

Hon. J. J. HOLMES: I have had better support from members than I anticipated. If we make the Bill apply to the 1st July, that would give the authorities a 12 months' run at the full rate of interest.

Hon. Sir Edward Wittenoom: I would point out that on the Estimates of Revenue and Expenditure there is an item for University exhibitions of £1,900.

Hon. J. J. HOLMES: When we passed this legislation we passed it about this time of the year, and made it retrospective to the 10th July. If we make that amendment now, the University will have had a full run from the 1st July, 1931, to the 1st July, 1932. I should like to move an amendment to incorporate the date 10th July, 1932.

Hon. Sir Charles Nathan: In the circumstances I am prepared to withdraw my amendment.

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

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

That the words "commencement of Part VI. of the said Act" be struck out, and "as from the 1st day of July, 1932" be inserted in lieu.

Hon. W. H. KITSON: When does the University year end? We are now in the month of December. If the University year runs from the 1st January to the 31st December the authorities will have exhausted their funds for the year. I am sure Mr. Holmes does not wish to embarrass the University in any way.

Hon. H. J. YELLAND: On the day when this Bill is proclaimed an Act all salaries which have been reduced at the University will revert to the old figure, and a further 22½ per cent. will be added to the expenses of the institution.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: I was going to draw attention to that matter myself. Mr. Holmes would be well advised if he reported progress in order to ascertain what the position is.

Hon. J. J. HOLMES: Whatever else is struck out, we must leave in the reference to Part VI. I do not know when the University year ends, but I do know they have received during the interim £4,000 more than they should have had, by claiming to be a State instrumentality. The outgoings have been reduced, but for the full period of 12 months the University will have had

the full rate of interest on all their land, mortgages, and everything else. The institution should be in a unique position. Unless we leave in the reference to Part VI., the professors and staff will go back to the old salaries. In view of what has been said I will report progress.

Progress reported.

House adjourned at 9.16 p.m.

Legislative Assembly,

Wednesday, 7th December, 1932.

	PAGE
Questions: Kalgoorlie battery	2261
R.S.L. Consultation	2262
Wyndham Meat Works	2262
Cattle overlanded	2262
Bills: Bills of Sale Act Amendment, leave to introduce, 1r.	2262
Mine Workers Relief, 2r., Com.	2265
Metropolitan Whole Milk, 2r.	2260
Road Districts Act Amendment, Council's Message, request for Conference	2293-4
Health Act Amendment, Council's Message, Com.	2294

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

QUESTION—KALGOORLIE BATTERY.

Mr. MILLINGTON (for Hon. J. Cunningham) asked the Minister for Mines: 1, What was the cost to the Government of the public battery at Kalgoorlie when the plant was taken over? 2, What has been the cost of repairs to date? 3, What have been the treatment costs? 4, What has been the time taken to treat each parcel? 5, How many tons were treated to the 30th November?

The MINISTER FOR MINES replied: 1. £30 per week, providing 10,000 tons per year crushed, falling to £21 per week if only 7,000 tons or under crushed per year, with option of purchase at not more than £5,000 at end of five years. 2, £129 2s. 8d.

3, 11s. 2.08d. per ton milling only, to end of October. Tailing treatment commenced in November. (November costs not yet available.) 4, Average tonnage, each parcel 44½ tons. Average time taken, excluding Sundays, but including all stoppages, 31 hours. 5, 6,692 tons.

QUESTION—R.S.L. CONSULTATION.

Hon. W. D. JOHNSON asked the Minister for Police: 1, Is the advertisement appearing in the "West Australian" of the 6th December correct in stating that the portion of the proceeds of the consultation now in progress will be handed over to the Returned Soldiers' League, or is this fund earmarked specially for the amelioration fund of the league? 2, If the latter, will he see that correct information is given to the public?

The MINISTER FOR POLICE replied: 1, Portion only of the moneys received from the charities consultation will be allotted to the amelioration fund of the Returned Soldiers' League. 2, The Advisory Committee will be asked to make this information public.

QUESTION—WYNDHAM MEATWORKS.

Mr. COVERLEY asked the Minister for Lands: 1, Is it a fact that the Chief Secretary promised prior selection of employment to all local unemployed in the North for last operating season at the Wyndham Meatworks? 2, If so, how many applications were received from local residents? 3, How many were employed for the season?

The MINISTER FOR LANDS replied: 1, The Minister gave an assurance that where local labour could be employed, it would be. 2, Applications for employment at the Meatworks by Wyndham residents number 35. 3, Twenty-two local residents in all were employed, three of whom are permanent employees.

QUESTION—CATTLE OVERLANDED.

Mr. COVERLEY asked the Minister for Agriculture: How many cattle have been overlanded south from Broome and north thereof during the past ten years?

The MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE replied: The following is the information desired—

Year.	South of Broome.	North of Broome.	Total.
1923	1,500	616	2,116
1924	—	—	—
1925	1,583	1,010	2,593
1926	1,731	1,008	2,739
1927	2,370	—	2,370
1928	1,879	1,045	2,924
1929	877	938	1,815
1930	1,100	917	2,017
1931	1,552	—	1,552
1932	—	—	—

BILL—BILLS OF SALE ACT AMENDMENT.

Leave to Introduce.

THE MINISTER FOR LANDS (Hon. C. G. Latham—York) [4.36]: On behalf of the Attorney General, I move—

That leave be given to introduce a Bill for an Act to amend Section 18 of the Bills of Sale Act Amendment Act, 1906, and for other purposes relative thereto.

HON. P. COLLIER (Boulder) [4.37]: I should like to know at this stage whether we have reached the limit of introducing new Bills. About two weeks ago the Premier discussed with me the programme for the session, and indicated the Bills he desired to get through, and also the new Bills likely to be introduced. I think I am not breaking faith with the Premier when I say that he gave me an undertaking that only one or two new Bills, which were mentioned, would be introduced. Now, sitting after sitting, Ministers calmly ignore the stage of the session, calmly ignore the tacit understanding between the Premier and myself, and bring down new Bills. This may be a Bill of no importance; I do not know. On the other hand, it may be a Bill of great importance. I do not think the Premier is entitled to bring down Bills at this stage of the session in the hope of getting them through after having discussed with me a fortnight ago what could be accomplished before the Christmas adjournment. Before I can approve of granting leave to introduce this Bill, I want to know its contents and whether it is debatable. Furthermore, I am entitled to ask whether the Premier intends to bring down other Bills on every sitting day between now and Christmas. I do not accuse the Premier

deliberately breaking faith with me, but certainly, in the spirit, he has broken faith with me. It has been the practice for leaders on both sides of the House to consult when the end of the session has been approaching, and to consider what Bills might be proceeded with and what Bills might be laid aside. It has also been the practice to consider what new Bills would be introduced. The Premier will not deny that, in the course of our conversation nearly three weeks ago, he gave me an assurance that no new Bills would be introduced, excepting one or two. Now, however, we are having new Bills introduced nearly every day. That is not fair to the House, having regard to the state of the Notice Paper, which contains most important Bills, or rather Bills that the Government regard as being most important. Even if our attention were confined entirely to a consideration of the Bills at present on the Notice Paper, we should not be able to give adequate and fair consideration to them if we are going to rise by Christmas. I think we should endeavour to avoid the practice that has obtained in the past, not only here but in other Parliaments, of rushing through or jamming through important Bills during the last few days of the session when members are worn out and have not an opportunity to consider the measures. Even though it may be possible for members to give consideration to such Bills, we must remember that we are here to legislate in the interests of the people. Most important of all is the fact that Parliament is not entitled to pass any Bill until the people have had sufficient time to inquire into it and decide upon it one way or the other. To do otherwise is to play a trick upon the electors, to go behind their backs. No Bills should be passed in such haste as to deprive the people of an opportunity to learn the contents of the Bills. At this moment we are asked to grant leave to introduce a new Bill, though the Premier knows perfectly well that the Notice Paper is crowded with Bills and other business that have been discussed in their initial stages. In the last day or two of the session, the Premier will tell private members that he is very sorry but that time does not permit of their business being discussed. Their Bills and motions, which are all-important to members on both sides of the House, will be crowded out because of insufficient time to discuss them. Yet the Government at this late stage of the session are bringing down new business. That is not

playing fair with the House. The Bill for which leave to introduce is now sought may be trivial and quite unimportant, but this is not the stage of the session to introduce a new Bill, seeing that the Notice Paper is crowded with the business of private members. There has been no opportunity to discuss the business of private members for months past—I think I am safe in saying for months past—and the prospect is that only a few hours will be made available on the last day of the session. I object to the introduction of any new Bills at this stage.

THE PREMIER (Hon. Sir James Mitchell—Northam) [4.43]: The Leader of the Opposition will realise that it does sometimes happen that a small amendment to an Act has to be made.

Hon. P. Collier: You might have consulted me about it. If you had done so, I might not have had occasion to make a protest.

The PREMIER: I am very sorry. When we discussed the matter, I told the Leader of the Opposition all I knew about Bills we would have to introduce. Leave is now asked to introduce a Bill to make a small amendment to the Bills of Sale Act, and the amendment is important to purchasers of stock. I do not think the House will object to the Bill, and I do not think its consideration will occupy many moments, but it is important to many people who, in these bad times, desire to buy stock to put on their properties.

Hon. P. Collier: You say it is not important. It may be very important.

The PREMIER: It is important to purchasers of stock—people who are buying stock on time payment.

Hon. J. C. Willecock: It may be important to sellers of stock.

Hon. P. Collier: It may be important to the people of the country.

The PREMIER: The object is to rectify a weakness in the Bills of Sale Act. The weakness has not previously been discovered because the circumstances have not arisen before. I imagine that the House will welcome the small amendment, and certainly it ought not to take any time at all. I am sorry I did not mention the matter to the Leader of the Opposition, but it deals with a point that has just cropped up.

Hon. A. McCallum: The Minister for Lands has just given notice regarding two additional Bills this afternoon!

The PREMIER: One is to make possible the construction of a hospital at Narrogin, and that will provide work there. It is really merely continuing the system of hospital building that has been followed but, owing to a limitation involved in the Act, a Bill has to be put through.

Hon. P. Collier: The Premier will not deny that he gave me an undertaking that there would be, as far as he knew, hardly any new Bills introduced.

The PREMIER: That is so, but these are not important.

Hon. P. Collier: The importance of a Bill depends upon the point of view. It may not be important to you, but it may be of great importance to me.

The PREMIER: Of course, but the Leader of the Opposition would not object, if a flaw were found in an Act, to a Bill being introduced to rectify the matter.

Hon. P. Collier: You might have consulted me.

The PREMIER: Yes, I am sorry I did not do so. However, that is the position. Members from the country areas and from the North in particular will recognise the importance of this matter. I assure the Leader of the Opposition that, had it not been considered necessary to introduce these amendments, particularly at this juncture, the Bills would not have found any place on the Notice Paper.

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

Ayes	23
Noes	17

Majority for	6
--------------	----	----	---

AYES.

Mr. Angelo	Sir James Mitchell
Mr. Barnard	Mr. Parker
Mr. Brown	Mr. Patrick
Mr. Church	Mr. Piesse
Mr. Ferguson	Mr. Richardson
Mr. Griffiths	Mr. Sampson
Mr. Keenan	Mr. Scaddan
Mr. Latham	Mr. J. H. Smith
Mr. Lindsay	Mr. Thora
Mr. H. W. Mann	Mr. Wells
Mr. J. I. Mann	Mr. North
Mr. McLarty	

(Teller.)

NOES.

Mr. Collier	Mr. Nulsen
Mr. Coverley	Mr. Pantou
Mr. Cunningham	Mr. Sleeman
Mr. Johnson	Mr. F. C. L. Smith
Mr. Kennelly	Mr. Troy
Mr. Marshall	Mr. Wainwright
Mr. McCallum	Mr. Wilcock
Mr. Mullington	Mr. Wilson
Mr. Munsie	

(Teller.)

PAIRS.

AYES.	NOES.
Mr. Davy	Mr. Withers
Mr. J. M. Smith	Mr. Lamond

Question thus passed.

Leave given.

First Reading.

THE MINISTER FOR LANDS (Hon. C. G. Latham—York) [4.51]: I move—

That the Bill be now read a first time.

HON. P. COLLIER (Boulder) [4.52]: Would I be in order, Mr. Speaker, in debating this question?

Mr. SPEAKER: Yes.

The Premier: I hope the Leader of the Opposition will not do so.

Hon. P. COLLIER: I certainly shall.

The Minister for Lands: It is only a one-clause Bill, and not very important.

Hon. P. COLLIER: This is the manner in which the business of the House is conducted and this is the courtesy extended to the Opposition! In a conversational way, across the floor of the House, I am informed that the Bill comprises one clause only.

The Minister for Lands: It is not my Bill; it is the Attorney General's Bill.

Hon. P. COLLIER: It does not matter. It is a Government Bill and the Government are responsible. I am, as I say, informed that it is a one-clause Bill and not very important, but I do not know. How do I know? I have not seen the Bill. I do not know anything about its contents. It may not be very important in the eyes of those responsible for its introduction, but it may be very important to the people of the State. It may be regarded as very important by members of the Opposition.

The Premier: The Bill would not be introduced if it were not important.

Hon. P. COLLIER: Of course not. Therefore it is important.

The Premier: I think it is a simple Bill.

Hon. P. COLLIER: And the Government decide whether or not it is controversial? Is that the position?

The Premier: Of course not.

