

Hon. E. H. Gray: In the big towns of the Great Southern they are working the day baking system at the present time.

Hon. H. Stewart: In only some of them.

Hon. J. DUFFELL: I am presenting the facts as they have been represented to me. I am chiefly concerned about the 23 bakers in the metropolitan-suburban area who state that the passing of the Bill in its present form will mean the end of their business.

The Honorary Minister: Are they small men or large men?

Hon. J. DUFFELL: They are men who do the work themselves without employing labour.

Hon. E. H. Gray: Or their children?

Hon. J. DUFFELL: The Bill contains some good features, and if the second reading be passed, we might be able to amend it in Committee to meet the cases to which I have referred. The position of the pastrycooks must be considered. If the Bill were passed in its present form, the pastrycooks would be very unfortunately placed. There is a conflict of opinion between the members of the Bread Carters' Union and the operative bakers as to the amendments required. Perhaps the Honorary Minister would consent to have the Bill referred to a select committee. The whole matter could be thrashed out in two or three days, and the Bill could then be presented in such a form that probably every member could agree to it. It is a measure that will have an important effect upon the community. It must result in an increase in the price of bread, and anything tending in that direction must receive careful consideration. There is no provision in the Bill to stipulate that the price of bread shall not be affected by the operation of the measure. I hope the Honorary Minister will agree to the appointment of a select committee.

On motion by Hon. W. H. Kitson, debate adjourned.

House adjourned at 9 p.m.

Legislative Council,

Thursday, 12th November, 1925.

					PAGES
Motion: Railway Dining Cars	1879
Bill: Day Baking, 2a.	1685

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

MOTION—RAILWAY DINING CARS.

Debate resumed from the 29th October on the following motion by Hon. A. Lovekin—

That the present system of leasing the dining cars on the railways, especially on the goldfields line, is detrimental to the best interests of the State, and should be immediately altered or revised.

THE CHIEF SECRETARY (Hon. J. M. Drew—Central) [4.35]: The railway dining car service between Perth and Kalgoorlie and vice versa has been attacked by three hon. members, namely, Mr. Lovekin, Mr. Cornell, and Mr. Macfarlane. Mr. Lovekin's chief complaint is about the fruit. He quotes the remarks of one of the delegates of the Imperial Press Conference who said, "I thought this was a good fruit-growing country. I suppose you export all that is of any value, and you yourselves eat the windfalls." Mr. Lovekin did not give the name of this Pressman. It was quite unnecessary for him to do so as the unkind observant revealed his identity. It is common talk that the hypercritical individual in question had not one good word to say publicly about Australia, whatever he may have had to say privately. I picked the gentleman myself at the first attempt, and my guess, if it can be called a guess, was the guess also of the Commissioner of Railways. The Commissioner, however, had more material to go upon than I had, for he had read that the same cynical gentleman had made a precisely similar remark in New South Wales when he asserted that that State was exporting the best fruit, and selling the windfalls locally. The facts are these: The car on the special train that brought the Press delegates from Kalgoorlie to Perth was served by the Department itself. If my information is correct the

visitor who complained of the fruit on that car must have been a man accustomed to super-fruit. I am assured by the Commissioner of Railways that the best fruit grown in Western Australia was on that particular car. Mr. Cornell sets out what he alleges the Trans-Australian train gives in the way of food for 18s., and he adds that on the Kalgoorlie express the same meals would cost at least 50 per cent. more. On the Trans-Australian train there is (1) dinner, (2) breakfast, (3) lunch, (4) dinner, (5) breakfast: five meals at 3s. 6d., equal to 17s. 6d.; two afternoon teas at 6d., equal to 1s., and two early cups of tea free. There are, therefore, five meals at 3s. 6d. and two afternoon teas at 1s., making a total of 18s. 6d., and two early morning teas free. On the Kalgoorlie to Perth express there is dinner at 3s. 6d., and breakfast at 2s. 6d., two meals for 6s., or 3s. per meal. In other words the price of meals on the Trans-Australian line is 3s. 6d., while on the Kalgoorlie to Perth train they average 3s., that is 3s. 6d. for dinner and 2s. 6d. for breakfast. How Mr. Cornell can say that those who patronise the local service are victimised to the extent of 50 per cent., I am quite unable to see. As a matter of fact, it is impossible by any manipulation of the figures to show that the meals served on the Trans-Australian railway are supplied at as low a price as ours, even with the two free afternoon teas thrown in. And yet Mr. Cornell alleges that we charge at least 50 per cent. more. I think he should have made some attempt to prove that allegation.

Hon. E. H. Harris: Did he not say the quality was 50 per cent. better?

The CHIEF SECRETARY: No. I quoted exactly what he did say. Mr. Cornell tells us "there are rumours abroad that are anything but savoury regarding the way in which the present contractor secured his contract." That is a very unfair way of putting it. If members are to make accusations in this House of unsavoury transactions having taken place, and base those accusations on rumours that are alleged to be abroad, no one's character will be safe.

Hon. C. F. Baxter: The present contractor for the dining cars has effected an improvement since he took over.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: So I understand. If Mr. Cornell had any reason to believe that there were "unsavoury" transactions, he should have tabled a motion

calling for the papers so that these rumours would either be scotched or the guilty parties brought to book. Mr. Macfarlane states that in his desire to supply the dining car with foodstuffs he has found that the standard quality foods are not bought by the caterer in all cases. He also says that in some instances local butter is not used. These are extraordinary statements if my information is correct. They would indicate that Mr. Macfarlane was revealing the business transactions between himself and the caterer.

Hon. J. M. Macfarlane: I am not referring to this caterer. I have done no business with him.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: It is not correct so far as this caterer is concerned. He buys his cream, milk, eggs and butter from farmers at Mokine and Claekline, and if that is so it is very improbable that he would continue to patronise them unless they were giving satisfaction. Members will agree that it is ridiculous to compare our dining cars with those on the Victorian railways. In the first place their passenger service is very much denser than ours. Their population averages 373 persons to the mile of railway, while ours is only 91. In Victoria they have a first class meal at one end of the car, and a second class meal at cheaper prices at the other end of the car. Our car has not the accommodation to provide separately for the different classes of meals. Probably comparisons are made of our average meal against the first class meal of Victoria, which is hardly just, I need not say, to our railways. Again, having to consider the pockets of all our passengers without distinction, the Commissioner cannot base his prices on what one might expect those to pay freely who can afford first class fares. Comparing our service with the Transcontinental service we find that on that train every passenger must, when buying his ticket, pay for all meals on the journey. This is a great and fundamental advantage to the caterer. He knows before the train moves off exactly how many meals he has to provide, and how many passengers he will have to cater for.

