Mr. Munsie: Why not give it a trial?

Mr. DAVIES: Though I listened attentively to the speech of the Leader of the Opposition, I failed utterly to understand what object would be gained by carrying the motion. Is it suggested that by carrying the motion the House should repudiate the report of the Piddington Basic Wage Commission?

Mr. Munsie: It has been repudiated for us.

Mr. DAVIES: Let me state how the matter appears to me. The last speaker said that the Prime Minister promised a Royal Commission on the Basic Wage, and that immediately the Royal Commission presented its report he repudiated that report.

Mr. Munsie: That is quite true.

Mr. DAVIES: The Prime Minister has done nothing of the kind.

Mr. Munsie: I say he has, and "Hansard" proves it.

Mr. Willecock: Are the workers getting that basic wage?

Mr. DAVIES: Mr. Justice Higgins has been quoted times out of number in connection with this subject.

Mr. Munsie: He delivered the Harvester judgment, and he has asked the Federal Government times out of number to appoint another Royal Commission.

Mr. DAVIES: Mr. Justice Higgins was the first judge who had an opportunity of putting into operation, if he so desired, from the Arbitration Court bench the Piddington basic wage.

Mr. Willecock: Hughes promised he would do it by an Act of Parliament.

Mr. DAVIES: The following was telegraphed from Melbourne on the 15th December, 1920:—

During the continued hearing of the plaint of the Amalgamated Society of Engineers against the Adelaide Steamship Co., Ltd., and others, before Mr. Justice Higgins in the Arbitration Court to-day, Mr. E. H. Barker, who appeared for the engineers, intimated that he desired to put in the finding of the Basic Wage Commission in support of the claims. "I hope," remarked Mr. Justice Higgins, "that the parties will understand that I have considered that finding, and will at some time have to speak about it; but I am satisfied that the basic wage referred to is not the basic wage as accurately understood at all. Owing to a mistake, I think not by the

Commission, but by the person, whoever he was, who drafted clause 1, what has been found by the Commission is not the basic wage. 'Basic' means the base, and here in place of confining the finding to the base they have taken in the first, second, and third storeys. The basement is different for the first, second, and third storeys. It will help all the parties to know the attitude in which I approach the matter."

Let me suggest to the Leader of the Opposition that if he desires to bring into operation something which will assist particularly the married people of this State, he should move for the appointment of a Royal Commission to inquire how the Piddington basic wage can be brought into operation here. There is now a Labour Government in Queensland. By way of interjection the other night—I am bound to mention this, and do it only with the idea getting the matter cleared up—the member for Perth (Mr. Mann) inquired whether anyone in Australia had as yet put into operation the Piddington basic wage. The member for South Fremantle (Mr. McCallum) replied, "No, not yet." Thereupon the member for Hannans (Mr. Munsie) added, "With the exception of Justice McCawley in Queensland."

Mr. Munsie: I did not say anything of the kind. I said that Justice McCawley in Queensland had repudiated the Harvester judgment, and had given an award 10s. 6d. per week above that judgment. I do not care what you have there.

Mr. DAVIES: I am not permitted to read from "Hansard," but I took a note of the words, and those are the words.

Mr. Munsie: I do not care. I did not say it.

Mr. DAVIES: If the words are repudiated anybody can look them up in "Hansard."

Hon. P. Collier: The member for Hannans could not have said that, because everybody knows that the Piddington basic wage was not put into operation in Queensland.

Mr. Munsie: I said that McCawley had repudiated the Harvester judgment and was the only judge who had done so. I do not dispute that you have the statement there, but I say I never made it.

Mr. DAVIES: The statement is substantiated by "Hansard." I took the words down as they were uttered. Justice McCawley never departed from the basic wage laid down by the New South Wales Board of Trade, £4 5s. per week, although he had the opportunity of doing so.

Mr. Munsie: Has McCawley departed from the Harvester judgment?

Mr. DAVIES: No.

Mr. Corboy: McCawley has.