Hon. P. COLLIER: In other words, the Government say it is not a debatable Bill and certainly not controversial. How do we know whether that is so or not? We have not seen the Bill and know nothing

about it. It may be from our point of view, and from that of a large number of people in the State, very important, yet it is to be, practically speaking, rushed through at this late stage. I again enter my protest against the manner in which the Opposition are being treated by the Government at this late hour of the session. Do the Government consider that because I and members of the Opposition have been extremely fair to them throughout the session, that they can do as they like? There has been no attempt on our part to use the session for electioneering purposes. The most biased critic imaginable could not say that we have endeavoured to use our position this session for political purposes. We have been very fair to the Government. We have met them in every respect to facilitate the business of the House. I think I am justified in assuming that because we have adopted that attitude, members of the Government have conceived the idea that we are a weak Opposition and do not count. The Government have taken advantage of our generosity, and certainly we have been generous on many occasions throughout the session. Because of that, apparently, the Government ignore us as of no account. Why this attitude? In conformity with the practice adopted by Parliaments in the past, the Leaders of the Government and of the Opposition have conferred regarding the business to be transacted during the closing weeks of the session. That discussion usually takes place three or five weeks before Christmas. Complying with a request from him, I met the Premier and we discussed the business for the remaining part of the session. I must say that the Premier gave me to understand at that time—I hope I did not misunderstand him and that I am not misrepresenting him—that there would be practically no new business of importance to be introduced. He informed me of the Bills the Government desired to have passed, but since then we have had a number of new Bills introduced. I do not think the Premier has been fair to the Opposition. No one can say that I have not been more than fair to the Government in the interests of the people I represent. There is a limit to this kind of thing. If the Premier takes generosity and consideration for weakness, he is greatly mistaken. I shall oppose the first reading of

the Bill and I shall ask members of the Opposition to oppose every item of the Bill from A to Z and also to oppose every other new Bill that is introduced, until I have a thorough understanding with the Premier as to where I and members of the Opposition stand with regard to the business for the remainder of the session.

THE PREMIER (Hon. Sir James Mitchell—Northam) [4.57]: I am sorry—

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! I am sorry but there can be no further discussion on the motion.

The PREMIER: No reply to the Leader of the Opposition!

Mr. SPEAKER: I am sorry. Standing Order 265 says that there can be no discussion on the motion for the first reading of a Bill.

Hon. P. Collier: I thought so, too.

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

Ayes	24
Noes	17
Majority for				7

AYES.

Mr. Angelo	Mr. McLarty
Mr. Barnard	Sir James Mitchell
Mr. Brown	Mr. Parker
Mr. Church	Mr. Patrick
Mr. Doney	Mr. Piesse
Mr. Ferguson	Mr. Richardson
Mr. Griffiths	Mr. Sampson
Mr. Keenan	Mr. Scaddan
Mr. Latham	Mr. J. H. Smith
Mr. Lindsay	Mr. Thorn
Mr. H. W. Mann	Mr. Wells
Mr. J. I. Mann	Mr. North

(Teller.)

NOES.

Mr. Collier	Mr. Nulsen
Mr. Coverley	Mr. Panton
Mr. Cunningham	Mr. Sleeman
Mr. Johnson	Mr. F. C. L. Smith
Mr. Kennedy	Mr. Troy
Mr. Marshall	Mr. Wansbrough
Mr. McCallum	Mr. Willcock
Mr. Millington	Mr. Wilson
Mr. Munsie	

(Teller.)

Question thus passed.

Bill read a first time.

BILL—MINE WORKERS' RELIEF.

Second Reading.

Debate resumed from the previous day.

HON. M. F. TROY (Mt. Magnet) [5.01]: The Bill before the House is what might be termed a fairly comprehensive

measure. As the Minister has pointed out, the principles contained in the Bill are very important to the mining industry. It is proposed to appoint a board with functions similar to those of the Mine Workers' Relief Board. The board is to be formed of representatives of the mine owners, the workers and the Government. That appears to be fair representation, but if prospectors are to be included in the scheme, they will require representation as well as the other parties. It is proposed to amalgamate all the measures now in force for the relief of miners and their dependants, namely, those entitled to relief under the Miners' Phthisis Act, those entitled to relief under the third schedule to the Workers' Compensation Act, and those entitled to relief under the Mine Workers' Relief Fund, the exception being that existing beneficiaries under the Miners' Phthisis Act will not be affected by the Bill. That is as it should be, because in my opinion it would be wrong to interfere with the rights of those beneficiaries. It seems that the proposal is to transfer the liability under the Miners' Phthisis Act from the Treasury to the State Insurance Department and the board to be constituted under the Bill. At present, the payments under the Miners' Phthisis Act are provided by the Treasury. Those payments amount to about £60,000 per annum. Up to date, I understand the various Governments have paid the sum of £200,000 from the Treasury for benefits under the Miners' Phthisis Act. This measure will remove that liability from the Treasury and make the payment a responsibility of the State Insurance Department and of the board to be constituted under the Bill. It is but right that the State Insurance Department should shoulder a share of the responsibility under this and similar measures. We know that a miner, no matter what his condition may be, even if he be suffering from advanced fibrosis, is not entitled to claim under the Workers' Compensation Act unless he can prove that he is incapacitated. Only in such a case will he be entitled to compensation. The consequence has been that a great number of men have remained working in the industry because there has been no opportunity afforded them of obtaining relief. This Bill will unquestionably relieve that situation. Those men will be entitled to compensation immediately upon the issue of a laboratory certificate or immediately a medical officer au-

thorised by the Government pronounces that they are unfit to work in the industry. Under the Bill, once a laboratory certificate is issued stating that a miner is suffering from advanced silicosis, he will be entitled to the full amount of compensation, £750, provided by the Workers' Compensation Act, to be paid to him at the rate of £3 10s. per week, plus 7s. 6d. per week for each child under the age of 16 years. The Bill makes a new departure, inasmuch as a beneficiary who has exhausted his rights under the Workers' Compensation Act will be brought under the fund to be constituted by this Bill, provided he keeps up his payments to the fund. He will be paid a rate, I understand, similar to that now being paid under the Miners' Relief Fund. There is this advantage about the Bill, that before a miner becomes totally incapacitated he will be able to leave the industry and will be entitled to compensation under the third schedule to the Workers' Compensation Act. When that compensation is exhausted, he will not be abandoned, but will be a charge upon the board. Consequently some provision will be made for his future. It may not be a very great amount, but at least it will be something, and in that respect the Bill is a distinct advantage. An unfavourable element of the Bill is the fact that the miner who would otherwise be compensated under the Miners' Phthisis Act will be placed on a similar footing to the miner suffering from silicosis, and he will lose by the measure. A miner suffering from T.B. is not classed as a miner suffering from an industrial disease; the qualification being, I understand, that if he has worked for two or more years in the industry he will be entitled to the same compensation as that paid under the third schedule to the Workers' Compensation Act to a miner suffering from silicosis. If he has been less than two years in the industry he will be entitled to the compensation provided for in the regulations under the Miners' Relief Fund. Therefore, a miner suffering from T.B. will be at a distinct disadvantage under the Bill as compared with a miner suffering from T.B. and receiving relief under the Miners' Phthisis Act.

The Minister for Mines: He is not competent at all if he has not been in the industry. You can hardly call him a miner if he has been in the industry for less than two years.

Hon. M. F. TROY: If he has been one day in the industry he is entitled to the scale of compensation provided for under the Miners' Phthisis Act, but he will not be under the Bill and consequently he will lose very considerably. The compensation payable to a man suffering from T.B. will not be a charge on the Treasury, but a charge on the board and it must be provided for out of the funds to be contributed to the board by the parties concerned. The parties contributing to the board are the mine owners, the employees and the Government. The Government have contributed very largely during the past two years. I think that to-day under the Miners' Relief Fund the worker is entitled to some help if he has contracted a disease while working in a mine. The Miners' Relief Fund provides for assistance not only to miners suffering from fibrosis, but also to miners suffering from any disease which it can be shown is the result of working in the industry. The Bill merely endorses what has been the policy of the Miners' Relief Fund in the past. The miner must be a contributor, and I notice that the beneficiaries under the Bill must also be contributors, otherwise they will be excluded from the benefits of the Bill. I am glad to know that provision is made to include prospectors in the scheme. First, however, the prospector must submit himself to examination. I am afraid that not too many prospectors will be able to join the scheme. Those who have devoted their lives to prospecting will find it hard to pass the examination. I am afraid that only a small percentage of them will be able to derive benefits from the Bill. I pointed out to the Minister that a prospector's occupation is a hazardous one. He probably does not make as much as the wages earned by the working miners. A great many prospectors work for six or twelve months without return. They may for a time be able to contribute to the fund, but there will certainly come a time when they will not have the money to pay their contributions. They are largely dependent upon the store-keepers, hotel-keepers and business men for such credit as they can obtain. These men will not be able to keep up their contributions to the fund. That is the weakness I see in regard to the prospectors, namely, first a great many of them will not be able to pass the examination, and secondly their returns are so hazardous that they will not always have

the money with which to make regular contributions. A hardship is imposed on the men who were formerly in the industry, but who are looking for work to-day because they cannot get back into that occupation. Many of them, having left the mines for the agricultural areas, have since gone back to the fields but cannot get permanent work there. They will be shut out because they cannot pass the necessary examination, although some of them are only slightly affected with dust. There might be discovered some means of getting those men to work on prospecting shows where they will not have to go down to great depths, where indeed they might be employed on the surface. Again, prospectors who find a mine and hand it over to a company under option will not be allowed to work on their own property. When a mining company gets such an option, the prospector is frequently offered employment by which to maintain himself, but under this he cannot be employed, because he is slightly affected with dust. Some exception might well be made in favour of those men. Summed up, the Bill takes away substantial advantages provided under the Miners' Phthisis Act for the T.B. miner and his dependants, that is to say in future, men entitled to benefits under the Miners' Phthisis Act. On the other hand the silicotic miner is advantaged under the Bill, because it takes him out of the mines and compensates him and gives him a new opportunity in life. The Bill will clear up the responsibility of the State Insurance Department, which has been able to get together a large amount of money because the Act did not make it incumbent on the department to pay certain claims. Under the Bill it is made definite that the advanced silicotic miner is entitled to workers' compensation. In that regard it is of distinct advantage although, as I say, the T.B. miner in future will suffer in comparison. The graph on the wall of the Chamber is very interesting, showing as it does that the examinations and administration under the Miners' Phthisis Act and the Workers' Compensation Act have considerably reduced the diseases from which miners have suffered. That is very gratifying. When first the Miners' Phthisis Act was put into operation and the Third Schedule of the Workers' Compensation Act was proclaimed,

there was a great deal of sickness in the industry, and the State had to undertake a very grave liability. But although the examinations have constituted a hardship on many men, still a great improvement has been brought about in mining conditions. I hope that with continued examinations and the exclusion of unhealthy men from the mines, in the near future the mines will be quite healthy. The activities of the department under the Miners' Phthisis Act and the Workers' Compensation Act have not been exclusively responsible for that. The administration of the Mines Department in insisting upon better ventilation has had very happy results. When one goes down one of the big mines at Kalgoolie and sees what has been done in ventilation improvements, one realises the change for the better in mining conditions. I hope that reform will be maintained. There are new mines opening up at Wiluna and in other districts, affording opportunity for the administration to insist upon improved conditions from the beginning, when the cost of such improvements will not be very great. Once a mine is developed under unsatisfactory conditions it is a very costly matter to effect the necessary improvement. The Bill is essentially a committee measure, so there is no occasion for a very exhaustive speech on the second reading. Under the Bill T.B. miners will lose in comparison, and this I hope will be rejected, but there are advantages for the silicotic miners.

MR. CORBOY (Yilgarn-Coolgardie) [5.23] There is just one aspect of the Bill which I wish to bring before the Minister. I regret that no provision is made to deal with those men who were advised to leave the mines and were assisted by the Government to take up farming, and have since developed T.B. Their position is very desperate indeed, and I regret that under the Bill it will not be possible to do anything for them. On the miners' settlement south of Southern Cross we have nearly a hundred men who were advised to leave the mines because they were dusted. Of that number half a dozen have since developed T.B.

Hon. S. W. Munsie: Some of them had it when they went there.

Mr. CORBOY: If that is true they should be covered by the Act, but they are not.

Officially, at any rate, they did not have T.B. when sent to the miners' settlement.

Hon. S. W. Munsie. One man was definitely reported to have T.B. before he went there.

Mr. CORBOY: One case, perhaps. Under the law as it stands, if the men are two years out of the mines they are not entitled to compensation. Those men, thinking they were merely dusted, went to the miners' settlement to take up farms, believing they would thus remedy the impairment of their health. Unfortunately they were so far gone with the dust that they have since developed T.B., but have not kept themselves within the scope of the Act by doing a week in the mines each 12 months. Other men, shrewder, have gone back to the mines each year and done just one week's work there.

Mr. Marshall: That is not necessary.

Mr. CORBOY: Well, they have done it, and so got themselves on the wages sheet each year, and consequently are still covered. But there are half a dozen who are not covered, yet whose cases are perfectly genuine, who adopted the advice of the Government, left the mines and took up blocks in the miners' settlement scheme. To-day they are suffering from T.B., and cannot either get back to the mines or carry on their farming operations. So they have no alternative to walking off their farms, and unfortunately they have no claim under the Miners' Phthisis Act. I appeal to the Minister to consult his officers, and see if it is not possible to find means of covering those men and bringing them within the scope of the Workers' Compensation Act, and so give them or their families some compensation.

