

attempt to jump in ahead of the Government to get a particular matter discussed, especially when the Government has announced its intention to deal with that matter. If the item is left on the notice paper, it is in its proper place and receiving the consideration it deserves.

Hon. J. Cornell: Decency demands that members should have an opportunity to discuss it.

THE CHIEF SECRETARY (Hon. W. H. Kitson—West—in reply) [9.36]: I am somewhat surprised at the remarks of Mr. Cornell. If he looks at the notice paper he will realise that there will be every opportunity to have his Bill discussed at the next sitting of the House. Apart from the hon. member's own measures there will be little on the notice paper.

Hon. J. Cornell: We have reached this Order of the Day four or five times before without discussing it.

THE CHIEF SECRETARY: I am trying to control the business of the House.

Hon. J. Cornell: And the House can control the Minister, if it likes.

THE CHIEF SECRETARY: I am not here to say that one member should be entitled to take the business of the House out of the hands of the Minister, and I will not be influenced by any remarks of his in that direction. I moved the adjournment until Tuesday next, because of the state of the notice paper, and on that day the hon. member will have every opportunity to get his Bill discussed.

Hon. J. Cornell: I do not want the opportunity, but I want other members to have it.

Question (adjournment) put and passed.

House adjourned at 9.38 p.m.

Legislative Assembly.

Tuesday, 18th October, 1938.

	PAGE
Questions: Education, First Aid	1433
Railways, regrading, Merredin-Southern Cross Section	1433
Native Administration Act, as to regulations	1433
Bills: Workers' Compensation Act Amendment, Com.	1434
Mines Regulation Act Amendment, Com.	1436
Bureau of Industry and Economic Research, Com.	1436

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

QUESTION—EDUCATION, FIRST AID.

Hon. P. D. FERGUSON asked the Minister for Education: 1, How many State school teachers have passed examinations in first aid principles in (a) metropolitan schools; and (b) rural schools? 2, How many State schools have first aid outfits as part of their equipment in (a) the metropolitan area; and (b) the rural area?

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION replied: 1, First aid examinations are held by the St. John Ambulance Association. There is no departmental examination and the number is not known. 2, First aid equipments are fairly general but the exact number is not known and inquiry will be made.

QUESTION—RAILWAYS, REGRADING.

Merredin-Southern Cross Section.

Mr. HILL asked the Minister for Railways: What is the estimated cost of regrading the Merredin-Southern Cross railway section?

The MINISTER FOR RAILWAYS replied: £114,000.

QUESTION—NATIVE ADMINISTRATION ACT.

As to Regulations.

Hon. C. G. LATHAM (without notice) asked the Premier: 1, Has his attention been drawn to a published statement by the Commissioner of Native Affairs that the regulations, recently gazetted, relating to the establishment of missions had not been withdrawn? 2, Would not the statement lead the public

to believe that the regulations referred to have the force of law? 3, Is he aware that Section 69 of the Native Administration Act, 1936, which requires that regulations shall be laid before both Houses of Parliament, has not been complied with, and that therefore the regulations relating to the establishment of missions cannot be enforced?

The PREMIER replied: I have read the paragraph in the Press. The position regarding the regulations is that they are being reviewed and revised.

BILL—WORKERS' COMPENSATION ACT AMENDMENT.

In Committee.

Resumed from the 13th October. Mr. Sleeman in the Chair; the Minister for Employment in charge of the Bill.

The CHAIRMAN: Progress was reported after two new clauses had been agreed to.

New clause:

Hon. C. G. LATHAM (on behalf of Mr. Watts): I move—

That the following be inserted to stand as Clause 6:—"Section 10 of the principal Act is amended by adding the following paragraph to Subsection (1) thereof:—'For the purposes of this subsection the term "incorporated insurance office" includes "incorporated insurance broker."'"

Under Section 10, the Minister has power to grant a monopoly to an incorporated insurance company. Other bodies, which are not incorporated bodies, are carrying on insurance business. They undertake workers' compensation insurance at a premium rate less than that charged by the incorporated companies. This amendment proposes to give such bodies the same rights as are enjoyed by incorporated companies under Section 10. Under the Act, the Minister cannot approve of a company unless it is an incorporated company. There are brokers carrying on insurance business on behalf of Lloyd's. I ask the Minister to agree to the amendment.

The MINISTER FOR EMPLOYMENT: I am not opposed to the principle contained in the proposed amendment, but the wording is not at all suitable, according to advice I have received from the Crown Law Department. If I read the relevant portion of that advice, I think the Leader of the Opposition will agree that the amendment

moved by him on behalf of Mr. Watts is altogether too broad. The advice reads—

If the amendment is accepted, any company could include in its memorandum and articles of association the business of insurance broking as one of its objects and would then be entitled to apply for approval under the Workers' Compensation Act. There is nothing in Mr. Watts's amendment even to state that a company must carry on the business of an insurance broker. So long as the company is incorporated as an insurance broker, it would come within the provisions of Section 10. If the amendment were accepted, any company which intended to deal exclusively in workers' compensation insurance would not bother to become incorporated as an insurance company, because all it would need to do would be to become incorporated as an insurance broker. It would thus avoid the liabilities thrown on insurance companies by the Assurance Companies Act and would not have to make any deposit by way of a guarantee with the Treasurer.

Hon. C. G. Latham: All we need do is to add these words to the amendment, "and who carries on."

The MINISTER FOR EMPLOYMENT: If an amendment were couched in the following terms I would have no objection to it:—

Section 10 of the principal Act is amended by adding the following paragraph to Subsection (1) thereof:—"For the purposes of this section the term 'incorporated insurance office' includes any duly incorporated company carrying on insurance business in Western Australia under the provisions of the Commonwealth Insurance Act, 1932 (No. 4 of 1932)."

I am not prepared to accept the new clause moved by the Leader of the Opposition.

Mr. McDONALD: When it is only a matter of wording, it seems a pity that the Committee should not pass this necessary amendment. Certain incorporated companies in Perth represent English brokers of the highest solvency, and have rendered considerable service to the public of Western Australia. They have quoted rates that are in some respects lower than those previously quoted. The Minister fears that such companies might not be strong financially, and might not pay to the Crown the deposits paid by other companies. That situation could be met by the approval section. Should the Minister not be satisfied that a company has the necessary financial standing, he can withhold his approval. When a company is of sound financial standing and can prove its ability to meet

its obligations, it should not be deprived of the opportunity to do this class of business. I should be sorry to see companies that have done good service for Western Australia prevented from receiving the approval of the Minister.

Hon. C. G. LATHAM: The Minister seems anxious to meet the wishes of the member for Katanning. Would it not be possible to add certain words to the proposed new clause and overcome the difficulty referred to? These incorporated insurance brokers are underwritten by Lloyds.

The Minister for Employment: They are registered under the Commonwealth Act, and have to pay a deposit of £5,000 to the Commonwealth Treasury.

Hon. C. G. LATHAM: I refer particularly to the Harvey Trinder Company and to Bennie S. Cohen. In the circumstances I ask leave to withdraw the new clause with a view to moving it in another form.

New clause, by leave, withdrawn.

New clause:

Hon. C. G. LATHAM: I move—

That the following be inserted to stand as Clause 6:—"Section 10 of the principal Act is amended by adding the following paragraph to Subsection (1) thereof:—"For the purposes of this section the term "incorporated insurance office" includes any duly incorporated company carrying on insurance business in Western Australia under the provisions of the Commonwealth Insurance Act, 1932 (No. 4 of 1932) . . ."

The MINISTER FOR EMPLOYMENT: The new clause now moved has been carefully drafted to meet the position outlined by the Leader of the Opposition. It will give to a company the right to apply for approval to do workers' compensation insurance business. All the companies operating in Western Australia that are not incorporated companies under our State law, but are registered under the Commonwealth Act, will thus be included. Being so registered, these companies have now to lodge a substantial deposit with the Commonwealth Treasury as a guarantee of their bona fides and standing. They are very important companies in the insurance world, inasmuch as they provide a measure of protection that would not otherwise exist. I support the new clause.

Mr. McDONALD: We are at one in this matter, but I am not certain the new clause will do all that is expected of it. Section 10 of the Act says it shall be obligatory for every employer to obtain from an incorporated insurance office approved by the

Minister a policy of insurance. The term "incorporated insurance office" is considered not to cover those companies that are really brokers for Lloyds or other English concerns actually carrying the insurance. The amendment refers to these brokers as "incorporated insurance offices."

The Minister for Employment: They are, under the Commonwealth legislation.

Mr. McDONALD: That does not cover the original trouble, I fear. The point is that the brokers do not carry on insurance business, but are only agents. That is why the member for Katanning thought it necessary to refer to them as "incorporated insurance brokers." However, I shall not oppose the amendment as I have not given the subject much consideration and the matter may, if necessary, be corrected in another place.

New clause put and passed.

Title—agreed to.

Bill reported with further amendments.

As to Report Stage.

The MINISTER FOR EMPLOYMENT: I move—

That the consideration of the report be made an order of the day for the next sitting of the House.

Mr. McDONALD: I wish to say a few words regarding an amendment I moved at the previous sitting. It was on the notice paper, and was partly accepted by the Minister. The hon. gentleman desired to exclude a limitation of time which the amendment in question contained, and by which the worker was required to elect within three months whether he claimed compensation from the employer or whether he pursued his civil remedy against a third party for damages. I said that I would move an amendment on lines which the Minister was prepared to accept, but that I would consider the matter in the meantime. I have now arrived at the conclusion that the amendment passed by the Committee, omitting that part which the Minister desired should be omitted, will have an effect which neither the Committee nor the Minister nor I desire it to have, because it will mean that the third party who may be liable for damages for negligence can be sued both by the employer and by the worker; that is, he may be compelled to pay damages twice. I understand, however, from the Minister that he will have the matter

looked into and any necessary correction made in another place.

Question put and passed.

BILL—MINES REGULATION ACT AMENDMENT.

In Committee.

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

Clause 1—agreed to.

Clause 2—Amendment of Section 55; Fortnightly payment of wages:

The MINISTER FOR MINES: On the second reading certain points were raised, and I now desire to move an amendment—

That in Subsection 1 of the proposed new section the words "due to," in line 6, be struck out and the word "of" inserted in lieu.

Amendment put and passed.

The MINISTER FOR MINES: I move an amendment—

That in Subsection 1 of the proposed new section the words "calculated up to and" be struck out.

The inclusion of the words would mean that the worker could demand his wages up to the night before pay day. To my knowledge it has been an established custom for 40 years in the mining industry to make up the time two or three days prior to pay day, which is usually Friday.

Mr. McDONALD: The idea of the amendment is that mines shall not be compelled, as they would be by the clause as originally drawn, to calculate wages up to the very day on which they have to be paid; that is, up to the very Friday on which payment of wages is made. The Minister's amendment has the object, with which I agree, that the mines shall be enabled to calculate wages up to a preceding day, such as Tuesday, and then pay on Friday. I am not entirely satisfied that even with this amendment the clause will not still be read as requiring a mine to calculate wages up to Friday, though that is not the Committee's intention. However, I have been informed by the Minister that the intention is that the mines shall be enabled to calculate the pay up to a preceding date, the usual date being Tuesday, but that the specific insertion of "Tuesday" is undesirable because some mines may prefer to com-

pute the pay up to the preceding Wednesday or possibly Tuesday, then paying on Friday. To put in a specific date, say Tuesday, might be inconvenient. I support the amendment, recalling the fact that Parliament intends that the mines shall be computing wages up to the preceding Tuesday or Wednesday or other suitable day. If it should be found that by court decision the mines had to pay up to Friday and that it would be impossible to carry out the rule, then the Minister could exercise power to suspend from the operations of the Act any mine involved.

Amendment put and passed.

Clause 3, Title—agreed to.

Bill reported with amendments.

BILL—BUREAU OF INDUSTRY AND ECONOMIC RESEARCH.

In Committee.

Resumed from the 11th October. Mr. Sleeman in the Chair; the Minister for Employment in charge of the Bill.

The CHAIRMAN: Progress was reported after Clause 1 had been agreed to.

Clause 2—agreed to.

