

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: The sleepers will be laid so that they will suit the 4ft. 8½in. gauge. The proposition is that we should set to work with that portion of the line we know will be a permanent part of the Transcontinental railway, the object being to get a one in 80 grade and carry out the earth-works on that grade. The evidence the gentlemen have given is that we should lay sleepers to carry the 4ft. 8½in. gauge and put down 80lb. rails which will be required in connection with the permanent line, so that later on the rails can be moved from 3ft. 6in. to 4ft. 8½in. This will obviate a good deal of expenditure on the construction of temporary sidings. If we do not construct this section we shall need ten or twelve temporary sidings for which the same number of attendants will be required, and trains will be hung up and traffic will be very seriously disorganised. By doubling the line as the Bill suggests, the return of rolling stock used in the carriage of material will be expedited, whereas if the section is not built a larger quantity of rolling stock will be required by the Railway Department. The later cost of removing the one rail to make the 4ft. 8½in. gauge will be very small in comparison with the large saving that will be effected in other directions. These dozen sidings will not be necessary with their dozen attendants. The Bill only provides for the construction of a line from Merredin to Coolgardie and Mr. Kirwan asks why not to Kalgoorlie. The explanation is that we have a double line between Kalgoorlie and Coolgardie which will carry the traffic. The estimated cost of this section is £434,941 for construction, and £241,140 for rails and fastenings, a total of £676,081. It is intended that the construction of the line shall be placed in the hands of the working Railways Department, not the Works Department, unless a deviation is proposed. If a deviation is found to be necessary, and it will only be necessary with a view to discovering a grade which will not be in excess of one in 80, it must pass into the hands of the Works Department, otherwise the construction will be carried out by the Working Rail-

ways. It should be obvious that it would be very difficult for the Works Department to construct a line close to and parallel with the existing line, which is worked by the Railway Department. It is expected that the greater portion of the line will be completed in time to carry the material for the Transcontinental railway. If the line is not actually completed, we will be able to carry the material over the first section. We are in hopes, however, to have the line ready for the carriage of the material throughout. I beg to move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

On motion by Hon. H. P. Colebatch, debate adjourned.

ADJOURNMENT—SPECIAL.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY (Hon. J. M. Drew) moved—

That the House at its rising adjourn until Tuesday, 3rd September.

Question passed.

House adjourned at 9.33 p.m.

Legislative Assembly,

Wednesday, 28th August, 1912.

| | PAGE |
|--|------|
| Paper Presented | 1363 |
| Question: Railway Rolling Stock, Harvest requirements | 1364 |
| Bills: Supply £253,846, all stages | 1364 |
| Shearers and Agricultural Labourers' Accommodation, &c., Com. | 1368 |
| Papers: Public Servants Retirement, Pilot Gilmour | 1368 |

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

PAPER PRESENTED.

By the Premier: Plans describing land resumed from Pastoral Leases Nos. 531/97 and 536/97.

QUESTION -- RAILWAY ROLLING STOCK. HARVEST REQUIREMENTS.

Mr. BROWN asked the Minister for Railways: What provision has been made for the necessary railway rolling stock to cope with the forthcoming season's harvest requirements?

The PREMIER (for the Minister for Railways) replied: The stock of locomotives on the 30th June, 1911, numbered 323. This has been increased to 359 during the past financial year, and will be further increased to 444 when present orders are complete. It is anticipated that by the 31st December next 376 locomotives will be in traffic. The wagon stock on 30th June, 1911, was equivalent to 9,530 four-wheeled trucks. On the 30th June, 1912, this had been increased to 9,915, and equal to 1,992 are now on order. When present orders are complete, the stock will be equivalent to 11,907 four-wheeled wagons. By the 31st December, 1912, it is expected that the number of wagons in traffic will be 10,468. It will be seen that steps are being taken to increase the number of locomotives by 38 per cent., and wagons by 25 per cent. on the stock available on the 30th June, 1911, which carried the good harvest of that season. But, as the average haulage power of the new locomotives and the carrying capacity of the new wagons exceed the averages of the stock in traffic on the 30th June, 1911, their actual efficiency will be considerably greater than is indicated even by those figures.

Mr. BROWN: You will want more than that.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: I hope so.

BILL—SUPPLY, £593,846.

Standing Orders Suspension.

The PREMIER (Hon. J. Scaddan) moved—

That so much of the Standing Orders be suspended as is necessary to enable resolutions from the Committees of Supply and Ways and Means to be

reported and adopted on the same day on which they shall have passed those Committees, and also the passing of a Supply Bill through all its stages in one day.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS (Hon. W. D. Johnson) seconded the motion. Question put and passed.

Message.

Message from the Governor received and read recommending appropriation in connection with the Bill.

Committee of Supply.

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

The PREMIER (Hon. J. Scaddan) moved—

That there be granted to His Majesty on account of the services of the year ending June 30th, 1913, a sum not exceeding £593,846.

He said: When Parliament assembled at the commencement of the session the Government obtained supply for a period of two months, in the hope that before that term had expired we would have had the Estimates here for consideration, and perhaps passed. Owing to circumstances, largely of a nature which we could not foresee, we were prevented from complying with our wish in that direction, but he hoped to be able to introduce the Estimates by Thursday week next. Even if they were here at present it would still have been necessary to pass supply to carry on while the Estimates were under consideration by Parliament. It was not an unusual procedure, in fact he was satisfied that in any case the Estimates would be presented earlier this year than they had been for some time. He had pointed out to the departments that he expected them in future to make every endeavour to present their Estimates before the end of July, instead of having to wait until two or three months of the year had expired before they could make up their minds regarding the amount of money they required. There was an amount for Loan Suspense Account of £100,000. The amount pre-

vously granted from Loan Funds was sufficient for the purpose, although a further amount was required from the Loan Suspense Account, but the leader of the Opposition would know that that account was adjusted when the Loan Bill had been passed by Parliament. In the meantime, on certain services, we had not the funds provided under the previous Loan Bill to carry on, and we had to increase it largely through increased activities under the agricultural development vote. He had inquired why £100,000 had been asked for and the reply was that an amount approaching £100,000 was required under the agricultural development vote, which the Government had had to exceed. The amount from the Consolidated Revenue Fund asked for was based on last year's expenditure for a period of a further two months. By that time the Government hoped to have the Estimates passed and a proper Appropriation Bill passed by both Houses.

Hon. FRANK WILSON: There was no intention on his part to oppose the Premier in getting supply for a further month. He presumed the period was one month, but he would like to have a little more information in regard to the £100,000 from the Loan Suspense Fund. He had been waiting to ascertain how the State steamers had been paid for and had never been able to find out how the Government had managed to pay for them. The Government had come along and bought two beautiful boats, established a regular line to the North-West, and told the House they were going to run to the Far East and perhaps to ports in India; at any rate, the State owned three or four steamers and they had been paid for, according to the Premier, in British sovereigns. He would like to know if the amount was included in these items.

The Premier: No. This is to authorise expenditure which will take effect from the 1st September; it is money we propose to expend from the 1st September.

Hon. FRANK WILSON: Would the Premier tell the House where the steamers were paid from?

The Premier: That has nothing to do with this Bill.

Hon. FRANK WILSON: The Premier had paid for them.

The Premier: I told you that long ago.

Hon. FRANK WILSON: The Premier said he had paid for the steamers out of the Treasurer's Advance, and yet the expenditure was not included in the figures for the financial year.

The Premier: You know the Loan Account is not presented until the 30th July.

Hon. FRANK WILSON: Then the steamers must be charged to Loan Suspense.

The Premier: No.