Mr. Munsie: It is useless arguing with a man like you.

Mr. DAVIES: I wish the hon. member would not argue with me, but let me get on with my statement. I will not say one word that cannot be substantiated from the lips of the men concerned in the matter. What is wrong with the whole business is, in a nutshell, this: when Justice Higgins said that

people had added second and third storeys, he meant that in laying down the basic wage in the Harvester case he had proceeded on a certain unit per family. Mr. Piddington altered that unit per family, taking more children than were allowed for in the Harvester judgment. The effect was to alter the basis. The average Australian family had been taken at three per married couple. However, that has been altered as the result of statements from the workers, which are on record. Mr. Theodore, of Queensland, said that if he had his way he would make the basic wage so much for a married man and his wife, with a bonus for each child. If we could agree on that basis, it would be quite possible to put the basic wage into operation here to-morrow. But what is wrong is that hon. members opposite desire to apply to the single man the Piddington basic wage, which is calculated for a married man, a wife, and three children.

Mr. Wilson: Does not the single man do the work?

Mr. DAVIES: I am not arguing that point. We are now talking about the basic wage. The member for Boulder in the course of his speech on the motion said—

The wage fixed by Mr. Justice Higgins at that time has been taken as the standard of the basic wage by practically all wage-fixing tribunals ever since. . . . It is necessary to consider the circumstances that existed at the time that award was made, and the circumstances surrounding the making of the award. It was the first inquiry of its kind that had been made in Australia. Necessarily, those who were associated with the inquiry were men who had had no previous experience. They were not skilled in the manner in which they are skilled to-day in the presentation of a case before the Arbitration Court. . . . The Court was called upon to fix what it considered to be a fair wage for men who were on the lowest rung of the industrial ladder.

Mr. Munsie: Are those words wrong?

Mr. DAVIES: In a sense they are wrong, and in a sense they are right. The men referred to were on the lowest rung of the industrial ladder because they were labourers in the Sunshine Harvester Works. But they were not on that lowest rung on which stands the man who cannot earn an economic wage. There is a difference between a minimum wage, and a basic wage which is regardless of a man's value to the community. There is a man who earns a wage in excess of the basic wage, which higher wage, however, he does not get, because there are many men who receive the basic wage without earning it, and for whom he has to make up.

Mr. Wilson: Who is going to be the judge of that?

Mr. DAVIES: The basic wage is based not on the man as a worker, but on the man as a family man. I have heard an employer in the brick-making industry say that if he had his way he would not employ one married

man, because a married man cannot earn as much as a single man. I quote that merely to show the nonsense talked by some employers. In the Government railways 17s. 4d. is the minimum wage for a fitter, and that amount is in excess of the basic wage for a labourer. The fitter is paid for skill and ability and application to his work. He gets the minimum wage of the industry in which he is working. Take the miner at Kalgoorlie and the porter on the Government railways. For the porter the basic wage is 12s. 10d. per day. The minimum wage for the Kalgoorlie miner is 16s. or 17s. per day.

Hon. P. Collier: No. He has been reduced. It is 15s. 4d.

Mr. DAVIES: In the one case the railway porter is paid the basic wage, regardless of what industry he is in. In the other case the miner's wage is the minimum wage. Here it is well to quote what Mr. Theodore said on this subject. If we were situated similarly to Queensland, then, instead of Sir James Mitchell being our Premier, the member for Boulder (Hon. P. Collier) would be filling that office, and he could only regard this matter in the same light as the man in the northern State regards it. The following remarks are reported to have been made by the Queensland Premier on the 2nd February, 1921:—