Clause 3—Act divided into parts:

The MINISTER FOR EMPLOYMENT: Some amendments are necessary to this clause. Prior to the printing of the Bill two clauses were amalgamated, and so the number of clauses in the Bill was reduced by one. Consequential alterations that should have been made to certain parts of the Bill were not made, with the result that a number of minor errors are to be found. It will be necessary to alter the figures in the clause under discussion. I move an amendment—

That "Sections 5 to 27" be altered to read "Sections 5 to 26"; that "Sections 28 to 31" be altered to read "Sections 27 to 30," and that "Sections 32 to 37" be altered to read "Sections 31 to 36."

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

Clause 4—agreed to.

Clause 5—Constitution of Bureau:

Hon. W. D. JOHNSON: I move an amendment—

That in line 2 the word "bureau" be struck out, with a view to inserting the words "Parliamentary Standing Committee" in lieu.

I have given notice of this amendment to try to convince the House that the ambition of the Government can be fulfilled by Parliament undertaking and not delegating its responsibility to an outside body. In criticising my second reading remarks the Minister said it was a question of doing nothing. I do not think any speeches were made on the basis of doing nothing. The speeches were made on the question of deciding how something should be done. I do not think anyone in the House is opposed to speeding up an investigation of the problem associated with unemployment. There are those in the House who believe that Parliament is elected to grapple with problems of that description, and that we are shirking our responsibilities by presenting a Bill of this kind. I suggest to members that we can do this job, that we are paid to do it, that in our election speeches all of us, more or less, have dealt with this self-same problem, and now we are telling our constituents that we propose to delegate the task of unemployment and industries research to some outside body. The Minister proposed to try to overcome the weakness of the past. The Bill has been introduced because nothing has been done, and it is a definite expression that something must be done. The Minister rightly suggests that the Government might have a special expert or director to guide it, one who can advise on the various problems associated with unemployment and industry, and then to advise Parliament through the Minister—if my amendment be carried—to put into operation the questions that in the opinion of the director are desirable for the better economic progress of the State. I shall have no objection to that at all. What I do object to is the director being definitely connected with, and given statutory authority, to consult with outside bodies, and that he and the Minister shall be able to discuss problems, outside of Parliament, and then just leave it to the discretion of the Minister as to whether Parliament shall or shall not be consulted. The Minister attempted to ridicule my contention that there was a danger that action might be taken or things done or progress made by the bureau if the Bill were agreed to without Parliament having any knowledge of what was taking place. I have been a member of Parliament for many years, but since the advent of the Loan Council and Premiers' Conferences,

the whole economic basis of the Government of the State has been changed, and, to a very large extent, the authority of Parliament has gone. What we have to-day is Cabinet Government.

Hon. C. G. Latham: You are quite right.

Hon. W. D. JOHNSON: It is not Parliamentary Government, it is Cabinet Government, and under existing conditions it cannot be otherwise.

The CHAIRMAN: The hon. member might keep to the amendment.

Hon. W. D. JOHNSON: I am just explaining that Parliament has not been consulted, and I am stating that a measure of this description is likely to weaken rather than strengthen Parliamentary control. I shall not go outside the scope of my amendment; my remarks will be definitely relevant to the subject matter of the amendment. A Bill of this description will simply aggravate the position that I have outlined. Parliament to-day is losing control of action in regard not only to industry and unemployment but also to economic matters generally. The reason is that previously it was possible to consult Parliament, and to get directions from Parliament. We were able to conduct our affairs on an annual basis. When the affairs of the House were submitted to us annually, it was a question of what we were going to agree to in the future. To-day, however, that does not apply, and it cannot operate because of the position created by the Financial Agreement of 1928. Under existing conditions, the Government is compelled to work on monthly balances, not an annual balance. When we dealt with annual Estimates and annual balances, members of Parliament could have a say in the general direction of government. To-day we cannot, as the Government must under existing conditions, have monthly balances. In such circumstances Cabinet decisions have to be arrived at speedily without any possible chance of consulting Parliament.

I stress the point that in my amendment I refer to a parliamentary standing committee doing the work. If we realise the position and reorganise Parliament on a basis that will enable it to do its work, we shall be able to justify ourselves when we go back to our constituents and ask for re-election and claim that we deserve a salary of £600 a year. Most emphatically I assert that all we have an opportunity to do to-

day is to look after the unemployed and sustenance workers, together with social services, and to secure for our constituents assistance that is possibly being rendered in other parts of the State. I want to do a bigger job than that, and so do other members of Parliament, all of whom were elected to do bigger jobs than I have indicated is possible under existing conditions. The trouble is that we have not appreciated the change brought about by the operations of the Financial Agreement of 1928, under which the Loan Council was created. We have not realised the necessity, under Loan Council control of finance, for reorganising Parliament so that it can function in relation to matters of economic concern to the State. Parliament could do all the work that is proposed under the Bill. No difficulty would confront it in undertaking the task, if only the Government would apply itself to reorganising Parliament on the basis necessary to justify the continuance of representative government. The Government could avail itself of the services of experts in the task of overcoming the difficulties associated with youth unemployment and the tardy establishment of secondary industries. No limit attaches to the power of the Government to bring in all the available experts for that purpose, and there is nothing to stop that being done. We are not asked merely to reaffirm that proposition.

The Bill seeks the authority of Parliament to create a statutory body to do the work of Parliament. If my amendment be agreed to—and, as I have pointed out, I ask for a parliamentary standing committee—what will be set up will, in effect, be an economic council composed of members of Parliament. That committee would have a director, exactly as is suggested in relation to the proposed bureau. The committee would be specially appointed for special tasks and would consult with the director. By that means, members of Parliament would be kept in constant touch with what was going on, and the responsibility would rest on the committee so created to report regularly to Parliament. Members would thereby be informed as to what progress was being made with different projects, and so would always know what was being done and be able to issue directions where they thought

improvements could be effected. As it is, members must appreciate that they are not consulted at all. Let them consider the position regarding the creation, and fostering, of industries. What do members generally know of what the Government has done with regard to the handling and marketing of fat lambs, an industry that is progressing enormously and has such great possibilities? The work is being done by the Fremantle Freezing Works, who have been in consultation with the Government, which has rendered financial assistance to the concern more than once.

Mr. Stubbs: And what about the Albany works?

Hon. W. D. JOHNSON: I do not know so much about the position at Albany as I do regarding the Fremantle works. I wish to impress upon members that in this instance those works provide a striking illustration. We are all proud of the progress the State is making in the export trade in fat lambs; yet members of Parliament have no knowledge of what has gone on, or of what part the State has played in the fostering of that industry.

Hon. C. G. Latham: The same applies to advances to mining concerns.

Hon. W. D. JOHNSON: I do not wish to take up too much of the time of the Committee in giving illustrations. All this goes to show that work is being done. I do not say it has been badly done.

Hon. C. G. Latham: I do.

Hon. W. D. JOHNSON: That is the hon. member's view.

The Minister for Agriculture: Did you suggest the illustration was badly done?

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

Hon. W. D. JOHNSON: It would be better if members rose above mere party considerations in dealing with this matter. I applaud what Cabinet is doing, but I am also conscious of the fact that I am doing nothing.

The Minister for Agriculture: You are lucky.

Hon. W. D. JOHNSON: I have worked as hard as any other member of Parliament, a mighty sight harder than a lot of them.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I do not think that question enters into the consideration of the amendment before the Committee.

Hon. W. D. JOHNSON: Members of Parliament are not overworked to-day; they have plenty of time at their disposal to

undertake bigger responsibilities. They should make their services available to the Government to advise and assist in matters such as I have referred to. It is useless arguing that members of Parliament have neither the time nor the capacity to undertake such tasks. The member for Middle Swan made a very fine speech, and the Minister, of course, tried to ridicule the hon. member's statements. The member for Middle Swan outlined the great development that had taken place in Western Australia. True, as the Minister pointed out, he delivered a historical sketch of what had been accomplished. Nevertheless, the hon. member's speech proved that Parliament has the capacity to deal with big problems when called upon to do so. Let members consider the great Goldfields Water Scheme. That undertaking was closely investigated by Parliament. Over and over again Parliament declared itself regarding that wonderful work. Because of Parliament's close association with the undertaking, weaknesses were exposed that were subsequently put right by Parliament.

Mr. Raphael: Do not forget that we had a good Minister for Employment in those days!

Hon. W. D. JOHNSON: Then there is the Agricultural Bank. To-day members look upon that institution as economically unsound, but if they knew the early history of the State, and the initial problems that confronted former Governments in their efforts to establish the agricultural industry, they would realise the enormous volume of work effected by that great institution, the Agricultural Bank.

Mr. Stubbs: Hear, hear!

Hon. W. D. JOHNSON: I had experience in the early days on the fringe of agricultural development. In those days Meckering was looked upon as the limit for safe farming. By means of the Agricultural Bank, men were encouraged to go beyond that point. They were backed and supported by the State. There again members will see that Parliament directed the policy and from the inception constantly debated the activities of the Agricultural Bank. The work along those lines flourished. Private banks entered the field, and control was assumed over farmers who had become prosperous and attained an economically sound position, through the assistance rendered by the Agricultural Bank. Many of those

farmers were taken over by the private banks, and to the extent that the private banks encroached, so the Agricultural Bank became proportionately weaker.

I shall not continue much longer in this vein, beyond asking members to visualise the State and its requirements. Let them consider what has been done by way of railway and road construction, the development of agriculture and mining, and the fostering of the great pastoral industry. All that work progressed under Parliamentary direction. Other activities in Western Australia have been fostered and encouraged by Parliament. I refer there to primary industries. In those circumstances, why should we be asked to go outside Parliament when secondary industries are to be dealt with? If Parliament was big enough to tackle the difficulties associated with earlier development and to promote the expansion of primary production to the stage it has reached to-day; if we contemplate the smallness of our population and at the same time the enormous expansion of our primary production, can we now admit that we must fall down on our job because unemployment amongst our youth has increased, and because secondary industries have not flourished to the extent some may desire? After all our experience in the work of development, to which the member for Middle Swan made extended reference, are we to agree that some outside authority must step in and take the task out of our hands? I appeal to members to endeavour to make practical use of Parliament. Let them think that Parliament consists of 80 members. Will anyone seriously claim that Parliament will be permitted to continue as it has been functioning? Will the people carry us much longer?

Mr. Marshall: They have carried 30 members far too long.

Hon. W. D. JOHNSON: I quite agree with the member for Murchison, but we must accept the position as it is. To-day we have 80 members of Parliament, with Cabinet shouldering the burden of government, while Parliament accepts a minimum of responsibility. Parliament in the past shouldered the problems associated with unemployment, but nowadays decisions are arrived at of which Parliament has little knowledge. Let me instance the work that has been undertaken in the North-West. What do members know about jetty and other construction in that portion of the State? We read in the Press that

certain works are being undertaken, but we are not consulted. We know nothing about the work. Take the declaration published the other day that the Government intended to help the pearling industry. That is quite a laudable desire and quite the correct attitude for the Government to adopt; but that assistance is not rendered by Parliament, the members of which know nothing about it at all. That is carried out by Cabinet and under existing conditions Cabinet has to do so. On the other hand, I want the Government to appreciate the fact that Parliament was elected for a purpose, and members should be able to fulfil that purpose without being asked to set aside their task, and an outside organisation established to do the work that rightly belongs to Parliament. I ask members to consider New Zealand, where parliamentary government exists in the truest sense. In that Dominion a wonderful extension of parliamentary control has occurred and remarkable achievements have resulted. It is true that Western Australia cannot follow the example of New Zealand because this is only one of six competitive States. If we attempted to do special things in Western Australia, we would be out of step with other portions of the Commonwealth and the Disabilities Commission would interfere. We should realise, however, that the Disabilities Commission does exist, and we should induce Parliament to influence the Commission to give the State greater power. The trouble to-day is that we send Ministers to Loan Council meetings and to Premiers' Conferences, and those Ministers try to influence the Loan Council and the Disabilities Commission without obtaining from Parliament any direction, support or encouragement in their representations.

The CHAIRMAN: The hon. member is getting away from the amendment. I would like him to keep somewhere near it.

Hon. W. D. JOHNSON: I am illustrating my arguments and consider that my remarks are quite relevant.