Hon. FRANK WILSON: The House should be informed how these steamers had been paid for. The amounts were not included in Consolidated Revenue. They were not in Loan Suspense. Where were they? They must be somewhere.

Mr. Underwood: Like the Opposition, at sea.

Hon. FRANK WILSON: Then they had better be got out of the sea quickly. The Premier knew what was meant. He had paid for these steamers and they were charged up to some account. The Premier should take Parliament into his confidence and state to what account they had been debited.

The PREMIER: It was his desire to repeat that the steamers had been paid for out of money appropriated by Parliament and now he was asking for authority to spend money in the future, not to legalise any expenditure of the past. The Government had not expended any money without an appropriation of Parliament. He had pledged his reputation as Treasurer to that statement. He was asking now for authority for money with which to carry on. As had already been stated, the £100,000 required from Loan Suspense Account was due to the demands which were being made in connection with the development of agriculture. It seemed a huge sum of money, but the fact remained that that was the reason why the Government had been called upon to provide it out of that amount. When the Loan Bill was passed, then the matter would be adjusted by

debiting the item "Development of Agriculture" in the Loan Schedule. The hon. member could easily discover what the Government were doing. The Government were taking on more activities than had ever been done in the history of the department, and that of course meant the expenditure of additional money. Until there was a Loan Bill, containing the items, properly before the House, the amount would have to be charged to Loan Suspense Account. The expenditure of that money had no connection whatever with any State enterprise. He had told the House previously that the Government had charged the expenditure in connection with the steamers to the Treasurer's Advance.

Hon. Frank Wilson: Was it not charged up against Consolidated Revenue?

The PREMIER: It was not.

Hon. Frank Wilson: Do you intend to do so?

The PREMIER: Certainly not. The hon. member knew that the Treasurer's Advance included expenditure under Loan Suspense.

Mr. Nanson: It is purely a temporary charge, but how do you propose to permanently charge it?

The PREMIER: When a Loan Bill was passed authorising expenditure, the amounts would be charged under their proper headings, but at the present time the only account to which the expenditure could be charged was Loan Suspense. Last year every penny that was a charge to Consolidated Revenue and expended from the Treasurer's Advance was shown on the balance sheet at the end of the year. If the leader of the Opposition looked up *Hansard* he would see that in reply to a question asked by Mr. Moss in another place, the whole thing was explained. The hon. member knew that the Loan Account was not balanced yet, but when it was every penny expended on Loan Suspense would be properly debited.

Hon. FRANK WILSON: It was to be regretted that the Premier should attempt to evade this question put so often with regard to the expenditure on the

steamers. Of course the Premier took as half a joke any reference which was made by him (Mr. Wilson) to the purchase of these steamers, but it was true that the Opposition had been endeavouring to find out how the Premier proposed to provide for the money for the purchase of these steamers. It was not a personal matter. The Premier could refuse to give Frank Wilson any information, and the Premier could also treat him with contempt, but the Premier had no right to treat the House with contempt unless there were some good and justifiable reason for withholding the information. Now it was understood that the Premier was going to charge the cost of these steamers up to Loan. The Premier said, and he had been haggling about it for months, that because he charged the cost of these steamers to Loan Suspense Account, there was no need to tell the House anything about it. The Premier was overstretching his power altogether and he was wrong as to what had been the custom in the past with regard to expenditure of loan funds in anticipation. There had been two accounts in the Treasury in the past, one the Treasurer's Advance from Consolidated Revenue and any expenditure in connection with that advance was charged up month by month to the Consolidated Revenue Account. When it was desired to anticipate expenditure from loan funds then that was charged up to Loan Suspense Account and ultimately it was brought in and covered by the Loan Bill and the Loan Appropriation and Loan Estimates. That was the course the Premier was taking now, but he argued because he had this Treasurer's Advance from Consolidated Revenue, that it covered loan expenditure as well. It was known that the Auditor General had been hammering away at this question for some time and it was known also that that officer had had the Premier carpeted.

The Premier: No, he has not.

Hon. FRANK WILSON: Perhaps it was the Under-Treasurer, but they were always at loggerheads, the Audit Department and the Treasury as to whether the department's books were being kept cor-

rectly, and the Auditor General of late had insisted that the Loan Suspense Account which had been in existence for the last 20 years, ever since Responsible Government was not a legal account. Probably the Auditor General was right and he (Mr. Wilson) was not prepared to pit his opinion against the advice which it was to be presumed the Auditor General had sought, but the fact remained that it had been the custom for 20 odd years to have this Loan Suspense Account, and it was still in evidence, because the term was used in the present Supply Bill. It was understood now for the first time that the steamers were to be purchased from loan funds and that was what he had urged all along. The Premier had evaded the question but now we had it definitely.

The Premier: I have never evaded the question.

Hon. FRANK WILSON: At any rate the explanation which the Premier had only just given was what had been asked for all along.

The PREMIER: The leader of the Opposition ought to be aware of the fact that where there was not a definite appropriation or authority by Parliament for the expenditure of money, that was by excessing an item on revenue or loan account, or by introducing a new item, it had to be charged to some account under an appropriation before it could be drawn from the public funds, and that money could not be drawn from the public funds without an appropriation from Parliament. The only appropriation that Parliament had yet given, other than the item shown on the Revenue Estimates, or the Loan Schedule, was per medium of the Treasurer's Advance last year. The sum of £250,000 was placed at the Treasurer's disposal exactly as was done in previous years, although he had to admit that not many years since there was no control over the expenditure of money under new items or excess items under Loan funds.

Hon. Frank Wilson: They had form J.

The PREMIER: They had all been amended and the leader of the Opposition was responsible for the amendment

of these forms, and the amendment of the regulations provided for an expenditure which he insisted should be charged against Treasurer's Advance in accordance with the desires of the Auditor General who pointed out that the public accounts could not be drawn upon except by authority of Parliament, and unless there was such, either by Treasurer's Advance or other accounts, he could not pass the withdrawal of money from public funds, and so there had to be included the £250,000 in the Appropriation Bill authorising the Treasurer to draw that amount from the public accounts. This matter could be discussed properly when we were dealing with the Consolidated Revenue Estimates or the Loan Bill. In the meantime, he was asking for authority to expend a further sum of £100,000 on account of Loan Suspense for the purpose of carrying on further activities in the Agricultural Department under the vote "Development of Agriculture" to which he had already referred. That was for this year. Eventually it would be adjusted by debiting it against the votes passed on the loan schedule. That being the case, the hon. member would accept the word of the Under Treasurer and himself that it was principally for carrying on the activities in the Agricultural Department.

Hon. J. Mitchell: The £100,000 is for the year?

The PREMIER: Yes.

Question put and passed.

Resolution reported, and the report adopted.

Committee of Ways and Means.

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

The PREMIER (Hon. J. Scaddan) moved—

That towards making good the supply granted to His Majesty for the service of the year ending 30th June, 1913, a sum not exceeding £493,846 be granted from the Consolidated Revenue Fund; and from the Loan Suspense Account, £100,000.

Question put and passed.

Resolution reported, and the report adopted.

Bill introduced, etc.

Pursuant to the foregoing resolutions, Supply Bill introduced, carried through all its stages and transmitted to the Legislative Council.

PAPERS—PUBLIC SERVANT'S RETIREMENT, PILOT GILMOUR.

On motion by Mr. CARPENTER (Freemantle), ordered: "That all papers in connection with the retirement of Pilot Gilmour, of Geraldton, be laid on the Table of the House."

BILL—SHEARERS AND AGRICULTURAL LABOURERS' ACCOMMODATION.

Message:

Message from the Governor received and read recommending the Bill.

Second reading, Amendment, six months.

