

# Legislative Assembly,

Wednesday, 16th November, 1921.

	Page
Questions : Goldfields Railways, Leasing ...	1711
Forest Products Laboratory ...	1711
Wheat, Flour, and Offal ...	1711
Ravensthorpe Copper Ore ...	1711
University Fees ...	1711
Personal Explanation : Hon. W. C. Angwin and the Westralian Farmers, Ltd. ...	1711
Leave of Absence ...	1712
Assent to Bills ...	1712
Bills : Evidence Act, Amendment, 3a., passed ...	1712
Reciprocal Enforcement of Judgments, 3a., passed ...	1712
Local Courts Act Amendment, report ...	1712
Stallions, returned ...	1712
Wheat Marketing, Council's Message ...	1712
Industrial Arbitration Act Amendment, 2a. ...	1715
Constitution Act Amendment, 2a. ...	1733
Permanent Reserve (Claremont), 2a. ...	1734
Health Act Amendment, 2a. ...	1735
Grain, Com. ...	1738
Papers : Whim Creek Copper Mines Water Supply ...	1715
Motions : Public Service, Housing ...	1712
Retirement of A. C. Kessell, to inquire by Select Committee. ...	1713

## QUESTION—GOLDFIELDS RAILWAYS, LEASING.

Mr. WILLCOCK asked the Minister for Railways: Are any negotiations being carried on, or have any negotiations taken place, this year in regard to the selling, leasing, or otherwise allowing any private company to use any portion of the Government Railways in the Northern or Eastern Goldfields railway districts?

The COLONIAL SECRETARY (for the Minister for Railways) replied: Yes.

## QUESTION—FOREST PRODUCTS LABORATORY.

Mr. PICKERING asked the Premier: In view of the demonstrated value of the Forests Products Laboratory, will he state the Government's proposals for the maintenance and continuance of its beneficial services?

The PREMIER replied: The Federal Government have been asked to observe the arrangement entered into for the continuance of the laboratory.

## QUESTION—WHEAT, FLOUR, AND OFFAL.

Mr. MANN asked the Minister for Agriculture: 1, What quantity of wheat will be available for milling for local consumption after November 30th? 2, Is he aware that neither the millers nor bakers are carrying stocks of flour for use after December 31st? 3, Is he aware that agents are offering flour ex South Australia at £12 10s. f.o.b. Adelaide? 4, In view of the above, will he say when new season's wheat will be available for gristing for home consumption? 5, Are arrangements being made to compete with

consignments of bran and pollard now offered at £5 2s. 6d. and £5 7s. 6d. f.o.b. Sydney, where large stocks are held apart from new season's gristing?

The MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE replied: 1, Approximately 4,000 tons of 1920-21 wheat. 2, Yes. 3, No. 4, During December. 5, No.

## QUESTION—RAVENSTHORPE COPPER ORE.

Mr. CORBOY asked the Minister for Mines: 1, What is the Government's intention in regard to the disposal of ore at present stacked at Ravensthorpe? 2, Is it intended to dispose of the ore for smelting elsewhere than at Ravensthorpe, and have estimates of probable profit or loss been prepared? If so, is it his intention to lay same on the Table? 3, Will the ore sellers be consulted before any sale or other disposal is made?

The PREMIER (for the Minister for Mines) replied: 1, The Government will real-ise on the ore to the best advantage. 2, Full inquiries are being made in this direction, but they are not yet completed. 3, No.

Mr. CORBOY: Will the ore sellers be expected to make good any losses on the proposed realisations?

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: No.

## QUESTION—UNIVERSITY, FEES.

Hon. P. COLLIER (without notice) asked the Premier: Will he endeavour to have the statute recently passed by the governing authorities of the University, imposing fees, placed upon the Table of the House at the earliest possible opportunity, and will he afford an opportunity for a full discussion of the matter by the House, and also for the taking of a vote on the question of the imposition of fees at the University before the session closes?

The PREMIER replied: I shall be very glad to ask the University authorities to furnish a copy of the statute as soon as possible, and I shall certainly give the House an opportunity of discussing, and voting upon, the matter before the session closes.

## PERSONAL EXPLANATION—STATE INSURANCE.

Hon. W. C. Angwin and the Westralian Farmers Ltd.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN (North-East Fremantle) [4.41]: I desire to make a personal explanation. During the discussion on the motion dealing with State insurance, I stated the following:—

I noticed in a report which was published, that last season the policies issued by the Westralian Farmers Ltd. to the Industries Assistance Board, a Government

institution which nominated the Westralian Farmers to transact their business, amounted to £694,982. This company, which acts under Government patronage and could not pay £5,000, in accordance with the Act, to carry on insurance, secures business to the extent I have just mentioned.

I have no desire to do any injury whatever to any company or person, and I am informed that some people have taken the statement quoted to mean that the Westralian Farmers Ltd. have not the money to put up the deposit of £5,000. I made the statement in question pursuant to the report of the Auditor General for the year ended on the 30th June, 1920—

The Act provides that each insurance company carrying on business in Western Australia shall deposit £5,000 with the Colonial Treasurer, so long as such company continues to carry on business in the State. A local company commenced insurance business on the 1st September, 1919, when a deposit of £2,500 was made. On the approval of the Treasurer a period of six months was allowed to elapse before the additional £2,500 was deposited. There is no provision in the Act for this concession.

I wish to point out that the Act provides that insurance companies may pay their deposits in two instalments, and that the Westralian Farmers Ltd. were granted the same concession as other companies. The Westralian Farmers had the money to pay the deposit, but availed themselves of the concession.

#### LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

On motion by Mr. O'Loughlen, leave of absence for two weeks granted to Mr. Chesson (Cue) on the ground of ill-health.

#### ASSENT TO BILLS.

Message from the Governor received and read, notifying assent to the following Bills:—

- 1, Administration Act Amendment.
- 2, Building Societies Act Amendment.
- 3, Land Tax and Income Tax.

#### BILLS (2)—THIRD READING.

- 1, Evidence Act Amendment.
- 2, Reciprocal Enforcement of Judgments. Passed.

#### BILL—LOCAL COURTS ACT AMENDMENT.

Report of Committee adopted.

#### BILL—STALLIONS.

Returned from the Council without amendment.

#### BILL—WHEAT MARKETING.

Message received from the Legislative Council notifying that it had agreed to the modification made by the Assembly in the Council's requested amendment No. 1, and that it had agreed not to press its requested amendment No. 4; also that the Bill had been read a third time in the Council and passed.

#### MOTION—PUBLIC SERVICE, HOUSING.

To inquire by Select Committee.

Mr. MacCallum SMITH (North Perth) [4.45]: I move—

That a select committee be appointed to consider the housing of the Public Service departments in one central building.

I expect but very little difficulty in getting the House to agree to the appointment of this committee, because every member has at some time or other expressed himself in favour of it.

Mr. O'Loughlen: What is the use of it if you have to wait ten years for the money?

Mr. MacCallum SMITH: We shall not have to wait ten months. The Government have had an offer from a member of the Opposition, and I understand they borrowed three millions the other day.

The Premier: All for conversion.

Mr. MacCallum SMITH: However, there will be little difficulty in securing the money required for the object I have in view. It is the general opinion of hon. members that the public service should be placed under one roof.

Mr. Munsie: Do you think a select committee would alter that opinion?

Mr. MacCallum SMITH: No.

Mr. Munsie: Well, why have the committee?

Mr. MacCallum SMITH: Because we will then obtain information as to the feasibility of carrying out the project. We have all thought a good bit about the subject, but have not yet had any information as to how the project can be achieved. The departments are scattered all over the city, many of them in buildings unsuitable for the carrying on of the work, and also from the point of view of health; while they are most inconvenient for the public and, generally, do not make for efficiency in the service. We have the Works Department situated in the old barracks. The Minister is doing his best with the accommodation at his disposal, but the place is nothing more nor less than a rabbit warren. I do not see how men can be expected to effectively carry out their duties under the conditions existing in the Works Department. The Minister cannot do any more than he is doing with the buildings at his disposal. We have the Education Department, certainly, in a very convenient building within these grounds.

The Minister for Works: It is no longer there.

Mr. MacCallum SMITH: Well, the Education Department is shifted so frequently that one is liable to lose track of it. Last year it was in a palatial building in St. George's Terrace. Where is it now?

The Minister for Works: In the old Government Stores building.

Mr. MacCallum SMITH: It is a good argument for the carrying of my motion. We have the Colonial Secretary's Department in Murray-street, in a building which is perhaps suitable enough; but the offices of the Lands Department are most inconvenient, although in a central position. Then we have the Forestry Department, the Mines Department, the Water Supply Department, and other Government departments scattered all over the place. Efficiency is not to be expected under such conditions. It is a costly way to run the Government of the country. No private business could possibly carry on in that way. A number of offices are being rented from private individuals.

The Minister for Works: No offices are rented at all.

Mr. MacCallum SMITH: What about the Wheat Marketing Scheme?

Mr. Pickering: And the Industries Assistance Board?

Mr. MacCallum SMITH: At all events, the system is both costly and inefficient, and a great deal of time is wasted in running backwards and forwards between the offices. It is even necessary to maintain a messengers' exchange to carry communications between departments. That in itself is an unnecessary expense, to say nothing of the waste of time involved. It is not infrequent for a letter to take 48 hours in travelling via the messengers' exchange from one department to another. It all tends to considerably increase the cost of administration. Moreover, the public should be considered. People from the country having business in Government departments are quite at a loss to find the offices required, and have to spend a good deal of time hunting them up. It almost requires a black-tracker to accomplish the task. If the Government will not agree to my motion, certainly they ought to publish a locality plan of all the departments for the benefit of those having business to transact with them. Then there is the health of the public servants to be considered. Many of the dens and dungeons where the men have to work are most unhealthy places. We should get far better work out of the employees if improved conditions were afforded. Almost every member of the House has preached economy in regard to administration. It is impossible to economise to any extent while our departments are scattered all over the city. The waste resulting from having the departments so widely separated must be very considerable. One object of my motion is to find the best locality for the departments when grouped.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: Take them down to Fremantle. We will not charge you any rent there.

Mr. MacCallum SMITH: Possibly the select committee may recommend the removal of the departments to Fremantle. The Government have ample land in the city for the erection of a substantial pile of buildings which would accommodate the whole of the public service for many years to come. The cost need not worry the Government, because they can find money for lots of other things. This project would save a considerable sum per annum, and it is the duty of the Government to raise the necessary money to carry out the improvement. I have my own ideas in regard to what should be done. The first step is the making of proper investigations in order to discover what accommodation is required, which is the best situation, what the scheme will cost and how long it will take.

Mr. Pickering interjected.

Mr. MacCallum SMITH: That is what I want to find out. As a qualified architect, the hon. member could lend considerable assistance in that regard. I hope the motion will be carried.

On motion by the Premier, debate adjourned.

#### MOTION—RETIREMENT OF A. C. KESSELL.

To inquire by Select Committee.

Captain CARTER (Leederville) [4.59]: I move—

That a select committee be appointed to inquire into the retirement from the Government service of A. C. Kessell.

This question has been discussed in the House before, and it is not my intention to go right through the large file now upon the Table.

Mr. Troy: We will adjourn this, too.

Capt. CARTER: Nor is it my intention to be balked by an inane interjection from ventilating one or two points which I think call for investigation. In the first place, from my perusal of the file, I can say there is no direct charge of dishonesty against this officer.

The Premier: It has never been suggested.

Capt. CARTER: It is borne out on the file that this officer has given many years of consistent and conscientious service. He has been secretary to several Premiers, and I speak from my own personal knowledge when I say that his work as secretary to the Agent General in London left nothing to be desired; yet as a bolt from the blue there comes an order from Australia sacking him as an excess officer. No notice was given, no retirement leave; in fact no leave of any sort. Neither was he paid anything in lieu of notice. His salary was nipped in the bud as it were, and no recompense was made to him for the loss he sustained.

Mr. Johnston: Did he not get a pension.

Capt. CARTER: He got a pension which was his just due, but I will refer to that

directly. This gentleman is now a constituent of mine. I have known him for many years, and I have looked closely into his file. My idea in moving for a select committee is that the matter should be probed thoroughly and that fair play should take its course. I believe that this House as a House stands for fair play. I have heard many things said in a more or less humorous way with regard to the motion, and I am sorry to see that the man's character, his future, and his family's future, are likely to be treated in a jocund way. This is a matter which should be approached only in a grave and serious manner, and I hope if hon. members have not yet studied the file, that they will do so, and that after the committee has been appointed, they will give the committee every possible assistance.

Hon. P. Collier: If they study the file, they will not support the motion.

Mr. Corboy: It will be very hard for them to support your case.

Capt. CARTER: If hon. members study the file, I admit, they will see that it contains many inconsistencies on both sides, but they will also see that those inconsistencies preponderate on the Government side, and they will admit the necessity for clearing up the matter. Perhaps it would be better for me to state the present position of the case. At the present time Mr. Kessell is in receipt of a pension which he has earned by long and successful years of service. But he is not actually drawing a penny of that pension; it is being absorbed by the Government to wipe off what is alleged to be owing by Kessell to the Government.

The Minister for Works: And that is a fact.

Capt. CARTER: When the matter was approaching the law courts, as probably hon. members know well it seemed likely to do, the Government without consulting Kessell who was the defendant in the case, took steps to settle the matter out of court. In this way they cut the ground from under Kessell's feet, giving him no opportunity of defence, which defence he had prepared. Counsel had been instructed by him, but the Government made it impossible for him to move in the matter. The next arbitrary step—not only arbitrary, but illegal, from my reading of it—was for the Government to commandeer the total amount of the pension. To-day Kessell is not actually wanting for bread and butter, and he is not asking for charity, but he is in the position where many calls are made on him in connection with this case, and as might be imagined, he is not in what might be said to be an easy position. The man asks for nothing but fair play; he asks for the clearance of his character in the eyes of the public.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: There has been no charge made against his character.

Capt. CARTER: What has taken place, I believe, affected the man's integrity in the eyes of the public; at any rate it has so affected his mental balance that the thing has

become an obsession with him. I can assure the House that that is so, because not once but many times I have gone into the question with him. I have cross-examined him in many ways, and so far as my reading of the file goes, there is every justification for an inquiry by a select committee. Upon retirement on the unusual conditions stated, Kessell applied for his furniture to be brought out to Australia. There was some hitch in the matter. Cables were exchanged, and eventually a preliminary agreement was arrived at without prejudice to any claim which he might make or might wish to make on arrival in Australia. When that claim was lodged in Australia, the least the Government could have done was to have heard the claim in a proper place, namely, a court of law. His counsel—and I quote the words of Sir Walter James—declared that in his opinion Kessell had been most unjustly treated. Other counsel also backed up that opinion. In connection with the extraordinary nature of Kessell's retirement, we know that a similar course was never before made to apply to any other officer who was retired. Neither was it made to apply to Sir Newton Moore, who, when he severed his connection with the Agent General's office asked for no less than six months leave of absence on full pay, which was granted. I know from my own knowledge that on many occasions when Mr. Kessell was acting as secretary to Sir Newton Moore, he was in sole charge of the London office for weeks at a time, Sir Newton Moore being absent on military duty. On that score alone, I think better consideration might have been given to Mr. Kessell. Another point is that in regard to the travelling allowance, authority for the amount of £70 was cabled for, to cover the expenses of Kessell and his family. That sum was £30 over the usual allowance. Kessell himself questioned it and a cable was sent repeating these figures. Again it was questioned and a third time it was repeated, and then accepted by the London office as being a special allowance. On page 123 of the file, it will be seen that the Public Service Commissioner recommends that £100 should be granted to Mr. Kessell and his family for the special work performed owing to war conditions. Yet, Mr. Kessell has not received one penny of that amount. I am only making a plea for fair play, and the appointment of the committee will bring to light information which will once and for ever clear up the matter. Until that is done, there will be one individual in the community who considers that he has every justification for believing that he has been robbed. I am not here to say that he has been robbed, or even to say that he has been unfairly treated, but I have studied the file as well as the man himself and I believe that he is suffering under a disability. Others say that Mr. Kessell has been unjustly treated and because of the reasons I have mentioned, I submit the motion to the House.

On motion by the Premier debate adjourned.

# PAPERS—WHIM CREEK COPPER MINES WATER SUPPLY.

On motion by Mr. Corboy ordered "That all papers in connection with the construction of water supply for Whim-Creek Copper Mines be laid on the Table.

## BILL—INDUSTRIAL ARBITRATION ACT AMENDMENT.

### Second Reading.

Debate resumed from 26th October.

The PREMIER (Hon. Sir James Mitchell—Northam) [5.12]: I should like to have heard the member for North-East Fremantle (Hon. W. C. Angwin) on this proposal, particularly Paragraph (b) of Clause 2. The object of the Bill is really to include insurance agents in the definition of the term "worker." I do not know why the hon. member desires to effect this amendment. The Bill will not apply to those who are regularly employed on a salary, but only to those who collect small amounts week by week, and who, for the most part are men who follow several occupations, men who while they may be insurance agents, may also be agents for the sale of sewing machines and half a dozen other things. How are these people to be brought under the definition of "worker"? These men may work an hour or half an hour on a day, and they get commission, and that is the beginning and the end of their association with an insurance company. I wonder where we would stop if we included in the definition of "worker" all who worked in this way on commission? I doubt whether such a thing would be possible or even right. These men work on a special arrangement to sell on commission. Theirs is purely a contract with the people who employ them, and so far as I know they get fair commission from the insurance companies. They cannot in any way be considered to be working for a salary.

Mr. McCallum: They work for one company and for nobody else.

The PREMIER: That is not so at all.

Mr. McCallum: It is.

Mr. Corboy: I can bring 100 of them who do.

The PREMIER: I hope the hon. member will not bring them. They merely work on commission. What the hon. member wishes is that the Arbitration Court shall fix the wages these men shall get.

Mr. McCallum: Fix their commission.

The PREMIER: This money amounts to the wages they get when solely working for a company. They should not be brought under the scope of the Act.

Mr. Corboy: Will the Premier withdraw his opposition if we can demonstrate that there are 40 persons who work entirely for one company and do nothing else?

The PREMIER: There are insurance agents all about the country from one end to the other.

Mr. Corboy: I am referring to the city only.

The PREMIER: They are found in every town in the State.

Mr. Corboy: Not this class of man.

The PREMIER: Yes, the men who collect small amounts on small policies of from £20 to £40 or £50, which are taken out on the lives of children, for instance. I have seen many of them working myself. The hon. member wishes not only to bring the insurance agent within the scope of the Act, but also wishes to bring all the employees of clubs within it. I do not know the class of employee he refers to. Most of them are already, I think, working under some award.

Mr. McCallum: There is not an employee of a club in the State who is.

The PREMIER: I think so.

Mr. McCallum: I assure the Premier that is not so.

The PREMIER: What about the barmen's award?

Mr. McCallum: That does not apply to clubs, although I do not say it is not observed by the clubs.