The CHAIRMAN: The Chairman decides that.

Hon. W. D. JOHNSON: I am endeavouring to live up to my conception of the Standing Orders. New Zealand is a striking illustration of parliamentary control. The progress of New Zealand is due to the fact that Parliament is in control. There is no bureau, no outside organisation. The Parliament of New Zealand, with a Dominion to

develop, is not creating statutory authorities to accomplish the work. It is expanding parliamentary control. It is giving Parliament extended power and wonderful results have followed. The methods of the New Zealand Parliament have been endorsed by the people of New Zealand because each member has been able to go back to his constituency and claim that he has played an important part in the achievements of the Dominion.

The CHAIRMAN: I rule that what they are doing in New Zealand has nothing to do with the amendment under discussion. I ask the member to confine his remarks to the amendment. I have given him a good deal of latitude.

Hon. W. D. JOHNSON: I thank you for the latitude, Mr. Chairman. What I wanted to convey to members was that Parliament, properly organised, has the capacity and skill to do the work it is proposed to allot to a bureau.

Mr. Patrick: You want to make Parliament the bureau.

Hon. W. D. JOHNSON: It is clear what I want.

Mr. Stubbs: You do not want the Bill.

Hon. W. D. JOHNSON: I contend that legislation is not necessary, but if legislation is introduced, I want to ensure that the work is entrusted to Parliament. I have mentioned what New Zealand has done and I ask members to appreciate the part that Parliament played in the extension of primary production in this State in the early days. Members ought to realise what Parliament has done in this direction. In New Zealand, work of this kind is being done better than in any other part of the world where there is a democratic form of government.

The Minister for Mines: New Zealand has a bureau constituted on similar lines to those suggested in this measure.

Hon. W. D. JOHNSON: It is not the same.

The Minister for Works: It is composed of members of Parliament and they have appointed a marketing board.

Hon. W. D. JOHNSON: I know what has been done in New Zealand.

The Minister for Works: I do not think you do.

Hon. W. D. JOHNSON: New Zealand is under parliamentary control.

The Minister for Works: It is under Government control, the same as is this State.

Hon. W. D. JOHNSON: The hon. member can call it Government control if he wishes, but the Government in New Zealand constantly and regularly consults members of Parliament. The position is that the Government of New Zealand has control of New Zealand and Parliament is in full accord with the Government and is regularly consulted by the Government. No outside statutory body functions in the Dominion apart from those approved of by the Government and by Parliament.

The Minister for Works: There is a section of the community that apparently disagrees with the Administration.

Hon. W. D. JOHNSON: Of course there is a section violently opposed to what is being done. That was disclosed during the election. I do not, however, desire to follow that matter any further. I spoke of what is being done in New Zealand in order to illustrate the power of Parliament to do things and the capacity of Parliament to achieve results if it is properly organised to achieve them.

The Minister for Employment: Tell the Committee how the New Zealand Bureau of Industry is constituted.

Hon. W. D. JOHNSON: I shall leave that to the Minister. The Chairman of Committees keeps warning me that I must not deal with New Zealand, and I can well imagine that if I began to discuss the details of New Zealand legislation, I should be declared out of order, though I claim that I am quite in order in speaking in general terms of parliamentary control in that Dominion.

The CHAIRMAN: The hon. member may compare the New Zealand bureau with the one proposed in the Bill.

Hon. W. D. JOHNSON: I do not desire a bureau at all. I am opposed to a bureau and am endeavouring to make members appreciate that they are called upon to do this work, which they have been elected to carry out. Moreover, I am seeking to convince them that if they fail to do the work and hand it over to a bureau to do, that will be a declaration that they are a party to the present standard of government, whereby executive power is exercised by the Government to the exclusion of members of Parliament. I want members of Parliament to be associated with the work of government to a far greater extent. I want them to have an opportunity

to function in regard to the government of this State, and I do not want a director to be under the guidance, control and direction of a bureau. Parliament can be organised to do it, and I submit to members that they need to take a serious view of the matter and to realise that the appointment of a bureau is likely to prevent parliamentary expansion. It will be a violation of democratic control. A democratic form of government provides for the appointment of members of Parliament to do this kind of work on a properly organised basis, and it is not right that we should appoint to such a bureau a body of individuals outside the elect of the people. The Bill could be accepted as a basis upon which the work could be done, but it should be carried out within this and the other Chamber.

I know the economic position of this State. I know what the youths of Western Australia are suffering and the mental anxiety that exists in the homes of our people on account of the unemployment problem. We have been tinkering with the subject for quite a long time, and we need to get on with the job and do something. We had an appeal for funds to assist unemployed youth and motherhood. We obtained the funds and appointed trustees to administer the funds, and to advise us as to how they could be utilised in relieving unemployment amongst youths, and also to stimulate industry. Specially selected trustees were appointed to do the job but they did little or nothing. Then the Government appointed a Royal Commission to investigate the position with a view to ascertaining what could be done for unemployed youths. The Royal Commissioner reported on the matter and suggested it be passed on to a bureau. Now we have a Bill before us—

The Minister for Mines: He passed the matter on to the Government.

Hon. W. D. JOHNSON: The Commissioner recommended to the Government that a bureau should be established and the Government has now submitted this Bill. If Parliament had been consulted earlier on the subject there would have been no need for a Royal Commission or the Bill. We should have done the work years ago. Because it has not been done the necessity for the Bill arose.

THE MINISTER FOR EMPLOYMENT: I hope it will not be necessary for me to occupy too much of the time of the Committee in dealing with the amendment. The effect of the amendment would be to set up a committee composed entirely of members of Parliament, to carry out the inquiries that the Bill proposes should be undertaken by the suggested bureau. The hon. member spent much time in telling us what New Zealand had done and what good results had been achieved for the industries and the people of that Dominion. I am quite sure, however, that the hon. member knew nothing about the constitution of the Bureau of Industry in that country. I doubt very much whether he knew of the existence of a bureau of that description in New Zealand. I desire briefly to quote from the report of the Royal Commissioner, Mr. Woolf, to show that in New Zealand, which admittedly has an excellent Government and has made substantial progress in recent years, a Bureau of Industry is operating very similar to the one proposed in the Bill. On page 11 of the report the Royal Commissioner stated—

In New Zealand a Bureau of Industry was established early in 1936 under the provisions of the Board of Trade Act, 1919, as an advisory body to the Minister for Industries and Commerce. The Industrial Efficiency Act, 1936, reconstituted the Bureau of Industry, giving that body certain statutory powers and defining its powers and functions. The reorganised bureau, which operates under the Minister for Industries and Commerce, was constituted in January, 1937. The members are appointed by the Minister and include representatives of manufacturing and farming industries, as well as State appointees.

Mrs. Cardell-Oliver: On a point of order, is the Minister in order in quoting the bureau of New Zealand? The member for Guildford-Midland was not allowed to quote it.

The CHAIRMAN: The member for Guildford-Midland mentioned the bureau and I distinctly told him he was entitled to compare it with the one in New Zealand. The Minister is quite in order.

THE MINISTER FOR EMPLOYMENT: To spare the feelings of the member for Subiaco, I shall not quote further from the report. Thus in New Zealand a Bureau of Industry very similar to the one proposed for this State has been operating since January, 1937, and we may reasonably assume that some of New Zealand's progress during

the last two years has resulted from the work of the bureau.

Mr. Patrick: More so from the price of butter.

THE MINISTER FOR EMPLOYMENT: The New Zealand bureau consists of representatives of various industries and Government departments under the control of the Minister. When replying to the second reading debate I pointed out that I had no objection to considering members of Parliament for appointment as members of the proposed bureau. Since then I have discussed the matter with the Government, and I am in a position to state that no member of the Government is opposed to giving members of Parliament the right to be considered eligible for appointment.

Hon. C. G. Latham: But will you appoint them?

THE MINISTER FOR EMPLOYMENT: If the Committee desires that we should set out clearly in the Bill that members of Parliament shall be eligible to be considered for appointment, the Government will offer no objection.

Mr. Wilson: You told us that before.

THE MINISTER FOR EMPLOYMENT: Yes, but I repeat it now with the authority of the Government. If members desire to have it clearly stated in the Bill that members shall be eligible to be considered for appointment, we are quite prepared to accept the proposal.

The Minister for Mines: They would have to be protected as regards accepting positions of profit under the Crown.

THE MINISTER FOR EMPLOYMENT: Yes, we would have to state clearly that such appointments did not constitute positions of profit under the Crown, and safeguards would have to be provided accordingly. If the amendment were accepted, the proposed committee would be fairly difficult to operate in practice. The member for Guildford-Midland might contend that no difficulty would be experienced in obtaining enough members of Parliament to devote all the time necessary to the very important duties contemplated by the Bill. I believe he is thoroughly conscientious in that belief; he has convinced himself that his is the best method of tackling the problems under consideration. Nevertheless, my experience persuades me that such a committee would not be able to devote, regularly and frequently, a sufficient

amount of time to the duties. From the State's point of view, we would do better if we appointed a bureau consisting of men well suited to represent the various activities carried on in the fields of trade and commerce. We should appoint men associated with those activities, men with practical knowledge and special experience of the different problems that beset our industries. The alternative proposal is not comparable with that contained in the Bill. We should not bind ourselves to impose upon certain members of Parliament the duties outlined in the Bill.

Mr. Rodoreda: You would have a difficulty in getting candidates.

The MINISTER FOR EMPLOYMENT: Our choice of the personnel should be unrestricted. If we restricted membership of the bureau to members of Parliament, I am inclined to believe that just when the bureau was needed most, members would find they had more pressing claims upon their time and attention. There would be a real danger of conflict developing between their duties to their constituents and their responsibilities as members of the bureau. The amendment would not only restrict appointees to members of Parliament, but would also definitely restrict them to members who might be available. The number that would be available to serve regularly and frequently and may be almost continuously upon such a bureau would be very small indeed, and if the bureau is to accomplish valuable results for the State, members would have to give attention to the duties at times other than when the actual meetings were being held. I would not envy any member who offered himself for appointment and was appointed. The demands that would be made upon his time, effort and thought would be considerable. If he had an assured seat in a settled district and did not desire to devote too much attention to the session's legislation, he might be able to give the necessary time and attention to carrying out faithfully and fully his duties as a member of the bureau.

Mr. Cross: If he was a member for a metropolitan constituency, he would not have the time.

The MINISTER FOR EMPLOYMENT: There are few arguments in favour of the amendment and many against it. The hon. member did not put up a very convincing

case; he did not get really to grips with the question. Certainly, his alternative contains much less merit than the proposal in the Bill, and as I believe it would not work in practice, the Committee would be unwise to accept the amendment.

Mr. SEWARD: The argument of the member for Guildford-Midland impressed me, particularly his contention that by constituting the bureau as proposed, we should be delegating duties that ought to be discharged by us. If we established some other body to make investigations that we ought to make, we might be inclined to leave too much to that body, hoping that it would do the job well. As the hon. member pointed out, the question of youth employment has been allowed to drag on for years, and the sum total of the Bill is simply to appoint a body to make inquiries into that very pressing question. For that reason I feel it incumbent upon me to vote for the amendment, and so prevent passing further responsibility from Parliament to some outside body.

Hon. C. G. LATHAM: I support the amendment. It is time we had a stocktaking of Parliament. I resent the Minister's statement that members of Parliament would not be competent to undertake this work.

The Minister for Employment: I did not say that.

Hon. C. G. LATHAM: I think the Minister said members were unfitted for the work.

The Minister for Employment: No.

Hon. C. G. LATHAM: I was referring to the Minister's second reading speech. There are members, on either side of the House, capable of expressing opinions and advising the Government. Ministers hold responsible positions and make important decisions affecting both the finances of the State and the welfare of its people. Sometimes, of course, the decisions may be wrong. If new Ministers were suddenly appointed in place of those now holding office, we would have to rely upon them in the same way as we rely upon the present Ministers. Ministers are endowed with a great deal of common sense, business acumen and knowledge.

The Minister for Mines: And they get a great deal of good advice from the officers of their departments.