In the course of an address at the Trades Hall to-night the Premier, Mr. Theodore, referring to the basic wage said that this question was giving rise to a considerable amount of controversy in Australia at the present time. They all knew him well enough to realise that he would not contemplate or think of the frustration of any matter formulated or designed to improve or benefit the condition of the workers. He had given a considerable amount of attention to the Piddington proposal that the basic wage should be £5 16s. in Melbourne, £5 17s. in Sydney, and £5 6s. 6d. in Brisbane. These amounts would mean an increase in nominal wages, but not in effective wages to workers. A mere increase of wages was illusory unless it secured some improvement in the standard of living. If a man were getting £3 17s. a week now, and his wages were advanced to £5 6s. 6d. tomorrow, it would be of no benefit if the £5 6s. 6d. would buy no more than the £3 17s. bought before. No one could say that the mere application of the Piddington decision by itself, with nothing more being done, would result in any benefit to the workers. Mr. Piddington himself had admitted that if the rates were brought up to the figures mentioned, there would be such an increase in the cost of living that wages would again have to be increased by a considerable amount. His (Mr. Theodore's) opinion was that it was not merely the responsibilities of the unions or members of Parliament, but the joint responsibilities of both, to find some means of getting away from the old shibboleths, the

old futile process of the dog chasing its own tail, and whilst higher wages were forcing up the cost of living the never-ending chase after effective wages which the workers never got. His opinion was that they should concentrate not so much on merely getting increased wages as on improving the remuneration of the workers by keeping down the cost of living. Every step taken in that direction meant a permanent gain to every worker enjoying wages. If we could exert some influence on the cost of commodities, house rents, clothes, and living generally, then every time we reduced these costs, to that extent we would increase the purchasing power of every man's wages. He admitted that it was not an easy problem, and that energy and brains would have to be applied to the solution of it if they were to have the power of regulating these matters. They had to see that the workers themselves recognised their obligations to the community. There were some workers who were prepared to loaf on their job, some who carried on active propaganda of the slow-down doctrine that had never been countenanced by the Labour movement, and that could never be consistent with any ideal of progress. The men who resorted to that kind of sabotage never had, and never would, accomplish salutary reform for this or any other country.

That was the speech made by Mr. Theodore in the Trades Hall at Brisbane when the Piddington Commission issued their report, and one wonders why it was not put into operation then. I am personally concerned in a matter such as this. I would like to see the Piddington basic wage established next month. It would benefit me very considerably, if not now, perhaps in a very short time hence.

Mr. Willcock: When you are put out.

Mr. DAVIES: It is not to my advantage to see the basic wage reduced below what is a fair thing to the workers. I have as much to lose as any other individual. We have to consider the effect of this, and unless we do that there is no chance of getting ahead with it. I would remind members opposite as well as others that apart from what the Prime Minister, Mr. Hughes, stated regarding the Piddington basic wage, Mr. Piddington himself made a suggestion regarding his own findings. Mr. Piddington said:—"If you want to bring into operation the report of the Commission, I suggest that you make the basic wage for a married man and his wife, £4 a week, with 12s. a week for every child."

Mr. Willcock: Hughes says it cannot be done.

Mr. DAVIES: He has not said anything of the kind!

Mr. Willcock: Certainly he has.

Mr. Munsie: I can show you a letter signed by Mr. Hughes himself in which he says it cannot be done. It was in reply to our request.

Mr. DAVIES: Notwithstanding what members may say, the facts will stand.

Mr. Willcock: That is on record against Hughes.

Mr. DAVIES: If hon. members go into any of the public offices here, they will find out that what I say is correct. If it is not correct, I am willing to accept the interjections as accurate. What did Mr. Hughes do when Mr. Piddington sent in his report?

Mr. Munsie: He sent it back to Piddington for another report.

Mr. Willcock: The Prime Minister said it could not be done for every man.

Mr. DAVIES: It cannot be done for every man, because the basic wage provides for a man, his wife and three children.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! Hon. members must not argue.

Mr. DAVIES: I do not think it should be given to a man with no children, just as to a man with four or five children. Mr. Piddington started with a family of five and made his basic wage for them. That basic wage should be reduced for a family of three but increased for a family of seven. There was no suggestion by the Leader of the Opposition or anyone else regarding the putting into operation of the Piddington basic wage.