Order of the Day read for resumption, from the 21st August, of the debate on the second reading.

Mr. SPEAKER: Mr. McDonald.

Hon. Frank Wilson: Does this close the debate?

Mr. SPEAKER: Yes, it does.

Hon. Frank Wilson: But two other members rose in their places, the member for York, and the member for Beverley.

Mr. SPEAKER: The member for Gascoyne was on his feet first, and caught my eye. The resumption of the debate is in the name of the member for York, who is in his place, but who did not rise to address the House. There is a general tendency to wait until the Speaker rises in his seat to put the question, but if the member for Gascoyne is willing to allow other members to address the House, I shall allow them to do so.

Hon. Frank Wilson: I protest, Mr. Speaker, against that. It is not within the privilege of the member for Gascoyne

to give any member the right to speak. Time after time Ministers get up in their places and say, "If no other member wishes to speak I shall reply." You surely remember that. The member for York was on his feet, and it was due to the member for Gascoyne to sit down immediately he saw another member prepared to address the House, and to allow that member to make his remarks.

Mr. McDonald: If I may explain, I did not notice any member on his feet, and I allowed a reasonable period of time to elapse, so that any member could address the House on the subject, before rising to reply.

Mr. SPEAKER: I cannot be accused of being unfair. I knew the resumption of the debate was in the name of the member for York, and the member for York will admit that I looked at him for a considerable time to see if he desired to address the House. I have no desire to prevent discussion, but I called on the member for Gascoyne because he certainly caught my eye, and was first on his feet. I must adhere to what I have stated.

Hon. Frank Wilson: It is not a question of who catches the Speaker's eye.

Mr. SPEAKER: Yes, who catches the Speaker's eye, and whom I call upon first.

Hon. Frank Wilson: Not in reply?

Mr. SPEAKER: Distinctly so. As I said before, if the member for Gascoyne wishes to forego his right of replying now, it is open to other members to address the House.

Mr. MONGER (York): When I moved the adjournment of the debate the other evening, Mr. Speaker notified the House that, unless a Message was received from His Excellency the Governor in regard to what he considered to be money clauses in this Bill, he would not allow the measure to be considered in Committee. It was only at the eleventh hour that this message was delivered from His Excellency the Governor through the Premier, and I was waiting for that message before asking if Mr. Speaker's ruling bore the construction which one might reasonably place on it. It may be fresh in the memory of members that strong exception

was taken to this measure by the Minister for Lands. It is not often that I have the pleasure of agreeing with the remarks that fall from gentlemen sitting on the Government side, but on that occasion it gave me pleasure to listen to the line of argument followed by the Minister. I, personally, hope that, before a measure of this kind is given any further consideration by this House, it will be viewed from every possible standpoint, so that a reasonable Bill may be evolved. How different this Bill is from the measure introduced by the member for Gascoyne during last session! It is a very different proposition altogether, and if the hon. member is allowed to go on in this way, goodness knows what sort of a measure he will attempt to introduce if another opportunity be given him in twelve months' time. As was pointed out by the Minister for Lands, there are many clauses which involve absolutely unfair treatment of the new settlers in the agricultural areas, and I would ask members on the Government side, if they are going to force this measure through, to at all events delete this particular portion of it. The principal object of the introduction of this measure was to deal with the accommodation given to the shearers in the north. But the member for Gascoyne, who, I think, has participated to a very small extent in shearing during his varied experiences, hardly knows the treatment meted out to the shearers on most of the big stations. I do not want to make any peculiar comparison as to the life of the shearer, but as far as I can gather, on the stations in the north, they have as fair treatment as is given to them in any part of Australia, whilst in the eastern districts, where agriculture and sheep are combined, the ordinary shearer has a really good time. What better accommodation can be given to the men in the back-blocks than the ordinary tent which the shearer expects? But, according to this Bill, the member for Gascoyne wants them housed under better conditions than the manager of the proposition.

Mr. McDonald: Evidently you do not know what I expect.

Mr. MONGER: If that be the idea, I say, with all due respect, that this is a measure which is entitled to more than ordinary consideration at our hands, and knowing the fate which a similar measure met with in another place a few months ago, I think that this Bill, with the additions which have been made to it, is not going to commend itself to the Council. Therefore, before attempting to go into Committee, may I ask the introducer of the Bill to again consider whether he cannot withdraw certain of the clauses which have received serious condemnation at the hands of Ministers and others on his own side? In order to give some further opportunity to those who have already spoken on this side of the House, I beg formally to move an amendment to the motion—

That the word "now" be struck out and "this day six months" added to the motion.

Mr. BROUN (Beverley): I desire to second the amendment, and in doing so, I want the House to understand that I am opposing the Bill because of the agricultural industry being included in its scope. I am surprised at the member for Gascoyne including the agricultural industry, because the provisions of the Bill must, to a great extent, interfere with the pioneers who are making a start on the land. I am quite able to express an opinion on that subject, and I feel certain that, if the member for Gascoyne had experience of pioneering in the agricultural industry, he would never have thought of bringing such provisions as these before the House. In many instances the man starting on the land is not able to provide good accommodation for himself, and he is forced to live in a bush shed for many months. Every shilling he possesses has to be put into the land in order that he may make ends meet, and he is not in a position to supply accommodation for his labourers. Besides that, I venture to say that ninety-nine out of every hundred farm labourers are satisfied with the accommodation they receive at the present time. I have never heard any of the men complain of their lodgings, and, so far as I know, they all have

reasonably good accommodation. In those circumstances it is not necessary to have a Bill requiring decent accommodation to be provided for the farm labourers, and for that reason, I second the amendment.

Mr. HEITMANN (Cue): I rise to oppose the amendment, which it seems to me is an extraordinary method to adopt in attacking this Bill. It would have been fairer if both the mover and the seconder of the amendment had at least endeavoured to criticise the Bill and its various provisions. I do not think that either member will contend that a Bill of this description will bear hardly on the people which it will affect in the north.

Mr. Broun: So far as the shearer is concerned, it is all right.

Mr. HEITMANN: The member for Moore stated that he had never found any necessity for introducing legislation to compel squatters to provide decent accommodation for their shearers. But while the necessity for legislation may be denied by some members, still it must be admitted that on some stations in Western Australia the accommodation provided up to date is not sufficient. That is the case in other parts of Australia as well, and individual cases can be cited in this State to prove that the accommodation is not all that can be desired. Why, then, have not the mover and the seconder of the amendment touched on this question?

Mr. Monger: I did not want to be personal.

Mr. HEITMANN: There is nothing personal in it at all. Surely, when three or four thousand shearers have asked their representative to bring in a Bill of this description—

Mr. Monger: Only a small percentage of them.

Mr. HEITMANN: That is the usual cry. When a member, at the request of a large body of men, brings forward any proposal, our opponents always say that it is asked for by only a small proportion of the workers. If the hon. member had said that only a small proportion of the squatters concerned are not providing the

necessary accommodation, we might perhaps agree with him, but if that is so, the Bill will not affect a great many, because already the large majority of them are fulfilling the requirements of the measure.

Mr. Broun: It is the inclusion of the agricultural industry that I object to.

Mr. HEITMANN: But there is a proper method of objecting. Possibly I object to those provisions too, but when we come to those clauses I will endeavour to alter the measure so that it will not bear hardly on the new settlers. I must say that I think it would have been better if the member for Gaseoyne had retained the Bill in the form in which he introduced it last session. From my travels in the agricultural areas, including the Eastern, the Great Southern, and portions of the South-Western districts, I heard no complaints in regard to the accommodation.

Mr. Broun: Well, why have these provisions in the Bill?

