

pleasure in supporting the second reading of the Bill.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

### *In Committee.*

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

*House adjourned at 9.42 p.m.*

## **Legislative Assembly,**

*Thursday, 8th September, 1938.*

	PAGE
Questions: Vermin destruction, dingoes and foxes, Queensland methods ....	647
Fremantle Harbour Trust, Commissioners' appointments, Primary Producers' representative ....	647
Railways, standard gauge, Fremantle-Brisbane ....	647
Relief work, men with families ....	648
Motion: Yampi Sound iron ore deposits, Commonwealth embargo ....	649
Bills: State Government Insurance Office, as to recom., recom. ....	648
Municipal Corporations Act Amendment, 3A. ....	648
Pensioners (Rates Exemption) Act Amendment, 2A., Com. report ....	661
Bureau of Industry and Economic Research, 2A. ....	662
Industrial Arbitration Act Amendment, 2B. ....	681

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

### **QUESTION—VERMIN DESTRUCTION.**

*Dingoes and Foxes, Queensland Methods.*

Mr. DONEY asked the Minister for Agriculture: 1, Is he aware that the Queensland Government, through its Land Administration Board, assists landowners in that State to destroy dingoes and foxes by—(a) distributing to landowners upon application a specially prepared bait in cases containing approximately 250 baits at 5s. per case, which is less than cost; (b) allowing free

railage to nearest siding; (c) distributing the baits free of any charge whatsoever in instances where landowners form themselves into groups of four or more for the purpose of making a systematic distribution of the baits in infested territory? 2, If he is so aware, will he consider the desirability of informing himself as to the suitability of the bait and as to the desirableness of adopting similar distributive methods in this State? 3, If he is not, will he make the necessary inquiries with a view to action as set out in 2?

The MINISTER FOR LANDS (for the Minister for Agriculture) replied: 1, Yes, and the matter is already being inquired into, but in view of the experience in this State, no decision has yet been arrived at. 2 and 3, Answered by No. 1.

### **QUESTION—FREMANTLE HARBOUR TRUST.**

*Commissioners' Appointments, Primary Producers' Representative.*

Mr. DONEY asked the Minister representing the Chief Secretary: 1, When do the periods for which respective Commissioners of the Fremantle Harbour Trust were appointed expire? 2, Have any new appointments or re-appointments been made during the last twelve months? 3, Has the Chief Secretary, during recent months, received any request for the appointment of a representative of the primary producers to a position as Commissioner of the Trust? 4, If so, has such an appointment been made? 5, Or, otherwise, is such an appointment to be made shortly?

The MINISTER FOR WORKS (for the Chief Secretary) replied: 1, 31st December, 1938. 2, No. 3, Yes. 4, No. 5, This will receive consideration.

### **QUESTION—RAILWAYS.**

*Standard Gauge, Fremantle-Brisbane.*

Mr. NORTH asked the Premier: 1, What is the length of line needing conversion to standard before Fremantle and Brisbane are connected on a through gauge, via Port Augusta and Broken Hill? 2, What is the estimated total cost (if information not available, then at £12,000 per mile)? 3, Is

this sum less than one annual payment to sinking fund on the National debt? 4, Is the amount not small—in relation to the benefits arising—when placed against the existing railway expenditure of £350,000,000? 5, Is it a fact that if the whole of the Australian railways were standardised in gauge, the cost per mile would still be less than a third of the capital cost per mile of British railways?

The PREMIER replied: 1, Approximately 673 miles. 2, At £12,000 per mile, £8,076,000. 3, No. 4, No. 5, No.

### QUESTION—RELIEF WORK.

#### *Men with Families.*

Mr. SLEEMAN (without notice) asked the Minister for Employment: Is he aware that relief workers are being denied the right to stay on road jobs because they have taken their families with them? If so, will he have this practice discontinued, and the men returned to their work?

The MINISTER FOR EMPLOYMENT replied: I understand that within the last day or two certain road jobs have been completed, and some of the men concerned have not been transferred to other jobs in the district because facilities for families have not been available. I will undertake to have an investigation made, with a view to obtaining full details and, unless some very substantial reason exists why the men should not be accompanied by their wives and families, they will be sent back to their jobs.

### BILL—STATE GOVERNMENT INSURANCE OFFICE.

#### *As to Recommittal.*

MR. WATTS (Katanning) [4.37]: I move—

That the Bill be recommitted for the further consideration of Clause 7.

THE MINISTER FOR EMPLOYMENT (Hon. A. R. G. Hawke—Northam) [4.38]: I do not desire to oppose the motion for the recommitment of the Bill, but I want to point out that in the last speech he made upon the Bill, the hon. member inferentially charged the Government or the Minister with having ulterior motives in regard to some portion of

it. That, normally, would be sufficient to make one seriously consider whether the Bill should be recommitted at the request of the hon. member, particularly in view of the fact that the amendment he proposes to move is not so very important. Nevertheless, the Government has decided to return good for evil in this instance, and offers no objection to the motion.

Mr. Sampson: A very nice change!

Question put and passed.

#### *Recommittal.*

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

Clause 7—Administration:

MR. WATTS: I move an amendment—

That in line 17 of Subclause (6) the words "in the opinion of the Treasurer" be struck out and the words "the Commissioner of Taxation certifies" inserted in lieu.

As I mentioned during the second reading debate, it seems to me that the Commissioner of Taxation is the proper person to say what tax should be paid, as the payment of taxation is provided for in the Bill. The amendment needs no stressing. The Minister offered no serious objection to it, and I have no doubt that he will be prepared to agree to it.

The MINISTER FOR EMPLOYMENT: I do not propose to offer any opposition to the amendment. I would be quite prepared to trust the present Treasurer to do the right thing, if the responsibility in this matter were to be left to the Treasurer. I think all hon. members would likewise be prepared to trust the present and any future Treasurer to do the right thing in this matter. Nevertheless, the Treasurer would have to consult the Commissioner of Taxation to ascertain the amount that should be placed as a debit in the account of the State Insurance Office. There is, therefore, no harm in setting out in the Bill that the amount as certified by the Commissioner of Taxation shall be the amount to be debited in the accounts of the office.

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

Bill again reported with an amendment.

### BILL—MUNICIPAL CORPORATIONS ACT AMENDMENT.

Read a third time and transmitted to the Council.

## MOTION—YAMPI SOUND IRON ORE DEPOSITS.

### *Commonwealth Embargo.*

Debate resumed from the 6th September on the following motion by the Premier:—

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

**MR. RODOREDA** (Roebourne) [4.43]: Most of the ground has already been traversed by various speakers, but a little reiteration will do no harm. As one of the members representing the North-West, the duty devolves upon me to say a few words in support of the motion. The attitude adopted by some of the speakers must have been rather disappointing to the Premier, although, judging by remarks made about the Yampi enterprise in previous sessions, such an attitude was not altogether unexpected. The action of the member for Nedlands (Hon. N. Keenan) in moving his amendment, I consider, was calculated to kill the motion by making it farcical. His suggestion was that we should approach the Commonwealth Government, indicating in effect that we were merely lodging the protest as a matter of duty and did not believe the Commonwealth would defer to it; and even before the Commonwealth had refused our request, the hon. member suggested offering an alternative. Had we presented our protest in that form, we would have invited ridicule. The hon. member also indicated how the Commonwealth Government could give effect to the alternative. That suggestion was even more ludicrous than his amendment. He proposed in all seriousness that the Commonwealth Government should hold out a threat to the Broken Hill Pty. Co. to socialise the industry unless the company obtained some of its iron ore requirements from Western Australia. Of course nobody in his sane senses could ever subscribe to that proposal. Could anyone imagine the Commonwealth Government's approaching the Broken Hill Pty. Co. and threatening to socialise the industry? Any threats made, in my opinion, would be in the opposite direction.

Mr. Marshall: The influence would be from that direction.

Mr. RODOREDA: The main objection of the Leader of the Opposition appeared to be based on the fact that Japanese capital was being employed to develop the Yampi deposits. The hon. member has harped upon this point previously; it has been the burden of his song for two or three sessions that Japanese capital would be employed to exploit the iron ore deposits. The hon. member made that discovery; he actually ferreted it out, and informed the House of it. Nobody has ever attempted to make a secret of the fact that Japanese capital was being employed. If no other capital could be attracted for this industry, I for my part would not care if it came from Lapland, the South Sea Islands or elsewhere, so long as it was made available to develop our resources, particularly those of the North-West where development is so badly needed. In spite of the hon. member's aversion to Japanese capital, he tried to make a point, when the Minister was speaking, by interjecting, "Why were not these leases forfeited when application was made for their forfeiture?" Yet he knows full well that the application for forfeiture was made on behalf of another Japanese company. Perhaps the hon. member wants to have it both ways.

The Minister informed us that no reason had been given for the imposition of the embargo, except that there would not be enough iron ore in Australia to meet the needs of industry at some indefinite time ahead. To my mind that reason is mere camouflage. It is too transparently false to carry conviction to anyone. Therefore we are compelled to delve a little deeper in the endeavour to ascertain the real reason that actuated the Commonwealth so suddenly to decide that the embargo must be imposed, —to decide without any investigation whatever, to prohibit the export of iron ore from Australia. I suggest that the main reason for imposing the embargo was to preserve the steel industry of the Eastern States. I am of opinion that vested interests brought pressure to bear and that the Commonwealth Government acceded to the demand, realising full well that the embargo would have no great effect upon the Broken Hill Pty. Co., which has all the Australian trade in its hands. That company would lose only the profits on its export trade in

iron ore, and would still be in a position to export pig iron.

Hon. C. G. Latham: In what way would this affect the company?

Mr. RODOREDA: It would affect the company in its foreign trade.

Hon. C. G. Latham: In what way?

Mr. RODOREDA: The company had a big trade with Japan in iron ore.

Hon. C. G. Latham: Not very big.

Mr. RODOREDA: It also had a big trade in pig iron. The chairman of directors of the company was moved to ecstasy, in his annual report, about the profits that were derived from the quantity of iron ore that had been shipped to Japan. The directors knew they would lose this business if the Yampi iron ore deposits were developed. That is shown by their activities at Yampi whilst there was still a possibility of the deposits being worked. Some seven or eight years ago representatives of that big organisation were actively engaged on Cockatoo Island because there was a chance that the Yampi deposits would be opened up. When that possibility was knocked on the head the activities of the company ceased. Later on, when proposals were set afoot for the development of the deposits, representatives of the company were again on the spot watching its interests. They knew that all the Japanese trade was likely to go to Yampi, and that they would be unlikely to participate in it, or, if they did participate, were likely to do so at less profit than formerly.

Hon. C. G. Latham: The royalty is not very high.

Mr. RODOREDA: That is one reason for the company's interest. The other reason is too fantastic for consideration.

Mr. Doney: Have you ascertained that as a fact, or is it a surmise on your part?

Mr. RODOREDA: I suggest that it is so, just as the Prime Minister has surmised that enough iron ore will not be left in Australia unless an embargo is placed upon its export. It is all surmise. We are told that unionists in the Eastern States supported the embargo. Possibly they did. They might have supported it to protect their own interests, and might not have desired that any branch of the steel industry should be established in Western Australia. It was natural for them to support the action of the Federal Government in that particular.

Hon. C. G. Latham: That would not affect the establishment of a steel industry here.

Mr. RODOREDA: Of course it would.

Hon. C. G. Latham: The embargo on the export of iron ore would not affect that position.

Mr. RODOREDA: The member for Nedlands (Hon. N. Keenan) realised that when he stated there was, as yet, practically no market in Western Australia for the products of a steel industry. The industry might, however, be started as complementary to the export of steel or iron. The position would be very different in the case of a company that already was doing a profitable trade. What leads me to believe this is that the Prime Minister, in reply to criticisms voiced by a member in another place, side-stepped the whole argument. He said there was no competition in Australia with which his Government could interfere. He was quite right. There is, however, competition for the trade with markets outside Australia. That was the competition the Broken Hill Proprietary was afraid of. I would also hazard a guess that after a few years someone will discover there is no need for the embargo, which will then be lifted. When that time comes, Yampi will have been strangled. There will then be no chance of getting the industry into operation again, and the export trade will have been absorbed completely by the Broken Hill Proprietary Company. In support of this statement I should like to quote a few lines from the "West Australian" of the 7th September. I refer to a speech made by the Minister for the Interior at a luncheon given by the National Party. He is reported to have said he hoped that the results of the survey would disclose circumstances that would permit the lifting of the embargo. By that remark he was paving the way for the Federal Government. He also said he gave this information not to the Government of the State, but to the public. Western Australians, he thought, had not been fully informed, as they should have been, of the motives behind the action of the Federal Government. Thus we find a Minister from Canberra making a public statement, not to the Government of the State, but to the people in general. If that is the opinion of the Federal Government, why did Ministers refrain from giving those reasons to the State Government?

The Minister for the Interior then went on to deal in detail with the same old reasons that had been advanced by his Government. The reasonable course for the Commonwealth authorities to follow would have been to accede to the request of the Yampi Iron Company to be allowed to export a million tons of iron ore per annum for 15 years. That would not have greatly reduced our resources, for it is estimated that in perhaps a hundred or two hundred years that quantity would be equal to two years' supply. The concession would have provided an easy way out of the difficulty. All question of the payment of compensation would have been avoided, and a flourishing iron ore industry would have been brought into existence. At the end of the term, the deposits might have been developed by another enterprise for the benefit of this State and Australia in general. Instead of adopting that course, the Federal Government suddenly decided to impose an embargo on the export of the commodity, and place upon the taxpayers the burden of paying compensation. Nothing was known of this 12 months ago, when the Federal Government informed the people concerned that they could go on without fear of anything being done to prevent the development of our natural resources. A few remarks have been made concerning the impossibility of developing the Kimberley cattle trade. It is a fact that for a number of years the Kimberley growers carried on a profitable cattle trade with Manila. That was before the establishment of the Wyndham Freezing Works. I do not know why the trade lapsed, but I presume it was mainly because of high freight charges. Nothing was coming into the Kimberleys and nothing was going out except cattle, and I presume the industry could not stand the strain. The position is different to-day. It appears to me that the market for Kimberley cattle in the metropolitan area and the southern portion of the State is gradually contracting, and that before many years have elapsed, there will be no market here for Kimberley cattle. The development of pastures in the South-West is the chief cause of that condition of affairs. I have no doubt that within the next ten or twenty years, all the requirements of the metropolitan market will be supplied from the South-West.

The Kimberley cattle growers will thus find themselves in a disastrous position, and will have to look to the export trade as an outlet for their product. We are told that cattle cannot be shipped through the tropics. In answer to that, I suggest there is such a device as air-conditioning. This has already been applied to passenger accommodation on ships, and there is no reason why it should not be installed on cattle ships that ply through the tropics. Air-conditioning is not an expensive installation. There should be no bar to the export through the tropics of cattle from the Kimberleys, provided some other cargo can be obtained as freight for the ships that carry the cattle. The Leader of the Opposition was very concerned about the length of time that had elapsed since developments at Yampi first commenced. Many difficulties crop up when anyone is starting an enterprise of this magnitude in an out-of-the-way place like Yampi. When men first went to the place, there was scarcely room for anyone to stand on the island, let alone land machinery and get developmental work going. It has been suggested that the leases were being held merely to prevent anyone else from working them. But who else wanted them? They have been hawked around the world resultlessly. The Queensland Government was interested in them for a while, but dropped the proposition. No one in Australia wanted the leases. The British Government did not want them. For 20 or 30 years they have been offered all over the world until someone was found wanting them and prepared to develop them, and then, suddenly, the embargo is imposed, with the result that all hope of our establishing an iron industry is destroyed. I hope this motion of protest will be carried in another place with more enthusiasm than it has evoked in this Chamber. I trust that when the protest reaches Canberra, it will spur on our Federal representatives to further efforts to have this iniquitous and most unwarranted embargo lifted immediately.