Hon. J. M. Macfarlane: He does not know how many want a meal.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: Their 4ft. 8½in. gauge gives them more room for cooking and service. Their cars are 10ft. 6in. wide, whereas ours on the 3ft. 6in. gauge are limited to a width of 8ft. 9in.

Theirs are much longer than ours, because ours are built on a smaller scale on account of the smaller gauge. One of the difficulties of the caterer has been to estimate, even approximately, the number of passengers who are likely to take meals. On one train practically every person will come to the car for meals; while on another perhaps only a quarter of them will do so. That has repeatedly been the experience. In the first instance that I referred to, it may not be easy to cater satisfactorily for an unexpected rush; and in the second instance there may be a considerable wastage of food. To obviate this difficulty the department have, in respect of transcontinental passengers, made provision for the adding of 6s. to the fare to furnish the passenger with breakfast and lunch on the Perth-Kalgoorlie journey and with dinner and breakfast on the Kalgoorlie-Perth journey, following the practice of the Trans-Australian railway. This has been in force only since the 1st November. The arrangement had been announced, but was not in operation, at the time when Mr. Macfarlane spoke, although he stated that some days previously a friend of his waxed wroth because two ladies who had been booked to travel by the Trans-Australian train over the Kalgoorlie line were charged an additional 6s. by the Railway Department for meals which they did not require as they were provided with a hamper.

Hon. J. M. Macfarlane: My informant told me he paid the amount.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: Either Mr. Macfarlane has been misinformed, or there has been on the part of the railway officials premeditated fraud which should be investigated. I am inclined to think, indeed I am almost certain, that Mr. Macfarlane has been grossly misled.

Hon. A. Lovekin: There might easily have been a mistake made in anticipation of what was coming.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: The department certainly do not attempt to get the last sovereign out of the lessee. They endeavour to co-operate with him in every legitimate way to secure a service satisfactory to the public. The department have tried the system of themselves running the cars, and have found by experience that a heavy loss results. They have tried the system of letting the dining cars to the highest tenderer without regard to suitability, and that system also has

failed. They are now trying the system of letting the cars at a reasonable rent with a due regard to the lessee's suitability as a caterer, and subject to such suitability as a primary consideration. Another alternative thought out was that the department should fix suitable rents and invite applications, giving the leases to those apparently possessed of the necessary qualifications; but this, even more than the tender system, would open the door to rumours that are anything but savoury, as mentioned by Mr. Cornell. Officials are naturally disinclined to leave themselves exposed to such insinuations. Besides that, the tender system in itself fixes the rent at a figure which can at least be considered reasonable; and it may be presumed that tenderers know their own business. The Commissioner of Railways states that his practice has been to inquire continuously from passengers of all sorts and conditions their opinions of the manner in which the dining car is conducted, and that from all quarters he has been given to understand that the service throughout has been very materially improved in the hands of the present lessee. Goldfields members may be able to confirm or refute that view, but the Commissioner will at all times be glad to hear anything they may have to say on the subject. It is suggested that this would be in every way better than the course which has been adopted. Members undoubtedly have a right to ventilate in this House any grievances that may oppress the public, but in a matter of this kind it seems to me that a more expeditious and more effective method of securing a remedy would be to report the matter either verbally or by letter to the Commissioner as soon as possible after the date of the cause of complaint arising. It is often extremely difficult to conduct a satisfactory investigation into matters that are several weeks old, and it is almost impossible to do so successfully after the lapse of a considerable time. The department have attacked the problem seriously, as the files which I have examined conclusively show. These files are quite open to Mr. Cornell or to any other member of Parliament by motion in either House, or by a visit to the office of the Commissioner of Railways. There is nothing whatever to hide in them, so far as I have been able to discover, and certainly there are no unsavoury transactions. Mr. Lovekin has moved that the present system should be immediately altered or revised. In what

way we are immediately to alter or revise it he does not say. If he has any suggestion to make, he can make it to the Commissioner of Railways, who will be glad to consider whether the proposed alteration or revision is likely to give any better results than those obtained at present. If such a suggestion does give promise of improving matters financially, or from the point of view of better service to the travelling public without too much financial loss, the Commissioner will be grateful to Mr. Lovekin for submitting it for consideration. But what the motion as it stands asks for, immediate alteration or revision of the existing conditions, without any indication as to the nature of the alteration or revision, may mean something in the nature of out of the frying pan into the fire: we may get a worse instead of a better service than we have now. For that reason I think Mr. Lovekin's motion should be rejected.

HON. J. W. KIRWAN (South) [4.54]: The Chief Secretary at the outset of his remarks referred to a statement that Mr. Lovekin attributed to one of the Press delegates concerning the quality of the food on the State railway between Kalgoorlie and Perth. I would remind the Chief Secretary that all the Press delegates did not travel on the special train that he referred to.

The Chief Secretary: I know that.

Hon. J. W. KIRWAN: Some of them came by the ordinary train. I have no idea which of the delegates Mr. Lovekin referred to as having made the remark.

Hon. A. Lovekin: This one came by the ordinary train.

Hon. J. W. KIRWAN: That perhaps is the explanation of the comment that was made. That delegate was an exception to the general rule, because the Press delegates had nothing except what was agreeable to say concerning Western Australia and the treatment they received here. None of the delegates made any remark to me that was in any way disparaging about the treatment they had received or regarding the products of the State. I think they adopted the policy that if they could not speak favourably they would be silent. However, so far as I could judge they seemed to be very favourably impressed with Western Australia and its products, and with the reception extended to them here. I think Mr. Lovekin and those who met the Press delegates will agree with me on this point.

