

AYES.

Mr. Coverley
Mr. Cross
Mr. Doust
Mr. Fox
Mr. Hawke
Mr. Hegney
Mr. Lambert
Mr. Leahy
Mr. Marshall
Mr. Millington
Mr. Nuisen

Mr. Raphael
Mr. Rodoreda
Mr. Sleeman
Mr. F. C. L. Smith
Mr. Styaute
Mr. Tonkin
Mr. Troy
Mr. Wilson
Mr. Wise
Miss Holmar
(Teller.)

NOES.

Mr. Boyle
Mr. Doney
Mr. McDonald
Mr. McLarty
Mr. North
Mr. Patrick

Mr. Seward
Mr. Thorn
Mr. Watts
Mr. Welsh
Mr. Willmott
Mrs. Cardell-Oliver
(Teller.)

PAIRS.

AYES.
Mr. Collier
Mr. Willcock
Mr. Needham
Mr. Panton

NOES.
Mr. Keenan
Mr. Latham
Mr. Warner
Mr. Stubbs

Amendment thus passed.

Progress reported.

House adjourned at 10.3 p.m.

Legislative Council,

Thursday, 29th September, 1938.

	PAGE
Questions: Police Act Amendment Bill, discussion	1133
Youth employment, Federal grant	1133
Leave of absence	1133
Resolution: Yampi Sound iron ore deposits, Commonwealth embargo	1141
Bills: State Government Insurance Office, 2A.	1133
Health Act Amendment, 2A.	1134
Fair Rents, 2A.	1135
Industrial Arbitration Act Amendment, 2A.	1138
Lights (Navigation Protection), 2A., Com. report	1144
Alsatian Dog Act Amendment, 2A.	1144

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

QUESTION—POLICE ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Hon. L. CRAIG (without notice) asked the Chief Secretary: Will he give the House an opportunity next week to discuss Order of the Day No. 10 (Police Act Amendment Bill).

The CHIEF SECRETARY replied: Provided that time is available, yes.

QUESTION—YOUTH EMPLOYMENT.

Federal Grant.

Hon. A. THOMSON asked the Chief Secretary: 1, Is the following statement, which appeared in the "West Australian" on the 24th September, 1938, correct:—

Unemployed Youths:

Distribution of Federal Grant:

Canberra, September 23.—Details of the distribution of money made available by the Commonwealth Government for the technical training of unemployed youths in the various States last year, and the extent to which this amount totalling £200,000 was subsidised by State Government grants, were given by the Prime Minister (Mr. Lyons) in the House of Representatives to-day.

New South Wales received £79,000, Victoria £55,000, Queensland £25,000, South Australia £19,000, Western Australia £14,000, and Tasmania £8,000. The New South Wales Government provided an additional £100,000, Victoria £55,000, South Australia £15,000 and Tasmania £8,000. The Queensland Government undertook to provide £25,250 and the Prime Minister is awaiting information regarding Western Australia?

2, (a) What steps are being taken to implement the technical training of unemployed youths in Western Australia; (b) when can the Federal Government expect the desired information of the proposals of this State?

The CHIEF SECRETARY replied: 2, (a) Extensions in the system of technical training at the Perth Technical College, Kalgoorlie and Wiluna Schools of Mines, and Muresk Agricultural College, have been effected, and plans for further extensions are now being prepared; (b) information was forwarded to the Hon. the Prime Minister on the 20th September.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

On motion by Hon. E. H. Angelo, leave of absence for six consecutive sittings granted to Hon. G. W. Miles (North) on the ground of private business.

BILL—STATE GOVERNMENT INSURANCE OFFICE.

Second Reading.

Debate resumed from the previous day.

HON. J. M. MACFARLANE (Metropolitan-Suburban) [4.35]: This session marks the seventh occasion when this Chamber has been asked to legalise the activities of the

State Insurance Office. I opposed every Bill that dealt with this subject, and I am opposed to this one. We are told that the measure is one the Chamber can accept, because it is more moderate than were any of its predecessors. This does not accord with my views. The office is really a State trading concern, and always has been one. A long speech on this matter is not called for from me. The subject has been canvassed so much from year to year that we need not traverse the whole ground again.

Statements were made in the House yesterday that the Minister and his colleagues were forced to establish the State Insurance Office, because of the objections raised by the incorporated companies to doing business of this nature. The evidence tendered to the select committee, especially that given by Mr. Bennett, effectively disposes of that argument. The incorporated companies have not been given the information the Government could have made available to enable them safely to quote for the risks associated with miners' diseases under the Act. The office was established as a State trading concern on the 14th May, 1926. Every year an effort has been made to induce Parliament to legalise it, and Parliament has always declined to do so. We are informed that the reserve fund of the office now amounts to £500,000, but nothing has been said about the liabilities that must be set off against the assets. I refer to the liabilities represented by delayed claims. Without that information at our disposal we cannot say that the business is at all sound. I cannot subscribe to the view expressed respecting the reserve of £500,000, as I consider the fund must be regarded in the nature of a pool from which delayed claims may be met. Even so, the amount will not, in my opinion, be sufficient for that purpose, bearing in mind the statement of the Chief Secretary some time ago that probably £1,000,000 would be involved in claims for miners' diseases. That figure was augmented in another place by the Minister for Employment (Mr. Hawke) when he gave his views regarding the total liability that the State would have to face. I feel positive that the Government will ultimately have to render financial assistance to the State Insurance Office to enable it to meet the full commitments.

Still, I cannot allow that to affect my attitude towards the principle involved in this

legislation. I believe that if the insurance companies were provided with the information they have sought for the past 12 years, they would be able to fix a safe premium and, by undertaking the mining risks, relieve the State of an increasing liability. That a premium of £4 10s. is too low can hardly be doubted. In my opinion the industry should be required to accept the responsibility of a premium more in keeping with the risks involved. If the incorporated companies were given the information they seek, the State could vacate the field of industrial insurance altogether. In such circumstances, I would agree that the Government could justifiably hold the reserve of £500,000, or whatever the sum might be at the change-over stage, for the purpose of meeting delayed claims.