Hon. C. G. LATHAM: I admit that. The Minister who interjected was not intimately

in touch with the affairs of the Mines Department when he assumed office; but he has his officers to advise him; if he had to study all the past actions of the department, it would take him years to acquire the knowledge necessary for him to arrive at decisions. In other Parliaments, public works committees and finance committees are appointed. What the member for Guildford-Midland said is true; we have but little control over public expenditure and if we pass this Bill, we shall be handing over to another body the right to expend public funds.

Mr. Rodoreda: You are wrong.

Hon. C. G. LATHAM: Much of the expenditure which appears in the Public Accounts has not been authorised by Parliament. For instance, we have handed over the Agricultural Bank to the control of commissioners. Parliament cannot even consider the salaries of the officials of the Agricultural Bank. Parliament has no authority over State Trading Concerns. True, we do consider their expenditure, but we have no control over them.

Mr. Lambert: But your Premier handed over the State Savings Bank. Did you say a word about that.

Hon. C. G. LATHAM: Rip Van Winkle has come to life again.

The CHAIRMAN: Order!

Mr. Lambert: What about the State Savings Bank that your Government handed over?

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The member for Yilgarn-Coolgardie must cease interjecting or I shall have to take action.

Hon. C. G. LATHAM: A very large amount of public expenditure is not authorised by Parliament.

The CHAIRMAN: The hon. member must confine his remarks to the Bill.

Hon. C. G. LATHAM: There should be no trouble in selecting nine members of this House to act on the bureau. I venture to say they would find sufficient time to do the work and do it well. Ministers find time to do their departmental work and also to attend the sittings of Parliament.

The Premier: You would not have the time to spare. One good man would thus be left out.

Hon. C. G. LATHAM: I admit I have had a very busy time, and I know members can be very busy; yet a little while ago members from both sides of the House spent much time in making an investigation which

I believe will be found to be worth-while. Of course, members could not be expected to travel to the North-West or to the Kimberleys each year. The members of the bureau could, however, avail themselves of the services of advisers, just in the same way as Ministers can obtain expert advice, if they require it. The member for Guildford-Midland is to be commended for his amendment. I agree with the Minister in this respect, that if the amendment is passed, it will be necessary to redraft the Bill.

The Minister for Mines: The amendment is ambiguous.

Hon. C. G. LATHAM: I do not agree. The member for Guildford-Midland is a very sensible man.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! We are not discussing the member for Guildford-Midland.

Hon. C. G. LATHAM: If the amendment is carried, the Bill will have to be redrafted on lines suitable to the Minister, bearing in mind that Parliament will be brought into closer touch with the expenditure of public funds.

Mr. MARSHALL: Having listened to the discussion, I have yet to be convinced that either a committee of parliamentarians, or a bureau of scientists or experts will solve the problem that the Bill, if it becomes law, is expected to solve.

The Premier: Not at all. We hope to make an improvement.

Mr. MARSHALL: I have not the slightest doubt if the amendment is carried, that experts from among members of Parliament can be secured to serve on the bureau. We can collate the figures and collect facts; but, having done that, what can we then do? When he introduced the Bill, the Minister quoted a list of imported commodities. Those particulars, however, are collated each year and published in the Year Book. We know exactly what industries can be established in Western Australia. Any men, whether parliamentarians or not, can assess, with the information already available, the value of the secondary industries of Western Australia. The Minister also made reference to youth unemployment, and I think the Leader of the Opposition said that the Bill would solve that problem. Strangely enough, similar organisations created in other States years ago have failed to solve it. It is no use any member quoting New Zealand, because there has been practically a

revolution in the economic life of that country during the last few years. New Zealand has nationalised banking and created marketing boards, but has done little to solve the important problem of youth unemployment.

Sitting suspended from 6.15 to 7.30 p.m.

Mr. MARSHALL: I am hard-pressed to keep up with all the work that is forwarded to me from my electorate. During the recess I spend from three to five months in the tropics. Although I agree that metropolitan members may not be absent from the city as long as that, I do know that most country members spend a good deal of their time during the recess outside the metropolitan area. If members were appointed to this bureau, they could not attend constantly, and the bureau could only operate at their leisure. If this organisation is to be of any value, it can only reproduce that value constituted as set out in the Bill. Until this session the mover of the amendment was one of the most difficult members to find present during the sittings.

The CHAIRMAN: The hon. member must not reflect upon another hon. member.

Mr. MARSHALL: I am not reflecting upon him, for he may have been called away on public business, but he certainly was repeatedly absent. Evidently pressure of business necessitated his absence from the Chamber. He, therefore, could not afford to devote much time to this bureau. I have taken a note of how members have recently attended to their Parliamentary duties. If they are unable to do so to a greater extent than I shall presently show, it is obvious they will not have time in which to carry out further duties.

Mr. Thorn: That applies to very few members.

Mr. MARSHALL: Members are sent to Parliament principally to assist in handling the legislation required by the country. If that is not their job, they have no right to be here.

Mr. Thorn: I thought you were referring to members' attendances.

Mr. MARSHALL: I have here figures showing the voting strength in six divisions that occurred in this Chamber during the current session. The maximum attendance could have been fifty. In the last division the number of members who voted was 36, and in the other five divisions the numbers

were respectively, 36, 33, 40, 32, and 38. Members are paid by the taxpayers to attend to the legislation of the country.

Hon. C. G. Latham: You have not allowed for pairs.

Mr. MARSHALL: The members who did not vote were not here.

Hon. C. G. Latham: They are very often here, but are paired with some absent Minister or other members.

Mr. MARSHALL: I admit the figures may be slightly improved. If members like to give pairs to other members, this shows that constant demands are being made upon them to be away from the Chamber. I do not say they are neglecting their duties, but there is such a demand upon their time that they have to be absent from the particular business they are sent here to perform. Would members voluntarily increase the burden they already carry? I respectfully submit they would not be able to do so. If any results are to be obtained from this Bill, they can be obtained only by the bureau that is to be set up. I do not think members could give efficient, successful or constant attention to the extra duties suggested. I oppose the amendment.

Mr. NEEDHAM: I also oppose the amendment. There is a vast difference between it and that suggested by the Leader of the Opposition. My opposition is not caused by any feeling that members of Parliament should not serve as members of committees. The Commonwealth Public Works Committee did splendid work for a number of years. Let me compare the powers given to that committee with the powers the Bill proposes to give the bureau. Section 14 of the Act governing the Commonwealth Public Works Committee sets out that the committee shall, subject to the provisions of the Act, consider and report upon every public work, except any work already authorised by Parliament, or which is authorised during the present session, and except works for the naval or military defences of the Commonwealth exempted by Order-in-Council from the operations of the Act, to be executed after the passing of the Act, and whether such work is a continuation, completion, repair, reconstruction, extension, or new work, in all cases where the estimated cost of the complete work exceeds £25,000. Before any work could be referred to the committee, a Minister of the Crown had to move for such reference and

secure the approval of Parliament. The Bill before us does not place any such limitations upon the proposed bureau. It states that the bureau shall investigate any kind of work, large or small, that will help industry in this State. When that has been done, a report is to be made to the Minister. There is no comparison between the Commonwealth Public Works Committee and the committee suggested by the member for Guildford-Midland.

Mr. Thorn: Are you speaking to the amendment?

Mr. NEEDHAM: I am opposing it, but I am not opposed to a member of Parliament serving on committees. I agree that members have not the time at their disposal for work of this nature. If there is to be a bureau of members of Parliament, their attendance must not be fitful, spasmodic or irregular. To be effective it must be continuous. Having had experience of two committees of the Federal Parliament—Accounts and Works—I oppose the amendment.

Mr. McLARTY: The carrying of the amendment would impair the usefulness of the measure. The Minister is out to obtain the best expert advice available, whereas the amendment proposes to restrict his choice to 80 members of Parliament, or rather a smaller number, since many members would not wish to serve on the bureau. Parliament sits during half the year, and members are in their constituencies attending to local matters during the other half. Again, the selection of nine members of Parliament for the bureau would be a problem for the Minister, whose views as to the fitness of some members for appointment to the bureau would probably differ from those held by the members themselves. The bureau should be kept free from political influence. Its members are to be bound to secrecy. That might place parliamentary members of the bureau in a difficult position when questioned by closely interested constituents. I have advocated the establishment of a public works committee; but this bureau is an entirely different proposal, covering every phase of industry. Therefore the best advisers should be selected from the widest possible field.

Mr. LAMBERT: My general attitude towards the Bill was made plain on the second reading. During my 20-odd years' membership of this Chamber I have embraced

wholeheartedly every possibility of establishing a bureau of this description. The member for Guildford-Midland thought it right to descend from the Chair to speak on the measure. What are the possible openings for our youth to-day? To me it is almost unthinkable that in this Chamber anyone can speak against the Bill while having knowledge of the thousands of untrained children who are walking about our streets because they lack not only employment but scientific instruction. Has the mover of the amendment reflected on the fact that our children of to-day are addicted to picture shows, to the dirty dregs of Hollywood, instead of attending schools where they would obtain scientific knowledge? Should a man capable of thought tolerate that position? Hundreds of our town halls, road board halls and other public halls are used to display the filthy inanities of Hollywood. Let us contrast that situation with the conception of a Government that brings down a Bill designed to give our children adequate education in the fields of mining, agriculture and other activities, to fit them to become worthy citizens of Western Australia. It disgusts me to think that members of this Chamber, who must possess the minds of 14-year-old boys—

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The hon. member must not reflect on members in that manner.

Mr. LAMBERT: In every field of intellectual activity the specialist is at home. Shall we cast aside poets, inventors, chemists, all who have made possible the great growth of civilisation during the past century or two?

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The hon. member will get back to the amendment.

Mr. LAMBERT: The Government is to be commended for having brought down the Bill. The secondary industries to-day have gone astray because we are importing annually over £12,000,000 worth of goods when nine-tenths of them could be produced here. The only way by which we could produce them would be on a scientific basis; certainly not in the clumsy way that has been attempted. That method has been followed because there has not been available scientific knowledge or advice. Years ago we had a suggestion about the appointment of a standing committee but it was dismissed by this House. What we want

now is a bureau for scientific investigation in the hope that its work will be the means of finding employment for the youth of the State. Such work could never be done by a standing committee, though I admit a standing committee might prove useful in other directions.

Mr. HUGHES: There is a continuous trend in the Parliamentary life of all the Australian States, including our own, to shed their functions of government and to set up all sorts of boards and bureaux. The continued establishment of such boards or bureaux will mean that if we go on in that way there will not be any work for Parliament to do, and there will not be any justification for the existence of Parliament. Look around to-day and see how many administrative boards there are, including a milk board, a lotteries board, probably a starting price board, and then a bureau of industry. We may soon find that members of Parliament are ceasing to be legislators. Nowadays members of Parliament have not the opportunity to participate in work that, as the member for Murchison pointed out, should represent their principal function. More often than not we are asked to pass legislation, the effect of which will be to hand over another portion of our functions to yet another board. Naturally, all the data and information we can obtain about the resources of the State and possibilities of development, is essential. Nevertheless that will not advance the position to any appreciable extent until we secure a revision of the distribution of power as between the Commonwealth and the State. In my opinion the Bill suggests putting the cart before the horse. If the bureau is to be established for the purpose of supplying information that will be the basis for legislation, the opportunity should be taken to utilise the services of as many members as possible so that they can be better educated respecting matters affecting the welfare of the State. The object of the proposed bureau is surely not to gather information for museum purposes or to be collated merely to be filed away and forgotten. Rather should that information be used for the promotion of our industrial development. The more the business man trains his staff, the more efficient will his business become and the less cause will he have for worry. The business of running the affairs of the State is important, and if the people desire efficient legislation, they must pay accordingly.

If nine men are to be appointed to the bureau for the purposes of scientific research and investigation, why should not those nine be chosen from members of Parliament, for it is much more instructive to participate in research work than merely to read the results of the investigations of others. Time is a relevant factor. We know that some men can be as busy as anything doing nothing all the week. Sensible men, when pressed for time, set aside minor issues and concentrate upon those of major importance. I admit that throughout my life I have found myself pressed seriously for one thing only more than for time. If members of Parliament concentrated on matters of major importance, their constituents would consider them justified in paying little attention to minor matters. I hope the amendment will be agreed to.