Furthermore, I consider that those who were interested in the reception of the Press delegates have nothing but a feeling of gratitude to the Government for the way they assisted them in their desire that the delegates should form a favourable impression of the State. The Government placed railway trains at the disposal of the delegates, and did everything necessary in order that the delegates should go away with as good an impression as possible of Western Australia. I am sure every member of the reception committee feels that thanks are due to the Government for what they did in connection with the visit of the delegates.

Hon. J. Duffell: Are you opposing the motion?

Hon. J. W. KIRWAN: Speaking more particularly with regard to Mr. Lovekin's motion, I do not think there is any member of this House who travels more frequently on the train between Perth and Kalgoorlie and has more experience of that route than myself. I am quite in sympathy with the object Mr. Lovekin has in view, that something should be done to improve the meals on the Goldfields Express, because travellers coming from the Eastern States and leaving the Trans-Australian railway, where everything is carried on in a very up-to-date style, do undoubtedly get rather a bad impression from the contrast between that railway and the State railway. I can quite understand the difficulties that were referred to by the Chief Secretary in connection with the catering, but I do wish that something could be done in the interests of the State generally to make the contrast less marked, and to endeavour to bring the accommodation provided on our State railway somewhat more into line with what visitors who come from the East have experienced on the Trans-Australian railway. I constantly meet those travellers on the Kalgoorlie-Perth train, and their comments on the contrast between the Trans-Australian railway and the State railway are most marked, and not in the interests of the railway system of Western Australia or of the State generally. For that reason I would suggest to the Government that the dining car ought not to be run entirely with consideration to profit. It is a very bad advertisement for Western Australia if the dining car on the State train compares unfavourably with the dining car on the Trans-Australian train. It would be a good adver-

tisement for the State to bring our car into line with what visitors experience on the Trans-Australian line. It is quite true that there are difficulties in connection with the State dining car, but there are also great difficulties connected with the running of the dining car on the Trans-Australian line. In the latter case there are difficulties with regard to keeping food fresh, especially in summer, and yet those difficulties are overcome. Just as the difficulties have been overcome in the case of the Trans-Australian railway, I suggest that an endeavour should be made to overcome the difficulties which exist in connection with the State railway service. I do not know that the suggestion made by Mr. Lovekin in the motion he has proposed represents the best means of getting over the difficulty. What I would suggest is that the Government should make some endeavour—I am not in a position to suggest what it should be—to bring our dining cars more into line with the conditions that obtain on the Trans-Australian railway, and more in consonance with the reputation of the State generally, irrespective of the question of profit or loss. It is much more important to the State generally than perhaps those who do not travel constantly upon our railways, are in a position to realise. I suggest to Mr. Lovekin that his action in bringing forward the motion has resulted in ventilating the whole question. No doubt the discussion will do good, but Mr. Lovekin will put some of us in rather an awkward position if we are asked to vote on the motion. Perhaps he will see his way clear to withdraw it in due course.

HON. H. A. STEPHENSON (Metropolitan-Suburban) [5.2]: Having travelled considerably during the last four years on the line between here and the Eastern States, I consider the present contractor, who controls the dining cars on the Kalgoorlie run, has brought about a considerable improvement compared with the conditions that obtained previously. I do not mean to say that the present position is perfect, but it represents a vast improvement on that which obtained before the present contractor took charge. My experience during the last two years, at any rate, is that there is very little difference between the menu on the Trans-Australian railway and that put before passengers on the Kalgoorlie express. Perhaps the meals are served a little better because

there are advantages on the Trans-Australian railway that are not available on the Kalgoorlie express. Sometimes there are some 100 or 200 passengers travelling between Perth and Kalgoorlie, and the dining car can accommodate only 26 people at a sitting. You can imagine, Mr. President, what a rush there is, and how difficult it is for the waiters to pacify those who want to get in first but cannot succeed in that endeavour. My great objection regarding the conditions that obtain on the Kalgoorlie express has reference to the fruit supplied to passengers. It is a great pity that a better quality of fruit is not made available. Passengers are not provided with the first class fruit that they should receive. That also applies to the Trans-Australian railway. During the trip from Kalgoorlie to Port Augusta I have not been able to procure pears, peaches, plums, apples, or any other class of fruit of a reasonable standard. For instance, there may be a dozen cases of pears, but not one of the pears is fit to eat. When they are put on the table they are black and rotten. Not one of them is eatable. That is a great pity, and it reflects very much upon someone. I do not know who is responsible for the position. Australia is producing much more fruit than the people can consume, and the passengers who travel on our trains would be prepared to pay almost anything for good fruit, but it is impossible to get it. When I go to the Eastern States, the last thing I do is to visit some of the shops and load myself up with sufficient supplies of fruit to provide for my requirements until I reach Adelaide. The same thing applies on the return journey. Many people can be seen at the Adelaide station buying fruit at the stalls and coming on to the platform with large parcels of it. They do that because they are advised that they cannot get any on the train. It is certainly regrettable that people who are willing to pay good prices for fruit are unable to get supplies on the train, particularly as we have so many growers who are anxious to sell their produce. That is practically the only complaint I have to make regarding our dining cars since the present contractor undertook the control of the cars between Perth and Kalgoorlie. Certainly I do not travel as much as Mr. Kirwan does, but I have been travelling more or less during the last 25 years. One must realise the difficulties under which our din-

ing cars are run. It is no easy matter. There is very little to complain of at the present time with the exception of the fruit supply, and I hope the Government will make an effort in the direction of having the best quality fruit put on the tables. If possible, they should make arrangements so that people can buy fruit on the train. At Kalgoorlie 20 minutes are available during which passengers are able to supervise the transference of their luggage from the Kalgoorlie train to the Trans-Australian train, or vice versa, and if they go to the fruit stall at the station they can only get in all probability a few shrivelled apples. That position should be remedied. Apart from that I do not think the Government can improve much upon the present methods regarding the dining cars on the Kalgoorlie express. Under the present system the Government call for tenders and accept the one put in by the man they consider can best carry out the conditions laid down. In the circumstances, I cannot vote for the motion.