THE MINISTER FOR MINES (Hon. J. Scaddan—Maylands—in reply) [5.27]: The Bill has met with just the reception I expected it would. Members opposite, representing goldfields constituencies, have taken a very fair view of the measure, and criticised it in the very direction in which I hoped they would do. The Leader of the Opposition, who said it was unfortunate the Bill should have been introduced so late in the session, had good grounds for that view, because it would be quite unfair to rush a measure of this sort through Parliament. On the other hand, members opposite—including the Leader of the Opposition—have

been generous enough to admit that it is a rather difficult problem to handle, that it was not easy to draft a measure that would mend the position and make provision for the future while remedying some of the existing difficulties, and at the same time protect those already in the industry. All those things have had to be kept in mind, and after having consulted with the departmental officers I took the unusual course of introducing the measure without even submitting its main proposals to either the Chamber of Mines, representing the mine owners, or the miners' union. Consideration has had to be given to the men who to-day find themselves unemployed, but who previously worked in the industry and were only slightly affected. They were unable to get back into the industry, because although not seriously affected, they could not get the re-admission certificate. They were treated at the laboratory as being applicants for the first time, or as though they had never previously been in the industry. That was a hardship inflicted on a number of men who very wisely took the opportunity, when it presented itself some years ago, to leave the industry when there was a market available for them in other directions. Probably they had intended to remain permanently out of the industry, but found it was not possible to do so. They then wished to go back to an industry to which they always thought they could return. I am making provision not to allow the reintroduction into the mines of men who will be dangerous to their fellow workers; that does not happen with silicosis alone. We do not want to allow back in the industry those who were advanced too far and would be likely to make too rapid progress towards advanced silicosis or T.B., and thus shorten their own lives. I have tried to devise means whereby we can be fair to them, and fair to their fellow-workers, and protect them against themselves, as is sometimes necessary. The initial certificate will continue under the Mines Regulation Act and regulations. A person who desires to enter the industry in Western Australia for the first time must get a clean bill of health. A man who has previously been employed in the industry for a number of years and has not passed the silicosis early stage can obtain a re-admission certificate. That will not permit him to work underground in any mine, as the word "underground" is interpreted. This term

was interpreted to cover a portion of a mine not below the natural surface, but places we conceived to be as dangerous from the point of view of the worker as if he was working under the natural surface. An affected person cannot get a re-admission certificate to work underground in the industry unless he obtains permission to work on a specified mine. That must be obtained through the recommendation of the inspector of mines, to ensure that the work will not be dangerous to the man or anyone else. Permission will only be given when it is very certain that the man in question is not likely to continue to be a menace to himself or to his fellow-workers. Members will recall that a brother of an ex-member, Mr. Heitman, was on the Patricia field, where he pegged out a lease. Eventually he gave an option over that lease to an Adelaide company. Under the terms of the option, he was to continue to work under their directions in developing the lease and costeening for possible lodes. As soon as he became an employee of the option-holder, he was subject to the regulations under the Mines Regulation Act. Because he was seriously dusted, although he was working in the healthiest spot on earth, in clear fresh air, merely making costeens across the lease, he was precluded from carrying on that occupation.

Mr. Corboy: Miners at Westonia have been stopped from working in the open bush.

The MINISTER FOR MINES: We do not want to go to such extremes as that. We were not able to fore-see all these things, but are taking the present opportunity to amend the law in certain directions. We could easily allow a man to go back to work under those conditions. We are also making provision for a special certificate, in cases where the doctor thinks that without injury to the man himself, or his fellow-workers, he can be permitted to work on some portion of the mine. He will be subject to re-examination at any time, and his certificate may be cancelled. The Bill will not meet every case that has come under our notice. Many men are so far advanced with silicosis that they will not get either a re-admission certificate or a special certificate. We cannot clean up the industry unless we take a stand even against the men themselves at times. I know that hardship may be inflicted upon a few, but we have to con-

sider the interests of the many. I am afraid there was a slight tinge of political colour in the speech of the member for Brown Hill-Ivanhoe (Mr. F. C. L. Smith). I say in all sincerity that the Government have no political purpose in bringing down this Bill. They cannot gain anything from it. Not a member on this side of the House represents a mining constituency. I do not see how it could possibly be expected, even with the elections coming on, that the Government could gain anything by bringing down the Bill. I have brought it down because I know what the mining industry has cost this State and Australia in manhood. If we cannot get gold without losing our vigorous, healthy young men in their prime, leaving dependants to fall back upon charity, the industry is not worth while. I believe we can avoid this, and I wish to do what I can to that end. I have brought down the Bill only with a desire to help along the lines that I think will at least improve the position as it exists to-day. If the Bill is found not to be all it should be, it can be amended at some later date. Members have suggested there will be a variation in the amounts allowed by way of compensation. In any other industry where a man is totally incapacitated through any of the diseases set out in the Third Schedule of the Workers' Compensation Act, Parliament has said he should be compensated to the extent of £750 as the full amount. I do not say whether that is right or wrong, but it is the limit. The conditions are set out under which the money shall be paid until the whole liability has been met. When a man has received the £750, he must fall back upon charity. He has no other fund to draw upon. We are placing the miner in a better position. When he has drawn his compensation of £750 under the Workers' Compensation Act, he will go on the fund to which he, his employer, and the Government have contributed, and he or his dependants will continue to draw from that fund. That is a step forward. We may some day go even further than that, but at present it is as far as we can go. The compensation may reach the maximum of the basic wage ruling in the district at the date when the mine worker was in employment. That is the present position and it is not fair. A man may have been denied the right to continue in the industry last week, when the

basic wage was at one figure, and another man may be turned out of it a week later when the basic wage stands at some other figure. Each man should be paid on the same definite fixed basis. What is accepted as a fair basis under the Workers' Compensation Act for industrial diseases ought to be the basis that is applicable to everyone. To that extent we have not done as much as we might have done. I do not know how the position can be improved without amending the Workers' Compensation Act. It cannot be done under this Bill. We cannot impose upon the State Insurance Office a demand that it shall do something that is not legal.

Mr. Marshall: The extra 8s. could be paid through the board.

The MINISTER FOR MINES: The board would only get the money from some other source. Parliament has to decide on a matter of that kind. Workers in other industries have the extent of their compensation laid down. The amount is fixed. In the case of the mine workers, we have fixed no limit. Under this measure the dependants will get the full £750, and go on receiving compensation from another fund which is not available to workers in any other industry. There is nothing to compel a man to remain on the goldfields where the cost of living is high. A fair percentage of them are already in the metropolitan area, working either for the State Gardens Board, the King's Park Board, or the Zoological Gardens.

Mr. Marshall: It is compulsory for them to come to Perth.

The MINISTER FOR MINES: They are not compelled to come here. It is not always incumbent upon a mine worker to remain in the district when he is compelled to leave the industry.

Hon. M. F. Troy: If he has lived in the district for a long time, the climatic conditions there suit him better than any other place would.

Hon. P. Collier: That is where his home is. He would have to pay rent elsewhere.

The MINISTER FOR MINES: In many cases that is so. Sometimes members of the family are at work in the district, and the miner does not want to leave.

Hon. P. Collier: It is the rent of the home that is the important factor.

The MINISTER FOR MINES: A man may have to break up his home and cause

his family to separate in search of work. There is that possibility.

Hon. S. W. Munsie: Men employed by the Gardens Board are being paid wages. They have been declared fit to do light work.

The MINISTER FOR MINES: The difference between what is considered to be the efficiency of a man and the basic wage is made up by the Mines Department, and charged to the Miners' Phthisis Fund.

Hon. S. W. Munsie: The whole lot is made up.

The MINISTER FOR MINES: Not in all cases.

Hon. S. W. Munsie: In some cases.

The MINISTER FOR MINES: The department fix the amount according to what is deemed to be the efficiency of the man.

Hon. S. W. Munsie: Some men working for the railways are getting 15s. from that source, and the balance from the fund.

The MINISTER FOR MINES: They are acting as caretakers. This is a point that can well be discussed in Committee. I leave it to the judgment of members to meet the position in the best possible way. I think the member for Hannans (Hon. S. W. Munsie) made a mistake when he said that a man suffering from T.B. only—this is not an industrial disease under the Workers' Compensation Act—would get compensation from the fund on the same basis as if it were an industrial disease.

Hon. S. W. Munsie: I did not say that. That is what the member for Murchison said.

Mr. Marshall: It is what the member for Hannans said.

The MINISTER FOR MINES: I think there was a misunderstanding. That is not the intention. When a man has obtained the amount he should have obtained had he been suffering from an industrial disease under the Workers' Compensation Act, he will do exactly the same as the person who is prohibited from working in the industry because he is suffering from silicosis plus T.B., and has drawn compensation under the Workers' Compensation Act. After he has drawn the £750, he falls back upon the Mine Workers' Relief Fund.

Hon. S. W. Munsie: I said that only applied in the place where it did apply. It is not fair. It does not apply to T.B.

The MINISTER FOR MINES: Another point raised by the member for Hannans was as to whether a person who was prohibited from working because he had sili-

cosis advanced, and made a claim under the Workers' Compensation Act, that if he voluntarily obtained payment of a lump sum, he would not receive any further payment afterwards. In other words, the hon. member wanted to know whether we would thus inflict upon the worker a penalty, and say to him, "If you take a lump sum you will not get anything further." That is not the position and the Bill does not say so. The Bill says that if a man is unable to obtain payment under the Third Schedule of the Workers' Compensation Act, he can get payment from the Mine Workers' Relief Fund. We will not say that because someone else is responsible for not meeting their obligations to him that we are going to make him suffer. If the employer takes him to court and obtains from the court a decision that he will have to be paid the lump sum or a smaller sum, then we say that we will not impose any penalty. In other words, if he starts out on the 1st January, 1933, to receive £3 10s. a week, it will take him four years to complete the period before he uses up the £750, and it will be at the end of that period before he starts to obtain anything from the Mine Workers' Relief Fund. If the employer pays a lump sum, which, if spread over a period, it will take 3½ years to pay out, then we say that he was not responsible for it and that he would start to obtain compensation from the Mine Workers' Relief Fund on the 1st July of that year. But if the miner himself asks for a lump sum and obtains it, then we say that he must have done it for the purpose of his own benefit, and as the member for Hannans maintained, we are entitled to assume that the man has had the advantage of the earning capacity of that lump sum. Having elected to take a lump sum, we assume that he is earning sufficient to keep him, and therefore he would not start to obtain any benefit under the Mine Workers' Relief Fund until that period had expired. That is fair. I discussed that aspect with the Attorney General and he considered it would not be right to allow the man to come in earlier.

Hon. S. W. Munsie: If that is what the Act means I have no objection to it.

The MINISTER FOR MINES: That is what it means exactly, that for the purpose of deciding when he would commence his transfer to the Mine Workers' Relief Fund, it would be assumed that he had drawn

£750 spread over the period set out in the Workers' Compensation Act, although the sum commuted might not have carried him over that period. That is the actual intention of the clause. If it is not sufficiently clearly set out, we can make it perfectly clear when the Bill is in Committee. I do not know that there is anything else that need be dealt with at this stage, except for one matter of the financial responsibility thrown upon the Mine Workers' Relief Fund Board. In a way I am sorry so much was made of this particular part of the Bill by the member for Brown Hill-Ivanhoe for the reason that it draws attention to the possibility of the measure becoming a financial burden on somebody. Really the only party on whom it is likely to become a financial burden is the Government. We cannot expect the mine owners, or the miners themselves, to contribute any greater amount than they are contributing to-day. A pretty high rate of insurance is being paid for compensation in the industry. Therefore if the fund is not sufficient at any time to meet the demands made upon it, we have the permission of the Treasury to make advances.

Hon. P. Collier: Loans.

The MINISTER FOR MINES: Call it loans if you like, but the hon. member will understand that there is no provision made for personal liability of the members of the board, and the result is that if they fail to meet their obligations by repaying those advances, they will not be doing any more than has been done by hundreds of prospectors who have actually given personal security for the repayment of loans. No Government can compel the repayment of money advanced for purposes of this kind. To prevent the board, consisting of two representatives of the employers, two representatives of the employees and a Government representative, being over-lavish in the expenditure of money, we make provision that the advances shall be in the form of loans.

Hon. P. Collier: Suppose, even with the greatest economy on the part of the board, there is still an insufficiency of funds, what then?

The MINISTER FOR MINES: They will get an advance from the Treasurer as they do to-day.

Hon. P. Collier: If they have not sufficient funds to meet their obligations from month to month, it is no use their borrow-

ing because they will only get into further trouble.

The MINISTER FOR MINES: That is not the position. Most people will realise at once that when there is a sense of responsibility, there is generally more care exercised; when there is no sense of responsibility little or no care is exercised. In recent years the Government have done very well towards the men and the mines, and the contributions made under the Miners' Phthisis Act, and I do not think the Government, or the people, would claim anything more than had been done in the past. The Government have at times made advances almost at a moment's notice because the board had not sufficient funds with which to meet their obligations. I have no doubt the Government will do the same thing again. We have not prescribed any rate that will be paid; I do not think we should. The funds may be in such a condition that it may be possible to increase the rate. The fact that we transferred the original obligation under the Workers' Compensation Act will make for the relief of the Mine Workers' Relief Fund. If they are not able to meet their obligations, application can be made to the proper source.

Hon. P. Collier: And the Treasurer could say, "No, you increase your rates."

The MINISTER FOR MINES: And the Treasurer would increase his as well. One of two things would occur: they would have to increase their rate of contribution or decrease the amount of compensation they were paying. I do not think either is likely to happen. I have left out of the Bill the prescribed rates to be paid to the fund or to be paid by way of compensation so as to allow the position to be met as it arises from time to time. What is proposed alone should be sufficient to convince the men themselves that they will not be left stranded when there is not only a legal but a moral obligation to discharge.

Hon. P. Collier: The question is whether, under the Bill, the liabilities will not be so much greater on the board than in the past.

The MINISTER FOR MINES: It will be possible to prove this only by actual practice. We cannot see into the future sufficiently to be able to fix anything definitely. It would be wrong to put something in the Bill which may cause hardship

in the direction of having to wait months perhaps for Parliament to amend the law. It can be left to the Government to decide by regulation so as to enable the position to be met as it arises from time to time. Hon. members opposite are now aware of what we have done. It is a question of recognising the importance of doing the right thing by those men who have given of their best to the industry, and I have no wish to put something into the Bill that might lead to the reopening of the whole question when it can be done without any difficulty by way of regulation. The member for Brown Hill-Ivanhoe was making the worst possible case he could regarding the claims that might be made against the board when he quoted the 1929 and the 1930-31 examinations. The examinations of men in 1932 totalled 3,264. These men were principally from Kalgoorlie and to a lesser extent from Gwalia and the surrounding districts. Of that total there were only six cases that had previously been treated, and only four were T.B. plus silicosis and only seven silicosis plus T.B. early. Altogether the number of affected men was 17 out of that total of 3,264. If the hon. member will read the report of Dr. Lee, he will find that in a number of cases that were further investigated, out of 18 a total of 14 would have been admitted to the industry under present conditions. Thus, only four out of the 18 would have been a charge against the fund.

Hon. J. Cunningham: Does that mean that the examinations are becoming more stringent?

The MINISTER FOR MINES: No.

Hon. J. Cunningham: It must be so.

The MINISTER FOR MINES: What is happening is this: On the Lake View and Star to-day it will be found that they are nearly all young men who are going off that mine.

Hon. J. Cunningham: How were they admitted?