Mrs. CARDELL-OLIVER: I support the amendment, not because I regard it as wholly right or the Bill as wholly wrong. I should like the Bill altered in certain of its phases. In the first speech I delivered in this House, I spoke in favour of members being attached to standing committees that would enable them to gain information and advance their education. The members of the Light Lands Royal Commission found time to collate the information furnished in their report. That work must have been of great educational value to the Commissioners, for the report is most informative. If we had a director or a bureau, I do not think more information could have been contained than is found in the Royal Commission's report. The Minister has received much expert advice regarding youth employment, for many organisations have furnished him with knowledge based on experience in other parts of Australia or overseas. If anyone should be an expert, the Minister should be in that position. Certainly he should not require guidance by any director of a bureau. I should think he merely requires to apply the knowledge he already possesses. No director could assist in the solution of the youth employment problem unless we could break down the antipathy of unions to the provision of a greater number of apprentices. The suggestion has been advanced that members of Parliament have not the time at their disposal to devote to the work proposed. As the member for Guildford-Midland remarked, members of Parliament are required to devote their attention to matters relating to

the unemployed, sustenance workers and social services, whereas their work should be in connection with more important phases.

Mr. Raphael: You will never avoid that so long as you have civil servants to contend with, in view of the lack of sympathy often shown to the poor devils.

Mrs. CARDELL-OLIVER: Members of Parliament were elected to control civil servants or any other body, and we should not relegate our functions to more boards. With the member for East Perth, I consider we have too many boards already. We are asked to approve of the establishment of the bureau at great expense, but without doing, I fear, any good. I do not know of any man in the world who could render worth-while service at a salary of £900 a year. I understand that £5,000 is the total sum to be allocated for the whole expense in connection with the bureau. That amount would not be sufficient to pay one man with brains enough to get us out of our present-day troubles. If we paid such a man £10,000 a year it would not be too much. I do not think all the 80 members of Parliament are duds, and I believe there are many who would be capable of at least endeavouring to find out what was wrong with our system, if given the opportunity to do so.

Mr. RAPHAEL: I oppose the amendment. The establishment of the bureau will be for the specific purpose of encouraging the establishment of industries, which will involve the investment of money. Should a parliamentary standing committee be set up in lieu of the bureau, we must remember that there is always in the minds of the public an underlying suspicion as to what politicians will do next. From that standpoint, a parliamentary standing committee might act as a deterrent to the investment of money. Mass production in the Eastern States accounts for the non-establishment of manufactories in Western Australia. In many instances the goods exported to Western Australia comprise the surplus production of factories in the East. The member for Subiaco suggested that £10,000 a year could be paid to the right man for the position of director, but I think it would be very difficult to find such a man in Australia.

Mr. Hughes: Soviet Russia paid huge sums to American experts.

Mr. RAPHAEL: But Russia paid those salaries not so much for the instruction

to be gained from those experts as for the inventions they were to introduce. I am not much enamoured of the bureau, and I do not know that its establishment will make much difference regarding our secondary industries. During the past 12 or 18 months a sharp falling off has been experienced in connection with industries that have been developed in Western Australia. Perhaps the present Minister for Employment is not taking sufficient interest in his job, perhaps not to the extent that his predecessor did. However, although I have not much faith in the legislation, I hope it will not be mutilated to the extent desired by the member for Guildford-Midland.

Mr. TONKIN: I am opposed to the amendment because I do not think it is an improvement on the proposal of the Minister. We have the experience of Queensland and New Zealand to guide us, and I think we shall be doing very well if we endeavour to emulate their example. We would be considerably better off if we did more than they are doing. Before the Queensland Government introduced a proposal for a Bureau of Industry the State had a Bureau of Economics and Statistics. The Premier of Queensland, in introducing the Bill to convert the Bureau of Economics and Statistics into a Bureau of Industry, pointed out that scarcely any benefit had resulted from the bureau, because though it had power of investigation and recommendation, it had no administrative power. Accordingly it was proposed to give such authority to the new bureau. With its experience of the activities of the original bureau, one would have thought that the Government in introducing the Bill for a bureau of industry would have taken the opportunity to include in the bureau members of Parliament, if it considered that thereby the bureau would be improved. The question, however, was never raised by members of either side of the House. Members were prepared to accept the proposal of the Government that the bureau should be reconstituted and given administrative powers. A similar state of affairs exists in New Zealand. No attempt has been made there to set up a parliamentary committee in place of a bureau.

In considering the matter and endeavouring to decide how much time a mem-

ber of Parliament could give to this job I was forced to the conclusion—without discounting the capabilities of members—that the work they could do upon a parliamentary committee of this description would not be of very great value, because they would not be certain of the time they would be able to devote to it. Members of Parliament are at the beck and call of their electors. Our electors expect us to be able to see them at almost any time of the day or night. Very often we make arrangements to fulfil certain engagements and have to cancel them to attend to some urgent business on behalf of an elector. In view of that fact, I fail to see how members of Parliament could be expected to give regular attention to a parliamentary committee such as is proposed. Numbers of members have other interests. Some of us give our whole time to our job as members of Parliament. But some members have other avocations. Some are professional men; others are farmers. Could we expect those men, if appointed to such a committee, forthwith to drop their other business in order to give their time to the necessary investigations? If they are prepared to do that, they should long ago have given their whole attention to their job as Parliamentarians.

Some people seem to have the idea that all that would be required of a member of the bureau would be that he should drop in now and again for half an hour and have a talk to the typist, after which the necessary investigation would be made, and everything in the garden would be lovely. But organised planning is required. If we are to do anything to remedy the unemployment situation and establish industries in this State, we shall have to carry out not some desultory investigation but some prolonged and organised inquiry. Regular hours will have to be devoted to the task and proper records will have to be kept. My experience is that it is most difficult to get half a dozen members of Parliament to attend a meeting at one time and all to remain to complete the job in hand.

Mr. Raphael: We could not get five members of a select committee to do that, could we?

Mr. TONKIN: When a select committee is appointed by this House, it is almost impossible to have every member present on

every sitting day. Usually one or another excuses himself in order to attend to some other business. Sometimes out of a committee of five only two members have been present, in spite of the fact that all members knew the time of the meeting, and the nature of the business. Usually the select committee sits for a fortnight or so, yet it has been impossible to get the members all to attend regularly for the whole of that period. What earthly chance, therefore, is there of members attending regularly to the job required of them under the Bill? They simply would not do it. If the amendment is carried, a proviso should be inserted that members who voted for it should be obliged to serve on the committee and should be in attendance from 9 o'clock in the morning until 5 o'clock in the afternoon under pain of loss of salary. Members then would not be too anxious to support the proposal. I take it that continuity of policy is essential. Every three years we have an election. I do not know whether there has ever been an instance in which, after an election, there have been no changes in the personnel of the House.

Mr. Needham: Yes, there has.

Mr. TONKIN: The member for Perth tells me that there has been an instance.

Mr. Raphael: It was in 1843!

Mr. TONKIN: Generally quite a number of changes are made. That would mean that some members would serve on the bureau for three years or less, and that after an election, during which time no member would give any time to the bureau at all, because he would be endeavouring to make his seat safe, a number of members might not be returned. Their work would be finished and new men, possibly without any training or Parliamentary experience whatever, would immediately take their places on the bureau. A nice investigation committee we would have under those conditions! Continuity of policy is essential and we need experts who know exactly what they are after, who would carry out their investigations along certain lines and who would make recommendations as a result of the conclusions to which they had come. I have no doubt that many members of Parliament could do admirable work if they had no other duties to attend to, and if they could devote the whole of their time to the task because they have specialised knowledge. However, although they tell us that they

would have sufficient time to devote to this work, they know that they would not. The Leader of the Opposition, in his second reading speech, mentioned that members had not sufficient time to read all the reports that are tabled. That is correct. I suggest there is no member in this House who has read half the reports put upon his bench this year. Mention was made of the report of the Light Lands Commission. I venture to assert that not 20 per cent. of the members have read that report, and possibly not 50 per cent. have even opened it. What happened was that the report was so sought after that before a number of members had an opportunity of reading it, members on the other side of the House who wanted copies obtained them from members who were not very much interested, so that many on this side of the House have never read a word of the report.

Mr. Hegney: Are you speaking for yourself?

Mr. TONKIN: No, mine is here, and I have read it and will have more to say about it later. Members opposite know that this is a fact; and that is not peculiar to the report of the Light Lands Commission. That happens to the reports of other Royal Commissions and select committees and to reports from the various departments, many of which are never read. If we were doing our job as we ought to do it, and if we had the time, we would read all these reports. However, I agree with the Leader of the Opposition that we have not time to read all the reports tabled. What we do is to read the reports of the departments in which we are particularly interested. If we get on the track of something, we look for the report of the department concerned, and read it thoroughly, but numbers of reports we do not read, through lack of time. Yet we are told that members of Parliament would have sufficient time to serve upon a Parliamentary committee appointed for the purpose of establishing industry.

Again, it is our duty to study all Bills that come before the House. How many of us can claim to be au fait with all the Bills that are introduced? If I am asked some time afterwards about some of the Bills introduced into this Chamber, I cannot recall having seen them and cannot say whether they were passed or not. Of course I make it my business to watch those in which I am

particularly interested, but I just read the titles of the others. Having assured myself that a Bill does not touch my district particularly, I leave it to the Minister, believing that if he is prepared to introduce the measure, it must be right. That happens with most members. Had we the time, we would study all the Bills that were introduced and all the amendments placed on the notice paper. If we have not time to do that work, how can we be expected to devote time to a committee of investigation for the establishment of industries? We would not be able to do it properly. We might be able to do it in some sort of fashion, but to think that we could get any concerted effort, any continuity of policy, or any organised planning is ridiculous. I make that statement without discounting the capabilities of members had they the time to serve. I hope the amendment will not be carried. If it is, I am afraid that will be the end of the investigations. If members have been seized with the necessity for making investigations and recommendations previously, how is it that we have had no organised planning? Other parties have been in power, but no attempt has been made to get members to act as a committee of investigation.

Hon. C. G. Latham: The previous Government assisted to establish various industries without a bureau.

Mr. TONKIN: Can the hon. member name any Government that set up a parliamentary committee of investigation?

Hon. C. G. Latham: We did not require any help. We did it.

Mr. TONKIN: No concerted effort has been made by members of Parliament to carry out investigations and make recommendations for the establishment of industries. Individual members might have made investigations, but that is all. What is proposed now is that a number of members of Parliament should be constituted a committee and charged with the responsibility of making investigations and recommendations. They simply would not do it. Knowing full well that such a parliamentary committee would be a failure, I am not prepared to vote for it. I prefer the Bill, even though I am not so fatuous as to believe that a bureau will solve all our problems. I think it will help: I expect some benefit from it, and because of that I am prepared to vote for the Bill. From a par-

liamentary committee, I would expect no benefit whatever.

Mr. HEGNEY: I shall oppose the clause and I am not keen on supporting the amendment. The unkindest cut of all in the Minister's remarks was his fear that I would have some uncomfortable moments later on. Be that as it may, I do not consider that the proposed bureau is necessary. Not many years ago we had only six Ministers carrying on the administration of affairs. The Department of Employment is practically new, and in it the Minister has the requisite machinery to do what he desires under the Bill and without increased cost to the State. I cannot see that the Bill is warranted or justified. The member for North-East Fremantle bemoaned that members of Parliament were overloaded with work. I represent probably the largest metropolitan electorate in area and numbers, but if a definite task were allotted me, I feel sure that I could give a good part of my time to it. Had the hon. member been elected a Minister, he would have had to attend to the needs of his constituents as well as to his duties of office. Therefore his argument that members could not do the work because of being burdened with other duties has not much substance. Ministers represent constituencies and have to attend to the wants of their electors as well as to the affairs of State.

Mr. Raphael: They have secretaries to do their work.

