

they were not getting a fair deal. The notes of the interview continue—

He believed that Addis should have been charged with something more specific than default of interest payment

I certainly think so, too.

. . . and was convinced that the Bank's attitude was a refutation of the statement that no trier would be evicted. In a letter to Mr. A. E. Piesse, M.L.A., Mr. McLarty had stated that, in view of the attitude of members of the Wheatgrowers' Union, it had become more and more imperative that the Bank should vindicate its authority as to the dispossession of Addis. That letter appeared to point to the fact that Addis was being victimised because he was a member of the union.

I could say a great deal more. I could quote Mr. McLarty's letter; I could quote Sergeant Buttle, the local sergeant of police, who said Addis was dangerous. Yet, when Addis was searched, he was quite unarmed. He had threatened to shoot people and to do all sorts of things, no doubt. I appeal to the House to give the motion serious consideration. As I say, there is much more I could quote, but I have no desire to weary members. I am firmly convinced that a grave injustice was done to Addis and I appeal to members to support the motion.

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

Ayes	10
Noes	14

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

AYES.

Hon. E. H. Angelo	Hon. H. V. Piesse
Hon. C. F. Baxter	Hon. A. Thomson
Hon. J. T. Franklin	Hon. H. Tucker
Hon. E. H. H. Hall	Hon. C. H. Wittenoom
Hon. V. Hamersley	Hon. J. A. Dimmitt

(Teller.)

NOES.

Hon. L. B. Bolron	Hon. J. J. Holmes
Hon. J. Corneli	Hon. W. H. Kitson
Hon. L. Craig	Hon. W. J. Mann
Hon. J. M. Drew	Hon. G. W. Miles
Hon. G. Fraser	Hon. J. Nicholson
Hon. E. H. Gray	Hon. H. Seddon
Hon. E. M. Heenan	Hon. H. S. W. Parker

(Teller.)

Question thus negatived.

House adjourned at 6.15 p.m.

Legislative Assembly.

Tuesday, 11th October, 1938.

	PAGE
Question: Land, unpaid rates, as to amending legislation	1279
Bills: Returned Sailors and Soldiers' Imperial League of Australia, W.A. Branch, Incorporated (Anzac Club Control), 1R.	1279
Sailors and Soldiers' Scholarship Fund, 2R.	1279
Inspection of Scaffolding Act Amendment, 2R.	1281
Alsatian Dog Act Amendment, returned ..	1285
Mines Regulation Act Amendment, 2R.	1283
Bureau of Industry and Economic Research, 2R., Com.	1290

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

QUESTION—LAND, UNPAID RATES.

As to Amending Legislation.

Mr. SAMPSON asked the Minister for Works: Owing to the cumbersome work, heavy cost and ineffective result frequently following upon the offering of land for sale by auction on account of non-payment of rates due to local authorities, is it his intention this session to bring down an amendment to the Act providing for more effective and flexible legislation?

The MINISTER FOR WORKS replied: The subject is now receiving consideration in conjunction with other suggested amendments to the Local Government Acts.

BILL—RETURNED SAILORS AND SOLDIERS' IMPERIAL LEAGUE OF AUSTRALIA, W.A. BRANCH INCORPORATED (ANZAC CLUB CONTROL).

Introduced by Hon. C. G. Latham, and read a first time.

BILL—SAILORS AND SOLDIERS' SCHOLARSHIP FUND.

Second Reading.

THE MINISTER FOR MINES (Hon. A. H. Panton—Leederville) [4.35] in moving the second reading said: The Bill will give the trustees of this scholarship fund power to utilise the money for purposes other than those originally set out. The amount in the fund was subscribed from the money represented by war gratuity bonds issued to soldiers who had returned from the War. Those contributions were made as a result

of an appeal by the president of the Returned Sailors and Soldiers' Imperial League of Australia (Sir Gilbert Dyett), who asked returned soldiers to contribute at least £1 each out of their gratuity bonds to assist in the education of the children of soldiers who had paid the supreme sacrifice during the Great War. The fund itself was established in 1920 by this means. As the outcome of the appeal by the Federal President of the league war gratuity bonds to the value of £2,623 8s. were handed over to the trustees named by the Federal Executive of the league, namely, the late Sir Talbot Hobbs, Rabbi D. I. Freedman, and Col. C. H. Lamb. Upon the conversion of all gratuity bonds the fund is now represented by the following:—

	£	s.	d.
4 per cent. inscribed stock due at 15/12/1938	300	0	0
4 per cent. inscribed stock due at 15/11/1941	300	0	0
4 per cent. inscribed stock due at 15/10/1944	300	0	0
4 per cent. inscribed stock due at 15/9/1947	300	0	0
4 per cent. inscribed stock due at 15/8/1950	300	0	0
4 per cent. inscribed stock due at 15/7/1953	300	0	0
4 per cent. inscribed stock due at 15/12/1955	270	0	0
4 per cent. inscribed stock due at 15/11/1957	200	0	0
4 per cent. inscribed stock due at 15/10/1959	200	0	0
4 per cent. inscribed stock due at 15/9/1961	200	0	0
	<hr/>		
	£2,670	0	0
Cash at Commonwealth Savings Bank	1	1	10
	<hr/>		
	£2,671	1	10

In addition, there is a sum of £111 15s. 11d. represented by undistributed income in hand to the credit of the current account of the fund at the Commonwealth Savings Bank. On the death of Sir Talbot Hobbs, the State President of the R.S.L., Mr. Alfred Yeates, was appointed by the surviving trustees to fill the vacancy.

Mr. Stubbs: What amount is involved?

The MINISTER FOR MINES: The total is £2,671 1s. 10d. That is the capital amount. The trustees are using the interest for the purpose for which the fund was originally raised. Since the inception of the

fund the capital has been retained intact, and the income utilised to provide educational benefits for the children of deceased ex-A.I.F. sailors and soldiers. Originally the idea was that only the children of those who had been killed at the War would receive the benefits. We have arrived at the stage when no more children, whose fathers paid the supreme sacrifice in the Great War, remain to be educated. Twenty years have now elapsed since the termination of the War, and the children of the soldiers who were killed have grown up. The trustees have available the amount of money I stated, but have not the children on whom to spend it. Although there were no deeds of trust or anything of the kind, the trustees felt, as the money was originally raised for a definite purpose, and acting on legal advice, that in the interests of everyone, it would be advisable to have an Act passed giving them power to do something else with the fund. The actual words setting out the scope of the original intention were "To provide for children of ex-A.I.F. men who paid the supreme sacrifice in the Great War." The trustees feel that only those children are legally entitled to be dealt with under the fund. There are, however, still a number of children to whom it is desired to afford educational benefits. Those children come under the following headings:—(1) The children of ex-A.I.F. men who have died since the War as a result of war injuries; (2), the children of incapacitated ex-A.I.F. sailors and soldiers whose disabilities may not be war-caused; and (3) the children of poor and distressed ex-A.I.F. sailors and soldiers. The trustees desire to have power to deal with the education of those children. Many soldiers have married since the War, and as a result numbers of children have been born. Some of the ex-soldiers are still suffering from disabilities caused as a result of the War, and the trustees are anxious to bring their children within the scope of the fund. In, say, another 25 years there will be none of these children available. The trustees, therefore, wish if possible to keep the capital intact. The Bill accordingly contains provision that when the time arrives that no more children are left to receive these benefits the capital sum, or investments thereof, shall be handed over to the trustees for the aged sailors and soldiers' relief fund as constituted by the West Australian Aged Sailors and Soldiers' Relief Fund Act of

1932. The provision, in brief, is that the trustees or their successors shall be allowed to use the money for the purposes set out in the Bill, and when there are no children available (estimated by the Deputy Commissioner of Repatriation-to-be in 25 years) to hand over any residue of the fund to the Aged Sailors and Soldiers' Trust Fund. I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

On motion by Hon. C. G. Latham, debate adjourned.

BILL—INSPECTION OF SCAFFOLDING ACT AMENDMENT.

Second Reading.

THE MINISTER FOR WORKS (Hon. H. Millington—Mt. Hawthorn) [4.47]: in moving the second reading said: The Bill seeks to make certain amendments to the principal Act of 1924, which has not been amended since 1930. The experience gained during the past eight years has indicated that certain amendments are essential to make the Act fully and reasonably effective, and to provide adequate protection to the large number of men engaged on building construction. The regulations dealing with the inspection of scaffolding are contained in the schedule attached to the Act. Recent developments in building construction have rendered it essential that the approval of Parliament shall be sought to the amendment of a few of the regulations, and to the insertion of another regulation dealing with a new class of scaffolding. The Minister for Works is charged with the administration of the Inspection of Scaffolding Act; the Chief Inspector of Scaffolding is in charge of the administrative detail; and the Principal Architect is the chief inspector and is assisted by three full-time inspectors. Section 5 of the principal Act provides that the Minister may, from time to time, issue certificates of approval to qualified persons to act as public inspectors of scaffolding in such localities as he may direct. Advantage has been taken of this section and the following appointees now hold office:—

The Assistant to the Principal Architect;
The Architect in charge of the Drawing Office;
District architects in the metropolitan area and at Bunbury, Geraldton and Katanning; and

Nine supervisors in charge of other districts directly under the control of the Assistant to the Principal Architect and the district architect for the metropolitan area.

In addition, there are six public inspectors holding office under the Commissioner of Railways, and two under the control of the Engineer for the North-West.

The number of inspection applications lodged during the past five years, together with the value of work carried out, are as follows:—

Year.	No. of applications.	Value of work. £
1933-34	1,596	1,096,417
1934-35	1,799	1,277,037
1935-36	2,018	2,217,380
1936-37	2,150	2,132,160
1937-38	2,230	2,026,682

I will briefly outline the effect of the principal amendments proposed in the Bill. With regard to Clause 2, the Act differentiates between works carried out in the metropolitan area and elsewhere, and defines the "metropolitan area" as that situated within the Metropolitan, the Metropolitan-Suburban and the West Provinces. In actual working, the definition has been found unsatisfactory because in one direction the area extends only eight miles from Perth, while in other directions the boundary extends to a distance of 30 miles. The boundary, where it is only eight miles from Perth, excludes such areas as Armadale, Bullsbrook, North Beach and a number of other centres where a considerable volume of building operations is in progress. The present proposal to define the metropolitan area as the whole of that comprised within a radius of 25 miles of the General Post Office, is considered will prove much more equitable and satisfactory. I have a litho. showing the existing and proposed boundaries of the metropolitan area, and I propose to lay it on the Table of the House later on.

The Act also provides that in the metropolitan area only scaffolding over 8 feet in height from the horizontal base is subject to inspection, whereas outside the metropolitan area, only scaffolding over 15 feet has to be inspected. The Bill contains an amendment, the effect of which will be that all scaffolding in the metropolitan area, irrespective of height, will be subject to inspection, whereas for districts outside the metropolitan area the present height of 15 feet will be retained. Departmental experi-

ence over many years has demonstrated that much unsatisfactory and dangerous scaffolding under 8 feet in height is utilised by builders, but as the Act stands, the inspectors are powerless to intervene for the protection of life and limb. Although unable to obtain statistics, the department is aware that many accidents have occurred as the result of the use of insufficient and defective scaffolding under 8 feet in height. On practically every building in the metropolitan area, some scaffolding is already subject to inspection under the Act, and as the fees are assessed on the total cost of a building, contractors will not be subject to the payment of any increased fees if the proposed amendment is made effective. On the other hand, the inspection of all scaffolding will undoubtedly afford workmen proper protection, to which I maintain they are justly entitled. A similar difficulty was experienced in South Australia where the Act was ultimately amended to eliminate references to a minimum height for scaffolding.

Departmental experience has demonstrated that it is necessary for all scaffolding on major works to be erected under the supervision and control of a skilled scaffolder. Many men posing as scaffolders are ignorant of the requirements of the Act and of the regulations, and have not had sufficient practical experience to be entrusted with the erection of large scaffolds, on the stability of which the lives of many workmen depend. Under the present arrangement, no one particular man is directly in charge of the scaffolding, with the result that portions of the scaffolding are removed and altered by the workmen without reference to the scaffolder until in the end the scaffolding is rendered unsafe, notwithstanding which no single individual can be held responsible. If the amendment embodied in the Bill be agreed to, it will be necessary to employ one certified scaffolder on each job. Other scaffolders could be employed under the direction of the certified man, but the latter would be responsible to the inspector for the erection and maintenance of the scaffold. This amendment will not impose any hardship or entail extra cost on the work. I am sure its adoption will provide not only for the proper protection of the workmen but also for increased efficiency from the contractor's point of view. The examination suggested in Clause 6 will be oral and is designed to make sure that the

man in charge has a proper knowledge of the regulations and possesses the necessary practical skill to admit of his being entrusted with such work. The amendment will apply only to scaffolding over 27 feet in height from the horizontal base, which means that only buildings of two-storeys in height will be subject to this provision.

Hon. C. G. Latham: Does that apply to all the amendments?

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: No, I refer to the amendment which provides that there shall be one certified scaffolder in charge of the scaffolding.

Hon. C. G. Latham: Then anyone will be able to erect a scaffold under 27 feet in height from the horizontal base.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: Yes, but above that height a certified scaffolder will have to be employed. The position in the building trade is continually becoming more complicated, and the engagement of practical men with the necessary knowledge of the requirements of the Act and of the regulations is essential and they will be held responsible. From the contractor's point of view, as well as from that of the workmen, such a provision will be beneficial. The Principal Architect and the scaffolding inspectors consider this amendment is necessary and believe that much of the present danger in the building trade will be eliminated if it is agreed to. Clause 5 represents solely a consolidation of Section 11 of the parent Act. Owing to the number of amendments made to it, the section has become rather unwieldy, and the proposed new section will merely clarify the existing position.

With regard to Clause 7, the regulations now provide that fees shall be paid on the completion of inspection, that is to say, after the construction of the building has been finished. The result is that accounts are not forwarded to the builders until the whole of the contract payments have been made. In many instances it has been found difficult and often impossible to collect the outstanding fees, with the result that the department has contracted many bad debts. The Bill proposes that the fees shall in future be paid in advance. The scaffolding fees will have to be lodged by the builder when he notifies his intention to erect scaffolding. This procedure will not only be of considerable help to the department, but also of assistance to the builders themselves. The payment of scaffolding fees will also be placed on

exactly the same basis as the payment of building permit, water, Health Act and other fees of a similar description, all of which must be paid before the various permits and licenses are issued.

Regulation 15 provides that gangways shall be two boards wide, which means about 18 inches. This is considered too narrow for most purposes on building work, and particularly where the gangways are utilised as run-ways for wheelbarrows. The amendment in the Bill proposes that a width of three boards shall be adopted, which will provide for safe working; and the additional cost will be very small. Complaints have been made to me that whereas some of the contractors are most careful in respect of these matters, others are not. Statements have also been made that where complaints are lodged, the effect has been prejudicial to the men themselves. All are in agreement that the extra provision is necessary, and now, instead of placing the responsibility on the men to lodge the necessary complaints, the duty will be imposed by the regulation. Until recently the spacing of the rungs of the ladders for the use of builders' labourers was not standardised. Different ladders on the same job had different spacing, and in some cases the spacing was different on a single ladder. Unequal spacing and wide spacing impose a very heavy strain on hod-carriers. As a result of experience, it has been found that 8½ inches is a comfortable and reasonable spacing, and practically all contractors have now brought their ladders to this standard. Therefore, if the amendment is put into force it will mean very little alteration to the existing equipment.

Regulation 19 provides that any scaffolding or gear that the inspector considers to be unfit for further use is to be marked so as to prevent its being used again, but in practice the department has found this method to be extremely unsatisfactory. It is impossible to mark much of the material utilised in connection with scaffolding, and even where it is possible to mark it, the marks are frequently obliterated or cut out, with the result that although the material has been condemned as unfit for further use, it frequently finds its way into the scaffolding. The only safe way to deal with the matter is to destroy any scaffolding or gear that is unfit for further use. The Bill provides for that. A new type of scaffolding, made of tubular steel, has lately come into vogue, and

is being utilised on a number of buildings. The existing regulations do not cover that form of scaffolding. An entirely new regulation has been framed to cover this, after careful consideration by the Principal Architect and the Chief Inspector of Scaffolding.

Mr. Warner: Is that new scaffolding being made locally?