The PREMIER: There would not be many such persons. The last proposal of the hon. member is to include persons engaged in domestic service. He wishes to cut out from the 1912 Act the words "but shall not include any person engaged in domestic service."

Mr. Underwood: What is domestic service?

The PREMIER: I should like an explanation as to what this really does mean. Is it intended by the amendment on the Notice Paper that the husband shall also be under the control of the wife?

Hon. W. C. Angwin: I shall tell my wife when I get home that in future she shall be my employee.

The PREMIER: I am certain she will not agree to that. I do not know that there has been any demand on the part of domestic servants to be brought under the scope of the Act, or that the position would be improved in any way if this were done. I remember discussing the matter at some length, as one of the managers that considered the Bill that was introduced by the member for Kanowna (Hon. T. Walker), who endeavoured to have these very words removed from the Act. Domestic servants are scattered about all over the country. I do not know why the hon. member thinks this procedure can improve the conditions of domestic servants. They can get work almost anywhere. They are always wanted and there is always a shortage of them. They can more or less make their own terms in getting an engagement. They are particularly fortunate because there always will be a shortage of such people. Most of the young girls in the community are prepared to do almost any class of work rather than domestic work, and there is therefore always a shortage of people required for domestic service. I still think it is unnecessary to include them under the Act. There is some proposal, I believe, to make the wife an em-

ployee of the husband. I do not suppose there are many of us who are not controlled by our wives. If the member for West Perth (Mrs. Cowan) were successful in getting an alteration made to that effect, I do not think it would very much alter the position. It is right that all those who need the protection of the Act should be brought under the Act, but it should be shown that it is necessary for such people to be afforded that protection. I do not question the right of people to obtain the protection of the Act where it is necessary they should do so, but it is quite unnecessary in many cases to go as far as that. If the proposal of the member for South Fremantle (Mr. McCallum) is an unnecessary one—and I do not think it is necessary—the House will not be justified in passing the Bill.

Mr. CORBOY (Yilgarn) [5.21]: The remarks of the Premier with regard to insurance agents are likely to create a wrong impression. He does not quite understand the particular section of men it is intended to register under the Arbitration Act.

The Premier: Certainly not the men on salaries.

Mr. CORBOY: No. It is quite feasible for the Arbitration Court to issue an award limited to some particular section of the State.

Mr. McCallum: They have to limit the area.

Mr. CORBOY: There are over 100 men in the metropolitan area at present who are working purely on a weekly basis for insurance companies, and who are dealing only with what are called industrial policies, on which payments of from 6d. to 1s. a week are made. The agreements which these agents sign with their companies provide also that they shall devote the whole of their time to the industrial work of their company. This refutes the statement that the men can do other work. They agree to put in the whole of their time for these companies, and that directly any policy holder wishes to pay in quarterly or half-yearly instalments, or on any other basis than the weekly basis, they will automatically cease to handle the particular business they were previously handling on the weekly basis. The agreement also provides that they shall account every week to the company, on a day to be mutually agreed upon, for all the moneys they have collected, and it also provides for weekly debits to be made against their accounts of all moneys they are entitled to collect, and for the taking of a weekly account of their whole transactions. This establishes the weekly employment by the company of these men to do certain work exclusively for the company. When it comes to asking that a reasonable living wage shall be paid to these men, or asking that their claims shall be heard in the Arbitration Courts, so that they may have a reasonable chance of success in obtaining an award from the court, the contention is put forward, "You are not

workers; you are working on commission, and are not entitled to the benefits of the Arbitration Court."

The Minister for Works: I thought you did not believe in piece-work.

Mr. CORBOY: I do not believe in it, but the necessity arises for devising some means by which the work can be done other than by the method adopted.

Mr. Underwood: Cut it out altogether.

Mr. CORBOY: That should be done. I would not have one of these industrial policies on my mind. One gets a far better deal by taking out a bigger policy, and does so at a cheaper rate by paying quarterly or half-yearly or on some other basis. So long, however, as the insurance companies employ men on this work exclusively, they should be prepared to pay them a living wage. We are constantly hearing about the Arbitration Court preventing industrial upheavals and strikes. It is not long since these insurance agents went out on strike in order to get a fair deal, because they were refused admission to the court. Their only alternative was to go on strike, and as a result they obtained a slightly better deal than they had before. Knowing these men as I do, I believe that unless something is done to enable them to approach the court, so that they may get a reasonable wage, there will be further trouble in the industry. The Arbitration Court was established in order to prevent industrial troubles and to adjudicate fairly between employer and employee. When it comes to the question of these insurance agents, the companies seize on the fact that the men are working either wholly or partly on commission, and on that ground they succeeded in preventing them from approaching the court. It is our duty as legislators to do anything we can to prevent a recurrence of any similar industrial dispute. By granting them permission to get to the court, we shall obviate the possibility of their taking strike measures to have their grievances redressed.

[The Deputy Speaker took the Chair.]

Mr. ANGELO (Gascoyne) [5.27]: The object of the hon. member for South Fremantle (Mr. McCallum), according to his first suggestion, is to have industrial insurance agents defined as "workers" in order, ostensibly, to turn them into "wages" men. Under the terms of the agreement which exists, these insurance agents are no more workers than is a doctor. Their duties are confined to canvassing for new business and to collecting premiums on existing business.

Mr. Corboy: If walking through the sand all day is not work, I do not know what is.

Mr. ANGELO: Take the difference between the bricklayer, the plumber, or carpenter, and one of these insurance agents. The bricklayer and plumber are supposed to produce a specified amount of work in a given time, and in such a manner as to satisfy their employers. The duties of an insurance agent can be performed by himself in his

own time whenever he likes, without any control or direction whatsoever. He might appoint members of his family or his servants to perform the work agreed upon in the agreement.

Mr. Corboy: They can keep a lot of servants on £3 10s. a week.

Mr. ANGELO: Some of them do. Exactly what the agent shall produce is left to himself. The only way of rewarding him is on the basis of payment by results. That can only be obtained by paying commission on the work done. The payment of premiums by policy holders is quite a voluntary matter. They need not pay at all, and they can pay if they wish to do so. The agent, therefore, has, in a great measure, to rely on his own ability to obtain payment. It is very clear, I think, that a wages award would not meet the case at all. The commission basis is the only proper remuneration that such an agent should be paid.

Mr. McCallum: We do not suggest wages.

Mr. ANGELO: I contend that the actual relationship between the company and these industrial agents is that of principal and agent and not that of master and servant. The provisions of the Industrial Arbitration Act were never intended to apply to persons other than servants. Mr. Justice Draper, in a recent decision in the matter of an appeal from a decision of the Registrar of Friendly Societies in the case of the Australian Clerical Association Industrial Union of Workers, Western Australian Collecting Clerks Division, and the A.M.P. Society and others, said, *inter alia*—

It seems to me impossible to hold that this agreement is one in which the parties bear the relationship of master and servant to each other. There is no control over the performance of the work. The work is done in the agent's own time whenever he likes; and he carries on other work. He is paid by commission; he can get anyone else to do the work for him; and neither the society (that is, the company) nor any officer is entitled to direct the manner or time in which the agent is to conduct his agency work.

I want to emphasise the point that the agents are entitled to carry on other work as well.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: That is typed out very nicely for you.

Mr. ANGELO: That is not type-written matter. It is a copy of an award from the Arbitration Court.

Mr. McCallum: There is no award at all.

Mr. ANGELO: As the hon. member referred to some typewritten documents, I will read him some. When the second reading of the Bill was moved by the member for South Fremantle (Mr. McCallum), and as I was not au-fait with the provision covering this industry, I took the trouble to interview one of the managers of an insurance company and read to him the speech delivered by the member for South Fremantle, as recorded in "Hansard." I asked him for his comments on that speech.

Mr. Marshall: You went and got your instructions.

Mr. ANGELO: It is not a question of getting instructions. I am not a servant of this company but I am fortunate enough to be a policy holder of one of the most liberal and soundest companies Australia, if not the world, can boast of. I desired to get information on the points raised by the member for South Fremantle.

Mr. Corboy: If the requests of the men were granted, it would mean 2d. a year off your bonuses.

Mr. ANGELO: I do not think that will come about.

Mr. Corboy: That is what is worrying you.

Mr. ANGELO: During the course of the hon. member's speech, the Colonial Secretary interjected to the effect that the agents get a fixed salary and commission. I was under the impression that that statement was not accurate. I am told that the Colonial Secretary is at fault, as there is no fixed salary for industrial agents.

The Colonial Secretary: The member for South Fremantle said there was.

Mr. McCallum: I said there was not. The Minister interjected and I replied no.

Mr. ANGELO: It was said just now that they got a salary.

The Colonial Secretary: Yes, the member for Yilgarn said so.

Mr. Corboy: I did not.

Mr. ANGELO: At any rate, "Hansard" says that the Colonial Secretary interjected to that effect.

Mr. McCallum: The Minister interjected in a tone of inquiry and I replied: "No."

Mr. Pickering: There is no sign of interjection in the "Hansard" report.

Mr. McCallum: That is possible.

Mr. ANGELO: In the course of his speech, the member for South Fremantle said:—

The companies agreed to give these agents what they called a "£20 book"; that with a certain amount of business they would get, would bring them in £4 a week. The companies in their agreement said they would guarantee a minimum of £4 a week. The companies have now repudiated that.

Mr. McCallum: So they have.

Mr. ANGELO: I am told that the companies did not agree to guarantee agents £4 a week.

Mr. McCallum: They did.

Mr. ANGELO: The companies agreed in the case of agents with debits smaller than £20, to increase their debits if such agents desired it, as soon as possible; and, in the meantime, to give such agents assistance to enable them to earn commissions to average at least £4 weekly.

Mr. McCallum: What is the difference?

Mr. ANGELO: There is a very great difference. That agreement has been carried out to the letter.

Mr. Corboy: It has not been carried out.

Mr. ANGELO: It is contended that an agent with a £20 debit, will earn good money unless he is lazy or incompetent. The member for South Fremantle went on to say—

This class of worker has had no increase in the rates of commission or pay since the insurance business was first established in Western Australia—

I put that aspect to the manager, and he replied:—

The rates of commission may not have altered, but an increase of late years in the volume of business has brought greater earnings to the agents.

Mr. Marshall: He has had to work harder for them.

Mr. ANGELO: Oh, well—

Mr. Marshall: That is so. That is your policy all through the piece. It is a case of morning and night with you people.

Mr. ANGELO: I do not know that there is any law that compels these people to take on the business of industrial assurance agencies.

Mr. Marshall: Economic conditions force the people to do it. They are not in a position like you and others. If they could produce a corporation like yours, they would not take on these agencies.

Mr. ANGELO: I do not know whether I should object to the member for Murchison taking exception to my corporation, but at any rate, I think I fill my seat better than he can.

Mr. Marshall: I envy you.

The Minister for Works: At any rate the member for Murchison should look at the member for Leonora. He is not too bad.

Mr. ANGELO: The member for South Fremantle next stated:—

If there is a line of business that can afford to pay a better remuneration, it certainly is the insurance business.

The manager's reply to that statement is:—

The general cry against industrial assurance is its high cost, due to the services rendered to the public—

That is on account of the trouble the companies go to in the payment of premiums and so on—

Any increase in "costs," would make the business prohibitive. Industrial assurance is conducted for the benefit of the policy holders to encourage thrift among the workers, thereby lessening the drain on the country's exchequer and is not run for the benefit of the agents alone.

Hon. P. Collier: It is a purely philanthropic institution.

Mr. ANGELO: The member for South Fremantle proceeds with reference to the agent's rates of pay and conditions of employment:—

Those matters have been settled by arbitration awards in the Eastern States and the same thing can be done here.

The manager's reply to that statement is:—

The agents' commission rates have not been settled by arbitration awards in the Eastern States—

Mr. McCallum: I still say they have.

Mr. ANGELO: The reply continues—

There is not one Eastern States Arbitration Act covering agents on commission—

Mr. McCallum: That is a deliberate untruth! Here are the awards!

Mr. ANGELO: He further says:—

In Queensland the Act it is contended, has been incorrectly interpreted to cover insurance agents—

Mr. Corboy: That is only their contention.

Mr. ANGELO: He continues:—

But the companies have not been able to increase the commission rates which are the same as exist in this State. The principal results of the award in Queensland have been to greatly reduce the number of agents and to make the proper conduct of the business extremely difficult.

Mr. McCallum: He says there are no awards and I have them here!

Mr. Underwood: Why should there be agents at all?

Hon. W. C. Angwin: Why not?

Mr. Corboy: If the company employ agents, they should pay them well.

Mr. Underwood: It is the poor wives who pay them.

Mr. ANGELO: The member for South Fremantle further said that the agents could only earn £1 or £2 outside their insurance work.

Mr. McCallum: I said they did not earn anything apart from their insurance work.

Mr. ANGELO: The manager replies to that contention as follows:—

The industrial assurance agents' work is not confined simply to what is known as industrial insurance. The agents may earn commissions on ordinary department and intermediate assurance, also in any other way they may care to engage.

Member: That is not a correct statement of the position.

Mr. ANGELO: I am giving the House what the manager of one of the leading companies in Australia has given me as authentic information.

Hon. P. Collier: It is purely an ex-parte statement.

Mr. McCallum: Some of it is absolutely untrue.

Mr. ANGELO: What is the statement of the member for South Fremantle?

Hon. P. Collier: The member for South Fremantle is not financially interested and the manager of a company is in an entirely different position. He is interested financially on account of the company.

Mr. ANGELO: I am sure a manager of such a company would not dare to give me information that was not correct, particularly when I said I wanted it for the information of the House.



Mr. McCallum: I say he has given you information which is not correct.

Mr. ANGELO: The hon. member will have a chance of proving that the information is not correct.

Mr. McCallum: I will do so, too.

Mr. ANGELO: The member for South Fremantle next stated—

If an agent writes new business and any of it lapses within five years of its being first written, he has to pay back the whole of the commission collected by him on that business.

He also mentioned something about these amounts being deducted from his deposit. The answer of the manager to that contention is—

The first consideration of the companies is the policy holder. Consequently, it is contended, the correct basis for commission should be "net increase," that is, on new business, less lapses. Considering human nature, it is quite natural to conclude that troublesome and other policy holders would be neglected and lose their policies through lapse, if some protection were not afforded them. The best protection is a financial responsibility by the agent—

I think we can all understand that contention—

The commission paid is on a most liberal scale and is not complained of by the agents. The number of the agents who may lose their deposits is very small. If the amount held by the company to guarantee the agent's fidelity and his stability, is £25 and the whole of this is absorbed to cover lapses after the termination of the agent's agreement, there must be extremely grave circumstances, in fact total neglect of the agency.

The member for South Fremantle said that nothing should be charged against the canvassers in respect of any business lost through the cessation of the business. The manager's answer to that is—

Mr. McCallum is again inaccurate. There was no such undertaking between the companies and the agents.

The last quotation I put to the manager was the following statement by the member for South Fremantle:—

Their work is hard and laborious, tramping from door to door. Yet companies deny the agents the right to approach the Arbitration Court.

The manager's answer to that aspect is as follows:—

Only to the lazy and incompetent, is the work laborious. The competent industrial assurance agent does not work long continuous hours unless it pleases him. As he is paid on results—the only true method of reward for services rendered—he can please himself how hard or otherwise he works. Under present conditions and terms offered

by the companies, good money can be made by good men.

Mr. Corboy: You come with me one day next week and go round with one of the agents. That will show you what their work is like.

Mr. ANGELO: Right! It might take down something of that adipose tissue objected to by the member for Murchison.

Hon. P. Collier: And the ambulance van will follow you.

Mr. Corboy: You ask your manager to show you the amount earned during the last 12 months by these agents.

Mr. ANGELO: The member for South Fremantle also desires to have domestic servants covered by Arbitration Court awards.

Mr. Marshall: Are they on commission too?

Mr. ANGELO: I do not think so.

Mr. Marshall: Right oh, go ahead.

Mr. ANGELO: In my opinion that would be a false step.

Hon. P. Collier: Poor old Mary Ann. Let her keep on at her slops.

Mr. ANGELO: If such was the case, I am afraid that true home life would disappear more rapidly than it is disappearing at the present time. We hear almost daily of people giving up their homes in order to reside in flats, simply because they cannot get domestic servants. I quite admit that there are numbers of bad mistresses as well as good mistresses. I have come across mistresses who did not deserve to have servants, because they did not know how to treat them. A mistress who desires to keep a good servant must treat her properly. Some good might be done if we had a law compelling inspection of the rooms occupied by domestics and the conditions under which they work. Not more than one inspection would be necessary if the inspector was satisfied. I am sorry to say that there are mistresses who put their servants into miserable quarters.

Mr. Marshall: We have known of them being put into stables before to-day.

Mr. ANGELO: I shall be only too glad to assist the member for South Fremantle (Mr. McCallum) to insure that domestics are properly housed and properly treated, but I am of opinion that if they were brought under the Arbitration Act for the purpose of fixing their wages it would be a fatal step.

Mr. McCallum: Fatal to what?

Mr. ANGELO: To the home life of the State and of the nation. In Sydney many thousands of homes have been given up, and the occupants have gone to live in flats, because of the dearth of domestic help.

Hon. P. Collier: Because the wealthy wives are too lazy to handle their own homes.

Mr. ANGELO: As the Premier has pointed out, there are so many openings for domestic servants that they need not take any place offering, because they know they can get a job at any time. If they are in the employ of people who do not know how

to treat them properly, it is their own fault. They have only to look around to get decent mistresses who will treat them properly. I do not think the Bill is necessary and, therefore, I intend to vote against the second reading.

Mr. UNDERWOOD (Pilbara) [5.48]: I oppose the Bill on broader grounds than those taken by the member for Gascoyne (Mr. Angelo), though I might also oppose it on the grounds which he has mentioned. Arbitration is something which Australia invented, and it has not yet proved altogether successful. I again express the opinion which I have expressed here previously, that this Act is not the best we could get. The system requires to be remodelled and, until we endeavour to remodel the whole thing, I am opposed to adding anything to it. I do not desire to debate the difficulties or the failings of the existing Arbitration Act, beyond saying that they are so great that anyone attempting to deal with the question should not tamper with the mean and little things, not with a few insurance agents, window cleaners, or lift attendants, but should endeavour to settle the disputes in our great industries, the industries that really matter. Until the member for South Fremantle (Mr. McCallum) comes along with a comprehensive scheme to make the Act workable, and gives us some assurance that if we pass the measure it will be obeyed, we would not be wise in adding anything to the present Act. I oppose the measure owing to the manner in which it was introduced. The member for South Fremantle repeated again and again "I did this," "I did that," and "Much as I dislike arbitration I prefer it to strikes." If he has anything to suggest in its place, it is up to him to put it forward.

Mr. Corboy: Are you dealing with the Bill or with the member for South Fremantle?