The MINISTER FOR MINES: There is provision in the Bill, and it is in the existing Mines Regulation Act, that will permit a man to enter the industry only after examination at the laboratory with up-to-date appliances. A man may also be admitted to the industry in any other part of the gold-fields after an examination by a qualified medical practitioner, but we do not regard that as the final examination. That is why

we make provision that if he contracts T.B. within two years of having entered the industry he shall not get compensation, because it is not possible in every case to diagnose T.B. by ordinary medical examination. If at the laboratory examination he was found to be suffering from T.B., and in the opinion of the doctor he had suffered previous to entering the industry, it would not be fair to ask the other men in the industry to compensate him for a disease he had not contracted in the industry. I admit the point raised by the member for Hannans. If a man has previously been examined by the laboratory and obtained a clean certificate, I would grant him compensation as if he had contracted an industrial disease, just as would be the case if he had been in the industry for some time. There are thousands of men in the industry who have been mining from their youth and who have reached a fair age. Many of them have silicosis early and advanced, but more and more of them are being excluded from the industry as time goes on. A man can now enter the industry only if he has a clean bill of health.

Hon. P. Collier: So that the liability is diminishing.

The MINISTER FOR MINES: It is diminishing all the time, because we are getting out of the industry men who would not to-day be permitted to enter the industry. When we put the Miners' Phthisis Act into operation, we accepted the position as we found it. There were men in all stages of T.B. and silicosis, but we are getting rid of those who have been long in the industry and have been seriously affected. What is more, the conditions in the industry regarding ventilation and sanitation have improved. Mining is an entirely different proposition from what it was 20 or 25 years ago. In the circumstances, we say that the number who will come on to the fund will diminish from year to year, and I believe that in course of time the gold mining industry can be made as healthy as are many industries and certainly healthier than some for which special conditions are not provided. I believe it will be possible to meet the obligations, though perhaps not in the early stages. Eventually, however, I believe that the fund will be capable of meeting the compensation set out in the Bill. I appreciate the manner in which the Bill has been received by members most interested. In Committee I shall consider any amendments

proposed, but I point out that we will be able to adjust any differences that may arise by way of regulation.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Mr. Richardson in the Chair; the Minister for Mines in charge of the Bill.

Clauses 1 to 4—agreed to.

Clause 5—Interpretation:

Mr. MARSHALL: Dependants include wife, widow until she re-marries, etc. There are some women on the goldfields who have not gone through the ceremony of marriage, but who have children.

Hon. P. Collier: You do not say that is peculiar to the goldfields.

Mr. MARSHALL: No, it would be more pronounced in the city, but the Bill will not apply there. A man was killed at Wiluna and it was thought that his children and their mother would be provided for under the Workers' Compensation Act, but it was found that she could not claim. Many couples on the goldfields have lived happily together and reared families without being married, but if the breadwinner happened to be taken, the widow would not be provided for. Some women may not re-marry, but may have a gentleman companion.

The Minister for Mines: Do you think he should be compensated too?

Mr. MARSHALL: No compensation should be paid in that event. The Repatriation Department have refused pensions to women living in that state.

Hon. P. Collier: If a woman had a pension, she would not find it hard to get a gentleman companion.

Mr. MARSHALL: No, but such a gentleman might not trouble about the children.

The Minister for Mines: The children are provided for whether they are legitimate or illegitimate.

Mr. MARSHALL: But if there was a gentleman in the home, he might get consideration to the exclusion of the children.

Hon. P. Collier: There are difficulties such as you indicate, but it is hard to legislate for them.

Mr. MARSHALL: I approached the Parliamentary Draftsman to get an amendment drafted, but it seems impossible to do it.

Hon. S. W. MUNSIE: I move an amendment—

That at the end of the definition of "dependants" the words "or guardian, as circumstance may warrant" be inserted.

All that the Mine Workers' Relief Fund Board are doing will be taken over by the board to be appointed under this measure, and the board should be permitted to make some little allowance to a guardian for the sake of the children. It need not be a large amount.

The Premier: Are not guardians to be found everywhere?

Hon. S. W. MUNSIE: I suppose so. Under the regulations of the existing board, provision may be made for a guardian, and inclusion of a similar provision in this Bill would prevent hardship in some instances.

Mr. F. C. L. SMITH: I support the amendment. There was a case recently that seems to have established a need for the amendment. A man with a couple of children lost his wife several years ago and he was turned out of the mines under the Miners' Phthisis Act. The children were looked after by an old age pensioner. Recently the mine worker died and the children remain under her guardianship. It seems desirable that that lady should be placed in a position to receive such benefits as would accrue to her if she had been the mother of the children. She is faced with the same responsibilities to the children as would have confronted the mother.

Sitting suspended from 6.15 to 7.30 p.m.

The MINISTER FOR MINES: One point may arise if we agree to the amendment in the form suggested. It may be possible that a worker will be able to claim under the Workers' Compensation Act as well.

Hon. S. W. Munsie: That is not the intention.

The MINISTER FOR MINES: No, but that is what I am afraid of. I suggest that the matter be left in abeyance, and I will have a proviso drafted that will safeguard the position and do what the hon. member desires. I do not want to take away any rights that exist now.

Hon. S. W. Munsie: Reference is made to the matter in the regulations.

The MINISTER FOR MINES: Yes, I will look into the position.

Hon. S. W. MUNSIE: I accept the Minister's assurance, and will withdraw the amendment.

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

Hon. S. W. MUNSIE: I think there should be an addendum to the definition of "mine worker" to cover the point I dealt with in my second reading speech. I want the Minister to give men a chance to get back into the industry after they have been withdrawn. For instance, the organiser of a union on the goldfields has been in his position for two years although he has worked for 28 years in connection with the industry. He will be required to secure an initial certificate, which will be impossible for him. There will be others in the same position. I know what amendments I want to move, but I was not aware that the Committee stage was to be taken this evening, and I have not been able to have them drafted for me.

The MINISTER FOR MINES: I will undertake to get the clause drafted to cover the point raised by the hon. member, with whose views I am in accord. The point is that a man may be withdrawn temporarily from the industry to carry on an occupation connected with the industry, but not mine work.

Hon. S. W. Munsie: That is so.

The MINISTER FOR MINES: What is required is some provision that will cause that man's occupation to be regarded as continuous in connection with the industry.

Mr. MARSHALL: I hope the Minister in any amendment he may frame, will not confine it to Kalgoorlie.

The Minister for Mines: No, it will have general effect.

Hon. S. W. MUNSIE: The definition of "tuberculosis" sets out that it means "tuberculosis of the lungs or of the respiratory organs." I know of an instance in which the doctors certified that a mine worker was suffering from tubercular glands. What happened in his case was that the lungs were strong enough to throw off the disease which concentrated, however, in the glands. The union desire that the "glands" should be included in the definition.

The Minister for Mines: For what purpose?

Hon. S. W. MUNSIE: So that men so affected may be brought under the provisions of the Act. I had intended to move an amendment, but the member for Brown Hill-Ivanhoe has drafted one that I think will meet the position.

Mr. F. C. L. SMITH: I move an amendment—

That after "organs" in the definition of "tuberculosis" the words "and tuberculosis of the glands or other parts of the body where the cause of such disease may reasonably be attributed to work in or around mines."

I endorse the remarks of the member for Hannans. My stepfather died and I received a certificate from Dr. Humphries, who had had considerable medical experience amongst miners, to the effect that he had died from tuberculosis of the glands caused through work in and around mines. I think the interpretation should be widened to cover such instances.

Hon. J. CUNNINGHAM: I support the amendment. I was a member of the Mine Workers' Relief Board when it was first established, and I remember an instance in which the doctor certified that a man was suffering from tuberculosis and that the respiratory organs had been sufficiently strong naturally to cast off the disease from the lungs and it had affected the skin on his face. That worker was suffering from tubercular skin, and the board had sufficient evidence to grant relief to him. Once we consider the ravages of tuberculosis, we are forced to a recognition of the fact that the various parts of the body can be attacked. If the lungs are strong enough to throw off the disease, it will fly to the weakest part of the body, which may be an injured leg or a damaged elbow.

The MINISTER FOR MINES: I will accept the amendment if the hon. member will substitute the words "legitimately attributed" for the word "reasonably." It would be difficult to interpret just what would amount to reasonable responsibility for an injury. In another part of the Bill provision is made for the payment of special compensation for certain ailments that may be "legitimately attributed" to the occupation of a mine worker.

Mr. F. C. L. SMITH: I am quite willing to agree to the alteration suggested by the Minister and will alter my amendment accordingly.

Amendment put and passed.

Hon. J. CUNNINGHAM: At present the Bill has application to quarry workers. There is a provision in the interpretation which refers to men working upon or about rock crushers in a rock crushing station, but I doubt if that is sufficient to include men working in quarries. Provision should be made whereby men working in quarries can contribute to the fund.

The MINISTER FOR MINES: I am afraid I cannot agree to the suggested amendment by the member for Kalgoorlie. A quarry can be established anywhere, but the Bill deals only with men engaged in the mining industry. "Mining industry," is defined by the Mining Act, 1904. In order that quarrymen may share in the benefits proposed by the Bill, they must be working in a quarry attached to mining operations.

Hon. J. CUNNINGHAM: My reason for bringing this matter before the Committee is that only to-day I met a worker who had recently been excluded from working in the mining industry at Meekatharra. He was employed in quarries in the metropolitan area after he left the goldfields, but nevertheless he had been employed for a number of years as a miner on the eastern goldfields.

The MINISTER FOR MINES: I must again point out that quarrymen, apart from those engaged in quarrying connected with the mining industry, cannot be included in the Bill. Provision is made in the Bill to meet the case mentioned by the hon. member. If a man is forced out of the mining industry on account of his health and goes to work in a quarry in the metropolitan area, he does not lose his right to benefits under the proposed scheme, so long as he maintains his contributions to the fund.

Mr. MARSHALL: I draw the Minister's attention to paragraph (f) of Clause 5. There are two kinds of tailings dumps on mines. One kind is dry and dangerous, but the other is wet and not dangerous. I move—

That the word "dry" be inserted between the words "any" and "tailings" in line 15 on page 4.

The MINISTER FOR MINES: While I have no objection to the amendment I suggest that a great deal of difficulty may arise in the interpretation of the words

"wet" and "dry." It would be better to leave the clause as it stands because we propose to frame regulations which will permit of men re-entering the industry. A wet dump would be a suitable place to allow a man to work on.

Mr. MARSHALL: After hearing the Minister's explanation I desire to withdraw the amendment.

Amendment by leave withdrawn.

Clause put and passed.

Clause 6—Persons suffering from silicosis or tuberculosis:

Hon. J. CUNNINGHAM: I would like the Minister to explain the words "that such person has closed tuberculosis" in paragraph (b) of Clause 6. Is it the purpose in this paragraph to protect only the individual? Under the provisions of the Miners' Phthisis Act the main responsibility of society is to protect the workers generally as against the individual. Under this paragraph it seems to me that if a man has tuberculosis, but not in a sufficient degree to prevent him from working, the Minister would be prepared to permit that man to continue his employment in the mine. If that is so, I would prefer to see this paragraph deleted.

The MINISTER FOR MINES: This paragraph is merely an interpretation to furnish a guide for the laboratory doctor when declaring that a man has tuberculosis to a sufficiently serious degree to prohibit him from working. Occasionally there have been disputes between medical practitioners and the laboratory doctor as to whether a man is suffering to such an extent that he ought to be prohibited from working. This interpretation is required to meet that position and to establish a case upon which an appeal can be lodged. It is not for the purpose of allowing any tubercular man to get into the industry.

Hon. J. CUNNINGHAM: I seem to recollect that the Minister a few evenings ago said that no person would be prohibited from working in the mining industry.

The Minister for Mines: That is news to me.

Hon. J. CUNNINGHAM: And so it seems to me that paragraph (b) has application to the Minister's remarks.

The Minister for Mines: But I did not say that.

Hon. J. CUNNINGHAM: Is it intended to continue the periodic examination of men still in the industry and, as the result of those examinations, prohibit tubercular men from working in the mines? How far will this paragraph (b) have application?

The Minister for Mines: It does not affect the position at all.

Hon. J. CUNNINGHAM: Yes, it does, for it provides that if a man has tuberculosis to a degree seriously impairing his capacity for work, he may be prohibited from working in a mine. If that means that a tubercular person not very seriously affected will be permitted to work in the industry, I may say it is not the desire of the men in the industry that any tubercular man should be permitted to work amongst them.

The MINISTER FOR MINES: I can only repeat that this is merely an interpretation in order to enable the practice of to-day to be continued; that is to say, that no person suffering from tuberculosis shall work in the industry.

Clause put and passed.

Clauses 7 to 12—agreed to.

Clause 13—Employment of mine workers suffering from tuberculosis may be prohibited:

Hon. S. W. MUNSIE: Here we have the old dispute about "may" and "shall." I want to know what "may" means here. "The Minister may by notice in the prescribed form prohibit the employment of such mine worker as a mine worker." I am not satisfied with that. I move an amendment—

That in line 5 of subclause (1) "may" be struck out and "shall" inserted in lieu.

Amendment put and passed; the clause, as amended, agreed to.

Clause 14—Appeal:

Hon. S. W. MUNSIE: I want to know the meaning of the concluding five or six words in Subclause 3. It is here stated that in certain circumstances the notice served on the appellant shall be set aside, but otherwise shall continue to have effect. Will the Minister tell us what it means.

The MINISTER FOR MINES: The only explanation I can offer is that probably action has been taken arising out of the notice, and if we made no provision for its having

effect up to the point of being set aside, there might be a claim for damages. We do not want that. However, I will make sure that that is the proper interpretation of those words.

Clause put and passed.

Clauses 15 to 36—agreed to.

Clause 37—Vice-Chairman:

The MINISTER FOR MINES: I propose to indicate an amendment I will move on recomittal, which will be necessary to meet the other points raised. The clause provides that at the first meeting of the board the members shall elect a vice-chairman and that, in the absence of the chairman, the vice-chairman shall act in his stead, and while so acting will have the same power as the chairman. I want to continue the practice that has been adopted by this board. There is between members of the board an understanding that they will not take advantage of the absence of the chairman to come to any important decision. So they suggest that instead of the board appointing the vice-chairman, the Governor should appoint him, or the chairman be given power to appoint a vice-chairman to act in his absence. In most cases it is the clerk of courts instead of the warden. I propose, therefore, to provide that the chairman in his absence may appoint a vice-chairman.