HON. W. H. KITSON (West) [5.7]: I cannot claim to have travelled often on the train between Perth and Kalgoorlie. During the last month or two, however, I have made several trips, and my experiences during that period were considerably better than they were a year or two ago. A wonderful improvement has been effected regarding the service generally and while there may be cause for complaint on occasions, I think it will be found, if inquiries are made, that perfectly satisfactory explanations can be obtained. For instance, I am told that quite recently there has been a considerable increase in the number of passengers between Perth and Kalgoorlie, principally stranded passengers from Fremantle, most of whom had to be supplied with meals. Seeing that he was without notice until the last moment, regarding the large increase in the number of passengers, the lessee was not able to render the service that was expected of him.

Hon. E. H. Harris: But that position has obtained during the last few weeks only.

Hon. W. H. KITSON: That is so, but my experience is that there is a considerable improvement on the train compared with the conditions that obtained in the past. There has been some criticism regarding the supplies of butter, eggs and fruit. I went to the trouble of making inquiries into that phase of the question. Bills were produced for my

inspection and these disclosed the fact that only the best of our local products are purchased. The eggs are procured from one of the best known producers in the State, a man who has a good reputation. The eggs are purchased in large quantities every week from the same place, and top prices are always paid. Documents were also produced which showed that only the best local butter was purchased. In fact, it was demonstrated that a higher price was paid for some of the butter than was the actual ruling rate according to the newspaper report for the day on which the purchase was made.

Hon. A. Lovekin: Have you the price?

Hon. W. H. KITSON: Yes. I can produce the document, but not at the moment. From what I was shown, I was satisfied that there was no cause for complaint on that score so far as the present lessee is concerned. It appears, however, that there is a bigger difficulty with regard to fruit, because I know, from my own observation, that some passengers are whales on fruit. It can hardly be expected that any lessee will provide an unlimited quantity of fruit during the course of a meal that costs 3s. 6d. With fruit at the price it is to-day, it could not be expected that much fruit would be provided at each meal. On the other hand, I agree that what fruit is provided should be of the best quality.

Hon. V. Hamersley: You can buy cases of fruit at 3s. 6d.

Hon. W. H. KITSON: Not at the present time. Apples, for instance, cost anything from 7d. to 9d. a lb.

Hon. V. Hamersley: That is all nonsense.

Hon. W. H. KITSON: I defy the hon. member to produce evidence to disprove what I say.

Hon. A. Lovekin: You should do as I do.

Hon. E. H. Gray: Yes, do without it.

Hon. W. H. KITSON: One hon. member remarked that if the fruit made available on the dining car were the equivalent of the fruit sold at the Perth station, there would be little cause for complaint.

Hon. A. Lovekin: I said that.

Hon. W. H. KITSON: I find that the fruit served in the dining cars is obtained from the fruit supplies on the station.

Hon. J. M. Macfarlane: Perhaps the best are picked out for the station and the rest sent aboard the train.

Hon. W. H. KITSON: That is hardly fair. I am putting before hon. members information that has been supplied to me and

I believe it to be correct. That being so, I do not think there is any cause for serious complaint regarding the position. I agree with the sentiment that we should supply the best fruit available. I believe it would be a good advertisement to the State if more were done in that direction. If we compare our service with those obtainable in other States, the prices charged and the facilities available for those who have to prepare the food and serve it on the trains, I think it will be found that we are doing very well at the present time. Personally I have had no cause for complaint, and apart from those mentioned in this Chamber, I have heard only one other complaint regarding this question. Consequently, while I am not prepared to say that there is no room for improvement, I do not think it can be a charge against the present lessee that he is not doing all that is possible in the circumstances.

On motion by Hon. V. Hamersley, debate adjourned.

BILL—DAY BAKING.

Second Reading.

Debate resumed from the previous day.

Hon. W. H. KITSON (West) [5.15]: The question of day baking as against night baking has been agitating the industry for a very long time. It is several years since first I had anything to do with this question. During that time I have found it necessary, owing to various positions I have filled, to attend quite a number of conferences dealing with this question. From time to time it has been thought that a satisfactory solution of the trouble was found, but no sooner have we thought that than something else has cropped up and our efforts have been nullified. The Bill is the result of a conference held between all the parties concerned.

Hon. C. F. Baxter: All the parties?

Hon. W. H. KITSON: The master bakers employing labour, the master bakers who do not employ labour, the country bakers and the Bakers' Union. In view of this, one would imagine there was very little cause for this Chamber to take exception to the Bill. The hours mentioned in the Bill are not those that were originally in the Bill. They represent a compromise arrived

at as the result of the conference to which I have alluded. All the parties to that conference are satisfied that under the Bill there will be no hardship imposed on any of them, and that it will mean quite a big difference to the trade in that the many arguments that have cropped up in the past will not recur. There can be no question of the truth of the remarks of Dr. Saw, who dealt with the question from the point of view of health. From personal knowledge I know that the majority of bakers who have had experience of night working, dread the necessity for going back to that system. In view of the fact that there is now no necessity for it, I think the Chamber should take the same view as the conference took and agree with the provisions of the Bill. Where night baking is in vogue, the baker has to work by night, year in and year out. He is not like a shift worker, this week on morning shift, next week on afternoon shift and the week after on night shift. There is no relief for him. He must work year in and year out under the same conditions. But the Bill will give him relief. Some members have said the Bill will affect the country bakers. I fail to see that the Bill will have any very great effect on country bakers, since I am informed that at least 97 per cent. of the country bakers are at present on day work. Only very few of them are working by night.

Hon. E. H. Harris: Then there is no occasion to apply the Bill to them.

Hon. W. H. KITSON: The two or three who are working by night should not feel any great inconvenience as the result of having to work by day instead.

Hon. C. F. Baxter: A much larger number than you suggest have to work to meet the railway service.

Hon. W. H. KITSON: That interjection might have to be considered. But from inquiries made I find there is nothing in that question that cannot be overcome under the Bill. The spread of hours provided in the Bill—from 5 o'clock in the morning to 8 o'clock at night—is sufficiently long to meet all contingencies. I have inquired into the statement made here as the result of a letter received from a master baker at Albany. The actual position is this: the baker alluded to is employing two operatives, both of whom have been in his service for a number of years. The employer himself makes the dough during the day, and his employees bake the bread

at night. The employer's objection is that in the event of the Bill becoming law the position will be reversed, and he will have to make the dough by night, or get someone else to do it, whilst his operatives will have the privilege of working by day, a privilege they have not had for many years past.