Hon. L. Craig: Would that money be handed over to the private companies?

Hon. J. M. MACFARLANE: No. The Government could hold it as a reserve fund from which to meet claims that could be justifiably charged against the State Insurance Office. I am satisfied that the acumen of city business men could overcome the difficulty and relieve the Government of all anxiety, and that the insurance work could be carried out satisfactorily to all concerned. I have always maintained that it is the duty of the Government to govern and to leave private enterprise to the people. The Government has the right to levy taxation to carry on social services and other operations of the State, and to individuals should be left the development of industry and ordinary business activities. I am unable to support the second reading of the Bill, even though it is submitted in a modified form compared with similar legislation presented to Parliament in former years.

On motion by Hon. A. Thomson, debate adjourned.

BILL—HEALTH ACT AMENDMENT.

Second Reading.

Debate resumed from the previous day.

HON. H. TUCKEY (South-West) [4.45]: I have been unable to ascertain any real reason for the amendment proposed in the Bill, and I shall oppose the second reading. I have been closely associated with local government for many years, and have not

yet heard a single request for any such amendment of the Act. Why should a householder who happens to cater for a few paying guests during several weeks in the year be required to register his premises as a boardinghouse? Such a requirement would operate harshly in country districts. The position may be somewhat different in the metropolitan area.

Hon. J. Nicholson: Not in this respect.

Hon. H. TUCKEY: If two or three local governing authorities desire such an amendment, which will affect approximately 150 such bodies throughout the State, the usual practice should have been followed of having the matter discussed at a road board or municipal conference where it could be considered in all its phases. I do not regard as proper, the proposal to pass legislation of this description in the present circumstances. To my mind the proposal is not unlike a clause in a Bill we considered to amend the Factories and Shops Act that would have set up *one-man factories*. If the Bill becomes law, should more than three persons lodge in a house, be it private or otherwise, the premises will constitute a boardinghouse. Surely that is quite unnecessary. People in the country centres and particularly at holiday resorts will be harassed in consequence. In such places people on vacation annually are accommodated for a brief season. If the object of the amendment is based on health reasons, then health inspectors already have ample power to deal with the matter. I am at a loss to understand the real reason for the Bill.

Hon. A. Thomson: Did the Road Board Association make any request for this legislation?

Hon. H. TUCKEY: I discussed this matter with the association, which represents approximately 120 road boards, and ascertained that to date no such request had been received, nor was any information available regarding it. There must be some reason for the proposal, but we are certainly not aware of it. If the suggestion had been discussed at a conference of local governing authorities, we would know where we stood. There is no urgency about the matter, and I hope members will reject the Bill.

HON. J. M. MACFARLANE (Metropolitan-Suburban) [4.50]: Since yesterday I have been endeavouring to secure some information on the statement made by the Honorary Minister that the local authorities have been asking for this amendment, and have discovered that one or two councils have made such a request. I intend to oppose the Bill. My information is that at least six boarders are required to make a boarding-house a business proposition; that is, to pay the rent and comply with the requisite conditions. Therefore, if anybody took only four boarders, the arrangement would be of a temporary nature. Either such a boardinghouse-keeper would soon fail, or the small number of boarders would be accepted merely temporarily, probably at holiday resorts. As Mr. Tuckey remarked, if the question of health is involved, the local health inspectors have ample power to investigate and ensure that boarding-houses are conducted in a proper manner. If there is any reason for the amendment, other than to narrow the scope and render it more difficult for individuals to live, we should be informed of it. The conditions that the measure would impose, however, would harass the small boardinghouse-keepers unduly. For these reasons, I shall oppose the Bill.

On motion by the Honorary Minister, debate adjourned.

BILL—FAIR RENTS.

Second Reading.

Debate resumed from the previous day.

HON. H. S. W. PARKER (Metropolitan-Suburban) [4.52]: This Bill is another hardy annual. I do not propose to cover all the ground I traversed on the previous occasion. The only State of the Commonwealth that has fair rents legislation is Queensland.

The Honorary Minister: What about New Zealand?

Hon. H. S. W. PARKER: New Zealand has an Act, due to expire on the 30th of this month. That may be news to the Honorary Minister. The law there was renewed in September last for one year. I received a copy of the New Zealand Act only last week, and up to, say, three weeks ago, there was no indication that the measure had been continued. Possibly and probably the law

is not being re-enacted. Let me point out, however, that the New Zealand Act differs entirely from the proposals in this Bill. We were told that this Bill was brought forward because of greedy landlords. The measure, if passed, would have very little effect in the direction of assisting the tenant, because the greedy landlord would continue to exist. True, he might not secure the same rent, but no more people would get houses. There will be only the same number of houses available, and the few selected tenants will perhaps have their rents reduced. I understood from the remarks of Mr. W. R. Hall that one of the main objects of the Bill is to get more houses on the goldfields.

Hon. G. Fraser: He did not say that.

Hon. H. S. W. PARKER: I gathered from his remarks that that is what is wanted.

Hon. G. Fraser: Lower rents for those already existing.

Hon. H. S. W. PARKER: I take it, then, that no more houses are required on the goldfields.

Hon. G. Fraser: That is not correct, either.

Hon. H. S. W. PARKER: Then I must conclude that more houses are required on the goldfields.

Hon. H. Seddon: Undoubtedly.

Hon. H. S. W. PARKER: My reply is that the measure will prevent the erection of more houses on the goldfields. Certainly it will not encourage the greedy landlord to provide houses, because he will have no scope. Neither will it encourage thrifty people to build, because they will run the risk of having the houses left on their hands in the event of the goldmining industry declining. I think Mr. W. R. Hall showed clearly that he was not perfectly satisfied in his own mind that 6 per cent. would be a fair return for landlords if we expected them to build additional houses.

Hon. G. Fraser: He said definitely that he would be satisfied with that return.