Clause put and passed.

Clause 38—Meetings:

Hon. S. W. MUNSIE: In this case the chairman is to have a deliberative, as well as a casting vote. If the vice-chairman was in the chair, he could on equal voting carry the whole meeting. It has been agreed that no vital question would be dealt with in the absence of the proper chairman. It was felt that if the chairman was given a deliberative vote only, and if then there was an equality of votes, the motion should be carried in the negative.

The Minister for Mines: That will be dealt with on recomittal.

Clause put and passed.

Clauses 39 to 41—agreed to.

Clause 42—Powers of board:

Hon. J. CUNNINGHAM: Paragraph (c) deals with the board taking over the maintenance and management of hospitals for

the care and comfort of mine workers. It is not necessary the board should be clothed with this power. They will have sufficient to do with the funds at their disposal without embarking upon such ventures as these. The paragraph should be struck out.

The MINISTER FOR MINES: I see no danger in it. The board is made up of those who contribute to the fund, and they are not likely to vote away money that will mean letting the beneficiaries go short. On the other hand, if some suitable building is made available to the board, or some person endows the board with a sum of money for the erection of some institution, power must exist to enable the board to handle such a situation. We have also provided that the board may take on certain liabilities, the cost of which at the time cannot be estimated. It may be possible to arrange with the State Insurance office a cover for prospectors for maladies that are not provided for under the Act. This would be done at a small cost, and the lump sum risk that would fall upon the board could possibly be arranged.

Clause put and passed.

[*Mr. Angelo took the Chair.*]

Clauses 43 to 47—agreed to.

Clause 48—Benefit in respect of a mine worker prohibited as suffering from T.B. and silicosis:

Hon. S. W. MUNSIE: Will the Minister explain the meaning of the words, "otherwise than with the consent of the mine worker"?

The MINISTER FOR MINES: The clause means that after a man has exhausted his compensation under the Workers' Compensation Act he can begin to get his benefits from the other source that is provided. The worker cannot get all his benefits under the Workers' Compensation Act, so we have provided that when the mine worker proves to the satisfaction of the board that as a result of the financial position of the employer he cannot recover the compensation due to him, he will come under the benefits of the fund. It is also provided that the mine worker shall be deemed to have received compensation in full when he is paid a lump sum in redemption of the weekly payments that are ordered by the local court. This lump sum will be computed as a payment

over so many weeks, at the end of which time the mine worker will go on to the fund. If the mine worker seeks to be paid a lump sum, he will do that for his own benefit. In that case too, the lump sum will be computed as a payment over so many weeks, at the end of which time he will go upon the fund.

Hon. S. W. MUNSIE: I accept the interpretation as being correct. I now want an amendment to Subclause 2. I admit we cannot in this Bill amend the payments under the Workers' Compensation Act, but we could add a proviso whereby a man may draw the maximum compensation at a rate not exceeding £3 10s. a week. If a man had more than two children under 14, he ought to be able to draw an increase up to the basic wage, which would only mean 8s. more than is being paid now. This should also reduce the period over which he would receive the full amount of compensation. That would be of special advantage to the man suffering from silicosis plus T.B.

The MINISTER FOR MINES: It does not amount to very much after all, and there is no way of providing greater payment under the Workers' Compensation Act except by amending that Act. The only way I can see by which it can be done would be to add a proviso to enable the board to augment the weekly payment and so assist the worker to receive the maximum amount, and to exceed the basic wage for the district, until such time as the total amount of compensation under the Workers' Compensation Act had been exhausted. That might mean a contribution of 8s. a week from the board. What it would mean in the aggregate I do not know. I only suggest that as a possible way out, and I will see whether it can be done.

Clause put and passed.

Clause 49—Benefit in respect of a mine worker prohibited as suffering from tuberculosis without silicosis:

Hon. S. W. MUNSIE: This is the clause to which I took exception when I spoke on the second reading. I think the Minister is prepared to have something drafted to overcome the difficulty, that is, where a mine worker has to prove to the satisfaction of the Minister that he has worked for a period or periods amounting in the aggregate to two years. When a man has passed a test and gets into the industry

there should not be any penalty. He should not have to prove that he has been in the industry two years. I move an amendment—

That in lines 5 and 6 the words "for a period or periods amounting in the aggregate to two years" be struck out.

The clause will be quite satisfactory without those words.

The MINISTER FOR MINES: I have no objection to the words being struck out, so long as the hon. member understands that I shall have a proviso drafted later setting out that if a man is admitted to the industry and has worked for less than two years without an examination at the laboratory he shall not be entitled to compensation.

Mr. MARSHALL: The Minister must not overlook the fact that he is making this law State-wide. There may be a doubt about practitioners in places like Meekatharra and Wiluna, but there are men working in the industry where there is no possibility of an examination at all. A man may be working at Jimblebar or Bamboo Creek. The measure will apply to him.

The Minister for Mines: If a man has been in the industry for two years and is found to be suffering from T.B., he will get the benefit of the measure. I proposed to add a proviso to meet the position that I have outlined.

Mr. MARSHALL: I hope the Minister will see that men in distant places are not penalised.

Amendment put and passed.

Hon. S. W. MUNSIE: I should like an explanation from the Minister regarding the proviso, especially as to the differentiation.

The MINISTER FOR MINES: Where we provide that compensation shall be paid because the sufferer is entitled to benefits through having contracted the disease, we call upon him to obtain his first compensation under the Workers' Compensation Act. We have not varied the conditions at all as set out in the Workers' Compensation Act: but T.B. only is not an industrial disease, and therefore we cannot make provision that he shall receive his compensation under the Workers' Compensation Act. He must receive it from some other source, and that source we propose shall be the Mine Workers' Relief

Fund, to which he has contributed. But we do provide that if he dies before the dependants have received the full amount of the £750, the benefits that would be received until that has been obtained shall be such as we shall prescribe by regulation. That is because T.B. is not an industrial disease.

Hon. S. W. MUNSIE: I admit the Minister is correct that in no other industry would there be any benefit, but against that I emphasise the point that in no other industry would a man be debarred from earning a living at his occupation. I regret that there is no power to prohibit T.B. men from working in industries other than mining.

The MINISTER FOR MINES: The hon. member has lost sight of the fact that, so long as a man is alive, he will draw the full amounts until he reaches £750. The reduced amounts apply to the payments to dependants if the man dies, and when that happens the man certainly cannot work.

Clause, as previously amended, agreed to.

Clauses 50 to 56—agreed to.

Clause 57—Prospectors:

Hon. S. W. MUNSIE: To be engaged in prospecting in Western Australia for an aggregate period of ten years is prescribed. The Minister said he was not wedded to that period, and I consider it too long. I move an amendment—

That in paragraph (b) "ten" be struck out and the word "five" inserted in lieu.

Hon. M. F. TROY: Every precaution has been taken to guard against the fund being imposed upon. Why fix ten years? Many prospectors are aged men, and it is doubtful whether many will possess the qualifications.

The MINISTER FOR MINES: I do not object to five years. Unless a man was extremely unfortunate he would not be likely to have reached the silicosis early stage after only five years' employment, but it must be five years in this State.

Amendment put and passed.

Hon. S. W. MUNSIE: Where in the Bill could I raise the point regarding the rates to be prescribed by the board? We know what the present rates are, and the Minister, in his second reading speech, said that the present rates would be adopted for a start under this measure. I take excep-

tion to the disparity between the rates for men already withdrawn from the industry, and the men to be withdrawn in future.

The MINISTER FOR MINES: It would be undesirable to include in the measure any amount to be paid by way of compensation. Once it was in the Act, an amending Act would be required before any alteration could be made. I should not like to do anything to prevent the hon. member, perhaps, in the years to come, showing his genuineness in the views he has expressed by introducing regulations to provide for a larger sum than the Treasurer can make available under existing conditions. If left to regulation, the amount could be varied as required from time to time. I prefer to leave it so that those who consider the benefits insufficient may make increased provision by amending the regulations.

Hon. S. W. MUNSIE: The Minister stated that so far as he knew, the existing amounts would be the amounts prescribed under this measure.

The Minister for Mines: That is so.

Hon. S. W. MUNSIE: Then the amounts to be prescribed are those already prevailing.

The Minister for Mines: You are becoming pessimistic.

Hon. S. W. MUNSIE: I wish the Minister would explain the position.

The MINISTER FOR MINES: The rates at present prescribed will be prescribed when this measure is proclaimed. The men who go out under this measure will not get those prescribed rates for at least two years, and perhaps for three years, and there will be plenty of opportunity meanwhile to amend the regulations and prescribe higher rates. Surely the hon. member is not so pessimistic as to think he will never get an opportunity to amend the regulations.

Hon. S. W. Munsie: I think I will.

The MINISTER FOR MINES: These rates will not apply to any beneficiaries under this measure because when they come out of the industry they will go under the provisions of the Workers' Compensation Act and, if not, then they will secure the benefits that are already provided with a £3 10s. a week maximum. Surely the hon. member has some faith in the future and I do not want to rob him of any opportunity to do later on, something that, if not generous, will be what he considers right. The

prescribed rates will not apply for 2½ to four years.

Hon. S. W. Munsie: That is so regarding some men, but in some instances they will not be entitled to the £750 in any circumstances. In others it will apply immediately.

The MINISTER FOR MINES: To the extent that it will not apply to some, the conditions do not apply to those individuals to-day. They get nothing under existing conditions whereas under the Bill they will get something.

Clause, as previously amended, agreed to.

Clauses 58 to 62—agreed to.

Schedule, Title—agreed to.

Bill reported with amendments.

BILL—METROPOLITAN WHOLE MILK.

Second Reading.

Debate resumed from 30th November.

HON. M. F. TROY (Mt. Magnet) [9.5]: The Bill is alleged by the Minister for Agriculture to be one of the most important he has ever introduced. He has taken an immense pride in the presentation of the Bill and I understand that if the measure secures the approval of Parliament, it will be the forerunner of many similar measures in future. To the extent that the Bill receives either discouragement or encouragement, I hope members will realise what it will mean to the community. My hope is that, as a result of the division on the second reading of the Bill, the Government will be so discouraged that they will not attempt to put legislation of this description before Parliament in future. During the past two years there has been considerable agitation in the dairying industry, particularly in that section that supplies milk to the metropolitan area. It has been alleged by parties concerned, particularly by the primary producers who are dairymen, that they are unable to make a living from what they receive from the sale of their product. I understand the Minister has been influenced by that argument and it is because of the complaints made by dairymen that they cannot make a living, that he has introduced this legislation. Before placing the measure before Parliament, he appointed an advisory board to administer the supply of milk in the

metropolitan area. That was a year or two ago. It was called an advisory board and the members included the Director of Agriculture (Mr. Sutton), who was the chairman, and Mr. Baron-Hay as the Government nominees. The dairying section of the Primary Producers' Association was represented by Mr. W. G. Pickering. What he has to do with milk production in the metropolitan area, neither I nor anyone else knows. He is a very estimable gentleman, and we knew him in this House. He has no dairying interests that I know of, and he does not produce one spoonful of milk. Why he should have been chosen as the representation of the dairying section of the Primary Producers' Association, I cannot understand.

The Minister for Agriculture: He is the chairman of the whole-milk section.

Hon. M. F. TROY: He would represent the whole-tail and agitation section. Then there was Mr. Taylor, representing the dairymen of Mundijong, Mr. Russell, representing the Serpentine area, Mr. Robinson, the Osborne Park area—all gentlemen interested personally in the industry. The depots were represented by Mr. Brown of Brown's Ltd., and Dr. Boyd representing Pascomi Ltd., and Messrs. McRobbie and Roberts represented the retailer. There was also a representative of the Harvey dairymen, but I forget his name. The advisory board functioned for some time, but their efforts were not satisfactory. They failed because they could not compel the consumer to pay what the producer wanted. The advisory board had to fail because they could not deliver the goods. There has been some log-rolling in connection with the business in order to create dissatisfaction and argument that would influence members on the floor of the House. Pascomi and Brown's Ltd., two depot keepers, reduced the price of milk at depots from 1s. 0 $\frac{3}{4}$ d. per gal. to 10d. per gal. This was done by depot keepers who were represented on the advisory board. The Retail Dairymen's Association passed a resolution setting out that they would not agree to any such reduction, which was not made with the consent of the association but against their will. It is alleged that the depot keepers reduced the price of milk, as I have indicated, because they wanted to create dissatisfaction and it is also stated that one of their reasons was to bring about the in-

troduction of a Bill such as that now before Parliament. They wanted a Bill under which they would have control of the milk supply by an Act of Parliament and thereby compel the consumer in the metropolitan area to pay what the controlling interests deemed it necessary to extract from them. The word "extract" is the proper one to use because the Bill will give them power to extract just what they jolly well like. There is no limit to their opportunities in that direction. The Bill appears innocuous when we read the preamble, which sets out that it is a Bill "for an Act to provide for the regulation and organisation of the production, purchase, treatment, sale and distribution of whole milk for use by consumers within the metropolitan area." That is a very fine title and one would imagine that the Bill had for its object merely the organisation of the milk supply and the securing of efficient service, providing the people with an adequate pure milk supply and the producers with reasonable remuneration for their labour. To achieve that objective it is proposed to establish a body to be known as the metropolitan milk board, which will comprise seven members. One will be representative of the consumers, four will be representatives of the dairymen, and two will represent the milk vendors. The consumers' representative is to be nominated by the Minister, the dairymen's representative is to be elected by the registered dairymen, and the representative of the milk vendors is to be chosen by those interested under that heading. Of the seven members who will comprise the board, four are to be representative of dairymen. The consumer is just as vital to the industry as any other section, and yet the consumer is to have one solitary representative.

The Minister for Agriculture: In the Bill you introduced the consumer was not to have any representation.

Hon. M. F. TROY: Yes, but my Bill was very different from that introduced by the Minister.

The Minister for Agriculture: It was very similar.

Hon. M. F. TROY: It did not allow any compulsion; it did not put any people out of the industry, nor did it limit supplies. It was not like the Bill before us.

The Minister for Agriculture: No, it was not as good.