Hon. E. H. Harris: Is it that the bakers do not want it, or that the employer does not want it?

Hon. W. H. KITSON: The bakers themselves would welcome it.

Hon. E. H. Harris: The letter said it was not so.

Hon. W. H. KITSON: The letter was from a master baker, and I claim that he cannot speak for the whole of the bakers in Albany. One of his operatives has been employed by him for 16 years. During that period he has been working longer hours than is provided for in the award. He has not received any overtime payment for it, and indeed he has been working for considerably less wages than is provided for in the award.

Hon. J. J. Holmes: The Arbitration Court, not Parliament, deals with that.

Hon. W. H. KITSON: In other words he is a non-unionist, and it is a non-unionist shop employing men under conditions that would not be allowed by the Arbitration Court. For instance, the operative I refer to is receiving £4 2s. 6d. per week for anything up to 60 hours per week, whereas he should be receiving £5 10s. for a week of 48 hours. The other operative referred to in that letter has been with the same employer for a number of years. He has not been employed as a baker for the period mentioned by Mr. Stewart. He was originally one of the bread carters, but is now employed as a baker and is receiving £3 2s. 6d. per week instead of £4 15s., while he is working the same hours as the other baker, namely, anything up to 60 per week, and receiving no overtime payment for the time worked over 48 hours. Take these facts in conjunction with the sentiments expressed in that letter, and also with the statements I have made in regard to the employer himself at present working by day, and the necessity for his working by night if the Bill becomes law, and you get the reason for his protest.

Hon. H. Stewart: He is one of the most widely respected citizens of Albany.

Hon. W. H. KITSON: He is the only master baker in Albany at present compelling his employees to work by night, and the only one I am aware of who is employing his servants under the conditions I have alluded to.

Hon. E. H. Harris: Is he bound by an industrial award?

Hon. W. H. KITSON: I do not think he is.

Hon. J. J. Holmes: Then if he be subject to no award, how can he be underpaying his men?

Hon. H. Stewart: I read out a letter signed by all the four master bakers of Albany.

Hon. W. H. KITSON: Those two operatives are not members of the Bakers' Union. Reference was made to what happened when the secretary of the Bakers' Union went to Albany. I am informed that what actually happened was that this master baker refused to meet the secretary. That is what happened. Mr. Baxter alluded to the bread carters and said the Bill would be prejudicial to them. Let me tell him that the Bread Carters' Union have no objection to the Bill.

Hon. H. Stewart: You have not referred to the other bakers employed by the four master bakers in Albany.

Hon. W. H. KITSON: Mr. Stewart said there were only three journeymen bakers in Albany.

Hon. H. Stewart: That is right. What about the third?

Hon. W. H. KITSON: I can inform Mr. Stewart that there are five journeymen bakers in Albany and that, naturally, they are all in favour of the Bill.

Hon. H. Stewart: There are four master bakers in Albany.

Hon. W. H. KITSON: And with the exception of the one who wrote that letter to Mr. Stewart, they are all in favour of day baking.

Hon. H. Stewart: Not the master bakers?

Hon. W. H. KITSON: Yes, the master bakers.

Hon. H. Stewart: But I have here the letter signed by the whole of them.

Hon. W. H. KITSON: The bread carters will not be affected by the Bill. Incidentally, the employer quoted by Mr. Stewart is not paying his bread carters the award rate.

Hon. J. J. Holmes: But you told us there was no award rate.

Hon. W. H. KITSON: I did not say that at all. There is a Federal award, and some time ago this particular employer should have paid his employees a considerable amount of money in retrospective pay. Moreover, he is continually committing breaches of the award.

Hon. E. H. Harris: But a Federal award binds only the parties to the award. I suppose he never was a party to it.

Hon. W. H. KITSON: He was.

Hon. E. H. Harris: And is now?

Hon. W. H. KITSON: So far as I know, yes.

Hon. H. Stewart: Has he been convicted of breaches of the award?

Hon. W. H. KITSON: If he has not, he should have been.

Hon. H. Stewart: A new Daniel come to judgment!

Hon. W. H. KITSON: These questions flying about the Chamber show that members have not due appreciation of the difficulties there are in the way of policing many of these awards in country districts.

Hon. H. Stewart: Your statement reflects upon a man's character. He must have felt pretty sure of his position before he wrote that letter and so courted criticism.

Hon. W. H. KITSON: And I am equally sure of my position. As a matter of fact, if his employees belonged to the union, it would be impossible for him to carry on.

Hon. J. J. Holmes: I suppose his best customers are the unionists?

Hon. W. H. KITSON: They have to buy their bread somewhere, and I presume this baker sells as much bread as does any other baker there.

Hon. H. Stewart: Is he bound by an award applying to Albany, and is he breaking the award?

Hon. W. H. KITSON: He is not paying the wages that he should be paying.

Hon. H. Stewart: Is he bound by an award?

Hon. W. H. KITSON: I presume he is, just as other bakers are.

Hon. E. H. Gray: He is not observing the honourable practice of the profession.

Hon. H. Stewart: Yours is a pretty weak case.

Hon. W. H. KITSON: It is one of the strongest that has come under my notice.

Hon. C. F. Baxter: Then it has been very weakly presented.

Hon. W. H. KITSON: If members desire to have full information, I am prepared to supply it, but I do not wish to enter into unnecessary details.

Hon. E. H. Harris: When you are giving full information, use the "Industrial Gazette," which shows that there is only one baker's agreement in Western Australia, and that applies to the metropolitan area.

Hon. J. R. Brown: The others have industrial agreements.

Hon. W. H. KITSON: Mr. Harris does not quite understand the position. Though there are a few exceptions, most of the bakers here and in the other States have adopted day baking. If members desire to know the hours that are being worked in other States, I can supply them.

Hon. C. F. Baxter: What about Victoria?

Hon. W. H. KITSON: There it is all day work.

Hon. C. F. Baxter: It is not; they start at midnight.

Hon. E. H. Gray: That is where you are wrong.

THE PRESIDENT: The hon. member cannot ask questions and answer them as well.

Hon. W. H. KITSON: Quite recently legislation has been passed in New South Wales providing for baking between the hours of 6 a.m. and 6 p.m. In Queensland the hours are 8 a.m. to 8 p.m. In South Australia the starting time is 6 a.m.