Members: Hear, hear!

**MR. MARSHALL** (Murchison) [5.2]: I am unwilling to cast a silent vote on this important question. The motion is national in character; and one might have expected a statesmanlike approach to it, more parti-

cularly from party leaders opposite who have contributed to the discussion. From leaders of the various parties in this House we expect careful, thoughtful, well-considered views, especially when dealing with a subject of national importance. It was with much regret I listened to contributions from leaders who seemed to me prepared to sacrifice all State interests in order to shield and hide other men elsewhere, who belong to the same political party. One word in support of the motion and twenty in defence of Lyons and company! Such have been the speeches so far delivered by party leaders opposite. The subject has not been approached by them from a statesmanlike standpoint. Their arguments throughout have been marked by inconsistency. Opposition members are continually crying out for secession. They say Western Australia must be separated from the rest of this sunny Commonwealth. Frequently they advance as an argument that secession is absolutely essential to the development of Western Australia; in other words, that without secession Western Australia cannot be developed at all. If there is any sincerity in that argument, if Opposition members are conscientious in advancing it, why do they hesitate to hurl back the embargo at those who have inflicted such an injustice on Western Australia by directly preventing its development? Instead, Opposition members have endeavoured to hide the real motive for the imposition of the embargo. They adopt this course because in the Federal arena there is a political creed to which they also subscribe. I respectfully submit that the Opposition's attitude on this subject has done Western Australia much harm. Assuredly the speeches of hon. members opposite have not been inspiring. On the contrary, they have been inconsistent and positively devoid of logic. In consequence, whatever chance there is of defending our sovereign rights and adequately developing our industries has been destroyed. That is so because of the faint praise members opposite have accorded to the motion.

Almost invariably accompanying a change of Government in the Federal sphere there are announcements in the Press that the new Minister for Markets will go abroad and search for profitable outlets for the commodities which Australia produces, and of which there are alleged to be surpluses. It must be confessed that so far these globe-trotting

episodes have proved failures rather than successes, for even at this date, one Minister for Markets having followed on the heels of another in trotting over the whole globe, we are still in search of markets for our products. Those who are continually preaching that orderly marketing will save our industries contribute only a half-hearted support to the motion, thus leaving the inference that the exploitation of a commodity for which we actually have a market is a matter of no importance. Such inconsistencies should cease. In national questions we should rise above party politics. To impress on those to whom the Constitution grants unlimited rights the fact that we possess sovereign rights, it is necessary that there should be sincere co-operation of all parties in Western Australia. Matters of such vital importance as this motion should not be mingled with the comparatively trifling subjects involved in party politics. Where the well-being of Western Australia and its people is concerned, at least let us be united. I repeat, I am deeply disappointed at the speeches that have been made by party leaders on the Opposition benches. I had believed that they would welcome the motion with open arms, as they never cease to inform us that wherever the welfare of the State is concerned we can look in their direction for sincere co-operation. Here was an opportunity. Thus early in the session, we have been confronted with a matter of national importance; but I regret to say that the contributions to this debate by leaders of the Opposition parties have tended to damn the possibility of Western Australia receiving compensation for the loss of the development of a major industry. It is saddening to contemplate.

Mr. Withers: What was the position regarding the wool embargo?

Mr. MARSHALL: Naturally, we could expect lively expressions of hostility against the Federal Government on that score, because the ground had been prepared through the attitude of a large section of the people in the Eastern States against the embargo on the export of wool. That, however, is beside the question. The North-West has always constituted a danger point to the Commonwealth. Of that we need have no doubt. Unless we speedily proceed with the development of industries in that part of Australia, we will find foreign countries gazing with ever-increasingly envious eyes

on our wide open spaces, upon which foreigners would like to encroach. Nothing is calculated to provoke foreigners to a greater degree. We ourselves would be provoked if we urgently required commodities that were easily produced in a foreign country, the residents of which adopted a dog-in-the-manger attitude and declared, "We cannot use the surplus commodities, nor will you be permitted to do so." We would be the first to evince our hostility to any such policy. Were we strong enough, we would in all probability say to those foreigners, "If you cannot supply us peacefully with the goods we require, we will seize them forcibly." Nothing is calculated to stir up conflict more promptly than one person shaping up to another. He who looks for trouble invariably gets it, and generally on the spot least appreciated by him. In the instance under discussion, Western Australia has been deprived of the opportunity to develop a most important industry, the establishment of which would have represented an untold blessing to the State generally. It must be obvious to anyone who gives the matter a few minutes' thought that, with the development of the Yampi Sound iron ore deposits, other industries must inevitably have been established in that vicinity. Time was when there was not a single industry throughout the Commonwealth. That was when the natives roamed in freedom hither and thither throughout the countryside. With the discovery of gold, the mining industry was established and then followed the agricultural development of the rural areas. Secondary industries were inaugurated, and so activity spread in various directions. Slowly but surely the industrial and social life of Australia generally was developed, but naturally from small beginnings. That applies to all nations. No one can say what the ultimate effect of the establishment of this huge industry in the North-West might have been, even though developed in the crude manner adopted by the company that proposed to operate at Yampi Sound. There can be no doubt that something happened within recent months to influence the Federal Government in decreeing the embargo. The Leader of the Opposition made much of the fact that the company was slow in the initial stages of development. In emphasising that point, he overlooked another fact that while the company was slow-moving in its methods,

the Federal Government had an opportunity throughout that period to carry out a survey of the iron ore deposits of the Commonwealth. Abundant time was available for the Federal Government to carry out that work, but it was not done. On the other hand, the Federal Government encouraged the company to continue its preliminary operations, and the Prime Minister, Mr. Lyons, said on several occasions that there was no reason why the Federal Government should take any action in the matter. He spoke truthfully and was apparently conscientious in his statements, but something suddenly changed his attitude. Neither he nor any other individual was in a position to say with any degree of confidence what the iron ore reserves of Western Australia were, much less what the reserves in the whole of the Commonwealth totalled. Throughout the length and breadth of Western Australia there are iron ore deposits. That was not what inspired the Federal Government to take action. I admit that it was the excuse the Government advanced.

Mr. Seward: No, it was not.

Mr. MARSHALL: I have not yet heard the member for Pingelly (Mr. Seward) discuss this subject, but the statements made by the Premier during the course of his remarks have not been contradicted. Until the survey of Australia's iron ore reserves is completed, we are told, the embargo must continue. If it is essential for a survey to be carried out to ascertain the extent and value of our iron ore deposits, would it not have been competent for the Prime Minister to expedite that work and in the meantime suggest to the company that it proceed slowly with its operations at Yampi Sound? The adoption of that course would have been quite logical. The Prime Minister could have limited the quantity to be exported, while at the same time suggesting to the company that progress with the development of the iron ore deposits should not be speeded up. The Prime Minister did not adopt that attitude. Without awaiting the results of the survey, he closed down entirely on the export of iron ore. There is something more behind the action of the Federal Government than the mere necessity for such a survey. I ask the Premier: Was he ever requested to supply the Commonwealth Government with information regarding the estimated quantity of the iron ore deposits in Western Australia? Did the Common-

wealth ask the State Government to supply that information before the embargo was imposed?

The Premier: The Federal Government knew years before what the estimates were.

Mr. MARSHALL: The Federal Government knew what the estimates were years before it decided to impose this embargo. It had exact information of the well-known and defined iron ore deposits.

The Premier: Some of them.

Mr. MARSHALL: I said the well-known and defined deposits. Those that are unknown are probably unlimited. I know of deposits of iron ore, but not the extent of them. People are not at present concerned about those deposits, because they are valueless. Proper methods of mining would have to be employed to secure the ore, of which not much is above the surface. In my electorate there are numerous iron ore deposits which, no doubt, later on could be worked economically, but it would not be profitable to work them at present prices. I suggest something else influenced the Federal Government's attitude, and I have no hesitation in subscribing to what the previous speaker said. We have in the Commonwealth groups of individuals who have complete control of certain commercial activities. One group has complete control of the metal industry; another has control of transport facilities, while other groups control various commercial enterprises in this sunny land. I suggest the metal group in the Eastern States influenced the Federal Government to take the stand that it did. Now, members will see how far my prognostications will prove correct. In the course of a few months, probably 12, what will happen is this: The Yampi Sound industry will be dead, and the iron ore deposits will have reverted to the position in which they stood on one or two occasions previously. It will be open to any person to apply for a lease of the deposits. When that stage is reached, the metal gang in the Eastern States will have no difficulty in obtaining control of Yampi. When it does, members will find that this embargo will swiftly be lifted.

Hon. C. G. Latham: Do you think the State could not prevent them from doing that, if the State so desired?

Mr. MARSHALL: I do not know.

Hon. C. G. Latham: I do.

Mr. MARSHALL: In my opinion, had the wise men who framed our Constitution ever contemplated a happening such as this, they would have provided against it in the Constitution. I could not see them framing a Constitution so watertight that it would give the Federal Government power to strangle the development of an industry within a State in this fashion. It is not to be forgotten that the Federal Government did not negotiate sympathetically with this Government before imposing the embargo. This Government, on the other hand, gave the Federal Government all the information it could and kept that Government fully advised of the development of these deposits. The Federal Government, however, did not reciprocate. It did not consult or negotiate with the company before deciding to impose the embargo. The Federal Government did that right off its own bat, so to speak.

Mr. North: Are you in favour of secession?

Mr. MARSHALL: I do not know that we would benefit from secession.

Hon. C. G. Latham: You are making a good secession speech.

Mr. MARSHALL: We sometimes view matters from different angles.

Hon. C. G. Latham: Circumstances change our minds.

Mr. MARSHALL: I differ from most of my fellow men—

Mr. Doney: In all things.

Mr. MARSHALL: I differ from most of my fellow men in this: Most persons seem to have a love for the place where they were born. They are so patriotic that no matter where they travel nor what their experience is in other lands, they always have a kindly word for the country of their origin. I have not. I have scarcely a good word for the State that gave me birth.

Mr. Sampson: Breathes there a man with soul so dead!

Mr. MARSHALL: I respect the country that is good to me.

Mr. Sleeman: This is the one.

Mr. MARSHALL: I was starved out of Victoria and so have not a good word for that State. I know of people who have starved in the country where they were born and yet who never say a wrong word about it. They are like that one-time famous Prime Minister, notorious as an umbrella-maker, who returned to Wales, the



place of his birth, and said, "Wales for ever." This State has been good to me.

Hon. C. G. Latham: I should say Wales was best if it produced such a great man.

Mr. Sleeman: Victoria produced a good man.

Hon. C. G. Latham: Yes, a very good man.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. MARSHALL: Western Australia has been more generous to me than has any other country, hence my presence in this State. It is the interests of Western Australia that I have at heart, that inspire me to speak in this way on this subject. The Leader of the Opposition has not done himself justice in resuming his seat after having supported the motion with faint praise.

Mr. Needham: Damned it with faint praise.

Mr. MARSHALL: He supported the motion because it retarded an industry, but he did it in such a manner that he paved the way for a refusal by the Federal Government to compensate this State for its losses.

Hon. C. G. Latham: No, I did nothing of the sort.

Mr. MARSHALL: The utterances of the hon. member were weak. They lacked fire. There was nothing hostile in them.

Hon. C. G. Latham: I am not an aggressive Labour man like you are.

Mr. MARSHALL: No. What a pity! What a much better man the hon. member would be. It is sad to find the Leader of the Opposition lacking in such qualities. It is not compensation that I am advocating because nothing whatever can compensate the State for the wrong that has been done to it, particularly when we have regard to the geographical position of the deposits.

Mr. Hegney: The Federal Government could have taken action 12 months ago.

Mr. MARSHALL: The leases were taken up many years ago and dropped, and they have been the subject of negotiations and discussion, as the member for Roebourne (Mr. Rodoreda) truthfully remarked, for the last 20 or 30 years. During the whole of the period of the negotiations there was never one hint of any possibility of a shortage of iron ore being experienced in Australia. It seems remarkable that just on the eve of the establishment of the industry, it should be found necessary to place

an embargo upon the export of the ore. There is no embargo on the export of pig iron, and at no distant date, when the iron ore deposits fall into the hands of the metal gang in the Eastern States, whether the embargo will then be still remaining or not, the same metal gang will continue to find a favourable market for pig iron.

Hon. C. G. Latham: Let us make our own iron now; I will do all I can to assist you.

Member: Hand over to the Commonwealth that part of the State.

Mr. MARSHALL: I do not know what the Commonwealth Government may or may not do, but I do know that it would be a dreadful tragedy if the Commonwealth acquired more territory than it has. I well remember the inquiry that took place into the administration of the Federal Territory, an inquiry that elicited the information that it cost £800 to grow one pumpkin. The Federal Government occupies a wonderful position, because it is the State Government that has to foster all the industries, and carry on the commercial and other activities within its boundaries. It is the State Government that brings into production and circulation all the wealth, while the Commonwealth Government has nothing to do except to impose taxation and administer the laws that it passes. The Commonwealth has that advantage over the States. The whole of the worry of developing the States falls on the shoulders of each of the State Governments, while the responsibility of the Commonwealth is nil. The Commonwealth's interference with the development of Yampi is totally unwarranted. One hon. member—and his remarks appeared to be endorsed by the Leader of the Opposition—was somewhat concerned about the capital to be employed in the development of Yampi being of foreign origin, in fact, Japanese. I believe that is not denied.

Hon. C. G. Latham: It is all Japanese.

Mr. MARSHALL: No one denies that.

Hon. C. G. Latham: Yet the sworn statements put before the warden were that it was to be all British capital and British machinery.

Mr. MARSHALL: The position is that again we appear to be most inconsistent, and our inconsistency on this occasion is doing the State untold harm. The factor to which I am about to refer applies to our everyday life, and we never complain. Are

there not millions of articles of Japanese manufacture in Australia—articles made by Japanese labour and brought to Australia in Japanese ships? Has there been any outcry?

Hon. C. G. Latham: When a protest was made, you were on the Japanese side.

Mr. MARSHALL: The Leader of the Opposition and those who are behind him are continually complaining about the tariff.

Hon. C. G. Latham: Do not you remember—

Mr. MARSHALL: I am speaking about the subject matter before the House, and I do not remember anything that may have happened years ago. The Opposition has continually complained about the high tariff; yet but for that tariff we would have had millions more pounds' worth of Japanese goods than we have at the present time. Why be inconsistent and complain about Japanese capital coming in to develop the iron ore deposits when millions of pounds' worth of their goods come into Australia?

Hon. C. G. Latham: How are those goods paid for?

Mr. MARSHALL: When we have the opportunity to develop an industry and export a commodity to pay for the goods that we import, the Commonwealth Government steps in. We allow manufactured articles to come in, and prevent raw materials from going out. Could not we have carried on in a peaceful way, rather than adopt the dog-in-the-manger spirit? It reminds me of the old saying about cutting off your nose to spite your face. True, Japan is at war. The member for Subiaco (Mrs. Cardell-Oliver) made some remark about, it and I am with her in her sympathy, but on this occasion we are the only people that are out of line. If all the producers of iron ore in the Commonwealth combined to prevent the export to Japan of iron ore, we would then be on fairly good ground. The embargo is not doing any injury to Japan; it is doing injury to us, because Japan is able to get from other countries all the iron ore she requires.

Hon. C. G. Latham: Japan has not had any from us yet.