Mr. HEITMANN: We could strike these provisions out, and still give to a certain body of men the relief that is necessary. Whilst I did not hear of any complaints about accommodation, I did find that, on some of the big farms, which are beyond the pioneering stage, the accommodation was such that, although it was not complained of, I would not like to use it.

Mr. Monger: Is it not optional on the men whether they use it or not?

Mr. HEITMANN: Some hon. members are always anxious to leave everything to the individual, but nowadays the State is taking the interest of the individual more and more into consideration. If we had insanitary coffee-palaces, would the hon. member leave it to the individual to say whether these establishments should continue in that condition or not? The idea that Parliament should not interfere with individual liberty has passed long ago. Generally speaking, from my experience of the farmers of Western Australia, I can see no reason why at the present juncture we should endeavour to bring them under the provisions of this Bill. Of course the hon. member who introduced the Bill will say that very few, if any, in the pioneering stage will come

under the Bill, but it is possible that we will inflict a hardship on the few, and I do not think we desire to do that as long as the many are treating their men reasonably fairly. I have lately come into close contact with some of the pioneering farmers in the State, and while I have always had sympathy with the man who is endeavouring to carve out a home for himself in the bush, lately my sympathies towards him have been increased. The life of a pioneer, the man who goes into the farming industry of Western Australia, particularly, as in the case of the majority of our farmers, when he has commenced without capital, is a very hard life indeed to tackle, and it is a job that is more than I would like to undertake. I would be very sorry indeed if we placed anything in the way of these pioneers' progress. I hope the hon. member in charge of the Bill will see if he cannot cut out that part which has been added to the measure this session dealing with the agricultural industry, and I hope he will, for the time being, be satisfied with a Bill dealing with the shearers, who are deserving of different treatment from what they are now receiving.

Hon. J. MITCHELL (on amendment) : I would like to point out to the member for York that he has the right to move his amendment on the third reading, and that I would like to have the Bill considered in Committee. If we are unable to alter it in Committee and make a satisfactory Bill of it, then will be the opportunity for the hon. member to move that the Bill be rejected. There is an inclination clearly shown on the part of members on the Government side of the House to be reasonable in this matter, and to take care of the agriculturists who are working under difficulties. It would be as well for the member for Gascoyne to allow the clauses relating to shearers to remain in the Bill, and to delete the clauses dealing with agriculture. I hope the member for York will withdraw his amendment, which he can move, if necessary, when the Bill reaches the third-reading stage.

Mr. MONGER: With the consent of the member for Beverley, who seconded my amendment, I desire to withdraw it.

Mr. SPEAKER: Does the member for Beverley agree to that course?

Mr. BROWN: Yes.

Amendment by leave withdrawn.

Mr. McDONALD (in reply): In rising to reply to some of the criticisms that have been urged from both sides of the House against this measure, it appears to me that with one or, possibly, two exceptions the attacks upon the Bill have been fairly weak. There is no doubt that the only contentious portion of the Bill is that which deals with agricultural labourers. Now it seems to me a most peculiar thing that any number of men should be asked to make sacrifices and to live in unhealthy and uncomfortable conditions, as many of them do, in order that another person may secure for himself, his wife and children a comfortable home in the future. Is the farmer some distance away from a railway, is it difficult for him to carry his produce to the railway; then let us at once spend thousands of pounds in building agricultural railways for him. Is he suffering from a bad season, then let us spend thousands of pounds in getting him free seed wheat. Is he suffering under difficulties as to a domestic water supply, then let us send boring parties and well and dam sinking parties all over the country and secure water for him. I do not object to these things at all; I welcome them, and I gladly support them; but on the other hand, let us ask the farmer to improve the conditions of his hired labourer; let us ask him to spend a few hundreds, or, possibly, thousands of pounds, according to the size of the holding, in order that the hired labourer may have a comfortable house to dwell in. But then we are told at once that we are interfering with the development of a great national industry. We help the farmer as far as we possibly can, because we recognise the development of the country depends to a very large extent on the agricultural industry; but at the same time we cannot lose sight of the fact that, while looking after the farmer, we are

also compelled to look after the labourer. Most of the objections deal with the difficulty of men going in and taking up land and clearing it. On the best possible authority in Western Australia I was told two days ago that one man, who left the public service two years ago and took up new country and cleared it and worked it, sold out last week for £1,900. That is a very fair profit for two years work.

Mr. Brown: How much capital did he put into it?

Mr. McDONALD: He took up the land under the ordinary conditions. Yet we are told by the critics of this Bill that when a man takes up new country he is not in the position to build homes for his working men. The same thing would apply to the purchaser of this land, and we will be told, seeing there is no accommodation on the block of this poor unfortunate new settler who has spent £1,900 to obtain it, that he is not in a position to spend any money on the improvements necessary for his working men. Among the many objections raised to the Bill I must admit the most reasonable was that raised by the member for Greenough, when he dealt with the definition of "agricultural labourer." The definition is not vague, it is quite the reverse, but it is not exactly what was intended. The Bill was drawn up by the Parliamentary Draftsman, and not by me. I trusted that the matter would be safe in his hands; and although I was invited to see a proof on the day of its distribution, I did not have sufficient time to go over it and find out such defects as there might be. The idea was that instead of "twenty-four hours" we should make it "fourteen days." I did not expect the Bill to pass without amendment, and I certainly intend to accept some of the amendments that have been suggested when the Bill goes into Committee. I want to deal with one or two complaints urged by the member for Moore in dealing with the possible want of cleanliness on the part of shearers in the huts. The hon. member said that pastoralists would come along and tell the men that a certain amount of money should be spent, or that certain work should be done, and

that they should refuse to do it and go away; but the Bill provides that the pastoralist has power to deduct from the wages of these men any sum amounting to £5 for each individual.

Hon. H. B. Lefroy: That is only on the order of the inspector.

Mr. McDONALD: The inspector would be there just about shearing time. Another remark made by the hon. member was that legislation of this kind was only burdening the Statute-book. I draw attention to the expression because it amply testifies to the fact that, no matter what comes forward in the direction of ameliorating industrial legislation, it is always considered by our opponents to be burdening the Statute-book with unnecessary legislation. The member for York asked what sort of a Bill I would bring forward next year if allowed. We need not waste time in discussing what may happen in the near future; but if it is necessary that I should bring forward a Bill in the interests of any portion of the working classes of Western Australia, or others, I shall certainly have the courage to bring it forward. Again, the hon. member spoke about the condition of the pastoralists and shearers in the North, and he asked was it reasonable that these men should get better accommodation than the managers of the stations on which they worked. We are not asking for it. We are only asking that a reasonable amount of accommodation be provided for. With regard to the fate of the Bill that was before Parliament last session when it reached another place, the hon. member is not entirely conversant with the facts. The Bill was turned down because there was not sufficient time for its consideration in another place. I would have been pleased had it been considered there, for then we would have known exactly where we stood if compelled to bring forward a Bill this session. In response to the remarks of the member for Beverley I may say that I received requests when bringing forward the Bill last session to place among the clauses some provisions dealing with agricultural labourers. These requests came from the Northam centre, the chief cen-

tre of the agricultural industry of the State. It is said there have been no complaints. The member for Cue, when speaking on a former motion, pretty well pointed out what I intended to say, that complaints did not come from many people when men were content to live in hovels and see their wives and kids starving and naked around them, because they could not see any way out of the difficulty. I regret the absence of the member for Murray-Wellington because I would have asked him to tell the House the conditions as he explained them to us last night when speaking on another Bill, the conditions that obtained in the old country when he first went to learn his trade. Although these things do not hold now, still there were no complaints from the great majority of the people then, but there were wise, far-seeing men, among whom I do not wish members to think I claim to be included, who saw that a remedy existed, and determined that that remedy should be made. I do not intend to say any more, but I hope that the Bill will go into Committee and that the clauses will be dealt with on their merits.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Mr. McDowall in the Chair; Mr. McDonald in charge of the Bill.