Mr. Munsie: It is strange that we have asked the Federal Government on four occasions to do the very thing you are asking, and Mr. Hughes replied that it could not be done.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! The member for Hannans has had his opportunity.

Mr. Munsie: Why does the hon. member continue saying what is untrue?

Mr. SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. DAVIES: I challenge the hon. member to say that to the Federal Public Service officers in this State, such as the post office and the pensions office, a wage of £4 3s. and 5s. a week for each child is not being paid. There are two men in the pensions office today, one of whom, a single man, gets £165 a year, while the other, a married man, gets £4 3s. a week, and both are doing the same work. There is also a man with three children who gets 15s. a week more, while the married man I have referred to also gets 15s. a week more than the single man. The fact remains all are doing the same kind of work. That system was put into operation shortly after the Piddington Commission submitted their report; yet hon. members say that the Prime Minister repudiated it.

Mr. Munsie: So he did.

Mr. DAVIES: He repudiated it to the extent that he did not pay what Mr. Piddington proposed, namely, 12s. a week, but he did differentiate between married and single men to the extent I have indicated. A single man in the Federal Public Service who is 21 years of age, receives £160 a year.

Mr. Corboy: That Commission was appointed to fix the basic wage for all the workers in Australia, and Hughes repudiated

practically all the workers of Australia when the report was submitted.

Mr. DAVIES: I endeavoured to show what was done.

Mr. Corboy: You said it was not repudiated a little while ago.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. DAVIES: What is the use hon. members saying I have mentioned certain things.

Mr. Munsie: Because you have repeated the same thing half a dozen times.

Mr. DAVIES: Hon. members are not prepared to admit what is true.

Mr. Corboy: You can twist nearly as quickly as the man you are defending.

Mr. DAVIES: I take exception to the word "twist."

Mr. SPEAKER: Does the hon. member take exception to it as being offensive?

Mr. DAVIES: Yes, I do.

Mr. SPEAKER: The member for Yilgarn must withdraw that expression.

Mr. Corboy: I will withdraw it, and will add—

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member must withdraw without any qualification.

Mr. Corboy: I do so.

Hon. P. Collier: All your friends have twisted but yourself. The member for Guildford stands where he was.

Mr. DAVIES: It does not make the slightest difference to me.

Mr. Munsie: I know it does not.

Mr. DAVIES: I will stand up for what is fair, just and correct. Reference has been made to Mr. Justice McCawley, the President of the Queensland Arbitration Court. He had an opportunity, had he so desired, to put into operation the Piddington basic wage.

Mr. Munsie: He did not.

Mr. DAVIES: He did. He sat daily on the bench in Queensland and, as a matter of fact, the Full Court, consisting of Mr. Justice McCawley and others, gave a judgment regarding this matter. When delivering his judgment in connection with the award for bank officers, the President of the Arbitration Court, Mr. Justice McCawley, referred to the question of pay for married and single men and said—

The court is obliged by law to base its wages for adults on the requirements of a married man with a wife and children—Our Arbitration Act provides for the same thing.

Mr. Willcock: They would not get a job otherwise.

Mr. DAVIES: The judgment continues—

The salaries prescribed in the present award will give single men who have no dependents a distinct advantage over married men. A social justice would seem to demand that such an income should be assured to married and single men performing equal work as will enable them to maintain an equal standard of living. It is difficult to see how this equality can be brought about unless the legislature prescribes, in respect to wife and children, payment from the State or from some fund to be established. At present an increase

of, say, 10s. a week in the cost of food requirements of a family is equivalent to not more than 5s. a week for a single man, but it compels the payment of 10s. a week to all male employees, married or single. This increase, the total cost of which is more than the total increased cost of food, is passed on by the employer and in the end the married man may find he loses though the single man benefits from the whole transaction.