Mr. MARSHALL: We ought to be particularly careful with all our primary industries, and I suggest to the Leader of the Opposition that we had better begin now to hoard up wool, wheat and other food-stuffs,

because we might want them in the near future! All this fictitious rubbish about what we might or might not want! It has not lent any logic to this particular subject. I sincerely hope the motion will be carried, and I think it will be. I hope that as a result of the protest, the Federal Government will be more guarded in its actions in the future, and will take no more retrograde steps that will prevent this State from developing its industries. The action of the Federal Government constitutes an unwarranted interference with the sovereign rights of the State, and we should have no hesitation in telling it so. The motion is framed along those lines, and I therefore support it.

MR. WATTS (Katanning) [5.41]: It appeared to me at first sight that the debate on this motion might well have been limited to the leaders of the respective parties. As the discussion has not been confined to the leaders of the respective parties, however, I consider that other private members might express their views on the matter. I propose to support the motion without reservation, mental or otherwise. The situation seems to be capable of being summarised very shortly, and I do not propose to take up much time in discussing it. I think we are all satisfied—at any rate I am—that the reason so far advanced by the Federal Government for the imposition of the embargo is totally inadequate. If there is any other reason, and it is probable and in fact possible that there is such a reason—an international or some other reason—of much greater importance than the one that has so far been offered, I venture to suggest that the Federal Government could have taken the Premier of this State into its confidence and told him what that reason was.

The Premier: Hear, hear!

Mr. WATTS: Had that been done, in all probability this motion would not have been submitted to the House. As it was not done, we are entitled to presume that the expressed reason for the embargo is the only one. Speakers on both sides of the House have freely admitted that the supply of iron ore is likely to be adequate for 60, 70 or a hundred years. One speaker went so far as to suggest that there was enough to last for 200 years. As a Western Australian, and one who realises or tries to realise, without knowing much about it, that the development of the

North-West is of very great importance to the State, I feel that the Federal Government should have been prepared to concede the last suggestion made, namely, that the deposits could be worked for at least 15 years, without seriously affecting the supplies of iron ore in this country which, at the worst, are regarded as being sufficient to meet requirements for a very long period and perhaps for a longer period than has been estimated. As the Premier has not been supplied with any reason that would convince him there was no occasion for this motion and that there was a sound basis for the imposition of the embargo—the information could have been given in confidence as between the head of one Government and the leader of another Government—we must as Western Australians support the motion.

I have felt that Western Australia would be a great deal better off out of the Federation, and were it not for the defence aspect I should be still more strongly of that opinion. The defence aspect does make some of us hesitate to put forward our ideas on the question of secession. However, the question of secession does not come into this matter. Nevertheless one thing is certain, and it is, that if we are to develop this State to the best of our ability, we need some strong and sound reason why our attempts to foster this particular industry should for the time being or for a considerable future period be hindered. In the absence of such a reason I intend to support the motion.

**MR. McLARTY** (Murray - Wellington) [5.45]: I do not think the member for Murchison (Mr. Marshall) was justified in saying that members on these benches are unsympathetic towards the motion. All of us were very sorry when we heard that the great iron ore deposit at Yampi Sound was not to be worked. I believe that the only reason why the Federal Government has imposed the embargo is because it fears that there is a shortage of iron ore in the Commonwealth. After all, Ministers cannot be blamed for accepting the advice of their experts.

The Minister for Mines: The experts never looked at the iron ore in this country, and had never even seen Yampi Sound.

**Mr. McLARTY:** The Federal Government accepted the advice of its experts.

**Mr. Coverley:** Do not you think it was a little over-cautious?

**Mr. McLARTY:** I consider that the request made to the Federal Government that it should permit a certain quantity of ore to be exported over a certain number of years should have been granted. The quantity stipulated was 15,000,000 tons. The export of that tonnage over a given period would have made no difference to the quantity of ore we would have left in Australia for future use, or at any rate, very little difference. Because of the Federal Government's refusal to permit that export I support the motion.

I can assure members representing the North that I have a good deal of sympathy for them and their constituents. I believe the development of the North constitutes our greatest problem, and I do not consider that part of the State has received the treatment it should have had. I sympathise with the people of the North who had a chance of witnessing the development of a great industry but who have now been disappointed. The Premier is right in making a protest. We were told by the Federal authorities in the first instance that there was an abundance of ore in the Commonwealth and that this deposit could be worked. As a result, not only has money been spent in the North, but a great deal has also been expended in the metropolitan area in making certain provisions to cope with trade that was expected to take place as a result of development at Yampi Sound. If the Federal Government is going to insist upon the embargo, we should be adequately compensated. Either the deposits should be worked or else the State should be compensated.

**Mr. Marshall:** How can any compensation be given when there is no basis upon which to assess it?

**Mr. McLARTY:** I realise that that is a difficult matter. I do not know where the compensation would end. I repeat that in my opinion the request for the export of 15,000,000 tons of ore should have been granted. Had work been started at Yampi Sound the foundations of a great industry would have been laid in this State. Mention has been made of losses that will accrue in other directions. The member for Kimberley referred to the cattle trade and said that he expected certain advantages for that industry. Other members suggested

that cattle could not be transported through the tropics. We had hoped that the work at Yampi Sound would lead to the development of the cattle industry and to the establishment of chilling works in the North, and if that had happened, there would not have been any need to carry the cattle through the tropics on the hoof. If the cattle trade could have been extended to Japan, there is not the slightest doubt that chilling works would have been erected at Derby, and the member for Kimberley is aware of the boon such works would have been to that part of the State. Therefore it is not enough to claim that we are losing only the benefit that would have followed the development of the iron ore deposits. Other industries have suffered, and certainly no part of Australia is more in need of markets than is the northern portion of this State. In my opening remarks I expressed the belief that the only reason that had actuated the Commonwealth Government in imposing the embargo was the fear of a shortage of iron ore in Australia.

Mr. Coverley: Do you believe that?

Mr. McLARTY: A statement was made in the House of Commons, in reply to questions, that no representations had been made by the Imperial Government to the Commonwealth Government to impose the embargo, and I think we can accept that statement.

Mr. Doney: Do you think the Imperial authorities would have told the world if such advice had been given?

Mr. McLARTY: If such advice had been given, I consider that the Prime Minister would have had a perfect right to inform the Premier of this State. I agree with the member for Katanning (Mr. Watts) that if there is any confidential information on which the Commonwealth acted, the Premier should have been informed of it.

Mr. Doney: Quite right.

Member: Perhaps he has been informed.

Mr. McLARTY: Had he been so informed, I cannot believe that he would have spoken as he did on this motion.

The Minister for Mines: The British authorities said they were not interested. That was published in the Press.

Mr. McLARTY: Quite so.

The Minister for Mines: If they were not interested, who else would be?

Mr. McLARTY: I consider that no harm would have been done had the Commonwealth allowed us to export 15,000,000 tons. That was a reasonable request, and in view of the Commonwealth's refusal, the Premier was justified in entering a protest. I hope that the motion will be carried unanimously. Western Australia—particularly the North—has suffered, and if the deposits at Yampi Sound are not worked, we should be adequately compensated for the sacrifices that the State is being called upon to make.

MR. WELSH (Pilbara) [5.55]: I did not intend to offer any remarks on the motion because I fully expected that it would be adopted by the House without comment. The North-West seems fated to have all manner of objections raised to thwart its development. I consider that nothing can justify the imposition of the embargo on the export of iron ore after the expenditure of money to develop the deposits. Operations at Yampi Sound would have led to the expansion of other industries in the North-West. I have in mind particularly the stock industry. For years cattle were exported from the North to the Philippine Islands, and that trade might easily have been regained had the work been continued at Yampi. I do not know whether there was any intention to convey cattle to Japan, but certainly there is a large market for our cattle in the Philippines and in the adjacent islands. Considerable expenditure would have been necessary to develop the iron ore deposits, for millions of tons of ore are available at the water's edge and could have been loaded direct from the hill to the ship. Why the North-West should be seemingly fated to have its enterprises nipped in the bud, I cannot understand. The Commonwealth had ample time to ascertain whether there was likely to be a shortage of iron ore in Australia before money had actually been expended on the deposits, and no amount of compensation would adequately recompense the State for the losses entailed by the imposition of the embargo. The motion has my whole-hearted support.

MR. HUGHES (East Perth) [5.57]: It is all very well to make a protest; talk is cheap. I do not think it is within our power to prevent war simply by shutting ourselves off from the rest of the world and declining to supply the means of war to any nation

that is at war. By refusing to supply our raw materials to European and Asiatic countries, we shall be more likely to provoke war. The cry has been raised in Europe that certain countries must be given access to the world's supplies of raw materials, and if we deny raw materials to some of those countries, they will certainly come and take them. Our best safeguard against war would be to populate the Northern Territory. The member for Murchison (Mr. Marshall) took great credit to himself in this Chamber the other night because he and the two other members occupying one of the front benches had three children between them.

Mr. Sleeman: No, thirteen.

Mr. HUGHES: Those members seem to have fallen into arrears in recent years. If those who can produce refrain from producing, there will certainly be no sense in suggesting, as the member for Murchison proposed, that we should hoard our edible commodities. I cannot believe that the iron ore we would supply to Japan could make much difference. I do not think that Japan will ever conquer China. If we supplied Japan with all the raw materials that exist in this country, she might temporarily secure a footing in China, but I am of opinion that Japan will not succeed in holding China for any considerable time.

Mr. Doney: You had better tell the Chinese that.

Mr. HUGHES: We do not need to tell them, because educated Orientals are telling us. The member for Williams-Narrogin would probably realise that fact if he could see a little further than his own town of Narrogin.

Hon. C. G. Latham: He cannot do it.

Mr. HUGHES: Students of politics in China have pointed out forcibly that the Chinese are not naturally deficient in intelligence. They have remained aloof for many years from the civilisation of the West. In other words, they have not expended all their energies and resources upon the invention and utilisation of means to destroy human beings. As soon as China becomes Westernised, say, in the course of the next 40 or 50 years, there is every reason to suppose that she will turn out her quota of engineers and scientists, who will also have become skilled in the destruction of human beings and in the organisation of the forces of destruction. When that time arrives, China, with her enormous man power,

will be able to expel from her borders any foreign power or powers that may temporarily obtain a footing during the ensuing five or ten years. We need not be alarmed about lending aid to Japan in her acts of aggression against China. We cannot live, in these days, in splendid isolation from the rest of the world. We have to accept as a fact, in the present state of society, that we are compelled to exchange our commodities with the rest of the world. If we excluded from Australia the commodities we now import, we would soon become a backward country. We possess no up-to-date means of transport and no up-to-date machinery. We would revert to a state of civilisation that would be more backward than that of the countryside of China, which the Japanese are now attempting to civilise with fire and sword. Whether the civilisation that is being conveyed to the countryside of China by means of fire and sword will make the Chinese any happier is a doubtful question. I also doubt, seeing that we have robbed Victoria of one of her illustrious sons, whether the people of this State are very much happier than are some of the humble Chinese. For the edification of the member for Murchison (Mr. Marshall)—

Mr. SPEAKER: I must ask the hon. member to deal more closely with the subject matter of the motion.

Mr. HUGHES: How does it come about Mr. Speaker, that when one member deals with a matter he is in order, but when another member deals with it in the same strain, he is not in order?

Mr. SPEAKER: It is for the Speaker to determine whether one member is overdoing it, and whether another is merely mentioning a particular matter.

Mr. HUGHES: There seems to be just a little faultiness about the decision.

Mr. Marshall: That is a reflection on the Chair, and I ask for a withdrawal.

Mr. SPEAKER: I know the hon. member did not mean that. He understands the position as well as I do. The hon. member may proceed.

Mr. HUGHES: This question is wrapped up in problems associated with the export of iron ore, and that in turn is wrapped up with the question of foreign aggression, not only against Australia, but also against portions of Asia. The history of Yampi has been a somewhat chequered one. The iron

ore deposits there were taken up from time to time for exploitation by various commercial interests. We know from the sworn evidence that was given when the leases were taken up, and again from the proceedings that were instituted to resist their forfeiture, that misrepresentations were made. On the one hand, it was alleged that the capital involved was British, and sworn affidavits were filed in support of that statement. We now find from the testimony of those who spoke for the company in question that the capital is entirely Japanese. That may or may not be so. In these matters there is difficulty in determining the nationality of capital.

Mr. Doust: Is there any nationality about capital?

Mr. HUGHES: We know that some oil companies that are allegedly American are predominantly British as to capital, and that some allegedly British companies are, conversely, predominantly American as to capital. Although the capital interested in Yampi may appear to be Japanese, it may be held by people other than Japanese. The company that started out to exploit the iron ore deposits in the North forfeited the leases by disobeying the laws of the State. It was bound to obey the mining laws of Western Australia, and, because it disobeyed them, the leases were forfeited. We gave the company the special privilege of having the warden's decision over-ridden by Ministerial decree. The company therefore is not entitled to any compensation whatever except for the machinery it placed on the leases. The member for Murchison suggested that the Commonwealth Government acted at the behest of groups of capitalists in the Eastern States. There may be a good deal in that. Unfortunately, concentrated capital in Australia, as elsewhere in the world, first makes it its business to secure control of the Press, and through that control obtains virtual control of Governments—apparently it matters little what the political complexion of any Government may be. The Yampi Sound situation seems to me the result of a dispute between two groups of capitalists, the Eastern States group being backed by the Federal Government, and the other group, pseudo-English and Japanese, being backed by the Western Australian Government. First of all the Japanese company was able to over-ride our rules,

and when its leases were forfeited the forfeiture was over-ridden by a Ministerial decree. Thus the company won the first round.

The Minister for Mines: Now you are spoiling a decent speech, as you usually do.

Mr. HUGHES: That is how the company won the first round. The Minister for Mines took no exception whatever when the member for Murchison was imputing evil motives to the Commonwealth Government. It was not political propaganda when that member asserted that the Commonwealth Government was acting in the interests of a private company. When I return an answer, it is bad.

Mr. SPEAKER: Possibly both hon. members were out of order.

Mr. HUGHES: Allow me to commend you, Mr. Speaker, for the wealth of caution in that word "possibly." It is our duty to protest against the continuous strangulation of Western Australian efforts to develop secondary industries. This iron embargo is merely the culmination of many acts of aggression on Western Australia by Eastern States interests. I remember, many years ago, when bottle manufacture was started in East Perth—notwithstanding that the constituency was represented by a teetotaler—bottles from South Melbourne were delivered in Western Australia at a cheaper price than they could have been bought at the factory door. Unless we contrive to do something that will prevent the strangling of efforts to establish secondary industries here, Western Australia will never make substantial progress. We are thoroughly justified in protesting whenever any action of the Eastern States tends to prevent the establishment of an industry in Western Australia, or prevents an industry established here from developing and enlarging. Everyone who has observed the efforts made from time to time to develop secondary industries in Western Australia will join in any protest that may be made, and I hope we shall not stop at a protest. When this embargo was placed upon us, the Premier had a wonderful opportunity to stir the Western Australian people to do something in the nature of a really vigorous protest. In every country of the world when a minority is being oppressed by a majority, the minority bestirs itself and eventually succeeds. Throughout Europe we hear of

minorities raising their voices in protest against the action of majorities.

Mr. Hegney: What about the domination of Austria by Germany, and what is taking place in Czecho-Slovakia to-day?

Mr. HUGHES: I fancy that the Sudeten Germans, notwithstanding that they are in the minority, will ultimately get their own way in Czecho-Slovakia. And now, having allowed the member for Middle Swan (Mr. Hegney) to display some knowledge of international affairs, I return to the Yampi protest. I hope that if the protest proves ineffective, if a deaf ear is turned to it, the Government will endeavour to devise some means of adopting continuous activity to regain some of the sovereign rights which Western Australia lost when our ancestors entered Federation.