Mr. UNDERWOOD: With the Bill. If the hon. member dislikes strikes and arbitration, that is no recommendation for this Bill. Why bring other sections under that system which he dislikes? We want something more than that to induce us to pass the Bill. Our present Act requires remodelling entirely. I do not intend to discuss the question of remodelling it, but I would like to point out that we have had from the member for South Fremantle the statement that, much as he dislikes arbitration, he dislikes strikes more, and we have had deliberate threats by Mr. Kenneally in conducting a certain case—"If you do not give me an award, I will not be responsible for what will happen."

Hon. P. Collier: I rise to a point of order. I submit that the hon. member is not in order in discussing any statement said to have been made by Mr. Kenneally or anyone else outside this House, insofar as those

statements do not affect any of the provisions of the Bill now before us.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: I think the point of order is a good one. The hon. member must discuss the Bill.

Mr. Munsie: You could not expect any support from that quarter. Why take exception to it? It is only what we expected.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. UNDERWOOD: I was trying to point out that, instead of amending our Arbitration Act, we should endeavour to get an assurance that the Act will be obeyed.

Mr. Munsie: Shall we get an assurance from the Pastoralists' Association as well as from the worker?

Mr. UNDERWOOD: It is useless to pass an Act which will not be obeyed.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: Then scrap every Act you have: none of them is obeyed.

Mr. UNDERWOOD: Well, scrap the lot and go back to the aborigines.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: And start again.

Mr. Munsie: You would be at home with the aborigines.

Mr. Marshall: Yes, that is where you ought to go.

Mr. UNDERWOOD: You have not sufficient stamina to go among the aborigines.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: The member for Pilbara must address the Chair.

Mr. UNDERWOOD: The proposition is that we should add to the existing Act, which is admittedly unsatisfactory because it is not obeyed, other people who do not now come under the measure. Whom do we propose to add to it? Insurance agents. I listened with considerable attention to the member for Gascoyne (Mr. Angelo) who in business is an insurance agent. Regarding industrial insurance agents, it is fine Parliament took cognisance of them and looked into their business.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: The companies you mean?

Mr. UNDERWOOD: Well, the companies and the agents too. They go round and gather a few shillings from the best of mothers—women who would starve themselves almost, because they realize that a child might die. I like to hear these great communists talking. This industrial insurance is the greatest economic waste which has ever occurred in civilisation—insured agents going around begging off these mothers and putting up to the mothers that their children might die! I am well able to speak on this point. A mother will starve herself to pay a shilling or two to the agent, and now these agents want to go to the Arbitration Court and get an award which will take more money from these poor deserving mothers.

Mr. O'Loughlin: What about the poor company?

Mr. UNDERWOOD: We should cut out both company and agent.

Mr. O'Loughlen: But you cannot get them both cut out.

Mr. UNDERWOOD: If we cut the agent out, we shall cut the company out.

Mr. O'Loughlen: That is right; cut the little fellow out.

Mr. UNDERWOOD: It is the duty of Parliament to deal with the companies who transact this industrial insurance business. I do not like to say anything about men who are not physically fit, but a man who is physically fit would be better employed at cutting wood or digging in the mines than in taking the money from these poor mothers. I am speaking of what I know. I have no sympathy for these agents. I know how they approach the mothers and I know the tales they put up, and I know how these mothers will stint themselves to pay the weekly contribution. I know also that both the agents and the companies in this business are robbing the mothers. As a man of sorrow and acquainted with grief, I can speak on this subject. I feel competent to speak also on the other portion of the Bill. We are dealing with domestic servants, but I have never heard "domestic servant" properly defined.

The Minister for Works: They will soon be extinct.

Hon. P. Collier: A good thing too.

The Minister for Works: I do not think so.

Hon. P. Collier: Let the good ladies do their own housework.

Mr. UNDERWOOD: I am able to speak on this question, because my mother was imported to this country as a domestic servant. Before the President of the Arbitration Court could fix a rate of wages for domestic servants, he would have to fix a standard of "missus" or employer. I can quite imagine—indeed, there is no imagination about it, I know—that there are some women for whom another woman could not work, and should not work, even for a thousand a year. There are other women for whom it would be almost a pleasure to work. In fixing the salaries of domestic servants the Arbitration Court must also fix the class of "missus."

Hon. W. C. Angwin: That applies to every worker.

Mr. UNDERWOOD: No, it does not. If a carpenter goes to work, he goes to work for a carpenter.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: It is a pleasure to work for some men, but decidedly not for others.

Mr. UNDERWOOD: That remark does not apply in the case of women. Domestic service has been degraded, and it is women who have degraded it.

Mrs. Cowan: No, no! It is men.

Mr. UNDERWOOD: No; it is women. One woman will not be inferior to another woman, just the same as we men refuse to be inferior to each other. When a woman requiring a domestic servant desires that a

girl or another woman should be inferior to her, should be called Jane or Susan instead of Miss Underwood, she is degrading that other girl or woman. That is why we have a lack of domestic servants. There is another reason for it, which is that every woman born has the right and the desire to be a mother and to have her own household. Certainly she has no desire to devote her life to being an attendant upon some other woman.

The Minister for Works: But a girl has got to learn her business.

Mr. UNDERWOOD: Now the Minister has come to the point. If we could by any means make domestic service acceptable, domestic service would be the best work that any young woman could possibly take up.

Mrs. Cowan: Hear, hear!

Mr. UNDERWOOD: It fits her, more than any other service can do, for the life that is coming to her if she fulfils her destiny as mother and housekeeper. But there is the position. It is not the fault of the Legislature; it is the fault of the women themselves. A woman wants some other woman to be inferior to her; and the position that the Australian woman takes is that she will not be considered inferior to any other woman.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: She is not inferior.

Mr. UNDERWOOD: I am not saying that. The hon. member has my full assurance on that point. Now suppose we go to a judge of the Arbitration Court to have the bedrock wage of domestic servants fixed. First of all, there is the fact that a woman is prepared to go out and work, and does work, as "lady help," living with the people for whom or with whom she works. Can that position be defined in an Arbitration Court award? Of course not.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: But the wage can be fixed.

Mr. UNDERWOOD: I can easily imagine, from my own temperament, that a woman would perhaps work for 15s. a week less, living with the family, and doing her work just as well, instead of working as a domestic servant and being considered an inferior and referred to as Jane or Susan. Can those things be stipulated in an Arbitration Court award?

Hon. W. C. Angwin: I do not think it makes any difference whether you call her Jane or Miss Jane.

Mr. UNDERWOOD: It does make a difference. I call my daughter by her Christian name, but no stranger is allowed to do that.

Mrs. Cowan: Hear, hear!

Mr. UNDERWOOD: A stranger would call my daughter Miss Underwood. If my daughter went to work as a typist, she would be called Miss Underwood; if she went to work as a domestic servant, she would be called by her Christian name, or, possibly, just Underwood.

The Minister for Works: Not in a decent household.

Mr. UNDERWOOD: Some years ago I said in effect that the Australian domestic servant is almost as extinct as the dodo. As a matter of fact, there are no domestic servants now; and I appreciate the position where there are no domestic servants. I appreciate the position of a country where one cannot get one woman to go to work as the inferior of another woman.

The Minister for Works: But you get that position in the big drapery shops.

Mr. UNDERWOOD: No. One does one's work there. We have got that position, and we do not want to bring that position under the Arbitration Court. In Australia a good domestic servant requires no Arbitration Court or anything else to look after her interests. A good domestic servant can command her own salary, absolutely.

Mr. O'Loughlen: What are domestic servants being paid? Have you any knowledge of that?

Mr. UNDERWOOD: Yes. I have considerably more knowledge of the subject than the hon. member interjecting has.

Mr. O'Loughlen: Well, you may have; but I just want the information from you.

Mr. Marshall: On an average, domestic servants are being paid 12s. 6d. a week.

Members: No.

Mr. Marshall: I can quote instances.

Mr. UNDERWOOD: I was speaking about good domestic servants.

Mr. Marshall: How could one possibly discriminate between one domestic servant and another? You could not discriminate between two cats.

Mr. UNDERWOOD: A good domestic servant, if there is one in Australia, wants no Arbitration Court to fix her wages. She can get them for herself. She is absolutely at a premium.

[The Speaker resumed the Chair.]

(Captain CARTER (Leederville) [6.10]: I wish to refer to one or two remarks made by the member for South Fremantle (Mr. McCallum) in moving the second reading of the Bill. As a previous speaker this afternoon was checked when attempting to discuss the question of the Arbitration Court as at present constituted, I do not know that you, Sir, will allow me to do so. The member for South Fremantle made some very pertinent remarks on that phase of the matter, and I think the aspect is pertinent to the Bill. I agree with the hon. member, as must everyone who knows anything about our arbitration system of to-day, that that system is unsatisfactory. For a beginning, the present Arbitration Court does not represent machinery capable of handling the volume of work placed before it, or anywhere near doing so. People who come before the court must be impressed with the fact that the total machinery at the president's command is absolutely inadequate. In the outside staff of the court we find one man attempting to do work sufficient to keep three men well employed.

Moreover, although I do not know that, as to this the member for South Fremantle will agree with me, in the constitution of the court we have an anomaly. There is a president, and there is a representative of each side. The position is simply that the president, sitting as chief arbitrator—

Mr. SPEAKER: I cannot allow the hon. member to discuss the whole question of arbitration on this Bill. I can allow him a little latitude, but not latitude to that extent.

Capt. CARTER: The privilege was given to the member for South Fremantle.

Mr. McCallum: There should be a general debate on the question of the Arbitration Court.

Capt. CARTER: I agree with the hon. member. I know it is the general desire of the public that the matter should be ventilated, and thoroughly sifted, and remedied, because it affects most vitally the present industrial situation. However, bowing to your decision, Mr. Speaker, I shall proceed to deal with the Bill. At the outset I must say that I oppose the Bill, on the ground that the industrial insurance agents are agents in every sense of the word, and completely so. They are not workers in the true sense of that term; that is to say, the arbitration sense of it. I know, of course, that insurance agents have to work; I know men who are doing that work.

Mr. Munsie: The object of the Bill is to get the law amended so as to bring these men within the definition of "worker" in the Arbitration Act.

Capt. CARTER: I do not agree that that should be done. I have been an insurance agent myself, and have seen something of the operations of the insurance companies working in this State.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: Have you been an industrial insurance agent?

Capt. CARTER: No. The industrial insurance agents are, to my mind, in the same position as land agents, for example, with whom people place houses for sale. A land agent is paid on results; if he does not sell the house, he gets nothing. Or one might say that an insurance agent is like a doctor who is called in to a case; when the work is done, the doctor is paid his fee for his services, and then is no longer employed. The insurance agent is only a part-time employee; he is employed for only part of his time on that "book" to which reference has been made during the debate. A man is given a "book," which represents £20 worth of industrial insurance business, the premiums ranging, as I think the member for Yilgarn (Mr. Corboy) stated, from 6d. to 1s. or so per week. The insurance agent's job in life as an employee of an insurance company is to collect those weekly shillings and sixpences. On the amount collected he gets a commission, amounting to roughly £4 per week. There are at the present time men in the business who can do their £20 book in three or four days. I know that I am speaking the facts of the matter,

and not making idle statements. There are men who employ the other two days of the week in other ways—earning, some of them, large sums. According to a review which I picked up within the last fortnight, and which I have here to-day, an insurance agent in the Eastern States employed his spare time to such good purpose that he attained a position enabling him to purchase an interest in a new insurance company. To-day, it is stated, he is a very wealthy man.

*Sitting suspended from 6.15 to 7.30 p.m.*

Capt. CARTER: Before tea I was discussing the functions of industrial insurance agents, and I mentioned the case of a man who, starting as an industrial insurance agent, worked his way to such a high position in the employ of his company that he was able to purchase an interest in the firm, and is to-day a member of the directorate.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: You find that in all walks of life.

Capt. CARTER: Yes, but particularly in this walk. A point made by several speakers this afternoon was that this particular avocation gives a man an opportunity for bettering his position, that it widens the scope of his operations, does not confine him to the collection of a weekly pittance, but enables him to launch out into the ordinary business of insurance and so get out of a rut. Let me refer to an article which appeared in the "Financial Review" of the 31st August, alluding to Mr. Confoy, as follows:—

Mr. Confoy simply would not be kept in the rut. The Australian Provincial Assurance Company claimed the discovery of Mr. Confoy. Whilst in the employ of that company he was given a free hand. In 1917 while in the employ of the Australian Provincial Assurance Company Mr. Confoy's commissions totalled over £5,000, in 1918 over £7,000, in 1919 over £9,000, and in 1920 over £10,000.

I admit that is an extreme case. However, it is an illustration that in this line of business a man may make his job what he wishes. Those men are like land agents and indent agents; they can be said to be commission agents pure and simple. To cover by legislation a set of men who cannot be supervised in their work, is extending the definition of the term "worker" far beyond that stage which industrial legislation ever intended.

Mr. McCallum: What about the timber hewer?

Capt. CARTER: In this case it is practically impossible. In the first case there is no other commission agent so covered. No parallel can be found in any of our awards. To do this now, whilst our Arbitration Courts are overcrowded, would be to impose upon the industrial situation an unfair position. In the second place the men cannot say that they are underpaid. I know personal examples of men who, undertaking this indus-

trial book, can draw the ordinary rate of £4 per week, and can enter the ordinary branches of insurance and so increase their earnings from £6 to £8 weekly and more.

Mr. Underwood: It is a disgrace that they should be allowed to do it.

Capt. CARTER: I do not agree. I believe that the very keenest insurance springs from the application of personal effort. Insurance will die when that personal effort is withdrawn, because many people are so imprudent that they will not see the necessity for insurance. The hon. member said this thing should be cut out, in support of which he quoted one or two extreme cases, the antitheses of that which I have quoted. He quoted the case of a poor mother, and painted a pathetic picture. He said they were all poor mothers. I think differently. Whilst many mothers and fathers are not in a position to go in for wholesale insurance and pay a lump sum of, say, £5 per half-year, they are glad to avail themselves of the opportunity for what might be called retail insurance. This has been successfully demonstrated in Australia, some 9,000 such policies having been issued. It proves the necessity for this branch of insurance. Having established the necessity for this insurance and for visiting those people in this way, we must look at the conditions under which the collections are made. The agents collect on a methodical basis. Having done their round of collections, their work for the department is finished; but they have the insurance tables in their pockets, and can go to the office of the business man, or meet him on the street, and insure him, and so carry out ordinary insurance business, which pays a higher rate than that which they get for industrial insurance. We have in Perth many men who have been employed upwards of 20 years on industrial books. They are not dissatisfied. The dissatisfied man in this industry is he who is not willing to go beyond a certain stage of individual effort. Many men have followed general insurance work in conjunction with their industrial books. I can quote the case of a man who, losing a somewhat lucrative post, preferred to take on industrial insurance. He knew its possibilities, and to-day he is making £8 a week, working his book in about 3½ days, after which he applies his efforts to ordinary insurance work. I can quote the case of a barber, the case of an auctioneer and the case of a land and estate agent, all working books in their spare time in Perth. Those men cannot be supervised in their work. Industrial insurance depends on the individual collector. We cannot picture a staff of inspectors being employed to see that these men do their work. The terms of employment are such as to make it of benefit to the man himself if he increases his work, for as he increases his work so does his remuneration increase. It is agreed that an agent with a £20 book, unless he be incompetent or declines to give his full time to his insurance agency, will earn good money. The

man who fails to do this is unsatisfactory to himself and to his employer, and therefore is not wanted. The rates of commission paid to those men have been referred to by the member for South Fremantle (Mr. McCallum) in the form of a complaint. He says those men have not had their commissions increased. But by the nature of their work they have had their increases. Industrial insurance has increased tremendously in every State, and with the increase of business comes increased remuneration. I believe this thing is vitally necessary to the working man.

Mr. Underwood: It is an imposition on him.

Capt. CARTER: It is wrong to call insurance an imposition. It shows that the hon. member knows nothing about it.

Mr. Underwood: Then I will employ a stronger term.

Capt. CARTER: That serves to emphasise the fact that the hon. member does not know what he is talking about. Industrial insurance is necessary to the working man. He is enjoying it to the tune of nearly a million policies in Australia to-day—

Mr. Underwood: You are wrong.

Capt. CARTER: Representing approximately 20 per cent. of the population. I have referred to the fact that an agent is paid commission on new business. That commission is paid at a special rate on all new business which the agent writes and retains. He is paid 15 times the weekly premium. Thus, if he writes three new members in a week at 1s. each, he gets 15 times each 1s. or 45s. for his week's new business which, added to the £4 he is drawing from his book, brings his salary to about £6 per week. The control of this work is less than nominal. Each man is sent out with a book. He is given a job to do, and if he does it he will be paid on that job. If he does not do it his employer will soon want to get rid of him. That many of these men have been in their positions for a number of years is a potent factor in the consideration of the whole case. The member for Yilgarn (Mr. Corboy) remarked that the weekly payments must be considered in a different light from quarterly payments, the ordinary business of insurance. He seems to think the functions of industrial insurance are all in favour of the insurance company. I think it is a big boon to the industrial world because, largely, those are the people who enjoy the benefits of industrial insurance, and they would find it a distinct hardship if compelled to bring their premiums into the office every week.

Mr. Corboy: They would be far better off on quarterly payments.

Capt. CARTER: That would be wholesale insurance and therefore it would be hard for the individual policy holder to make up his premium payments. We know that in these hard times it is difficult for a mother to find her shilling per week, and

if that is going to be increased to a lump sum of 13s., she will find it even more difficult, and the policy must lapse. In that case she will be the loser and not the company. If we are going to place these men on a wages basis, on a fixed hourly basis; if we are going to bring them under the provisions of the Act, I do not know where it will lead us. At the present time I understand that each company has given an undertaking to increase each man's book and so ensure that his remuneration weekly will amount to £4.

Mr. Corboy: But they are not keeping that promise.

Capt. CARTER: I believe in some cases that is not desired. Where a man has another business he cannot undertake more collections. In other cases where an increase of business has been placed on the books from the office itself, the men whose books did not total £20 had their weekly remuneration brought to £4. Seeing that the industrial insurance agent is not a worker according to the Arbitration Act, and in view of the circumstances which I have outlined to the House that such an agent is nothing else but a commission agent, I do not see how it is possible to bring these people under the terms of the Arbitration Act. The proposal contained in the Bill will make for industrial turmoil rather than peace.

Mr. Corboy: Is that a threat?

Capt. CARTER: That remark is worthy of the hon. member. I am stating my own opinion and I am not inspired, and I hate such a suggestion to come from an hon. member.

Mr. McCallum: What about the letter read by the member for Gascoyne?