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: I cannot say offhand. I am glad the hon. member raised the question, because it can be inquired into. There has not been an amendment of the Act for eight years, although we have received repeated requests from those engaged in the building industry that certain amendments should be made, particularly the regulation in regard to the height of scaffolding. Having made personal inquiries, I am satisfied that the amendments have become necessary, because of the height of the buildings and the complicated gear and machinery now in use. The use of modern equipment renders it essential that we should review existing legislation. If the Bill be passed, it will bring inspection of scaffolding up to date; it will correct some anomalies that exist, and will make for the safety of the workmen, and improve the conditions under which the men labour. I am hopeful, therefore, that in view of all the circumstances members will agree that the time has arrived for the alterations proposed to be made to the existing law. It is my intention to lay on the Table the litho I have here. It shows the 25-mile radius to which the Bill will apply, as against the radius as defined, under the existing Act, that is, to the area covered by the Metropolitan-Suburban, Metropolitan and West Provinces. I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

On motion by Mr. Doney, debate adjourned.

BILL—ALSATIAN DOG ACT AMENDMENT.

Returned from the Council without amendment.

BILL—MINES REGULATION ACT AMENDMENT.

Second Reading.

Debate resumed from the 6th October.

MR. LEAHY (Hannans) [5.8]: Not having been present at last Thursday's sitting, I was rather amazed to learn that a

member of this House had opposed the suggested amendment to Section 55 of the Mines Regulation Act. I was amazed for the reason that throughout the whole of the Commonwealth, and practically the whole of the industrial world to-day, a weekly or fortnightly pay is universal. Surely the hon. member who raised the objection to the proposed amendment does not really understand the conditions existing on the eastern goldfields of this State. No member of this House or another place if he possessed a thorough knowledge of the mining industry and the difficulties under which men have to work and exist, not only here but in any country where mining operations are carried on, would raise any objection to such a measure going through. The disadvantages associated with the present system of payment are many. One need only be connected in some way with the industry to realise just what those disadvantages really are. I referred to this in my maiden speech in this House, and I will not go over the same ground, except to point out the need that exists in the gold mines, as in every other industry, for a regular system of either weekly or fortnightly payment of wages. People seem to be under the impression—it is quite a wrong idea—that everyone connected with the goldmining industry in Western Australia is making wonderful money. I might remind the House that the people who do receive big money in the industry are only those who are contractors. But there are not too many contractors who make big money. I will admit that there are some parties doing so, but not many. Those parties may have a poor place to work in this month, and perhaps a better place next month; but if an average is struck it will be found that that average is not very big. The housewife on the goldfields who has a family to provide for is at a distinct disadvantage because of the existing method of payment of wages. If she has not ready cash with which to pay for her requirements, she will deal on the credit system, and we know that that means additional cost. That is the position obtaining on all the goldfields throughout the State. We are aware that at week-ends big firms put out cheap lines, and therefore it is to the advantage of the housewife that at the week-ends she should have ready cash with which to make at least some of her purchases, and in that way secure bargains that are available to others more fortunately situated. Consequently,

the sooner a weekly or fortnightly pay is introduced, the sooner will the existing difficulty on the goldfields be relieved. If the housewife had a regular fortnightly pay, she could provide many necessities for her home at the minimum cost, since she would be able to buy in the cheapest market, and in addition, perhaps, have a few shillings over, which could be put away. It must be realised that the existing position is very unsatisfactory, especially when it occasionally happens that three weeks elapse before there is a pay. An hon. member raised an objection to the proposed amendment because of the possible effect it might have on production. I assure the hon. member that he is unnecessarily alarmed; that his is a totally mistaken idea. As a matter of fact, it will be more likely to have the very opposite effect. Anyone who is associated with gold mining knows very well that at the end of a period a man who has earned good pay, has also exhausted himself. The man engaged in contract work labours exceedingly hard; with him it is not a matter of being pushed into the work, it is a question of holding him back when really he should not be working. That is entirely the result of the contract system, a system that has filled the cemeteries throughout the State with the flower of Australia's manhood. It is usually the case that if one man finds that another is earning a pound or two more, he will say to himself, "I will keep up to the other fellow;" and so he goes on until he exhausts himself. That is the position to-day on our goldfields. The contract system means death to gold miners. If we could avoid it—I do not see how we can—I feel convinced that we would be able to conserve the health of those who work in the industry. On the subject of production, I advise the hon. member who feared that the output might suffer if a fortnightly pay were instituted, that more could not be produced even if the men were paid yearly. The men do the very best they possibly can; they work very hard. They are unlike the ordinary worker who receives a daily wage. A miner has a certain amount of work to perform, and that is the minimum and it must be done. With a contractor it is different.

Mr. Sleeman: The contract system was not always like that.

Mr. LEAHY: The contract system has prevailed since I have been in the State, and I have been here for 35 years. On one occasion another system, which was even

worse, crept in. I am trying to impress upon the House that production will not be lessened; it will be increased by virtue of the fact that the men, knowing they will receive their regularly fortnightly pay, will work harder so as to secure a better return at the end of the quarter. It seems strange to me that anyone would seek to deny this privilege to miners. For the greater part of his life, the miner is denied God's good sunshine and fresh air. He is delving in the bowels of the earth like a mole. From the moment he enters the cage in the morning until he returns safely to the surface in the evening, he is toying with death. Any member who has been associated with or done a little practical mining will agree with that statement. The miner, from the moment he starts work until he knocks off, is definitely toying with death, death by fatal accident. He is also liable to serious injury. Even if he avoids injury, he will, after he has been working in the industry for a number of years, almost inevitably contract that dread scourge, miners' complaint. History throughout the world has proved that. It would be far better were he to meet with a fatal accident. Why these objections to the Bill should be raised I cannot possibly imagine. We have had no objections backed up with solid arguments to convince us that the miners should not receive a fortnightly pay. It may be news to members, but I know that many companies to-day are prepared to pay their workers in this way. Other employers, to whom the request has been made on innumerable occasions, will, of course, refuse it. I am relying upon the honesty of purpose of members of this House to stand by me in my effort to secure the passage of the Bill. I feel I am not asking anything out of the way of any member of this House when I request him to support me and not enter any objection. If a reasonable objection can be brought forward, I will debate it.

Hon. C. G. Latham: Will you tell this side of the House some of the advantages? I do not see any.

Mr. LEAHY: Yes. As a matter of fact, I have already mentioned two or three.

Hon. C. G. Latham: You told us the unfortunate side of the mining industry, but that has nothing to do with the payment of wages.

Mr. LEAHY: I mentioned the advantage it would be to the housewife. I mentioned

many other advantages that would accrue. I must leave it to the common sense of the hon. member. As a matter of fact, the hon. member likes to get his pay regularly.

Hon. C. G. Latham: I get mine once a year on the farm.

Mr. LEAHY: The hon. member gets that regularly once a year, but what does he get here?

Hon. C. G. Latham: As a matter of fact, I get my salary monthly; probably you get yours fortnightly. It makes no difference.

Mr. LEAHY: I would like the hon. member to explain whether there is any comparison between his occupation and the occupation of the miner.

Hon. C. G. Latham: You connected them. I did not.

Mr. LEAHY: The hon. member said he was paid yearly. Perhaps it would not matter if he were not paid at all. Probably he is a man of means.

The Minister for Mines: That is his trouble.

Mr. LEAHY: That is the difference. I sincerely hope that no further objection will be raised to a reasonable request such as this. Throughout the industrial world, men are paid in the way we wish miners to be paid. Those men actually sacrifice their lives; no man can question that. It has been asked, "Why do not they leave the mining industry?" But after a man has been in the industry for a few years, he feels it is not much use his trying to get out of it. That has been proved. I crave the indulgence of members not to raise futile objections. I do not know who is spurring on the Opposition members. I honestly think every member of this House conscientiously believes he will be doing the right thing if he raises no objection to the measure. I will not detain the House longer. If any member has an objection to raise, I would like him to raise it, so that it may be debated. The matter is very important and I sincerely trust the Bill will pass.

MR. NULSEN (Kanowna) [5.21]: I support the second reading of the Bill because it will be helpful to the wives of miners and to the miners themselves.

Hon. C. G. Latham: They will probably have a little less.

Mr. NULSEN: It will also be helpful to the business men.

Hon. C. G. Latham: Some business men, publicans and bookmakers.

Mr. NULSEN: I have had practical experience. It will also help the landlord. It is very convenient for people to know the exact day when they will receive their wages; the people concerned could have their accounts made up on a fortnightly basis and pay them fortnightly, and could use the balance remaining in such a way as they desired. As I said, I have had practical experience of making out fortnightly accounts. These workers are paid on the third and the eighteenth day of each month, so they practically lose a week and thus get a little behind with the payment of their accounts; and a person on wages who gets behind in that way has very little chance of picking up. I see no objection to the Bill at all. I feel sure members will pass the Bill when they have the matter put before them on a commonsense basis. I concur with all that the member for Kalgoorlie (Mr. Styants) and the member for Hannans (Mr. Leahy) have said and I shall not repeat their arguments. I sincerely trust the Bill will be passed, as the amendment will be of great assistance not only to the miners and their wives, but also to the business community.

MR. McDONALD (West Perth) [5.24]: Every member of the House would not desire to oppose any reasonable adjustment of the pay-days in the mining industry. We realise that miners follow a very arduous calling; and, if a readjustment of their pay-days will be advantageous and will not affect the industry unreasonably, there should be no opposition to the Bill. I cannot help feeling, however, that the disabilities arising from being paid on the 15th and the 30th of each month, instead of on the 14th and the 28th, have been painted rather heavily.

Mr. Styants: The miners are not paid on the 15th and the 30th.

Mr. McDONALD: I stand corrected. I do not pretend to be so well acquainted with this subject as is the member for Kalgoorlie. I understand the miners are paid twice a month.

Mr. Lambert: Some impecunious solicitors pay their staff every day.

Mr. McDONALD: Solicitors may be in a very different position; some of them may not have been paying their staff at all. The mines, fortunately, are not in that position to-day. However, if this readjustment will

assist the miners and their wives, as well as the storekeepers and the business community, then no one could reasonably object to the alteration. I would like the member for Kalgoorlie (Mr. Styants) and the member for Hannans (Mr. Leahy) to assist me on one point. Some miners work on contract and are paid according to the extent of the work that they do. To enable their wages to be ascertained, there work must be measured. If they are paid on a Friday for work done up to the Friday, would not the proposal be impracticable in their case?

Mr. Marshall: That is never done. The employers always hold three days' wages in hand.

Mr. Lambert: They often make a good guess.

Mr. McDONALD: But even a guess in the case of contract miners must take up some time.

Mr. Lambert: That is a solicitor's guess.

Mr. McDONALD: At present the pay takes place three days after the day on which the work is measured.

Mr. Marshall: That is right.

Mr. McDONALD: That period of three days enables the employer to measure the contract work and to ascertain the amount to which the worker is entitled.

Mr. Marshall: The Bill need not alter that practice.

Mr. McDONALD: Does not the Bill alter it?

Mr. Sleeman: No.

The Minister for Mines: The management will measure up the work just the same.

Mr. Marshall: They will measure it on Tuesday and pay on Fridays.

The Minister for Mines: They always keep two or three days' pay in hand so as to get the pay-sheets made up.

Mr. McDONALD: The Bill says—" . . . the wages due to all workmen employed on all mines shall be calculated up to and paid on the last Friday of each successive fortnight . . ." That means that the wages which the contract worker has earned for his contract work must be calculated up to the Friday, the last Friday of each fortnight, and paid on that day. I cannot agree with the suggestion that under the Bill any employer may calculate the contract worker's wages up to the preceding Tuesday and pay him on Friday. He could not do that.

Mr. Marshall: That is what we expect him to do.

The Minister for Mines: That is done with wages men now.

Mr. McDONALD: What I am endeavouring to explain is admitted by the interjections, that is, that three days is a reasonable time in which to allow the employer to measure up the work of contract workers, prepare the pay sheets and pay the wages. If the Bill said that, there might be no objection to it, but the Bill does not say that. The Bill says that on the Friday morning, or at a certain time on Friday, the employer shall estimate how much work the man has done. That means that the employer must measure it and then, on the same day, pay him for the work.

Mr. Lambert: That is what you do with your bills of costs. You render your bills of costs and want your money very quickly.

Mr. McDONALD: If the Minister will consult his mining colleagues, the members for Kalgoorlie and Hannans, and make that clear. I think it might remove any doubts about the Bill such as have been expressed to me. I understand that a number of the mines asked—and this may or may not be reasonable—that they should measure up the work every four weeks. They would pay the man every fortnight, but for the first fortnightly pay of the period he would receive the basic wage, or the proper wage according to the award, for the work that he had been doing. He would get the comparative or relative wage for a man doing that class of work on wages only. Then, after the measurement had been made at the end of the four weeks, any necessary adjustment would be made to give him the contract wage for the four-weekly period. That has been suggested to me, not by the Chamber of Mines, as a reasonable proposal which would give the contract worker virtually the same thing, but would not put the mines to the expense of a double estimate of work during the four-weekly period. Now the companies measure up the work once, which costs something; and under the scheme proposed they would still measure up the work once every four weeks, but the man would draw pay every fortnight, and every second fortnight his pay would be adjusted according to the measurement of the work. I am sure goldfields members would prefer some-

thing that would be workable fairly by the mines as well as being fair to the men, and I would like to see consideration given to amendment of the Bill rather on those lines. But, in any case, it appears to me that the Bill as drawn does not carry out the idea that is behind the measure, namely, to leave three days during which the work can be measured and, I suppose, in every case the pay sheets made up.

Mr. Lambert: Whose objections are you voicing? The objections of the member for West Perth?

Mr. SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. Lambert: Whose objections are you voicing?

Mr. SPEAKER: When I call for order, the member for Yilgarn-Coolgardie must immediately obey.

Mr. McDONALD: It appears to be implicitly admitted that three days is a reasonable time to allow the employer to make up wages sheets and measure the work. I have been informed that in the case of large mines a considerable time is needed to make up the wages sheets, men even working overtime to complete them in three days. However, I cannot speak of that from my own knowledge.

Hon. C. G. Latham: The quantities have to be worked out.

Mr. McDONALD: Yes; and in the case of contract men, and probably in other cases, there are variations in the wages of individual workers which have to be estimated at the end of the fortnightly period. However, it seems to be agreed that at least in the case of contract men three days should be allowed to measure up the work and make up the wages sheets. The Bill does not make that provision. If it were clearly inserted, that might go a long way to give the Minister what he wants and goldfields members what they want.

MR. RODOREDA (Roebourne) [5.34]:

It seems to me that the Leader of the National Party has put his finger on a defect in the framing of the Bill. The clause in question distinctly states that wages due to workmen shall be paid up to and paid on the last Friday of each successive fortnight. I do not know the exact meaning of the phrase "calculated up to Friday." I do not know whether that would include the Friday in the pay, or whether the pay would be up to Thursday only.

Hon. C. G. Latham: Up to Thursday night, I think.

Mr. RODOREDA: There is room for difference of opinion on that point. I hope the Minister can give an assurance that that doubt will be cleared up by an amendment in the Committee stage. If three days are necessary for the contract men, the employers can claim that the wages shall be calculated up to the end of Tuesday night, or some such time, and the wages paid up to Thursday night, but shall be paid on the Friday of each successive fortnight. I think that would meet the objections of the Leader of the National Party. I support the Bill in the anticipation that amendments will be moved in Committee to clarify the clause.

Mr. Lambert: That is the position that has been operating all the time.

MR. MARSHALL (Murchison) [5.37]: The member for West Perth (Mr. McDonald) has said that the Bill makes it obligatory to pay right up to and on to Friday. We have never intended that. The member for West Perth is entirely astray regarding the procedure adopted in the payment of miners on the goldfields. Right through the history of the goldfields and the payment of miners the companies have always held in hand two or three and sometimes four days' wages. I have worked on mines where we scratched the plates in the battery up to the sixth day in order to try to get the gold needed to pay wages. Not that that is the correct procedure. It is certainly contrary to the award, as well as to the regulation which the Bill attempts to amend. I gathered from the speech of the member for West Perth that he thinks the procedure has always been to pay miners right up to the day on which they receive their wages, that under the Bill the contract would have to be measured up, and that this requirement would make the position impossible. There the hon. member is entirely astray.

Mr. Lambert: Yes; the companies have always three days in hand before closing their accounts.