Hon. C. F. Baxter: A day baking Bill has been rejected in South Australia.

Hon. W. H. KITSON: But the measure contained other provisions. In Victoria day baking is observed, but I do not know the hour of starting.

Hon. C. F. Baxter: They start at midnight.

Hon. W. H. KITSON: I repeat that day work is observed in Victoria.

Hon. C. F. Baxter: Then you are misinformed.

Hon. W. H. KITSON: If that is so, I have been misinformed by people whose business it is to know. Day baking is carried on in all the country centres of this State as far north as Wyndham. Mr. Holmes suggested that there might be some difficulty if the measure were applied to the North. I can tell the hon. member that in the North the spread of hours stipulated in this Bill is being observed. There the bakers make the dough in the morning and bake the bread in the afternoon.

Hon. H. Stewart: I think your statement is too broad a generalisation, the same as your replies to my questions.

Hon. W. H. KITSON: Apparently the day is the most suitable time to bake bread. Those engaged in the industry are the most competent to decide the point, and their views should be respected. This is one of the best measures that have been introduced into Parliament. Its effect will be two-fold: it will obviate the necessity for men to work at night and will avert many industrial troubles such as have been experienced during the last few years. As the people engaged in the industry are agreed that this Bill will give them what they desire, we should allow them to carry on the industry as they wish. As the parties to the agreement prevailed upon the Minister for Works to alter the hours to those contained in the Bill, we can do no other than agree to the proposal and pass the Bill.

Hon. H. Stewart: For the metropolitan area?

Hon. W. H. KITSON: No, for the whole of the State.

HON. J. J. HOLMES (North) [5.36]: I have listened to the debate very carefully and one thing that has puzzled me has been the continual reference to undesirable competition. We are told that the two parties are in agreement on this matter, the large employers of labour and the large body of employees, and repeated reference has been made to undesirable competition.

Hon. E. H. Gray: Unfair competition.

Hon. J. J. HOLMES: This leads me to inquire, "What is undesirable or unfair competition?" If the Bill aims at creating a monopoly for the large employers of labour and the great body of employees, and the small bakers are regarded as causing undesirable competition, there are two other sections of the community that will suffer. With any combination aiming at excluding the small bakers—which must be the object of the big employers and the big body of employees—the principal sufferers will be the public. I have no sympathy with any complaint about undesirable competition of that kind, because the public must always suffer where a combination exists. We should consider this Bill from the public standpoint. I can quite imagine that there are a lot of small bakers in the community, men starting in a

small way, and desirous of ultimately becoming larger bakers employing a number of hands. As their businesses develop they will come into competition with the bigger bakers, and the more competition we have, the cheaper will bread be to the consumer. If this Bill aims at removing such competition, I do not think it will meet with much sympathy in this Chamber. Another aspect is this: If we create a monopoly that will wipe out all the smaller bakers—

Hon. E. H. Gray: There is no danger of that.

Hon. J. J. HOLMES: The supply of daily bread will be in the hands of two parties—the large employers of labour and the large body of employees. We must remember what has happened in the past and what will happen again. If we had a body of employees controlling the bread supply, they could when it suited them, cut off the supply and there would be no small men to keep the public served with bread. It is idle to talk to me about the small baker causing undesirable competition. He is the man we should encourage; yet he is the man that the Bill proposes to get rid of.

Hon. J. R. Brown: How will it get rid of him? Be reasonable!

Hon. J. J. HOLMES: We are told there is an agreement. I have been circularised by the big baker who wants to get rid of the small man, and I have been circularised by the big body of employees who also wish to get rid of the small man. While the small man is operating, the big man cannot put up the price of bread; nor will the big body of employees be in a position to dictate their own terms. Mr. Kitson has referred to the award. He said a baker at Albany was not paying the award rate. When he was challenged on the statement, he had practically to admit that there was no award.

Hon. E. H. Gray: Country bakers should receive higher wages than those in the town.

Hon. J. J. HOLMES: We have heard criticism from Mr. Kitson's side of the House about the proposal to review the basic wage, and yet the hon. member himself would set up the rate of pay to be paid by a baker in a certain town, without there being any award.

Hon. W. H. Kitson: It shows that you did not understand my remarks.

Hon. J. J. HOLMES: The hon. member did not understand them himself; he got away from the point very quickly and went on to deal with something else. Still he

assumed the position of the President of the Arbitration Court, by stating that a baker at Albany was paying less than he calculated should be paid. That is only blank ammunition that will have no effect upon members here. Assuming that we hand over control of the bread supply to these two great bodies, what would happen? What would happen if we had another strike of tearoom employees?

Hon. E. H. Gray: That would make no difference to the bakers.

Hon. J. J. HOLMES: Has the hon. member never heard of a sympathetic strike, of one body of workers striking in sympathy with another body of workers? Had the bread makers' union been in a position at that time to cut off the bread supply from the public, who would have won?

Hon. J. R. Brown: The strikers.

Hon. J. J. HOLMES: The strikers would have won without there being any justification for their demands. They had their award and they had the Arbitration Court to appeal to. If they had been able to control the bread supply of the people, it would have been cut off from sympathetic motives, and the strikers would then have been in a position to dictate to the master caterers, and continue to set the court at defiance.

Hon. W. H. Kitson: They could do that now if they desired.

Hon. J. J. HOLMES: When they desire and when the time is opportune, they will do it if the House is foolish enough to give them this Bill. When we have established an Arbitration Court to deal with these matters, I do not want to see the public put in the position of being starved into submitting to the unjust demands of any union.

Hon. E. H. Gray: But they are not unjust.

Hon. J. J. HOLMES: If they are unjust the Arbitration Court is there to decide the matter. When we finish with the Arbitration Bill in the manner in which this House will finish it, we will possibly include the bakers. As the Minister desires that the court shall deal with all matters, then let the court deal with this as well. We have to remember that the Bill will affect every part of the State. Reference has been made to Wyndham. If Mr. Gray does not know, he ought to know, that the men who work at Wyndham go there in the winter months. A great body of men proceed to Wyndham every year and they are well paid and underworked. I think they finish their day's

work at noon after having started at 8 o'clock. They get their fares paid to Wyndham and up there the best cuts out of every bullock are supplied to them. Mr. Gray referred to climatic conditions, but he visualised the Bill only from the standpoint of Fremantle and Perth.