Capt. CARTER: I object to the remark made by the member for Yilgarn. The whole situation is this: These men are commission agents and are paid on results and they cannot possibly be brought under the term "worker." I hope therefore that the Bill will not be passed, and that the member for South Fremantle will recognise that the day is not far distant when the House must consider the whole question of arbitration and debate it thoroughly. Our arbitration laws and the Arbitration Court must be put on a sound basis, very different from the position which exists to-day.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN (North-East Fremantle) [7.50]: I have listened attentively to the hon. member who has just sat down. The hon. member having done some arbitration work, I thought he might have enlightened us a little in regard to the matter. He has, however, talked all round the subject without referring to the Bill. I think I can safely say that there is not one member in the House who likes strikes. Therefore, it is our duty as far as possible to try to legislate in such a manner as to prevent strikes taking place. It is true that the Arbitration Act has not given every satisfaction. Some people do not like it at all, but no legislation has ever been placed on the Statute Book

that has satisfied everyone. There are few laws on our Statute Book to-day that are carried out in their entirety; in fact the Government themselves are in that respect the greatest sinners. Seeing then that we do not like strikes, and that the Arbitration Act is not all that we desire, we all agree that the Act, bad as it is, is much better than strikes. That being so, why should we not endeavour as far as possible to include a person who is a worker of any description, and so prevent trouble taking place. It is all very well to say that the men in question do their work in their own time. I do not know whose time it could otherwise be if it is not their own. Every worker to-day does his work in his own time, and if he works after hours, whatever he does is done for the purpose of adding to his income. Take the statement made by the member for Leederville. An insurance agent is given a book. I think I would be safe in saying that the company itself on fixing the rate of commission in regard to the work that the agent has to carry out, puts the position in such a way that it will take the agent an ordinary week to carry out the work of collecting. Some of these people have made good, but others have not. In every line of industry the same thing applies. Suppose, as actually took place a few months ago, a company said, "We are only going to pay you a certain amount; we cannot afford to pay you on commission; we cannot supervise your work. You must get your money in the best way you can."

Capt. Carter: "And if you do not get the business here is your £4 a week."

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: No, they do not say that. Suppose a company say, "We cannot increase your remuneration; we cannot do anything at all because it does not pay us to do so." Take the average man who is employed. He finds that it is impossible to live on the rates of commission paid. Then where is there a better opportunity of saying, "Let the Arbitration Court settle the matter"? If it is good for the clerk it is good for the collector. Where is the difference?

Capt. Carter: Supervision.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: There is no supervision required. If a collector does not bring in the money, his commission is stopped. He must see week after week, month after month, that the contributions are paid, or he goes short of money to provide for himself and his family. There is no need for inspectors or for any supervision except to see that the man who is employed is honest. No other supervision is required. Take the Act as it is to-day. A worker is—

Any person not less than 14 years of age of either sex employed or usually employed by any employer to do any skilled or any unskilled work for hire or reward and includes an apprentice; but shall not include any person engaged in domestic service.

It does not say for wages. It says for hire or reward. So far as insurance companies

are concerned, commission is paid on the collections of the premiums week after week, and the court has declared that as these collectors are paid on commission, they cannot come under the definition of worker. It is a point which could reasonably be argued, and I think if the matter were one of justice instead of law, these people would come under the definition. It is only because lawyers have construed the meaning of words of this description that the insurance agents have been kept outside the law. It is the lawyers, and not Parliament, who say that these men are paid a commission for their services, and because of that they do not come under the definition of "worker." The member for South Fremantle declares that that being so he wishes to make the position clear by amending the Act to the extent of including this provision—

The term also includes agents employed by insurance or assurance companies or societies in collecting premiums, etc., payable under policies, and in canvassing for insurance business, or who are principally employed in such work, whether such agents are paid by salary, commission, or otherwise.

That makes the definition more clear and brings it into line with what undoubtedly was the intention of Parliament when the section was passed. The judges have interpreted it wrongly, and they interpreted it in such a way that it is now the duty of Parliament to step in and say that we believe in arbitration. If we do not believe in it we should abolish the Act. We pass laws for the purpose of carrying arbitration into effect and we desire that arbitration decisions shall be abided by. Arbitration therefore should be extended to all classes of workers whether paid salary, wages or commission. The people in question are not placed in the fortunate position of the Government employees who are able to demand the appointment of special boards to deal with their cases. In my opinion any hon. member who is opposed to bringing all classes of workers under the arbitration laws does not believe in arbitration but prefers strikes.

Mr. Hickmott: These men are opposed to it themselves. They do not want to come under it.

Mr. Corboy: I will bring them all here to-morrow night to convince you differently.

Mr. Munsie: Ninety-five per cent. have expressed the opinion that they want to come under it.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: The member for Gascoyne put the case very clearly from the insurance point of view. Unfortunately so far as the employers are concerned they prefer to have a free hand in every instance. It must be admitted that the insurance agent or the collector is in a position entirely different from that of the land agent or auctioneer.

Capt. Carter: I do not see that.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: I can go to Fremantle to-morrow and put up a sign as a land agent, but I could not take out insurance policies, because the law says that before this sort of thing can be done certain formalities have to be complied with. In the one case I am my own employer, but in the other case I have to be employed by an insurance company that has to lodge a bond with the Government as a guarantee that the policies which the company agrees to pay will be properly carried out.

Capt. Carter: As a land agent you are just as much a servant of your client who gives you a house to sell as an insurance agent is a servant of his company.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: The one is an employer and the other is only an employee. If I had not £20 in the world I could start as a land agent, but I could not start an insurance agency.

Mr. Pickering: You could start one.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: Hon. members know that if I went from door to door offering people certain conditions in some insurance proposal that I had brought out, and if that insurance proposal had not been registered and approved by the Government and the necessary deposits lodged with the Government, I should have the police on my trail and would very soon be in their hands.

Mr. Pickering: Do you not think that is right?

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: I do not say it is wrong, but I am merely pointing out the difference between the land agent and the insurance agent. I could go from door to door as a land agent and ask people to give me their houses to sell under certain conditions, and the police would say I was doing a legitimate business and would not interfere with me. There is no analogy between the two classes of employment. In the interests of peace, fair play, and justice to all concerned, I am surprised that members are opposing the extension of the term "worker" as proposed under this Bill. I admit there are many lines of business carried on with which I do not agree. I do not agree, for instance, with industrial insurance or with any form of insurance at all. I did insure for 30 years.

Mr. Pickering: You did not let it drop after that, did you?

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: I kept it on until I got the money, but I did not insure again afterwards. It would be a good thing if the workers could be convinced that instead of paying money to these insurance companies, they would be better off if they deposited it in the State Savings Bank.

Mr. Johnston: Not in case of death.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: I know that many people have paid out far more than they have got in, but that is not so in the case of the State Savings Bank.

Mr. A. Thomson: Unfortunately, you can draw money out whenever you want it.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: One can get money out of the bank in case of necessity.

Hon. P. Collier: Look at the profits made by the insurance companies.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: Seeing that we are all agreed that arbitration is preferable to strikes, and we realise that differences of opinion are bound to exist in all industries between the workers and the employers, we have set up a court to deal with these troubles so far as the workers are concerned. Are we now to say that though we have set up this law to settle disputes of this nature, and place in the hands of the court powers to deal with such questions, this is only to apply to a few people in the State and that others are to be debarred from these privileges? It is our duty to serve all alike and place everyone on terms of equality with others, and so prevent the fiasco which occurred 12 or 18 months ago when the insurance companies refused to deal fairly with those men whom they employed as their agents. The companies must carry on their business. The member for Leederville has pointed out the advantages of industrial insurance, and said that it is necessary to make weekly collections of the money due, otherwise people would suffer. He also stated that many people were not able to go to the companies themselves in order to make these payments, and that someone must be employed to collect the money. As legislators it is our duty to see that these very people are placed in a position similar to other workers, no matter whether they are paid on commission or by salary. These people are doing certain work which, according to the member for Leederville, it is necessary for them to do, and they should be placed in exactly the same position as the man who is working at the bench. That is all we are asking for. Hon. members are opposing that line of action. I have not heard any reason why it should be opposed. The member for Leederville has said that these agents are earning good money.

Hon. P. Collier: They might get a reduction in their rates.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: The court must decide that. If the court says they must receive less than they are now getting they will receive less, and if the court says they must get more, they will get more. It makes no difference so far as the law is concerned.

Mr. Davies: They cannot get less than the court prescribes.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: The court fixes the rate in the case of every dispute. If everyone is satisfied, the services of the court are not required. They only go to the court in the case of a dispute. These people should be placed in the same position as others in the event of a dispute arising. I trust members will pass this Bill and assist insurance agents in getting fair play, just as they have done in the case of others who are termed workers under the Act. Members seem to object to that portion of the Bill dealing with domestic servants. We have been told by interjection that it is almost impossible to deal with that question under the Arbitration



Court. I cannot understand their attitude. These people are workers.

Mr. Teesdale: You are surely not going to push that?

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: No member can say that the court cannot fix the minimum rate in the case of domestic servants; if it is necessary to do so. I object to the statement that domestic service is not popular, because the girls are not spoken to as "Miss." Unfortunately there are some snobs in the community who say that a domestic servant must address children as "Master Jack" or "Master Jim," whilst the children speak to her as "Jane" or "Mary." I think the girls themselves would prefer to be called by their Christian names than to be called "Miss." They would prefer to be regarded as members of the family, as this form of address would denote. They would be quite content to be one of the family. This idea of suggesting that they would prefer to be called "Miss" is obnoxious. It has no effect whatever upon domestic service. There is no reason why the court should not be able to say, if it is so desired, that this shall be done, but the court does not move of its own volition in such matters.

Mr. Pickering: It moves very slowly.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: The court does not take action unless something arises which, in the interests of peace, makes it necessary to do so.

Mr. Pickering: That necessity is always arising.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: The court will not say "Jane Smith has a disagreement with her mistress. Let us see what it is like. Summon her to the court and let us hear all about it." The court would not do anything of the sort unless requested to do so. When an injustice is done it is the duty of the court to see that the people are properly protected. That is all the Bill is asking for. Again, why should an employee in a club, a man-servant working there day in and day out, and serving beer and whisky when other people are in bed, not to be regarded as a worker?

Mr. Pickering: You cannot belong to a club if you say that.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: Why should not such men be placed in a similar position to men who serve beer behind the bar of an hotel?

Mr. Pickering: You do not know anything about a club.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: I rarely go to a club now, but I have been in one. There should be no difference between an employee of a club and an employee of an hotel.

Mr. Money: One is a private house and the other is a public house.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: One is a disgrace and the other is looked after. If I had my way I would close up every club. There are more homes broken up as a result of club life than through hotels.

Mr. J. Thomson: You do not know what you are talking about.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: I do. Clubs have been the cause of more distress among men than any hotel that was ever built. I have seen it; I could mention the names of influential people who have gone to the dogs because they have been members of clubs; but that is not in the Bill. If clubs desire to employ men to keep them in proper order, either as attendants, or in some other capacity, these men should have the protection that the court can afford in fixing such rates and conditions that are made to apply to other workers. That is all the Bill asks for. If a dispute arises let them go to the Arbitration Court. People say, let them work in harmony with their employers, but settle their differences without striking. Let them keep the machinery going. And yet, when this simple request is made, members oppose it. I am surprised that they should do so. They have given no tangible reasons for their attitude. I trust they will realise it is only fair that, since we have an arbitration court, every employee, no matter what circumstances exist under which he is employed, shall have an opportunity of availing himself of the privileges offered by the court.

Mr. MULLANY (Menzies) [8.13]: I intend to oppose the second reading of this Bill. I doubt very much whether it would have the effect which the member for South Fremantle thinks it would. He says it is intended to bring about smoother working in industrial matters in this State. I am inclined to agree with the member for North-East Fremantle (Hon. W. C. Angwin) in his contention that the definition of "worker" in the Act is broad enough to cover insurance agents. A mistake has been made by the judge in the Arbitration Court in giving a ruling that this class of worker is outside the jurisdiction of the Arbitration Court. There is a danger of Parliament going to extremes in specifying different industries which should come within the scope of the Act. All workers should come within it. An illustration of this danger has already been afforded to us. The Act specifically says that domestic workers do not come under it, and yet the arbitration court has ruled that employees in clubs come under the definition of domestic workers. There is a danger that if we start stating specifically who shall be included under the Arbitration Act, amateur advocates who are not concerned with the smooth working of industry but rather with making a living as advocates in the Arbitration Court will raise the contention that because specific industries are not mentioned in the Bill, those industries are outside the scope of the Arbitration Court. I will not deal with the question as to whether insurance agents are a desirable class in the community or not, but the contention was put up that the work these men are doing is conducive to thrift on the part of the poorer section of the community.

It is contended that, without the work of these agents, those industrialists would not save that percentage of their earnings that they do to-day. If it is correct, as the member for Yilgarn (Mr. Corboy) stated, that there are something like 100 of these agents in and around Perth, I think the industrialists should realise that they are paying too much towards the upkeep of that number of men for the services they are receiving. It would be wise to point out to the industrialists of this State that it would be better if they went to the trouble of putting their shilling or so per week in the Savings Bank, where they would get better returns.

Mr. Corboy: They do not have much chance to do that.

Mr. Munsie: It would not pay them any better if they did that.

Mr. MULLANY: I do not know.

Mr. Munsie: I do.

Mr. MULLANY: The member for Hannans (Mr. Munsie) is dogmatic but I do not know that what he is saying is correct.

Mr. Munsie: I have the tables here and they would not get so much for their shilling a week.

Mr. MULLANY: In any case, I am opposing the Bill along these lines. Regarding the second proposal, namely that which affects domestic servants and those people who are engaged in domestic work generally, that proposal is a very different matter indeed. Some hon. members have asked whether we can give a definition of what is a domestic servant. I admit it may be difficult but, without attempting to give an exact definition of the term, I think it will be generally agreed that the women folk who are engaged in domestic service are conferring the greatest possible benefit on their fellow men and on the State. There is no more desirable or more honourable work in which women can embark than domestic service. My definition would be roughly—and it should be good enough for the Arbitration Court—"the care of young children and the attending to the material welfare and comfort of the men engaged in our primary and producing industries." I believe one of the greatest tragedies of present day life is that there are too many young girls and some practically middle-aged women who are neglecting that most important phase of women's work, namely domestic service, and are showing a desire to go into shops, offices and, generally, to compete with the male workers. I do not believe that this spirit is conducive to the welfare of this or any other community, and if we can do anything to raise the status of domestic service and make it, if I may use the term, more fashionable, I believe that in a few years' time we will be a much happier and more contented community. What would be the effect of bringing domestic workers within the scope of the Arbitration Act? I do not take any notice whatever of remarks made by different hon. members in opposing the Bill, in the course of which they contended that the wages and con-

ditions are already adequate, that there is no necessity for enabling domestic workers to go to the Arbitration Court, that there are good employers and that good domestic servants can get good conditions and practically control their own remuneration and conditions themselves. All that may be true to a limited extent. If all employers were good, there would be no necessity for Arbitration Acts at all. Unfortunately, when we attempt to legislate, we have to keep the view in mind that all employers are not good employers. If I thought it would do something towards raising the status of domestic servants, I would support the proposal brought forward by the member for South Fremantle (Mr. McCallum). Has arbitration, looking back over the very few years that system has been in existence in Western Australia and in Australia generally, been successful? I am doubtful, in view of past results and in view of actions taken by parties concerned in arbitration, about the success which will attend the proposal if agreed to, and I am doubtful if it will have the effect of raising the status of this particular body of workers. It was pleasing to hear the member for South Fremantle say that he has always supported arbitration, and he said that resolutions had been carried by Labour organisations throughout Australia affirming the principle of arbitration. That is perfectly correct, but I would also like to point out that, unfortunately, both sections in past years, namely employers and employees, have treated arbitration much in the manner that unworthy parents, who have brought into the world a child they did not want, have starved that child by neglect and indifference. How has arbitration been treated in recent years in Western Australia, notwithstanding that labour organisations have undoubtedly carried resolutions affirming the principle of arbitration? I think that, though organisations have carried resolutions affirming the principle of arbitration, they have done so with the reservation that they accept arbitration when it suits themselves.

Hon. P. Collier: But there has not been so great a departure as you suggest. The overwhelming majority who have affirmed the principle of arbitration have honourably carried out their obligations.

Mr. MULLANY: I regret I must differ from the Leader of the Opposition regarding that statement.

Hon. P. Collier: Give us facts.

Mr. Corboy: The Arbitration Court cannot deal with all the cases before it now.

Hon. P. Collier: The courts are crowded with cases that cannot be given a hearing.

Mr. MULLANY: That is because arbitration has never yet been given a decent chance either by employer or employee.

Mr. Marshall: Do you advocate the abolition of the Arbitration Court altogether?

Mr. MULLANY: The member for Murchison (Mr. Marshall) may advocate anything he likes.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. Marshall: I am asking your opinion on arbitration.

Mr. MULLANY: My opinion is that to-day we have nothing better than arbitration for the settlement of industrial disputes; nothing more workable has been advanced by mankind so far. I agree to that extent with the member for South Fremantle. I have been asked whether there are any instances where arbitration has been flouted.

Hon. P. Collier: I did not ask you that. I know there are some such instances but I contend that the overwhelming majority of those who pledged themselves to the principle of arbitration, have honourably carried out their pledges.

Mr. MULLANY: That may be so, but unfortunately minorities have flouted the Arbitration Act and they have done it so successfully that, notwithstanding that an overwhelming majority of the workers of Western Australia have observed the conditions of arbitration, the minority, led by different individuals, have flouted the awards and the overwhelming majority have had to sit down and support them or be termed scabs.

Hon. P. Collier: The majority of the people flout every law.

Mr. MULLANY: That may be so. Unfortunately, employers and employees have not regarded arbitration as it should have been regarded and stuck to the principle as they should have done. This has been the weakness of arbitration all through. I was pleased to hear the member for South Fremantle say that although he disliked arbitration, he dislikes strikes more. In putting up his case, however, he appeared to think he carried the full burden of the workers regarding arbitration upon his shoulders. He said:

I am giving my own personal experiences. I know the position I have had to face; I know the arguments I have had to meet; I know what accounts and documents I have had to produce. It is of no use saying that this sort of thing does not exist when I have had to meet it on so many occasions.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: He could say that in the position he has held.

Mr. MULLANY: He also said:

This is the stand I take regarding arbitration. At present I am not able to propose anything better, but I wish to improve the system. I wish to suggest an improvement to the existing law . . . I wish to get away from the system of strikes. I have never entered into a strike with any feeling of pleasure but always with a great deal of anxiety and worry, knowing what it means to a man holding the position which I held in the movement. No one has greater abhorrence of strikes than I have. Much as I dislike arbitration, I dislike strikes more.

Hon. P. Collier: The hon. member was speaking for himself.

Mr. MULLANY: But here we have an accredited leader of the Labour movement of

Western Australia and when he speaks of arbitration in this manner, is it to be wondered that the system has not flourished? Here a leader of the Labour movement says, "I dislike arbitration; I only like it because we cannot get anything better."

Mr. O'Loghlen: That was the attitude you adopted.

Mr. MULLANY: No, it was not.