Mr. MARSHALL: The member for Yilgarn-Coolgardie is becoming almost intolerable with his continuous repetition of a mumbling statement. That has been going on for practically half an hour. Neither the member for West Perth nor I can address the Chamber. I think the member

for Yilgarn-Coolgardie should have some regard for those who take an interest in the welfare—

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! The hon. member had better get on with the Bill.

Mr. MARSHALL: What is the use, Sir, of my attempting to get on with the Bill if I am continually interfered with? If you will control the member for Yilgarn-Coolgardie—

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! I appeal to the member for Yilgarn-Coolgardie to keep order. He can appreciate exactly what the opposite attitude brings forth. I will not again appeal to the hon. member for order. He must realise that unless he remains silent in the Chamber when he is called upon to do so, that if he persists in disorderly interjections, there is no room for him in the Chamber.

Mr. MARSHALL: Let me put the member for West Perth right. The practice has always been that in the case of companies paying either wages under an Arbitration Court award or contract rates, for a delay of three or four days to occur in the payment of the wages or the contract rates. That aspect therefore does not come into the picture at all. The proposal which has been put up to the member for West Perth is not only intolerable to the miner, but is also impracticable. A contractor would be paid the Arbitration Court rate for the work he has performed during one fortnight, and then at the end of a month's service he would be paid the contract rate for the whole month after his work had been measured up. But most contractors do not remain either in one party or in one place very long. Some certainly do so, but others are mobile, moving from one place to another. It would be impracticable to assess what each man had earned in the different places.

Mr. McDonald: Has not that been done during the last few years with monthly surveys?

Mr. MARSHALL: No. Contract work has been measured up bi-monthly. Most companies pay on the 3rd and the 18th of each month. Some pay on the 4th and the 19th.

Hon. C. G. Latham: But do they measure up separately for each pay?

Mr. MARSHALL: Yes. Each party is measured up and paid in full, with the single exception that three or four days' pay is still kept in hand.

Hon. C. G. Latham: Are the men paid up to the day of measurement?

Mr. MARSHALL: Yes. The measurement is made up three days before the pay is due, and payment is made accordingly. If a man leaves or is dismissed, he goes to the office and collects what is due to him. A man commences work on, say, the 9th. The pay would be on the 3rd. That man would receive no pay at all meantime, but at the end of the next fortnight he would receive the full fortnight's pay, the company still holding three days' pay in hand.

The Minister for Mines: He could get a sub meantime.

Mr. MARSHALL: Companies are not very agreeable to granting subs. As a rule they do not like subs. The proposal submitted by the member for West Perth could not possibly be put into operation, and in any event would not be acceptable. What puzzles me more than anything is why there should be any objection to the Bill. Let me frankly confess that it involves an obligation upon the companies to measure up twice a year additionally—26 times annually instead of, as at present, 24 times. That is the only further obligation that the passing of the measure would impose on the companies. They already have their staffs to measure up and do all other work necessary for paying 24 times a year. The Bill asks that these things shall be done 26 times annually. It is correct, as stated by the member for Hannans (Mr. Leahy), that many companies have not the slightest objection to the proposal. Probably there are some that do object, not wanting to be put to the inconvenience of making two additional pays per annum.

Mr. Patrick: They have never objected to wages men being paid fortnightly.

Mr. MARSHALL: Why should the miners be singled out to receive only two pays each month when weekly pays are the order for the great mass of the workers? Why should the miners have to wait a fortnight?

Mr. Patrick: Why should contract men like shearers have to wait till the job is finished?

Mr. MARSHALL: The hon. member is speaking of contractors, financial men.

Mr. Rodoreda: They can get their money at any time they like.

Mr. MARSHALL: Contractors on the mines can pull out and get their work measured up when they like. I was referring to contractors in a big way that employ men. Taking all industries into consideration, wages are paid weekly to the great mass of workers.

The Minister for Mines: That should apply to the miners, too.

Mr. MARSHALL: No one complains of inconvenience in doing that. Yet business people might have to employ extra labour in order to pay wages weekly. Members take no exception to that, but because we ask that the mining companies provide the necessary labour to permit of two more payments being made in the year, we are told that the existing system has been operating for years and no alteration should be made. I remember when wages on the goldfields were paid on the monthly basis and the conditions then were tragic. Many people worked hard and were never paid at all. Particularly did the business people suffer. I agree that the member for West Perth is correct. If we insert the words "the Tuesday" after the words "up to," the companies would be in practically the same position as they now occupy, except that they would have to make two more pays during the year than are made at present. The people of the goldfields expect to enjoy the advantages and concessions that are given to workers in other parts of the State. The spirit of progress is apparent amongst goldfields residents. The housewives of the goldfields should be given an opportunity to purchase catch lines at the sales just as people in the city are able to do. True, as the member for Kalgoorlie (Mr. Styants) pointed out, there comes a time when the tenants of homes find themselves owing three weeks' rent and having only two weeks' pay in hand with which to meet it. That is a very unfair position in which to place them. The housewife with a family to support is obliged to spend practically every shilling to provide the necessities of life, and perhaps compulsorily or without thinking she spends the money and finds that she has an extra week's rent to meet and no money with which to pay it. The consequence is that she has to cut down on the necessities of life during the succeeding fortnight in order to make up the week's rent. If the men were paid every Friday,

they would feel secure in their financial obligations. They could take advantage of the sales that were held and business people would know exactly what they were doing. Some mining companies, if the third falls on the Saturday or the Sunday, do not pay until the following Monday, so instead of the companies holding back three days' pay, they sometimes hold five or six day's pay.

Hon. C. G. Latham: When they do that, do not they measure up accordingly?

Mr. MARSHALL: No. I have sometimes had to wait five or six days for my pay, and thus there was nearly a week's pay owing when I collected those wages. I admit that the larger companies on the Murchison are now paying on the Saturday, but some years ago they would not pay on the Saturday. The office staff finished work at 1 p.m. To retain those men later would have involved the payment of overtime. As some of the miners did not finish until 4 p.m., they could not be paid on that day, and of course the companies did not pay on Sundays. The miner is not receiving anything like fair treatment. I cannot see that the Bill will impose any severe obligation upon companies. I wish members to understand that the companies already have the requisite staff at their disposal, and I cannot believe that the alteration will involve the companies in any additional cost. Perhaps the surveyors and others who have to measure the ground will need to speed up their work slightly over the year in order to bring in two more pay days, but that is about the only difference. I suggest that the Bill is wrongly worded and that the member for West Perth is right. I hope members will support the second reading and that the amendment will be made so that the miners will be brought into line with the great mass of other workers.

THE MINISTER FOR MINES (Hon. A. H. Panton—Leederville—in reply) [5.52]: No doubt advantage might be taken of the position explained by the member for West Perth. Ever since I can remember, even in the days when as a boy I was working underground in Victoria, the two or three days' pay was kept in hand while the pay sheets were being made up. That has been the custom for 35 or 40 years. The Bill is not intended to compel measuring up and paying to the night before. If the second reading is carried, I will have the

Committee stage deferred to enable any necessary alteration to be made.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

BILL—BUREAU OF INDUSTRY AND ECONOMIC RESEARCH.

Second Reading.

Debate resumed from the 6th October.

MR. HEGNEY (Middle Swan) [5.54]: I have listened with considerable interest to the speeches made by various members. I have read the Bill and also the report of the Royal Commissioner, and have come to the conclusion that I cannot support the measure, because I believe that what the Bill sets out to do can very well be done by the existing departments. While we are all agreed that the development of secondary industries should be encouraged, I feel certain the measure will not achieve that end. The Bill proposes to do many things; it aims at accomplishing this, that and the other thing, but I fail to see how it can possibly compass the task desired by the Minister. There is no need to set up another statutory body. We have in the Government departments all the machinery necessary to do what the Minister desires shall be done. The Royal Commissioner, in his report, submitted for our consideration details of what is being done by the National Bureau of France and also what is being done in Queensland. I prefer to accept Queensland as a guide because of the disparity between the number and characteristics of the people in the two countries and the fact that France is much nearer to the markets of the world than is Australia. Even if we take Queensland as a guide, we have to bear in mind that Queensland has a population of nearly 1,000,000 souls, whereas the population of Western Australia is approximately 460,000. When we consider the question of developing industries, we should realise how limited is the local market for the purpose of consuming the goods. Therefore we should be wise to hasten slowly. Industries might be established here and might go to the wall because of lack of markets in which to sell the goods.

I suggest that to establish another statutory body such as the proposed bureau is unnecessary. I am not opposed to investigat-

ing the problems of industry; nor am I opposed to assisting industry, but I am opposed to creating a new body and superimposing it upon other departments of the State. One half of the members of the Queensland bureau are civil servants. I cannot understand why we should not follow Queensland's example and utilise our various departmental heads for this work. That would provide a body possibly much less cumbersome than that proposed in the Bill. The measure will deprive members of Parliament of a good deal of power that they now exercise. According to the Bill the bureau is to be given powers that I believe even the Minister does not possess. Under the heading "Powers and functions of the bureau," Clause 27, paragraph (c) provides that subject to the directions of the Minister the powers and functions of the bureau shall be—

To obtain from all Government departments, State instrumentalities and public officers, any information and copies of any documents which the bureau may at any time and from time to time require.

It is not competent for the Minister in charge of one department to go into another and secure such information, but the Bill proposes to give to the bureau the right to go into any department, obtain information from the officers, and secure whatever documents may be required.

Mr. Rodoreda: What objection is there to that?

Mr. HEGNEY: As a member of Parliament, I am not entitled to go to a department and demand such information as may be in its possession, although I have been elected to this Assembly by the voice of the people of my electorate. The Minister for Labour could not go into the Agricultural Department and demand the fullest information of its officers. He might ask for such information, but could not do as this Bill proposes the bureau shall do. The Bill gives the proposed body too much power, and I do not intend to support that principle. Inquiries into conditions of unemployment and the causes and extensions of unemployment are also provided for. Most of us know all about that subject, without the services of a bureau being requisitioned for the purpose. By his suggested amendment, the Minister for Employment proposes to insert a paragraph as follows:—

To co-operate with the Public Works Department of the State in the development and plan-

ning of a long-range programme of public works, and to inquire into and report upon the economic side of any works included in such programme.

Already Ministers control departments containing many expert officers, who would be able to discuss and examine any public works programme. Probably the only reason why these officers do not plan five or ten years ahead is that they know the Government does not possess the necessary finance. A bureau could tell us nothing about that. The Bill aims at the establishment of a statutory body that will lead to the creation of further official posts, involving the payment of high salaries to persons who could hardly be expected to do more than is already done by existing officials. This would react upon the workers of the State, because the payment of additional salaries would bear proportionately upon the national income. Already the workers are receiving an income lower than is received by anyone else in the community. I do not want to see too many bureaux set up with consequent high salaries to certain people, thus taking away something from the national income, and possibly preventing the workers from receiving more than they are getting to-day. The Bill proposes to assist primary industry. Surely we possess all the information required for development in that direction. The State has expended vast sums on the development of various primary industries. Our principal difficulty is to find markets for the commodities we produce. We have public officers who are competent to disseminate amongst those concerned considerable knowledge dealing with primary industries. If markets can be found in which to sell our primary products, finance will soon be made available, and those engaged in the industries concerned will become prosperous again. Already they can get all the advice and help they require. Neither Parliament nor the Government needs very much more information than is already available through official channels. The greatest obstacle seems to be finance. If money and markets could be made available, there would be no great need for additional expert advice. Members of Parliament, it is said, are not competent to offer advice on these subjects, that they have not the time to devote to such matters, that they are unable to concentrate upon them, and have done little or nothing

for the development of the State. Such an opinion is contrary to the facts. The history of this Parliament shows that it has been the means of establishing many valuable industries in Western Australia. Several important activities within the State were initiated by a Labour Government, and have led to the employment of large numbers of people. The State Quarry, in my electorate, has given employment to many men for a number of years. This industry helps to supply the needs for road building, ballasting of the railways, etc. The State brick-yards have been in competition with private enterprise, and have held their own. Side by side with these has been the development of the Workers' Homes Board, which utilises the bricks manufactured by the State. The State Sawmills have been severely criticised by members opposite. That undertaking was established by a Labour Government. It has brought a great deal of revenue into the State, has survived all competition, and is a credit to its administrators. I am pleased to say that undertaking was also initiated by a Labour Government, and it has been the means of employing many hundreds of workers. To say that Parliament has not helped in the development of State industries is not in accordance with fact.

Mr. Doust: That was not developing a new industry.

Mr. HEGNEY: It might not have been a new industry, but the State activity greatly assisted in its development. The Bill provides for the fostering of existing industries, and the development of new ones. I have referred to those that have been initiated by Labour Governments and passed by Parliament. The State Sawmills supply sleepers for the railways and for the tramways. They have been the means of developing markets throughout the world for our timbers—markets in South Africa, Ceylon and England. Karri has been exported in considerable quantities. Some years ago the streets of London were paved with wood blocks from Western Australia. So it will be seen that a market exists for our timber. The industry was undoubtedly developed by a Labour Government. Parliament also authorised the building of numerous railways throughout the State, the work being carried out by the Public Work Department. The undertakings meant the employment of large bodies of men, and the policy

received the support of all parties in the House. There has been continued activity in railway development, with consequent employment for many people. The Fremantle Harbour was developed by Governments with the authority of Parliament. It is reputed to be one of the most effective and economical harbours in Australia. I recently visited several of the Australian harbours, and I found that from the point of view of the handling of goods, etc., Fremantle harbour is second to none in the Commonwealth. Employment is given at Fremantle to large numbers of people. Many years ago the tramway system was owned by private enterprise, but was subsequently taken over by the State. To-day the State has complete control of the tramways, and gives employment to many workers. Members of this Assembly and of another place had the opportunity to express their views on all these undertakings. The result has been that great activity has been witnessed throughout the State. I fail to see why Parliament should not continue to carry out similar activities, and why we should not extend our activities by bringing further national industries into being. Another undertaking was the Goldfields Water Supply Scheme, and other water schemes for the development of country districts. These enterprises, too, have been carried out by the Public Works Department, and have led to the employment of large numbers of men. Associated with the railway system are the Midland Junction Workshops, where 1,500 men are engaged. Many important engineering feats are carried out there. The establishment can hold its own with probably any other engineering works in Australia. The Midland Railway Company is an active organisation, although there is no comparison between the State instrumentality and the private company. I know that, because I have worked for both concerns. A Labour Government established the State Implementation Works, which did enormous good for the State whilst it operated. That undertaking met with a good deal of opposition in Parliament, but carried out many necessary works in connection with harbour development, repairs to vessels, etc. Eventually it was killed through lack of support on the part of those who should have known better. The works, too, employed a number of people. Several other industries were established by the authority of Parliament. These

were inaugurated by various Ministers on the advice of departmental experts, and administered by competent officials.

Sitting suspended from 6.15 to 7.30 p.m.

Mr. HEGNEY: Before the tea adjournment I was referring to industries in which the State takes a prominent part, and which were initiated by this Parliament through Ministers of the various departments. I wish to supplement that list with one or two additional examples. There are the activities of the mining industry, and we all know what the State has done to help that industry by State batteries and by assistance under the Mines Development Act. Those activities continue to function. I instance them as showing that through the activities of members of Parliament elected by the people, and through the activities of Ministers in the various departments, a larger measure of employment has been created. I need only glance at the activities of the Agricultural Bank. Everyone is aware what that institution has meant to primary industries throughout the length and breadth of Western Australia. The Agricultural Bank Act emanated from the Legislative Assembly. It had in view a definite purpose, the development of the agricultural industry by assisting persons willing to enter it. The result has been the supply of our people's domestic needs and the creation of surpluses for export oversea. Being a small community, we have been engaged chiefly in primary production. We are able to supply our own needs and to sell our surpluses abroad.

Hon. P. D. Ferguson: I wish we could!

Mr. HEGNEY: We have been able to do it, though latterly at low prices. The fact remains that we are able to sell our primary products in oversea markets. Although prices are against us now and our producers do not receive the value of their labour, yet on the average over the years we have been able to sell our surpluses abroad at favourable prices. As much can hardly be said of our secondary industries. Save in very few instances, we are unable to sell their surpluses beyond our borders. While we are able to supply our local needs, the keenness of eastern Australian competition has prevented us from exporting surpluses in that direction. We all desire to establish secondary industries, but I do not think the Bill will have any such effect. Its

object may be all right, but no facts have been submitted to us to show what industries are likely to be brought into being as the result of passing the Bill. With reference to the case of Queensland, no such information has been given to us.