Hon. H. S. W. PARKER: He said he would be satisfied if he had the money, or if he was somebody else, but not personally. The Bill certainly will not encourage the erection of houses. "Dwelling-house" is defined as any premises leased substantially for residence, and the measure will apply to any dwelling the rent of which does not exceed £3 per week. Apparently

all the flats in the metropolitan area will be brought within the scope of the measure. The New Zealand Act does not apply to flats.

Hon. J. M. Macfarlane: Or to shops.

Hon. H. S. W. PARKER: That is so. I cannot see the object of the Bill. If the effect would be to reduce rents and bring about what is commonly known as fair rents, I would be solidly in favour of the measure. But I cannot see how it can assist those people whom we are told it is designed to assist. The only way in which the less fortunate people of the community can be assured of having a roof over their heads is by instituting a proper housing scheme, such as I understand is in operation in Queensland. The Honorary Minister might be able to tell us whether there is not a satisfactory housing scheme in Queensland, and another in New Zealand. He might be able to give us details of those schemes. We have a housing scheme of a sort—the workers' homes scheme—and not nearly sufficient money is set aside for the purpose. Complaints are frequently made of the attitude of the Government to house building on the goldfields. The Government cannot shirk its obligations by contending that the people cannot get houses because they cannot get fair rents. I am advised by agents throughout the city that very few landlords do in fact get a clear return of 6 per cent. on their investment, so that the measure will be of no avail in that respect.

Hon. G. Fraser: Then you have nothing to fear by passing it.

Hon. H. S. W. PARKER: Except that I do not wish to vote for something that will bluff people into believing we are assisting them when we shall merely be damaging their interests.

Hon. G. Fraser: How do you know you will be doing that?

Hon. H. S. W. PARKER: We should tell them the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth. The truth is that if the landlords are hamstrung, investors will not build houses except to live in themselves; they certainly will not build houses for tenants to occupy. A saying well known before Fair Rents Bills were ever thought of is that fools build houses for wise men to live in. That is a very true saying. For the reason that I do not believe this measure will have the effect of housing the less for-

fortunate members of the community, I feel bound to vote against it. In case the Bill goes through, I wish to mention a query as to whether the measure can have any effect at all. We know that 90 per cent. of the residences in the metropolitan area—and to some extent this applies on the goldfields as well—are registered as orchards at a shilling fee. An exemption under the Bill is the premises of any orchard. The Honorary Minister may not realise that. I do not wish him to have the Bill passed and then find it of no effect.

HON. G. FRASER (West) [5.3]: I support the Bill. In reply to the previous speaker, on most of the rented places on which the shilling orchard registration fee had to be paid, the solitary fruit tree was cut down, and thus the premises ceased to be orchards.

Hon. H. S. W. Parker: Then they will not be exempt.

Hon. G. FRASER: I was surprised to hear once again this session the arguments invariably used whenever a Bill of this nature comes before the House. The chief argument is that the passing of the measure would mean that nobody would invest money in the building of houses for letting. That is a fear which hon. members may dismiss from their minds. If they study the subject at all, they will find that for the last 15 or 20 years in the metropolitan area the building of houses for renting has been a dead letter.

Hon. H. S. W. Parker: Then the Bill is not warranted.

Hon. G. FRASER: Legislation is not necessary to stop something that is not going on.

Hon. H. Seddon: What about the building of flats? Are they not for letting?

Hon. G. FRASER: If the passing of the Bill stopped the building of flats, I think the hon. member would be as pleased as I would be. Of all buildings, apart from business premises, put up in the metropolitan area during the last 15 years, hardly any have been intended for letting. I ask Mr. Parker and Mr. Dimmitt to examine those portions of their province in which the greatest progress has been made during the last 15 years and ascertain how many houses there have been built to let.

Hon. H. Tuckey: Does not that indicate that there is not much in the business now?

Hon. G. FRASER: The contention of some members that the measure will stop the building of houses for letting is beside the mark, because the building of houses for that purpose has ceased.

Hon. J. M. Macfarlane: What about the companies that build houses?

Hon. G. FRASER: Those companies are selling the houses to tenants. Many such houses stand empty for months, until a buyer appears. The object of the Bill is to give a fair deal to persons renting houses which were built a good many years ago. Cases are known of houses built 30, 40 and even 50 years ago, paid for over and over again, which are now producing higher rents than they did 15 or 20 years ago.

Hon. J. M. Macfarlane: That might be by reason of location.

Hon. G. FRASER: Yet we are told that legislation of this kind is not needed.

Hon. H. S. W. Parker: Might not the reason be that the value of the land has gone up?

Hon. J. M. Macfarlane: There is the factor of location, too.

Hon. G. FRASER: During the Address-in-reply debate I requested hon. members to inquire, before this measure came before the Chamber, into the types of houses let and the rents paid for them. Such inquiries produce startling results.

Hon. W. J. Mann: Cannot you give us some particulars?

Hon. G. FRASER: I have given the particulars here on numerous occasions. At the same time I stated that the chief trouble was in connection with houses bringing rentals up to 20s. or 25s. per week. That is where the extortion goes on. Houses in the old industrial areas bringing up to 22s. 6d. per week lack ordinary conveniences, such as bathrooms.

Hon. H. S. W. Parker: That is because you will not bring in a Municipal Corporations Act.

Hon. G. FRASER: Often they are without washhouses. The housewife is deprived of ordinary conveniences. For that type of house this legislation is needed. Persons who can afford to pay higher rentals do not require legislative protection. The person the Bill seeks to protect is the person receiving somewhere about the basic wage. He should have a fair deal. He does not get it to-day. Mr. Baxter quoted the number of residences built in the metropolitan area during a certain period as 5,000, but

not one of those 5,000 residences, probably, was built for the purpose of letting. I was surprised at a remark by Mr. Craig—though I do not doubt it—about a railway guard who said he would not think of buying his own house. I have been associated with working people for the last 30 years, and never in all my travels have I found a working man who did not wish to own his own home. However, in many cases the difficulties are too great. The man on the basic wage rearing a family cannot possibly make a deposit which would give him a reasonable chance to purchase a property. In other cases the price of a residence is such as a working man cannot even look at. The acquisition of a £400 or £500 house would cost him, if he lived long enough to acquire it, the best part of £1,500.