Mr. O'Loghlen: Of course it was.

Mr. MULLANY: I have always supported arbitration.

Mr. O'Loghlen: No matter what the decision may have been?

Mr. MULLANY: I admit at times it may have been irksome.

Mr. O'Loghlen: You would not try to get the position improved?

Mr. MULLANY: Yes, of course I would.

Mr. O'Loghlen: That is what the member for South Fremantle is trying to do.

Mr. MULLANY: Yes, that may be so, but with the member for North-East Fremantle (Hon. W. C. Angwin) I hope to see the Government bring in a consolidating measure which will remedy the position to a greater extent.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: That is only an excuse.

Mr. Marshall: You are also dissatisfied with the Arbitration Court as it stands?

Mr. MULLANY: The member for South Fremantle complained that the Government did not adopt his suggestion when he asked for the appointment of a permanent president. He said that the weakness of the present Arbitration Court system was that we have never had a permanent judge. He said:

The position now is that a president may give a decision in one way to-day, and a month hence we may have another judge interpreting the law in the opposite direction. Up to the present time not one president has occupied his position with the intention of retaining it permanently. Each one has been anxious to get away from it at the earliest opportunity.

I agree with the hon. member there, and I would go further and say that another weakness in the Arbitration Court is that whereas we have as president a judge of the Supreme Court, we also have two other members of the court who are termed his colleagues. To my mind, they are not colleagues of the president at all. They are simply the advocates for the employer and the employee respectively.

Mr. SPEAKER: I am afraid the hon. member is getting away from the question.

Hon. P. Collier: He has been away from it for some time.

Mr. MULLANY: I was putting this up as an argument as to why I reject the proposed amendment at the present stage with a view to getting a more comprehensive measure embodying my ideas in the near future. I believe that the principle of the employers electing one member and the employees electing another is absolutely unsound. I have no objection to the method of ap-

pointment, but I do decidedly object to each one of the supposed colleagues of the president of the Arbitration Court having to go for re-election by the employers and employees every three years. Under these conditions no man, I care not who he is, can give justice while sitting there. He knows that if he were even suspected of giving straight even-handed justice, when his time came for re-election, he would have a very unenviable experience indeed. I would not mind the workers and employers appointing a man, but after that the members of the court, who are just as important in the court as the president himself, should be permitted to remain there pending good behaviour, as is the president. This would be a good amendment to make to the Act.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member must not pursue that further.

Mr. MULLANY: The Premier this afternoon referred to the proposed amendment on the Notice Paper in the name of the member for West Perth (Mrs. Cowan).

Hon. P. Collier: You cannot discuss that.

Mr. MULLANY: It has been discussed already.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member may refer to it.

Mr. MULLANY: This amendment is an additional reason why I intend to oppose the second reading of the Bill.

Mr. Corboy: Reject the amendment in Committee.

Mr. MULLANY: I would not like to give the member for West Perth an opportunity to move such an amendment as this, an amendment for which I believe she would be very sorry ever afterwards.

Mr. Corboy: That is the weakest get-out I ever heard.

Hon. P. Collier: I must rise to a point of order. The hon. member is still discussing this amendment. It is clearly out of order to discuss an amendment which may not be reached, which may never be moved, and which is not in the Bill before the House.

Mr. SPEAKER: I shall permit the hon. member to refer to it. I must allow a lot of latitude on this, because the question is important.

Hon. P. Collier: Yes, but the amendment should not be discussed.

Mr. MULLANY: A considerable amount of latitude was given to the member for South Fremantle (Mr. McCallum) in moving the second reading of the Bill, and I do not think that I have transgressed very much. The Premier referred to the amendment at some length this afternoon and opposed it. I wish to say nothing more than that I trust, in the interests of the married folk of this State, such a proposal will never be debated, and never be carried by any Parliament in Australia.

it would be better to wait until we can bring in satisfactory and conclusive amendments which are badly needed to the Arbitration Act. It would have been better if some attempt had been made to get the Government to bring down a Bill of this description than to deal with the question piecemeal in the way we are trying to do. I realise that there are plenty of men in this House to deal with the questions which have arisen with regard to Clause 2, but if the Bill is proceeded with I intend to move an amendment which stands on the Notice Paper. I do not know whether I am in order in reading it now.

Mr. SPEAKER: No. The hon. member may refer to it, but she can deal with it in Committee.

Mrs. COWAN: The amendment is the only logical corollary to bringing household workers under the Act.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member is in order in discussing it, because domestic servants are mentioned in the Bill.

Mrs. COWAN: I think it will be a great mistake to eliminate the words mentioned in paragraph (b).

Mr. Munsie: Let the poor girls work for anything the "missus" likes to give them.

Mrs. COWAN: I do not wish or suggest such a thing. Why should not married women have a union? Why should they be cut off from the same privileges? I do not think members of the Opposition would wish that their wives should be cut off from the same standing and privileges as a domestic worker will enjoy.

Mr. Corboy: I would sooner have her as a partner than as an employee.

✓ Mrs. COWAN: This is my reason for giving notice of the amendment. If the Bill were passed, a woman doing domestic work would be forced to do more than ever, and she should have a reasonable wage and be able to apply to the Arbitration Court for proper hours, payment and so on. No man, when he marries a woman, asks her to be anything else but his wife and the mother of his children. He does not ask her to be the cook, the housekeeper, the cleaner, the scrubber and the washerwoman. Therefore, if we are to bring any section of household workers under the Act, I maintain that logically, and in justice to the married women, they have a right also to be brought under the Act and have their hours, etc., dictated by the judge, before whom they will have an opportunity to state their case. Of course, they will not be bound to go to the Arbitration Court. They need not be bound by the Arbitration Court if they do not wish it. If it is good for the housemaid and cook to go to the Arbitration Court, if it is good for the washerwoman to go to the Arbitration Court, it is equally good for the wife to do so. That is my reason for giving notice of the amendment.

Mr. Teesdale: We shall have a revolution.

Mrs. COWAN: That is perfectly true. I have heard it stated in this House that there

X Mrs. COWAN (West Perth) [8.33]: I do not wish to support this Bill at the present time for the simple reason that I think

are some things which can only be put right by a revolution. Consequently, if measures of this nature are brought down, we must expect revolutions. Logically, that is the only thing which can happen. If the privacy of every home is to be invaded by people going in to see whether the wages book is properly kept and whether the time sheets are properly kept, I am not objecting to it if it is considered to be the proper thing; but I want to see that the wife gets a time sheet, and the husband will then have to keep it together with the wages sheet, and the wife will have her proper hours day and night. She will not be bound to go to the Arbitration Court if she does not wish to, and she will have a very much better time than ever before. I must ask this House to consider seriously these amendments to the Arbitration Act. They are serious and may possibly deal a blow to home life.

Mr. Lambert: Then why make them a laughing stock by your amendment?

Mrs. COWAN: The member for Roebourne (Mr. Teesdale) said we shall have a revolution. It is time we had a revolution in that respect—

Mr. Simons: Will the court be asked to define the duties of a wife?

Mrs. COWAN: But let it come by degrees, if possible. I stand for the women of this State.

Members: No.

Mr. Marshall: You do not stand for my wife's cause, anyhow, and I will see that she does not go to the Arbitration Court.

Mrs. COWAN: The hon. member, judging by his tone and the remarks he made here one night, is probably one whose wife might be most happy and pleased if brought under the Arbitration Act.

Mr. DAVIES (Guildford) [8.40]: It is to be regretted that the Standing Orders will not permit members to discuss the question of industrial arbitration generally.

Hon. P. Collier: It is regrettable.

Mr. SPEAKER: Not on this Bill. I have allowed a lot of latitude:

Mr. DAVIES: It would be better for this country if right here and now members were permitted to discuss the whole question. Since the inception of industrial arbitration in this State—members on the Opposition side particularly will agree with me in this—it has been abused firstly by the employers and secondly by the unions, particularly by those who have occupied a strong economic position in the affairs of the State.

Mr. Wilson: And sometimes by the judge.

Mr. DAVIES: Possibly sometimes by the judge. If there is one thing more deplorable than another in connection with industrial arbitration, it is due to the selfish and unmitigated attitude of many of the strong unions jumping the claims of the weak unions awaiting their turn before the Court of Arbitration.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member is getting away from the Bill.

Mr. O'Loughlen: What instances have you in mind?

Mr. DAVIES: We are not permitted to quote instances. The member for Forrest knows them very well.

Hon. P. Collier: The judge decides that.

Mr. DAVIES: Not often.

Mr. O'Loughlen: Of course, he has full power.

Mr. DAVIES: How many judges have been game enough, when a strong union holding a key position in this State has gone on strike, to say, "All right, you shall be heard next year."

Hon. P. Collier: The Commonwealth Government have given them a lead many times.

Mr. SPEAKER: I cannot allow the hon. member to spread himself on general principles.

Mr. Troy: You are dealing with the general principles.

Mr. DAVIES: I admit that. If one clearly desired to get at the root—

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member cannot discuss that under this Bill. The Bill does not permit of a wide discussion on general principles. I have allowed him great latitude.

Mr. Troy: Move a motion and you can then spread yourself.

Mr. DAVIES: I have to be restricted, much as I dislike it.

Mr. Pickering: You can get in a word now and again.

Mr. Lambert: The member for Sussex will show you how to do that.

Mr. DAVIES: I intend to adopt an attitude somewhat different at least from those who have spoken on my side of the House.

Mr. O'Loughlen: I am glad to hear that.

Mr. DAVIES: There has been some discussion to-night with regard to the question of principal and agent. Let me tell members that, whatever they are called, the real relationship is employer and employee. Those men who are working for salary, wages or commission stand in the relationship of employer and employee. There is absolutely no difference between an agent working for a commission and an employee who has sometimes to go and beg for employment. The member for Katanning (Mr. A. Thomson) said it would be an easy matter for an insurance agent to obtain employment. Let me remind him that, first of all, a man, to obtain employment of this character, has to produce testimonials as to his character.

Mr. Corboy: And pretty stiff ones, too.

Mr. O'Loughlen: He is generally half starved before he takes it on.

Mr. DAVIES: I have lived in the day when an ordinary coal miner had to produce credentials as to his character:

Mr. Wilson: I did not think they had any.

Mr. DAVIES: I have lived in the days when, before one could obtain employment either in a mine or in a factory, one had to produce one's discharge from the last place of employment. We discovered that those discharges were secretly marked, sometimes in

invisible ink, as to the character one bore in the last employment.

Mr. Wilson: How did you read the marks in invisible ink?

Mr. DAVIES: Because geniuses cropped up equal to the occasion. But let me come to the subject of the Bill. Not one member of this Chamber to-night has raised a logical objection to the inclusion of insurance agents in the Bill. I say that without any disrespect.

Capt. Carter: It is only your opinion that no logical argument was advanced.

Mr. DAVIES: I am rather surprised that the member for Leederville, who stated that he was expressing his opinions, should object to me expressing mine. We have to take responsibility for our opinions. I am prepared to take the responsibility for mine.

Capt. Carter: You did not say anything objectionable. I was referring to objectionable remarks.

Mr. DAVIES: In speaking on the measure, members preserved a remarkable silence with regard to the inclusion of domestic servants employed in private houses. If one goes through the debate in "Hansard" and re-reads it as carefully as possible, one must come to the conclusion that domestic servants in private houses have been included—

Member: As a side issue.

Hon. P. Collier: There is only one speech in "Hansard" yet on this Bill.

Mr. DAVIES: That is so.

Hon. P. Collier: And yet the hon. member speaks of what members opposite are recorded in "Hansard" as having said.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. DAVIES: Let the Leader of the Opposition bear in mind that there is no more important speech on a Bill than that of the mover of the second reading. If he is silent on this particular matter—

Mr. O'Loughlen: Was he silent on it?

Mr. DAVIES: Yes.

Mr. O'Loughlen: I do not think so.

Mr. DAVIES: On Clause 2 (b) I think he was absolutely silent, so far as it concerns domestics in private houses.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member is not replying to that if it was silent.

Mr. DAVIES: There are at least two classes of domestic servants. One is the servant employed in a club, whether residential or otherwise, and another is the domestic in private employ. Then I may say there is the domestic servant in an institution such as a hospital. Domestics in Government institutions have been granted arbitration by the present Government. An arbitrator has conducted an inquiry with regard to their claims, and delivered an award. For instance, there are the domestics employed at the Hospital for the Insane. That being so, how can the Government, or how can hon. members on this side, logically object to the inclusion of domestic servants of that description in this Bill?

Hon. P. Collier: They are not objecting logically, but merely as a matter of prejudice.

Mr. DAVIES: They are objecting. I ask

hon. members to take note of the fact to which I allude, and to see that domestics employed in clubs are included in this Bill. However, we have not yet come to the position when we can decide that domestics in private houses shall be included within the scope of the Arbitration Court.

Mr. Munsie: What is the difference?

Mr. DAVIES: One employee is engaged for profit, the other is not. I do not think any judge would rule that domestic servants in private employ are engaged in an industry for profit. If one goes into homes where the mothers have families above the average, and then if one goes into homes where the family is below the average, one frequently finds that a girl from the latter goes to assist the mother in the former, with the result that the mother with the large family receives a little help and that the mother with the small family gets a few shillings extra. How are the conditions of work of a domestic in private employ to be defined or regulated? Shall we say there must be so many domestics for so many children? The House need not go into hysterics on the question of the inclusion of domestics or their exclusion. To-day there is sitting in Washington a conference which is to decide whether the nations shall disarm completely and settle their disputes by arbitration; and here we are disputing over the insignificant question whether insurance agents shall be included within the scope of the Arbitration Act. Where is our sense of proportion?

Mr. Money: With our deficit, where is our sense of proportion?

Mr. DAVIES: I fail to see what bearing the deficit has on this Bill. For some reason to my mind unaccountable, the Government, or the Standing Orders, permit private members' night to be occupied with heroics, or hysterics, or—

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member is not right in that statement. We are now dealing with an Order of the Day, in the ordinary course of business.

Mr. DAVIES: I did not intend any affront to hon. members.

Mr. Pickering: How are you voting on this Bill?

Mr. DAVIES: I intended to say—

Hon. P. Collier: You did say.

Mr. DAVIES: I did say that I intended to support the measure as far as the inclusion of insurance agents and of domestic servants engaged in an industry. By that I implied the exclusion of domestics in private employ.

Mr. Marshall: Are you afraid of the amendment of the member for West Perth (Mrs. Cowan) being carried?

Mr. DAVIES: There will be a time for discussing that.

Hon. P. Collier: There is a time for silly moments.

Mr. DAVIES: I am concerned as regards the question of industrial arbitration. While I agree that the whole subject should be reopened and discussed, I think half-a-loaf to-night is better than nothing. We are taking

things piecemeal. Look where we will, we cannot see that anyone has taken up the question of industrial arbitration so as to go through with it properly. We patch here and we patch there, simply because things are in a state of flux.

Hon. P. Collier: "Next session" is always the session for important comprehensive measures.

Mr. DAVIES: Yes; or else a summer session, held during the months when our blood is at the highest heat and we therefore can discuss things, dispassionately. I appeal to members, and especially to members on this side of the House, to realise that industrial arbitration, while not on its trial—it has passed its trial—is, like a good many other things to-day, somewhat obsolete and therefore in need of amendment. I do not believe in judge-made law. No one has been more incensed than myself at some of the objections raised by employers against employees in the Arbitration Court.

Mr. SPEAKER: I must draw the hon. member's attention to the Bill.

Mr. DAVIES: This Bill provides that, either through a private arbitrator or through the Arbitration Court, all employees, as far as possible, shall have some tribunal available for the redress of their grievances and the hearing of their just claims. I hope the second reading will be carried. In Committee I shall take the opportunity of endeavouring to get domestic servants in private employ excluded from the Bill.

On motion by Hon. P. Collier debate adjourned.

## BILL—CONSTITUTION FURTHER AMENDMENT.

### Second Reading.

Hon. P. COLLIER (Boulder) [8.58] in moving the second reading said: On several occasions during the past four years I have attempted to secure an amendment in our Constitution liberalising the franchise for another place. Sometimes I have been defeated in this House, and sometimes in another place; but always, in the final result, have I suffered defeat. However, I am hoping for better fortune on this occasion, because I have been more moderate in the Bill now offered for the consideration of the House. One attempt I made to reform the franchise of another place sought to place the franchise on a similar basis to that obtaining in respect of elections for the Legislative Assembly. That proposal did not meet with the approval of Parliament. Later I made an attempt to go half-way, so to speak; to modify the franchise for another place and to abolish some of the property qualifications—qualifications which still exist. If hon. members will turn to the modest little Bill before them, they will see that it provides one amendment only, an amendment in relation to what is generally known as the householder qualification. As hon. mem-

bers are aware the qualification to-day consists of a householder occupying a dwelling of a clear annual value of £17 sterling. I propose to repeal that £17 sterling qualification, and in its place put what is known as the household qualification. That is to say, that every person who is an occupier, whether as owner or tenant, of a house, regardless of its annual value, shall be entitled to be on the roll for the Council. It does not meet with my conception of what the franchise for another place should be, but I introduce it in the hope that it will help to remove a qualification or a clause which has been the subject of bitter dispute at the elections for another place, and I am hopeful that before the next elections for the Council come around we shall have removed that source of objection and of many prosecutions in different parts of the State.

Mr. Mann: Mostly on the goldfields.

Hon. P. COLLIER: Yes, by virtue of the standard of the homes occupied up there. The present £17 qualification does not affect anybody in the city, because there is practically no house in the metropolitan area or in the more settled portions of the State which does not reach that qualification. So the Bill will not affect the settled portions of the State. A large number of people have to follow an occupation in more remote parts of the State, engaged in an industry which cannot be described as permanent. Because they follow a transient industry they do not go to the expense of building the same class of homes as is to be found in districts where the industries are of a more permanent nature. Why should they be deprived of a vote for the Council? There is on the goldfields a considerable number of people living in small hessian or galvanised-iron houses, the value of which has been held to be under £17 per annum, and therefore their occupiers have been disqualified as electors to the Council. Why should those people be disfranchised? At least they ought to have similar opportunity as those following occupations of somewhat the same value in other parts of the State, particularly in the metropolitan area. There is too, something of a logical feature behind household franchise. It is an utter absurdity to fix a qualification based on an annual value. What, precisely, is it that guides us in fixing an annual value at £17 instead of at £15 or £20? What virtue is there in a 7s. weekly rental as against a rental of 5s. or 10s.?

[The Deputy Speaker took the Chair.]

Mr. Mann: It represents a shilling per night for a bed. If a man lives a year in a camp he must be held to have expended more than £17 for his accommodation.

Hon. P. COLLIER: But he would not be qualified by reason of that. Hundreds of men on the goldfields are living in camps which meet all their requirements. However, the camps have been held to be under the

value of £17, and therefore their occupiers are not entitled to a vote for the Council.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: They have always taken the municipal valuation, which is wrong.