Mr. Lambert: What about your people at Bassendean?

Mr. HEGNEY: The Bassendean people depend almost entirely on the demands of the mining industry. Most of their products are sold to mining companies. The products of Hadfields are disposed of to that industry. Labour Governments have sought to bring into being activities for the treatment of certain products in this State, but those proposals have not received the approval of Parliament. Some years ago an effort was made to establish freezing works at Fremantle, and a good deal of money was spent on the project without the authority of Parliament. Unfortunately the State eventually had to step in and buttress this private venture. The same remarks apply to the Carnarvon freezing works. Those works were established by private enterprise, and unfortunately they had to be dismantled and taken down.

The Premier: The Government put in money there.

Mr. HEGNEY: Yes, and the Government lost it. That was an instance in which the Government supported private enterprise. However, I have given instances in which the State has taken the lead. Very few of the cases in which industries have been created by the State itself have proved failures. Most of them to-day are buoyant and prosperous and functioning well—giving considerable employment to those who work in them. Again, the Wyndham Freezing Works were established by a Labour Government. If they have not paid directly, over the years they have done a great deal for the development of the North-West. They have proved an immense help to cattle producers in the North. Even the Commonwealth Government through its Minister, Mr. McEwen, has indicated readiness to help the enterprise by having cattle overlanded for treatment there. Works started by Labour Governments and initiated by Labour Ministers have been the source of a great deal of employment. In the case of the Wyndham Meat Works, workers go north every year to work in them.

The Premier: Cannot we do a bit better, though?

Mr. HEGNEY: Possibly we can. There was no necessity, however, to do all this through the establishment of a statutory body. The Government is elected by the people, and it is the Government's duty to carry on the State departments and develop industries on the lines I have indicated.

The Premier: Suppose we did twice as much for the benefit of the State?

Mr. HEGNEY: We might or we might not. In my opinion that is a task that should be undertaken by a Minister of the Crown who is responsible to Parliament. The task has been set for Ministers and they can re-double their efforts to secure the development of secondary industries within the State. In speaking along these lines, I am endeavouring to answer the argument that members of Parliament are not capable of doing the work.

The Premier: That is not the argument.

Mr. HEGNEY: Possibly the Premier was not present when that argument was advanced.

Mr. Lambert: No one suggested that.

Mr. HEGNEY: Parliament at times appoints select committees to inquire into problems that are vital to the welfare of the State. The suggestion might be advanced that members of Parliament do not possess the expert knowledge requisite for such a purpose, or that they are not well informed on the issues involved. The fact remains that matters of vital importance to the State are so investigated by members of Parliament. Witnesses are called and ultimately reports are presented to Parliament. The fact is generally accepted that those reports are logical and the recommendations are of substance. Such reports, for the most part, are adopted by Parliament. The member for Claremont (Mr. North) drew an analogy between the proposed bureau and the Main Roads Board. The latter represents a form of activity altogether different from that contemplated in the Bill. The Main Roads Board has a definite task.

Mr. Hughes: And it is administrative.

Mr. HEGNEY: There is a Commissioner of Main Roads and certain funds are allotted for his purposes. He has expert engineers and the road requirements of the State are reported upon and construction carried out where deemed necessary.

Mr. North: You approve of that body?

Mr. HEGNEY: But the engineers report on proposals for the construction of roads that are required, and the Commissioner has

funds at his disposal for the purpose of carrying out work that is decided upon. That represents a definite task, something quite tangible. On the other hand, the proposed bureau will deal more with the theoretical side of problems presented to it. No evidence has been submitted to us to indicate the possibility of any industry being established as the result of the functioning of the bureau. We have not been informed of such a result following upon the establishment of a bureau in Queensland. There is a striking contrast between Queensland and Western Australia because the former State is closer to the dense population of eastern Australia. The surplus goods produced in the Eastern States are dumped here and the Commonwealth Constitution contains no provision enabling that practice to be prevented. Secondary industries in this State cannot compete with the goods dumped here from the Eastern States, and many have been forced out of existence. I suggest that the policy Western Australia should pursue is to bring pressure to bear on the Commonwealth Government to prevent the dumping of Eastern States' surplus goods, thereby creating so much unfair competition.

The Premier: How can we find out all these facts?

Mr. HEGNEY: The facts are known, and were presented to the Commonwealth Grants Commission.

The Premier: Some of them.

Mr. HEGNEY: We have irrefutable facts with which to establish the difficulties confronting Western Australia under this heading. I fail to see how the establishment of the proposed bureau will affect that issue. The existing position will continue irrespective of what the bureau may be or what recommendations it may present. Our difficulties are almost insuperable. Our distance from the Eastern States furnishes another reason why we have been unsuccessful in securing the establishment of secondary industries in Western Australia. Efforts have been made to induce the Commonwealth Government to spend some of its financial resources on the manufacture of munitions in Western Australia, but success was not achieved. The member for Fremantle (Mr. Sleeman) has endeavoured to secure the construction of a graving dock at Fremantle, where repair work could be carried out on ships that required docking.

Mr. Sleeman: We still live in hopes of success.

Mr. HEGNEY: The hon. member has a long struggle ahead of him yet. All his persuasive powers will be required over a period of years before a graving dock is established at Fremantle. Quite 20 years have elapsed since we thought one would be established in Cockburn Sound, but to-day we are no nearer the consummation of our hopes than before.

Hon. P. D. Ferguson: This bureau may secure its construction.

Mr. HEGNEY: Another objection that I have to the Bill is that the Labour Party, during various Federal election campaigns, has condemned the activities of the Bruce-Page Government and succeeding Nationalist-Country Party Governments in relegating to boards the powers of Parliament. I sincerely ~~hope the members~~ of the present State Government will not follow the bad example of the Federal Government. All Labour members, in common with myself, have denounced the practice of creating a multiplicity of boards to carry out functions proper to established Governments, and that in itself furnishes a strong argument against the Bill receiving the approval of Parliament. The Premier is honest in his intentions and sincerely believes that the bureau, if established, will prove effective. In his criticism of the Bill, the Leader of the Opposition said that if the bureau were established, political friends of the Government would receive appointments. I do not believe that for one moment. The hon. member's criticism was ungenerous, and surely the Bill can be criticised without stooping to political suggestions of that description. I have given the Bill much consideration, and I am convinced that all that is desired could be just as effectively carried out by the organisation existing to-day. A former Labour Minister for Industry was responsible for establishing the Council for Industrial Development. That body has done excellent work, and I understand is still pursuing its objective. The present Minister, to the best of his ability, is endeavouring to develop a psychology in our midst that will encourage the purchase of local goods. Nevertheless, that desire does not exist. Many people totally disregard local products, although in many instances they are better than the imported article. Difficulty is experienced in selling goods manufactured within the State, and yet, to some degree, our surplus production in some lines is exported to the East-

ern States, where a ready sale is forthcoming. When he moved the second reading of the Bill, the Minister for Employment submitted a list of various items imported from the Eastern States and the value disclosed was approximately £12,000,000. He suggested many of the articles could be produced in Western Australia. That may be, or may not be so.

The Premier: Oh, surely!

Mr. HEGNEY: Many of the articles could not possibly be produced here, because we have not the industries capable of manufacturing them. The member for North-East Fremantle certainly does not agree with that. If we were to start an iron and steel industry here, we would have to meet the competition of the Broken Hill Proprietary Co. That company has huge steel works established at Newcastle which can compete with the whole of Australia. Therefore, to establish that industry in this State would be very difficult.

Member: We could make our own steel.

Mr. HEGNEY: But we could not export it to adjacent countries.

Mr. Marshall: We could sell it locally.

Mr. HEGNEY: The steel industry means a great deal to Newcastle. Fortunately, the coal to produce the power required by the works is mined on property adjacent to the works. The company employs a large number of men. Young men leave this State to go to eastern Australia.

The Premier: What are you going to do about that?

Mr. Lambert: You are driving them out of the country.

Mr. HEGNEY: I once heard a tale of a crow and some magpies. The magpies were attacking the crow, who said, "One at a time." I will meet my interjectors one at a time.

Several members interjected.

Mr. HEGNEY: Much of the steel manufactured at Newcastle finds its way into this State. I do not think it possible to establish a similar industry in this State for many years to come. In any case, the services of a bureau of industry would not be required to establish such an industry. We have experts here. The matter is one entirely of funds. Unfortunately, the engineering industry here is not very extensive; and if we started large works here, we would have no market for our product, so the works would have to close down. A parallel case is that

of the manufacture of boots. The boot factories in the Eastern States can produce all the boots required in Australia in three months of the year, and close their factories for nine months. During that time the operatives could walk about.

Mr. Lambert interjected.

Mr. HEGNEY: The hon. member knows nothing about it. I have submitted my view and shall be pleased to hear what the member for Yilgarn-Coolgardie has to say on the Bill. I do not intend to support it, as I think we can manage just as well under existing conditions.

Mr. Lambert: By staying where we are.

MR. DOUST (Nelson) [7.56]: I intended at first not to support the Bill, but after listening to the member for Swan and the arguments put forward this evening, I am confident the Bill is urgently required.

Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. DOUST: The statement has been made that the annual cost of the bureau will be high. The members who made that statement probably jumped at conclusions, because nothing in the Bill, so far as I can see, would lead one to that decision. The main reason for the statement that the cost would be high is the fact that at least nine members will be appointed to the bureau. Their remuneration, however, will not be determined until they are engaged. The members would represent certain specified industries, such as the mining industry, the agricultural industry, and some of our bigger undertakings. Probably representatives of the consumers will be on the board; after listening to one of the speeches this evening, I think that would be a wise step. At least one or two members of Parliament should be co-opted, and they would receive no salary at all.

Mr. Lambert: What?

Mr. DOUST: The question has also been asked, where are we to get the money to start new industries? The State for a long time past has been borrowing annually sums varying from 1½ to three million pounds. So far as one can judge at present, we shall have to continue to borrow annually to the same extent for a number of years. In the earlier days money was borrowed for the purpose of constructing reproductive public works, and the people were given to understand that those works would produce suffi-

cient to pay interest and provide a sinking fund. Few works of that nature are being constructed to-day. We are actually now borrowing money merely to keep our people in employment. If we could place the 6,000 odd men now on sustenance in some remunerative employment, the Government could carry on quite easily without further borrowings for a number of years. That, I understand, is the object of the Bill, to ascertain what new industries can be opened up that will absorb our unemployed.

Mr. Lambert: We could establish a hundred industries in this State to-morrow.

Mr. DOUST: It has been said that to find new works or industries that could be commenced here is almost impossible. The member for Middle Swan (Mr. Hegney) mentioned that nothing had been said about the industries which it was proposed to start. The Minister, when introducing the Bill, said that we imported goods to the value of 13½ million pounds per annum. Surely we could set aside some part of that vast sum of money to establish works to produce some of the commodities which we are importing.

Hon. C. G. Latham: Do you think it would help if that paper-pulp mill were established?

Mr. DOUST: I will mention that directly. If out of the millions of pounds we spend on imports we could provide a sum sufficient to pay the 6,000 men on sustenance £3 a week, surely we could establish new industries. These men might be paid half wages for the first five or ten years. That would be a big saving to the State, which would not have to pay the men sustenance. The Government could pay a bonus to the new industries to ensure that the men should receive at least £3 a week.

Mr. Lambert: And exempt the industries from taxation for ten years!

Mr. DOUST: The industries could be subsidised to meet the interest payments on loans required to start them. Money might be found on the pound for pound basis so that fresh industries could be commenced. No matter what view we take of the subject or from what aspect we approach it we find scope in plenty for a bureau such as this. Members have contended that these industries could be investigated by the secretaries of the various departments, as well as by a committee made up of members of Parlia-

ment. Both suggestions are ridiculous. For example, how could a committee of members be expected to report on the advisability of establishing, locally, certain industries that are already in full swing in the Eastern States? Neither would it be possible for the under secretaries of departments to make investigations of that kind. If they were able to undertake such work it would only be because they had not sufficient official work of their own to do, and I cannot believe that that is the case.

Mr. Lambert: Specialised knowledge is required in these matters. That would not be the work of an under secretary.

Mr. DOUST: Members have expressed the fear that the bureau would deprive Parliament of a certain amount of power. I cannot read into the Bill anything that would authorise the director to commence a new industry. I take it that all recommendations would first be brought before Parliament, and be considered by members before a new enterprise was embarked upon. If that were not so I would raise some objection to that portion of the Bill.

Mr. Thurn: You can rest assured it is not so.

Mr. DOUST: I have expressed my view. Much has been said about State enterprises being in competition with private undertakings. That is outside the scope of the Bill. I do not consider that it in any way presupposes the establishment of further State enterprises. The bureau would suggest to Parliament the best means of assisting new enterprises so that the citizens of the State might have presented to them more opportunities of entering into profitable lines of industry. The Government is the biggest employer of labour, because it has the handling of the largest amount of money. If new industries could be established here they would tend to reduce the volume of imports of produce, food, etc., now being brought into the State, and should these be brought into being as a result of the activities of the bureau its establishment would be fully justified. Members pointed to works that have been undertaken or assisted by the Government, though subsequently they have failed. Is that not another good reason for establishing a bureau that would advise the Government before it assisted any existing enterprise or helped in the establishment of any new one? Possibly had the institution been in existence the mis-

takes referred to would never have been made, and the State would have been better off than it is to-day.

Mr. Lambert: As, for instance, the 3,500 farm scheme in my electorate.

Mr. DOUST: Seeing that upwards of £13,500,000 worth of goods and commodities generally are imported into Western Australia annually, I claim that whatever Parliament can do to counter such a drift is worth the expenditure of a few thousand pounds. The money would be spent on the appointment of a director, and a certain number of scientific men possessed of the requisite knowledge, who would be able to advise concerning any industry it might be desired to exploit, and it would be well spent in such directions. The member for Middle Swan (Mr. Hegney) and other members stated that a committee made up of members of this House could report either for or against this, that, or the other industrial activity. During the last six months efforts have been made to establish pulp and paper mills at Pemberton. I am informed that a company could have been formed with a capital of £300,000 and that this sum had actually been underwritten. These concerned needed a certain amount of Government assistance for the first four years. Because of the number of men who would have been employed in the new industry a saving of outlay by the Government on unemployment to the extent of £60,000 or £70,000 per annum would have been effected, and yet the amount of assistance required would not have been equal to more than a third of that sum. I claim that the industry would have been of great advantage to the State and the district, especially if it had been established by means of foreign capital. It would have been in opposition to similar industries in the Eastern States, but would certainly have supplied our own requirements. Western Australia would have derived great benefit from such an enterprise, which would have assisted the Government materially to reduce its expenditure on sustenance. Are members capable of reporting upon an undertaking of that nature? An expert came out from Sweden and went thoroughly into the whole business. Members would have no knowledge of that sort of thing. I cannot conceive of any committee of this House possessing sufficient knowledge to enable it to make recommendations of the nature required.

Mr. Lambert: Members are usually the highest authorities.

Mr. DOUST: I do not consider that I suffer from an inferiority complex, but it would be with very grave misgivings that I accepted any position on a committee of the kind suggested. If every member were honest with himself he would say the same thing. Scientific men are required to advise the Government on all such questions. I trust that the Bill will have a satisfactory passage. For the good of the State as a whole, I hope that the second reading will be agreed to, and that any amendments considered necessary will be made in Committee.

MR. RODOREDA (Roebourne) [8.11]: Most of the opposition to this Bill seems to be based on the assumption that for a start it is unnecessary; then, if it is necessary, the bureau will cost too much; that anyhow we can do nothing, but if conceivably we can do something, we are the people to do it. I think that fairly summarises the opposition to the Bill. Apparently, most members are suffering from a superiority complex. According to them, we have all the time required to investigate the hundred and one avenues of employment that should be available in this State, to consider the vast mass of statistics at hand, and to decide all the issues involved in a decision such as would be reached by the proposed bureau. We have been told to look at the select committees we appoint. I ask members to consider the result of the efforts of those select committees. What good has any select committee appointed by this House ever done? I do not know of any good that has arisen out of the report of any select committee.

Hon. C. G. Latham: And yet you will keep on supporting their appointment.

