

low betting on racecourses to be legal and inside the law. My personal feeling, as I have said, was stated on those occasions to be that the starting-price betting evil had become submerged in an even greater evil, in an even greater menace to the community; and that is the spectacle of an illegal business being flagrantly carried on under the eyes of the police every day throughout the week, without any adequate action for suppressing it. The Commissioner of Police has appealed for legislative help to make more effective his effort to put down the evil at the present day. He has drawn attention, as regards the owner of premises in which starting-price betting is carried on, to the particular difficulty involved by the words "knowingly and wilfully"; and therefore the Bill seeks to eliminate those words and to give the Commissioner more effective powers to enforce the existing law than he has, or thinks he has, under the existing wording of the relevant Act of Parliament.

I come now to the question of a magistrate being entrusted with the responsibility of dealing with these cases. There are, of course, on our statute-book various Acts of Parliament in which the magistrate is alone to adjudicate on a certain class of case. In the Illicit Sale of Liquor Act, 1913, it is provided that charges for illicit sale of liquor shall be heard before a magistrate; and in the Police Amendment Act, 1902, dealing with illicit possession of gold it is provided that proceedings shall be taken before a magistrate. Thus there is plenty of precedent for putting different classes of proceedings under the control of resident or stipendiary magistrates.

It is considered that by taking this particular class of offence from the jurisdiction of justices of the peace and entrusting it to a resident or stipendiary magistrate we shall secure more uniform administration of the law, particularly in the case of fines, and also more effective administration of the law, because this class of case, such as betting, which is not looked upon as a flagrant offence but more like smuggling or drinking out of hours, is one in which justices on the bench are sometimes placed in a rather difficult position. It may be that they have neighbours or friends—whom they otherwise respect—who may be involved in matters of this kind; and if they are on the bench they may be placed in a position of some difficulty. It would therefore be

a relief to the justices and make for more effective administration of the law if, in line with liquor cases, we provided, as this Bill proposes, that cases for keeping a betting house under this section of the Criminal Code should be within the province of the magistrate himself.

That, I think, sufficiently describes the Bill. As I say, the measure accepts the existing law, which Parliament has allowed to remain on the statute-book, and it merely seeks to make the administration of that law more effective. It responds to the report of the Commissioner of Police when he asks for more effective legislation to enable him to administer the law, and I think it will render a service to the community in enabling those who are entrusted with the enforcement of the law to carry out their duties in the way the community expects them to do. I therefore move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

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

House adjourned at 8.31 p.m.

Legislative Council,

Thursday, 13th November, 1911.

	PAGE
Question: Cash order companies	1868
Bills: Money Lenders Act Amendment, Assembly's	
Message	1869
Industrial Arbitration Act Amendment, recon.	1869
Financial Emergency Act Amendment, 2r. Com.	
report	1869
Mortgagees' Rights Restriction Act Continuance,	
2r. Com. report	1870
Potato Growers Licensing, 2r., Com.	1870

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

QUESTION—CASH ORDER COMPANIES.

Hon. Sir HAL COLEBATCH asked the Chief Secretary: 1, Are the cash order companies which are operating in Perth and

Fremantle, registered under the Money Lenders Act? 2, If not, why not?

The CHIEF SECRETARY replied: 1, No. 2, There is no information in the hands of the department to indicate whether or not these companies come within the provisions of the Money Lenders Act.

BILL—MONEY LENDERS ACT AMENDMENT.

Assembly's Message.

Message from the Assembly received and read notifying that it had agreed to the Council's amendments.

BILL—INDUSTRIAL ARBITRATION ACT AMENDMENT.

Recommittal.

On motion by the Honorary Minister, Bill recommitted for the further consideration of Clause 13.

In Committee.

Hon. J. Cornell in the Chair; the Honorary Minister in charge of the Bill.

Clause 13—New sections:

The HONORARY MINISTER: I will explain what happened last night. When the original Bill was before another place, a penalty provision was included in proposed new Section 174B. The section was amended and the penalty placed in proposed new Section 174A which was struck out last night. Subsection 3 of proposed new Section 174B commences with the words "Notwithstanding the penalty provided." With the elimination of proposed new Section 174A, no penalty remains. I move an amendment—

That at the end of Subsection 2 of proposed new Section 174B the following words be inserted:—"Penalty for breach of either of the above subsections: Fifty pounds."

Hon. C. F. Baxter: That is, not exceeding £50.

Hon. A. Thomson: The words deleted were "not exceeding £50."

The CHAIRMAN: "Fifty pounds" means not more than £50. The Honorary Minister has made an explanation which is not necessary. He has referred to the proposed new Section 174A, which was deleted. Another place omitted to include the penalty, and the

defect was discovered here. The Honorary Minister has moved this amendment so as to put the Bill in order. The amendment is not due to any slipshod manner of doing things on our part.

Hon. W. J. MANN: I want to be clear that "fifty pounds" means "not exceeding £50"; and is not a mandatory fine of £50. I move—

That the amendment be amended by inserting after the word "subsection" the words "shall not exceed."

Amendment on amendment put and passed.