Hon. P. COLLIER: Three or four years ago, scores of men were prosecuted and fined, merely because they got themselves enrolled as occupiers of those camps.

Mr. Teesdale: Would you hold a bush hut to be a qualification?

Hon. P. COLLIER: I would hold as a qualification any structure which furnished the requirements of a home.

Mr. Teesdale: What about a 6 x 8 tent?

Hon. P. COLLIER: Some of the best men that ever set foot in this country have lived in a 6 x 8 tent. Many of them afterwards became wealthy and were able to live in palatial residences; but they were not any the better citizens than when living in a 6 x 8 tent.

Mr. Teesdale: It is not a permanent structure, is it?

Hon. P. COLLIER: If the hon. member will read the interpretation of "structure" he will find that it does come within that definition. A 6 x 8 tent, if affixed to the ground, provides all the requirements of a home.

Mr. Mann: I do not think you had that in mind when you drafted the Bill.

Hon. P. COLLIER: I will be quite satisfied if the Bill goes through as it stands. I do not think it can make any distinction between a tent and a hessian camp. A tent may not be considered to be a permanent building affixed to the soil, but I think it would come under the definition of this clause. In any case, the line must be drawn somewhere. We cannot insert in a Bill a detailed description of the house which would enable the occupier to become qualified as an elector to the Council. We cannot say it shall be composed of brick, or of wood, or of iron, or of canvas. We must describe it in general terms, and so I believe the clause covers a tent as well as structures of more permanent character. The people living in less imposing structures are carrying on the duties of citizenship just as well as, and in many cases better than, those fortunate enough to be living in more stately homes. Particularly is that the case in Western Australia which, if we leave the city out of account, is in its pioneering stages. The men who have, ever since the State was founded, done most in opening up and assisting in the development of the State and its industries were men who by virtue of their calling had to live in flimsy structures. That will ever be the case in a young country. It would not apply to the same extent in a State like Victoria, or in many portions of New South Wales, which are more closely settled. It is wrong that we should deny those men who have the courage to go out in the remote parts of the State, and say that because they do not occupy houses of a certain annual value they shall be deprived of a vote as electors to another

place. There are 160,000 electors on the rolls for the Assembly, as against 45,000 electors—I do not say names on the rolls—to the Council and I need not remind the House that members of another place have equal power with members here; in fact they have many times shown that they have greater power, because whereas we might spend days and weeks discussing Bills, another place merely throws them into the waste paper basket without very much consideration. It is wrong that such a limited section of the adult population of the State should have votes for another place and so have power to veto the will of the greater number who elect members to this House. The Bill will be easily and readily understood. It embraces the very minimum of reform which could be asked for. In regard to the extension of the franchise, I do not propose to take away any of the qualifications enjoyed to-day. The freehold and the two leasehold qualifications under the Constitution Act are to be retained. Whilst the Bill will extend the vote to a limited number who do not enjoy the franchise to-day, it will not deprive of his vote any person now qualified. Therefore the objection raised by the member for Williams-Narrogin (Mr. Johnston) last time I introduced the Bill, namely that while it proposed to extend the franchise to a large number it proposed also to take away the vote from many who then enjoyed it, does not lie in respect of the present Bill. I hope the Bill will meet with favourable consideration.

On motion by the Premier, debate adjourned.

## BILL—PERMANENT RESERVE (CLAREMONT).

### Second Reading.

Mr. J. THOMSON (Claremont) [9.14] in moving the second reading said: I am sorry I cannot put before the House something attractive, as the Leader of the Opposition has done. If in order I would have supported him in wiping out the whole of the Upper House.

Mr. McCallum: You are looking for support for this Bill.

Mr. J. THOMSON: That is so.

Hon. P. Collier: This is a very good little Bill of yours.

Mr. J. THOMSON: For the last six months we in Claremont have been trying to get some agreement from the Perth City Council to supply us with electric current. Unfortunately some Government—I do not know which—entered into an agreement to give the council a monopoly of the electric supply within five miles of the post office.

Mr. O'Loghlen: These monopolies are always dangerous.



Mr. J. THOMSON: They are. The Claremont municipal council have decided to duplicate the present plant, and we are asking that a little over one acre be taken from the reserve in order to put the new plant alongside the old one.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: Cannot they supply you more cheaply than you can generate?

Mr. J. THOMSON: No. We have decided to duplicate the plant at Claremont, and we are merely asking that we shall be granted a little over an acre of this particular Class A reserve, so that we may erect the necessary additional plant beside the existing one. It is our desire to start work straight away, and I hope therefore that hon. members will agree to pass the Bill without delay.

The Minister for Works: Why not arrange with the Perth City Council?

Mr. J. THOMSON: They want to charge us a rate which would give them a profit of 1d. per unit, and we say that is too much. I thank the Premier and the Leader of the Opposition for their promise of support. I can assure hon. members that the proposal of the Claremont Council will be of considerable benefit to the ratepayers in that suburb. This is only a small Bill that I am introducing, but at a later stage I hope to be able to introduce Bills, either from this side of the House or the other side of the House, which will be of benefit to all the citizens of the State. I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

On motion by the Minister for Works debate adjourned.

## BILL—HEALTH ACT AMENDMENT.

### Second Reading.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY (Hon. F. T. Broun—Beverley) [9.20] in moving the second reading said: The passage of the Bill is necessary because of the fact that Section 256 which deals with venereal diseases continues in operation only from year to year. Since the Health Act was originally passed it has been necessary to present a Bill similar to the one before hon. members each year. The Bill relates to that particular section of the Act which provides that where the Commissioner has reason to believe that a person is suffering from venereal disease, he can compulsorily, if he considers it necessary to do so, order that person to be examined. During last year the number of cases notified was 983. Of that number 867 were males and 115 females. Since the Act came into force in 1916, the total number of notifications has been 5,713.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: How many of those are duplications?

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: That is all the more reason why we should continue this particular section. Even if these people went up for examination half a dozen

times, that proves that the Bill is necessary in order to compel those suffering from the disease to attend to receive treatment. Of the total of 5,713 the males numbered 4,887, and the females 826. These, of course, are cases that have come under supervision and have been reported to the Commissioner. Outside of that number, of course there are those who obtain medicines themselves and who go to chemists for treatment and who do not notify medical practitioners.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: Are you sure of that? The COLONIAL SECRETARY: I am not sure of it.

The Minister for Works: It is extremely probable.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: Why do the Government not prosecute the chemists? What you say is only supposition.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: That is so. I am justified in supposing that it is so. There is nothing in the Act to prevent anyone from going to a chemist and purchasing medicine for the treatment of the disease. I am not able to understand the opposition of the hon. member. By that opposition he is doing an absolute injustice to the community.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: I am up against the unsigned statement.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: The Bill will be useless without the unsigned statement.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: Bunkum!

Mr. Teesdale: This legislation is being copied everywhere.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: True, during the past year, there were only two compulsory notifications, but because of that I do not want hon. members to say that the Act is of no use and that we should not continue it. But for this legislation we would have had unscrupulous and indecent people, men especially, and some women as well, going about contaminating the community because they would not trouble about being cured.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: Why don't you say that you think that would be the case?

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: The fact of the section being in the Act is an incentive towards compelling them to realise their responsibility.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: Bunkum; rot. You have no proof of what you say; it is only supposition.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: There is a rapidly growing feeling in favour of compulsory notification.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: That is why they dropped it in New South Wales.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: This feeling exists not only throughout Australia but in many parts of the world to-day. In England, America, Canada, and South Africa, similar legislation exists, while Norway, Sweden, and Denmark are realising the importance of compulsory legislation. It has been stated at different times,

and it is stated even now by a number of people who still object to the Act—

Hon. W. C. Angwin: People are not objecting to the Act; they object to the unsigned statement.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: Objecting to that section whereby anyone can give information to the Commissioner setting out that a person is suffering from this disease, and without having to sign a statement when making their charge to the Commissioner. It has been said that the Bill will operate mainly against women.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: You had six at least who were proved not to be infected.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: The percentage in that respect has been very small.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: Six that we now of.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: The Bill is justified even with that small percentage. Every precaution is taken and there is every secrecy observed. When notifications are made, the woman has the opportunity of going to her own medical adviser, or even to a female doctor if she so desires, and where it has been found that the results of the examinations were negative no complaints were made by the individuals. They asked for no redress.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: It would have been useless.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: One feature in connection with this legislation is that those who have been up for examination are watched and are obliged to report from time to time to the medical officer who is attending them, and they are not given a certificate to show that they are cured until the medical officer is undoubtedly satisfied that his patient is free from the disease. Prior to this particular section coming into force, quite a number abandoned treatment before they were absolutely cured, and in that way they continued to spread the disease.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: How many men did you ask to come up for compulsory examination? Not a solitary individual.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: Quite a number of them. They are bound to go before a medical man until they obtain a certificate proving that they are free from the disease. I would also like to point out the absolute necessity that exists for the continuation of this clause. We have not only in this State but in all parts of the world that dread disease syphilis. Out of the number of cases I quoted, 5,000 odd, no fewer than 1,055 were of syphilis. This goes to show that the disease is a danger to the community. Every step and precaution should be taken so as to make it compulsory for those who are neglectful being made to look after themselves. Before I came to this House I knew of two cases, which I can prove up to the hilt, but I have no desire to do so. If we had had a Bill of this kind in force at that time I could have prevented two indecent men from contaminating quite a number of people in the community.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: You would not object to putting your name to it, would you?

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: Undoubtedly I would. I am not an authority on the question of whether a person is diseased or not.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: I would not object to putting my name to anything that I had spoken about.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: I would not hesitate about going to a medical officer and asking him to make careful inquiry, which is done with discretion under the Act, to see whether a person was diseased or not.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: A man who will say a thing but not put it in writing is not a man at all.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: That alone would prevent quite a number of people from being affected by this disease.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: I thought you were a better man than that. I did not think you would say a thing that you would not put in writing.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: The hon. member will have an opportunity of refuting the arguments of the Minister.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: There is no argument. It is a rotten thing.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: I am surprised at the hon. member voicing so much opposition to this clause. I thought he was a reasonable and fair-minded man.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: I am reasonable in this case.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: In time to come, if he and other members vote against this provision, preventing us from forcing these people to be cured, he and they will regret their action, for doubtless the disease will then spread within the State.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: I do not believe in penalising women and letting the men go scot-free.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: I hope members will carefully consider the position, and that when the question goes to the vote they will support the Bill as they have done in years past. We should be in a position to continue the good work that has been done already. There are other clauses in the Bill which it has been found necessary to insert. One of these deals with the interpretation of boarding-houses. Provision is made that where more than six persons, exclusive of the family, are in a house, it comes within the interpretation of a boarding-house. As the interpretation now stands, it prevents many of these places from coming under the notice of the health authorities, because they have actually to find six persons in the House, and to do that they would have to go there at night time when the people were in bed. This alteration is made so that, where beds are provided to accommodate six persons in a house, that house shall come within the interpretation of a boarding-house and under the supervision of the Health Department. Provision is also made in the Bill to register places of public entertainment.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: You except agricultural halls and institutes.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: And workers' halls.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: It shows that you are afraid of the opposition here.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: And workers' halls.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: On Crown lands.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: They are all on Crown lands—agricultural halls, institutes or workers' halls erected on Crown lands.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: It shows that you are afraid, as usual.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: In the past it has been necessary, wherever a new building has to be erected, that the plan shall be submitted to the health authority for approval. The building is also subject to inspection by the health authorities when it is finished, prior to its being opened. Under the Health Act the authorities have the right to inspect buildings.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: That is an attempt to make work for the inspectors.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: The inspectors have to do the work now just the same as they will when the Bill is passed. No more inspectors will be needed.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: You have double the number required already.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: We are under-staffed in the matter of inspectors since the Factories and Shops Act was passed. Provision is made for the registration of these buildings and for fees to be charged. When an inspection is made we can fix a small fee by regulation, not to exceed a certain sum on each occasion. It may in odd instances be £10, though I do not think that sum will be reached. The fees will be fixed from time to time, and upon enclosed buildings the sum of £10 may be charged, and in other cases £5. It is necessary that the inspector should inspect these buildings to see that they are properly ventilated, and the public safety attended to. We received nothing for the inspection of these buildings at present, but this portion of the Bill will enable a small inspection fee to be charged, which will go into the Consolidated Revenue.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: Put it to your Solicitor General as to whether you can make the fee less than £10 when that figure is mentioned. You cannot exceed it and you cannot make it less. That is a fixture.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: It can be made less.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: Ten pounds is the amount.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: In cases where a fine is imposed, and the penalty is not to exceed £50, no bench ever imposes a fine of £50.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: This has been tried in the law courts in connection with a health rate.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: There is also another part of the Bill which relates to Section 37 of the amending Act of 1918. This has to do with the section whereby the medical practitioner reports to the Commissioner of Public Health regarding the patient who has been under him for treatment, and this need not come under the notice of the principal medical officer until the expiration of 10 days from the time when the person was supposed to come in for treatment, and did not do so. This was omitted when the Act was reprinted, and it is necessary to have that clause inserted. There is another clause dealing with midwives. Provision is made whereby women whose names are not registered may attend to lying-in women if there is no registered midwife or medical officer within five miles of the place. There are cases where the present position of affairs has created hardship in country districts. Under this provision the women I speak of will be enabled to charge a small fee if they so desire. There is another provision whereby nurses who have gone through their usual course of training for three years in an approved institution and received the certificate of a nurse can also act in midwifery cases, provided they can show six months' experience in that direction.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: You have been acting in that way illegally all along. I challenged Dr. Atkinson on the subject and he admitted it.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: I do not know whether that is so, but at all events we want to make it legal.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: I tried to make it legal myself.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: When a nurse has undergone three years' training, provided she has had experience for six months in midwifery cases she can act in the capacity of a midwife as I have stated. There is another provision in the Bill dealing with the examination of school children. Provision is made whereby a nurse can be appointed by the Commissioner of Public Health to attend children who are suffering from verminous heads or anything of the kind. At present only medical officers can carry out this work. It has been necessary for them to go back to schools and see the children who needed attention, and this has meant a good deal of expense to the department. A nurse is quite capable of carrying out this work, and we are making such provision as should mean a saving of expense to the department. We have not many medical men who can afford the time to be continually visiting schools for the purpose of examining children. These are the main provisions of the measure, and I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

On motion by Mr. Underwood, debate adjourned.

## BILL—GRAIN.

In Committee.

Resumed from 18th October; Mr. Angelo in the Chair, the Premier in charge of the Bill.

Clause 3—Right of company to construct elevators:

The CHAIRMAN: Progress was reported on Clause 3, Subclause 1, upon an amendment moved by the member for North-East Fremantle to strike out the word "sole" in line 3.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: My object in moving this amendment was to ensure that the company did not have the sole right to handle wheat in bulk. Members of the company have endeavoured to show that Canada has been successful in handling wheat in bulk. In Canada no company has the sole right to do this. The State handles the wheat in bulk. There are no fewer than 17 companies in Canada.

Mr. A. Thomson: How much wheat do they handle?

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: I have seen the prophecy of the Premier, that he expects within the next few years this State will produce 50 to 60 million bushels of wheat. If that prophecy is correct, we shall have a large quantity of wheat in this State. By handing over this sole right we will prohibit competition in the handling of wheat, no matter how much grain may be grown in Western Australia during the ensuing 25 years. Is it fair in a young country like Western Australia to make any such provision, bearing in mind that each year larger areas are brought under cultivation? I believe the time is not very far distant when we will be the greatest wheat producing State in Australia. If the reports of experts are borne out, that will be achieved in the near future. The Bill seeks to hand over the sole right to handle wheat to one company for a period of 25 years, no matter what quantity of wheat may be grown.

Mr. Pickering: That is not so bad as the electric light agreement.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: The Chairman would not allow me to discuss electric light matters, but if he did, I would say it was a damn sight worse. It would be a good job if this Bill were not passed for some years to come.

Mr. Latham: It would be a bad job for the farmers.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: It would not be a bad job for the farmers. It would be of advantage if this Bill were postponed for five years at least. Many of the individuals who promised to put money into the scheme have not done so.

Mr. Latham: There are not many of that class.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: They have to get £108,000 yet, and the hon. member says that is not much! The company have raised £16,000 and they want 1½ million pounds!

another undertaking altogether. If the member for York wants information about the financial position of this company, he can get it. Never in the history of Australia has any company in such a financial condition sought permission to carry out an undertaking such as this without any capital.

Mr. Latham: That may be due to the Federal Government. You know of the loan of £440,000.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: The less the hon. member says about that aspect the better. We know there was something said about getting money from the Federal Government. I am sorry the hon. member brought me to this point. We know there were 275,000 ten-shilling shares taken up. Considerably over 100,000 have not been paid for. We do know that very little over £19,000 has been contributed altogether, and the expenditure was a little over £3,000 out of this £19,000.

Hon. P. Collier: It is a great concern, isn't it?

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: They have got something less than £16,000 to carry out a job costing 1½ millions.

Mr. Money: It is not costing that now, is it?

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: I am not speaking about this through my neck. Bulk handling will not be provided at all the principal ports of Western Australia for 1½ millions.

Mr. Pickering: That is not contemplated.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: Yes, it is.

Mr. Pickering: Not at this stage. It is only at one port.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: During the next five years, according to the Bill, it is expected that provision for bulk handling will be made at the principal ports of the State, namely Albany, Bunbury, Fremantle and Geraldton. I will admit the accusation hurled at me by the Premier that I want to defeat the Bill. I do want to defeat it. If I achieve the defeat of the Bill, I believe I will do a good turn to the farmers. They have been misled by their representatives. If the farmers believe in it, why do they not pay up?

Mr. Hickmott: It can be called up.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: It was called up long before this balance sheet was published.

Mr. Hickmott: It was not.

Mr. Latham: Evidently the member for North-East Fremantle does not know much about the finances of this concern.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: I know as much as the member for York, if not more.

Mr. McCallum: I will give the member for York all the information he wants about the finances.

Mr. Latham: I say the money can be called up.

Hon. P. Collier: That is as far as you can go.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: I want to suggest to the House that it is not fair to the general community to give the handling of grain to one company for a period of 25 years.

Mr. Harrison: The company consists of the growers themselves.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: Some of them. The hon. member has probably heard that piece of poetry about the battle of Waterloo, each verse of which finishes up with the words, "Good men too, some of them." The same thing applies to this company. Some of them are good men. The number of good men is very small indeed, because the balance sheet shows who have paid up.

Mr. Lambert: It has cost 20 per cent. to collect that money.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: I remember endeavouring to make arrangements regarding cement works in this State so as to try to assure competition. With the assistance of the Crown Law Department I endeavoured to make provision so that two companies would not be able to amalgamate and thus create a monopoly. To-day, instead of having two companies, we have one. In that case I endeavoured to prevent the creation of a monopoly. The Bill before the Committee at the present stage comes forward with a straight-out request for a monopoly. I have stated repeatedly that the time will arrive when there will be the necessity for a bulk handling scheme in Western Australia.