Mr. RODOREDA: I voted against one select committee and, as a punishment, the House made me a member of it. I realise the futility of select committees. To get five members of this House to meet as a select committee on a certain date and at a certain time is almost an impossibility. That being so, how on earth we are going to get eight or nine members of this House to undertake the full-time job of investigating all the avenues into which such a bureau would have to delve is beyond me.

Mr. North: Why is a bureau necessary in Queensland?

Mr. RODOREDA: Undoubtedly the Government in proposing the formation of this bureau desired to ascertain what could be done to assist secondary industry in this State. That to me is the real purport of the Bill. Practically no assistance has been given to secondary industry here. The member for Middle Swan (Mr. Hegney) says, "It is of no use giving assistance to secondary industry. We cannot do anything: we have not the population, so we might as well sit down and let things go as they have been going."

Hon. C. G. Latham: On every bit of financial assistance given to secondary industry, the Government has lost money.

Mr. RODOREDA: The explanation is that that assistance would probably not have been given had there been a bureau in existence to obtain the necessary information beforehand. On that point the member for Middle Swan quoted an imposing list of works that had been established by the authority of Parliament. But none of those works represented new industries. The hon. member quoted brickworks and sawmills. Such industries, to my mind, are beyond the scope of this measure. We do not import bricks and we import very little timber. The bricks had to be made here. Whether they were made in one factory or another did not affect the total volume of employment. The same number of bricks had to be produced and the same number of men had to be employed. They were not new industries. Doubtless quite a lot of new industries could be established with the help of the bureau, but quite a lot would have no hope of surviving unless the Government, on the advice of the bureau, gave them assistance.

Hon. C. G. Latham: What sort of assistance would they get?

Mr. RODOREDA: Monetary assistance for one thing.

Hon. C. G. Latham: Where would the Government get the money?

Mr. RODOREDA: That is the same old cry. Where do we get the money every year? The Government has spent millions of money on the primary industries of this State.

Hon. C. G. Latham: You mean the Government takes millions out of it.

Mr. RODOREDA: The various Governments have put millions of money into primary industry. Compared with that expenditure, the assistance given to secondary industry is nothing at all.

Mr. Seward: What are you talking about?

Mr. RODOREDA: The time has arrived when we should review the position and establish a bureau or some such body to ascertain the practicability of establishing new industries, to determine whether they are deserving of assistance, and, if so, to what extent. I view the granting of such assistance to secondary industries in the same light as I would a tariff. In the early days of the Eastern States, people did not sit down and say they could not compete with English or American goods. They did not adopt the attitude that they would be unable to manufacture in competition with the imported goods and so should do nothing. The wise men of the East had another plan. They built a protective wall and their industries were able to flourish within the shelter of that wall. Unfortunately, we cannot help our industries by imposing a tariff on imports, but we can do it by this indirect method. We can subsidise industries deserving of assistance against dumping from the Eastern States.

Hon. C. G. Latham: We cannot subsidise them.

Mr. RODOREDA: Of course we can.

Hon. C. G. Latham: No, we cannot.

The Premier: What do we do with the agricultural industry? We spend a hundred thousand pounds a year through one department.

Hon. C. G. Latham: You may make advances.

The Premier: The Department of Agriculture spends £100,000 a year in giving advice.

Hon. C. G. Latham: That is not subsidising industry.

The Premier: But it is helping primary industry.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. RODOREDA: I firmly believe, with the member for Middle Swan, that there is very little chance of most secondary industries surviving without monetary assistance at the inception. We have to consider the ultra-conservatism of consumers, particularly of foodstuffs. People become accustomed to using a certain brand of commodity and it is the devil's own job to get them to change to some other brand, no matter how good the competing brand may be. We have to combat that conservatism before we shall be able to establish any secondary industries dealing with foodstuffs. Still, I maintain that our factories can be put on

such a basis that they will be able to produce goods of quality and keep operating over a period of years. We shall overcome the difficulty. People will realise that the goods produced here are of a quality equal to that of goods imported from the Eastern States, and we shall have our own market for our own goods. The rising generation will be accustomed to our own products. Consider the tobacco industry. Most people of our generation who were accustomed to the imported leaf do not like local tobacco because they have a taste for the imported article.

Mr. Sampson: Poor things! A lot of them have got used to it.

Mr. RODOREDA: With the rising generation that does not hold good, and it is one direction in which the bureau could advise the Government. Power is given to the Government to assist secondary industry, but the whole idea so far has been that primary industry is all we are bound to assist, and the primary producers regard such assistance as a right. Any suggestion to the contrary is met with a storm of disapproval. The time has arrived when we should get away from that idea. As regards preference to local tenderers for Government requirements, we know that the Tender Board does grant a certain preference to local manufacturers. However, it is slight, and is not based upon any special inquiry into each particular tender. There is merely a preference of 10 or 12 per cent. It would repay the State to grant even 15 per cent. or still greater preference to local tenderers for certain lines of manufacture. Water meters, for example, will always be required; and if we got a plant for their manufacture established, the local article would be able to hold its own against subsequent competing tenders from other States. That position also should be investigated. Every item ought to be treated on its merits. Investigation should not be on the lines members of Parliament might adopt, but on the lines of facts and statistics, and all costs, in particular, should be gone into thoroughly. I do not for a second believe that members of Parliament would have the necessary time or, in many cases, the special ability required for such investigations. Certain industries undoubtedly need to be investigated. The fishing industry is one. What do members of Parliament know about that industry? What advice could they give the Government in regard to it? True, we often hear of

members of Parliament going on fishing expeditions, but that is not the kind of fishing I have in mind.

Mr. Rodoreda: We had State fish shops here 20 years ago.

Mr. RODOREDA: The turtle industry also needs investigation. The demand for turtle products is world-wide. The market is always crying out for those products, but they are not obtainable. Four or five companies have tested the turtle industry on the North-West coast. Everything seems to be favourable, but yet through lack of needful information all the companies proved unsuccessful. Now another company is trying on different lines, after obtaining scientific advice from America. The earlier companies ought not to have failed, for there were ample supplies of turtle, and a strong demand for the products. The companies did not succeed simply for want of concrete information which could have been supplied by a bureau such as the Bill suggests. The member for Nelson (Mr. Doust) referred to a paper mill being started in Western Australia. I had a part in trying to persuade the Government to assist the industry; but, probably because of want of detailed scientific information on the subject, the Minister was compelled to recommend that assistance be not granted. Probably, had there been in existence a bureau such as the Bill proposes, to examine the position, the application might have received favourable consideration. What makes me hold that view is that in spite of all the opposition offered by representatives of Australian Paper Mills, Ltd. to a similar proposal in South Australia, the South Australian Government not only assisted the scheme but took £100,000 worth of shares in it. That Government, therefore, must see some benefit in the proposal. I may add that the proposition submitted here was on lines far more favourable to the Government and the State than the South Australian proposal is.

Hon. C. G. Latham: And yet our Government turned it down.

Mr. RODOREDA: Because it had no one to advise it. That is why I want the bureau established. What does a Minister know about the establishment of a paper mill or the scientific production of paper? And where, at present, could he get information on the subject in this State? No one in this

House could give it, not even the member for East Perth. The member for Middle Swan (Mr. Hegney) made a great song about the powers to be given to the bureau. One power actually is to go into Government departments and demand documents. What a power! I would not like to give that power to some members of Parliament, by the way.

Mr. Thorn: You might apply that remark to yourself.

Mr. RODOREDA: Too right! I have not a superiority complex. The power to inspect documents is not extraordinary. If by exercising that power the bureau could gain the information it needed, I would say it was a very wise power to grant. Reference has been made to the cost of the bureau. That is all supposition, of course. Unfortunately, the Minister has not given us any idea of the estimated or contemplated cost. I hope he will do so when replying, for, after all, that aspect does concern the Chamber. We do not wish to give the Minister an open cheque to spend whatever amount he may think fit. We ought to have some idea of the expense involved. In any case, whatever the bureau would cost. I should say the expense would be more than repaid by the advantages the State would gain from having more men employed in secondary industries of our own.

The member for Nelson touched on a point with which I would like to conclude. In this State the position is rapidly arising that the Government will be hard put to it to discover new works on which to expend loan moneys—that is to say, new works which will be of benefit to the State in the years to come. It is nearly an impossible task now to find such works. No member of this Chamber can suggest any of magnitude. We are faced with the position of having to keep men employed doing work just for the sake of being kept at work. If some loan moneys were spent in subsidising secondary industries which would employ these men on the production of goods that would probably recoup at least 50 per cent. of the wages, would not that be a good proposition? Far better than keeping them just employed in order to give them something to do by way of earning the money paid to them for relief work.

I trust the House will cast an affirmative vote on this measure, even if the Bill has to be amended in Committee. It would be scandalous to say that we will do nothing, but will let the situation continue as it has been for the last three or four years, without our making any attempt whatever to enable Western Australia to supply the £10,000,000 or £11,000,000 worth of goods which we import annually from the Eastern States. We can produce those goods here. We have the men, and the ability; and we can get the necessary finance. There is no reason at all why the bulk of our imports should not be greatly reduced once the proposed bureau gets to work and obtains sound, solid information for the Government, enabling it to subsidise industries for which there is a local market and which deserve encouragement.

MR. SEWARD (Pingelly) [8.29]: Practically all I wish to say on the measure is that I am opposed to it. Still, such extraordinary statements have been made during the course of the debate that I feel I must take the opportunity to say something in criticism of them. I was sorry when the Minister introduced the Bill, because his action seemed to indicate that he regarded this phase as the most important of the recommendations made by the Royal Commissioner who inquired into the problems of youth unemployment. Admittedly the youth of to-day are denied opportunities in life that in previous years could be availed of. Apparently, in the opinion of the Minister, the most important thing to do is to institute some more inquiries. To anyone who has read the Royal Commissioners' report, the exhaustive nature of the inquiries he carried out must be fairly evident. When the member for Swan (Mr. Sampson) interjected with regard to the necessity for revising the regulations governing apprenticeship matters, the Minister did not seem favourably impressed. Nevertheless, I regard that question as of vital importance in the problem of improving the position of our youth. As the Leader of the Opposition pointed out, the purpose of the Bill is simply to duplicate an already existing service. I need hardly remind members that recently the executive head of the Council for Scientific and Industrial Research, Sir David Rivett, visited Western Australia and said that the object of his visit arose from in-

structions given to the C.S.I.R. to conduct investigations regarding secondary industries such as that body had formerly instituted regarding our primary industries.

The Minister for Employment: Nothing of the kind.

The Premier: Of course not.

Mr. SEWARD: If the Minister has not read what Sir David Rivett said, I will send to him the report dealing with the matter.

The Minister for Mines: He said nothing of the kind.

The Minister for Employment: And I had a discussion with him for more than 40 minutes.

Mr. SEWARD: I certainly read that statement.

The Minister for Employment: You should not misrepresent the position.

Mr. SEWARD: I have no desire to misrepresent the position, but it is a fact that the C.S.I.R. is now turning its attention to secondary industries.

The Minister for Employment: Nothing of the kind.

Mr. Patrick: That statement appeared in the Press.

The Minister for Mines: Then the Press statement was wrong.

Mr. SEWARD: If the Minister asserts that the statement attributed to Sir David Rivett was wrong, I accept his denial; but that statement certainly did appear in the Press. The point I wish to make is that the Council of Scientific and Industrial Research has carried out valuable work in connection with our primary industries, and I am confident that when it turns its attention to our secondary industries, equally valuable work will be carried out.

The Premier: If it will do so.

Mr. SEWARD: Even so, in carrying out inquiries regarding primary industries, the Council of Scientific and Industrial Research stipulated that investigations would not be carried out regarding any form of primary industry where such investigation overlapped similar activities by another body. The Premier will remember that. We may reasonably suppose, therefore, that in investigating secondary industries, the Council of Scientific and Industrial Research will again make that condition, and will not conduct inquiries in avenues already the subject of investigation by others.

The Premier: And if the Council of Scientific and Industrial Research will not do that, will you support the Bill?

Mr. SEWARD: I will not.

The Premier: If it is proved that you are wrong in your statement, will you support the Bill?

Mr. SEWARD: No.

The Premier: There you are!

Mr. SEWARD: I will not do so, because I have other objections.

The Premier: You say it is a good thing that the Council of Scientific and Industrial Research can carry out this work, but what if it will not do so?

Mr. SEWARD: If the Premier will be patient, I will make the position clear. I have pointed out that the Council of Scientific and Industrial Research laid it down that inquiries would not be made where they represented a duplication of effort. The Council of Scientific and Industrial Research has the money, the staff, and the necessary buildings and equipment.

Mr. Cross: How many officials are on the Council of Scientific and Industrial Research staff?

Mr. SEWARD: The Council of Scientific and Industrial Research is able to conduct various inquiries.

Mr. Cross: How many are on the staff?

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! This sparring will have to cease.

Mr. SEWARD: The Council of Scientific and Industrial Research is equipped to conduct the inquiries into matters referred to it.

The Premier: And if the Council of Scientific and Industrial Research does not do it, we are not to do it.

Mr. SEWARD: For the reasons I have advanced, I shall oppose the Bill. During the course of his remarks, the Minister said—

The condition of our primary industries today is precarious. That condition has been brought about not because of any lack of production in our own country or of any lack of effort on the part of our own people, but only because of dangerous policies and the unsettled conditions existing in other countries of the world.

I do not think exception can be taken to the Minister's statement regarding dangerous policies; yet when the member for Roebourne (Mr. Rodoreda) was speaking, he gave me the impression that he paid very little attention to such dangerous policies. What the Minister referred to was, I assume, the bolstering up of industries, particularly our secondary industries, to such an extent that to-

day those associated with primary production are unable to pay the price demanded for the products of secondary industries. For years past, Country Party members have been pointing out that, by means of the Arbitration Court and the tariff policy, costs of commodities have been so inflated as to make it almost impossible for the primary producers to carry on. Among those who have addressed themselves to the Bill, the member for Nelson (Mr. Doust) asserted that it would pay the State to contribute half the wages of the men if employment could be secured for them in secondary industries.

Mr. Patrick: You will get plenty to start under those conditions.

Mr. SEWARD: Of course. Who will the member for Nelson get to buy the products of those industries? Under the tariff policy of the Commonwealth Government, many industries have, unfortunately, been started with the object of providing a diversity of employment. That would be all very well if an article could be produced at a price people could afford to pay. That result has not been accomplished, and the goods so produced have been turned out at a price that the general public cannot afford to pay. Artificial industries have been established with the object of providing employment; but that policy cannot be defended. Such a practice simply means that we reach the stage, now apparent in the primary industries, at which the prices for requirements, not only tools of trade, but living expenses and even articles of clothing, are so inflated that an adequate return cannot be obtained. Hence we have the taunt that the primary industries cannot pay the basic wage. The industries cannot afford that payment because their products have to be sold in the markets of the world and cannot be disposed of at prices sufficient to enable them to support the sheltered secondary industries. For that reason alone, I am not prepared to support the Bill, seeing that it will represent so much duplication of effort. As pointed out by the member for Roebourne, an expensive bureau will be set up. We are entitled to assume that it will be expensive, because good work cannot be carried out for the payment of low fees. The bureau will consist of a director, nine members, and others whose services may be co-opted. The expenditure of a large amount will be involved to

collect information that could easily be secured by those engaged in secondary industries. Those who embark upon such activities have the necessary ability to make essential inquiries to enable the businesses to be established on a sound basis. What are required are stable conditions and a public disposed to buy local products. A former Minister for Employment engaged upon a very laudable effort to stimulate a local products buying conscience in Western Australia. He was instrumental in establishing the Council of Industrial Development to promote enterprise in Western Australia. I accompanied him on one occasion when he urged people to purchase the products of a certain company, the name of which I shall not mention. A very good article was placed on the market, but in due course I noticed that its quality deteriorated to such an extent that country storekeepers, who had stocked it, could not get rid of the article. That was a bad policy to adopt. I took it upon myself to write to the company and point out that their product had deteriorated in quality. I regret to say that the company did not even acknowledge my letter. That represents one of our troubles. We start an industry, but we do not take any steps to ensure the maintenance of the quality of the manufactured article. The particular company to which I have referred has improved the quality of its product again, with the result that there is a ready sale for it. Members have no doubt read the article that appeared in the "West Australian" a few weeks ago dealing with the Albany Woollen Mills: the company was deploring the fact that it could not get a market for its materials. The Government could assist the company by creating a buying conscience in the State: but that would not require a bureau of nine highly paid men.

The Premier: Not nine highly paid men.