Clause 1—Short title and commencement:

Mr. MALE: The first day of January next was too early a date on which to bring the Bill into operation. Some notice should be given to the squatters and others concerned. He moved an amendment—

That in line 3 the word "January" be struck out, and "July" inserted in lieu.

Mr. McDONALD: So far as the Kimberley squatters were concerned, the amendment was unnecessary, because in the hon. member's own electorate the shearing was finished for the year, and, in any case, sufficient notice had already been given them to provide the necessary accommodation. However, no objection

would be offered to the amendment if the hon. member would make the word to be inserted "June" instead of "July."

Mr. MALE: The difference was so slight that the hon. member might just as well accept "July"; it was the beginning of the second half-year, and was altogether a more reasonable date.

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

| | | | | |
|------|----|----|----|----|
| Ayes | .. | .. | .. | 13 |
| Noes | .. | .. | .. | 20 |

Majority against .. 7

AYES.

| | |
|--------------|------------------|
| Mr. Allen | Mr. Moore |
| Mr. Brown | Mr. Nanson |
| Mr. Harper | Mr. A. N. Piesse |
| Mr. Lefroy | Mr. F. Wilson |
| Mr. Male | Mr. Wisdom |
| Mr. Mitchell | Mr. Layman |
| Mr. Monzer | |

(Teller).

NOES.

| | |
|---------------|------------------|
| Mr. Angwin | Mr. McDonald |
| Mr. Carpenter | Mr. Mullan |
| Mr. Dooley | Mr. Munzie |
| Mr. Foley | Mr. O'Loughlin |
| Mr. Gill | Mr. Scaddan |
| Mr. Green | Mr. B. J. Stubbs |
| Mr. Heitmann | Mr. Swan |
| Mr. Hudson | Mr. Walker |
| Mr. Johnston | Mr. Underwood |
| Mr. Johnson | |
| Mr. Lewis | |

(Teller).

Amendment thus negative!

Mr. MONGER: Would it be competent to move to strike out the date at which the Bill was to come into operation, and insert in lieu the words "after His Excellency's consent has been given to the Bill"?

The CHAIRMAN: The clause had already been dealt with down to and including the word January, and we could not now go back beyond that point.

Hon. J. MITCHELL: Most certainly the date for bringing the measure into operation was altogether too early, seeing that the Bill was scarcely likely to become law for the next two or three months. The result would be that the people most interested would have no notice whatever of the measure before it was in full operation. Mr. McDonald had himself agreed that June would be quite

early enough for bringing the measure into operation.

Mr. McDONALD: January would not be too early a date by any means. It was true that shearing in the Kimberleys started on March 28th, and finished about May, while on the Gascoyne it did not start until June 23rd; but in the Red Hill country and intervening districts it started much earlier. Therefore it was his intention to let the clause stand in its present form.

Mr. MALE: It was a pity the hon. member had not accepted July. It would be virtually impossible to bring the Bill into operation on January 1st if it did not become law for another couple of months. In any case very short notice would be given to the squatters, who, if they had a wet season, rendering carting impossible, would find themselves quite unable to secure the material necessary for the buildings. It would be more reasonable to bring the measure into operation at a time when it would be operative. He moved an amendment—

That in line 4 the word "thirteen" be struck out, and "fourteen" inserted in lieu.

Mr. McDONALD: Many of the pastoralists were only waiting to know what the specifications would be before they went on with the necessary buildings. In the event of the new buildings being delayed, no trouble would be made so long as the squatters showed that they were willing to comply with the measure.

Hon. J. MITCHELL: If the Bill were brought into operation in January next, it would be impossible for the squatters to make the provision required under the measure in time for the next shearing. It was their duty to allow sufficient time for people to comply with the measure after it became law. This applied particularly to the squatters in the far North, who were distant from the mail services and from timber yards. He was prepared to be helpful rather than critical. If a year would be too long, an extension of time could be granted by altering another clause.

Mr. MUNSIE: The amendment would delay the measure too much, and for that reason he opposed it.

Mr. FOLEY: The clause would have his support. Clause 18 provided that in special circumstances the Minister might grant exemptions and that the Minister might delegate his powers to the inspector. Mr. McDonald was wise in not accepting the suggestion to make the Bill operate after June. Shearing started earlier than that month but in the Gascoyne the measure would affect shearers, and the farther south they came more agricultural labourers and shearers would enjoy the benefit of the law next year, and they would be denied it if the time were extended.

Mr. MALE: To have enforced the law from the 1st July would have given reasonable time. He must regard it from the point of view of the people he represented, though the measure might be brought into operation in the southern part of the State much earlier. At the end of the year, mail communication with the far North was not as good as during the shipping season, and the rains which set in about the end of November made it difficult or impossible to get building material taken up the Fitzroy. He was justified in asking for the extension for six months and the only protection he now had was to substitute 1914 for 1913. He was certain the House would not grant it, but he urged it as a protest.

Mr. McDONALD: There was no part of Western Australia which could not be communicated with by mail inside of two months. Assuming that the Bill became law on the 1st January the measure should be known all over Western Australia by November. A wise man would then set to work to make the necessary provision. If the wet season prevented a man from securing the material, the Minister could grant exemption. He was not asking an impossibility, but where the Bill could be put into operation it should be done.

Hon. J. MITCHELL: It was a pity if Mr. McDonald committed himself to the retention of the clause because it did not give sufficient time to obey it. He

suggested that he should consider an amendment to extend the time mentioned in Clause 2, or later on recommit Clause 1 and agree to the insertion of June instead of January.

Mr. McDONALD: The accommodation should be provided in those places where the provision could be made by the time mentioned. In other places where that was impossible, exemption could be granted.

Hon. H. B. LEFROY: More time should be allowed before the measure was put into operation. Though a similar Bill was before the House last session it did not become law, and the people affected might assume that the present measure would not be passed. It was necessary to make regulations and they could not be framed in a few days.

Hon. J. MITCHELL: If Mr. McDonald took time to reflect he thought he would conclude that the amendment was reasonable.

Sitting suspended from 6.15 to 7.30 p.m.

Hon. J. MITCHELL: Did the member for Gascoyne still adhere to the determination not to accept the amendment?

Mr. McDonald: In the event of the clause passing as it now stood, the Bill could be recommitted, and a later month than January in 1913 inserted.

Mr. MALE: On the understanding that the clause would be recommitted he would withdraw his amendment.

Amendment by leave withdrawn.

Clause put and passed.

Clause 2—Saving:

Mr. MUNSIE: The hon. member exempted pastoralists' buildings where the total number of shearers employed in the shearing shed was less than eight, yet he proposed in another part of the Bill to compel the agriculturist to provide accommodation for one agricultural labourer. If the hon. member was not prepared to grant the same exemption to the agriculturists and would stick hard and fast to the exemption for pastoralists, it would be necessary to move an amendment to the first paragraph in Clause 2.

Mr. McDONALD: When the Bill was previously before the House the number was fixed at eight, and he had let it stand at that. It was not eight shearers, however. There were other men employed about the wool shed during the wool season.

Hon. J. MITCHELL moved an amendment—

That the following stand as paragraph vi.:—"To settlers during the first five years of their occupancy of conditional purchase lands, or to any agricultural settler for the first twelve months after the passing of the Act."