Hon. E. H. Gray: It suits Carnarvon.

Hon. J. J. HOLMES: I want the Bill visualised from the far North. It is no use looking at the subject through Mr. Gray's spectacles, because his vision is circumscribed by the harbour at Fremantle, and it is obscured at times by police, rifles, bayonets, etc. I ask Mr. Gray to try to get past that and to look at the position as it will affect not only the metropolitan area, but the whole of the State, and to remember that if we get the bread supply of the people in the hands of two bodies, the people will be starved into submitting to the demands the union may choose to make. This proposed legislation is only in keeping with a lot of other legislation that is put up for us to make equitable or perhaps to establish a record in the way of Bills rejected by this House in one session.

Hon. E. H. Gray: In this case all the parties are in accord.

Hon. J. J. HOLMES: If all legislation that is submitted were loaded as this Bill is, I would be prepared to throw out the whole of it.

Hon. E. H. Gray: No fewer than 33,000 unionists, in addition to the master bakers, are supporting the Bill.

Hon. J. J. HOLMES: There is a well paid body from which I think we should have heard something in regard to this subject. I refer to the Royal Commission on Prices that is now sitting. For a long time they inquired into the food supplies of the people and in respect of bread they took a great deal of evidence. I have had a good deal to do with Royal Commissions, and I know that after having heard voluminous evidence it is necessary to prepare a report very quickly, otherwise you are likely to forget the important points. The Prices Commission, I understand, propose to continue their investigations until next session. Incidentally there will be a very big bill to foot, but apart from that the evidence taken this year will be entirely forgotten next year when the Commission will set about preparing their report. Knowing that this Bill was coming up for consideration, and remembering that every baker in the metropolitan

area has given evidence before the Commission, we might at least have had a preliminary report from the Commission, a Commission that is overpaid and underworked. I cannot conclude my remarks without making a reference to what was said by Dr. Saw. That hon. member, if I correctly interpreted his remarks, told us that he intended to support the Bill this year because he declared last year that if the measure was submitted in a separate form he would assist to put it through.

Hon. A. J. H. Saw: Provided it was brought in as a separate Bill.

Hon. J. J. HOLMES: I understood Dr. Saw to say last night that he did not want this Chamber to have anything to do with the Arbitration Court, the basic wage, hours, wages, or anything else. I assume that Dr. Saw has been caught napping, that he does not want to support the Bill now, but that because of his promise last year he feels compelled to do so.

Hon. A. J. H. Saw: Your assumption is wrong.

Hon. J. J. HOLMES: The fact remains that Dr. Saw wants this Chamber to decide when and how the people's bread shall be baked, while in regard to other questions he wants the Arbitration Court to decide. So far as consistency is concerned, I can claim to be far more consistent than the hon. member. I do not propose to say any more except that I shall be reluctantly compelled to vote against the second reading.

HON. J. M. MACFARLANE (Metropolitan) [5.53]: The object of the Bill is to regulate the hours of baking by statute, rather than by an award of the court. I agree with Mr. Holmes that this is a matter that should be dealt with by the court rather than by statute.

Hon. E. H. Gray: The Arbitration Court has no jurisdiction over the man who does not employ labour.

Hon. J. M. MACFARLANE: From the remarks of the Honorary Minister the House might be justified in passing the second reading because of the assurance given that an agreement has been arrived at on the subject between the employers and the employees. I have reason to believe, in fact I am certain, from correspondence that I have received, and as a result of conversations I have had with various people, that

an important section of the community has been overlooked.

Hon. W. H. Kitson: Who are they?

Hon. J. M. MACFARLANE: The Metropolitan Master Pastrycooks' Union of Employers. We were told that these people were exempt from the operations of the Bill, but I assure the House that that is not the case. There is also another question which is very much in doubt, and which I would like to have cleared up, and that is in regard to the baking of Vienna bread. There is a firm at Subiaco who have a very large plant. This was installed at a cost of £2,000, and was designed specially for the manufacture of Vienna bread.

Hon. E. H. Gray: They will not be affected at all.

Hon. J. M. MACFARLANE: When the Honorary Minister was introducing the Bill he told me that they would be affected. I would like to know from the Leader of the House, in the absence of the Honorary Minister, whether what I have stated is correct. There are other reasons why I believe the maker of Vienna Bread will be seriously affected by the Bill. Another section of the industry, and an important section too, is that represented by the bread carters. They constitute 60 per cent. of the industry, and I am prepared to say that up to date they have not been consulted.

Hon. E. H. Gray: That is not so.

Hon. C. F. Baxter: I have had the same information from a number of them.

Hon. J. M. MACFARLANE: These people are greatly concerned about this proposed legislation. One man to-day told me that they were not quite so much concerned about it now as they were at the start. The fact remains that they are concerned because they know they will have to complete their work within the award hours. Here, then, is one of the anomalies. The bread carters are affected by an arbitration award and the Bill proposes to bring 40 per cent. of those engaged in the industry under the proposed law. The carters have an award which compels them to complete their week's labour at noon on Saturday. The Bill is designed to stop baking on Friday at 8 o'clock, resuming again on Sunday morning at 5. The Bill is totally callous in its application to the public interest. I am informed that the carters start at 6 on Saturday morning and they have to finish delivering by noon. In that interval they must deliver

what is equivalent to two and sometimes three days' supply of bread in order to accomplish what is required of them. It sometimes happens that Monday is a holiday and some families have to be supplied on Friday from Thursday's baking so that the carters may endeavour to get through their work. It can easily be realised, however, that it is quite impossible for the carters to do so. The result is that the consumers often get bread on the Monday or the Tuesday that is not palatable. The Bill is designed to abolish night baking. To my mind the title of the Bill is a misnomer. Advocates of the Bill have told us that 25 per cent. of the men employed in the industry have to make dough and the other 75 per cent. will be engaged on day baking. I cannot see why a change over of shifts should not take place, relieving the dough maker from continuous night work. Bakers will be employed baking on five days out of the six in the day time and I think it only fair that on the sixth day they should be permitted to work from 12 o'clock midnight, to get out a loaf that will be palatable and, from the consumers' point of view, will represent value for what is paid. The changeover could readily be made.