Mr. SEWARD: Monetary assistance to create new industries will compel the producers to sell their products at a high price; that would be waste of time, because the people would be unable to purchase the products. For the reasons I have given I find myself unable to support the Bill. The work could be done better by an honorary board, similar to the one we had before, and without great expense. We have had no indication of the cost of the proposed bureau, but it will be high, because, as I said before, to

get good work done by such a bureau the members must be paid high salaries. I intend to vote against the second reading of the Bill.

MR. McDONALD (West Perth) [8.42]: I propose to say a few words on the Bill, because although I do not favour it I do not desire to be misunderstood. With many of the Minister's objectives I am in entire agreement. The time has come when this State—in fact, any country, but this State in particular—has to make a survey of its resources and plan the future of its industries. It has to co-ordinate its facilities to overcome problems such as unemployment and other industrial difficulties. We all know—I do not need to stress it—that the situation has undergone a complete change in the last few years. Trade is now not a matter for merchants and enterprise, as it was in the old days. It is now a matter of national policy: to a very large extent that is so with England and other countries. I agree with the Minister to this extent, that under modern conditions organisation of trade and industry is more than ever necessary. In fact, the more recent economists say that whereas the old-fashioned statement was, "Land, labour and capital are the sources of wealth," to-day there must be added to those three, organisation or management. The four are in modern days the sources of wealth, because organisation or management is required as the co-ordinating factor to link together land, labour and capital and make them fruitful and productive for the benefit of the country. Some organisation, therefore, is necessary, but I have reluctance in supporting the Bill, because I think the organisation proposed is too extensive. There is general misgiving on the part of the people about the setting up of more boards, and what would be, in this case, a minor department. We have not been told what the expense is to be; I do not think it need be very high, but it may be.

The Premier: It will not be.

Mr. McDONALD: It may prove to be very expensive. We may set up boards which, like Federation, are to be equal to the amount of a dog tax, as was said in the early days of Federation; yet, after a few years, the expenses run into many thousands of pounds a year. At a time when the Treasurer must feel, as I myself feel, that great care is required in the control of our

finances, I do not wish to see any added burdens on the exchequer. With others, I think the Minister could achieve his objectives by setting up departmental organisations, which could be assisted by honorary committee men or councillors. This was done by his predecessor in office. The committee men could be drawn from representative men of industry who would be able, for the time being at all events, to do much of what the Minister and the State require to be done. We have in this State men engaged in commerce, primary industries, secondary industries, industrial circles and trade union circles, men of great ability and wide knowledge who would, I am convinced, be prepared to offer their services to an organisation of this kind, and to offer those services in an entirely honorary capacity. The ability of those men is such that even if the Government paid a high salary it would not secure better services. The C.S.I.R., according to information supplied to me by a member of the Chamber of Manufactures, is carrying out research work and is prepared to give assistance to our secondary industries. My information is that the council has set aside moneys for research work in secondary industries, and that it has already supplied information and inquired into matters at the request of the Chamber of Manufactures. Someone said the cost of the C.S.I.R. was about £200,000 a year, which shows what expense is involved in conducting such an organisation.

Hon. C. G. Latham: It is little more than that now.

Mr. McDONALD: I think the member for Swan (Mr. Sampson) made a rhetorical parallel with regard to the C.S.I.R. We may well rely more upon the Commonwealth bureau and appoint a local committee, composed of effective representation and at comparatively small cost, to work in conjunction with the C.S.I.R. By this means we can achieve many of the objectives which are in the Minister's mind. The Minister has relied upon the recommendation of the Royal Commission on youth employment. One pays every deference to the authority of the Royal Commission's report, coming as it does from a man who is now a Supreme Court Judge. The Royal Commissioner might well have been led into rather a doctrinaire view concerning what might be done by way of boards of this description. We, here, must be impressed by the fact that we have to find the money for every additional

feature of government in this country. We have to find the money at a time when we are certain of largely increased costs of administration in the forthcoming years, and when we are faced with the possibility of a not inconsiderable fall in revenue due to depreciated prices of our primary commodities. Whatever the learned Commissioner may think is theoretically justified in the way of boards—the bigger and more expensive the board is, the better will it be—we have to look at the practical aspect of what this will cost, and whether we can achieve sufficiently satisfactorily the same objectives at what would be a fraction of the cost of the present proposal. I know of no other State in Australia that has established a bureau of industry except Queensland. No other State is mentioned in the Commissioner's report. I read the other day that the Dunstan Government of Victoria has what is called a Small Brain Trust—I am speaking of the personnel and not of the brains—comprised of men who are highly qualified to express an opinion and offer guidance on matters brought before them. It is not a bureau, nor is it an organisation. People are merely paid a fee, which may occasionally be substantial, for the advice, investigation and research carried out.

Hon. C. G. Latham: Sir Herbert Gepp does that work.

Mr. McDONALD: Yes; Victoria can get along very well in that way at what must be a comparatively small cost. I do not see why here, in conjunction with a body of experts, who would give their services in an honorary capacity, we could not from time to time obtain expert professional services from men whose guidance might be of value in any particular direction, and do that at comparatively small cost. I agree we should be more active in planning and organising our economy, particularly as considerable changes are in front of this State so far as external markets are concerned. We can, however, achieve our objective without setting up a bureau of this nature, and without committing ourselves to a council of at least nine members, as indicated by the Bill (let alone the co-opted members) and without appointing members of the council for three years and a director for seven years. By that time the organisation would have become very extensive and pretty expensive. Surely we can achieve our objective in a much

more modest but sufficiently effective manner. I agree we should have these inquiries and should plan our organisation better. If the Minister desires to have a sum of money made available with which to form the framework for such a council as I have mentioned, I will support the proposal, but I do not feel prepared to vote for something that may grow into another department and may involve the State in considerable expense.

THE MINISTER FOR EMPLOYMENT

(Hon. A. R. G. Hawke—Northam—in reply) [8.55]: After listening to the speeches delivered in opposition to the Bill, I understand clearly for the first time why secondary industries in this State are in their present backward condition. The attitude displayed in the speeches made against the Bill has been doleful and destructive. It has been an attitude of "do nothing."

Mr. Cross: They want you to copy their policy.

The MINISTER FOR EMPLOYMENT: We have been told that because of certain difficulties existing in Western Australia in connection with the carrying on of existing manufacturing industries, and the establishment of new ones, we must regard those difficulties as insuperable, that we must develop an attitude of complete resignation in face of them, and realise that our position with respect to those industries is at present hopeless, and will continue to be hopeless in the years to come. I am surprised that our factories are as numerous as they are, and that they have made the progress they have made. It is interesting to consider what measure of progress our primary industries would have made had the public men of Western Australia, and the people of the State, adopted the same attitude towards them as has been adopted towards our manufacturing industries by members of this House, who have spoken against the Bill. The only exception to the remark I have just made is the Leader of the National Party, the member for West Perth (Mr. McDonald). He did not adopt a doleful tone nor take up a destructive attitude towards the proposal. He realised, and frankly admitted, that the objectives aimed at were altogether desirable. He said that every effort should be made to achieve these ob-

jectives, and he gave the principle contained in the Bill his blessing. I believe that in his own mind and heart he believes that the proposals contained in the measure, if put into operation, would have an effect that would be beneficial to our manufacturing activities. All the reasoning to which he gave expression was in favour of the Bill. How he found it possible right at the conclusion of his speech to say he was opposed to the Bill is difficult to understand.

Mr. Raphael: He changed his mind at the last minute.

The MINISTER FOR EMPLOYMENT: That represents an exhibition of mental gymnastics that has not been equalled in this Parliament during the time I have been here.

Mr. Raphael: You have a long way to go yet.

The MINISTER FOR EMPLOYMENT: I therefore hope that by the time I have concluded my explanation of the point upon which he based his opposition to the Bill, he will be able to realise that his fear about the possible tremendous cost of the bureau has no foundation at all. I shall be fair in saying that if a reasonable explanation can be given by me, I have a very strong claim to his support on the second reading. Probably the second strangest speech made against the Bill was that of the member for Middle Swan. I shall have something to say about the first and strangest speech against the Bill a little later on.

Mr. Cross: We can guess whose speech that was.

The MINISTER FOR EMPLOYMENT: The member for Middle Swan gave a very interesting historical account of the establishment and development of our State enterprises and public utilities. If that historical account had anything to do with the Bill, it was very little. The hon. member told us what we had done in this State enterprise, that State enterprise, and some other State enterprise. He told us we had developed this public utility, that public utility and the other public utility. He spent much time in telling us what we have done, but he spent no time in telling us what we have not done. This Bill deals entirely with what we have not done and what we must do and attempt to do in this State to make the balanced progress in future that is so necessary. What we did not do last year

was to manufacture in Western Australia about £20,000,000 worth of goods. As a result of our failure to do so, we had to import £13,000,000 worth of those manufactured goods from Eastern Australia and the balance from other countries of the world. This Bill is concerned with what we have not done.

Mr. Hegney: No, it is not.

The MINISTER FOR EMPLOYMENT: It is concerned with setting up an organisation that will investigate in an expert way the basis of our manufacturing industries in this State. The bureau will investigate in an expert way the difficulties that face our existing secondary industries and prevent the establishment of new industries of that kind.

Mr. Raphael: Massed production prevents it; nothing else.

The MINISTER FOR EMPLOYMENT: The member for Middle Swan gave his blessing to the Main Roads Department. He told us that the comparison made by the member for Claremont (Mr. North) to the effect that the proposed bureau would, in operation, be something the same as the Main Roads Department was one that could not be sustained. It seems remarkable that we should apply expert thought and expert investigation to roads and bridges and refuse to apply the same system to the manufacturing industries of the State. Does the member for Middle Swan think that the future destiny of Western Australia can be worked out satisfactorily if we apply expert thought and investigation to roads and bridges and refuse to apply it to the manufacturing industries? The time is long overdue when expert thought and investigation should be applied to the problems of manufacturing industries. Such thought and investigation should have been applied to those industries many years ago. They had a prior claim to such consideration over the roads and bridges of the State.

I am afraid that we in this State have developed the type of mind that concentrates too much upon roads and bridges and too little upon the important industries upon which the very existence of the State depends. Therefore, I appeal to members to realise that the time is long overdue when the expert thought and investigation given to roads and bridges and other comparatively unimportant activities should be concentrated upon the important problem of our secondary industries. Both the member for

Middle Swan and the member for Guildford-Midland skated in very clumsy fashion over the fact that in Queensland there does exist and has existed for some years a Bureau of Industry and Economic Research.

Hon. C. G. Latham: Can you give us any instance of industries having been established?

The MINISTER FOR EMPLOYMENT: Yes, a whole page of them.

Hon. C. G. Latham: I should like to hear of them.

Mr. Raphael: Well, read them on your own afterwards.

The MINISTER FOR EMPLOYMENT: The member for Guildford-Midland skated clumsily over the vital fact of the existence in Queensland of a bureau similar to the one proposed in this Bill by telling us that Queensland has the uni-cameral system of Government. He told us that in Queensland there was only one House of Parliament. I should like to know what difference that makes. What difference would it make to the existence of a bureau if there were one, two, three or ten Houses of Parliament? The fact that there exists in Queensland a bureau of this kind and the fact that the bureau has continued in existence for several years and is highly regarded by every member of the Queensland Government and Parliament proves beyond the shadow of a doubt that the institution has achieved for Queensland very beneficial and valuable results.

Mr. Needham: And intelligent members of Parliament like those of this one.

The MINISTER FOR EMPLOYMENT: It is useless to say that Queensland is justified in having a bureau because it has only one House of Parliament while we in Western Australia, because we have two Houses of Parliament, are not justified in having a similar bureau and would be unwise to establish one. The member for Middle Swan made a slightly better attempt to face up to the fact that such a bureau exists in the northern State, but his attempt was altogether ineffective. I am sure he realises that it was ineffective. I am sure that he regretted having to face up to the fact at all, as did the member for Guildford-Midland. The member for Middle Swan told us that half the members of the Queensland bureau are Government officers.

Mr. Hegney: It is a fact too.

The MINISTER FOR EMPLOYMENT: It is a fact. If the hon. member paid as much attention to the contents of our own Bill as he has paid to the constitution of the Queensland bureau, he would know that half of the members of the proposed Western Australian bureau would also be Government officers.

Hon. C. G. Latham: The Bill does not say so.

Mr. Hegney: Then why the Bill?

The MINISTER FOR EMPLOYMENT: Why the Act in Queensland? Why the bureau in Queensland? Evidently the member for Middle Swan gives the Queensland bureau his blessing because its membership to the extent of 50 per cent. consists of Government officers. No doubt he realises and knows that in Queensland the bureau has done valuable work.

Mr. Hegney: As a matter of fact, I do not. Neither the report nor your speech has indicated that.

The MINISTER FOR EMPLOYMENT: I understand that the member for Middle Swan paid a visit to Queensland not so many months ago, spending several weeks there, and that he examined very exhaustively the subject of starting-price betting. The subject of this Bill was something he could have much better examined from the Queensland aspect if he was anxious to bring back valuable information to Western Australia.

Mr. Hegney: I knew nothing about this Bill, and the other question is much more important.

The MINISTER FOR EMPLOYMENT: I am surprised, too, that the member for Middle Swan should oppose this measure, for his district probably has a greater percentage of employment in secondary industries than has any other district. If one electorate is more likely to benefit than any other from the setting up of the operation of this Bill, it is the very electorate which he himself represents. Unless he can find far better arguments and far sounder reasoning than he was able to put forward this evening in opposition to the Bill, I fear he has some uncomfortable moments ahead of him.

Mr. Hegney: I have no fears in that regard. You will be just as uncomfortable as I shall be.

The MINISTER FOR EMPLOYMENT: Now I propose as briefly as possible to deal

with objections raised by other members, and then to explain just what the main provisions of the Bill are, and what they mean. I propose also to reply to some of the main questions which have been raised, and to give advice along the lines requested by various members who have spoken to the Bill. The Leader of the Opposition told us that "we" know the extent of the unemployment problem in Western Australia. Without any hesitation I say there is not one member of this Parliament who knows the real extent of the unemployment problem in this State. It is impossible to know the real and complete extent of the problem. If the Bill becomes law, it will assist us to understand more fully the extent of the problem. The Government has under consideration other measures, which are really associated with this Bill, and which will be brought before the House if the Bill is accepted by the House. The problem of unemployment is far more extensive and more intricate than any member realises. I make no claim to knowing the full extent of the problem. It is impossible to know the complete extent of it unless it is far more expertly and exhaustively investigated than has been done up to the present moment.

Mr. North: The unemployed do not all register, do they?

The MINISTER FOR EMPLOYMENT: More important still is the fact that we do not know and cannot know just when and to what extent the problem will be aggravated. In Western Australia, by virtue of the fact that we have very little in the way of manufacturing industries, our men depend for their employment upon industries that are more or less irregular in operation. As a result of the fact that we have to depend for the major volume of our employment upon irregular industries, we are always faced with the possibility of sudden and substantial increases in the number of our unemployed. There is only one safe path for us to follow in an endeavour to safeguard against that danger. The path to be followed is that of endeavouring as far as possible to encourage the development of our existing secondary industries and to take whatever steps are possible for the purpose of establishing new secondary industries, so that in the field of secondary industry we may find additional opportunities for the regular and continuous employment of many more of our people.

Mr. Withers: And for the increased consumption of our primary products.

The MINISTER FOR EMPLOYMENT: The Leader of the Opposition states that "we" have all the information "we" desire. If he was speaking on his own behalf, or on behalf of his colleagues in the Country Party, that probably is altogether true. He and they may have all the information they desire. I am confident that all the members of the National Party and all the members of the Ministerial Party are convinced that they have not all the information they desire. I am sure also that they are convinced that they have not all the information that can be obtained. Further, I am convinced that there is a great field of inquiry regarding valuable information that it is necessary to have if the problem of developing our manufacturing industries is to be tackled in a commonsense and constructive fashion. The Leader of the Opposition, as is his popular pastime in recent months, has used the Bill not for the purpose of examining its merits, not for the purpose of trying to understand its objectives, but for the discreditable purpose of a party political platform. That was his only interest.

Hon. C. G. Latham: Most of your legislation this session is nothing else.