That is simple enough, but since then the Queensland Full Court had an opportunity of going further into the matter. This is part of Mr. Justice McCawley's judgment in that case—

The fixing of a basic wage depended largely on the rates fixed in the other States, and it must therefore be influenced largely by the maximum fixed by the Federal Court. The court has decided that it was permissible to lay down a minimum wage which might be applicable to industries of average prosperity, but the court reserved the right to fix a lower minimum in any other industry. After careful consideration the court had come to the conclusion that it would be inimical to Queensland's interests and employers if they now adopted a higher wage than that of New South Wales, namely, 85s.

Mr. Willcock: That is logical.

Mr. DAVIES: I am not disputing that.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! Address the Chair!

Mr. DAVIES: I was endeavouring to maintain that it was logical. Still some say that we should bring in Piddington's basic wage of £5 13s. 11d.

Mr. Munsie: No one said anything of the sort.

Hon. P. Collier: One would imagine my motion was one for the adoption of the Piddington basic wage. You are arguing against the Piddington Commission.

Mr. DAVIES: I would prefer to see it adopted.

Mr. Corboy: So that you could knock it down.

Mr. DAVIES: Not at all. A Royal Commission should be appointed to go into the ways and means of applying the Piddington basic wage in this State.

Mr. Munsie: It cannot be done except by the Federal Government. Everyone knows it must be done federally.

Mr. DAVIES: I am prepared to admit that, but no one has been game to alter the basis from that of a married man with five children to one of a married man, giving extra allowances for the family. No one has attempted to do that. I have had experience of what this means. When the Wilson Government were in power, they gave a shilling war bonus to the married men and it was a serious source of complaint in the railway service, particularly among the fettlers. In a gang of six men, three may have been single men and three, married men who got a shilling extra.

Hon. P. Collier: The trouble was that the whole basis of that was wrong. There was not that distinction which was suggested by Piddington under which employers would not benefit by the employment of single men.

Mr. DAVIES: Yes; but as it was a Government matter, it was the easier way to do justice to the married man.

Hon. P. Collier: You know that it was an inducement to employ single men.

Mr. DAVIES: I raised that objection myself. The Government endeavoured at the time to give some relief to the married men.

Hon. P. Collier: It was the wrong way to do it. It was a vicious principle.

Mr. DAVIES: It was, and later on Mr. Justice Starke suggested the same thing in the Federal Arbitration Court, but he was prevented from doing anything by the outcry throughout Australia.

Hon. P. Collier: It was doing the same thing in a different way.

Mr. DAVIES: There was the suggestion of the Storey Government in New South Wales that the assistance should be given from a central fund, but before such a fund could operate, we would have to change the unit of the family. No one is game to do that.

Hon. P. Collier: My motion is not opposed to anything you are arguing.

Mr. DAVIES: I am not opposing the motion. I would support a motion to bring about a more desirable state of affairs.

Hon. P. Collier: It is competent for a recommendation to be made in the direction you suggest.

Mr. DAVIES: I have admitted twenty times over—

Hon. P. Collier: It might make such a recommendation and legislation might be advocated along those lines.

Mr. DAVIES: That is so. It might do that. I will support anything that will bring that in, because I stand to gain personally. If you will make the unit a married man and his wife, and give 12s. for every child, I will be prepared to throw up my Parliamentary position and go back to a basic wage outside, for I could then earn more money there.

Mr. Willcock: Is that all you are in Parliament for, merely to get a better screw than you can get outside?

Mr. DAVIES: What a suggestion for the hon. member to make!

Hon. P. Collier: You made it yourself.

Mr. DAVIES: I was merely saying that on the basis suggested it would pay me to do so.

Mr. Willcock: Apparently you have been seriously considering it.

Mr. DAVIES: The hon. member would be pleased to see me adopt that course, but I am not going to do that; I am going to remain here as long as I can. However, it is useless for hon. members to slander those

who are doing their best for the workers. To say that Mr. Hughes repudiated it—

Hon. P. Collier: Hughes did repudiate it.