Hon. E. H. Gray: It could not be done.

Hon. J. M. MACFARLANE: It can be done if baking from midnight is allowed on Fridays. It would be necessary to alter the carters' award, I admit. That would be a good thing, because the public were not considered at all when that award was made.

Hon. J. Duffell: Would not the carters have to work every Saturday afternoon?

Hon. J. M. MACFARLANE: Not if baking were started at midnight on Friday. It is strange that the Government should be so much concerned about day baking. The Minister who brought down the Bill has any number of mining constituents in his division, as has also the Leader of the House. Those men are working in perpetual night, whether their shifts are by day or night. We know how the men who are working in the mines become affected by pneumoconiosis, dust, draught and heat, all these conditions being dangerous to their health. I have often wondered indeed whether the game is worth encouraging, because it costs so much money to get an ounce of gold, and yet the Minister, who

brings down the Bill, supported as he is by other members, does not say a word about the mining industry.

Hon. E. H. Gray: This Bill has nothing to do with the mining industry.

Hon. J. M. MACFARLANE: It is the thin edge of the wedge in the direction of having day work for everything.

Hon. J. J. Hoimes: Should not the Arbitration Court decide the matter after hearing evidence?

Hon. J. M. MACFARLANE: That is my view. The matter should not have been brought to the House.

Hon. V. Hamersley: The principle will kill every industry.

Hon. J. M. MACFARLANE: The advocates of the Bill are asking for relief from night work for men who can get relief from it on five days a week, and yet they make no reference to such an occupation as flour-milling, which has also similar conditions to baking, and in which there is a lot of night work.

Hon. E. H. Gray: The flour mill employees work in shifts.

Hon. J. M. MACFARLANE: The men can do so in the case under review. Then I would refer to telephone exchanges, breweries, glass works and newspaper offices. I do not care whether I get my news at 6 o'clock in the morning or in the evening.

Hon. J. R. Brown: But you want your bread early.

Hon. J. M. MACFARLANE: It would be no hardship for the people to get their news by midday.

Hon. A. J. H. Saw: We will get Mr. Lovekin to draft a special clause to meet the case.

Hon. J. M. MACFARLANE: In Melbourne and Sydney special editions of the newspapers come out at nearly all hours of the day. Why the supporters of this Bill should be so concerned about night baking, when the baker is really working in the day, I am at a loss to understand. The charge made by one master baker is that it is all due to the activity of a member in another place, whose endeavours are ceaseless on this particular point. It seems to be an obsession with him. One or two of the master bakers, I gathered were prepared to accept this Bill on the ground that it will lead to industrial peace.

Hon. E. H. Gray: That is a good argument.

Hon. J. M. MACFARLANE: This incessant driving to force them to do what they are already doing is enough to make them agree to the Bill. They want to get rid of this intolerable and undue interference from outsiders. The Bill can be regarded as being the result of union domination, and not designed to meet the public needs.

Hon. E. H. Gray: What about the international opinion?

Hon. J. M. MACFARLANE: If the framers of the Bill thought so much about the international recommendations, why did they not adopt them in full? They have not done so. It is idle for them to say that we should swallow all this. Great Britain has not done so.

Hon. J. Nicholson: The recommendations are not to have effect until 1927.

Hon. J. M. MACFARLANE: Why should they affect us?

Hon. H. Stewart: One would imagine that the passing of these resolutions was equivalent to the passing of an Act of Parliament.

Hon. J. M. MACFARLANE: It seems that these recommendations have been used in order that those responsible for this measure may gain their ends at almost any cost. I have a brochure dealing with night baking and certain statutory declarations and statements from the Federal Master Bakers' Association of Australia, showing the case against the abolition of night work in bake-houses. In a sworn statement Walter J. Hill, on 7th March, 1925, before Mr. S. M. Whittington in Adelaide, says—

On the 10th day of April, 1919, a further variation of the award was made on the application of the Master Bakers' Association. This alteration was found necessary in order that the convenience of the holiday-making public should be met. The application was resisted by the employees, but His Honour, President Brown, varied the award in such a way as to permit work to be started at 12.1 a.m. on any public holiday which fell on a Monday for the purpose of the making and baking of bread or rolls for restaurants (not being hotels), cafes, racecourse and picnic stands and ham shops. He found that the general drift of the evidence went to show that the holiday-making public wanted fresh sandwiches and wanted them early. By a submission filed on the 4th day of October, 1919, the employees asked for the old award to be rescinded, and repeated their claim for an 8 a.m. starting time. The matter was again thrashed out, but the president refused the application, and in the result, whilst rescinding

the old award, made a new award which increased the number of hours during the night on which the work could be done in the bake-house at the usual rates of wage, and also lifted the bar on other hours by allowing work at any time at special rates of pay. The material portions of the award are as follows:—Making and baking of bread and rolls, Mondays to Fridays, starting time 5 a.m., finishing time 6 p.m.; Friday nights and double and treble nights, starting time 6 p.m., finishing time 11 a.m. the following day.

If the Bill had contained a provision like that, I should have been prepared to support it. I believe it would have given the public a better deal, and met with the wishes of the supporters of the Bill. Unless some such provision is promised, I will vote against the second reading of the Bill, and will divide the House when we reach that point in Committee. In this brochure are affidavits from people in nearly every State of the Commonwealth, all of them being along the same lines. Strikes have taken place over this matter, and struggles lasting from six to eight weeks occurred both in Sydney and Melbourne. Finally, the employees found that the public were against them, and they went back to work because they could not get the full percentage of the employees to stand up to the proposal. As one who conducts a handyfood shop, I can support the statement that bread is required for fresh sandwiches on holidays. I have definitely stated where I stand. I want the Bill to provide for Friday night baking, and for midnight baking before a baker's holiday. If these points are conceded, I am sure a compromise satisfactory to both parties can be brought about, and that the Bill will then go through. Under present conditions the public are not receiving due consideration, and are being put on one side by this Bill.

On motion by Hon. G. Potter, debate adjourned.

House adjourned at 6.11 p.m.