Question put and passed.

On motion by the Premier resolved: That the resolution be transmitted by message to the Legislative Council and its concurrence desired therein.

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

## **BILL—PENSIONERS (RATES EXEMPTION) ACT AMENDMENT.**

*Second Reading.*

Debate resumed from the 6th September.

MR. DONEY (Williams - Narrogin) [7.31]: I know of no objection that can reasonably be raised against the one proposal embodied in the Bill. The Returned Soldiers' League is the body principally concerned in the matter and is wholeheartedly behind the proposition. So far as I am aware, that organisation may have prompted the introduction of the Bill. Be that as it may, the Bill is designed as an instrument of justice in the interests of the wife or widow, as the case may be, of a soldier who himself is, or was, a service pensioner, and whose wife or widow is also a pensioner and owns a home. Hon. members may perhaps understand the position more easily if I explain that the Bill, if agreed to, will place the wife or widow of a service pensioner in precisely the same position regarding exemption from municipal or other rates, as is the wife or widow of an invalid or old-age pensioner who owns, or did own, a house. No

one is likely seriously to quarrel with such an objective. The Bill is desirable from any angle from which we care to view it. Parliament thought this necessary provision had been made in 1936 when the Pensioners (Rates Exemption) Act Amendment Act was passed. Unfortunately it allowed, quite inadvertently, exemption to anyone who was a member of the forces within the meaning of the Australian Soldiers' Repatriation Act (Commonwealth), 1920-1935. Consequently Parliament unwittingly disqualified wives and widows other than those who served as nurses during the war. In effect, the Bill is aimed to do what Parliament thought had been done in 1936.

By way of interjection the Leader of the Opposition—I think I am correct in saying that that hon. member raised the point—suggested that in the case of a service pensioner who occupied a house provided by the War Service Homes Commission, the consent of the War Service Homes Commissioner would be necessary before the exemption could operate. If I understood him aright, the Minister in reply said he considered the Bill satisfactorily over-rode that obstacle. I have read the portion of the clause dealing with that phase, and it seems to me that the consent of the Commissioner is essential. The position, as I understand it, is that the exemption from the necessity to pay municipal or other rates is permissible only during the lifetime of the pensioner, and upon his, or her, death the accumulated unpaid rates will become a first charge on the estate. Therefore it will be seen that to the extent of the total of those unpaid rates there will be interference with the priority of the rights of the Commissioner who happens to be the mortgagee. The Commissioner does not always object to exemptions from rating, and in those relatively few instances where he does object, it seems to be the practice in this State for the Returned Soldiers' League to take up the cudgels on behalf of the pensioner and submit in due course his, or her, case to the Commissioner. I understand that in very few instances have those appeals failed. There is not much room for more to be said concerning the Bill which is a wholly desirable measure, and I shall have much pleasure in supporting it.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

*In Committee.*

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

**BILL—BUREAU OF INDUSTRY AND ECONOMIC RESEARCH.***Second Reading.*

Debate resumed from the 1st September.

**HON. C. G. LATHAM** (York) [7.40]: I have carefully perused this Bill and cannot see one thing in it that I can recommend to the House. We are duplicating in the Bill many other systems for doing what it is proposed shall be done by the bureau. The Bill proposes to set up a bureau of not fewer than nine members, who may co-opt a great many others, thus making the bureau a very unwieldy affair. Consequently, if we pass the Bill, it will be impossible to forecast what the expense will be to the State. I wonder if the Minister has any idea in his mind other than what he informed the House when he introduced the Bill. I have read his speech very carefully and, for the life of me, cannot find anything in it to justify the Bill. It is true the Minister paid a compliment to those engaged in primary production in this State. He pointed out how our primary products had been improved and the benefit that improvement had been to the State. He mentioned the wonderful reputation we had built up overseas by the commodities we export. May I point out to the Minister, however, that those very words of his convey to the House how we did improve our primary industries? All those improvements were effected without the aid of a bureau of industry and economic research.

The Minister for Employment: The improvement would have been greater had a bureau been established.

**HON. C. G. LATHAM**: I have my doubts about that. I cannot see in what way such a bureau could have achieved more than has been done. Some two or three years ago, in order to assist our primary producers, Parliament decided to amend the Agricultural Bank Act so as to provide that it should be controlled by three highly qualified officials. The chairman was paid £2,000 per annum and the other two members £1,500 per annum each. I ask the Minister if he proposes that the Commissioners of the Agricultural Bank shall

take advice from the proposed bureau. Are the members of the bureau to instruct the Commissioners of the Agricultural Bank? If so, then it is time we had a stock-taking of our public officials.

**HON. P. D. FERGUSON**: Only one now is drawing £1,500.

**HON. C. G. LATHAM**: Two of the Commissioners of the Agricultural Bank are paid £1,500 per annum; that was the arrangement made with them at all events. I understand the present general manager is now receiving only £1,500 per annum. I would like to know whether the proposed bureau is to override or tender advice to these highly-paid officials. When the Minister interjected, I suppose he had in mind a statement he made to the effect that a large sum of money had been lost in developing the primary industries of the State. It is true that we have assisted our primary producers with a large sum of money, but I have yet to learn the difference between losses made by individuals and the collective loss. What is the difference? In one case, the person who took up land lost his money in the venture. Parliament decided years ago that it would be better to have a collective loss instead of individual losses and so the Agricultural Bank was established. If we examine the returns from the primary industries, however, we shall find that no loss at all has been made, because we have created an asset in our agricultural and dairying industries that can never be taken from us. Yearly that asset is a source of national income, so that in reality there is no loss at all. Despite the fact that the Minister for Lands has frequently tried to impress the public, through this house, with the enormous losses that have been made in the primary industries, there is no doubt that those industries are the means by which we pay our interest overseas. The Minister will admit that the bureau will not assist one iota in exporting a commodity that can enter into competition with commodities produced in other parts of the world. I should be very pleased if we could have a change from exporting primary products alone to exporting manufactured goods also; but members know very well that it is impossible for us to compete successfully with manufactured goods, if we have to export them on the same basis as we export our primary products and sell them in the dumping markets of the world.

The industries that the Minister has applauded, and which he stated this bureau



would materially assist, are being built up without any assistance at the present time; they are the only means we have of paying our debts overseas, they enable us to find money to pay our interest and provide the cash necessary for the importation of manufactured articles from overseas. They also find the money required by our people who travel abroad.

The Premier: We want to stop importing articles by making them here.

Hon. C. G. LATHAM: We have attempted to do so for a very long time.

Mr. Sleeman: We once attempted to make agricultural implements.

Hon. C. G. LATHAM: Yes. That remark leads me to say that this Bill is an insult to the intelligence of members. The interjection of the member for Fremantle (Mr. Sleeman) is pertinent. On one occasion we did attempt to manufacture agricultural machinery.

Mr. Sleeman: Do not say "we," say "they."

Hon. C. G. LATHAM: No. The Labour Government some years ago—

Mr. Sleeman: Don't say we killed the implement works.

Hon. C. G. LATHAM: When we took over in 1930, we found that the loss on the State Implement Works was £12,000 a year and but for the backing of the people we could not have carried on the works. If we were to compare our losses from secondary industries with our losses from primary industries, there would be quite a different story to tell. I share the Minister's regret, which I have repeatedly expressed in this House, at the importation of goods from the Eastern States and from overseas, because, as I pointed out in my speech on the Address-in-reply, we shall experience great difficulty this year in finding sufficient money to meet our commitments overseas. I do not speak particularly of Western Australia, but of Australia generally. We shall experience the difficulty I have mentioned because of the low price of our export commodities. The value of our imports has increased slowly, until it has reached a total of £13,000,000. Quite a number of the imported articles could be manufactured here. Why are we not able to manufacture them? If the Government investigated some of those industries or businesses to which assistance has been given, it would learn the cause

of the trouble. I am aware of what members will say immediately I mention what the trouble is. It is wages, hours of labour and volume of turnover. These are the factors that count and, until we can reconstruct ourselves somewhat on the basis of the Eastern States, we cannot possibly hope to compete with them. Probably the greatest difficulty we have to overcome is mass production in the big cities of the Eastern States. Mass production enables the manufacturer to obtain a small profit by dumping goods into this State far in excess of our requirements. Although there may be only a slight difference in the basic wage—perhaps no more than 3s. a week—such an increase has a considerable effect in an industry that employs a large number of men and women. The payment of an extra 3s. a week and the shortening of the hours of labour add to the cost of the goods manufactured. Members of the Government may charge me with being a unificationist. I certainly believe that until we can get some uniform method throughout Australia we will not be able to build up our industries here even with the aid of this bureau.

The Premier: We can try.

Hon. C. G. LATHAM: I will mention some of the industries we have attempted to help in Western Australia. Money has been advanced to assist in the establishment of jam factories; and with what result? The Treasurer knows. I will tell him the reason for that result. The reason is that we cannot possibly compete with the mass production in Victoria and Tasmania. Immediately we establish a jam factory here, this State is flooded with a commodity that is cheaper than the locally manufactured product.

Mr. Hegney: We produce better jam than do manufacturers in the Eastern States.

Hon. C. G. LATHAM: I have a friend who has spent a lot of money in the manufacture of jam in this State and he tells me he has been absolutely forced out of the market.

Mr. Marshall: Not by high wages and better labour conditions.

Hon. C. G. LATHAM: That had something to do with it.

The Minister for Lands: What kind of business did he conduct?

Hon. C. G. LATHAM: He was a jam manufacturer. The wages paid do have some influence upon an industry. If 1,000 workers are engaged in a factory, and 3s. a week extra has to be paid to each one, 3,000 shillings or £150 a week is involved. Of course wages have something to do with the position. Again, we attempted to build up a pottery works in this State. The Premier knows all about that, too. I wish that a success could have been made of that enterprise.

The Premier: So do we all.

Hon. C. G. LATHAM: Could the proposed bureau assist that industry? Of course not. The trouble is that we cannot compete with imported articles, about which the member for Murchison (Mr. Marshall) reminded us to-night. We are faced with the difficulty that manufacturers in foreign countries dump goods in this State at prices below those at which they are prepared to sell the articles to their own people. Unless imports of those commodities are totally prohibited, we cannot compete with overseas manufacturers. One of the most successful local industries is the Albany Woollen Mills, but even that cannot be regarded as a complete success. If it were not for the generous custom of the State Government those mills would have a very lean time. The tradesmen in this State are as good as others anywhere in Australia, but we cannot compete with manufacturers that export similar goods from other places. Unless there be control over imported commodities, the proposed bureau will not be of much assistance. Perhaps the Minister will tell us how the bureau will assist local industries. I have gone very carefully into the matter and I can discover no way in which the bureau can be of value.

When the last National-Country Party Government was in office an economic council was established. An endeavour was made to have all interests represented on the council, not only the manufacturers, but commercial and other interests. We tried to obtain the assistance of representatives of those various interests. We were not as fortunate as the present Government because the Trades Hall refused to have anything to do with us.

The Premier: It was about time——

Hon. C. G. LATHAM: I will admit it was. But Trades Hall refused to have anything

to do with us. There was quite a different state of affairs when the Labour Government made a similar move. Everyone associated with the council did his best. I believe that body attempted to do everything possible to foster the development of industry. The people chosen to inquire into various matters were quite qualified to express an opinion and had a scientific knowledge of their subject. What was the result? The first thing they did was to build two houses in order to stimulate the building industry. People responded to the stimulus. That body rendered service in a voluntary capacity. Now we are going to turn down those voluntary workers and establish a bureau with an unlimited number of members who are to be paid. Why does not the Bill set out what it is proposed to pay? Why does the Bill stipulate that the members shall be paid such money as may be prescribed by regulation? We have no knowledge of what is intended. I know how much authority Parliament has. I have said time after time that we have no control of the finances to-day. It is no use saying that we have, because we have not. Here is another means of taking away control from Parliament.

Mr. Sleeman: Then who has control of the finances?

Hon. C. G. LATHAM: We have frittered away our control of the finances by Act of Parliament. I wanted to discover what was the position with regard to the University and I found there was an Act of Parliament by which £30,000 is provided every year for that institution, and the money must be paid unless we amend the law. The salaries of members and of the Agricultural Bank trustees are fixed. We have no say in the matter.

The Minister for Lands: The law can always be amended.

Hon. C. G. LATHAM: Well, we will take you at your word. We will amend it some day.

The Minister for Lands: You can always take action.

Hon. C. G. LATHAM: No one knows better than the Minister that those of us on this side of the House can take no action.

The Minister for Lands: You can amend the law.

Hon. C. G. LATHAM: We cannot. Did not the hon. member tell us that he would put it in writing so that we could not do it? Of course he did.

Member: All the writing of the Minister for Lands can be over-riden by the decision of Parliament.

Mr. Sleeman: Who controls the finances?

Hon. C. G. LATHAM: The Arbitration Court controls the finances of the Government workers.

Mr. Fox: That is a very weak statement.

Hon. C. G. LATHAM: Who fixes the wages? Do any of the Ministers or the departmental heads? No. I say definitely that the Arbitration Court does.

Mr. Rodoreda: Parliament gave it that authority.

Hon. C. G. LATHAM: I agree with the hon. member, and Parliament was probably very wise in doing so. But the point is we do not control the finances in that regard.

Mr. Rodoreda: You are growling about it now.

Hon. C. G. LATHAM: I am merely pointing out how little control we have of the finances. We do not control the salaries of our civil servants.

Mr. Needham: Does any Parliament control the salaries of civil servants?

Hon. C. G. LATHAM: Those salaries are controlled by the Public Service Commissioner.

The Minister for Education: Do you want to amend the Act which makes provision for the University?

Hon. C. G. LATHAM: The Minister would not allow me to amend it. If I attempted to do so I should be ruled out of order by the Speaker.

The Minister for Education: Do you want to increase or reduce the amount?

Hon. C. G. LATHAM: I want it increased of course. I do not mind having it increased while the hon. member is in office. I have no objection to its being increased while he is the Minister for Education.

The Minister for Education: So you do not mind the expenditure of more money than Parliament has authorised.

Hon. C. G. LATHAM: We have no control over the matter; and now the Government has come down with a Bill to authorise the appointment of a bureau of nine persons and such other persons as the bureau, with the consent of the Minister, may co-opt by reason of their industrial, economic or scientific knowledge. The Bill provides that any person so co-opted shall act in an advisory capacity only, and all are to receive a certain amount of

payment. We do not know what the cost will be. That is information the Minister omitted to give the House.

I mentioned how difficult it was to get manufactured articles in this State at a price that the public would pay. Unfortunately, the people insist upon buying the cheapest articles. There would not be the importation of all the Japanese goods, with which the member for Murchison is so well acquainted, if the people did not buy them.

Mr. Hegney: Then how would you sell your wheat and wool?

Hon. C. G. LATHAM: The reason why Japanese goods are imported in such large quantities is that there are ready customers for them. As a matter of fact, people are compelled to buy the cheapest articles because their finances are so limited. Consider the part-time workers; what hope have they of buying other than the cheapest articles? A tin of jam manufactured in Western Australia costs 1s. 1d. compared with 11d. for the imported article. Which would they buy? They are compelled to buy the jam at 11d. Men with large families have no alternative. The bureau will not help us at all in that respect. It will duplicate many services already existing and available to us. I know of no way in which the bureau would be able to overcome that difficulty.