The MINISTER FOR EMPLOYMENT: That was his only interest in the Bill—to use it as a party political platform for the purpose of making a pre-election speech, for the purpose of trying to re-establish himself in the favour of the electors of Western Australia, which, of course, is an impossible task so far as he is concerned—and for the purpose at the same time of discrediting this proposal and those responsible for it. He told us that the Bill was introduced for one purpose, and one purpose only. He said the only purpose for which the Bill was introduced was that of enabling the Minister to appoint nine of his political friends as members of the bureau.

Hon. C. G. Latham: That is what you have done all the time you have been there, anyhow.

The MINISTER FOR EMPLOYMENT: He even told us that the nine persons to be appointed were already in the bag, ready to be placed upon the bureau as soon as Parliament gave its approval to the proposal.

Hon. C. G. Latham: I never said anything of the sort. Be truthful!

The MINISTER FOR EMPLOYMENT: The Leader of the Opposition is so uncertain of what he does say—

Hon. C. G. Latham: I said nothing of the sort.

The MINISTER FOR EMPLOYMENT: He is so desperately anxious to restore himself in public favour and so desperately anxious to discredit the Government that he does not realise—

Hon. C. G. Latham: Don't tell me about discrediting the Government! Your own members are doing that enough, surely.

The MINISTER FOR EMPLOYMENT: —that he does not realise what he actually does say.

Hon. C. G. Latham: Nothing of the kind.

The MINISTER FOR EMPLOYMENT: Every member who heard the speech by the Leader of the Opposition knows that he did say the only reason for the Government introducing the Bill was to provide jobs for nine of its political friends.

Hon. C. G. Latham: I admit I said that, but I did not say you had them in the bag.

The MINISTER FOR EMPLOYMENT: The hon. member did say that.

Hon. C. G. Latham: I did not.

The MINISTER FOR EMPLOYMENT: Even if he did not—and he did—what difference does it make? If the Government introduced the Bill merely for the purpose of finding jobs for nine of its political friends, is the conclusion not logical that nine political friends of the Government are ready to be appointed to the bureau?

Mr. Styants: It means that nine men want jobs.

Hon. C. G. Latham: And one will be at £2,000 a year, and others at £1,500 a year.

The MINISTER FOR EMPLOYMENT: The Leader of the Opposition's statement in that regard was not merely incorrect but was quite unjustifiable. He knew it was incorrect and not justified. Because he knew that, the statement was altogether discreditable to him.

Hon. C. G. Latham: All right, we can deal with it in Committee.

The MINISTER FOR EMPLOYMENT: The attack made upon the Bill by the Leader of the Opposition was altogether ineffective.

Hon. C. G. Latham: It is taking you a long time to reply.

The MINISTER FOR EMPLOYMENT:
He failed to convince even——

Mr. Fox: Himself.

The MINISTER FOR EMPLOYMENT:
He failed to convince even his own colleagues. I am sure his speech increased the measure of disappointment that his colleagues have felt regarding every speech he makes in Parliament.

Mrs. Cardell-Oliver: Then why waste time in replying?

The MINISTER FOR EMPLOYMENT:
The Leader of the Opposition dealt with the difficulties facing manufacturing industries in Western Australia and, in a not very subtle way, re-echoed the advocacy he indulged in a few years ago when he suggested that one of the greatest deterrents to the establishment, and carrying on, of manufacturing industries in this State was the fact that in Western Australia better wages were paid to employees than elsewhere in the Commonwealth. The member for Swan (Mr. Sampson) opposed the Bill. That fact itself ought to be sufficient to cause every other member to support it. Why did he oppose it? What reasons did he advance?

Mr. Raphael: Has he ever got any reason for anything?

The MINISTER FOR EMPLOYMENT:
He said the proposal was too big, too ambitious. Why is it so? The scheme is not too big for Western Australia, nor is it too ambitious for the State to embark upon. It may be too big and ambitious for the mind of the member for Swan to comprehend in the period of many weeks the Bill has been before the Chamber; but I am hopeful that, before this House has completed its consideration of the measure, he may have comprehended its import and the greatness of its possibilities for the future welfare of Western Australia. He also said that if Parliament approved of the Bill, we would establish palatial offices and provide a big staff. On that account the proposal was altogether too big and ambitious. The Bill proposes that a full time director shall be appointed. How it is possible for the member for Swan to visualise that the employment of a full-time director will necessitate the erection of palatial offices and the provision of a big staff is difficult to understand. It may be due to the fact that the offices under the control of the member for Swan are usually staffed by half a boy and a most anaemic looking cat!

Mr. Sampson: Don't forget the dog.

The MINISTER FOR EMPLOYMENT:
The member for Nedlands (Hon. N. Keenan) told us that we wanted not a scientific but a practical body. He seemed to suggest that if we had a scientific body, it would not be practical. That contention would have impressed people 30 years ago when men interested in science were regarded as being up in the clouds, but it will hardly impress anyone to-day, when almost everyone admits that science is a very practical thing. It has assisted in the development of most human activities of to-day. The fact that the proposed bureau may be scientific will not make it impractical. Indeed we realise that we need more scientific investigation and inquiry for the purpose of providing the knowledge necessary to establish more firmly our existing secondary industries, and to encourage the successful establishment of new manufacturing industries in Western Australia. The member for Nedlands said that if we had a practical body, capable of giving the Government an assurance that this or that industry was worthy of assistance, the Government would be thoroughly justified in assisting that industry, either by way of a monetary advance or by some other means. The proposed bureau will be practical as well as scientific, and will be practical because it will be scientific.

The member for Murchison (Mr. Marshall) said that all industries in Western Australia had failed, wholly or partly. That is not correct, because industries are operating to-day that have not failed, wholly or partly. When I explained the provisions of the Bill, I told members that at present 27,000 people are employed in factories now operating in Western Australia. Those people could not be employed in our factories to-day if all our attempts in the field of secondary industry had failed, either wholly or partly. Furthermore, I pointed out that 2,850 factories are operating in Western Australia and last year they produced goods to the value of £18,000,000, and provided £12,000,000 worth of trade, mainly in the purchase of raw materials in this State. They added approximately £7,000,000 to the value of the raw materials during the process of manufacture. Clearly, therefore, our industries have made some progress and the owners and controllers of our secondary industries have succeeded, by

some means or other, in overcoming the serious difficulties with which they were faced in their efforts to establish those industries or to extend those that were already in existence. The information I have just given regarding the volume of our secondary industries and the progress they have made during recent years proves that there are possibilities. It proves that the position is not hopeless, but that every justification exists for this Bill and for the establishment of the proposed bureau. We know, as the member for Murchison (Mr. Marshall) has told us, that numerous and serious difficulties face not only our established secondary industries, but also any person or group of persons desirous of commencing manufacturing activities. There is the problem of finance, which is always difficult. To obtain financial accommodation from our existing financial institutions for the purpose of establishing secondary industries is a problem of great magnitude. We also know that any such financial assistance is made available upon an unsafe and impermanent basis so far as the financial institutions are concerned. We, as a Government, are anxious to assist financially any attempt to establish secondary industry in Western Australia.

Hon. C. G. Latham: Why did not you help the paper mill at Pemberton?

The MINISTER FOR EMPLOYMENT: The Government's difficulty is that it has not available, despite what has been said to the contrary, an organisation capable of making exhaustive investigation into this, that, or the other proposal and report to the Government whether it should financially assist any such proposal. The Government desires to establish an organisation that has the confidence of the Government, an organisation the members of which have the ability and the training necessary to investigate thoroughly any proposal and report thereon to the Government, and make recommendations that the Government can safely accept and act upon. We, as a Government, know that much money now being spent could be used for a better purpose if we were sure of our ground. We know that much money that has been spent in this State during past years could have been better employed in expanding secondary industry, if we had had an organisation, such as is proposed by this Bill, continuously making investigations and solving the problems and difficulties of secondary industries. The statement has been made

that we cannot prevent the dumping tactics adopted at various times by the big manufacturing interests of eastern Australia. True, that is a difficult problem. It is not easy to find ways and means of counteracting the unfair trading practices which have been employed to the detriment of our manufacturing industries. Yet we ought to do something about it. The incidence of that dumping policy upon our industries ought to be far more completely investigated than it has been. If it were thoroughly investigated, an exposure so sensational could be made as would determine the great majority of our people to give far greater patronage to the products of our factories.

Member: Hear, hear!

The MINISTER FOR EMPLOYMENT: When all is said and done, while trade by individuals may be guided to a large extent by the price of an article, there yet remains in the minds of most people the quality and the standard of the article. People revolt against trade practices that are not only discreditable, but actually dishonest. People do not always buy an article because it is cheaper than that made by some other manufacturer. In recent months in this city, as in other cities of Australia, very large numbers of people who formerly bought Japanese goods because of their cheapness have ceased to buy those goods. The price factor there has not been the deciding factor. The people have taken a higher, broader and better view and decided to discontinue the purchase of those goods, no matter how cheap they may be compared with similar goods made in Australia, England or some other country. The proposed bureau could do a great deal to expose the unfair and unjust methods employed by manufacturers in other parts of Australia in their endeavour to capture our markets. The proposal contained in the Bill is well and hopefully regarded by local manufacturers, although I understand it is looked upon with a great deal of disfavour by people engaged in the importing business in this State. They do not desire the bureau to be established: they do not want a lesser volume of goods to be imported from eastern Australia. Much of the opposition to this Bill has been generated by vested interests who know only too well that if the Bill becomes

law the importation of goods from eastern Australia will, with the passing of time, be greatly lessened, with the result that their business will also be lessened. It is true they should take a broader view: they should realise that the development of our State is far more important than is the business that they carry on. We realise, however, that it is difficult for them to look at the matter from this angle, when their income, their power, and whatever other benefits accrue to them, all flow from the goods imported by them to this State.

The member for Guildford-Midland tells us seriously that this Bill will discount Parliamentary authority and the ability of members of this House. The Bill, in effect, will do neither. It will not discount Parliamentary authority in any shape or form, nor will it discount the ability of any member of this Parliament. Judging from that particular portion of the speech of the hon. member, one would think that the proposed bureau was to be set up with complete powers of its own and was to be responsible to no one at all, that whatever it decided to do would be done without any proposal or decision being considered by anyone; in other words, that the bureau would be a power unto itself, and would be able, without consulting anyone, without having its recommendations considered or approved by the Government, to do anything it decided to do. I point out to members that under the Bill the Minister would have to be a member and the chairman of the bureau. He would be a member of the Government and responsible to the Government. The Government would be responsible to Parliament and, through Parliament, responsible to the people. There is that clear and direct line of responsibility from the bureau through the Minister to the Government, through the Government to Parliament, and if necessary to the people. It is the limit of absurdity to suggest that the establishment of this bureau will discount the authority of Parliament and discount also the ability of members. Parliament, in fact, will at any time be in a position to say what shall be done concerning the future of the bureau, once it is established. It will be in a position always, should it consider the circumstances sufficiently serious, to say that the law must be amended in this, that or the other direction. Beyond the shadow of any doubt the authority of Parliament will in no way be affected, and

the ability of members of Parliament will not in the slightest degree be discounted. We were told that the bureau might assist the Minister and the Government and ignore Parliament. That is an altogether strange process of reasoning. How in the name of conscience would it be possible for the bureau to assist the Minister and the Government and yet ignore Parliament? Is not the Minister and is not the Government part of Parliament, and are they not a creation of Parliament? Is not Parliament in a position at any time to say that this, that or another Government shall no longer exist? Has not the Minister some responsibility to Parliament, and is not the Government responsible directly to Parliament? If, therefore, the bureau assisted the Minister and assisted the Government, it would inevitably assist Parliament and every member of Parliament. By assisting Parliament it would naturally assist the industries of the State and benefit the people of the State as well.

It is interesting to compare some of the statements made by the member for Guildford-Midland with one statement made by the member for Nedlands (Hon. N. Keenan). The member for Guildford-Midland told us in effect that the bureau would be a power unto itself, that it would be all-powerful and supreme. The member for Nedlands told us that members of the bureau would be the creatures of the Minister. We were informed that the Bill, if passed, would reduce the opportunities and the value of all members of Parliament. I say that the passing of the measure and the setting-up of the bureau would increase the opportunities and greatly enhance the value of members of Parliament. It would bring to them information that is not at present available. The bureau, by carrying out expert and extensive investigations into the very root causes of our failure to make greater progress in the field of secondary industries, would provide every member of Parliament with more knowledge than he ever possessed before, or more than he is ever likely to obtain unless some organisation of this kind is set up for his benefit. The bureau by its operations would obtain detailed information concerning the difficulties besetting the secondary industries of this State. It would obtain detailed information regarding the possibilities for the expansion of existing industries and the establishment of new ones. How would it be feasible for a bureau carrying

out duties of that description to lessen the opportunities and the value of members of this Parliament? Obviously everything done by the bureau would be to the advantage of members, because everything done by it in the way of investigation and research would bring new knowledge and increased knowledge about the industries of our State to every one of us.

The suggestion has been made that instead of our having a bureau comprised of private citizens, we should have one composed entirely of members of Parliament. I am afraid most of us are too busy dealing with the results of unemployment and such like problems to have available the time necessary to be given to a bureau of this description. I know of no member of Parliament whose time is not now fully occupied with the multifarious duties that members are called upon to carry out in these days. In any event, the Government is not unalterably opposed to giving members the right to be appointed to the bureau. Whilst we are opposed to any suggestion that all members of the proposed organisation should be members of Parliament, we would not be opposed to saying that members would be eligible for appointment to the bureau in the event of any one or more of them being available and the Government considering that any one or more of those available would be useful and valuable in that capacity. Even if members of Parliament were not made members of the bureau, they could assist it. We were told that when the Economic Council met frequently and carried out its many activities, members of Parliament could get into touch with the Minister and could make contact with the members of the Economic Council. We were told that that contact between members of Parliament, the Minister and members of the Economic Council was a very valuable one, and that it helped both members of Parliament and members of the Economic Council. I know that is quite true. But how will it be impossible for members of Parliament to interview the Minister concerned with this bureau? How will it be impossible for them to make contact with members of the bureau? What difference will there be as compared with the position existing four or five years ago? Are we providing that members of Parliament shall not be permitted to interview the

Minister concerned to discuss any problem associated with our industries? Are we making it impossible for members of Parliament to put forward any suggestions or proposals to the members of the bureau? Of course we are not. Members of Parliament will be as free in that way as they were free in previous years when the Economic Council was operating more fully than it is at present.

We were told there was a Minister for Employment and a Department of Employment dealing with the problem of unemployment, and that it was their job and responsibility to deal with the matter. Of course it is. They understand that only too well. They realise the difficulties of the position quite well. They know, as every member of Parliament ought to know, that what we in Western Australia require most is more industrial activity, more factories, more life in the field of secondary industry so that many of the 6,500 men now dependent on the Government might find profitable and regular employment in the industries of the State instead of having to depend upon the Government for the employment they receive. The Minister for Employment and the officers of the Department of Employment want this bureau because they realise it will offer some possibility of expanding our existing industries and establishing new industries, so that in those expanded and new industries men and women may find employment where there is no employment to-day.

The problem of youth employment is very strongly linked up with this proposal. This is the best proposal ever placed before Parliament to benefit the youth of the State. There will be no use in members going before their electors next year and saying that the problem of youth unemployment is still difficult. There will be no use in their explaining that the problem is still severe. The electors will rightly ask what we have done about it. The best prospect of providing employment for the youth of the State, and for the future youth of Western Australia, is in the secondary industries of the State.

Mrs. Cardell-Oliver: But you will not get it going by March.

Hon. C. G. Latham: A good electioneering promise again!

THE MINISTER FOR EMPLOYMENT: The bureau will not achieve any remarkable results by March next.

Mrs. Cardell-Oliver: Of course it will not.

THE MINISTER FOR EMPLOYMENT: But I point out to the member for Subiaco that it is our responsibility to establish the bureau as soon as possible.

Hon. C. G. Latham: After six years of office!