Hon. M. F. TROY: Furthermore, I did not give any person power to exploit the people; I made them subject to the Minister. The Minister, by a stroke of the pen, could have wiped out the board entirely, and I would have done it, too, if the necessity had arisen. I am perfectly sure the influences behind this legislation will not permit the Minister to do that. The Bill was drawn up outside the Minister's office. It was inspired from outside his office. This is one of a type of Bills of which we have had quite a number during the session. They have been inspired by interested parties outside. The parties have not been diffident about it or shown any modesty, but have made public statements regarding the Bill. The persons who inspired the Bill have acted upon the principle that they must control the industry. It does not matter what my constituents think about the milk vendors in the metropolitan area, or what they charge for their milk, but what I regard as most distasteful is the unfairness of the Bill. What are we to think of the type of mind that can conceive legislation of this character, which will hand over the consumer, body and soul, bound hand and foot, to the milk producers of the State? We are told this is legislation we ought to encourage and the Minister says that if the Bill is passed we shall have more like it. I hope we shall not. The representatives of the dairymen will control the board. They will have four representatives out of seven, while the consumer will have only one representative. Yet without the consumer it is no use the dairymen producing milk for sale in the metropolitan area. The dairymen cannot make a living without the consumer. Furthermore, in order to buttress themselves, the board will appoint their own chairman. The chairman will be a producer and will have both a casting and a deliberative vote. Members will therefore see how one-sided the Bill is, and yet we are told it is fair legislation. I do not think many Ministers would introduce this type of legislation. Absolute and despotic power is given to the dairymen to do as they wish, because they control the board and further four members of the board shall form a quorum. Therefore, the producers can form a quorum whenever they like. The Bill was framed by people outside of Parliament. Two active members of the Primary Producers' Association—the Minister knows who they are, they did not hide their light under a bushel and neither of them is

a dairymen—framed the Bill. Neither of them has the slightest interest in the industry.

The Minister for Lands: In no instance have they declared that they drew up the Bill.

Hon. M. F. TROY: Have they not? Of course they did.

Hon. P. Collier: They did say what the contents of the Bill were before anybody else knew them.

Hon. M. F. TROY: They went further than that. The Bill provides that the Minister is to nominate the first board, which is to remain in office for two years, when a new board will be elected. That is not right. Why should a nominee board remain in power for two years? Let the first board be nominated for a few months to put the organisation in order, and then let the members be subject to election by the persons interested in the organisation. The Bill provides that the board is to be financed by the fees prescribed by and payable to the board and by moneys appropriated by Parliament. Does the Minister hope to receive authority from this House to find money for the board? What do the words "moneys to be appropriated by Parliament" mean? Appropriation means a vote on the Estimates, a vote from the Treasury. Parliament I hope will not provide money for establishing such an organisation. I should like to hear the Minister's explanation on that point. The members of the board are to be paid such fees and expenses as are prescribed. The board is to have supreme control of milk distribution in the metropolitan area and of the purchase and supply of milk. The board can appoint officers and inspectors. The board has power to utilise the services of departmental inspectors, who are to be authorised to act for the board when required. The Minister is to fix the remuneration payable for their services. What will happen? Who are the inspectors? They will be either health inspectors or pure food inspectors or dairy inspectors. The inspector will be a servant of the board, yet it is his duty to see that dairy premises are clean and that the milk supplied is pure. If the inspectors are under the jurisdiction of the board, what sort of inspection shall we get? If the board decides upon strict supervision, the members will not be re-elected. If the inspectors carry out their duties strictly,

they will be very unpopular with the board and with the dairymen who dominate the board. There will not be a thorough inspection: it will be a go-as-you-please inspection, because it is only human nature that the dairymen will resent too strict an inquiry into their business. They will resist any measures taken by the inspectors. Under the Bill, the Minister may constitute and declare any portion of the State to be a dairy area in which milk is to be produced or deemed to be produced for the purpose of sale to consumers in the metropolitan area. The Minister will have power to divide the metropolitan area into districts in which persons may carry on the business of milk vendors. I understand the difficulty to-day is that too much milk is being produced, and, in order that dairymen may get a higher price, the board will limit the production of milk. The result will be that many people will be put out of business. The whole difficulty to-day, so far as I can gather from the dairymen, is over supply.

Mr. North: Consumption has fallen a lot in the last two years.

Hon. M. F. TROY: I do not know the reason. Apparently there is more milk for sale than the consumers require or can afford to pay for. The monstrous thing about the Bill is that dairymen and milk vendors can be put out of business and have their livelihood destroyed without receiving any compensation whatever. There is not one word in the Bill about compensation. It has taken many of these men 25 to 30 years to work up a business into which they have put their best efforts, and yet, with one stroke of the pen, they can be put out of business if the supply is to be limited. Their occupation will be gone. It has been urged by the Minister that the supply will be organised by introducing what is known as the block system, which will bring about economy in the service to consumers. I know for a fact that there are retailers working 14 and 15 hours per day who are rendering very good service to the consumers. The block system will not be worked in that manner. It will be worked on an hourly basis and in the end will probably prove to be more expensive than the present system. There is no guarantee, if the Bill is passed, that the milk supplied will be of better quality. The Bill will eliminate competition, and it is competition that begets

quality. I know full well that good results can only be obtained by competition. Good results are not obtained by making things easier for people in any industry, because that leads to slackness and inefficiency. That is what will result if the Bill is passed. I am sure the Bill will not result in efficiency in the industry. It will keep the least efficient man in the industry while some of the best men will be pushed out of it. It will not raise the standard of the milk supplied in the metropolitan area. The men in the industry will now be sacrificed. Clause 25 provides for that. Unless a man gets a license, he will be out of the business, and since the supply of milk will have to be limited, it is the most deserving dairymen who will be sacrificed. All those amongst them who have built up successful dairying ventures in the metropolitan area have a reputation for fair dealing and industry. Under this measure those qualities will not be required, for the board will be able to get any price, since they have the power to get it; so there will be no necessity for fair dealing and integrity. We are told the Bill provides for the organisation of the dairying industry. I should say it provides for the disorganisation and inefficiency of the dairying industry. The board can grant a license, refuse a license, or cancel an existing license, and even if a dairyman gets a license this year, the board may refuse him one next year. No man can enter the business without a license. I have heard complaints of the monopoly of sugar-growing in Australia. If any person went to Queensland to engage in sugar-growing, he would first have to get a license, the purpose being to limit the production of sugar so that the price can be maintained and the consumer imposed upon. We have exactly the same principle in the Bill. A dairyman may be refused a license and that, of course, cannot be good for the State. The powers and functions of the board constitute a full-time job. I have heard that certain people are ambitious to get seats on the board, and so secure full-time jobs. The board is to have extraordinary powers, including the power to give favours to certain people. It is to be a despotic body, for even the Minister will not have control of it. The board is to be elected by the dairymen, and when it no longer holds the confidence of the

dairymen it will have to make room for another board. Undoubtedly the board will be approached by dairymen who want to stay in the industry. Only a few days ago I read in the "West Australian" that a Royal Commission was to be appointed to inquire into the activities of the Dairy Board of New South Wales.

The Minister for Agriculture: That is an appointed board, whereas this is to be an elected board.

Hon. M. F. TROY: It does not matter whether elected or appointed. This board is to be elected by the dairymen, and so must carry out the will of the dairymen.

Hon. P. Collier: And the board members will be made up of the same qualities as those on the appointed board.

Hon. M. F. TROY: And the same influences are at work here as are at work in New South Wales. There is to be opportunity for the board to grant favours. There will be the greatest possibility of corruption in a board of this character.

Mr. Sampson: The board in Queensland has done excellent work.

Hon. M. F. TROY: It has not the same powers as this board is to have. This board is to be an absolute authority with no control over it. It is quite possible there will be great opportunities for corruption in such a board. It will be able to give opportunities for trading and to fix the price for that trading. We are asked to pass legislation like this, to create this authority to impose on the whole of the community. Somebody said by interjection that consumers had not complained. They are inarticulate now, but they will complain, and there must be a reaction. This legislation proposes to impose absolutely unfair conditions. There never has been legislation of this character but it has evoked reaction. The Minister may think this is a wonderful programme. He may imagine that statues will be erected at Osborne Park and Serpentine to his honour as the man who created this great scheme; but he may rest assured that inasmuch as it is grossly unfair, it cannot last.

Hon. P. Collier: If this Government get one statute, they will be lucky, and it will not be to the Minister for Agriculture.

Hon. M. F. TROY: Just consider the board's powers. The board is charged with the following matters: The regulation and organisation of (a) the production of milk

in dairy areas; (b) the supply and sale of milk by dairymen to milk vendors; (c) the supply, sale and distribution of milk to consumers in the metropolitan area. (d) the treatment of milk before sale and distribution to consumers in the metropolitan area; (e) the transport, carriage and conveyance of milk produced in dairy areas; (f) plant, machinery, appliances, containers and other things used or reputed to be used in connection with the production, supply, sale, distribution, treatment, transport carriage and conveyance of milk. The board may do anything. It is to be all-powerful. And all these powers are to be given it in the mere pretence that the board will organise the industry and create a pure milk supply for the metropolitan area. Then the board is charged with the inspection of (a) dairies, milk stores, milk and places for the treatment of milk. At present this activity is the duty of the Health Department, but this board, which is to be subject to the will of the dairymen, is to have under its control the inspection of dairies and milk stores and places for the treatment of milk. It is only natural that if the board insists upon dairies being kept clean, the board will not be re-elected, for we know what happens to elected institutions when they get into disfavour. But with the opportunities the board is to have, it is not likely to get into disfavour; it will see to that. Then the board is to have the inspection of plant, machinery, appliances, containers and other things used or reputed to be used in connection with the production, supply, sale, distribution, treatment, transport, carriage and conveyance of milk. In fact, the board will have all the powers necessary now or likely to be necessary within the next ten years. The board can issue and revoke licenses and take measures to provide a regular supply of fresh, clean whole-some milk. I do not know of any other board in this country with similar far-reaching powers such as this board will have. It will have the power to fix the price of milk supplied to the consumers, and the price is to be fixed partly in accordance with butter fat content and value and bacterial tests. There is nothing wrong with either of those. The added value for services involving production of whole milk and, if necessary, a premium during periods of scarcity constitute the crux of the whole matter. The milk will not be

valued on the bacterial test or on its butter fat content, but on the alleged value for services involving production of whole milk, and on a premium during periods of scarcity. What board could arrive at the value of services involving the production of whole milk or at a premium during periods of scarcity?

The Minister for Agriculture: It is done in every country in Europe.

Hon. M. F. TROY: No. It might be done in Siberia.

Hon. P. Collier: And not by a board constituted as this is to be.

Hon. F. M. TROY: One man's services are more costly than another's, and milk can be produced in some areas much more cheaply than in others. Some people enjoy natural advantages as against others. If we are to arrange the value of milk on the cost of production, we must provide for the most inefficient man in the industry; so it is possible that the value assessed by the board on the cost of production will be the cost which the least efficient man in the industry incurred. So this will be utterly opposed to efficiency. The board have power to fix the price, and they can calculate it in their own minds. They will say, "It cost certain men so much per gallon, so we will fix the price on that basis." In Western Australia, with so many diverse conditions, it is impossible to fix the price on the cost of production. What account will the board take in assessing the cost of milk production? The board will define the functions, authority and duty of inspectors and any other matter. Consequently there is nothing the board may not do. It is to be an absolutely despotic body. It may take a man's living from him. It may destroy a business built up over years at the cost of great sacrifice and labour.

The Minister for Agriculture: There are amendments on the Notice Paper to deal with that.

Hon. P. Collier: We are dealing with the Bill, not with amendments on the Notice Paper.

Hon. M. F. TROY: If the Bill be defeated, there will be no need to consider the amendments. That is the crux of the whole Bill. There is no comparison between the powers of Parliament and the powers proposed to be conferred upon the board. To the board dominated by the dairymen are to

be handed over the milk consumers in the whole of the metropolitan area, and this at a time when thousands of people are making only a bare living. Many of them are living on bare sustenance amounting to £1 a week or a little more. The people are to be handed over to the tender mercies of a board dominated by the dairymen who will not err on the side of moderation, but will demand as much as they can possibly get. The board, to be successful, will depend upon getting a big price for the dairymen. We know what has happened in the dried fruit industry. Last year there was a scarcity of dried fruits overseas, and producers received a big price for their product. Although they had been granted a monopoly in Western Australia, they did not reduce the price of dried fruits locally, even by a fraction. And they never will reduce the price. It is only human nature to take all that one can get. The same thing will happen under this Bill. In the metropolitan area, the direst possible conditions exist. Thousands of men are out of work and there are many women and little children hungry. I shall be surprised if metropolitan members are not alive to the position. Will they allow this imposition to be placed on the community? The Minister is quite enamoured of the Bill, but that is due to his perfect simplicity. He thinks it a wonderful Bill. He says everything depends upon Parliament agreeing to the Bill. I do not wish to be personal, but it is a great pity the Minister is not possessed of greater experience. That is the real handicap. Men get into a Ministry, and, full of ambition, they desire to do things, and this is the result. The Minister has told the producers that there will be a controlled market for them. You, Mr. Speaker, and I produce wheat and wool, but it is of no use to us unless we can sell it. The producers of this State produce tons of commodities, and they want to sell their produce at a price. There is not the slightest good in producing anything unless it can be sold. But the Minister says that the person who buys milk is not concerned.

The Minister for Agriculture: I do not say that.

Hon. M. F. TROY: In effect he does say it, by providing for only one representative of the consumers on a board of seven. Does he call that fair legislation? He is not an unfair man, but he is badly advised on this Bill. The zealous people who sur-

round him have influenced him unwisely.

Hon. P. Collier: He is not a bad chap, but he has been misled.

Hon. M. F. TROY: If this Bill be passed, it will be but the beginning of other impositions. Next year we shall be asked to legislate for a pool for potato growers, and they will have just as much right to a board. The orange grower, the wheat grower, the wool grower—

Hon. P. Collier: The onion grower and the cauliflower grower—

Hon. M. F. TROY: Yes, they will all be entitled to ask for boards. If we are to have all those boards and boards of merchants and business men to fix prices then there can be no logical objection to the workers' representatives fixing their wages for themselves.

Mr. Sampson: Your Bill would have been a good measure.