There is no suggestion, surely, that the bureau should have the right to dictate to the Arbitration Court. There is no suggestion, surely, that it should even advise the Arbitration Court. The court has its sources of information, and probably its members would be the last ones to approach the bureau for information as to the value of wages or on similar matters. After having read the Bill carefully, I am still wondering where the power begins and ends. The bureau is even to inquire into conditions of sweated labour. That is the duty of factories and shops inspectors, or the authority can be delegated in order to give effect to the Minister's desires. The Minister complained of the difficulties occasioned by the violent fluctuation of prices. I can think of no way in which the bureau could exercise control there. Parliament can fix the price of commodities for home consumption, if it so desires. Parliament can limit the prices to be charged for commodities, but the bureau will not be able to do that.

I have endeavoured to ascertain why the Royal Commissioner on Youth Employment made a certain recommendation. After listening to the speech of the Minister in moving the second reading of the Bill, I decided to turn to the Royal Commissioner's report. It is a bulky report, and I dare say no member has had time to read the whole of it. Members have all too little time to devote to the reading of the many reports that are submitted. Still, the Commissioner's report is useful for reference. The Commissioner said there were three countries that have these bureaux—France, Queensland and New Zealand. Let us examine the functions of the National Economic Council of France. I would like members to ask themselves whether they propose to set up a similar bureau here. The report states—

The "International Labour Review" of July, 1937, has the following passage relating to the National Economic Council of France:—

The Popular Front Government, however, from the outset made intensive use of this institution to an extent which had perhaps not been foreseen by its predecessors. The organisation in question was the new National Economic Council. France had had an earlier National Economic Council which remained in existence for ten years and did useful work, although sometimes perhaps of a rather academic nature. Neither its composition nor its powers enabled it to go much beyond the theoretical field. The powers and the composition of the new council make it something entirely different.

The powers of the council are quite clearly defined in Section 8 of the Act of 19th March, 1936, which instituted it, and it will suffice to quote that section:—

"The National Economic Council may consider, either at the request of the Government or of one of the Chambers or of a Parliamentary Committee or on its own initiative, any Government or private member's Bill of national economic importance, or any economic problem.

"Government or private members' Bills of national economic importance shall be transmitted by the Government to the National Economic Council as soon as they are distributed.

"Draft public administrative regulations affecting the national economic system shall be submitted to the National Economic Council for an opinion."

This means that France has adopted a form of bureaucratic government.

Mr. Sleeman: Tell us what has been done in New Zealand.

Hon. C. G. LATHAM: I have not been able to obtain particulars of the legislation in New Zealand, but I do know what is being done in Australia. According to the "Hansard" reports I have read, it is somewhat similar. France, as I said, has adopted a form of government by bureaucratic methods. Surely there is no desire to set up a system of that sort here. Although I differ politically from members opposite, I regard this House as a well-constituted assembly.

Mr. Needham: Hear, hear!

Hon. C. G. LATHAM: The hon. member might be the exception. Amongst the members are men possessing a thorough knowledge of our industries and of the commercial, professional and industrial sections. Consider the members occupying the front benches: there is no need to go outside the House for information on subjects in which they have specialised.

Mr. Fox: But do you think they would agree in their views?

Hon. C. G. LATHAM: On the Government cross-benches are members possessing a thorough knowledge of trade union conditions. When I require advice along those lines, I do not go to somebody in St. George's-terrace; I go to those men who have made a study of trade union affairs. Amongst members on the Opposition side of the House are men possessing a knowledge of agricultural affairs that probably could not be surpassed. I give Ministers credit for having a knowledge of the departments they control. I have no desire to see a bureau established here. Irresponsible people from time to time speak of members as if they were morons. Are we, by our attitude to this Bill, going to support that theory? The Bill may be regarded as a confession that we are incompetent to deal with these matters. If Ministers or members opposite desire the assistance of outside people, there is no difficulty in obtaining it. People are always willing to help, so I contend that we can dismiss that side of the question. We have a more stable Government than that of France. Probably it is the lack of stability about the Government of France that accounts for the political unrest there. Are we going to follow that system? It does not commend itself to me, nor do I think it does to other members.

Mr. Rodoreda: You think it is a question of having no confidence in ourselves?

Hon. C. G. LATHAM: In Queensland there is a Government representing the same political thought as we have in this State. Mr. Justice Wolff says—

The State of Queensland organised a bureau in 1932 pursuant to the Bureau of Industry Act, 1932. The constitution of the bureau and its powers and functions are set out in Sections 5, 10 and 11 of the Act, which are hereunder—

5. (1) For the purposes of this Act there shall be established a bureau which shall be called the "Bureau of Industry" (hereinafter in this Act referred to as the "Bureau").

(2) The number of members of the bureau shall be the number from time to time declared by the Governor-in-Council by Order in Council, but shall not exceed 15 at any one time inclusive of—

- (a) The Minister for the time being who shall, ex officio, be a member and chairman of the bureau;
- (b) The director of the bureau for the time being who shall, ex officio, be a member of the bureau;
- (c) The Public Service Commissioner for the time being who shall, ex officio, be a member of the bureau;
- (d) The chairman, Land Administration Board, for the time being who shall, ex officio, be a member of the bureau;
- (e) The Under-Secretary, Department of Labour and Industry, for the time being who shall, ex officio, be a member of the bureau;
- (f) The Commissioner of Main Roads, for the time being under the Main Roads Acts, 1920 to 1929, who shall, ex officio, be a member of the bureau;
- (g) The Under-Secretary, Department of Public Works, who shall, ex officio, be a member of the bureau.

The bureau is a combination of all departments. It seems to have been brought into existence in Queensland to co-ordinate the various services. We had a similar organisation in this State, but it was found not necessary to bring down a Bill for its establishment. Departments were found to be spending money on articles that were already lying idle in some other department. Possibly that sort of thing goes on to-day. We, therefore, set up a departmental committee consisting of representatives of each of the departments, with a view to seeing whether that committee could reduce expenditure on equipment and such-like. The result was satisfactory. Apparently Queens-

land has adopted the same system. The powers, functions and responsibilities of the bureau in Queensland are very extensive, probably as extensive as are the powers the Minister proposes to give the bureau in Western Australia. Every one of the matters to be investigated by the proposed bureau can be investigated to-day. In Government employment are departmental experts and scientists, and the university is always available to us. If we are not satisfied with the facilities already available we still have the State committee of the C.S.I.R. The State committee consists of one member who is a member of the Commonwealth organisation, sitting as chairman, three Government representatives, three representatives of the Australian National Research Council, three representatives of industry, and other members not exceeding ten as may be required. Surely that committee is sufficient for the requirements of the Government. It costs the people of this State very little, seeing that the paid members are remunerated from Commonwealth funds. Why are we duplicating that system? Is it not an extravagance to do so?

The Premier: There will be no extravagant expenditure.

Hon. C. G. LATHAM: I am afraid there will be. If the Premier wants to use any organisation, let him use the State committee, which is available to him under Commonwealth law.

The Premier: It is a useful body, and probably some of its members will be members of this bureau.

Hon. C. G. LATHAM: Why put them on two committees to do the same work? Let me tell members the powers that have been delegated to the C.S.I.R.—

(2) The powers and functions of the council shall, subject to regulations and to the approval of the Minister, be—

(a) the initiation and carrying out of scientific researches in connection with, or for the promotion of, primary or secondary industries in the Commonwealth;

(b) the training of research workers and the establishment and awarding of industrial research studentships and fellowships;

(c) the making of grants in aid of pure scientific research;

(d) the recognition or establishment of associations of persons engaged in any industry or industries for the purpose of carrying out industrial scientific research and the co-operation with and the making of grants to such associations when recognised or established;

(e) the testing and standardisation of scientific apparatus and instruments, and the carrying out of scientific investigations connected with standardisation of apparatus, machinery, materials and instruments used in industry;

(f) the establishment of a bureau of information for the collection and dissemination of information relating to scientific and technical matters; and also that of acting as a means of liaison between the Commonwealth and other countries in matters of scientific research.

The Federal council has all the power it requires, and the State can use that council whenever it desires to do so. In addition, as I have said, we have the State committee of that council, with three Government representatives upon it.

The Premier: Not three Government representatives on the local committee?

Hon. C. G. LATHAM: Yes. I think Mr. Lefroy is the chairman. The State incurs no expense in respect of the local committee.

The Premier: We could avail ourselves of the services of that committee on this bureau without cost.

Hon. C. G. LATHAM: Why duplicate the machinery? All the powers necessary are given by Federal statute, and are exercised at Federal expense. I have frequently complained that these bureaux are an admission by the Government of its incompetence.

The Premier: Then the Commonwealth Government must be incompetent.

Hon. C. G. LATHAM: No, the Commonwealth Government is quite a different matter.

The Premier: Of course it is.

Hon. C. G. LATHAM: Its ramifications extend beyond Australia. I have always stuck to the State Government, because of its close relationship with its own people. I always maintain that the Commonwealth Government is far removed from the people, and cannot be otherwise. In the Federal Parliament are members representing Western Australia, and they spend half the year in Canberra. How can they keep in touch with the people of this State? We are on the spot and are amongst our own people. They have representatives in the State Parliament, and those representatives are in close touch with the people. This Bill is an admission by the Government that it has no policy with which to help the State along the road to prosperity. It is obliged to build

up this bureau as an excuse for the lack of policy, or as a means of excusing itself when it comes to facing the public at a general election. That is my belief.

The Premier: That is not so.

Hon. C. G. LATHAM: It is. For nearly six years we have waited for the Government to put forward some policy. All we have had is a road policy, a sewerage policy and a policy for the construction of dams in the hills. We have had nothing else. Immediately one road is finished another has to started. That sort of thing can never help in solving the unemployment problem. It can only be solved by the absorption of men in industry.

Mr. Sleeman: You employed men picking weeds off footpaths. That did not solve the problem.

Hon. C. G. LATHAM: It was as effective as is the policy the hon. member has been fostering for 5½ years.

The Premier: Oh no!

Hon. C. G. LATHAM: Probably it was not the most desirable policy, but it was just as effective as is the present policy of the Government.

The Minister for Works: How barren you are of ideas.

Hon. C. G. LATHAM: The problem cannot be solved in any other way than by absorbing men in industry. It is true there has been an improvement in the mining industry. Despite what members opposite have said, I maintain that the price of gold affords the only reason for that improvement.

The Premier: And secondary industries.

Hon. C. G. LATHAM: There has been very little increase in secondary industries.

The Premier: An increase of 20,000 employees.

Hon. C. G. LATHAM: All I go by is the imports. That is the answer.

The Minister for Lands: The imports show prosperity. People are able to buy, and you tell them they are down and out.

Hon. C. G. LATHAM: It shows that our people are forced to go out of Western Australia for articles, because there is no policy—

The Premier: A few of them are buying luxuries.

Hon. C. G. LATHAM: I have heard an hon. member opposite say that the Government had a policy of despair.

Mr. Lambert: I said, a policy of negation.

Mr. Sleeman: Is this your policy speech for the general election?

Hon. C. G. LATHAM: It is not. I shall hardly need to make a policy speech. I almost regret to say the only thing the present Government will have to do will be to walk out on the platform, and then the death knell of its political career will be rung. There will be no need for us on this side to do anything.

The Premier: You will have to stop over there.

Hon. C. G. LATHAM: I sincerely hope that when the change does come we shall be able to put up a policy that will mean the absorption of people in permanent employment, real employment. We shall be able to do that without sheltering behind boards and bureaux.

The Minister for Lands: You will put the people in Blackboy.

Hon. C. G. LATHAM: I am glad that those who left the Treasury bench in April of 1930 did not have to carry on the government of this State for the three years that followed. It was wonderful to be sitting on this side of the House criticising whatever was done.

The Premier: I did not do that.

Hon. C. G. LATHAM: But the gentleman who occupies the position of Minister for Lands has never hesitated to criticise.

The Minister for Lands: And with good reason.

Hon. C. G. LATHAM: Without any reason whatever. If we attempted to do anything it was always wrong. If we attempted to settle married men on the land, where they could get some sort of living for their wives and families, it was wrong. I admit it is the function of an Opposition to criticise. It is not the function of an Opposition to help the Government.

The Minister for Agriculture: If that attitude is wrong, do not adopt it.

Hon. C. G. LATHAM: I will not adopt it. However, if this Bill had any value whatever, I would support it to-night. There is not the slightest feature to recommend it to us. In fact, it has only one object, that the Minister who has introduced it may be able to fill nine positions with his political friends.

Ministerial Members: Oh!

Hon. C. G. LATHAM: I suppose he has those friends all ready now.

The Minister for Works: Try to be fair!

Hon. C. G. LATHAM: That is fair. I am sure members on the Ministerial bench do not want me to tell them the political appointments that are being made—appointments of political friends. At one time the primary producers had a representative on the Fremantle Harbour Trust. They have none to-day. Another political appointment has been made there. What are the present Agricultural Bank trustees if not political appointments?

The Premier: What has that to do with the Bill?

The Minister for Lands: The secretary of the Agricultural Bank is a friend of yours.

Hon. C. G. LATHAM: Who put him in the Bank?

The Minister for Lands: You put him in the Treasury.

Hon. C. G. LATHAM: I never did anything of the sort and I did not put him in the Bank either. He must have been a good man or the Minister would not have given him the Bank appointment.

The Minister for Lands: Did I put him there?

Hon. C. G. LATHAM: Yes. He is your friend.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! The Bill provides a very wide range of discussion, but even that wide range has limits. I suggest it would be better for the hon. member to stick to the Bill than hold a discussion with the bench opposite. I think the hon. member could get much closer to the Bill than he has done during the last quarter of an hour.

Hon. C. G. LATHAM: If you will not object, Mr. Speaker—

Mr. SPEAKER: I know the range is very wide.

Hon. C. G. LATHAM: Will you permit me, Sir, to set out what the bureau is expected to do?

... the powers and functions of the bureau shall be—(a) To encourage and assist industrial development throughout the State, including for that purpose the carrying-out or the procuring of the carrying-out of scientific investigations and research.

That duplicates the work of the Council of Scientific and Industrial Research and of the State committee of that organisation.

(b) To encourage and assist any industry already established, or proposed to be established, and for that purpose to make through all available channels all such inquiries as

may be deemed necessary or convenient to be made.

We have available all the necessary staff for that purpose. We have the Factories and Shops Branch, the Economic Council with a secretary, and so on.

(c) 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.

Surely Ministers can get that information if they want it, and so can any departmental officer.

(d) To solicit, seek for, and acquire information relating to industry, trade and commerce and to make such information available to such persons and in such manner as the bureau may think expedient.

That is already done. The information is available in the Statistician's Branch. Yet the House is asked to set up a bureau to do the work that Mr. Bennett is doing to-day.

(e) To make to the Minister recommendations concerning the measures and methods which, if adopted, would assist and encourage industrial development.

We know what is required for that purpose—satisfactory prices. If we can get satisfactory prices for all our commodities, the position will be satisfactory. However, we know that cannot be done.

(f) To advise the Minister in respect of the granting by the Government of financial and other assistance in relation to any industry or proposed industry.

The Agricultural Bank trustees are there for that purpose. They administer the Industries Assistance Act. The bureau is to enlighten or advise those highly-paid officers.

(g) To solicit, seek for and obtain from all available sources, information regarding raw materials and manufactured products and any other matters of material interest to the industrial life and industrial development of the State.

So that the Government Geologist and the Government Mineralogist are to be superseded by the bureau! We already have those experts available to supply all information required. Further, we have available to us, because of the State's annual contribution of £35,000 to £40,000 a year, the University professors.

Hon. P. D. Ferguson: They are not much use.