THE MINISTER FOR EMPLOYMENT: So I urge upon every member the necessity for giving special attention to this proposal from the point of view of the possibility offered for the absorption into industry of the youth of both sexes. The member for Guildford-Midland had something to say about the Loan Council. I could not quite grasp the point he was making, but I would say that if the bureau achieves some of the results we hope for, our dependence upon the Loan Council in future years will be lessened. Why do we have to depend upon the Loan Council so much? Mainly because the industries of Western Australia are not capable of absorbing all of the would-be workers in the State. Our industries are not capable of absorbing those 6,500 men. Because they are not capable of absorbing 6,500 men, the Government is under the necessity of organising road work, water supply work, and a hundred other classes of work, some of which are necessary, some not necessary, and some certainly not urgently necessary. Because we have to organise work for 6,500 men, we have to depend upon the Loan Council to an extent that is embarrassing, difficult and unsafe. The best way for us as a State Parliament to tackle the problem is by endeavouring to establish more industrial activity within the State. If we can establish an additional volume of industrial activity and thereby absorb, say, 3,000 of the men now dependent upon the Government, we will reduce our reliance upon the Loan Council by approximately 50 per cent. If the bureau becomes established and achieves any success at all, to that extent our reliance upon the Loan Council will be lessened.

The bureau is to consist of not fewer than nine members. The Government is not wedded to the provisions in the Bill. If a majority of the members feel that the number should be less than nine, we will not argue or fight about it. We are quite willing to give full consideration to every sug-

gestion put forward by any member of the House. The number is comparatively unimportant. The number fixed was decided upon because we desired to obtain the co-operation of the representatives of all the main activities of the State. We desire the primary industries, the secondary industries, the mining industry, the commercial interests and the industrial workers to be represented on the bureau. We need their representation. If we can obtain the co-operation of the representatives of the main activities, there will be a far greater opportunity of the bureau succeeding, and a far greater chance of its achieving substantial results. Still, if there is any argument about the number, we are quite prepared to meet such argument in a reasonable way. We are quite prepared to reason the matter out, and to fix upon the number that is considered most appropriate and most effective. The bureau as we propose to set it up will consist of men with special knowledge of the various industries and activities which they represent. It has been said that the cost of the bureau may be prohibitive. It has been said that the bureau may cost a very large sum of money yearly. We provide in the Bill that members of the bureau shall be paid fees and expenses. I agree with the member for West Perth (Mr. McDonald) that no doubt there is in Western Australia a sufficient number of public-spirited men available ready and willing to act in an honorary capacity as members of the bureau. So if the question of paying fees to members of the bureau is an important one, if some members of the Chamber have fears that the payment of those fees would result in tremendous expenditure, then the Government is quite prepared to consider and discuss that aspect reasonably. If it is the will or the desire of the majority of hon. members that fees shall not be paid, then we shall accept that decision quite peaceably and in an altogether satisfied way.

Hon. C. G. Latham: Peaceably!

THE MINISTER FOR EMPLOYMENT: That is an attitude of mind which the Leader of the Opposition was never able to develop, unfortunately for himself and unfortunately for others. Thus the question of fees is not an important one at all. We provide fees in the Bill because we feel that one or two members appointed to the bureau might be men who would have to lose time and wages as a result of having to leave work, say, one day a fortnight, or whatever the

period may be, for the purpose of carrying out their duties as members of the bureau. If they have to do that, we feel they should be entitled to recompense. But if the majority of members of this Chamber believe that there are available sufficient public-spirited men to act in an honorary capacity as members of the bureau, we shall be prepared to meet them in that regard. It would mean that expenses only would be paid to members of the bureau, an item of expenditure which would not be great. In any event, if Parliament approves of the Bill in a way that provides for fees and expenses to members of the bureau and to members of committees, then the total cost of the bureau, including the salary of the full-time director, is hardly like to exceed £5,000 a year. The total expenditure of the Government this year from revenue will be £11,000,000.

Hon. C. G. Latham: And then you are going to have a deficit!

The MINISTER FOR EMPLOYMENT: Yet we hesitate, we stall, we back and fill, and express grave fears, because a matter of £5,000 may be expended in connection with an organisation whose object it will be to do everything possible to extend the secondary industries of the State and, wherever possible, establish new industries of that description. I trust that those members of the House who have expressed doubts and fears on that particular point will realise that the Government would be justified in expending on this endeavour not only £5,000 but, if necessary, £10,000 a year if circumstances were found to be such as to justify that expenditure. Whatever is expended will be thoroughly justified, because it will be returned to the State ten times over. How far would one have to extend any existing industry to return to the State £5,000 a year, which may be the cost of the proposed bureau? How many new industries would one require to establish in order to return to the State £5,000 a year, or to save that yearly amount to the State? So I ask members to take a broader view of this particular objection which has been raised against the measure. The salary of the director is not stated in the Bill. I think most members will agree that it would be undesirable to state the salary in the Bill. A salary stated in the Bill might be too high or too low, according to the calibre of the men available for the position. The Bill might contain a figure of £800 a year, and then as the result

of investigation it might be found that the services of a man pre-eminently suited to the position could be obtained for £900 a year, or the services of an altogether capable man at £800 a year. The Government feels that the salary for the full-time director should not be stated in the Bill, but that the Government should be left to engage the services of the best man available at a salary considered to be reasonable in accordance with the knowledge and the services which such a person would be in a position to bring to bear in the post to which he would be appointed.

I have already mentioned briefly that the proposed bureau would carry out expert investigation of all phases of existing industries, with the object in view of recommending action for the expansion of those industries. It would carry out surveys of raw materials and other resources in connection with established industries and possible new industries. It would inquire into difficulties facing established industries and proposed new industries. Undoubtedly there is a field of inquiry which is not covered to-day, which has never been adequately covered; which could be covered by this bureau, and would be covered by the bureau, if it were established and given the necessary powers to carry out those investigations.

We live in an age when the methods of industry are changing, when new ideas are being developed and new methods being brought into operation; and we have to keep ourselves up-to-date: otherwise we shall find ourselves going back instead of forward, because other States of Australia are in a position to keep themselves up-to-date. They have up-to-the-minute information always available to them. It is up to us as the Government and Parliament of Western Australia, where the establishment and development of industries is far more difficult, to see that whatever assistance is possible shall be given to manufacturing industries in this State, and also to ascertain whether it is not possible to establish new industries here.

Hon. C. G. Latham: Why are industries so difficult to establish here?

The MINISTER FOR EMPLOYMENT: Each member who has dealt with the Bill has stated one reason why it is difficult to establish industries here. I do not know whether the Leader of the Opposition wants me to go through the whole thing again.

Hon. C. G. Latham: I want you to give us your opinion.

The MINISTER FOR EMPLOYMENT: I have already given some opinions.

Hon. C. G. Latham: I have not heard them.

The MINISTER FOR EMPLOYMENT: That is the trouble with the Leader of the Opposition.

Hon. C. G. Latham: I have sat here and listened very patiently. You have no reason to complain of me on that score.

The MINISTER FOR EMPLOYMENT: I am not denying that the Leader of the Opposition has listened attentively. That is not the trouble. The difficulties, of course, are many, and they have been explained. There is interstate competition, which is a very big factor and one to which I have already referred. There is the difficulty that our local market is not so big a market to be provided for as is the Eastern States market. And yet there is the compensating factor in that regard that we import into Western Australia from Eastern Australia approximately £13,000,000 worth of goods each year. So whatever the difficulties may be, there are possibilities of overcoming those difficulties. What we desire to obtain is a more complete knowledge of the difficulties and more detailed information regarding them in order that, understanding the difficulties, we shall then be in the position to shape a policy which will have a better chance of overcoming them and of establishing better conditions for the carrying-on of secondary industry in Western Australia. Although we have heard talk about the duplication of effort, there will be no such duplication. Whenever the proposed bureau will be in a position to co-operate with the local committee of the C.S.I.R., that co-operation will no doubt be carried out. Members will agree that it is sensible and logical to conclude that the bureau and the committee will co-operate where necessary. I say very definitely that the C.S.I.R. is not investigating problems associated with secondary industries in Western Australia, nor is it likely to do so. If we desire problems associated with our secondary industries to be investigated, we shall have to do it ourselves, even though the C.S.I.R. should engage upon those activities. How could we be assured that any Federal organisation investigating the problems associated with indus-

tries in Western Australia, would do so to our advantage?

Hon. C. G. Latham: That is rather uncharitable.

The MINISTER FOR EMPLOYMENT: It may be.

Mr. Patrick: What we want are men, not bureaux. We want a few more men like Michelides.

The MINISTER FOR EMPLOYMENT: That may be so, but we also require as much information as possible regarding the difficulties of the present and with regard to future possibilities, in order that enterprising men may be accorded the necessary encouragement to commence industries in our midst. The Government should be in a position at any time to know whether it is justified in rendering financial assistance to an industry already established by enterprising men, although carried on for their own advantage but yet of benefit to the State as a whole. Members will agree that that is most desirable. Then it was suggested that we have Government officers quite capable of carrying out the necessary investigations, without establishing a bureau. I shall tell members the names of the present members of the State Council of Industrial Development. They include Mr. A. H. Macartney, Secretary of the Employment Department; Mr. A. J. Reid, Under Treasurer; Mr. S. L. Kessell, Conservator of Forests; and one other. Can we expect officers holding such high positions, who carry heavy responsibilities in connection with their ordinary departmental functions, to have the necessary time and opportunity exhaustively to investigate the different problems associated with industry in Western Australia? Of course, they have neither the time nor the opportunity. Those officers have to shoulder heavy responsibilities and are required to carry out important work, in their ordinary positions. Every officer employed by the Government should have a full-time job, otherwise there would be no justification for their continuance as Government officers.

Hon. C. G. Latham: Does not the bureau in Queensland comprise Government officers?

The MINISTER FOR EMPLOYMENT: Partly.

Hon. C. G. Latham: Mostly.

The MINISTER FOR EMPLOYMENT: No, to the extent of 50 per cent.

Hon. C. G. Latham: Look at the Queensland Bureau's report. You were going to tell me what industries were developed as a result of the work of the bureau in that State.

Mr. Raphael: Don't start off on a new track.

The MINISTER FOR EMPLOYMENT: Most members will agree that it is evident we require something different from what we have at the present. We must relieve those officers, whose names I have mentioned, of this particular responsibility. They occupy positions to which they should devote the whole of their time, attention, and ability. For the positions in connection with the bureau, we require other men. We propose to appoint, as I have already explained, a director whose duty will be to devote the whole of his time and attention to the powers and responsibilities associated with the bureau. There will be no duplication of activities at all. On the other hand, there will be co-ordination of activities and co-operation with men possessing special knowledge regarding the production and industrial activities of Western Australia as a whole. No question of bureaucratic control will arise. Any suggestion to that effect is a mere figment of imagination. I have already explained that the Minister will have a duty to carry out in connection with the bureau, and he will be responsible to the Government, which, in turn, will be responsible to Parliament. Another suggestion was that the Bill represented an admission of the incompetency of the Government. No such admission is admitted. On the other hand, the Bill represents an indication of the desire of the Government to obtain, in a systematic manner, complete and expert knowledge of the State's industrial activities and the possibilities for the future. We live in an age of planning and of scientific inquiry. That point was stressed by the member for West Perth (Mr. McDonald). In the past we have experienced some complete and some partial failures. On the other hand, we have had some complete and some partial successes. We ought to pay more attention to our complete and partial successes, and less to our complete or partial failures. Instead of contemplating our complete or par-

tial failures with an air of pessimism and dolefulness, let us take into consideration successes that we have achieved in the field of secondary industries, through the efforts of enterprising men such as those mentioned by the member for Greenough (Mr. Patrick).

Hon. C. G. Latham: All that was done without Government aid. Immediately the Government rendered assistance, undertakings collapsed.

The MINISTER FOR EMPLOYMENT: I am doubtful whether any of them were established without Government aid. If they did not receive such aid directly, Government assistance was rendered indirectly. It would be impossible for any industry, secondary or primary, to enjoy any real success without receiving from the Government some assistance, direct or indirect.

Mr. Lambert: The primary industries owe £2,500,000 for deferred interest.

Hon. C. G. Latham: What was lost on the State Brickworks?

Mr. Raphael: Anyway, that State enterprise turns out the best bricks.

Hon. C. G. Latham: What about the plasterboard factory?

The MINISTER FOR EMPLOYMENT: In Western Australia at present, quite a creditable variety of goods are being turned out by our factories and workshops, and we have achieved that much in the face of great difficulties through fierce interstate competition.

Mr. Lambert: And sabotage.

The MINISTER FOR EMPLOYMENT: Because of the pessimism and dolefulness of thousands of our own people, including many men in public life, those difficulties have been emphasised. In these circumstances, the Government says the time has arrived when the people must develop a new outlook regarding secondary industries. The time has arrived when they should take a more optimistic view regarding our future industrial possibilities. That a small population, such as we have in Western Australia, should in one year import manufactured goods from the Eastern States to the value of £13,500,000 is a reflection upon Parliament and upon the Government. There can be no excuse for that. The volume of imports from the Eastern States should not nearly reach such figures.

Hon. C. G. Latham: Are you wearing a suit of Albany tweed?

The MINISTER FOR EMPLOYMENT: Yes, I am.

Hon. C. G. Latham: It does not look like it.

The MINISTER FOR EMPLOYMENT: Instead of the Leader of the Opposition asking the Minister if he is wearing a suit of Albany cloth, merely for the purpose of salving his own conscience, he would be far better occupied in making up his mind to extend support to the Albany woollen mills, rather than buy suits made of materials imported from England.

Hon. C. G. Latham: I happen to be an unfortunate shareholder, too.

The MINISTER FOR EMPLOYMENT: For the particular benefit of the Leader of the Opposition, I will read a list of some of the industries that have been assisted by the Bureau of Industries, Queensland; otherwise he will suggest afterwards that I did not have the list at all. The list is as follows:—

Dinmore Pottery, Ltd.
Bennett Chain Co. Pty., Ltd.
Cardboard Co. of Queensland (Pty.), Ltd.
(in voluntary liquidation).
Morris Woollen Mills (Ipswich) Pty., Ltd.
Shand's Gulf Meatworks, Ltd.
Mount Isa Mines, Ltd.
The Everlite Trading Company.
The Hornibrook Highway, Ltd.
Rustproofing Pty., Ltd.

The rust-proofing industry would be a very good one to establish in Western Australia, for the prevention of rust in the affairs of the Country Party.

Hon. C. G. Latham: There will be no rust while you are here.

The MINISTER FOR EMPLOYMENT: The list continues—

The Queensland Textile Pty., Company, Ltd.
Maryborough Drainpipes Pty., Ltd.
C.O.N. Pty., Ltd., engaged in metal part manufactures.

Hon. C. G. Latham: You can imagine the help the bureau gave the Mt. Isa Mines.

The Minister for Railways: They were helped in the way we helped the Big Bell mine.

Hon. C. G. Latham: You built a railway to that mine.

The MINISTER FOR EMPLOYMENT: The Queensland bureau helped the Mt. Isa Mines to the extent of £500,000. Whether the amount was expended in the building of a railway or not, does not matter.

Member: It was expended on smelters.

The Premier: The company erected its own smelters.

The MINISTER FOR EMPLOYMENT: The fact remains that the bureau did help the Mt. Isa Mines and, as a result, Queensland benefited. I invite members to give the Bill every consideration. It is an important measure. We realise the proposal is new to Western Australia and we realise also it is experimental. It is not a costly proposition; it will prove to be very cheap. The amount of money required to finance it is very small in comparison with the possibilities which will flow from its establishment. I therefore specially appeal to all members to support the second reading. I give them the assurance which I gave earlier that, in Committee, the Government will be prepared to adopt a reasonable attitude towards any amendments that may be brought forward.

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

Ayes	26
Noes	14
Majority for					12

AYES.

Mr. Gross	Mr. Raphael
Mr. Doust	Mr. Rodoreda
Mr. Fox	Mr. Shearn
Mr. Hawke	Mr. Sleeman
Mr. Lambert	Mr. P. O. L. Smith
Mr. Leahy	Mr. Styants
Mr. Marsault	Mr. Tonkin
Mr. McLarty	Mr. Troy
Mr. Millington	Mr. Wilcock
Mr. Needham	Mr. Willmott
Mr. North	Mr. Wise
Mr. Nulsen	Mr. Withers
Mr. Pantou	Mr. Wilson

(Teller.)

NOES.

Mrs. Cardell-Oliver	Mr. Patrick
Mr. Ferguson	Mr. Sampson
Mr. Hegney	Mr. Seward
Mr. Hill	Mr. Thorn
Mr. Keenan	Mr. Warner
Mr. Latham	Mr. White
Mr. McDonald	Mr. Doney

(Teller.)

Question thus passed.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Mr. Sleeman in the Chair; the Minister for Employment in charge of the Bill.

Clause 1—agreed to.

Progress reported.

House adjourned at 10.29 p.m.