Hon. J. M. Macfarlane: Nonsense!

Hon. G. FRASER: I would like to see more liberal funds made available for the operations of the Workers' Homes Board. It does build a fair number of homes, but nothing like the number required. Many people purchase homes through building societies. But there again the fee which must be put up in the first place, and the monthly contributions, are beyond the financial scope of many workers. That applies especially to workers on or near the basic wage.

Hon. A. Thomson: Still, many people on the basic wage have homes of their own.

Hon. G. FRASER: They are generally men in permanent positions, or positions practically permanent. The man whom we should protect is the man who has not a permanent position and whose income is small. It is such men who have to pay extortionate rents under existing conditions. The rents charged in the old suburbs are truly astounding. Hon. members should inquire into that phase of the subject.

Hon. H. S. W. Parker: Do you think letting houses is a profitable business now?

Hon. G. FRASER: I do not know anything about it, never having owned houses to let. Whether the business is profitable or otherwise, those who rent houses should be given a fair deal; and that is all the Bill aims at. A feature which many members have overlooked is that the only cases which will come before the court will be those in which the tenant is convinced that he is not being given a fair deal. If I know anything

about the average man, his case will have to be exceptionally burdensome before he appeals to a court. The working man does not like the idea of going to court, and he avoids doing so if it is at all possible. The only people who will take action under the Bill will be those definitely imposed upon.

Hon. H. S. W. Parker: They are the ones who seek the advice of lawyers.

Hon. G. FRASER: If they seek the advice of lawyers, they will not get much further if they have not a bean. The only serious objection raised against the Bill—that it will put a stop to the building of houses for letting—will not stand investigation, as I have proved. Therefore, I hope that on this occasion the dripping of the water during the years will have worn the stone away, and that the measure will now pass.

On motion by Hon. H. Tuckey, debate debate adjourned.

BILL—INDUSTRIAL ARBITRATION ACT AMENDMENT.

Second Reading.

Debate resumed from the previous day.

HON. A. THOMSON (South-East) [5.14]: It is frequently stated in this Chamber, because we oppose various types of measures, that we oppose industrial legislation, and that we are not in sympathy with the requirements of the workers. Those who oppose some classes of industrial legislation are just as sincere in their desire to protect the interests of the workers as are those who introduce it. A Labour Government did not first introduce industrial legislation. As far back as 1900, the then Government considered the introduction of this class of legislation to be necessary. I will quote from the remarks of the late Mr. R. W. Pennefather, the then Attorney General, who introduced the first Industrial Arbitration Bill. He said—

It is undoubtedly accepted as an axiom nowadays that the industrial prosperity of every civilised country depends on the harmonious relations existing between labour and capital.

Therefore, the statement can be made that other than Labour supporters view with concern a measure such as is now before the House. No doubt people outside will say that some members of this House always op-

pose industrial legislation. Members of this Chamber gave long and anxious consideration to the industrial arbitration measure that was introduced by the late Mr. McCallum. It redounds to the credit of those hon. gentlemen who represented this Chamber and another House on that occasion that they sat for 19 hours considering various amendments of that measure. As a result of their deliberations, Mr. McCallum stated that we had a measure which, in his opinion, was one of the best arbitration laws on any statute-book.

In 1900, in my youthful enthusiasm, I well remember a discussion that took place between myself and my workmen. I then had a contract at Fremantle. We were sitting down to lunch and I was extolling the wonderful benefits that were to be derived from the introduction of the arbitration Bill then before Parliament. I was taught a useful lesson by one of my employees, an old man. He said to me, "Well, boss, you seem to be enthusiastic about this matter. Of course, if the measure passes and you have to pay us 14s. per day, you will pay it." I said, "Certainly I will." He then said, "If it goes the other way and reduces our wages, you could not make me work for you." He demonstrated that the proposed legislation even at that time was one-sided. I then said, "We can make you work." He said, "Suppose you could make me work. Suppose you had the right to come to my home and place me on the job, how long do you think you would keep me there? I would make so many blunders that you would be only too pleased to get rid of me."

Arbitration legislation, as it now exists, is also one-sided. When discussing a similar measure last year, I suggested a means of preventing stop-work meetings. We should be in a position to impose penalties upon those who break the law. In the present Bill provision is actually made to imprison employers if they are not in a position to pay wages when ordered to do so by the court. Yet only recently we have had measures before the House from which we have been deleting similar provisions. I would stress this point: Under the present Act power is given to impose penalties upon employees who decide to take a holiday, or go into conference. They do not go on strike, Mr. President. So we find that in-

dustry is dislocated, the employers suffer considerable loss and no redress at all is given to them. Last year I mentioned that about £80,000 or £90,000 had been collected by way of fees by various trade unions in Western Australia. If my suggestion were adopted generally, I venture to say the present strike in the Eastern States would not have occurred. That industrial trouble has not been brought so prominently under the notice of the people of Australia because it is overshadowed by the disturbed state of affairs in Europe. If a percentage of the fees collected by the unions were placed in a trust account, either with the Government, or preferably with the Arbitration Court, we would not be faced with so many of these pin-pricking stop-work meetings; because immediately a stop-work meeting took place, such funds would be available for the payment of any fine that might be inflicted upon the union.

I have been associated with working men for over 50 years and I know scores of them who, in their inmost hearts, have no desire to stop work. Has anything more absurd happened than the recent trouble in the building trade in Perth, when the men, having asked for certain conditions, stopped work because they were not granted, and so lost a considerable sum of money? The unfortunate part is that the men do lose money. I speak from experience and I know it takes the working man a long time to make up money lost in that way, if ever he makes it up. In the Eastern States, the coal miners are boasting that they have a huge fund and so are able to defy the law. If that fund were liable to forfeiture by reason of the strike, which is preventing other people from carrying on their ordinary vocations, I think the union officials would have hesitated before taking such an extreme step.