Mr. A. Thomson: Yes, 1,000 years hence, if you had your way. At that time you would be of the same opinion.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: It is amusing to hear the hon. member gabble. Twelve months ago the hon. member was strong in his support of a clause. He has altered his tactics since.

Mr. A. Thomson: That was not this Bill.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: It was almost similar to Clause 3. I pointed out the position to the hon. member and others, and they voted with their eyes open. After 12 months have elapsed, they know that they made an error. I again state that, in a few years time, bulk handling will be necessary, but at the present time it will mean a loss. When that time does arrive and elevators are necessary, there will be better sites procurable for elevators.

Mr. A. Thomson: You want to get them in your own electorate.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: It makes no difference to me, as the site selected for these elevators is in my own electorate. If I were like the hon. member and desired to be selfish I would support the expenditure of this money in my electorate.

Mr. A. Thomson: It might lose you votes.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: I am not worrying about that, but this Parliament is not justified in handing over to one company for a whole generation the handling of wheat for the whole State. The majority of people are

against this Bill. We should keep the whole position in our control.

Mr. Latham: You want two companies at Fremantle.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: In Canada there are 17. When the time arrives for the bulk handling of wheat, the Government should undertake it.

Mr. Latham: Another State trading concern?

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: Seeing this affects the food supplies of the people, the interests of the people would be better safeguarded by the Government undertaking the work.

Mr. Latham: This will deal with wheat for export, not for local consumption.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: If there is any increase in the cost, it will be added to the price of wheat sold within the State and not of that exported.

The PREMIER: If this word is struck out the Bill will go, because no company would spend so much money in erecting works unless they had this protection.

Mr. Harrison: Or make themselves responsible for the Commonwealth money.

The PREMIER: This is a farmers' company. The men who grow the wheat will be the shareholders and, if they have not a right to handle their own wheat for export, I do not know who has. I cannot see how a single word can be said against a co-operative company of grain growers handling their own grain.

Mr. Lambert: They do not seem too enthusiastic about it.

The PREMIER: A great many shares have been applied for, and when the next dividend is paid, a good deal of money will be received. The company can well be given a monopoly of the handling of wheat. They have to provide sufficient accommodation to handle all the wheat and if they fail, they will lose their right to the monopoly. It would be a very different thing if we were granting this monopoly to someone outside the wheat growers. Bulk handling must come and, although I believe in the port facilities being State-owned, I think that in this case we might well give to the grain growers the right to work these elevators and put the wheat on the ships. They must do the work as cheaply as possible, because every penny on the cost of a bushel of wheat will be important. This handling can best be done by the bulk system. The member for North-East Fremantle said the farmers who put their money into the concern would lose. I believe there will be sufficient increase in the wheat production of the State to make the concern pay very soon. The grain growers of to-day, to-morrow, and all time will be able to come into the scheme.

Hon. P. Collier: You are giving away the rights of future grain growers.

The PREMIER: No, they can all come in.

Hon. P. Collier: But this company will have the sole right.

The PREMIER: If a farmer wishes he may still ship his wheat in bags. The Committee would not be justified in refusing to give the right asked for.

Mr. SIMONS: If the amendment is carried, the whole proposal will be emasculated.

The Premier: That is so.

Mr. SIMONS: I oppose the amendment in the interests of enterprise. This State cannot remain stagnant for all time. I am for getting something done, and I am not inclined to inquire too closely into details, so long as something is being done to develop the great enterprises of this State. I want to get ahead with the job, and we cannot do this if we discuss things too minutely and put a microscope on everything that comes before us. The same objections are raised to every big public work that is presented for consideration; there are interminable debates. In Canada there are 17 elevator companies supplying the needs of eight to nine millions of people. This means that we can raise our population to the half million mark before we would have enough to justify a company entering on the business. The member for North-East Fremantle has remarked that many business men of Perth are against this proposal.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: I said against this monopoly.

Mr. SIMONS: Many business men of Perth have been too narrow in their vision. There has never been a great public forward movement in which the business men of Perth have joined wholeheartedly. They have never shown the faith in the State which they should have shown. If one visited the Eastern States and found something derogatory to Western Australia, he would discover that it had been sent by some merchant of this State. Mr. Richard Teece, as general manager of the A.M.P. Society, came here years ago to build a big block of buildings, and the people who tried to discourage him were the business men of Perth. He was told that the buildings would be too big and that he would have nothing but suites of empty offices. If he had followed the advice of the business men of Perth, we would never have had that magnificent pile of buildings on the corner of St. George's-terrace and William-street. The experience has been that at no time could offices be obtained without booking six months ahead. Business men opposed the Fremantle harbour and the Goldfields water scheme. They are the worst of all prophets and I would not follow them. The member for North-East Fremantle said the time is not ripe for the construction of elevators. We want to start this work within a year. Members have repeatedly complained that the Federal Government are always robbing us and have deplored that we do not get a fair deal. Here is a chance for us. The Federal Government are offering a silver tray containing half a million of money, and we are hesitating about accepting it. They will not continue to offer

this money indefinitely. The country is crying out for work and development, and we are hesitating to accept the money. The people who are opposing this step to-day are the people who are damning Federation all the time.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: This is not a gift of money.

Mr. SIMONS: It is a subsidy for a big Western Australian enterprise. It will bring back to us nearly half a million of our own money.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: At 6 per cent.

Mr. SIMONS: This monopoly would be a bad thing if it were not controlled by the men who are producing the grain. I believe my job here is not to stand in the way of a big enterprise like this. My turn will come later on to see that the employees of this big enterprise get a fair share of the wealth produced by the machinery. I am not going to stand in the way of a big enterprise such as this. We want elevators, not five years hence, but now. The other day I saw one of these big plants operating in Sydney. A ship carrying 9,000 tons of wheat was loaded in 16 hours. If we adopt this scheme, we shall make Fremantle one of the most modern ports in the Southern Hemisphere. We have 15,000,000 bushels of wheat in sight this season. Within the next five years we should have 30,000,000 bushels, and by that time the elevators will be only a year old, and not a single year ahead of their time.

Mr. McCALLUM: I shall certainly support the proposal to have bulk handling of wheat established here speedily; but, unlike the last speaker, I cannot, as a member of the Labour Party, support the handing over of a public utility to a private concern.

Mr. MacCallum Smith: This is not a private concern.

Mr. McCALLUM: I will show in a moment what sort of a concern it is. Fully three years ago the Commonwealth Parliament passed an Act placing at the disposal of State Governments money to go on with schemes of this sort. Two millions of money are waiting for the State Governments in that connection. The matter of handling over monopolies to individuals, as proposed by this Bill, has engaged our attention during half the sittings of this Parliament to date. We shall be flying in the face of all the teachings of history if we agree to hand over a monopoly, especially one in food, to a private company. To this company the Premier has already given, behind the back of Parliament, in defiance of Parliament, a picked site in Fremantle for a term of 99 years at a peppercorn rental of £5 per week. The member for North Perth, who is a director of the company, has been very silent regarding the position of the company to-day. He would not even agree to let members of this Chamber have a copy of the Company's articles of association.

Mr. MacCallum Smith: Nonsense! I handed you a copy myself.

**Mr. McCALLUM:** This company with a million and a half of capital, how does it stand to-day? At the 31st August the subscribed capital of the company was £227,385, less calls unpaid £188,249, leaving a net capital subscribed of £19,136.

**Mr. MacCallum Smith:** What was the use of calling up capital then?

**Mr. McCALLUM:** The expenditure of the company comprised £5,000 for shares in the Portland Cement Company, £750 for a motor car, £490 for printing, and the same amount, £490, for salaries, £1,396 for canvassing for shares, £122 for the travelling expenses of directors; a total expenditure of £3,332, leaving available a working capital of £15,904. Such a company proposes to establish a scheme for the bulk handling of wheat for the whole of this State! Why, the company could not equip this country with pie stalls! The company has already broken the Statute under which the Commonwealth Parliament agreed to make loans. One of the conditions embodied in that Statute is that such a company shall not traffic in grain, but shall act only as an operator of silos and elevators. But in their articles of association the company take power to do practically everything and anything in this State, barring the running of hotels. Notwithstanding the repeated statements of the Premier, the company is not open to all comers for all time. The member for North Perth knows that that is not the position. Unless the amendment I have placed on the Notice Paper is carried, the company may possibly become the property of a few directors, since the articles of association provide that before any shares are placed on the market they must first be offered for purchase by existing shareholders. Why do our Government funk the job of establishing the bulk handling scheme here?

**Mr. MacCallum Smith:** Owing to their previous experience of State enterprises.

**Mr. McCALLUM:** The member for North Perth is one of the directors handling this company. Do Ministers acknowledge that they are not as capable of undertaking bulk handling as is the member for North Perth? I will fight this Bill clause by clause. If I cannot secure its defeat, I hope to secure improvements. The Commonwealth Act provides that the company must spend £100,000 of their own money before drawing a penny of Commonwealth money.

**Hon. P. Collier:** The company will want a loan from our Government.

**Mr. McCALLUM:** It is quite evident that the wheat growers of Western Australia have refused to put money into the company.

**Hon. W. C. Angwin:** Mr. Colebatch has said as much in the Legislative Council.

**Mr. McCALLUM:** The company have only £15,000 of capital available. It is a fair thing that Parliament, before being asked to grant this monopoly, should have some demonstration of the bona fides of the company. The Commonwealth Government have protected themselves. Under the Com-

monwealth Act the company will have to mortgage to the Commonwealth Government the lease granted to them by this State Government at Fremantle. What security have the State Government? None whatever. Before we pass a Bill of this kind, the company should be able to prove that they have the £100,000 which the Commonwealth Government say must be expended by the company before the company draw on the Commonwealth loan. The company ought to prove that they are firmly established financially. The passing of this measure will only mean the hanging up of bulk handling for some years to come. Then we shall be asked to grant the company a further extension of time. It is evident that the proposal has not the backing of those it is intended to serve. Already more than a fair proportion of the money raised has been spent in canvassing for shares. I support the amendment.

**Mr. HARRISON:** The company has been formed and applications have been made for hundreds of thousands of shares. When Parliament has passed the Bill, further amounts will be paid over in order to comply with the conditions laid down by the Commonwealth Government. Unless these conditions are complied with the shareholders will not get the money from the Commonwealth. Unless something is done the company will lose the chance of this allocation. All that the producer of wheat is trying to get is fair value for his produce, and he thinks he can get it by means of the system of bulk handling. The wheat will be acquired and its quality will be known, and the flour millers and the merchants will know exactly what they are getting. This measure will assist not only the producer but the consumer. I cannot understand why members are trying to hinder this development. The matter has hung fire for a long time, and members should not hesitate to assist the wheat growers to get as high a value for their produce as possible. We must have more modern appliances than we have had in the past for dealing with our wheat. Without such appliances we cannot hope to compete with other wheat producing countries of the world.

**Hon. P. COLLIER:** The hon. member has misunderstood the purport of the amendment. The question of the principle of handling wheat in bulk is not in dispute. No one on this side of the House is opposed to the formation of this company, or to its making the necessary provision for handling wheat in bulk. I say with all good wishes, let the company go ahead if the farmers think its operations will be beneficial to them. I do, however, strenuously oppose giving to the company a monopoly. Parliament should not be asked to give this company the sole right of entering into the business of bulk handling for 25 years.

**Mr. Harrison:** It does not interfere with the operations of wheat handling.

Hon. P. COLLIER: If it is a good thing to handle wheat in bulk let them go ahead.

Mr. Harrison: That is what they want.

Hon. P. COLLIER: Then why not do so? This monopoly for 25 years is not necessary.

Mr. Harrison: Can you expect them to go ahead without some security?

Hon. P. COLLIER: There we come to the point.

Mr. Harrison: Of course we do.

Hon. P. COLLIER: It is argued that unless the company can secure this monopoly people will not put money into it. That is the argument advanced by men whose sole creed and religion is the spirit of competition. Men who invest money in commercial enterprises are generally shrewd enough not to put up their money until they are satisfied that there is scope and opportunity for getting a return of the capital they invest. Let us assume that the company is formed without this sole right of handling grain in bulk. Is it to be supposed that investors would put their money into a second company unless the circumstances were such as to lead them to believe that an opening existed for an additional company? If those circumstances did arise, why should not a second company be formed?

Mr. Harrison: No second company has been formed.

Hon. P. COLLIER: If the opportunity arises for the formation of a second company and the present company has a monopoly, it would not be possible to form it. I do not like the attitude of members who want a monopoly in the handling of the foodstuffs of the people. They might as well ask Parliament to give some co-operative store at Doodlakine the sole right to handle all the groceries distributed within that district. Who would put their money into a company to establish a store at Doodlakine if there was a possibility of serious competition? We might extend the principle all along the line and so, in the course of a generation or two, we should have no business of any sort except it carried a monopoly for a quarter of a century. Would that be beneficial to the general well-being of the commercial life of this community? The law of supply and demand, of which we hear so much, will function in this way: If the demand for elevators be only sufficient to justify one company operating, there will be only one operating, but if the demand increases to such an extent that the formation of a second company be justified, a second company will be formed. Why should not this inevitable law of supply and demand operate? Members who support that law are very ready to desert it when to do so suits their purpose. What right has this Parliament, which may be totally extinct in a few years, to grant this monopoly to endure after we have passed away? Possibly all the wheat growers of to-day will have disappeared before the expiration of the 25-year period, and the new generation of wheat growers may not want to trade with this company, but because the dead hand of a past Parliament will be upon them, they will not be able to act.

Mr. MacCallum Smith: We granted a monopoly over the lime deposits.

Hon. P. COLLIER: There is no monopoly there. It is open to any other company to manufacture lime to-morrow. Indeed, the concessions which Parliament gave aimed at the setting up of competition in the manufacture of lime, whereas the Bill says that none but one company shall handle grain in bulk for 25 years. It means restriction of trade, a thing utterly inimical to the welfare of the country. I am going to oppose all propositions to confer sole rights on companies, no matter what their particular purpose may be. Long before the end of the 25 years our population will be very greatly increased, and our wheat crop may be approximately 60 million bushels.

Mr. LAMBERT: I cannot altogether agree with the views of the last speaker. I am a firm believer in co-operation. If there be sufficient safeguards in the Bill to embrace the whole of the wheat producers in the State, then I shall lend assistance to the farmers trying to develop the co-operative movement. I do not believe in monopolies granted to individual persons, but I do believe we shall be well-advised if we allow a big section of the community to market their goods in the co-operative way suggested in the Bill.

Mr. Troy: Would you give them a monopoly?

Mr. LAMBERT: I would make the principle of co-operation apply in every industry in the State. I hold that belief more strongly than I do many pet theories put forward to remedy the social and economic ills we hear so much about. The time has arrived when we should display a spirit of progress, of energy and of enterprise, rather than that of hesitation and doubt. We should show the people of Western Australia that nothing is too big for us.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: I am glad we have two members who believe in boom and bust.

Mr. Simons: A little judicious boom is not a bad thing.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: You are all boom.

Mr. Simons: You may be all bust.

Mr. LAMBERT: I prefer the man who attempts and fails, to him who attempts nothing. There is a section of the community who always attempt to decry Western Australia and every one of her many resources. No matter where one goes, one meets people of that type and one finds them even among the business men of Perth, people who are sucking the life blood out of the citizens of this State. Some of them are people whose head offices are in the Eastern States or London and they act as blood suckers on this young country.

Mr. A. Thomson: They throttle our industries.

Mr. LAMBERT: And they try to throttle, financially and otherwise, men who endeavour to develop the industries of our State.

Mr. Johnston: Some of them are importing corn sacks.

Mr. LAMBERT: They are making money out of that too.

Mr. Latham: They are making 2s. a dozen this year.

Mr. LAMBERT: The same thing applies to the State Implement Works and to almost every other form of activity whose objective is to assist the farming and producing communities. I hope the representatives of the farmers will



recognise the fact that those activities to which I refer, were established to assist the producers, and underlying the attacks upon those industries may be noted the "unseen hand" as the member for Boulder has suggested, of those who desire to profit from the importation of goods into the country. As has already been indicated, we find it hard to know whether those who are seeking support for this principle at the present juncture are really standing for co-operation or competition. I can quite understand that men, like the member for Boulder, who has consistently supported the farmers of Western Australia, are disgusted from time to time at the gibes hurled at them by the so-called representatives of the farmers in Parliament. Every possible safeguard should be embodied in the Bill. I hope that the principle of co-operation will not only be applied to the farming community, but that it will be extended to every other industry where possible. I believe it should not be legal for any enterprise to be established in Western Australia under the present economic position without embodying the principle of co-operation. It should be necessary to safeguard the position of the wheat growing industry by seeing that the future of Western Australia and the handling of its wheat is not hampered by a provision such as that embodied in the clause under discussion.

(Mr. Stubbs resumed the Chair.)

Mr. TROY: I support the amendment. I have just as much belief in the principle of co-operation as the member for Coolgardie.

Hon. P. Collier: That principle, however, is not under discussion at all.

Mr. TROY: Certainly not. The question under discussion is the granting of a monopoly, not the principle of co-operation. The amendment will mean that the present so-called co-operative company shall not have the sole right for 25 years to handle wheat in Western Australia, and shall not prevent the establishment of another co-operative concern embarking upon similar business. I fear the movement, which is called "the co-operative movement," as it exists and is controlled in Western Australia to-day. I do not fear persons like Mr. T. H. Bath and Mr. W. D. Johnson. I know they are directors for the time being, but the time will probably come when they will be pushed out by a little faction existing in St. George's-terrace. Take the Westralian Farmers' so-called co-operative movement. That confers no benefit upon the farmers.

Mr. Latham: You are evidently not a shareholder.

Mr. TROY: I am a shareholder. The farmers are charged just as much for articles they procure from the Westralian Farmers Ltd. as they are charged by private firms. I have dealt with the Westralian Farmers Ltd. because I believe in the principle, but operating as the firm does, I still believe that it does not confer any benefits upon the farmer compared with the rest of the commercial community. It certainly does not show big profits.

Mr. McCallum: It shows big gross profits, but small net profits.

Member: How did you come to be a shareholder?

Mr. TROY: I came in as a shareholder under the bonus system.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: Practically under compulsion.

Mr. TROY: I believe this movement in Western Australia is developing into a reactionary one. It cannot be denied that the so-called representatives of the farmers and of this so-called co-operative movement meet with representatives of the big business interests in the country, with the Chamber of Commerce, the Chamber of Manufactures, and with other similar bodies. This is for the purpose of arranging for the carrying on of business within the State, and is, in some instances, in opposition to those concerns which have been established to keep a check upon the operations of private companies. Take, for instance, the State Implement Works. That trading concern constitutes the greatest check the farmers have against exploitation regarding machinery prices.

Mr. Latham: That concern has not reduced the cost of machinery.