If the clause remained as it stood and buildings had to be erected by the 1st January next, it would be setting a most difficult task upon our farmers. The amendment would give them time to provide at a reasonable cost the accommodation the Bill required.

Mr. McDONALD: If the period in the amendment were reduced to three years from the granting of the lease, it would be accepted, because it was doubtful whether occupancy started from the date of the granting of the lease, or from the actual settling on the land. An instance was quoted during the second reading debate of one man without capital selling out for £1,900 in two years, so that three years was a reasonable limit.

Hon. J. MITCHELL: The amendment could read "from the granting of the lease," but the period should not be reduced to three years, because many of these conditional purchase leases had already run several years. In the case quoted by the member for Gascoyne, the man who got £1,900 cash no longer held the land, and the man who previously held the cash and now held the land no longer held the cash. He would be prepared to strike out the words "of their occupancy" with a view to inserting "from the granting of the lease."

The CHAIRMAN: The hon. member cannot move an amendment on his own amendment.

Mr. McDONALD: It was not easy to understand why the member for Northam insisted upon five years. In the event of

the paragraph being added to the clause, would it then be possible to amend it?

The CHAIRMAN: If the hon. member desired to amend the paragraph the amendment would have to be made before the paragraph was agreed to.

Mr. McDONALD moved an amendment on the amendment—

That in line 1 of the proposed new paragraph the word "five" be struck out and "three" inserted in lieu.

Mr. E. B. JOHNSTON: There was no occasion to reduce the five years. This period was not more than enough to enable a settler to get on his feet. In other legislation the Government had accepted five years as a period during which settlers should be specially considered, as, for instance, in the legislation dealing with land taxation. The member for Gascoyne would be well advised in giving these people at least five years' exemption.

Amendment (Mr. McDonald's) put and a division taken with the following result:—

| | |
|----------------------|----|
| Ayes | 19 |
| Noes | 17 |
| Majority for | 2 |

AYES.

| | |
|---------------|------------------|
| Mr. Angwin | Mr. McDowall |
| Mr. Carpenter | Mr. Mullaney |
| Mr. Dooley | Mr. Munsie |
| Mr. Foley | Mr. O'Loughlin |
| Mr. Gardiner | Mr. Scaddan |
| Mr. Green | Mr. B. J. Stubbs |
| Mr. Hudson | Mr. Senn |
| Mr. Johnson | Mr. Taylor |
| Mr. Lewis | Mr. Underwood |
| Mr. McDonald | (Teller). |

NOES.

| | |
|--------------|------------------|
| Mr. Allen | Mr. Mitchell |
| Mr. Brown | Mr. Monger |
| Mr. Gill | Mr. Moore |
| Mr. Harper | Mr. Nancon |
| Mr. Heitmann | Mr. A. N. Piesse |
| Mr. Johnston | Mr. Walker |
| Mr. Lander | Mr. F. Wilson |
| Mr. Lefroy | Mr. Layman |
| Mr. Male | (Teller). |

Amendment on amendment thus passed.

Mr. McDONALD moved a further amendment on the amendment—

That in line 1 of the proposed new paragraph the words "of their occupancy" be struck out and "after the

granting of the lease" be inserted in lieu.

Amendment passed.

Amendment (Hon. J. Mitchell's) as amended put and passed; and the clause as amended agreed to.

Clause 3—Definition:

Hon. J. MITCHELL: Under the clause the term "agricultural labourer" included every person employed for any period exceeding twenty-four hours. Why had the hon. member selected twenty-four hours as the limit? Frequently men who were legitimately temporary employees were employed for a longer period than twenty-four hours.

Mr. FOLEY moved an amendment—

That in line 3 the words "twenty-four hours" be struck out and "seven days" inserted in lieu.

Amendment passed.

Hon. J. MITCHELL: Was there any provision for exempting from the operation of the measure persons travelling stock?

Mr. McDONALD: It had never been his intention to suggest that men travelling on the roads with teams should have special accommodation provided for them by the employer. As a rule these teamsters slept in or under the waggon, and it was not necessary to include them in the Bill.

Mr. LANDER: Surely nobody had ever intended that teamsters and carriers should be provided with special sleeping accommodation. As a rule a good tarpaulin was all that these men required.

Mr. MONGER moved an amendment—

That after the word "sheep" in line 2 of the definition of "shearer" the words "on day, weekly, or other wages but not on piecework rates" be inserted.

His reason was to show the disparity existing between the rates of wages paid to shearers and those paid to other labouring men. The only worker who was given absolute preference over every other class of worker was the shearer. This was a fitting opportunity for members on the Government side to explain why shearers should be treated differently from other workers. Why should not the

man who could lay two thousand bricks a day be paid proportionately? A shearer who could do two hundred sheep a day was paid on the basis of the number shorn.

The Minister for Works: Quite right too.

Mr. MONGER: Then why should not the bricklayer be allowed the equivalent of the work he was capable of doing?

The Minister for Works: Because it would be ridiculous; you could not regulate them.

Mr. MONGER: Shearing was the only class of labour in which the men were paid for the work actually done; shearers were the only privileged section of the labouring community.

The Minister for Works: There are thousands of workers paid at piecework rates; they are paid at piecework rates if you can regulate it.

Mr. MONGER: Contract work was not to be allowed under the Arbitration Bill.

Mr. HEITMANN: Was the hon. member in order in discussing rates of pay and the Arbitration Bill, etcetera?

The CHAIRMAN: The hon. member was only making a comparison. I understand what he means.

Mr. MONGER: In moving the amendment he expected to have practically the support of every honest-thinking representative of labour.

Mr. McDONALD: The amendment would defeat the object of the Bill, which was to provide proper accommodation for shearers and others. Most of the employees, apart from contractors for fencing and well-sinking on a station, were shearers; the rest were on weekly wages. The amendment would mean that the weekly wages men would receive the accommodation and the shearers would not.

Mr. Taylor: You will have to alter the title of your Bill.

Mr. DOOLEY: The amendment would exclude the shearer. He could not see the logic of the amendment.

Mr. NANSON: It was one of the cherished ideals of members on the Government side that a man should not be paid more because he was a little stronger

or more energetic than another. He took it that Mr. Monger wished to see how far that principle was to be accepted in regard to the shearing industry. Was it to be taken as part of a trades unionist's creed that day wages and piecework were equally approved of, or was one superior to the other? Mr. Monger's argument, developed a little further, was that it was contrary to unionists' principles as usually accepted for a man to work at piecework.

The Minister for Works: It is not.

Mr. NANSON: Then the member for York must be wrong. It was well known, however, that unionists were in favour not of piecework but of day work.

Mr. Heitmann: What has that to do with shearers' accommodation?

Mr. NANSON: Mr. Monger argued that that being the case this was a Bill to benefit shearers, and the Arbitration Bill according to some members should provide that if a man was a non-unionist he should be deprived of all benefits. Mr. Monger's argument was that if a man was so untrue to unionist principles as to work on piecework he should be denied the benefit of the Bill under consideration.

Mr. FOLEY: In defining a shearer he failed to see why they should consider the question of the remuneration paid for this class of work. The object of the measure was that the shearer or other labourer should be provided with good accommodation irrespective of whether he earned £20 or 10s. a day. There were many men who worked in the shed on the day labour system. He failed to see how anyone on the Government side was breaking faith with the people who had returned representatives of labour.

Mr. GREEN: The amendment was simply a clumsy attempt to defeat the whole Bill. Not only would the shearer be excluded but also the farm labourer, as in many instances much of the work on the farms was done by contract labour. The member for Greenough tried to make the matter appear reasonable to members but it was very easily seen and it was transparent also, that the appeal to unionism of the member for York was just so much piffle, if

he might be permitted to use the term, in order to cover his real object.