Hon. C. G. LATHAM: They may not be a great deal of use, but still they are avail-

able. And then, as I stated before, there is the Council of Scientific and Industrial Research. There is also the Department of Industry.

(h) To co-operate with Federal and State institutions or bodies and with any other organised societies or bodies whose powers and functions and activities are either wholly or in part of a nature similar to the powers, functions and activities of the bureau under this Act; and to collaborate with any of the institutions, bodies or societies aforesaid when, in the opinion of the bureau, such collaboration will or may be beneficial to or be in the interests of the development of industries in the State.

Surely to goodness a highly paid bureau is not required for that purpose. All that is necessary is to get the departmental and sub-departmental heads together to advise the Government, with the aid of the various bodies now available. Then the bureau is—

(i) To inquire into and advise upon scientific investigation and research beyond the limits of the State with a view to the use or application of the discoveries obtained by means of such scientific investigation and research in and for the benefit of industries in the State.

That is exactly what the C.S.I.R. is doing. All that is necessary is for that organisation to send an officer along, and his work can be followed up by a State officer.

The Minister for Agriculture: But there is a difference.

Hon. C. G. LATHAM: Very little.

The Minister for Agriculture: The C.S.I.R. devotes all its time to primary industries.

Hon. P. D. Ferguson: Of course it does not.

Hon. C. G. LATHAM: It does nothing of the sort.

The Minister for Agriculture: Yes, it does.

Hon. C. G. LATHAM: The Minister cannot have read any of the C.S.I.R. reports.

Hon. P. D. Ferguson: Sir David Rivett made that clear the other day.

Hon. C. G. LATHAM: I shall send some of the reports to the Minister for his enlightenment.

The Minister for Agriculture: The officials of the C.S.I.R. are devoting the whole of their time to primary industries.

Hon. C. G. LATHAM: Not the whole of the time. One branch of the C.S.I.R. is dealing with that phase, and perhaps that is all with which the Minister has come into touch.



The Minister for Works: The C.S.I.R. does not show a backward State how it can catch up with the Eastern States. That is not a function of the C.S.I.R.

Hon. C. G. LATHAM: Will the bureau to be set up under the Bill accomplish that end?

The Minister for Works: That is what is intended.

Mr. Thorn: Is Western Australia a backward State?

The Minister for Works: Yes.

Hon. C. G. LATHAM: And it will be, so long as the present Government is in power!

Ministerial members: No!

Mr. Cross: The electors will not take a risk with you.

Hon. C. G. LATHAM: We will change the position very soon, and we will do all this without the assistance of the bureau that the Government seeks to set up. Then the bureau will be required—

(j) To inquire into the conditions of employment and the causes and extent of unemployment in the State.

Perhaps the bureau may justify itself under that heading. It may inquire into the conditions of employment. This, however, is an admission by the Minister that he cannot do so himself.

Mr. Doney: And, at any rate, even that means duplication.

Hon. C. G. LATHAM: Of course it does. All these functions are aimed at allowing Ministers to sit down and do nothing.

Mr. Marshall: Will that be a change?

Mr. Seward: And they will have no responsibility whatever.

Hon. C. G. LATHAM: As though we do not already know the extent of unemployment in this State! There is no doubt what this provision is for. Then the bureau is—

(k) To inquire into and report upon requests for assistance by way of advances or guarantee made under Part III. of the Industries Assistance Act, 1915, and its amendments.

Already the State has a staff of officers doing that very work. The Agricultural Bank Commissioners control operations under the Industries Assistance Act.

Hon. P. D. Ferguson: And the Under Treasurer is associated with that work.

Hon. C. G. LATHAM: Yes, and the bureau can do no more than is already being done, unless, of course, there is a desire to throw money away foolishly in rendering assistance to industry. I regret to say that

immediately it becomes necessary for the Government to render assistance to an industry, that help is forthcoming, but seldom is the money returned to the State. The mining industry furnishes an exception to that assertion, but I am afraid that under Part III. of the Industries Assistance Act no money has been returned to the State.

Mr. Cross: That was mostly for the farmers.

Hon. C. G. LATHAM: If the member for Canning (Mr. Cross) had sufficient intelligence to understand what I said, he would appreciate that I referred to advances under Part III. of the Act, and that has nothing whatever to do with farmers.

Mr. Cross: That was what you inferred.

Hon. C. G. LATHAM: It has nothing to do with the farmers. Part III. applies to industries quite apart from farming. Although money advanced in connection with the mining industry has been returned to the State, losses have been incurred under that heading. Nevertheless, those losses were not extensive in comparison with the benefits that accrued from the advances made. All that assistance has been rendered without the necessity for a bureau of industry and economic research. Then the bureau is—

(l) To ascertain and report to the Minister upon the manner in which, and the extent to which, persons engaged in industry and who have received, or are receiving, in relation thereto, financial or other assistance from the State are carrying out the obligations undertaken by them in consideration of the granting to them of the assistance aforesaid.

Whenever advances have been made—I do not know what the position has been since the present Government took office—we always appointed an officer to follow up such matters to see what was being done. Despite that, this expensive bureau is to be created to do that work. Then the bureau is—

(m) To investigate and report to the Minister upon unhealthy occupations and dangerous trades.

We have expert officers in the State service who know all about that phase. The mining experts know full well the dangers associated with mining. They knew all about the position at Wiluna, which was a very difficult mine to deal with at the outset.

Mr. Marshall: Experts were not required to find that out.

Hon. C. G. LATHAM: It certainly did not require the establishment of a bureau for that purpose.

Mr. Marshall: Some of the poor unfortunate miners knew all about it.

Hon. C. G. LATHAM: We have departmental officers who can supply the information necessary, but if an officer with the requisite knowledge and qualifications is not available, the Premier can always secure a man from outside the State to furnish the necessary advice. The bureau is—

(n) To make such investigations and to hold such inquiries concerning matters of economic interest as may be referred to the bureau by the Governor, and to furnish to the Governor reports of the results of such investigations and inquiries.

You will appreciate, Mr. Speaker, that all these different headings amount to a re-hash of what I have already pointed out. The phraseology is high-sounding, but the meaning in many instances is almost identical. The bureau is—

(o) To advise the Minister generally upon all matters concerning the development of industry.

That work is already undertaken. The bureau is—

(p) To solicit, seek for, and obtain any statistical and other information available relating to what is commonly known as "the sweating evil" in relation to industrial labour, and to unfair competition in industry, and to monopolies detrimental to the interests of the public as and whenever it is desirable or expedient in the opinion of the Minister that such information should be obtained.

Our factories and shops inspectors know what sweated labour is. Repeatedly during past years complaints regarding sweated labour in industry have been made to the Arbitration Court, with a view to checking the trouble. A bureau is not required to attain that end, unless it is that the Minister, who is new to his job, has suddenly discovered that such instances may happen and desires to secure information from outside sources. If I wanted information on such matters, I would consult members sitting on the Government cross-benches. There is not one member representing a Labour constituency who does not know all about the evils that exist in his particular sphere.

Mr. Thorn: That is where the brains are!

Mr. Wilson: That is only too true.

Hon. C. G. LATHAM: Then the bureau is—

(q) To make such other investigations, hold such other inquiries and furnish such other reports upon such other matters concerning or affecting or likely to concern or affect the industrial development and the industrial well-being of the State as and whenever required so to do by the Minister.

That is a drag-net clause. Should anything be omitted, it can be dealt with under that particular heading.

Hon. P. D. Ferguson: Do you think the Minister would avail himself of that?

Hon. C. G. LATHAM: I suppose the Minister would do so. Generally speaking, I consider it an insult to the House that a Bill of this description should be introduced. There is no need for it. If the Minister desires to get the best advice possible, he is likely to get it from members of this Chamber without the necessity for any such legislation.

Mr. Cross: He could not get it from you.

Hon. C. G. LATHAM: Certainly if I had to rely upon the member for Canning for assistance, I would be in a bad way.

Mr. Cross: That is your opinion.

Hon. C. G. LATHAM: If I desired to know anything about the coal mining industry, I would not hesitate to consult the member for Collie (Mr. Wilson), who knows all about that industry. Of course, there are other well-informed members in this House, but may I suggest we must be careful of the man who thinks he knows everything, whereas he knows nothing.

Mr. Thorn: If you desired any information about the zoo, could you not get it from the member for Canning?

Hon. C. G. LATHAM: I do not know.

The Minister for Lands: At any rate, that is the attitude the hon. member is adopting to-night. He is scolding, and is speaking as a know-all.

Hon. C. G. LATHAM: Nothing of the sort. I do not profess to be a know-all. I leave that role to the Minister who knows everything of the evil he presumes to exist in the mind of everyone else. He talked about my appointment of officers to Government positions. His suggestion was ridiculous. I had nothing to do with the appointment of the officers in departments now controlled by the Minister. I have been out of office for 5½ years, and so could have had nothing to do with those appointments.

The Minister for Lands: They were made before you left office.

Hon. C. G. LATHAM: Nothing of the sort.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! I am afraid I will again have to intervene. I do not desire to do so, but I would like the hon. member to confine his attention to the Bill.

Hon. C. G. LATHAM: You need not intervene, Mr. Speaker, but I would like you to keep the Minister in order.

Mr. SPEAKER: I am anxious to keep the Leader of the Opposition in order for the time being.

Hon. C. G. LATHAM: I have gone carefully through the Bill, but can find nothing in it worthy of commendation. Had I been able to find something to recommend it, I would have said so.

Mr. Cross: You have a single-track mind.

Hon. C. G. LATHAM: I have nothing in common with the member for Canning. If he is not careful, I will tell some of his Nationalist friends about him and he will not be able to get their funds made available to him for the next election.

Hon. P. D. Ferguson: To what funds do you refer?

Hon. C. G. LATHAM: The member for Canning knows all about it.

Mr. Cross: They would not risk any of their money on you.

Hon. C. G. LATHAM: At any rate, I usually happen to head the poll. I have tried to find some justification for the introduction of the Bill. I have pointed out to the House that we are already supplied with all the information we require. We have all the boards that are necessary, we have our State Economic Council, we have the State Committee of the Council of Scientific and Industrial Research, we have the parent Council, we have Ministers with their expert advisers, and we have Parliament with its members. If, with this help, we cannot provide all the information necessary to assist the Government, then it is time some change was made. What worries me is that an attempt is being made to set up bureaucratic control of the State. Make no mistake about that. If our population of 450,000 souls cannot secure 80 men capable of managing their affairs—and nine of the 80 are Ministers—then our case is hopeless. If we have to admit to our electors that we are incapable, that it is necessary to establish this bureau, then we are in a hopeless posi-

tion. I suggest the Government had better resign.

Hon. P. D. Ferguson: That would be better for the country.

Hon. C. G. LATHAM: Let the Government admit in an honest way that it is incapable of framing a policy. That is apparent if one studies this Bill, which I have done very carefully. In effect, the Government says, "We are so hopeless that we desire to appoint a bureau of not less than nine members and as many more as we like so that they can advise us, as well as advise highly-paid officials whom we have put into State positions. I feel sure the Premier has been so busy that he has not had time to read the Bill.

The Premier: No.

Hon. C. G. LATHAM: I think he has been too busy. Had he read it, I do not think it would have seen the light of day.

The Premier: I had a lot to do with the Bill.

Hon. C. G. LATHAM: It must have been in a sorry condition when the Premier first saw it. It seems to me only the other day that the Minister in charge of the Bill entered this Chamber; he is merely an infant in politics. Therefore I can understand that he might bring along a new-fangled idea such as this. To me, it is an insult to the intelligence of the members on the floor of the House.

The Minister for Works: That is what worries you; it is new.

The Minister for Employment: It is too good to be treated as a political matter.

Hon. C. G. LATHAM: The C.S.I.R. was, I think, established in 1920, and we have that council to refer to. I cannot see any justification whatever for the Bill, unless it is to provide good and, to use a vulgar phrase, "cushy" jobs for the friends of Ministers.

The Minister for Works: Did not your party make very many appointments?

Hon. C. G. LATHAM: Did it?

The Minister for Works: Yes.

Hon. C. G. LATHAM: I am sorry the Minister for Health is absent. I would ask him about an appointment to the Fremantle Hospital Board. He appointed the Honorary Minister to that board.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order!

Hon. C. G. LATHAM: Members opposite will say these nasty things about me, and I

must defend myself, if you, Mr. Speaker, will permit me to do so.

Mr. SPEAKER: I will not permit you.

Hon. C. G. LATHAM: Not even to defend myself?

Mr. SPEAKER: Not in the way you are doing.

Hon. C. G. LATHAM: I must crave your indulgence.

Mr. Marshall: Do not reflect on the Government.

Hon. C. G. LATHAM: I would not think of reflecting on the Government. I have given much consideration to the Bill, and have tried to find one iota, one speck, that would warrant my supporting it, but I cannot do so. It is not a party measure, so far as I am concerned. If I am the only member of my party who does not support the Bill, I shall not mind but I will not support a measure that will put the State to great expense merely because the Government cannot do the job that it is paid to perform.

**MR. LAMBERT** (Yilgarn-Coolgardie) [8.45]: I compliment the Minister on the lucid way in which he explained the subject matter of this Bill. I was rather pained to hear the Leader of the Opposition speak as he did, but I have never heard in this Chamber a more total surrender to a policy of negation than has been preached by the Leader of the Opposition.

Hon. C. G. Latham: We are not responsible for the policy.

Mr. LAMBERT: I did not think, Mr. Speaker, that there was a man in this State mean and thoughtless enough to believe that we have not resources capable of being developed and controlled scientifically. That is the policy preached by the Leader of the Opposition.

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

Mr. LAMBERT: It is an absolute surrender to a policy of negation, which has ever been inseparable from the policy pursued by the hon. member since he has been in Parliament.

Mr. Needham: It was a terrible effort.

Mr. LAMBERT: If there is one thing this State urgently needs, it is a bureau of industry and economic research. Many of the industries that it has been attempted to establish the state have been bankrupt of the political interest and scientific guidance necessary to ensure their success. If

we reviewed the many industries that have failed in this State, we would find that 95 per cent. of the failures were due to lack of capital and lack of technical and mechanical knowledge. Technical and mechanical knowledge is indispensable to industry to-day. The services of chemical engineers are indispensable to the control of industries. In England, on the Continent, in fact in every part of the world where large industries are established, chemists are being trained in universities and other institutions and, immediately they are qualified, are absorbed in the industries of their countries. I shall deal with the composition of the bureau at a later stage.

We have had considerable technical assistance from the chemists employed in our Government laboratories. It is to be regretted that year after year Parliament fails to appreciate the value of the services rendered to the State by these competent officials. A chemist may at any time make a discovery the value of which would be impossible to assess. The officials to whom I refer are working in the laboratory, in season and out of season, trying to unravel some of the difficulties to be overcome in the development of industry in Western Australia.

Mr. Hughes: I thought the scientists did their work for the love of it!

Mr. LAMBERT: I did not hear the hon. member's remark.

Mr. SPEAKER: Will the hon. member please proceed with his speech?

Mr. LAMBERT: I do not suppose that the interjection was of any moment, nor of any importance to the subject under discussion. I should like to pay a tribute to the unselfish work of Dr. Simpson of the Government Chemical Laboratory. He has been a most faithful servant and is a man with an extensive knowledge of the resources of Western Australia. Associated with him are Mr. Bowley, his assistant, and an excellent staff. These men have done invaluable work, not only in the geological field, but in every other sphere of activity in which their scientific knowledge could be availed of.