Mr. TROY: It has kept the cost from being considerably increased. As soon as the farmers lose the State Implement Works, they will find themselves in the merciless grip of the machinery firms who will charge what they like.

Mr. MacCallum Smith: What about the farmers in the other States?

Mr. TROY: They never had a check upon these firms as the farmers in Western Australia now have.

Hon. P. Collier: Even the "Narrogin Observer" butts in on State trading concerns.

Mr. TROY: I suspect that W. D. Johnson and Thomas Bath will not be on the directorate once this concession is granted. We had an experience of this in connection with the University. A considerable number of democrats were appointed to the Senate but where are they now? The University is becoming a reactionary institution. I have the greatest possible suspicion regarding a number of gentlemen associated with this movement—Basil Murray, Alex. Monger and Sinclair McGibbon. They are not legitimate wheatgrowers; they are job-hunters pure and simple.

Mr. Johnston: Murray grows a lot of wheat at Doodlakine.

Mr. TROY: McGibbon does not.

Mr. MacCallum Smith: McGibbon is neither a shareholder nor a director.

Mr. TROY: But he will be.

Mr. MacCallum Smith: He was a director and he resigned because he was not a wheat-grower.

Mr. TROY: There is a mob in St. George's-terrace using the farmers' co-operative business for their own ends.

Mr. MacCallum Smith: You do not suggest that W. D. Johnson would lend himself to that sort of thing.

Mr. TROY: But I suggest the hon. member might.

Mr. MacCallum Smith: What about T. H. Bath?

Mr. TROY: Neither Bath nor Johnson would lend himself to that sort of thing, but these gentlemen will not be there long. The company will merely use them to give the movement a democratic flavour. I believe that if this little

body get the power they are asking for, they will not use it in the best interests of the farmers. The poor old cockey will be given a lot of platitudes and a few concessions, and will be used by the reactionaries as he always has been.

Mr. Latham: You do not give him credit for much brains, anyhow.

Mr. TROY: I do, but I know that his occupation does not give him opportunity to look into these matters for himself.

Mr. Latham: He has more time for thinking than you have.

Mr. TROY: I know the farmers; they have no opportunity to discuss these matters; they are easily hounded by men who come along and spin fine fairy tales, and by the Press. They have no opportunity to discover the hypocrisy. I have no objection to the co-operative company engaging in this business and I wish them success, but I object to giving them a monopoly for 25 years. How are they likely to treat me as a farmer in the Geraldton district? Have I any guarantee of being treated fairly and squarely? Will not they drag my wheat past the natural port of Geraldton right down to Fremantle for the sake of economical working? This operation might cost me 4d. or 5d. a bushel, whereas now it costs me 2d. per bushel to ship from Geraldton. Further, I must hand over my business to people in whom I have no faith.

Mr. Johnston: They will have to give you the same treatment as anyone else.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: Not under this Bill.

Mr. Johnston: Under the Federal Bill.

Mr. TROY: The company, for so-called economical working, will be able to bring all the wheat from the Northern district to Fremantle, on the plea that they can handle it there more easily. The company should not be given the sole right to the concession for 25 years. During that time a great many genuine farmers in this State may be willing to form another company to operate in their own locality. Seventeen companies are operating in Canada.

Mr. MacCallum Smith: There was only one in Canada at the start.

Hon. P. Collier: But they were not granted the sole right, or there would have been only one still.

Mr. TROY: In 25 years a great many changes will take place in Western Australia. The great body of our farmers in the future might not be satisfied with this particular company, might be unwilling to take shares in it. I have no faith in some of the men connected with the company.

Mr. Latham: Then join the company and change the directorate!

Mr. TROY: Many of the farmers of this country have no time at all for some of the so-called farmers in the movement, but they cannot displace them. The farmers in general come down to a conference once a year, and have soft words spoken to them by a few blarneyers. Then they return to their farms, and hibernate for another 12 months. We all know how people can be humbugged by Press propaganda, and also by men, before the propaganda and the men are found out. The farmers' movement in this country is being used for personal purposes. I fear the placing of this power in the

hands of certain persons connected with the farmers' movement.

Mr. PICKERING: The narrowness of the arguments used by certain members is astounding. They advocate co-operation, but fail to grasp the first principles of co-operation. The moment co-operative trading starts, it is up against every trade combination. Every private trader's hand is against co-operation, because he knows the danger of it to him. Denmark and Scotland are shining examples of the success of co-operation. In Western Australia the co-operative movement has made great strides thanks to the Westralian Farmers, Ltd. The member for Mt. Magnet should know that but for the co-operative movement, prices of the necessities of producers would be much higher here.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: You were against co-operation by the whole of the people through the State Implement Works.

Mr. PICKERING: That is something altogether different. The co-operative company of which the member for North Perth is a director, has other directors who I thought were held in the highest esteem by hon. members opposite: I refer to Mr. W. D. Johnson and Mr. T. H. Bath. Why should those gentlemen be pushed out, as suggested by the member for Mt. Magnet? They were elected directors by ballot. Why should hon. members opposite doubt Mr. Johnson's and Mr. Bath's belief in the co-operative movement? I shall vote for giving this company the sole right over a term of 25 years. The principle of bulk handling has come to stay, and we should do our best to further it. The member for East Perth is right as to the sum of £440,000 having been allocated by the Federal Parliament to this purpose on two occasions.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: Obtained under false pretences.

Mr. PICKERING: That is quite incorrect. The sum in question will not be allocated by the Federal Government for ever; if we do not obtain it this session, it is likely to be withdrawn. We should get that money to spend in this State, thus benefiting the community generally and, in particular, those of our people who are now out of employment. I hope the matter will be considered seriously, and not treated as a joke. The co-operative movement will establish in Fremantle an industry of much value. I trust the measure will not be obstructed.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: I am surprised to hear hon. members say that the Commonwealth Government are giving us £500,000 and that we should avail ourselves of this offer, no matter whether the money will be wasted or not. They say, "Let us grab it and spend it, and make work." Hon. members also have pointed to the fact that this money will be spent in Fremantle. I never cast my vote in favour of spending money unless it is required to be spent in a proper manner, no matter whether my electorate is concerned or not. This promise was obtained by statements made to the Commonwealth Government which were not true. Senator Russell stated in the Senate that the Western Australian Government, he was informed, had not sufficient supporters at their back to enable them to carry out the work, and that this being so the Commonwealth Government were approached by the representatives of the farmers and had agreed

to give them the money so that they could go on with the undertaking.

Mr. Johnston: Do not you think that referred to Mr. Baxter's Bill, which was defeated in the Upper House?

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: That was when the Bill went through granting to the Westralian Farmers £500,000. It was a lie to say that the Western Australian Government had not the necessary support at their back in this Chamber, because Mr. Baxter's Bill went through this Chamber. As events have turned out, it is a good thing the Upper House threw it out.

Mr. A. Thomson: You fought the other Bill consistently.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: I did not oppose it, and there was no division in this House.

Mr. A. Thomson: You have opposed this one consistently.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: I said it was a matter for the representatives of the farmers.

Mr. Johnston: You do not take that view now.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: The position is different now. That was a case of work to be done by the Government, and there was no monopoly in it.

The Minister for Agriculture: That was the bulk storage.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: Yes, and it was to become a bulk handling scheme afterwards. The time is not ripe for the bulk handling of wheat. When that time does come, it will be the duty of the Government to take charge of the work at our ports. We shall have to spend £200,000 to provide the necessary equipment on the railways.

Hon. P. Collier: Will the company assist the Government in finding the money for this equipment?

Mr. Latham: The company are doing a lot; give them a chance.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: I would not be surprised if the company attempted to run the country altogether. I am of opinion that the Commonwealth will take more than they will give. The company will have to pay as high as 10 per cent. on the money.

Hon. P. Collier: They will exhaust their capital in paying interest.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: The only question at issue is whether we are right in handing to one company for 25 years the right to handle wheat in bulk.

Mr. Sampson: You are feeling fit after your holiday.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: After my holiday!

Mr. Sampson: I am referring to the hour.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: I have done infinitely more work than the hon. member has ever done. I never stand up to oppose anything that I am in favour of, or to speak in favour of anything that I am opposing. I never waste time over any question unless the interests of the public are concerned. This Bill will be detrimental to the consumers of the State, and, for the time being, to the farmers. It will be prejudicial to the interests of the public to hand over to this company a monopoly for 25 years. For that reason I am opposed to the Bill. It is not a personal matter with me, since it does not affect me at all. Those who vote in favour of the Bill

will be giving away the rights of the State for 25 years. On a former occasion we sold the birthright of the people, and we are asked to do it again to-night. The chairman of the company has admitted that it is a private Bill. Unquestionably it is a private Bill, and therefore it should have been investigated by a select committee. The Standing Orders set out the procedure to be followed in the case of all private Bills. The Anglo-Persian Oil Bill was a private Bill, and was introduced as a private Bill. Why has not the same course been followed in respect of this Bill, and opportunity given to those who were prepared to adduce evidence as to the real character of the Bill? We are to give away the rights of the people in the interests of a few who have influence with the Government. If we grant this monopoly to the company, we shall be introducing methods such as obtain in Russia to-day.

Mr. Troy: Is MacCallum Smith a Bolshevik?

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: MacCallum Smith a Bolshevik! He is the greatest individualist in the House. What co-operation can be greater than the co-operation of the people as a whole! Who, to-day, is agitating against the State Implement Works, a trading concern belonging to the whole people? Who but Basil Murray! And why should he attack the State Implement Works? Because they took from him the agency. Co-operation is all right with such people, so long as it suits them. The people's foodstuffs should be handled by the co-operation of the people as a whole. I trust hon. members will defeat the Bill; if they do not, then I hope to God another place will do it.

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

Ayes	...	...	...	...	11
Noes	...	...	...	...	24

Majority against ... 13

#### AYES.

Mr. Angwin	Mr. Munsie
Mr. Collier	Mr. Troy
Mr. Corboy	Mr. Willcock
Mr. Heron	Mr. Wilson
Mr. Marshall	Mr. O'Loghlin
Mr. McCallum	(Teller.)

#### NOES.

Mr. Angelo	Sir James Mitchell
Mr. Broun	Mr. Money
Mrs. Cowan	Mr. Pickering
Mr. George	Mr. Piesse
Mr. Gibson	Mr. Richardson
Mr. Harrison	Mr. Sampson
Mr. Hickmott	Mr. Simons
Mr. Johnston	Mr. Teesdale
Mr. Lambert	Mr. A. Thomson
Mr. Latham	Mr. Underwood
Mr. C. C. Maley	Mr. Mullany
Mr. H. K. Maley	(Teller.)
Mr. Mann	

Amendment thus negatived.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: I will challenge this damn Bill on the third reading! It is a private Bill.

CHAIRMAN: Order!

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: On the Notice Paper there is another amendment standing in my name to strike out the words "for the term of 25 years." In view of the passing by the Committee of the last amendment, I will not proceed with that amendment, but will substitute the following amendment, which I move—

That in line 4, the word "twenty-five" be deleted and "ten" inserted in lieu.

Ten years hence we shall know whether the Premier's prophecy has been fulfilled or not. The amendment will give the people of Western Australia an opportunity of knowing where they stand regarding bulk handling. We will know the requirements of the State and whether the farmers have been treated fairly under this measure. We will be able to appreciate whether it would be better for the Government to take over the bulk handling of wheat or to allow another company to start. The period I suggest would be a fair time to permit the company to have the sole right to handle wheat in Western Australia.

Hon. P. COLLIER: I ask the Committee to give serious consideration to the amendment. Apparently there is a considerable majority of the Committee favourable to the company having the sole right to handle wheat over a given period. That being so, I consider 10 years will be a fair period. It will enable Parliament 10 years hence to decide what action should be taken. In the interval the company will be protected against any possible competition. The company consider they will not be justified in investing so much money unless they have that much protection. It is not likely that if the farmers are treated satisfactorily during that period, they would attempt to form another company to carry on similar co-operative work. A quarter of a century, however, is not like the passing of a year or two. During that period, the whole circumstances may have entirely changed. When the future historian of the public life of Western Australia comes to deal with the record of the last Parliament, he will proclaim to generations to come that that Parliament betrayed the best interests of the country in a manner never before witnessed since the granting of responsible Government. At about 3 a.m. Parliament betrayed the birthright of the country by handing over vast pastoral areas for a period of 28 years for a mere mess of pottage, handing over those vast areas to a few shepherd kings.

Mr. Johnston: That was done by the Parliament before last.

Hon. P. COLLIER: It was in 1916. That action will stand as an undying record of what I may not be justified in referring to as the dishonesty, but perhaps to the stupidity of Parliament in granting such a monopoly. On this occasion, at probably about the same hour of the morning, we shall be deciding to give away the rights of the people in the same way. It is an outrage upon responsible Government to agree to handing over the handling of the wheat for the whole State for a period of 25 years. What right have we as a Parliament to lay down provisions which may not be altered for a quarter of a century. All other classes of legislation are open to amendment in any other session. Bills of equal and greater importance are passed

and it is open to future Parliaments to alter them in accordance with the wishes and desires of the electors, as expressed through the ballot box. No Parliament has the right or authority to go beyond that. Who gave us authority to legislate for the next generation? We have no such authority. We are asked to stipulate a quarter of a century. Why not a century? Ten years would be ample protection for the company. If the wheat growers are genuine in their desire to establish a system of bulk handling on a co-operative basis, as I believe they are, and if they are convinced, as their representatives say they are, of the almost certain success of this scheme, they should be prepared to have the whole situation reviewed at the end of 10 years. The amendment is reasonable and fair, and Parliament is not justified in going beyond it.

Mr. O'LOGHLEN: In the light of past experience, one would expect much support for the amendment. We have made some colossal blunders during recent years, and it is not right that Parliament should put a dead hand on the future. We are asked to grant an exclusive right. It is proposed to hold up for a long period the right of review. If the company abuse the privileges which it is proposed to bestow upon them, it might be said that Parliament could curb their power. It is exceedingly difficult, however, to deal with established rights. I have a vivid recollection of trying to deal with monopoly and privilege. The Leader of the Opposition referred to what had happened in the pastoral areas under a paternal Government desirous of getting a little more revenue, but more desirous of securing their friends in their leases for a considerable period.

The Premier: We ought to turn them all off the land, I suppose?

Mr. O'LOGHLEN: No, turn more on to the land in their places. The people of the North-West have no desire to leave the land; they eagerly seized the conditions offered by Parliament and sought more advantages than we intended to give under the Act. Casting back to the dark days of this State, before there was much development, when it was necessary to give the State a lift along and when timber was unsaleable, certain companies were able to get a monopoly of the areas adjacent to the seaboard and close to the routes along which the trunk lines were afterwards laid, and they have been able to hold the country at bay ever since. A powerful company have arisen, buttressed by all the privileges that a benevolent Parliament could bestow upon them, and they are able to smite their competitors hip and thigh and dictate terms to the State. This came about through giving privileges. I do not blame the legislators of that time. It was necessary to give some little protection, but this Bill proposes to give too much protection. One company could get a quarter of a million acres—

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

Mr. O'LOGHLEN: I am drawing an analogy between the concessions granted to private companies which have operated to the detriment of the State. It has been a disadvantage to Western Australia.

The Premier: The cathedral site has gone forever.

Hon. P. Collier: There is no monopoly in that, because there is a church alongside.

Mr. Latham: There is a monopoly of electric light in the city.

Mr. O'LOGHLEN: That might be justified; the public have the right of control. The railways are a monopoly, but Parliament retains the power to direct the policy of the railways. There is no power under this Bill to direct what the grain growers shall do once the right is handed over for a definite period. They will be sheltered from all competition, and be able to pursue a policy which will be of advantage to those they particularly represent. I have opposed exclusive rights for pearling and for the taking of dugong and other marine products. These proposals mean giving away the right along a big frontage of our seaboard to a company for a long period, and no one else will have the right to come in and make a living. The promoters of the company should realise that if they deliver the goods within 10 years, the people of the State would not elect a representative who would disturb the good work they were doing. If we fix the term of 25 years, the people will be powerless to make a change. It is the duty of Parliament as the custodian of the public interests to protect the public rights.

Mr. MacCallum Smith: You have bulk handling on the Labour platform.

Hon. P. Collier: Bulk handling by the State.

Mr. MacCallum Smith: That is a monopoly.

Mr. O'LOGHLEN: The member for North Perth knows how many beans make five, and is able to distinguish between a private monopoly and a State monopoly.

Mr. MacCallum Smith: The State monopoly would not be operated for the benefit of the farmers.

Mr. O'LOGHLEN: Give an individual uncontrolled power, and he will misuse it; give a group of individuals uncontrolled power, and they will misuse it. The finest argument can be put up in favour of what are called "department stores," as tending to reduce prices; but avarice and greed step in, and prevent the attainment of that object. Here, in a thin House, it is proposed to give a monopoly to a private company, a monopoly which cannot be curbed if a few years later the private company seek to injure public interests. In the case of the Railway Department, rates and conditions are subject to the approval of Parliament; but that is not the case with the Midland Railway Co., who render almost any sort of service they like. We have given away our coast line for fishing purposes; we have given away our timber country; we have given away our midland country; we have given away our pastoral lands. As for exclusive rights and monopolies, if the public were given the opportunity to vote on the question, they would turn all such things down as a general principle. In exceptional cases a monopoly may be necessary. During the early days of South Australia J. H. Angas took up a huge territory, but the influx of population compelled the unlocking of those lands. What have the people of Western Australia to gain, by giving away rights and privileges for 25 years, as proposed by this measure?

Years ago I introduced into this House a Bill compelling timber companies to carry goods and passengers over their lines at Government railway rates. The measure passed this Chamber, thanks to the support of the Premier of the day; but in the Upper House the attorney of the timber companies successfully moved "That the Bill be read a second time this day six months." Where the desires of the people are in conflict with the power of privilege, privilege wins every time, because the voice of the people cannot make itself heard in another place. The Opposition would be justified in opposing every line of the Bill. If after, say, 10 years the company was able to demonstrate to the grain growers of the State that they had been able to render good service to them, a fair-minded Parliament would tell the company to go on with the good work. If the company could not show such service and had another 15 years to run, Parliament would have no right to interfere.

Progress reported.

*House adjourned at 12-12 a.m.*

## Legislative Council,

*Thursday, 17th November, 1921.*

	Page
Bills: Inspection of Machinery, recom. ....	1747
Local Courts Act Amendment, Assembly's Amendment ....	1750
Mining Act Amendment, 2n. ....	1750

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

### BILL—INSPECTION OF MACHINERY.

#### Recommittal.

On motion by Hon. J. J. Holmes, Bill re-committed for the purpose of further considering Clause 1.

Hon. J. Ewing in the Chair; the Minister for Education in charge of the Bill.

Clause 1—Short Title and commencement:

Hon. J. J. HOLMES: I move an amendment—

That the following be added to the clause:— "Provided that such proclamation shall not issue before the 1st day of July, 1922."