Mr. DAVIES: My criticism is not made with any idea of being hostile to the motion. The Leader of the Opposition said the wage fixed by Mr. Justice Higgins had been taken as justification for succeeding awards. Union advocates have endeavoured to get Mr. Justice Higgins to depart from the Harvester judgment, but he sticks hard and fast to it, which means that he is of the same opinion to-day.

Hon. P. Collier: I said that Mr. Justice Higgins had frequently expressed a wish that a further inquiry should be held.

Mr. DAVIES: Yes. Mr. Justice Higgins said—

Mr. SPEAKER: I cannot allow discussion as to what Mr. Justice Higgins said.

Mr. DAVIES: But the Leader of the Opposition made the statement, and I wish to reply to it. I cannot let it go unchallenged.

Hon. P. Collier: I am agreeing to your statement.

Mr. DAVIES: If I thought good would come of this motion I would support it, but I am afraid it may be regarded by outsiders as signifying that we are departing from the standard laid down by that particular Commission. Personally I should have liked to see it put into operation.

Hon. P. Collier: You mean Mr. Piddington's Commission; there is nothing in my motion concerning Mr. Piddington's Commission.

Mr. SPEAKER: There is nothing in the motion dealing with it at all. I cannot allow the hon. member any further latitude.

Mr. DAVIES: I am going to raise my voice in opposition to this continual cry made for an increase on the base, when it does not mean the base at all.

Mr. SPEAKER: We are not discussing the base. The motion is to consider a reasonable minimum standard of living, irrespective of anything that has occurred or is likely to occur. The hon. member must confine himself to the motion.

Mr. DAVIES: Surely I am in order in discussing the sum of money necessary?

Mr. SPEAKER: No. The hon. member can discuss merely whether the appointment of the proposed commission is justified. I am not going to allow the hon. member to proceed any further on those lines.

Mr. DAVIES: Can I not discuss what money is necessary to provide a reasonable standard of living?

Mr. SPEAKER: No. The hon. member can discuss only whether it is necessary to place in a Royal Commission power to ascertain that.

Mr. DAVIES: I am sorry I cannot discuss that.

Mr. SPEAKER: I have allowed the hon. member a great deal of latitude.

Mr. DAVIES: But, Mr. Speaker—

Mr. Pickering: You are too weak. Anybody on this side of the House is too weak.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! The hon. member must withdraw that statement.

Mr. Pickering: I withdraw.

Mr. DAVIES: As I have previously said, I am greatly concerned in this question. I should like to see a Royal Commission appointed if it will alter the present standard. If it will do that, the mover of the motion shall have my benediction and that of thousands of others who are suffering because the base adopted was a wrong one.

Hon. P. Collier: The hon. member could appear before the Commission and put his case.

Mr. DAVIES: I should be delighted to attend as a witness and show that what has been done was wrong. I have not argued at any time that all and sundry should not receive what is laid down by law, but I am appealing for those people with families in excess of the number provided for, and for whom no relief is afforded. It is time something was done in this direction. If the commission can devise some means for providing such relief its appointment will have been justified. If anyone suffers to-day, it is the man with a large family. I referred the other night to a statement made in all seriousness that in Osborne Park there were six families with a total of 80 children, an average of nearly 14 per family.

The Minister for Works: I know of two families with 22 and 20 children respectively.

Mr. DAVIES: When we remember that the wage prescribed for these families is calculated on the basis of what would keep a wife and three children in reasonable comfort, and that these families have 10 children in excess of the number and not one penny extra by way of relief, we realise the seriousness of the position. Members should not shut their eyes to facts. It has been stated in the Federal Parliament and in every Arbitration Court in Australia that, unless this basis is altered, it will not be possible to afford relief to large families. It has been proved by statistics that the total wealth produced in Australia for distribution amongst its people amounts to 500 million pounds, and that if this amount were equally distributed between the whole of the adult male workers, it would provide about £3 5s. 6d. per week per man. This does not take into account female or junior workers. This amount and no more would be the same for the merchant, the millionaire, the Premier, the Minister for Works. If one man is paid £5 a week it means that someone else must receive less than £3 5s. 6d. These figures have not been challenged so far as I have been able to learn from Knibbs and the Daily Press. If they could be challenged, I think particulars would have been published in the columns of the "Westralian Worker," of which I am a regular reader. I heartily support the motion and trust it will lead to the achievement of

the results desired by the Leader of the Opposition.