Mr. GARDINER: It was surprising to hear the member for York professing to take up the cudgels on behalf of the unionists of Western Australia. It was obviously a direct attempt to upset the real question at issue. So far as the shearers were concerned, the hon. member made an admission that they were the only body of workers who were receiving just remuneration. It was pleasing to hear that and he agreed with the hon. member, inasmuch as the shearers received a certain measure of justice.

The Minister for Works: But they only work at a certain time of the year.

Mr. GARDINER: Yes, and in many cases they had to travel thousands of miles in order to get to their employment and they had to pay their own fares.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: The member for Greenough would lead the House to believe that piece-work was opposed to trade union principles.

Mr. Nanson: I did not say it was.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: Trades unionism permitted piece-work provided it could be regulated. It was impossible to regulate bricklaying, for the reason that laying bricks at a height of 3ft. was very different from laying them at a height of 5ft. Then again, there was also a difference in the class of bricks. There would be required so many conditions that it would be an utter impossibility to regulate piece-work, and if this was allowed the conditions would vary so much that sweating would be introduced. When we come to shearing it was a different proposition. Each shearer had equal opportunity and shearing was so easily regulated that there was no objection. Tailoring and bootmaking were done under piece-work conditions and all engaged in those industries were trades unionists. It was impossible however, as he had stated, to regulate it in the building trade because of the varying conditions. The amendment should not be taken seriously and he did not want

it to go forward that trades unionism was against piece-work.

Mr. McDONALD: There was a big difference between contract work and piece-work but at one time in this State sheep-shearing was paid for by day work.

Mr. Monger: I do not remember the time.

Mr. McDONALD: There was a station owner, whose name was as well known as that of the member for York, who once went alongside a shearer who was shearing 120 sheep a day, which meant that he was earning 30s. per day. This owner said "I am astonished at the wages you men earn now; when I was a young man I used to shear sheep for 8s. a day." The shearer said to him "There is a vacant pen, and here are a pair of shears, hop in and let us see what you can do." The station owner started shearing the sheep but before he had gone very far the shearer said to him "knock off, you are not worth even eight bob a day."

Amendment put and negatived.

Mr. MALE moved a further amendment—

That in the definition of "shearer" the following words be added "or any aboriginal native."

It was surely not the intention of the mover of this Bill to exclude natives, or that accommodation should have to be provided for natives, as it was provided for white shearers.

Mr. LANDER: It was to be hoped the amendment would not be carried. In the North-West it was a scandal the way in which the natives were being tampered with in reference to shearing. Not only now were aboriginal males employed in the work of shearing but the women were also secured to engage in that occupation.

Mr. GARDINER: The Committee should not include in the Bill anything which would lead the people to believe that we were condoning the employment of aborigines upon stations where they were not receiving adequate remuneration.

Mr. Male: How about the Government station?

Mr. GARDINER: The Government station was essentially a station for the

purpose of providing for natives. It was known that in the North-West there were many stations owned by wealthy men who did all their shearing by native labour, and if they were to be permitted to include natives they should be compelled to provide accommodation for them. He was hopeful of seeing a measure introduced this session which would have the effect of preventing natives from being employed in this particular occupation. He would not object to a native working alongside a white man provided that that native was receiving remuneration commensurate with the work he did.

Mr. MALE : Independent of the merits as to whether it was advisable or not to employ natives as shearers, it was not right to include natives in this Bill under the definition of shearer. Otherwise, if an owner had to provide accommodation for eight shearers, some of whom might be natives, it seemed to him that the accommodation would be in one or two huts. We should not mix up the accommodation for white shearers with that for black shearers. . .

Mr. NANSON : There seemed to be no provision in the Bill by which native shearers could be accommodated apart from white shearers. The definition of Asiatic did not include aboriginals, and in that case, unless the hon. member in charge of the Bill was prepared to move an amendment, he would be providing that aboriginals and white men might have to sleep in the same shed. . . .

Mr. McDONALD : That question might be safely left to the good sense of the shearers or shed hands. This measure did not recognise the aboriginal worker at all, and the hope of members was that before the session closed legislation would be brought down to prevent the present unpaid aboriginal slavery.

Mr. NANSON : The desire of the member for Kimberley was that the measure should not recognise the aboriginal shearer but at present it provided that the aborigine should have the same accommodation as the white shearer. The Asiatic shearer was excluded but not the aborigine.

Mr. McDONALD : On almost all stations where black labour was employed there were also white shearers, and there was no need to have a clause inserted in a Bill to compel white shearers to object to aborigines sharing their sleeping accommodation. If the owners of stations where natives were employed thought fit to provide proper accommodation for the natives, such action would be welcomed.

Hon. J. MITCHELL : The member for Gascoyne should accept the amendment.

Mr. McDonald : It gives tacit consent to the employment of natives.

Hon. J. MITCHELL : Natives were employed and were usually living on the station and fed the whole year round. It was no more desirable that natives should be confused with white shearers, than it was that Asiatics should be confused with white shearers.

Mr. GARDINER : It was to be hoped the amendment would not be carried, as the inference which would be drawn from the insertion of the words proposed was that members of the Labour party agreed that natives should work in this particular occupation. On the contrary, members were expecting an amendment of the Aborigines Act which would preclude natives working on pastoral leases unless they received adequate remuneration.

Hon. J. MITCHELL : It would be time enough to discuss an amendment of the Aborigines Act when the measure came forward. The natives employed about stations must be looked after, and the owners should be encouraged to do that.

Mr. FOLEY : The supporters of the Government were being asked to connect themselves with a policy they had long fought against. If white shearers were employed on the station they were strong enough to protect themselves. Members desired, by not recognising the aborigine at all in the Bill, to in some way protect him. Aborigines were engaged in almost every station employment and when they were employed as shearers it was desirable that they should be paid the same wages as the white man, because then the supremacy of the white

race would be shown. The black shearer might shear 50 sheep a day and in turn get no pay except perhaps good food, and immediately the shearing was completed there was nothing to prevent the employer turning the native adrift. Members who were supporting the Bill believed that the only way to discourage a man from using black labour and to bring about the supremacy of the white race, and the realisation of the White Australia ideal was to make the employer pay for the aboriginal labour under the same conditions as he paid for white labour.

Mr. UNDERWOOD : The member for Leonora was somewhat astray in his ideas of a White Australia. The Australian native had nothing to do with that policy ; the native was in the country and the Labour party had no desire to kill him off. Either the Government had to keep him or he must work to keep himself.

Mr. Foley : Then if he works let him be paid.

Mr. UNDERWOOD : Certainly, but the Labour party's advocacy of a White Australia was entirely apart from the aborigine. The Labour party believed in treating aborigines as fairly as possible. Their country had been taken from them, and it was better that they should work for their living than that the Government should keep them in idleness.

Mr. A. N. PIÉSSE : It was remarkable that the member for Gascoyne should decline to accept the amendment. According to the definition shearer meant any person employed in or about a shearing shed, but did not include certain persons who were specified. The blackfellow was not specified, and he was a shearer within the meaning of the definition, unless the amendment of the member for Kimberley was accepted.

Mr. GARDINER : The amendment only meant that the aboriginal shearer was not to be provided with accommodation under the Bill.

Mr. McDONALD : It was unnecessary to put in the clause anything dealing with the aborigines. The shearer no more meant an aboriginal than a brick-layer or a tailor. If creatures used

aborigines to shear and did not pay them it had nothing to do with the Bill. For the time being all that was asked was that the white shearer should get accommodation. If the pastoralist employed aborigines and was at all charitable let him give accommodation that was fitted to the black man.