Mr. HEGNEY: The Minister for Employment has a secretary and an advisory committee. The committee has done excellent work. A good deal of activity was shown by his predecessor, and the present Minister has carried on the good work of encouraging the buying of Western Australian goods. The difficulty of establishing secondary industries is to create in the community the buying sense in favour of local goods. Too many people prefer imported to locally-produced goods. The Minister emphasised that the measure would solve the problems of our secondary industries and assist in the establishment of new industries. The Bill also proposes the granting of assistance to existing industries. The Minister chided me with having, while in Queensland, been more interested in inquiring into starting-price betting than into the activities of the bureau. This Parliament has nearly run its course, and the Minister is somewhat belated in advancing the fact that this Bill contains all the requisite merits to solve the problems of

our secondary industries. The Minister himself indicated that two years would elapse before the effects of this legislation would be felt. Thus we shall have to wait a considerable time before a solution of the problems is found, even assuming that this Bill will lead to the discovery of that solution.

Mr. Raphael: He is preparing for the next election, I think.

Mr. HEGNEY: I do not believe that the Bill will solve the difficulties of secondary industries. I have worked in the engineering industry in Queensland and in New South Wales. I know that Queensland today has an unemployment problem just as we have. The unemployment problem is handled better in Western Australia than in Queensland or New South Wales. There are thousands of unemployed even in those States where large secondary industries exist.

The CHAIRMAN: The hon. member is getting a long way from the amendment.

Mr. HEGNEY: I am speaking in opposition to the proposed bureau. In every country unemployment is rife. If I thought that the Bill would lead to a solution of our difficulties, I would support it, but I consider that the money would be better spent in providing employment for workers.

Hon. C. G. LATHAM: More than once the member for North-East Fremantle stressed the point that members would not be able to do the work because I had said they had not time to read the various reports tabled in Parliament. Members would not be likely to read reports in which they had no interest. For instance, quite a long time would be required to read the report of the Royal Commission responsible for the introduction of this Bill. Therefore I hope the hon. member will not take my remark too literally. Members devote quite a lot of time to select committees and the results are very valuable. The member for North-East Fremantle said that during our term of office nothing was done to provide employment. Without the aid of a bureau of industry, two condensed milk factories were started in the years 1930-33. One pipe factory was started to manufacture pipes for the goldfields water supply. There is also an asbestos and fibre factory which manufactures small pipes that are being used extensively. Fibrolite and corrugated asbestos roofing are also being extensively used.

Mr. Raphael: You started that in 1930?

Hon. C. G. LATHAM: Between 1930 and 1933. In 1932 the Government bought the first corrugated roofing and used it on some cottages that were built out of the McNess fund. One cheese factory and a factory for making cigarette papers were also established. No bureau was required to ascertain whether their establishment was possible. It is not altogether a question of whether members of Parliament could provide assistance. I believe every member would assist. The point we have to consider is the competition of the Eastern States, and I cannot see how the establishment of a bureau of industry would overcome that. I have before me a report of the W.A. Worsted and Woollen Mills, Ltd., paragraph 2 of which reads—

The operation of a new Textile Workers' Award which increased wages and holiday pay very considerably, during the year, contributed to increased working costs which could not be passed on.

I read that because the Minister said I had made a veiled insinuation about reduction of wages. What I did, however, was to point out the difficulties with which our State has to contend in competition with goods imported from the Eastern States. Another paragraph of the report I desire to read is as follows:—

The result of the year's trading as shown by the accounts herewith, is a net loss of £5,860 19s. 5d., after paying interest and debenture interest totalling £4,653 16s. 3d., which has increased the debit balance of profit and loss account to £7,513 3s. No depreciation has been written off plant and machinery, which, however, has been maintained in a state of efficiency.

The report clearly shows we have men who know their work. The manager of that company is very competent.

The Minister for Mines: I am told that the company is exporting more of its goods to the Eastern States than we are using in Western Australia.

Hon. C. G. LATHAM: According to the company's balance sheet as at the 30th June, 1938, stocks on hand amounted to £36,844 14s. 9d. I notice that the company has had a temporary loan from the Western Australian Government of £7,500, and has an overdraft with the National Bank of £54,815 9s.

Mr. Lambert: The guarantee was given by your Government.

Hon. C. G. LATHAM: I am not disputing that. Both Governments have assisted

the company and I am not complaining about the assistance given. I am trying to show that Governments have assisted the company. There has been a campaign of "Buy W.A. manufactured worsted and material from the Albany Woollen Mills," but despite that campaign, our people do not purchase those goods. The Minister for Mines interjected that the company exported to the Eastern States more of its material than we use in Western Australia. Will a bureau remedy that? Members of Parliament can, of course, assist materially by advocating each time they go on a platform the purchase of this locally-manufactured material.

Mr. Lambert: We had such a campaign years ago.

Hon. C. G. LATHAM: That may be so. The Minister might assist if he were to purchase Western Australian tweeds. I believe members of Parliament could do more good than could the proposed bureau. I point out the difficulties with which even a bureau will be faced. I believe the cost of the bureau would be much less if the amendment moved by the member for Guildford-Midland was carried.

Mr. SAMPSON: I regret the Minister's persistence with the Bill. There is an old saying that "You cannot get lost on a straight road."

The CHAIRMAN: Order! We are dealing with one clause of the Bill.

Mr. SAMPSON: It would be better to give the lads, who are ultimately to benefit from this measure, the opportunity to learn a trade.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The question of lads learning a trade has nothing to do with the proposed bureau.

Mr. SAMPSON: The object of the Bill is to provide for youth employment.

The Minister for Employment: But we are discussing the amendment.

Mr. SAMPSON: If the Minister will take the right, wise and straight course, there will be no need to labour the measure at all. The debate has proceeded for hours on one clause. I am opposed to the clause and so is, I believe, a majority of members. Why will not the Minister see the light?

The Minister for Mines: It depends upon the colour.

Mr. SAMPSON: The Minister should realise that the Bill cannot prosper if he

hind it a definite conspiracy exists to prevent the boys of this State from learning a trade.

THE MINISTER FOR EMPLOYMENT: I emphasise the fact that the amendment will have the effect of restricting seriously the field from which the members of the proposed bureau can be recruited. As framed, the Bill will leave the Government free to choose the members of the bureau from the whole of the adult population of the State. Whilst it is reasonable to suggest that every member of Parliament has the ability to do a certain job, that is not to say other people in the community are not equally capable, if not more capable, of carrying out the particular duties that will attach to membership of the proposed bureau. Members would be unwise to restrict the choice. They would be doing wrong in saying that membership of the bureau should be drawn from only 80 members of Parliament, when the choice could be spread over 800, 8,000 or 80,000 people. A bureau composed of members from that wider field would operate more continuously and more successfully than would a bureau drawn from the narrow circle that the proposed amendment would establish. The final point I desire to make is the one I made earlier, namely, that the Government has no objection whatever to members of Parliament being eligible for appointment to the bureau. The Government feels that members of Parliament should be eligible, and provision can be made in the Bill accordingly. If it is, then from among members of Parliament who are available and willing to act, and who have time to devote to the duties of the bureau, no doubt one or more would be appointed.

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

Ayes	15
Noes	27
					—
Majority against	12
					—

AYES.

Mr. Boyle
Mrs. Cardell-Oliver
Mrs. Ferguson
Mr. Hegney
Mr. Hill
Mr. Hughes
Mr. Latham
Mr. Mana

Mr. Patrick
Mr. Sampson
Mr. Seward
Mr. J. M. Smith
Mr. Thorn
Mr. Warner
Mr. Doney

(Teller.)

NOES.

Mr. Coverley
Mr. Cross
Mr. Doust
Mr. Fox
Mr. Hawke
Miss Holman
Mr. Lambert
Mr. Leahy
Mr. Marshall
Mr. McDonald
Mr. McLarty
Mr. Millington
Mr. Needham
Mr. Pantou

Mr. Raphael
Mr. Rodoreda
Mr. Shearn
Mr. F. C. L. Smith
Mr. Styants
Mr. Tonkin
Mr. Welsa
Mr. Wilcock
Mr. Willmott
Mr. Wilson
Mr. Wise
Mr. Withers
Mr. Nulsen

(Teller.)

PAIR

AYES.
Mr. Troy

NOES.
Mr. Stubbs

Amendment thus negatived.

Mr. MARSHALL: I desire to take this opportunity of replying to the Minister, who took it upon himself to place an entirely wrong construction upon my utterances on the second reading of this Bill. It is true I made the statement—

The **CHAIRMAN:** Is the hon. member dealing with the clause under discussion?

Mr. MARSHALL: I am dealing with the bureau. If this clause is not passed, the Bill will be defeated. That is the point; Clause 5 is the Bill. On the second reading I stated that certain industries had failed either partially or wholly. The Minister quoted my words (and produced figures from the Year Book to show that the number of factories had increased. That was meant to indicate that I was in error in what I said. The Minister ought to be more accurate when he refers to the remarks of members, especially when those members are telling the truth. Scores of industries have been started in this State and have been squashed by competition from other States. The taxpayers of Western Australia have lost half-a-million of money in the endeavour to maintain those industries. I am not very sanguine about either the clause or the Bill as a whole, nor am I impressed by members' remarks in support of the measure. The Minister has yet to convince me that such a bureau has been successful elsewhere in promoting the interests of secondary industries. In defiance of Eastern States competition, Western Australia will continue to establish industries.

Mr. Raphael: Dumping you mean, not competition.

Mr. MARSHALL: Whether it is fair or unfair it is still competition. With or without this Bill industries will be established in this State, but the length of their existence will depend upon their ability to

withstand competition from the Eastern States. Should the Bill become law and the cost of the bureau become exorbitant, we shall have presented to us a schedule of every industry the establishment of which has been attempted, to prove the benefits the State has derived from the existence of the bureau. We shall be unable to distinguish industries that have been established with the aid of the bureau, from those that have gone ahead without it. Every industry that is established after the creation of the bureau will be said to have been made successful by reason of the bureau. I am doubtful, as I have always been, concerning the effect the Bill will have on industry. I fear a fair amount of money will be spent without any greater result being achieved than if the money had not been spent. Of what use is it to talk about youth employment? Look at the United States, the best organised, the most scientific and highly mechanised English-speaking country in the world! The unemployment trouble there is far greater than it is in Australia. In America about three-quarters of a million youths are unemployed, and about 30,000,000 people are on the bread-line. Bureaux exist in practically every State in America, scientific, economic and industrial bureaux, but they have brought no relief to the country. Unemployment is more acute there than in some primitive countries, because of the highly mechanised methods of production. When the machines come in, men go out. To attempt to cope with the situation by this means is futile. Whilst the bureau may cause some research work to be done, it can only apprise us of the industries that can successfully be established having regard to the local market. We know that already. From the Year Book we can see what industries are likely to prove profitable, but we do not know how soon such industries will be stamped out by Eastern States competition. In North-East Fremantle a company was started with local capital. As soon as the industry began to compete seriously against a similar industry in the Eastern States, pressure was brought to bear upon it and its production is now confined to certain small lines. The moment it begins to produce goods that affect the market for Eastern States manufactures, it will have to face the bankruptcy court. The same thing ap-

plies to many other local industries. If the bureau could solve that problem I would give it my wholehearted support, but I know it can do nothing in the matter. I am not impressed when I am told the bureau will relieve unemployment. The argument is ridiculous. Countries that produce in the biggest way have the largest number of unemployed. I do not want the Minister to misrepresent me. Many small industries are as yet uninjured by competition, but the moment they begin to affect the local market for the products of the Eastern States, pressure will be brought to bear upon them. Queensland has its bureau. Has it prevented unemployment there?

Mr. Tonkin: How do you know that but for the bureau there would not be more unemployed in Queensland?

Mr. MARSHALL: To what extent has it reduced unemployment?

Mr. Tonkin: The Royal Commissioner investigated that matter.

Mr. MARSHALL: How is it the other States have not established their own bureaux?

Mr. Tonkin: They may follow our example.

Mr. MARSHALL: I am not as optimistic as is the hon. member. How is it the other States have not seen the beneficial effects following in the train of the Queensland bureau?

Mr. Tonkin: That may be due to the political complexion of Governments.

Mr. MARSHALL: Every Government in Australia is anxious to solve the unemployment problem, no matter to what political faith it belongs. I should like to believe the bureau will be successful, but will reserve my decision on the question until we arrive at the third reading stage.