On motion by Colonial Secretary, debate adjourned.

MOTION—COMPENSATION, OCCUPATIONAL DISEASES.

Debate resumed from the 7th September on the following motion by Hon. P. Collier—

That in the opinion of this House the Government should introduce legislation during the present session for the purpose of providing compensation for workers affected by occupational ailments and diseases.

The PREMIER (Hon. Sir James Mitchell—Northam) [10.45]: Under the Miners' Phthisis Bill now before the House it is proposed to deal with those men who have been compelled to leave the mines because of the dread disease of tuberculosis. We realise that if these men are going to leave their occupation—and thank God there are not many of them—they have to be cared for. They cannot be compelled to leave the only occupation they know, and their homes, unless other provision is made for them. Under the Miners' Phthisis Bill I think we shall be able to make satisfactory arrangements for such people. We must face this responsibility, and we must see that those who have employed these men for some time contribute towards their support until they recover sufficiently to follow an occupation which will give them a comfortable living. I hope that such men can be transferred to suitable surroundings and will speedily recover. I want to assure the House that under the Bill we shall give to the miners—the workers most concerned—the protection and assistance required. It is quite another matter to ask us to mete out similar treatment to all workers in all industries, as suggested by the motion of the Leader of the Opposition. To do that would be very difficult indeed. I hope the House will agree that by making a start as the Minister for Mines proposes to do, we shall be doing enough for this session.

Mr. Marshall: Under the Bill there is no provision for those men.

The PREMIER: But the Bill will be amended to make the necessary provision. We cannot withdraw from their present occupational men who are suffering from tuberculosis and leave them stranded on the goldfields. The idea is to give them an opportunity to recover so that they can follow some useful occupation. The Minister for Mines proposes to make additions to the Bill under which provision can be made for these people. Although the Government may have to support them in the end, there will have to be a contribution by the employers and the Government, as is usual in such cases. I suggest that the debate be adjourned until we deal with the Bill. If we can take the step I have indicated this year, we should be satisfied with doing that much for a start. To suggest embodying all

workers is a very big question and one which should receive earnest consideration.

On motion by Mr. Mullany, debate adjourned.

House adjourned at 10.50 p.m.

Legislative Assembly,

Tuesday, 26th September, 1922.

	PAGE
Question: Native prisoners and road work	891
Bill: Licensing Act Amendment, Com.	892

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

QUESTION—NATIVE PRISONERS AND ROAD WORK.

Hon. P. COLLIER asked the Colonial Secretary:—1, Is it a fact that the Chief Protector of Aborigines has submitted proposals to the Wyndham Road Board for the employment of native prisoners on road work under the supervision of the said board? 2, Does he approve of the policy of forced native prison labour in the manner contemplated? 3, What are the particulars of the scheme in question?

The COLONIAL SECRETARY replied: 1, In order to minimise the heavy cost of maintaining in gaol natives convicted of cattle killing in the Kimberleys, the Chief Protector of Aborigines submitted a scheme to the Government, having for its object the transfer of such prisoners to the Aborigines Department, as contemplated by Section 35 of the Aborigines Act, and their employment upon work in the interior which would not otherwise be undertaken. The natives would thus serve their term of penal servitude in a useful manner at less cost to the country. The scheme was recently submitted to the Wyndham, Hall's Creek, West Kimberley, Roebourne, Broome, and Port Hedland Road Boards, and received the indorsement of each. It has been most favourably received by residents of the North, and is generally regarded as offering an improvement on the present system, being humane and beneficial to the aborigines, and useful to the country. 2, The matter is now under consideration. 3, Particulars of the scheme are attached. The scheme contemplates the care and employment of