Hon. M. F. TROY: But mine was very different from this one. This is termed a splendid adventure. The Minister has blossomed forth with a new idea. This man is to have a board, the next man is to have a board, and everybody is to have a board, and they are all to charge what they like until in the end we are all bankrupt. The Minister says this is the sort of legislation to save the producer. When there are boards for everybody, then we can put the employers in the Arbitration Court and instruct Mr. Mooney or Mr. Barker to fix the employees' wages on the same principle. The Bill is for a board to fix the wages of the producers. What is wrong, then, with providing a board of the workers' representatives to fix their wages for them? The same principle is involved; there is no difference whatever. This is the sort of thing that the Minister thinks will help the producers, but it will re-act upon the community. I do not propose to vote for the second reading of the Bill which is an utterly unfair measure. First of all it does not devise means by which men may efficiently organise, but it introduces the vicious principle of compulsory organisation. It proposes to create a board dominated by a section of the industry. It proposes to give the board power to take away a man's living. The board could put a man out of business. The health inspectors are to be handed over to the board, and then the board will be allowed to fix the price and impose upon the whole community whatever price they think is in the interests of

the people they represent. Before hearing the speech of the member for Murray-Wellington in support of the Bill, I considered him a very fair man.

Hon. P. Collier: A very promising man.

Hon. M. F. TROY: I thought his principles were sound, but there must be bad influences operating at the Peel Estate. I do not think he believes in the Bill at all. What is the hope of Western Australia? The hope of Western Australia is to develop its rural industries, by reducing costs and becoming more efficient. If we are to compete in the markets of the world we must reduce costs and become efficient people. If we are a protected people, and we have a monopoly and can get an easy living, what happens? We become flabby and inefficient. That happens the world over. Here is the opportunity to become inefficient. The board will fix the price for the least efficient man in the industry—the man who in the interests of the State ought to be out of the industry. What else can be expected from such legislation but endless trouble because the measure cannot operate fairly. For those reasons I cannot support the Bill.

HON. P. COLLIER (Boulder) [9.55]: It is almost impossible to believe that a Bill of this description could emanate from the members of the present Government. Every clause of the Bill is a negation of the policy of members opposite. They have always proclaimed themselves to be individualists, and have contended that the law of supply and demand should operate. I remember during the years when we were in office listening to speeches of members now sitting on the Government side in which they railed against any form of legislation that would interfere with what they termed the natural flow of trade and commerce. All interference of that kind was detrimental to everybody concerned. There was no question about it. I am not exaggerating the position at all. They said trade and business should be allowed to flow in its natural channels, and that the wonderful law of supply and demand would regulate prices.

Hon. A. McCallum: We were told that that law had been repealed.

Hon. P. COLLIER: There could be no profiteering on the part of any section of the community because the law of supply and demand would control prices. I am

reminded of an occasion during the war years when a Nationalist candidate—he had been a Labour man—was speaking in Hannans-street. A questioner asked, "Will not the law of supply and demand regulate that?" And the answer was, "No, Billy Hughes repealed that law last year." So this measure is repealing the law of supply and demand which members opposite profess to stand for so strongly. Apparently a policy is either good or bad according to the source from which it emanates. If Bills of this kind are introduced by a Labour Government they are iniquitous and bad, and are condemned by members on that side of the House and by all the influences that stand behind the party outside the House. When Bills of this kind are brought down by the present Government, then of course they possess all the virtues.

The Minister for Agriculture: Your side condemns it all.

Hon. P. COLLIER: Not at all. My party never introduced such a one-sided Bill as this is. Its provisions are a discredit to any Government; I care not what policy they pretend to stand for. It is the most one-sided thing that has ever been brought forward in this House. Labour never attempted such a regimentation of trade, commerce and industry as is proposed in this Bill. Price-fixing is one of the essential parts of it, the price to be paid to the producer, the power to fix price in every aspect with regard to milk. When the Labour Party introduced legislation to govern prices we were denounced by every member on the opposite side of the House. We were told that price-fixing was an impossible theory, one of those fantastic ideas which emanated only from the Labour Party and could not possibly be successful. We were told that, no matter how far Parliament might go in price-fixing, it would be ineffective, that this wonderful law of supply and demand would eventually govern prices. We attempted to put through Bills dealing with price-fixing, Bills that had to do with the fixing of the price of commodities to the consumer. We were resisted in every effort that we made by members opposite. We sought to control the powers of the trading community, who were then exploiting and profiteering upon the citizens of the State in the matter of commodity prices. Such Bills were de-

nounced and opposed by every member opposite. A Bill providing for the fixation of prices to the producers is all it should be. Immediately the principle is reversed, everything is out of order. What kind of consistency is there on the part of members opposite in such an attitude? Is legislation right only when it is designed to assist the people they claim to represent, the producers; and is it wrong when it is a question of assisting the consumers? Where is the consistency of the Government and those standing behind them?

Mr. Kenneally: Their consistency has also been repealed.

Hon. P. COLLIER: I have never known anything so inconsistent. If a change occurs in the parties in this House, and similar legislation is brought forward by our party, it will be opposed by members opposite, as it has been opposed in the past.

The Minister for Agriculture: I will help you to get it through.

Hon. P. COLLIER: The Minister will be where he was before he became a member of Cabinet. His name will figure in the division lists against us, as it figures in "Hansard" against our other price-fixing proposals. How does the Minister justify price-fixing in this matter and his opposition to price-fixing in other directions, as shown in the past?

The Minister for Agriculture: I have never opposed it.

Hon. J. C. Willcock: What nonsense.

The Minister for Agriculture: No price-fixing measure has been before Parliament since I have been a member.

Hon. J. C. Willcock: What about the anti-profiteering Bill?

Hon. P. COLLIER: I could produce "Hansard" to show that price-fixing Bills dealing with rent and other things have been introduced, having been brought down by my Government, and I am sure the name of the Minister will not be found wanting in the division lists. How does he justify his change of front? How does any member opposite justify a somersault of this kind.

Mr. Sampson: I supported the ex-Minister for Lands throughout every stage of his primary products Bill.

Hon. P. COLLIER: Did the hon. member support the price-fixing Bill or the rent-fixing Bill? He supports anything. He

supported price-fixing if it affected the people he represents. That is the attitude of mind of hon. members. Price-fixing is only good and justifiable if it affects the people they represent.

Mr. Sampson: I was with the Leader of the Opposition throughout the piece.

Hon. P. COLLIER: The hon. member was not with us in price-fixing generally. Was he with us in attempting to fix rentals?

Mr. Sampson: That is a different matter.

Hon. P. COLLIER: Was he with us in our effort to appoint a board to fix the price of commodities?

Mr. Sampson: That was an unworkable measure.

Hon. P. COLLIER: Listen to the subterfuge of the hon. member.

Mr. Sampson: It was impracticable.

Hon. P. COLLIER: I know where the hon. member stands in matters of this kind. He does not care how far he violates his policy or principles so long as the legislation may be of benefit to his own electorate. He will go no further than that.

Mr. Sampson: The producers generally.

Hon. P. COLLIER: Are they the only people entitled to price-fixing legislation? Are the consumers of no account? Is there to be no control of the prices that may be charged to consumers? Does the hon. member imagine he is consistent in saying that he approves of price-fixing for the producers, but denies it to all other members of the community?

Mr. Sampson: This Bill provides protection for the consumers.

Mr. Kenneally: It gives them only one voice in seven.

Hon. P. COLLIER: The hon. member is a remarkable man in many ways.

Mr. SPEAKER: But he is not in the Bill.

Hon. P. COLLIER: Fortunately for the hon. member, he is not; otherwise I should be compelled to deal with him. I am permitted, perhaps, to comment on his interjections. Has so one-sided a board ever been suggested in the history of this House or of any other Parliament in the world? The board is to consist of seven members, made up of four dairymen, two vendors (one wholesaler and one retailer), and one to represent the consumers. The majority of the board will consist of dairy-

men, the milk producers, the vendors, the people who have the commodity to sell. That is the point, and it is all-important. Has a more one-sided kind of board ever been thought of? Imagine creating a board to deal with any commodity—meat, bread, groceries or anything else—that is constituted with a majority of those who are selling the goods, conferring upon those persons the sweeping powers of price-fixing, disposing of competitors, and doing anything and everything in their own interests. That is what the Bill proposes. It sets up a board to fix prices, and the majority on the board are to be dairymen. Not only will they have power to fix the price of the commodity they sell, but they will be able to put competitors out of business by refusing a license to them. Let us consider the powers of the board for a moment. To thoroughly understand the wretched constitution of this board, we must keep in mind the enormous powers they will possess. Without the permission of the board, no dairyman, no milk vendor or any person at all may engage in any kind of business relating to milk consumption in the metropolitan area, without a license from the board. Imagine that sweeping power. Then again, the board, on which the majority will be milk producers and vendors, may refuse to grant a license or may cancel a license that has been issued.

The Minister for Agriculture: We will amend that provision in Committee.

Hon. P. COLLIER: I am not concerned with what will be done at the Committee stage. I hope the Bill will not reach that stage. So far as my physical powers will enable me, it will certainly not go far in Committee. No provision is made for any appeal against the cancellation or refusal of a license. In all our courts where a man may be convicted or where a verdict may be given against him, whether it be by a police magistrate, a jury or a judge, there is the right of appeal, but that is not conceded in the Bill.

Mr. Kenneally: They will be able to take a man's living away.

Hon. P. COLLIER: Although the board may refuse to grant a license or may cancel a license after it has been granted, the person concerned will have no redress whatever. What kind of a Bill is this? Where did it emanate from? What kind of a mind can any Minister have who would confer such outrageous powers as these on any board? It will even enable the board to refuse a license to a successful competitor whose busi-

ness has affected that of a member of the board.

Mr. Kenneally: And that competitor may have been in the business all his life.

Hon. P. COLLIER: Of course. The board will be able to deprive a man of his living by refusing to enable him to continue his business in which he may have invested all his savings. That may be done on the low-down sordid ground of wiping out a competitor. I have not lost faith in human nature, but I know what it is. Everyone knows that where self-interest is concerned and where one's business is affected, self-preservation is the first law of nature. That stands to-day as ever. Should a member of the board find himself faced with a successful competitor in his business, the law of self-preservation and self-interest might influence him in refusing a license to that competitor or to cancel a license already issued. The board will have power over the regulation and organisation of the production of milk in dairying areas. They will have power to control, regulate and organise the supply and sale of milk from the dairymen to the vendors. They will control the supply, sale and distribution of milk to consumers in the metropolitan area. If the board were an impartial one comprised of men with no connection with the trade, it would be a different matter. They might be relied on to deal fairly as between one interest and another, but the board will consist of a majority of producers and sellers of milk. Not only will the board exercise the powers I have indicated, but they will also control the transport, carriage and conveyance of milk produced in various areas. There is no phase of milk production in the metropolitan area that will not be entirely under the control of the board. They will have power to regulate and organise the plant, machinery, appliances, containers and other things used in connection with milk production. Did Mussolini ever conceive anything more autocratic, more powerful, than that? It is extraordinary, and I am all the more amazed that it is proposed to give these powers to a one-sided board, a board which represents one interest alone.

Mr. Angelo: Do you think if it were an independent board it would be all right?

Hon. P. COLLIER: I will have something to say about that directly. I am dealing now with the Bill, which is the only thing before the House. I should think

that if Mussolini saw the Bill, he would feel he was not the supreme autocrat that he imagines he is. The board will have power to issue and revoke licenses. In case the specific powers set out in the Bill do not embrace everything, something in the nature of a dragnet clause has been included.

Hon. A. McCallum: Something might have been forgotten.

Hon. P. COLLIER: The board can take such measures and means which in the opinion of the board are requisite and necessary. Think of that for a moment! Let us try to interpret the words "requisite and necessary." The words mean that the measures and means are only to be requisite and necessary in the opinion of the board. They may be utterly ridiculous, but if the board decides they are requisite and necessary, it proceeds to take them. The board is also given power to make, settle and approve of contracts for the supply of milk by dairymen to the vendors. What do members on the other side of the House think of representation by Parliament and control by Parliament? Where does the free flow of trade and commerce come in? We are told that the people benefit by competition, but there is to be no competition here at all. The board shuts out all competition. The board fixes prices. It controls the whole industry. Members will note the wide power the board has, because the Bill provides that the board can fix the price in accordance with the butter content and value, the bacterial test, and added value for services involving production of whole milk.

Mr. H. W. Mann: There is one thing the board cannot do, it cannot make the people purchase the milk.

Hon. P. COLLIER: Nothing has been omitted from the Bill with regard to the powers conferred upon the board. If necessary, the board can fix a premium during a period of scarcity. What protection is there for the consuming public? The board can fix maximum rates for road transport. If I should lose my seat at the next elections, I do not know where I would look for an occupation.

The Minister for Lands: We will put you on the board.

Hon. P. COLLIER: I might be forced to buy a truck and run milk from the farms to the railway station, but I am not free

to fix my price. The board will tell me what price I shall charge.

The Minister for Agriculture: That is one avenue in which the producers have been fleeced more than in any other.

Hon. P. COLLIER: It may be so, but where does this wonderful law of supply and demand come in? If men are charging exorbitant rates for the conveyance of milk from the farms to the depots or elsewhere, they are no doubt making good profits. Surely there is an opening for others to step in. Why do not others undertake the job? Competition, we are told, is the life of trade. I know there is no such thing as competition; it has been broken down long ago, but it is only when we say it is broken down that the statement is not accepted. No one is allowed to trade freely. I wonder what my friend the member for Roebourne thinks about the restriction. The member for Roebourne is a man who all his life has been an individualist. He has pioneered the State and built up parts of it by individual effort. He has not been under the control of anybody. He would scorn to have his activities or his energies curtailed by a board of this description, or by legislation of this kind. I am certain, having regard to his experience of the benefits of competition, he cannot endorse the Bill. Then the board can fix the value of services, and fix a premium, and will have power also for defining the functions, authorities and duties of inspectors. This is the most thoroughly complete and iniquitous Bill of its kind ever brought into this House. After taking control in every possible way, the board is to be the judge of the quality of the milk, and will appoint inspectors. I have had experience of local authorities controlling the inspection of health, and I know that very often a health inspector of a road board has been precluded from carrying out his duties, because if he did he would have to take action against a member of the local authority, one of his bosses, and being human he is not going to risk his job. Imagine the inspectors appointed by this board going to the board and saying, "Your milk is not up to standard, and you will have to do such and such a thing." How long would that inspector hold his job? In these times of difficulty in obtaining situations, how many men would dare to risk their employ-

ment by reporting adversely on the milk produced by this board, these men who are their bosses? Nothing so iniquitous was ever put before this House. I sympathise deeply with the milk producers, and I am aware that to-day, and for some time past they have not been getting a fair price for their product. They have been sweated, so to speak. But whilst the producer has had to accept a rate below the cost of production, I am aware that at the same time the consumer at the other end of the scale has been paying a maximum price. The difference between the price the producer gets per gallon and the price the consumer pays is a very big margin indeed, and it ought to be possible to give the producer a much higher price than he obtains to-day without necessarily increasing the price to the consumer.