We know the unfortunate attitude adopted by the Government in the goldfields strike. We also know what took place recently in the coal mining industry. To me it seems strange that while the coal mining industry of this State has an opportunity of securing another customer, the Midland Railway Co., the union secretary is giving a definite assurance that no coal will be supplied to the Midland Railway Co. I would have thought that it was an excellent opportunity of demonstrating to the management of the company that its trains could be run with the

local product. I was amazed to hear the company was importing coal from the Eastern States. I am opposed to many of the provisions of the Bill. No doubt I shall be accused of opposing the interests of the industrial section. May I say, however, that a large section of our workers is compelled to contribute to the funds of a huge industrial union in Western Australia? It remained for the Government, and a Labour Government at that, to declare this policy. We had the spectacle of men forced to leave their homes, work on the roads and live in tents, leaving their wives at home. Some of the wives—and I take my hat off to them—accompanied their husbands to the road construction camps and shared with them the rough living conditions. This type of woman has made Western Australia what it is, and made the British Empire, too.

Hon. L. Craig: They put up with a lot of discomfort.

Hon. A. THOMSON: Many of those men had followed other callings. Unfortunately, owing to the depression, they had to take up what is called pick-and-shovel work. God knows, some of them must have suffered! Yet, before they were permitted to earn a living for themselves and their families, the Government said "You must be a member of a union, and you must contribute to the funds of that union." In my opinion, that is conscription in its worst form. I regret the Government was able to force its will upon so many defenceless men. I know many of them did not desire to contribute to the funds of the A.W.U. Some of them asked my opinion. I replied, "Unfortunately, the Government has the power. That is the only condition on which the Government will permit you to work, and I regret I must advise you to obey."

Hon. G. Fraser: They expected the wages and conditions that that organisation had obtained for the workers.

Hon. A. THOMSON: I appreciate the excellent work done by the unions. We realise all they have done to improve the conditions of the workers, but they have gone to the other extreme. The extra burdens imposed on some industries by their demands can be passed on; but the point is that, when the cost of production is increased in every direction, inevitably the cost of living goes up. The hon. member who has just interjected also pointed out that workers are not able to get cheap rents, and that the

man on the basic wage is unable to secure a house the rent of which compares favourably with the wages he receives. We realise the fact that much of the increased cost of buildings has been occasioned by the awards of the court. Those awards, of course, have been based on strictly actuarial calculations. The cost of living has been shown to have increased, as a consequence of which it has been found necessary to provide increased wages for the men. Thirty years ago I was able to build a three-roomed brick house in Katanning for about £225. I could not do that to-day. Members may ask, "Why?" The reason is that the cost of materials has increased so greatly. Timber and bricks are dearer, largely on account of the additional wages that have to be paid. I do not suggest that men are not entitled to decent wages.

The Chief Secretary: Then what are you growling about?

Hon. G. B. Wood: Did not the men lay more bricks in those days?

Hon. A. THOMSON: I am growling about the attitude of the Government in over-riding the Arbitration Court, which was established to provide a means of settling disputes. In two definite instances the Government over-rode the court. Consequently I cannot view sympathetically a measure that proposes to give powers that I would hesitate to give.

Let us consider Clause 4, which proposes to class any steward, agent, bailiff, foreman or manager as an employer. Such a definition does not meet with my approval. Again, the Bill proposes to amend the definition of "worker" by eliminating certain words, as a result of which any person may be regarded as a worker, although he may be doing voluntary work. The general tightening up proposed by this Bill is too one-sided. The Bill, if it became law, would render more difficult the carrying on of business in any shape or form. I am informed that some large businesses have to appoint a special man carefully to scrutinise the awards under which employees are working. Sometimes as many as 16 or 18 awards are involved.

Consider also the proposal relating to imprisonment of offenders. I do not notice any desperate attempt on the part of the Government to imprison workers or to impose severe penalties for

breaches by employees. I agree with Mr. Bolton that much of the industrial dissatisfaction that has existed has been due to the difficulty of approaching the court. I fail to understand the necessity for Mr. President Dwyer's having two associates on the Bench, one to represent the employers and the other the employees. As pointed out by Mr. Bolton, such a provision was needed when the Arbitration Act became law. We were then embarking on new methods of industrial legislation, but times have changed. I agree that the President of the Court is a man of considerable experience, and the money that is being spent on providing him with two associates would be better expended in providing another judge. For years I have advocated the appointment of wages boards. I hold the view that if we can get men directly interested in a particular industry around a table, they will arrive at an agreement much more quickly and on a much more satisfactory basis than is possible under the present system.

I congratulate Mr. Parker upon his very clear and concise dissection of the Bill. He demonstrated that many of the suggested amendments to the Act are not in the interests of the State as a whole. Though I shall be accused of voting against an industrial measure, I intend to oppose the Bill. I believe there are large numbers of men who have an equal right to be heard, but under present conditions they have no opportunity of being heard. I have already pointed out that this industrial legislation was introduced in 1900 by men who allegedly were opposed to the workers industrially, but I am convinced that the Act is capable of providing a great deal of satisfaction. Had the Government shown any disposition to balance the scales of justice equally and to introduce penal clauses applicable to both sides, I would have been more sympathetic to the measure.

The Chief Secretary: Who has no opportunity of being heard?

Hon. A. THOMSON: I thought I explained that. I said that sections of men were compelled by the ukase of this Government to contribute to the funds and become members of the A.W.U.

The Honorary Minister: That is worn out.

Hon. A. THOMSON: Perhaps so, but it is perfectly true. I was asked who could

not be heard, and I am answering the question. Then I have an interjection to the effect that what I am saying is worn out.

The PRESIDENT: The hon. member should address the Chair.