Mr. HEGNEY: I oppose the clause. The Minister said that a fairly large number of secondary industries had been established in my electorate, and that the Bill would have a favourable effect upon them. I have since made inquiries, and do not think the Bill will help them at all. What is needed most is financial assistance. On one occasion the Minister visited several factories in my electorate, and the only request made to him was for financial help. Fowler's nail factory in my electorate required financial assistance at the time, but it has now been absorbed by MacPherson's. The tannin factory at Belmont was getting along fairly well,

but needed an improved market for its products. It had its own experts, but needed openings for expansion. They were getting rid of all they possibly could. There is Cresco, supplying superphosphate. That firm requires no experts to help it in its industry. The same remarks apply to McKay's harvesters, and to Brisbane's tile factory in Belmont, which has expanded owing to the development of the building industry and has absorbed Wunderlich. Then there was a one-man rabbit-tongue factory in Belmont; that was unfortunately settled by the operation of the Transport Act. A windmill factory at Maylands supplies farmers all over the State. I fail to see how the measure can help Middle Swan industries. If the money proposed to be spent on the bureau were spent on helping factories, material benefit would ensue.

THE MINISTER FOR EMPLOYMENT: I hope no member of this Committee thinks a claim has been made that the passing of this Bill will completely solve Western Australia's unemployed problem. The cause of unemployment lies so deep in the economic system of the whole nation that a bureau of this kind cannot deal with it adequately. But it is felt that the activities of such a bureau would very likely assist established industries to operate more satisfactorily, and help to assist new industries to become established here. One fact is outstanding: each year we import £13,000,000 worth of manufactured goods from Eastern Australia. That sum certainly provides a good deal of employment for people somewhere. At least a portion of the money might reasonably be spent in purchasing goods produced by our own people in factories of our own. The bureau will be able to ascertain in a far more decisive fashion than has ever been known in the past, the real causes, in detail, of the difficulties facing factories already established and projects for the establishment of new industries here. The Queensland and New Zealand bureaux have undoubtedly justified their existence; otherwise they would have been wiped out long before now. The Queensland bureau has been operating for several years.

Mr. Marshall: To establish a bureau is much easier than to get rid of it.

THE MINISTER FOR EMPLOYMENT: Recently the director of the Queensland bureau secured employment with the Commonwealth Government. If the bureau had not justified its existence, if the Queensland

Government was not convinced of that, here would have been a splendid opportunity to wipe it out. However, the Government looked around and made inquiries throughout Australia, and then appointed Mr. Colin Clarke, who was attached to our University for a short period, to be director of the bureau, as he is today. The New Zealand bureau was established in 1936, was reconstructed in 1937 on the basis of this Bill, and has operated ever since—I may add, most successfully. The New Zealand Government would not operate the bureau were it not producing valuable results. Western Australia has greater need for such a bureau than has any other Australian State. Queensland, New South Wales, Victoria, and, to a lesser extent, South Australia have natural advantages for the carrying-on of existing secondary industries and the establishment of new ones. In Western Australia the difficulties are great, from the geographical and financial points of view as well as from other aspects. We propose to set up an organisation that will investigate those difficulties thoroughly. Strong organisation is needed for the protection, within the limits of a State Government's powers, of the secondary industries here from difficulties which beset them; to assist to carry on those industries and to establish new ones, so that we may produce a large proportion of manufactured goods, thus making Western Australia more self-reliant and creating greater opportunities for employment in this State.

Clause put and passed.

Clause 6—Membership of Bureau:

Mr. McLARTY: I move an amendment—

That in line 1 of paragraph (e) of Sub-clause 1, the word "less" be struck out, and the word "more" inserted in lieu.

The measure has been strongly opposed because of the number of members of which the bureau is to consist. Paragraph (d) empowers the Minister to co-opt any other persons. Nine persons should be ample, and by limiting the membership to that maximum we shall help towards the more economical operation of the bureau.

Amendment put and negatived.

Mr. SEWARD: I move an amendment—

That the following words be added to Sub-clause 2:—"and shall be the nominee of a responsible body connected with the particular branch of industry they represent."

I wish to ensure that those appointed to the bureau shall be prominently connected with the particular industries they represent. Should the appointment of a representative of the primary industries be in question, a person should be eligible for appointment provided he was nominated by a responsible body connected with those industries. Such a provision would tend to establish greater confidence in the bureau on the part of industries.

THE MINISTER FOR EMPLOYMENT: I cannot accept the amendment. It would be difficult to decide which organisation was entitled to nominate a representative of any particular industry. The Government desires the choice for membership of the bureau to be unrestricted and the amendment would serve to limit that scope. If nominees were to be confined to representatives of organisations, the best men might not be appointed. The Government desires, in accepting responsibility for the bureau, to have an unrestricted choice.

MR. SAMPSON: I am surprised at the Minister's objection. Surely those associated with a particular industry should be best fitted to select the representative of that industry! What does the Minister desire? I have heard of an instance in which primary producers were represented by an old secretary of a union.

THE MINISTER FOR MINES: An old union secretary takes a very prominent part in the affairs of the Primary Producers' Association. Mr. W. Diver was one of our early union secretaries.

MR. SAMPSON: Mr. Angwin is undoubtedly a man of capacity, but he represents the primary producers on the Harbour Trust. That is an amazing position, and the Minister desires to perpetuate such a system. I support the amendment.

Amendment put and negatived.

Clause put and passed.

Clause 7—agreed to.

Clause 8—Disqualifications:

HON. C. G. LATHAM: The clause is the most extraordinarily worded I have ever read. It sets out that "any person who has his affairs under liquidation or is an undischarged bankrupt or insolvent, or has been convicted of an indictable offence, or is undergoing a sentence of imprisonment for a period of not less than 12 months, or becomes an insane person" shall

be disqualified from appointment on the bureau.

MR. SAMPSON: Why opposition to an insane person being appointed to the bureau?

HON. C. G. LATHAM: I think the reference to undergoing a sentence of imprisonment for not less than 12 months should be deleted.

THE MINISTER FOR EMPLOYMENT: The clause disqualifies such a person, but if it were amended as you suggest, the person undergoing a sentence of imprisonment would not be disqualified.

HON. C. G. LATHAM: But the Government would not consider appointing a man who was undergoing a sentence of imprisonment.

THE MINISTER FOR EMPLOYMENT: No.

HON. C. G. LATHAM: I think this is a mistake in drafting, and the clause should be amended.

MR. SAMPSON: I wish to alter an earlier part of the clause. I move an amendment—

That in lines 1 and 2 the words "who has his affairs under liquidation or is an undischarged bankrupt or insolvent, or" be struck out.

I do not desire to trespass upon the suggested preserve of the member for East Perth; but surely those words are superfluous.

MR. DONEY: The Minister has a choice, in any case.

THE MINISTER FOR EMPLOYMENT: I am prepared to trust myself with that.

MR. SAMPSON: The Minister would be considering his own peace of mind if he struck the whole clause out, but it is not competent for me to move that.

THE MINISTER FOR MINES: You can vote against the clause.

MR. SAMPSON: I am dealing only with that portion of the clause that has not already been hypothecated.

MR. LAMBERT: The Minister should agree that the clause be struck out.

THE CHAIRMAN: The Committee is dealing with Mr. Sampson's amendment. It is not competent for the member for Yilgarn-Coolgardie to move that the clause be struck out. He can vote against the clause.

MR. LAMBERT: The wording of the clause is wrong; the clause speaks of a person who has his affairs in liquidation. The term "liquidation" applies to a company that has gone into liquidation, either voluntarily or compulsorily.

Mr. HUGHES: I am in agreement with the member for Yilgarn-Coolgardie. A person goes bankrupt or compounds with his creditors; a company goes into liquidation. The words "has his affairs under liquidation" in the clause are meaningless. As regards an undischarged bankrupt, a person who becomes bankrupt under discreditable circumstances would not be allowed to sit on the bureau. Such a person could be prosecuted and dealt with criminally, but to prevent any person who is a bankrupt from sitting on the bureau would not be right, because a person may become a bankrupt through no fault of his own and in circumstances not involving moral turpitude. Members know of the type of person who is highly educated and extremely capable, but yet is hopeless in the realms of finance. To prevent such a person from acting on the bureau would be unwise. I propose to deal now with the term "insolvent." If a person who is insolvent is to be eliminated we should have a clear definition of what the term means.

Hon. C. G. Latham: It means a person without money, I suppose.

Mr. HUGHES: So far as I know, a man who is insolvent is one unable to pay from his own money his debts as they become due.

Mr. Sampson: That is a commonplace.

Mr. HUGHES: When a person takes advantage of the Bankruptcy Court he becomes something more than an insolvent; he becomes a bankrupt. Even if he compounds with his creditors, it is a bankruptcy and all the provisions of the Bankruptcy Act apply, but if his creditors accept a composition or a scheme of arrangement he obtains a discharge from his bankruptcy. But the Bill would not eliminate a farmer who had taken advantage of the Farmers' Debts Adjustment Act and obtained a stay order, because he is not regarded as a bankrupt. Thus, we can have a farmer who owes thousands of pounds but who, because he is under the Farmers' Debts Adjustment Act, can sit on the bureau, while a commercial man owing only one-tenth of the amount would be eliminated. As I understand the term "insolvent" any man would be disqualified from sitting on the bureau who was unable, with his own money, to pay his debts as they became due. That would include an enormous section of the community because many people have to ask their creditors to wait. There are members in this House who

cannot always sign a cheque as soon as they receive their accounts. Unless we give some limiting definition to the term "insolvent" we shall eliminate half the community, particularly the commercial community, from the bureau. Many men in Perth are worth £20,000 or £30,000 in real estate, yet before they can spend £100 they have to ask a bank manager if they can increase their overdraft. Those men would be eliminated from the committee. If the proposed Act is to function properly, those words must be omitted. The first words referring to liquidation are meaningless, the word "insolvent" is practically meaningless and if the reference to undischarged bankrupts is retained people will be eliminated that should not be eliminated.

The MINISTER FOR EMPLOYMENT: The words referred to will not eliminate enough people to create any difficulties in the recruiting of sufficient highly qualified persons to fill the positions that will be available on the bureau. Beyond accepting an amendment which is to be moved later for the deletion of the words "for a period of not less than 12 months," I am disinclined to accept any of the amendments, either the one moved or the others proposed.

Amendment put and passed.

Mr. HUGHES: I move an amendment—

That in line 2 the words "or has been convicted of an indictable offence" be struck out. There is a great number of indictable offences and a man may be convicted of an indictable offence that in the eyes of the community does not carry with it a great deal of stigma. A man might have the misfortune to drive his motor car negligently and cause serious injury to some fellow citizen, and find himself convicted of an indictable offence. He might kill a man as a result of negligent driving, but though he would be convicted and sentenced, there would be a great deal of sympathy for him and he would be regarded as somewhat unlucky. Having committed the offence he would purge himself by serving a sentence. Why should he thereafter be subjected to an additional disability?

The Minister for Justice: He might have committed a burglary.

Mr. HUGHES: Yes, but there is a safeguard in the appointment of men to the committee. Consideration can be given to the nature of the offence. The Minister would not be obliged to appoint a man who had com-

mitted a burglary, or had been convicted of manslaughter as the result of a motor accident. As the Bill stands, he could not appoint such a person. Some people who are not in gaol have done worse than to commit a burglary.

The Minister for Mines: The burglar is convicted only because he is caught.

Mr. HUGHES: Individual company promoters have done more harm than many burglars have done, and yet have escaped prison. A man can be elected to Parliament after serving his sentence for an indictable offence. I have sat in this Chamber with a man who once served his sentence for an indictable offence, and no one had any disrespect for him. What objection could there be to such a man being elected a member of this bureau? From the business point of view, we should secure the best talent available. People can be indicted for an offence against the Electoral Act.

The MINISTER FOR EMPLOYMENT: The number of persons who would come into this group would be small. If there are to be any disqualifications, in addition to insane persons we should include those who fall into this particular group. The number of persons convicted of indictable offences would not represent more than 2 per cent. of the total population, and there would still be 98 per cent. of adults from whom to choose the eight persons required under this clause.