The Minister for Agriculture: That is the idea of the Bill.

Hon. P. COLLIER: I know. I do not believe that necessarily the Bill would mean an increase in the price to the consumer, because there is quite enough margin between the price received by the producer and that paid by the consumer to give the producer a price sufficient to reward him for his work without increasing the price to the consumer. I think that is quite possible, for the existing margin between the two prices amounts to a scandal. I have always stood for a fair price to the producer, whether of wheat, flour, milk, butter or fruit, and would not deny him legislation to ensure his getting a fair price. If I might be permitted to digress, I would say the greatest mistake Australia has made in recent years is that there has not been a price fixed for wheat and flour consumed in Australia. What right have I or any other citizen to demand that a man shall grow wheat and give us the bread we eat at a price that does not afford him a fair wage? We have no such right, and insofar as I have always stood for a fair remuneration for the workers, for the services they render, so shall I always stand for a fair return or reward for the services rendered by the men producing wheat and milk and other primary products. This country ought to have ensured that, and but for the cowardice of the politicians it would have done so; and no reasonable man could object and ask that he should be

supplied with bread at a price less than it cost the farmer to grow it, or that he should be supplied with milk or any other commodity on similar terms. So I would go a long way with the Minister—

The Minister for Agriculture: I can see you supporting the Bill yet.

Hon. P. COLLIER: I would go a long way with the Minister in assuring that the man who produces this essential food of life, milk, should get a fair price for it. But I hold that it cannot be done under the provisions of the Bill, which must be drastically amended in Committee. I am not prepared to tempt human nature by giving such powers as this board is to have: because the board may begin by fixing a price that would be just a fair thing to them and the producers for their labour, but being human they would go a little farther and a little farther, and eventually the board and the milk producers would become exploiters of the people. And that is not to impugn the integrity or standard of any man occupying a seat on the board. Human nature being what it is the board, having the tremendous power it is proposed to confer on them, are going to exercise it. History tells us that, and in fact history tells us also that there has been responsible for most of the tragedies of the world the giving of great power to individuals, or to sets of individuals, who would exercise those powers to the detriment of the people as a whole. So all history tells us that the board will go on and on, and will exercise its powers, not in the manner in which it was first intended, in the interests of the people, but in the interests of the board itself, and of the producers: the board will go on and use those special powers which it is proposed to give, use them in the interests of its fellow producers instead of the interests of the people as a whole.

MR. ANGELO (Gascoyne) [10.40]: I intend to support the second reading because, after a fairly long residence in the metropolitan area, I consider that we need better control of the milk supply of the city and suburbs. Further, I think the Bill is a good one provided it is controlled and administered by an independent board, or by a better balanced board than the one proposed by the Minister. The board I would have liked to see provided for would be one of five members. I think seven would

be rather cumbersome and it is not necessary to have so many. If the member for Mt. Magnet (Hon. M. F. Troy) is right, and if it is going to involve full-time work for the board, perhaps a board of three would be sufficient. The board I would have liked to see provided would be two members representing the producers, two members representing the consumers, and the chairman a medical man. I think the Minister has overlooked a very essential feature. The Bill is designed to protect not only the producer but also the consumer, and the health aspect enters very largely into the objects of the measure. Therefore I should like to see a medical man as the fifth member of the board and as chairman.

Mr. Panton: Why a medical man?

Mr. ANGELO: Because the health aspect enters so largely into the question.

Mr. Panton: The worst business man in the world.

Mr. ANGELO: I know medical men who have just as much business acumen as have any other section of the community.

Mr. Panton: How could he give his full time to the work of the board?

Mr. ANGELO: He could be a full-time member of the board. I am somewhat with the member for Mt. Magnet that it should be a full-time job, but in that event I think the strength of the board should be reduced to three, because the expense of five or seven members would be too great. Let me ask members to recall what the Licensing Board have done. Think of the wonderful change they have wrought in the control of the liquor industry. They are a full-time board and they number only three. Therefore I think a board of three, one representing the producers and one representing the consumers, with a medical man as chairman, would be the best board to adopt if it be a full-time job.

Mr. Panton: The Licensing Board do not have any say in the fixing of prices.

Mr. ANGELO: It is a pity that they do not have some say in the fixing of prices. They have already controlled the size of "pots," so that their powers are fairly wide. I should like to see a well balanced board of that kind, under the chairmanship of a medical man, given almost the full powers provided in the Bill, not only to control the industry but to reconstruct the milk distribution business in

the metropolitan area. If something along those lines were done, I am satisfied it would result in great benefit to the people of the metropolitan area.

MR. J. H. SMITH (Nelson) [10.45]: I move—

That the debate be adjourned.

Motion put, and a division taken with the following result:—

Ayes	17
Noes	21

Majority against	4
------------------	----	----	---

AYES.

Mr. Collier	Mr. Millington
Mr. Corboy	Mr. Munsie
Mr. Coverley	Mr. Sleeman
Mr. Hegney	Mr. J. H. Smith
Miss Holman	Mr. J. M. Smith
Mr. Kenneally	Mr. Troy
Mr. H. W. Mann	Mr. Willcock
Mr. Marshall	Mr. Wilson
Mr. McCallum	

(Teller.)

NOES.

Mr. Angelo	Mr. Fenton
Mr. Church	Mr. Parker
Mr. Doney	Mr. Patrick
Mr. Ferguson	Mr. Piesse
Mr. Griffiths	Mr. Richardson
Mr. Latham	Mr. Sampson
Mr. Lindsay	Mr. Scaddan
Mr. J. I. Mann	Mr. F. C. L. Smith
Mr. McLarty	Mr. Thorn
Sir James Mitchell	Mr. North
Mr. Nulsen	

(Teller.)

Motion (adjournment) thus negatived.

MR. THORN (Toodyay) [10.50]: I give my whole-hearted support to the Bill. It is most necessary to have some such legislation in view of the situation of the industry, which is so badly in need of organisation. The producers are getting from 6d. to 6½d. a gallon for their milk, and the retailers are getting from 2s. 4d. to 2s. 8d. a gallon. It is high time the Government brought down some measure to help the producers. The margin is roughly 2s. a gallon. I feel confident that members opposite are anxious to help the industry. The Government have a good deal of money wrapped up in it, and we cannot allow it to go under. How can any industry carry on when prices are as low as I have quoted? No doubt the retailers object to the Bill. They are getting the lion's share, and it is only natural they should object and do all they can to defeat the Bill. We hear that the Metropolitan Milk Producers and Stock-owners' Association are supporting the measure. That is a pleasure to me.

Those men are in the trade both retail and wholesale, and yet they realise the seriousness of the position in which the producers find themselves. They are prepared to give the Bill their support. I am in accord with the principles contained in the measure, and with other members am prepared to do all I can in Committee to make it a thoroughly satisfactory piece of legislation. Reference has been made to the health regulations. I believe this Bill will improve the conditions under which milk is produced. It provides for a thorough inspection of all dairies. Milk is subject to disease, but this Bill will bring it under more strict supervision than in the past, and afford greater protection to the public. With regard to the representation on the board, I am prepared to consider the opinions of other members. If it is thought that the board is badly balanced, we may be able to adjust this in Committee. Very few people realise the serious position of the milk producers. It is life or death to them that we should move in some direction to save the industry. I appeal to members not to be harsh, but to allow the Bill to go into Committee and give it their most sympathetic consideration.

MR. J. H. SMITH: I move—

That the debate be adjourned.

MR. SPEAKER: I cannot accept the motion.

HON. S. W. MUNSIE: I move—

That the debate be adjourned.

Motion put and passed.

Point of Order.

MR. J. H. SMITH: I rise to a point of order. I moved that the debate be adjourned. Why could not that motion be accepted?

MR. SPEAKER: Only seven minutes have elapsed since the hon. member moved that the debate be adjourned. It is necessary that 15 minutes should elapse before any member can move again a motion of that nature.

HON. P. COLLIER: I do not think the Standing Orders refer to a particular member. If the member for Nelson is out of order because a quarter of an hour has not elapsed since he moved the motion for adjournment, I would point out that you, Mr. Speaker, accepted a similar motion from the member for Hannans. I do not

think the Standing Orders deal with the question of a particular member, but with the time that has elapsed. Moreover, there is no such thing as provision for a quarter of an hour. A motion for the adjournment of the debate can be moved minute after minute.

Mr. Speaker: Possibly I am wrong. I was confused with another Standing Order. I desire to express my regret to the member for Nelson, and will allow him to move for the adjournment of the debate. Perhaps the member for Hannans will have no objection to that.

Hon. S. W. Munsie: I have no objection.

Mr. J. H. SMITH: I move—

That the debate be adjourned.

Motion put and passed.

BILL—ROAD DISTRICTS ACT AMENDMENT.

Council's Message.

Message from the Council notifying that it did not insist on its amendment No. 8, it insisted on its amendments Nos. 11 and 15, and disagreed to the amendment made by the Assembly to amendment No. 14 of the Council, and insisted on its amendment No. 14, now considered.

In Committee.

Mr. Angelo in the Chair; the Minister for Works in charge of the Bill.

The CHAIRMAN: The Council deleted Clause 39 and inserted in lieu thereof the following:—

39. Section two hundred and two of the principal Act is amended by inserting therein a subsection, as follows:—

(3.) The Governor may, upon application by a Board at any time, by Order in Council, declare that in any district or any portion of a district it shall be lawful to use wood in the construction of the external and internal walls of any building intended for use as a dwelling-house, and notwithstanding that the provisions of the said Second Schedule have been extended to and are in operation in such district, or portion of a district, and until such Order in Council is revoked, any of the provisions of the said Second Schedule (save and except regulations twenty-nine to thirty-three, both inclusive), and of any by-laws made thereunder which are inconsistent with or repugnant to the authority granted by such Order in Council, shall be suspended and have no force or effect in relation to any such building aforesaid.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: I move—

That the amendment be not agreed to.

We discussed this matter fully. It deals with the erection of wooden houses. The Assembly disagreed to the Council's amendment that they now insist upon. The Council's amendment means that the Government would have to wait until a road board told them to do their job.

Question put and passed; the Council's amendment not agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN: The Council insist on their amendment to delete Clause 64.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: I move—

That the amendment be not agreed to.

This amendment deals with the system of auditing. Some time ago negotiations took place with the local governing authorities. The Act prescribes that ratepayers' auditors must be appointed, but the system has been a farce. The department agreed with the Road Board Association that the Government should double the number of Government auditors, and the road boards were to pay half the additional cost. The auditors would be appointed in various parts of the State, and the effect would be that the books of each local governing authority would be audited at least every six months. There are many local governing bodies, such as the Perth Road Board, that require a more continuous audit. If such road boards can appoint their own auditors to carry out a daily, weekly or monthly audit, they should be allowed to do so, and, of course, the Government would still have the right to audit their books if necessary. The Legislative Council do not agree that the local authorities should have that power.

Question put and passed; the Council's amendment not agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN: The Council insist on their amendment to Clause 63 which would have the effect of deleting paragraph (b), and disagree to the Assembly's amendment to add the proviso reading, "Provided, however, that no such auditor so appointed shall be removed without the consent of the Minister." The reason given by the Council for insisting on their amendment is that a more uniform and efficient system will be established.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: This also deals with the auditing question, and I move—

That the Assembly's amendment on the Council's amendment be insisted on.

Question put and passed; the Assembly's amendment on the Council's amendment insisted on.

Resolutions reported and the report adopted.

Request for Conference.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: I move—

That a conference be requested with the Legislative Council on the Road Districts Act Amendment Bill, and that at such conference the managers shall be the Minister for Works, Mr. Sampson and Hon. J. Cunningham.

Question put and passed.

Resolution reported, the report adopted and a message accordingly returned to the Council.

BILL—HEALTH ACT AMENDMENT.

Council's Message.

Message from the Council notifying that it agreed to amendments Nos. 1, 3 and 5 made by the Assembly but disagreed to amendments Nos. 2 and 4, now considered.

In Committee.

Mr. Angelo in the Chair; the Minister for Health in charge of the Bill.

No. 2. Clause 10.—Delete this clause:

The CHAIRMAN: The reason given by the Council for disagreeing to the amendment made by the Assembly was—

Clause 10 is subject to agreement with local authorities and will facilitate the work of sewerage and drainage in many towns throughout the country and will give powers which will be found desirable and beneficial in the interests of health.

The MINISTER FOR HEALTH: I move—

That the amendment be not insisted on.

I rather misinformed the Committee when dealing with the amendment. The advice I gave the Committee was based on information supplied by the departmental officials, who subsequently found that they

were in error. The clause will give certain individuals authority to sewer their premises. It is a matter of minor importance.

Question put and passed; the Assembly's amendment not insisted on.

No. 4. Clause 45.—At the end of this clause add the following words: "but there shall be an appeal to the Commissioner against any such refusal of a local authority."

The CHAIRMAN: The reason given by the Council for disagreeing to the amendment is—

The right of appeal is already provided for by Section 35 of the principal Act.

The MINISTER FOR HEALTH: I move—

That the amendment be not insisted on.

The member for Hannans raised a question with regard to a registration that had been refused by a local authority. It was suggested that a right of appeal should be given from the decisions of local authorities, but under Section 35 of the Act any person aggrieved by an order of a local authority may appeal from such order. It is therefore proposed that the words be deleted.

Question put and passed; the Assembly's amendment not insisted on.

Resolutions reported, the report adopted, and a message accordingly returned to the Council.

House adjourned at 11.12 p.m.