Hon. A. THOMSON: This sort of thing has been going on year after year. Certain unions have taken strong exception to the pressure brought to bear upon their members who have had to take positions as road workers, and then have had to join the A.W.U. In the eyes of the Government I may be opposing an industrial measure, but I intend to vote against the Bill because I do not consider it to be in the best interests of the State.

On motion by Hon. J. Nicholson, debate adjourned.

RESOLUTION—YAMPI SOUND IRON ORE DEPOSITS.

Commonwealth Embargo

Debate resumed from the previous day on motion by the Chief Secretary to concur in the Assembly's resolution as follows:—

That this Parliament of Western Australia emphatically protests against the embargo placed by the Commonwealth Government on the export of iron ore from Australia, in view of its disastrous effects upon the development of the State. We consider that the information available does not warrant such drastic action, and we urge the Commonwealth Government to remove the embargo.

to which Hon. A. Thomson (South-East) had moved an amendment as follows:—

That the following words be added to the motion for concurrence:—"Provided the resolution be amended by striking out all the words after 'Western Australia' and inserting in lieu the following words:—'considers the embargo imposed by the Federal Government on the export of iron ore—which has been done in the interests of the whole of Australia—means a serious loss to the State of Western Australia in particular, and it is considered therefore that a substantial grant should be made by the Federal Government to compensate this State for the disastrous effect this embargo has caused in the loss of employment for its workers and the retarding of development in the Yampi area; such grant to be earmarked for the development of the northern portion of the State.'"

THE HONORARY MINISTER (Hon. E. H. Gray—West) [5.39]: I intend to support the resolution and am surprised at the attitude adopted by several speakers.

Had a Federal Labour Government been in power and had the embargo on the export of iron ore from Yampi Sound been imposed by that Government, a chorus of disapproval would have been raised by members who have spoken against the resolution and one much more strongly worded would have been carried by this Chamber.

Hon. L. Craig: It would not have been introduced.

The HONORARY MINISTER: The attitude of the majority of speakers against the resolution is dictated solely by political expediency.

Several members interjected.

The HONORARY MINISTER: The attack by Mr. Holmes on the originators of the scheme to develop Yampi, and his caustic criticism of the London financiers, boils down to an epic exposure of the evils of capitalism. Our present system of production is percolated—

Hon. J. J. Holmes: Are you sure you are using the right word?

The HONORARY MINISTER: —with financial schemes of questionable character so ably denounced by Mr. Holmes. Quite unwittingly Mr. Holmes attacked one of the root causes of international strife and discord. In discussing this question, members should be very careful lest they fan the flames of international hatred and render more difficult the task imposed upon the British Prime Minister and the leaders of all peace-loving nations who are desperately trying to maintain peace with honour to all parties in the present world crisis.

Hon. J. J. Holmes: Who wrote that?

Several members interjected.

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The HONORARY MINISTER: I am giving a sincere opinion.

Hon. J. J. Holmes: But whose opinion?

The PRESIDENT: Order! I hope members will allow the Minister to proceed with his speech.

The HONORARY MINISTER: I strongly disapprove of the somewhat guarded criticism of the Japanese nation and its alleged business methods. Whatever may be their methods, the Japanese have been taught mainly by British and German capitalists. They have risen rapidly to the position of a big world power under the tutorship of English and German naval and military experts. They have learnt big

business under specialised teaching in English and German universities. Forty-three years ago the mercantile marine of Great Britain took a personal pride in the Japanese Navy. In those days it was difficult to distinguish the difference between a British man-of-war and a Japanese man-of-war unless one had binoculars or was close enough to see the flag. The development of the Japanese Navy in the early stages was fostered under the guidance of Great Britain and Germany.

Hon. E. H. Angelo: That is one of the grave mistakes that Great Britain committed.

The HONORARY MINISTER: The hon. member agrees that that was done.

Hon. E. H. Angelo: Unfortunately it was done.

The HONORARY MINISTER: Nothing the Japanese have done in their process of feudal capitalistic production could possibly be worse than what was done 50 or 60 years ago when the factory system was developing in England and Germany. I quote those two countries because—

Hon. J. J. Holmes: What has this to do with Yampi Sound?

The HONORARY MINISTER: Everything. The hon. member himself introduced the question of Japan's attitude and criticised that country for its stand in the present crisis. A classic example of the influence of the British is the development of the flour milling industry in Japan. Why does that country possess the largest and most modern flour mills in the world? Is it not mainly because of the unscrupulous thieving exploitation indulged in by exporters of flour in which Australia 40 years ago took a leading part? A common practice of the British mercantile marine was to dispose of Australian flour before the ships began their return voyage, because it was impossible to make decent bread with the Australian flour exported at that time. Extreme care had to be exercised in husbanding the supplies of flour gathered from the home ports of the Old Country for the round trip that sometimes lasted for four months, in order that the officers and crews might have decent bread which it was almost impossible to make with Australian flour.

The PRESIDENT: I would like the hon. member to connect up his remarks with the motion.

The HONORARY MINISTER: You have allowed other speakers to take a wide view of the subject.

Hon. J. J. Holmes: Are you speaking to the motion or the amendment?

The PRESIDENT: The amendment does allow a fairly wide range to be taken. At the same time, I would like the hon. member to connect up his remarks with the amendment.

The HONORARY MINISTER: Both the motion and the amendment involve the question of the selling of the ore to Japan. The export of flour from Australia, including Western Australia, was ruined because of the rubbish exported during that period to the Malay States, China, Dutch East Indies, and Japan, which literally compelled the Japanese to mill their own flour from imported wheat. Japan now has the most modern mills in the world. Let us not forget the bad example we set to those people in the bad old days of unrestricted and unsupervised industry. The emancipation of the Japanese working class is steadily taking place under intense difficulties, but nothing Japanese capitalism can do can possibly be worse than the physical deterioration that took place in the working classes of England through merciless sweating, low wages, long hours of labour, and adulterated food. This was a prominent feature of the development of the capitalist system in England and Germany. We can safely leave the Japanese to emancipate themselves, and this will receive the sympathetic consideration and sympathy of organised labour right throughout the world.