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

Ayes	11
Noes	31

Majority against	..	20
------------------	----	----

Mrs. Cardell-Oliver	Ayes.	Mr. Seward
Mr. Ferguson		Mr. Shearn
Mr. Hill		Mr. Thorn
Mr. Hughes		Mr. Warner
Mr. Mann		Mr. Doney
Mr. Sampson		(Teller.)

Mr. Boyle	Noes.	Mr. Pantou
Mr. Coverley		Mr. Patrick
Mr. Cross		Mr. Raphael
Mr. Doust		Mr. Rodoreda
Mr. Fox		Mr. F. C. L. Smith
Mr. Hawks		Mr. J. M. Smith
Mr. Hegney		Mr. Styants
Miss Holman		Mr. Tonkin
Mr. Lambert		Mr. Welsh
Mr. Latham		Mr. Willcock
Mr. Leahy		Mr. Willmott
Mr. Marshall		Mr. Wilson
Mr. McDonald		Mr. Wise
Mr. McLarty		Mr. Withers
Mr. Millington		Mr. Nulsen
Mr. Needham		(Teller.)

PAID.

Ayes.
Mr. StubbsNoes.
Mr. Troy

Amendment thus negatived.

Hon. C. G. LATHAM: The Minister is unlikely to appoint any person who is undergoing a sentence of imprisonment. Why, then, put this into the Bill as a suggestion that he might do so? I move an amendment—

That in lines 3 and 4 the words "is undergoing sentence of imprisonment" be struck out.

Amendment put and passed.

Mr. NEEDHAM: I move an amendment—

That in lines 4 and 5 the words "for a period of not less than twelve months or" be struck out.

No person should be appointed to the bureau who is undergoing sentence of imprisonment for any period.

Amendment put and passed.

Mr. DOUST: I move an amendment—

That in line 6 the words "being appointed or from," be struck out.

The deletion of the words would give the Minister an absolutely free choice in appointing. He would be able to appoint the persons he considered most suitable. Disqualifications would not apply unless they arose after the appointment of a member.

The MINISTER FOR EMPLOYMENT: The amendment is unwise. The clause as it stands disqualifies certain persons from being considered for appointment and from being appointed. Another disqualification is that if persons appointed do not at the time of their appointment fall within any of the classes of disqualifications specified, but subsequent to their appointment do fall into one of the classes, they shall then be disqualified from continuing in office any longer. There should be a bar to the appointment of any of the persons in question.

Amendment put and negatived.

Clause, as previously amended, agreed to.

Clauses 9 to 13—agreed to.

Clause 14—Meetings of the Bureau:

The MINISTER FOR EMPLOYMENT:

I move an amendment—

That after the word "meet" in line 1 of Subclause (1) the words "at least once in every calendar month" be inserted.

The intention is that the bureau shall meet regularly.

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

Clauses 15 to 25—agreed to.

Clause 26—Status of director and officers:

The MINISTER FOR EMPLOYMENT: I move an amendment—

That the following subclause be added:—“(5) Neither the Director nor the Secretary nor any other officer shall either directly or indirectly, except in the performance of any duty as Director, or Secretary, or other officer aforesaid, and either while he is, or after he ceases to be, the Director, Secretary, or other officer aforesaid, make a record of, or divulge or communicate to any person any information acquired by or for the Bureau or by him in the course of the performance of his duties.”

Two other subclauses appearing on the notice paper are linked up with this one. The object of the three subclauses is to ensure that secrecy shall be observed by the Director, the secretary, and other members of the bureau in connection with information which shall come into their possession.

Amendment put and passed.

The MINISTER FOR EMPLOYMENT: I move an amendment—

That the following subclause be added:—“(6) The Director and the Secretary and every other officer shall make an oath or declaration in the manner and form prescribed to maintain secrecy in conformity with the provisions of subsection (5) of this section.”

Mr. DOUST: Will the word “officer” cover members of the bureau? It is equally necessary for the members of the bureau to be bound to secrecy.

The MINISTER FOR EMPLOYMENT: In my opinion members of the bureau will be included under the term “officer,” but I will undertake to have further inquiries made with a view to setting the position out more clearly, if necessary.

Hon. C. G. LATHAM: The point raised by the member for Nelson is pertinent. If the Minister looks at the interpretation clause, he will find that an officer is a “person employed by or under the bureau.” The nine persons to be appointed comprise the bureau, who will employ the officer.

The Minister for Employment: Yes, that is so.

Amendment put and passed.

The MINISTER FOR EMPLOYMENT: I move an amendment—

That the following subclause be added:—“(7) Any contravention of subsection (5) of this section shall be an offence.

Penalty—Two hundred and fifty pounds or imprisonment for twelve months with hard labour.”

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

Clause 27—Powers and functions of board:

The MINISTER FOR EMPLOYMENT: I move an amendment—

That after the figures “27” at the beginning of the clause the brackets and figure “(1)” be inserted.

I propose later on to move for the insertion of other subclauses and the amendment will make the first portion of the clause a subclause.

Amendment put and passed.

The MINISTER FOR EMPLOYMENT: I move an amendment—

That paragraph (a) of Subclause 1 be struck out, and the following paragraph inserted in lieu:—“(a) To foster existing industries and encourage and assist in the establishment of new industries.”

The new paragraph (a) will set out more clearly what is aimed at.

Amendment put and passed.

The MINISTER FOR EMPLOYMENT: I move an amendment—

That paragraph (b) of Subclause 1 be struck out, and the following paragraph inserted in lieu:—“(b) To interpret promptly and continuously statistical and other essential information and show industrial and financial trends, and to issue forecasts regarding such trends.”

The new paragraph will deal with other functions of the bureau.

Hon. C. G. LATHAM: I do not know to what extent the Minister expects the bureau to give effect to this objective. How will the bureau “interpret promptly and continuously statistical and other essential information”? What is the meaning of that? Probably the bureau will be able to show industrial and financial trends by means of graphs, but how will the bureau be able to “issue forecasts regarding such trends”? If they will be able to do that, they will be much more clever than most people. For instance, experts closely associated with the wheat market forecast a rise in wheat prices.

with the result that growers held on to their wheat. Prices declined rapidly until the recent war scare, then they rose slightly, only to drop again. Will the members of the bureau be able to forecast what the future market will be? What is in the Minister's mind?

THE MINISTER FOR EMPLOYMENT: If the Bill becomes law, we propose to amend the Statistics Act so that the collection of statistics shall be brought more up to date than is possible now. The object will be to provide statistics as nearly as possible up to the minute with regard to happenings in industry and in other directions. At present, our statistics are more a history of what happened 12 months previously, so they are not as valuable as they might be.

Hon. C. G. Latham: Some are issued quarterly.

THE MINISTER FOR EMPLOYMENT: Yes, and others annually. The object is to have, wherever possible, a continuous collection of statistics proceeding, so that they may be made available immediately to members of the bureau, who would thus know what industrial trends are taking place in a particular industry, and what the possibilities of expansion are in that industry or for the establishment of a new industry. The information would also be available for the public as a whole, including financiers who have money available for investment in established industries or new industries.

Amendment put and passed.

MR. SAMPSON: I move an amendment—

That after the word "methods" in line 2 of paragraph (c) the following words, "including the question of increasing the quota or numbers of apprentices in any trade or industry" be inserted.

I am hopeful that the Minister will approve of the proposed addition. The supply of tradesmen for an industry is a matter of the first importance. The board could delegate one of its members to attend at the Court of Arbitration to give evidence and urge, when necessary, that a greater number of apprentices should be approved. The Minister no doubt will welcome the power which the amendment will give.

THE MINISTER FOR EMPLOYMENT: I feel sure the member for Swan has carefully read the report of the Royal Commissioner.

Mr. Sampson: Yes, some of it.

THE MINISTER FOR EMPLOYMENT: The Royal Commissioner in his report pays special attention to the question of apprenticeship. He makes definite recommendations, which are now being considered. The rough draft of a Bill dealing with those recommendations was placed in my hands today. I have not had time to study it carefully, but I point out that the whole question of apprenticeship is to be dealt with in a separate Bill. It would be unwise to deal with it in this Bill, although from the legal point of view it might be considered that the powers given to the bureau by this clause are, in a general way, wide enough to enable the members of the bureau to make an inquiry into the question, if such an inquiry were considered to be necessary. My opinion is that the question is of such magnitude as to deserve treatment in a separate Bill altogether. I therefore cannot accept the amendment moved by the member for Swan.

MR. SAMPSON: The attitude of the Minister in connection with a Bill allegedly brought down for the purpose of the encouragement of employment and the development of industry is amazing. This is the only clause in the Bill where there could be a provision concerning recommendations for increasing the number of apprentices in any trade or industry if it appears necessary that more workmen are required. The Minister says that it should not be done in a general way, but I contend that the provision should be inserted in the Bill. It must be, if I am to have any faith in the Bill at all.

MR. CROSS: You have already said you have faith in it.

MR. SAMPSON: Because of the absence of any references to apprentices—

MR. CROSS: You have an obsession about apprentices.

MR. SAMPSON: Just so. The hon. member cannot see the timber for the trees. He imagines we can have success in industry without any workmen. The Minister says there should be a special measure concerning apprentices. Why? The Ten Commandments are contained in the Bible, and the most important feature in connection with industry should be contained in the Bill. Is everything of importance to be left out of the Bill? There is not a scintilla of justification for such a viewpoint.

The Minister for Employment: The Bill does not deal with the apprenticeship question.

Mr. SAMPSON: It is a Bill to deal with the development of industry and the encouragement of employment, and the question of apprenticeship is a most important matter. Surely one member of the proposed bureau might be permitted to proceed to the Arbitration Court and advise the court of the difficulties existing in a particular industry in regard to the apprenticeship quota! If the Minister will not approve of the Bill; if he will take the bone out of the Bill; if he fails in this matter and is guided by the member for Canning who has an antipathy for trade apprentices in any circumstances—

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The member for Canning is not mentioned in the clause.

Hon. C. G. LATHAM: The Minister has said he proposes to bring down legislation to deal with apprentices.

The Minister for Employment: I did not say that.

Hon. C. G. LATHAM: In all probability it will be introduced. At any rate it should be if this legislation is going to have the desired effect. The Minister dismissed the amendment rather airily, but if he reads what the Bill proposes to do, he will see that all sorts of things might easily be covered. The Bill says that the bureau shall inquire into the conditions of employment and the causes and extent of unemployment in the State, and shall investigate and report upon unhealthy occupations and dangerous trades, and solicit, seek for and obtain statistical and any other information available relating to what is commonly known as the sweating evil in relation to industrial labour and to unfair competition in industry. Those are all matters bearing on the employment of labour. Certain trade unionists are preventing the employment of apprentices. The result is that there is no alternative but to bring people from overseas to do the work that our own boys should do. Our own boys are becoming labourers for overseas men who are able to carry on the trade, and that is wrong. In this State there is a little coterie of people engaged in one class of work, and they are foreigners. Two who recently arrived can hardly speak English, but they are engaged in that trade, while at the same time our

own people cannot be taught the trade because objections are raised. This is one way in which we can deal with the unemployment problem. We should be able to teach our boys all the trades possible.

Mr. Withers: You cannot compel employers to take apprentices.

Hon. C. G. LATHAM: We should say, "You cannot employ a certain number of people without taking a certain number of apprentices." There should be somebody to say when the apprentices can be engaged. A restriction may be necessary when there is an over-supply as we found in connection with the training of nurses.

The Minister for Employment: We do not want to particularise in this Bill on a matter that can be dealt with in a separate Bill.

Hon. C. G. LATHAM: The Minister is particularising in certain respects.

The Minister for Employment: We should not particularise on a matter that is to be dealt with in detail in another Bill.

Hon. C. G. LATHAM: I do not know what is proposed.

The Minister for Employment: Otherwise we shall be setting up two authorities to do the one job.

Hon. C. G. LATHAM: I am anxious that some independent person should be able to tell the court exactly what the position is. At present two interested parties go to the court—the employer and the employee. They argue before the tribunal but there is no question of what effect an award will have on any industry. If that were taken into consideration, we might get somewhere. I am hoping that the bureau will materially assist people engaged in industry by showing the effect that court awards have on industry.

Progress reported.

House adjourned at 11 p.m.