In suggesting that the proposed bureau would result in a mere duplication of offices and duties, the Leader of the Opposition indicated that he had not the slightest conception of the work that could be accomplished by such a bureau. I shall take a little time to enlighten him, if that is possible, about the potential industries of this

State. In 1937-38 goods were imported to this State of the value of £13,000,000, and the great bulk of the commodities so imported could be produced in Western Australia. Practically the whole of the potential industries of this State remain absolutely untouched. Something has been said about the activities of the Council for Scientific and Industrial Research.

Hon. P. D. Ferguson: The institution has the best scientists in the world working for it.

Mr. LAMBERT: What industries have they investigated in Western Australia? Tell me one.

Hon. P. D. Ferguson: Ask the Minister for Agriculture. He will tell you a number of problems they have investigated.

Mr. LAMBERT: The member for Irwin-Moore is an ex-Minister for Agriculture. He has stated that the C.S.I.R. has the greatest scientists in the land on its staff. Let him tell me one industry they have attempted to develop in Western Australia.

Hon. P. D. Ferguson: They have investigated half-a-dozen avenues in the agricultural industry alone.

Mr. LAMBERT: Well, tell me one.

Hon. P. D. Ferguson: I could give you half-a-dozen.

Mr. LAMBERT: The hon. member can probably imagine half-a-dozen.

Hon. P. D. Ferguson: Have you ever heard of the wasting disease at Denmark?

Mr. LAMBERT: No, I have heard of a wasting disease in politicians. The position is that at the present stage in the development of Western Australia we must look beyond the slip-rails of the farm. Our vision must extend beyond that; otherwise the State will revert to the position it occupied before the Eastern States people came here. The member for Irwin-Moore is not the only one with a limited vision. We have had an instance of the Commonwealth Government aiming a deadly stiletto at the interests of the State. Lying in ambush, the Commonwealth Government waited until we attempted to develop an industry, and then threw a deadly stiletto. Unfortunately not only the Commonwealth Government has done that; but some of our local members of Parliament also, through lack of vision or knowledge of understanding, would assist in the throwing of the deadly stiletto at the very heart of industry in Western Australia.

What is required in the establishment of the proposed bureau is a man well equipped with a sound practical knowledge of the resources of the State and with a wide general knowledge. A trained clinical engineer is needed. Let me, through the Speaker, enlighten the member for Irwin-Moore upon what the C.S.I.R. has not done. Perhaps in his travels around Irwin-Moore, or whatever his district is named, the hon. member may have heard of what is called superphosphate. Does he know that the superphosphate companies are bringing into this State over 120,000 tons of sulphur per annum to produce superphosphate? Does he know that there is a million pounds worth of sulphur going up in the air from the mines at Kalgoorlie that could be recovered and converted into sulphuric acid and used in the superphosphate industry? Does he suggest that the C.S.I.R. has ever come here and said to the Government of this State, "We will lay down a policy for the recovery of elemental sulphur or for the production of sulphuric acid so as to save the farmers a quarter of a million pounds"? Has the C.S.I.R. done that? Has the hon. member suggested it? Not he! The hon. member has spoken about wasting disease in sheep and cattle. Every pound of sheep dip used has to be brought into the State. We send 20,000 or 30,000 tons of arsenic from the Wiluna mines overseas for use in manufacturing sheep dip, which is then sent back here and sold. The arsenic is sent to the Old Country, and manufactured into sheep dip and rabbit poison and other things, and those commodities are brought back here for sale. Has the Commonwealth Government suggested how we might manufacture those products in this State, and so provide considerable employment for our rising generation? I will not deal with any other aspect of the agricultural industry for the moment, because possibly I may get the member for Irwin-Moore, out of his depth.

Mr. Thorn: You do not understand it yourself.

Mr. LAMBERT: Let us consider the fruit industry. As an ex-Minister for Agriculture, the member for Irwin-Moore should know something about that. Does he suggest that a quarter of a million pounds' worth of canned fruit and jams could not be manufactured in Western Australia?

Hon. P. D. Ferguson: It could be, if your people would eat it.

Mr. Raphael: What is wrong with eating it yourself?

Mr. LAMBERT: The fact that £126,000 worth was brought into the State last year over and above what was produced here, indicates that even if the member for Irwin-Moore lives on something else, other people at least are eating jam. That jam could all be produced in this State. That reminds me of the sugar industry, because sugar is inseparable from the manufacture of jam and preserves. I believe £250,000 worth of sugar is brought into the State each year. Has the Commonwealth ever indicated that it is possible for us to produce beet sugar in Western Australia? A refinery has been established by the Colonial Sugar Refinery at North Fremantle. If we encouraged the beet industry in the South-West we could produce the whole of the sugar required in Western Australia. Did it ever occur to the ex-Minister for Agriculture that that industry would prove profitable to the State and absorb a considerable amount of labour?

Hon. P. D. Ferguson: Yes, we tried it out and found that it would not be profitable.

Mr. LAMBERT: Of course not, and it would not be profitable to-day to produce wheat under the conditions that obtained when the hon. member was producing it 50 or 60 years ago. I do not know what his age is; I can only make a rough guess. He has never acknowledged his age in order that we might be able to assess his experience. If we have to revert to the methods of producing cereals that were employed when othersiders were flocking to this State years ago, we would not be able to feed the people of the Irwin-Moore district, much less the people throughout the State. The dehydration of fruit and vegetables offers scope for the establishment of another important industry. The people in the northern part of the State are crying out for supplies of vegetables that could be provided if dehydration were adopted here, as it is in other countries. There is still opportunity to produce canned vegetables under an effective system of dehydration, so that when a glut occurred in the markets, the surplus could be dehydrated and supplied to the people of the North, who are starving for vegetables.

What did the ex-Minister for Agriculture do? Did he ask his advisers what they could suggest in the matter of dehydration? Large quantities of tomatoes, cabbages and cauliflowers that are unsaleable to-day could be subjected to this process and disposed of profitably. Did the hon. member say to his advisers, "Return in 48 hours with a policy of what can be done; not with a cry as if you are being fed on quinces"? That would never get a country anywhere.

Mr. Withers: What, the quinces?

Mr. LAMBERT: No, the feeling you generally have after eating quinces. So long as we have men of limited vision, so long will these possibilities remain unexploited. Let me now turn to the mineral kingdom. Recently there has been much discussion of the iron ore embargo, and rightly, too. I regret that the Commonwealth has imposed an embargo on such an industry. To my mind the Commonwealth has acted at the behests of the big commercial interests in the Eastern States. If permission had been granted to operate the deposits for 10 or 20 years on the understanding that the position would then be reviewed, our iron ore reserves would even then have been almost untouched. Therefore no sound reason existed for the action of the Commonwealth. The prosperity and stability of a country may be gauged by the quantity of steel produced and used. This brings me to a matter familiar to the member for East Perth, namely, manganese. The hon. member had a lot to say, as he usually does, about matters on which he was not well informed. If a state of war occurred, we could not produce one pound of steel unless we imported ferro-manganese. When the Great War broke out, the price of manganese rose from 8d. to 8s. per unit; in other words, it rose to £20 per ton. The Broken Hill Proprietary Company was buying manganese from the New Hebrides at about that figure. If the Government of the day had had sufficient vision, the ferro-manganese industry could have been established in this State. Two-and-a-half tons of manganese ore are required to produce one ton of ferro-manganese, and obviously it would be the more economical to bring the coke to the State where the manganese ore deposits are located and there convert it to ferro-manganese. As one who was associated with the

industry, I regret that such an opportunity to establish it should have been lost.

Other minerals are springing into prominence in a world that is moving very rapidly. I refer to the minerals required for the manufacture of aircraft. Recently I received an interesting newspaper clipping from the member for North Perth (Mr. MacCallum Smith), who is ever on the alert to pass on information likely to be of value to the State. The clipping deals with magnesite and magnesium metal—the lightest metal known to science. It is even superseding aluminium for the manufacture of aircraft. We have countless deposits of magnesite north, south and east of Perth, and this metal could be produced here. There is no reason why the bureau should not call for the latest information on the production of magnesium metals, and point out to the Commonwealth authorities that as they are building aircraft in Australia, we have the resources to provide the requisite metals for centuries to come. Alunite for the production of aluminium is another important metal, though there are difficulties to be overcome. It is all a matter of effective research. We have a lecturer at the School of Mines at Kalgoorlie, Mr. Dodd, who was brought from California and who pointed out that we had 13,000,000 tons of alunite containing  $7\frac{1}{2}$  million tons of aluminium, but there it remains unexploited. Mr. Rowley undertook extensive research, but he is almost fully occupied with other urgent work in the laboratory. The problem of dealing with our alunite deposits would offer a useful avenue of research work for scientists provided with a properly equipped laboratory. Let me instance jarosite, which is used in the production of paint. We in Western Australia import all our paints and varnishes. On the South-West coast are deposits of jarosite that require only to be roasted and crushed to be converted into iron oxide. Thousands of pounds worth of this commodity is imported into Western Australia, probably the better part of £200,000 worth. Practically nothing has been done to develop that particular industry. A few attempts have been made to produce the paints and varnishes we need, but have not carried us very far. All our calcimine comes from overseas. The formulae are simple. Many men have tried to produce calcimine but have not possessed the neces-

sary technical knowledge. If it is desired to produce a commodity of high standard, the producers must be possessed of technical knowledge.

Let me also instance common salt. A few people are scraping from our salt lakes small quantities of that commodity, but it is put up in a crude way and under unhygienic conditions. Surely we can produce great quantities of salt in this State. Millions of tons of it are available. I took a sample of salt brine at Three Springs, and found that apart from the salt contents the brine was richer in potash than are the famous springs in Germany. Possibly the member for Irwin-Moore (Hon. P. D. Ferguson) would not believe that. We can produce potash in this State as cheaply as it can be produced in Germany. Here is a pressing need for research work, and we need not stop at salt. The reference to salt immediately suggests the electrolytic production of soda. The Mt. Lyell Company, as a corollary to its other activities, uses numbers of electrolytic cells in the production of alkali. Not only do we leave our salt deposits where they have always been and neglect the opportunity to produce alkali, but we send our tallow to the Eastern States, where it is converted into soap. Before the combine of soap distributors was formed to create an absolute monopoly in soap manufacture in this State, thousands of tons of soap were exported from Western Australia to the Near East. To-day not one pound is exported from this State. There is a monopoly in the Eastern States, where a lower grade of soap is manufactured for export to Java and other islands. To-day that export trade is entirely in the hands of Lever Bros., of Sydney. From our abattoirs we sell to the Eastern States practically the whole of our tallow output at the buyer's price, whilst our salt and alkali industries go by the board. Chlorine gas is a by-product of the electrolytic production of caustic soda from salt, as is also hydrogen. These are two important factors in industry.

The Royal Mint, where our gold is refined, once used a local product, manganese ore, but to-day it imports liquid chlorine from the Eastern States. Chlorine gas to-day is used extensively in warfare. This chemical is recovered as a by-product of the alkali industry. The member for Irwin-Moore does not think it neces-

sary to investigate, encourage, foster or even finance essential industries of this description. Take the tanning industry. I am sorry the ex-Minister for Agriculture is so ill-informed that he does not know that only in one particular did the Commonwealth bureau take any part in the establishment of that industry. The University inquired into the tanning industry generally and the extraction of tannin. A firm commercialised the information and established an industry at Belmont. The tannin extract produced there was exported from this State. Evidently the ex-Minister for Agriculture has quite decided that we are in a hopeless position, and that hides must be exported to the Eastern States. Practically all the hides produced in the State are exported, and all the tannin extracts, which are economical to produce here, follow the hides. When I hear the remarks of some members I wonder why, when they are in a despondent mood, they do not follow the hides and the tannin extracts.

Then there is the question of the fixation of nitrogen and the production of nitrogen from the atmosphere. The Imperial Chemical Industries, one of the biggest combinations in the world, is engaged in establishing the industry in South Australia. Nothing has yet been done in this State. Our atmosphere contains as much nitrogen as does that of South Australia or Victoria. Possibly the ex-Minister for Agriculture would not believe that.

Hon. P. D. Ferguson: There is more of it here.

Mr. LAMBERT: In his moments of impenetrable despondency he would not believe that. In war time nitrogen is essential for the manufacture of nitro-glycerine, and in peace time it is essential as a fertiliser for the soil. When Germany was at war with the world, in 1914, that country was producing annually 100,000 tons of nitrogen. Scientists in that country so perfected the fixation of nitrogen from the atmosphere that when the war ended Germany was producing over 2,000,000 tons of the chemical. I have given only a brief survey of the various industries I could deal with. In South Africa scientists are producing gelignite as well as cyanide. Owing to the adverse rate of exchange possibly some of the big companies in Australia could be persuaded, with the capital at their command, to establish industries in this State

for the manufacture of cyanide and gelignite. I have in mind particularly the Broken Hill Proprietary, which in recent years has increased its capital to £7,000,000 or £8,000,000, and invested in Australian securities. I am not so despondent as are some members regarding Western Australia's possibilities of progress. As I see our insular position, Australia is more or less lashed by the Indian Ocean and caressed by the Pacific Ocean, and is free from the possibility of great attack from outside. Australia is an island continent, with resources that are almost limitless. It matters not whether one turns north, south, east or west, one sees possibilities of wealth to be realised. All that is needed is a combination of scientific knowledge and direction with fostering care by the Government during the initial stages—by a Government with a proper conception of its duties. Then we shall have many secondary industries established here. This continent, I fully believe, can produce cereals and foodstuffs enough to feed millions of people. To realise that we need only foresight and belief in our country. With the aid of those factors will be realised the great destiny that future Australians should enjoy.

**MR. SAMPSON** (Swan) [9.22]: I move—That the debate be adjourned.

Motion put and negatived.

Mr. SAMPSON: I regret my inability to support the Bill. I can quite believe that it is a Bill of which the Minister is proud. However, it is a well-known fact that if one feels particularly proud of any piece of literature, the wisest course is not to allow it to see the light of day.

The Minister for Employment: It is a pity you do not apply that principle to your newspapers!

Mr. SAMPSON: Well, yes; there are one or two that are suffering. The Minister sets out in the Bill a wide field of effort and endeavour. It would seem, judging from a clause which has 17 paragraphs setting out the powers and functions of the bureau—which are subject to the directions of the Minister—that the hon. gentleman has out-Hitler'd Mussolini. The mountain has laboured—well, I do not know that that properly describes it. Certainly the labour has brought forth a very unusual creature.

The Minister is optimistic if he thinks the Bill can survive. It cannot survive. I marvel



at what I presume to be the success of the hon. gentleman's importunity with the Premier, who has approved of the introduction of the measure. The Bill is conceived on gigantic lines. The proposed bureau will have powers and functions wider than those of the British Board of Trade or the Commonwealth Council of Scientific and Industrial Research. Candidly, the scheme is too ambitious altogether. The Commonwealth Council of Scientific and Industrial Research was once a small pet poodle. It has now grown into a mastodon. Last year it ate up £138,000. It was expected that the appetite would increase, as the Federal Parliament voted £155,000 odd for the creature's sustenance this year.

The Premier: It has saved Australia millions of pounds.

Mr. SAMPSON: Exactly; and it is an excellent organisation, and no one who knows anything of it but will be grateful and thankful for the work that it has done and is doing.

The Premier: And yet we cannot imitate that example in a small way!

Mr. SAMPSON: Admittedly, the C.S.I.R. has done and is doing magnificent work; but what can the Western Australian proposed outfit do that is not being done in scientific work in a bigger and a broader way?

The Premier: You do not want Western Australia to do anything.

Mr. SAMPSON: Oh yes!

The Premier: Oh no!