Now I shall again connect my remarks with the subject matter of the motion. Under the terms of the agreement, the development of Yampi Sound by exportation of iron ore to Japan would be suspended in times of national emergency. Whether or not iron deposits are limited, only investigation will prove. In any event the Commonwealth Government has hopelessly bungled matters by not intervening earlier. In my opinion, the embargo is an affront to a nation which yesterday was an honoured ally, and which rendered signal service to Australia during the Great War. It is to our mutual advantage to foster goodwill, and keep open and expand trade between the two countries. As far as my investigation goes, and relying also on

statements made in this House, the Yampi Sound proposal was hawked around for years and no one wanted it. Acting on the assumption that ample supplies are available for export—I stress this—Western Australia makes, under this agreement, a distinct contribution to world peace. I say that in all sincerity.

The festering sore that always threatens international disruption is the lack of recognition of one of the basic principles of international justice, that it is the duty of any nation possessing ample reserves of any raw material to make available to other countries that may be short of the commodity, supplies on a fair basis to both contracting parties. Countries may be legal owners of raw materials within their boundaries—that is not disputed—but when a surplus exists beyond their own requirements, they are really trustees for all countries that may urgently need those commodities.

Hon. H. S. W. Parker: What about sugar from Java?

The HONORARY MINISTER: We grow our own sugar. Australia desires to foster trade with Japan. We want her to take an increasing quantity of our wool, wheat, and timber. Japan vitally wants iron ore in large quantities for the legitimate requirements of her home industries. There is no fundamental difference between the selling of wool, wheat and timber and the selling of iron ore to Japan. Any statement to the contrary is mere bunkum. Why did not the Commonwealth Government move earlier in the matter of this embargo? There may be a perfectly clear explanation why that was not done. A conviction is growing amongst a large section of the community that the Broken Hill Proprietary Co. is exercising too great an influence or a sinister influence in the financial life of the Commonwealth. I am not casting any reflection upon the Commonwealth or Cabinet Ministers. I have the highest regard for the integrity of every member of the Federal Government. The Broken Hill Proprietary Co. is the biggest monopoly in Australia. Its ramifications extend to all kinds of activities in the business sphere.

Hon. W. J. Mann: And it has been one of the biggest and best employers of labour for many years.

The HONORARY MINISTER: The company's record is an unenviable one. Its tre-

mendous business edifice was built by merciless treatment of its employees.

Members: Nonsense!

The HONORARY MINISTER: I am speaking from personal knowledge that members do not possess. The company's early history in Broken Hill is a story of relentless oppression of leaders of labour. It has made enormous profits from its mining venture, and at the same time has exploited its employees and shown a total lack of regard for the well-being of the men without whose services success would have been impossible. The cemeteries at Broken Hill and in other parts of Australia are a silent rebuke to this company, because hundreds of the finest men that Australia has ever produced were cut off in the prime of early manhood, while thousands of others were forced from the mines, broken in mind and body.

Hon. W. J. Mann: What you are saying is not correct.

The HONORARY MINISTER: It is correct.

The PRESIDENT: Order! Members must allow the Honorary Minister to proceed without interruption.

The HONORARY MINISTER: When important business is being discussed, members should devote some time to studying the past records of the big business concerns of the Commonwealth.

Hon. W. J. Mann: What have they to do with Yampi Sound?

The HONORARY MINISTER: There is a growing feeling that the Broken Hill Proprietary Co., has too much say in the affairs of the Commonwealth.

Hon. J. Nicholson: To make a statement like that is not right.

The HONORARY MINISTER: I have not said anything that is not true. To-day that company is a giant monopoly vitally interested in the iron and steel industry.

Hon. H. S. W. Parker: Will you break up the industry by selling ore to Japan?

The HONORARY MINISTER: If the embargo must stand, the company should be forced to take a substantial tonnage of its own requirements from this State. Notwithstanding the present critical condition of international affairs, the resolution of protest now before us should be endorsed by the Chamber. The international situation should not blind us to the duty of ensuring that justice is done to the State. Mr. Holmes has adopted a perfectly sincere and honest

course, according to his convictions, but as far as we know there is an ample supply of iron ore available, and therefore it is a fair thing to ask every member to subscribe to the motion.

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

BILL—LIGHTS (NAVIGATION PROTECTION).

Second Reading.

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

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Bill passed through Committee without debate, reported without amendment, and the report adopted

BILL—ALSATIAN DOG ACT AMENDMENT.

Second Reading.

HON. G. B. WOOD (East) [6.0] in moving the second reading said: This small Bill seeks to amend the Alsatian Dog Act of 1929.

Hon. G. Fraser: It is a small Bill with a long tail.

Hon. G. B. WOOD: Yes. Section 2 of the Act reads—

No person shall after the expiry of three months from the passing of this Act be the owner of, or keep or have in his possession, or under his control, any dog of the Alsatian wolfhound species, if such dog is of or over three months of age and has not been effectively sterilised.

This seeks to make illegal the keeping of an Alsatian dog over the age of three months if it is not effectively sterilised. The Bill is designed to secure the deletion of the words "is of or over three months of age and," in lines 4 and 5 of Section 2 of the Act. If the Bill be passed, to keep an unsterilised Alsatian dog in Western Australia will be illegal. At present it is illegal for anyone to breed an Alsatian dog in this State. Very few of such dogs are bred here, and very few of those that are here are unsterilised. On the other hand, in South Australia, where there seem to be no restric-

tions, considerable numbers of these dogs are bred. The amendment seeks to prevent dogs being brought from South Australia that are under the age of three months and are unsterilised. Many dogs that are bred in South Australia and brought to this State eventually get away to the country districts. Unfortunately, they are not sterilised. They are forgotten and get out into the bush. This has happened not only in the country districts but on the goldfields. The Bill seeks to obviate that menace, and will prevent the importation of any dog into Western Australia until it has been sterilised and until it has reached the age of three months.