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

| | |
|------------|----|
| Ayes | 11 |
| Noes | 22 |

Majority against .. 11

AYES.

| | |
|--------------|------------------|
| Mr. Allen | Mr. Moore |
| Mr. Brown | Mr. Nanson |
| Mr. Harper | Mr. A. N. Piésse |
| Mr. Lefroy | Mr. F. Wilson |
| Mr. Male | Mr. Layman |
| Mr. Mitchell | (Teller.) |

NOES.

| | |
|---------------|------------------|
| Mr. Angwin | Mr. McDowall |
| Mr. Carpenter | Mr. Munzie |
| Mr. Dooley | Mr. O'Loughlen |
| Mr. Foley | Mr. B. J. Stubbs |
| Mr. Gardiner | Mr. Swan |
| Mr. Gill | Mr. Taylor |
| Mr. Hudson | Mr. Thomas |
| Mr. Johnson | Mr. Underwood |
| Mr. Johnston | Mr. Walker |
| Mr. Lander | Mr. Heitmann |
| Mr. Lewis | (Teller.) |
| Mr. McDonald | |

Amendment thus negatived.

Hon. J. MITCHELL : Seeing the result of the amendment it would now be necessary for the member for Gascoyne to alter the Bill to provide that aborigines should have separate accommodation.

Clause as amended put and passed.

Clauses 4, 5—agreed to.

Clause 6—Sufficient accommodation in other building :

Hon. H. B. LEFROY : As paragraph (ii.) of Subclause 2 now read it might prevent the pastoralists putting up numbers of houses. In order to simplify and improve the wording he moved an amendment—

That paragraph (ii.) of Subclause 2 be struck out and the following inserted in lieu :—“ The sleeping rooms shall be made to accommodate not more than four persons or shall be divided

into compartments to accommodate not more than four persons."

Amendment passed.

Mr. FOLEY moved a further amendment—

That in Subclause 2 the following stand as paragraph (iii):—"The employer shall provide in each compartment a wire stretcher with mattress for each and every shearer; each mattress to have a removeable cover that may be taken off and washed."

This was no innovation. Every man employing labour believed in giving sufficient accommodation and this was a requisite when sufficient accommodation was spoken of. It was provided in many instances by pastoralists and agriculturists.

Mr. MALE: This was a most extraordinary provision. The clause provided that every employer should furnish proper, adequate and sufficient accommodation for the comfort and health of shearers. Surely that was sufficient. If we were to define every article to be provided there would be no limit to the Bill. Why, for instance, omit the pillow and the blanket? As one who lived in the North he would certainly object to sleeping on a mattress on a wire stretcher in summer time, and, objecting himself, he would not ask the shearer to sleep in such circumstances. At most he would provide for the shearer a cool canvas stretcher. No shearer would sleep on a mattress on a wire stretcher in Kimberley in March.

Mr. McDONALD: There were at least two well-known stations, one in the Gascoyne and one in the Roebourne district, the owners of which provided mattresses for the shearers. These mattresses were welcomed by the men. It was true that shearing in Kimberley lasted only three months, and was carried on in fairly warm weather; but there were other portions of the State to be dealt with, besides Kimberley. The amendment moved by the member for Leonora was a good one.

Hon. H. B. LEFROY: Any aboriginal employed about a wool shed would be a shearer under the Act, and, being a

shearer, would have to be provided with a wire stretcher and a mattress with a removable cover. The average aboriginal would not accept any such luxury; yet an inspector under the Act would come along and insist upon the stretcher and mattress being provided for the smallest aboriginal tar-boy. Like other hon. members he was desirous that proper accommodation should be provided for shearers, white or black, but surely there was some limit to be observed?

Mr. McDONALD: It was nearly time we gave the nigger some consideration. These aborigines did nearly all the work about the Northern stations. Only today he had received two sworn declarations showing the class of work being done by the aboriginal natives. One of these sworn declarations was by a man who had worked on sheep stations in Western Australia, and who swore that during this year he had seen aborigines, male and female, at work on some of the stations, sinking post-holes and running wire. The object in quoting this declaration was merely to show that the class of work being done by aborigines was not confined to shearing sheds.

Mr. FOLEY: Being a member of the Labour party, and, therefore, a reasonable man, and having heard the views of hon. members who had had experience in the industry, he was perfectly willing to substitute the word "suitable" for "wire."

The CHAIRMAN: The hon. member could not move to amend his own amendment.

Mr. GREEN moved an amendment on the amendment—

That in line 2 the word "wire" be struck out and "suitable" inserted in lieu.

Mr. MALE: That was not quite what he wanted. If the subclause read "The employer shall provide in each compartment a suitable stretcher for each and every shearer" he would raise no objection. Personally he preferred a canvas to a wire stretcher.

Amendment (Mr. Green's) put and passed.

Mr. MALE moved a further amendment on the amendment—

That the words "with mattress" be struck out.

Amendment passed.

Progress reported.

[The Deputy Speaker took the Chair.]

BILL—SUPPLY, £593,846.

Returned from the Legislative Council without amendment.

House adjourned at 9.24 p.m.

Legislative Assembly.

Thursday, 29th August, 1912.

| | PAGE |
|--|------|
| Questions: Resumed property, rents charged ... | 1382 |
| Ludlow clearing, preference of employment ... | 1382 |
| Cyclopaedia of Western Australia ... | 1382 |
| Railway project, Wongan Hills-Mt. Marshall ... | 1383 |
| Paper presented ... | 1383 |
| Bills: Industrial Arbitration, Com. ... | 1383 |
| Pearling, Com. ... | 1389 |

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

QUESTION—RESUMED PROPERTY, RENTS CHARGED.

Mr. FOLEY asked the Minister for Works: 1, Is he aware that the agents for Sir E. A. Stone have given tenants of property recently resumed by the Government notice to increase rents therefor? 2, Have the late owners power to so increase rents?

The MINISTER FOR WORKS replied: 1, No. 2, The department has not granted late owners any power to increase rents since the date of resumption. Under the Public Works Act owners of

property are entitled to receive the benefits of the property from the date of resumption to the date of payment of compensation, and when notices of resumption were sent to them they were all advised that they could continue collecting the existing rents until further advised by the department. The department has power at any time to collect the rents itself, and rebate to the owners—less cost of collection.

QUESTION—LUDLOW CLEARING, PREFERENCE OF EMPLOYMENT.

Hon. FRANK WILSON asked the Minister for Lands: 1, Is he aware that the foreman in charge of clearing at the pine plantation, Ludlow, has opened a store, which is in charge of his wife, and that it is freely stated that men dealing at his store receive preference of employment? 2, Will he cause inquiries to be made, and the evil remedied, if in existence?

The MINISTER FOR LANDS replied: 1, (a) The question submitted is the first intimation I have had of the matter. (b) Inquiries indicate that there has been no influence as suggested. 2, The matter will be thoroughly investigated.

QUESTION — CYCLOPAEDIA OF WESTERN AUSTRALIA.

Mr. BROWN (for Mr. Monger) asked the Premier: 1, Did he give a letter of reference to the South Australian firm now exploiting Western Australia with a publication called the *Cyclopaedia of Western Australia*? 2, Is he aware that this proposed publication is merely a glorified advertising scheme wherein only the people who pay have their biographies inserted? 3, Has he also undertaken to subsidise the book, and, if so, to what extent? 4, Where is the book to be produced?

The PREMIER replied: 1, The Hon. H. Gregory, when acting Premier, gave to the company a letter of approval, which letter the present Administration duly confirmed and endorsed, after sighting in