Mr. SAMPSON: I am not too confident about the Minister, because when I put up a question as to increasing the number of apprentices, there appeared to be an absence of enthusiasm that prompts me to believe this Bill will not do all that it might do if it were permitted to become an Act. The Bill contains no definite statement that the number of apprentices is to be increased. All members of the House know there is a shortage of apprentices, because we took part in passing a Bill to enable the construction of the Adelphi Hotel to be held up for some weeks owing to an insufficient number of plasterers. The first need of this country, if it proposes to develop its manufacturing industries or possibilities, is that there shall be workmen to carry out the operations. The field otherwise appears to be well covered. Further, the C.S.I.R. and its State committees have 60 scientists with strings of degrees following their names.

Apparently those scientists represent the best brains in their respective lines of endeavour, and no one who is qualified has ever criticised the C.S.I.R. adversely. The Bill proposes to duplicate the cost of this array of talent; and that, one must admit, is a tall and expensive order. The C.S.I.R. covers all the States, and some of its investigations have been made in Western Australia into Western Australian questions. The Hawke Bill—the Minister's Bill—will permit scientific investigation and research beyond the limits of the State. That is one of the duties with which the proposed bureau is charged—

To inquire into and advise upon scientific investigation and research beyond the limits of the State with a view to the use or application of the discoveries made or information obtained by means of such scientific investigation and research in and for the benefit of industries in the State.

I shall not read any more of the Bill. The list of duties has already been read twice to the House, and I shall not be guilty of reading it a third time. An earlier speaker suggested that we should do something towards expanding our primary production. Naturally, we should do so, but the great problem is to find markets. How are we to manage that with regard to our secondary industries and our manufactories? There is an opportunity for something to be done along those lines, because the time is long overdue when this State should produce many of the commodities that are now purchased from the Eastern States. Because of dumping and, comparatively speaking, mass production in the Eastern States, it has been difficult, if not impossible, for the factories of Western Australia to compete successfully with those operating in other parts of the Commonwealth. Under Clause 27 the powers of the proposed bureau are sketched in the broadest of terms, concluding with a dragnet provision setting out in effect that the bureau will be authorised to make such other investigations as shall be required by the Minister. It may be as well to acknowledge the suggestion that the Minister concerned is a model of vigour. He is dynamic in the energy that he will apply to carrying out all these various functions. Should the Bill become an Act I daresay that on odd occasions we shall see the Minister here. If he endeavours to carry out all the duties that will devolve upon him, I am

afraid those occasions will be few and far between. Although the functions of the bureau are limited to the extent that it will be able to investigate, advise and so on, nevertheless the measure savours somewhat of dictation. There is a dictatorial element throughout its provisions.

Mr. Watts: Sentimental!

Mr. SAMPSON: No, dictatorial.

The Premier: Merely hard business, and the hon. member is familiar with that.

Mr. SAMPSON: That is the Premier's belief, and it is an indication of the kindly nature of that hon. gentleman. If the Premier, as Treasurer, has money to throw to the birds, then the criticism of the Bill might be modified. The fact is, however, that the Premier has not funds that he can throw away.

The Minister for Agriculture: Neither to birds nor to beasts.

Mr. SAMPSON: He has not one penny that he can afford to throw away. There is nothing that the bureau can do at a reasonable cost that cannot be accomplished now by the various Government departments. The truth of that statement cannot be denied. It is manifest by reference to paragraphs (a) to (g) of the clause that I have mentioned.

The Minister for Employment: What are you quoting from?

Mr. SAMPSON: Partly from my memory of the Bill, and partly from my notes.

The Minister for Employment: Then your references are partly authoritative.

Mr. SAMPSON: I did not suggest anything about bird lime, or words to that effect. I referred to what money the Premier might have to comply with the importunities of the Minister. In one of the paragraphs it is astonishing to note that the publication by the Government of another newspaper or journal is contemplated. That reference is to paragraph (d) of Clause 27. That, I think, is an indication of absolutely unnecessary enterprise. The proposed collection of statistics and so forth is already effectively dealt with by the Government Statistician. Many other matters indicated in the Bill appear to be largely of academic interest only. Under the Bill, the bureau although it is not to exercise executive functions, will be authorised to inquire, investigate and recommend. Any officer or group of officers of the Public Service may do that for the Minister under existing conditions.

All these requirements can be met to-day without the establishment of the proposed bureau. Why the need for "a body corporate with perpetual succession and a common seal" of which "all courts and judges shall take judicial notice"? It is all so very flamboyant! Apart from these considerations, is the principle of creating such a bureau sound? We have commissioners, trusts and boards galore, all eating up public money and adding to the ever-increasing army of well-dressed gentlemen who, with delicate irony, sign themselves—or, at any rate, previously did so—"your most obedient servant." I was particularly surprised at one feature of the Bill. Although the Minister has power to appoint nine members of the bureau and to co-opt others as circumstances may require, it is not competent for him to go to the Public Service to secure necessary assistance. Surely that is a reflection upon the service! There may be Government officers thoroughly qualified to deal with whatever may be necessary. Such an officer could be relieved temporarily from his official duties in order to undertake special work for the Government. Apparently that must not be done. The Bill specifically precludes the possibility of appointments from the Public Service. There are to be a director, a secretary, and not fewer than nine other members who will constitute the bureau. All are to be paid for their services, and I raise no objection to that because if we are to have efficient service we must pay for it. Nevertheless, all this represents so much duplication of work, and prompts the query as to whether there is any real justification for the Bill. All this is just the beginning, for with the establishment of a bureau possessing a common seal of which "all courts and judges must take judicial notice," the best in the way of office accommodation will not be too good. A staff—the bigger, the better—will be installed to add tone and dignity to such an august body. As I have pointed out before, it is provided that the director, secretary and other officers of the bureau shall not be public officers or subject to the Public Service Act. Is it not clear to the Minister that such power given to any Minister of the Crown means that the door is thrown wide open to political patronage? I would much regret if a charge of that description should ever be levelled against the Minister.

Yet, if the Bill be passed in its present form, such a charge is almost certain to be raised.

Hon. P. D. Ferguson: At any rate, it means the creation of another Government department.

Mr. SAMPSON: Yes, and a very costly one. When the Minister replies to the debate, he may be good enough to tell us why no civil servant should be allowed to assist in the performance of the duties outlined in the Bill. It is evident that there will be quite a number of juicy plums for distribution if the Bill becomes an Act. I hope for the peace of mind of the Minister, and in view of the possibility of the Premier endeavouring to balance the Budget, the Bill will not be passed. I cannot see that it will be of any service to the State. It is well known to every member that when the Premier is approached with a request for a few pounds to provide gravel for the surfacing of school grounds or to meet some other small need in a district, no money is available. In those circumstances, how can the Minister persist in his impious endeavour, should the Bill be agreed to, knowing full well there is no justification for it, and that the Premier cannot afford the expenditure involved? The Minister has told us that the bureau will not cost the State very much. That is another indication of his optimism. No one can say what it will cost. When federation was advocated in the early days, it was estimated that it would cost about 2s. 6d. per head of the population. "Just the price of a dog license," said Bernard Ringrose Wise, K.C. Barton's first budget, speaking from memory, was a modest one of £300,000. Nowadays such an amount is a mere item in a schedule. Last year it cost over 80 millions to run the Commonwealth, while the "half-a-crown" a head had risen to £11 19s. 8d. per head. That is what it cost to run the Commonwealth. The grandiose aim of the Bill, "encouragement and assistance of employment and development of industry" is so much political "eyewash." That is not intended to be in any way offensive; it is the outcome of an examination of a Bill that I am sorry has seen the light of day. Even if by some mischance the Bill becomes an Act, the bureau may do nothing but "inquire, report and recommend." Actually, there is no need for another board, there are too many already. Ample facilities now exist for the preparation of more

reports and recommendations than any Minister has time to read. I shall vote against the second reading of the Bill.

On motion by Mr. North, debate adjourned.

## BILL—INDUSTRIAL ARBITRATION ACT AMENDMENT.

### *Second Reading.*

Debate resumed from the 6th September.

MR. NEEDHAM (Perth) [9.42]: The Bill now before the House proposes to amend the Industrial Arbitration Act. The design of the measure is to modernise that very important piece of social legislation. I listened with interest to the speech of the member for West Perth (Mr. McDonald) and followed closely his exhaustive analysis of some of the clauses of the Bill. I noticed he was very concerned about the clause of the Bill that proposes to extend the definition of the words "worker" and "employer." The hon. member let his imagination almost run riot when he gave examples of the evil results that might follow from an extension of the definition of those two words. What he said almost bordered on the absurd. The definition of the words has in recent times been extended in legislation other than that which we are now considering. One would think from the criticism levelled by the hon. member against this clause of the Bill that the proposal is something of a revolutionary nature. That is not so. I would refer him to the definitions of the same words in the legislation of New South Wales. A comparison of the two definitions would speedily convince the hon. member that the proposal is anything but revolutionary. The word "employer" in the New South Wales Act of 1912—which has not since been amended—is as follows:—

"Employer" means person, firm, company, or corporation employing persons working in any industry, whether on behalf of himself or itself or any other person or on behalf of the Government of the State, and includes the Crown (except as to any employees employed under the Police Regulation Act, 1899, or any statute passed in substitution for or amendment of the same), the Chief Commissioner for Railways and Tramways, the Sydney Harbour Trust Commissioners, the Metropolitan Board of Water Supply and Sewerage, the Hunter District Water Supply and Sewerage Board, and any council of a municipality

or shire, and includes for the purpose of constituting a board, a director, manager, or superintendent of an employer as aforesaid.

This definition, if a comparison is made with the definition in the Bill, is even more comprehensive than ours. The definition of "employee" in the New South Wales Act is as follows:—

"Employee" means person employed in any industry, whether on salary or wages or piece-work rates, or as a member of a butty gang, but shall not include a member of a family in the employment of a parent, and the fact that a person is working under a contract for labour only, or substantially for labour only, or as lessee of any tools or other implements of production, or any vehicle used in the delivery of goods, shall not in itself prevent such person being held to be an employee.

The definitions of the same words in the Queensland legislation are worth quoting, so that a comparison can be made with them. In Queensland the word "employee" is used instead of the word "worker," but the same person is meant. The definition reads—

"Employee"—Any employee, whether on wages or piecework rates, or a member of a butty gang: The term includes any person whose usual occupation is that of employee in a calling; the fact that a person is working under a contract for labour only or substantially for labour only, or as lessee of any tools or other implements of production or any vehicle used in the delivery of goods, or as the owner, whether wholly or partly, of any vehicle used in the transport of goods or passengers, shall not in itself prevent such person being held to be an employee.

The word "employer" in the Queensland legislation has a definition somewhat similar to that in the New South Wales Act.

The member for West Perth criticised very severely the omission from the Bill of the words "hire or reward," and contended they would mean that voluntary workers in religious or charitable organisations would be deemed to be workers within the meaning of the Act. A great stretch of the imagination is required to enable such a construction to be put upon the proposed omission from the Act of the words "for hire or reward." I might remind the honourable and learned member, and others who think as he thinks, that the omission of those words has been found necessary as a result of experience gained in the operation of the present legislation during the years in which it has been in force.

We are all aware that no matter what law is passed, people will always be found endeavouring to evade their responsibilities. Some go so far as to defy it. This happened under the law of industrial arbitration. That law is not immune from breaches by certain people any more than is any other law. Trades union secretaries and organisers have discovered that. I do not know whether hon. members realise the time that is devoted by trades union secretaries to the policing of awards. We have heard a good deal recently about governmental action in the recent difficulty in the coal-mining industry at Collie and about the steps taken to preserve industrial peace there. I desire to tell hon. members opposite that every day in the week many union secretaries do scarcely anything else but police awards in order to preserve industrial peace. This State has the best record of all the States in the Commonwealth in respect of the preservation of industrial peace. It has been found that there are some employers in this State—though very few I am glad to say—who endeavour to prove that certain workers are not employed for hire or reward, and by that means seek to evade the law. The representatives of the unionists have to be very vigilant in ensuring that awards are observed and in trying to prove to the court that such employees are engaged for hire or reward. The deletion of these words will prove to be of inconvenience only to unscrupulous employers. I repeat that such employers are very few. Notwithstanding that, however, necessity does exist for the suggested amendment.

Another proposal in the amending measure that was severely criticised by the member for West Perth (Mr. McDonald) was the inclusion of insurance canvassers in the definition of "workers." I admit that this has previously been attempted but without success. For many years these men have endeavoured to secure recognition of their rights so that they could avail themselves of the industrial arbitration law. That opportunity has been denied them, but I fail to understand why they should not have the same benefit of this legislation as other workers have. Unless constantly engaged in canvassing for industrial insurance they cannot be recognised under the present law. Experience has taught us, however, that very few of these insurance

canvassers are engaged wholly and solely in the collection of industrial insurance. They also collect premiums on other classes of insurance. Hence the necessity of an attempt to bring them under the provisions of the Act.

The member for West Perth was very anxious about the proposal to register the Australian Workers' Union. A close scrutiny of the Bill discloses that such registration will be contingent upon the observance of certain conditions. Certain conditions must be fulfilled and must continue to be observed if the Australian Workers' Union is to secure registration, and, having secured it, to retain it. I cannot understand why there should be such continual opposition to the registration of the Australian Workers' Union. That organisation blazed the track—if I might use the term—of arbitration law in this country. When I say "this country" I mean Australia as a whole. Thirty-four years ago the Australian Workers' Union pioneered the way for the settlement of industrial disputes per medium of conciliation and arbitration. The union had considerable experience of the direct action method which its members, together with all sensible workers, realised was of no use. Consequently it paved the way to industrial arbitration. The union has since adhered to that policy throughout. It is leading in that regard in the Commonwealth arena and rightly desires to be permitted to register under the State law. One can understand its desire when one realises the very cumbersome and expensive method that has to be adopted by the union before it can obtain recognition from the State court. Various sections have to be formed. Branches of the various sections have to be established such as branches of the pastoral section and mining section. For those branches officers and organisers have to be appointed and when all that has been done, and agreements have been entered into, application can be made for the registration of the particular agreements. But if registration is granted to the Australian Workers' Union as provided for in the amending Bill that cumbersome and expensive method will be obviated and this will go a long way towards preserving industrial peace. I consider that the provision for the registration of the Australian Workers' Union is a much-needed amendment.

Clause 23 has for its object the tightening up of the law relating to wrongful dismissal: in other words, to minimise the chances of victimisation. There is nothing more repugnant in industrial warfare than victimisation. In fact, when negotiations are being concluded for the settlement of an industrial dispute, steps are invariably taken to ensure that anyone who has participated shall not lose his employment on that account. But victimisation does take place. In order to police awards a case has to be cited before the industrial court, and sometimes it happens that an employee who has given evidence is victimised to the extent of being dismissed from his employment. An industrial magistrate has difficulty in determining whether there really has been victimisation, and the provision in Clause 23 will be a welcome addition to the law. I repeat that we should always bear in mind the expense and trouble to which organisations are put to ensure that awards are policed and that the law is observed. When the unions cite cases before the court, witnesses must be called to prove the charges levelled against the employers, but unions are able to progress a very short distance along that road if their witnesses are afraid to appear in court, or are fearful of losing their employment if they give evidence. Yet, in giving evidence, they are only endeavouring to uphold the law of the land. Therefore I hope that this provision will receive favourable consideration, not only in this Chamber but in another place. Those are the principal features of the measure with which I propose to deal. I realise that the fate of the Bill lies in the laps of the legislative gods in another place, but on this occasion we may hope that a little more reason will prevail than has been displayed in the past, and that the Bill will receive the approval of another place, and pass into law.

On motion by Mr. Watts, debate adjourned.

*House adjourned at 10.4 p.m.*