Veterinary surgeons say it is impossible to be sure whether a dog can be sterilised until it has reached the age of three months. The owner of every Alsatian dog in Western Australia, no matter what its age may be, must have a veterinary surgeon's certificate to show that it has been effectively sterilised. Numerous instances have occurred in the agricultural districts of depredations by Alsatian wolfhounds and their crosses when these animals have got away from their owners. In the Kalannie district an Alsatian dog ran away some time in 1929 and took up with dingoes. Subsequently a dingo was found with a litter of half-bred Alsatian-dingo pups. In another instance a dog that became known as Two-toes came into the Wongan Hills district. He was a half-bred dingo-Alsatian. This animal did damage on several farms to the extent of £1,000. One farmer alone lost £300 worth of sheep. The unfortunate people concerned suffered many sleepless nights thinking about what might be happening in their paddocks whilst this animal was at large. They were so perturbed over a period of two years that they obtained a special trapper from the central vermin board to go after the dog. After two or three weeks the trapper succeeded in catching the beast. When the Minister for Agriculture in another place spoke in support of the Bill, he said he had been assured by an officer of the vermin board that the dog in question was a half-bred Alsatian-dingo. The farmers were so pleased with the success of the trapper that they contributed a considerable sum of money to compensate him for his services.

I will give one other instance concerning a dog I know of, to show that other than Alsatian-dingo crosses are likely to become dangerous. A friend secured a half-bred

Kelpie-Alsatian dog. Ordinarily the Kelpie is a tame and timid animal and is not a natural killer. When the dog had grown up and was nine months old, he was allowed to run amongst the sheep. The first time this happened he accounted for six sheep. Apparently no matter what the cross is the Alsatian cross is naturally a killer. I have here one or two exhibits that members might like to see. The first is the scalp and the hide of Two-toes from the head to the tail. This shows the enormous size to which the Alsatian cross grows. I have already indicated the extent of the damage done by that dog.

Hon. L. Craig: It was twice the size of the ordinary dingo.

Hon. G. B. WOOD: Yes. Foxes do a considerable amount of damage, but they are only about a quarter the size of a dog like Two-toes.

Hon. J. J. Holmes: Cannot the dogs be kept out of the country altogether?

Hon. G. B. WOOD: I would be quite agreeable to that, but would not like to be too drastic. Many people like these dogs, for when kept under control they make excellent pets.

Hon. C. F. Baxter: They are a menace.

Hon. J. Nicholson: I heard of one dog in the Old Country that attacked its master.

Hon. G. B. WOOD: I wish to read a few extracts to show what happens in the Eastern States, where the authorities are far more drastic than we propose to be here. These are extracts from the "West Australian"—

Sydney, 9/6/36.—The Carrathool Shire Council, following killings by Alsatian dogs, decided that sterilisation was insufficient, and carried a resolution that all Alsations or Alsatian cross-bred dogs be declared noxious. It was decided to notify the police that all such dogs in the district would be destroyed on sight.

Queensland, 1/6/34.—At a conference of representatives of the Cloncurry, Mackinlay, Boulia, and Barkley Tableland Shires, it was decided that every Alsatian dog in the shires represented must be sterilised or destroyed, and that future importations of such breed of either sex into the shires be prohibited.

From the "Pastoralists' Review" I take the following:—

Victoria.—During last year 1,582 Alsatian dogs have been destroyed at the Animal Hospital and the Dogs' Homes, North Melbourne, where the average destruction rate has been four a day. Officials expect the rate to be

considerably increased by the end of the month, when the annual tax of £2 15s. will become due. Many dogs have been disposed of by the Animal Welfare League and by private veterinary surgeons in addition to the foregoing.

Queensland.—The Emerald Shire Council last month decided to impose a registration fee of £3 5s. on Alsatian dogs. Any dog not registered is to be destroyed and the owner prosecuted.

We are not asking for anything more drastic than is found in the other States, with the exception of South Australia. If the same precautions were taken in South Australia, we would have no need to worry. No great hardship is entailed by this Bill, which means that lovers of Alsations will have to leave them until they reach the age of three months before they bring them into Western Australia. That is the only extra hardship we are imposing upon people. It is vitally necessary for sheep owners that a measure of this kind should be passed. Mr. Holmes suggested that we should exclude these dogs altogether. I would like to see that done, but think it might be a little too drastic. I trust I have said enough to convince members of the desirability of passing the measure. I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

On motion by the Chief Secretary, debate adjourned.

House adjourned at 6.12 p.m.

Legislative Assembly.

Thursday, 29th September, 1938.

	PAGE
Questions: Railways, Institute for Collie	1146
North-West cattle, transport to goldfields, precautions	1146
Milk as food, medical officers' opinions	1147
Electricity Supply, extension to Riverton	1147
Annual Estimates, 1938-39, Com. of Supply	1147
Votes discussed: Agriculture	1147
Education	1175

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

QUESTION—RAILWAYS.

Institute for Collie.

Mr. WILSON asked the Minister for Railways: 1, What is the position in regard to the proposed construction of a railway institute at Collie? 2, Can he state the probable date when the building of the institute will be proceeded with?

The MINISTER FOR RAILWAYS replied: 1, The matter is being considered in connection with the loan proposals for the current year. 2, No.

QUESTION—NORTH-WEST CATTLE.

Transport to Goldfields: Precautions.

Mr. BOYLE asked the Minister for Agriculture: 1, Is he aware that North-West cattle, consigned to the goldfields and being sent through Merredin on the hoof by train, are detained at Merredin into stock yards used by other stock, and watered there, before resuming the journey to the goldfields? 2, In view of the public danger resultant from this practice, will he order that these cattle be slaughtered at port of entry and conveyed to their ultimate destination on hooks?

The MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE replied: 1, Cattle are allowed to be unloaded only under special circumstances, such as when they are sick or get down. Loading is then permitted under the supervision of a health inspector or police officer at any station where facilities are available. 2, Under the conditions set out, the Chief Inspector of Stock advises there is no risk of infection spreading locally.