Hon. C. F. BAXTER: There was a penalty in proposed new Section 174A but it had no connection with proposed new Section 174B. They are two separate matters. The penalty provided in proposed new Section 174A relates to the hindering of officers in the carrying out of their duties. The amendment, which is necessary, refers to premiums charged for securing employment. When the Honorary Minister stated that this amendment is to correct what was done yesterday, he was wrong.

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

Bill again reported with a further amendment.

BILL—FINANCIAL EMERGENCY ACT AMENDMENT.

Second Reading.

THE CHIEF SECRETARY (Hon. W. H. Kitson—West) [4.51] in moving the second reading said: The Bill proposes to continue the operation of the Financial Emergency Act for a period of 12 months ending on the 31st December, 1942. The Act was originally passed in 1931, was re-enacted in 1934, and provided for a general reduction of 22½ per cent. in salaries, retiring allowances, pensions and interest. Most of the Act, however, was repealed in 1935, and the only part now remaining in operation is that dealing with mortgagors' interest. That legislation has been renewed from year to year, and if not re-enacted will expire on the 31st December next.

The Act now provides that there shall be a reduction of 22½ per cent., or a reduction to 5 per cent., whichever is the greater, of interest which may be payable on all mortgages executed before the 31st

December, 1931. A mortgagee has the right to appear before a commissioner, appointed under the Act, to make application that the original rate of interest provided under the mortgage shall apply. Authority is granted to the commissioner to declare what may be a reasonable rate, consideration having been given to the particular circumstances of the case and also the existing financial and economic conditions. I think the House will agree that we really have no option but to continue the statute for another year, and I have no doubt whatever that if the war continues for a longer period we shall have to bring down further continuance measures. I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

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

BILL—MORTGAGEES' RIGHTS RESTRICTION ACT CONTINUANCE.

Second Reading.

THE CHIEF SECRETARY (Hon. W. H. Kitson—West) [4.56] in moving the second reading said: The Bill proposes to continue for a further period of 12 months, to the 31st December, 1942, an Act which has been in operation since 1931. The statute applies to mortgages and agreements for sale which were in existence at the date the statute came into operation. Under the Act a mortgagee cannot enforce his security without first obtaining leave of a judge of the Supreme Court. In the case of agreements for the sale of land, the onus is placed upon the purchaser to approach the court; otherwise the vendor can exercise his rights after the expiration of one month from the service of the notice on the purchaser of his intention to do so.

Section 8 of the Act sets out the principles which the court should take into consideration when dealing with any application under the Act. The court has to decide whether the mortgagee would be likely to be severely prejudiced by being refused leave to take action, and whether the mortgagor could redeem his mortgage, or borrow at a reasonable rate of interest the

amount required to redeem the mortgage. So far as the mortgagor is concerned, the court would consider whether the granting of leave would inflict great hardship on him, whether his default was caused by general economic conditions, and also whether refusal of leave would enable him to meet his liabilities within a reasonable time.

The Act has been continued from year to year since 1931, and now, owing to the effects of war, its continuance is, if anything, more necessary than at any time since 1931. So long as the same conditions obtain, I fear there will be no real grounds for discontinuing the parent Act. I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

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

BILL—POTATO GROWERS LICENSING.

Second Reading.

Debate resumed from the previous day.

HON. A. THOMSON (South-East) [5.1]: I must confess to a feeling of surprise regarding the criticism offered on this Bill. True, it does not perhaps include all the provisions that some members would like it to contain, but the Government has seen fit to introduce a measure having as its object the licensing of potato growers and the payment of an annual license fee.

Hon. J. J. Holmes: Is that all the Bill does?

Hon. A. THOMSON: To a certain extent. It has for its object the improvement of the industry. That is the reason the Bill is introduced.

Hon. Sir Hal Colebatch: How? Simply by growers paying a fee?

Hon. A. THOMSON: I could give instances where the same procedure is in operation now. A Bill was passed in this House enabling a levy to be made upon wool. I think that something like 6d. per bale is deducted for publicity and other purposes. That was an attempt to help the wool industry. Again, Mr. Cornell dealt very extensively with the activities of the Onion Board which also has in view an improve-

ment of the conditions of those engaged in that industry. This measure, while it is not all that we would desire, nevertheless is an honest attempt by the Government to help those engaged in the potato growing industry. Potato growers will be licensed and the fees will provide a certain amount of money for publicity and other expenses. Delegates travel to conferences held frequently in the Eastern States in connection with this particular industry and the licensing of growers will mean that they will pay at least a little towards the expenses of such delegates who at present attend these meetings entirely, or partly, at their own expense.

Some people argue that the measure represents a desire to fix the price of potatoes. There is nothing in the Bill to indicate that such is the intention. To a great extent one can sympathise with Sir Hal Colebatch in his desire to see established a co-operative effort within the industry, but the strange fact is that quite a large number of people who could benefit very materially by joining a truly co-operative organisation, refuse to do so. They are not loyal to their fellow growers.

There has been an endeavour by those concerned in the industry not to fleece the public, but to give growers a reasonable return for the money they expend in producing their crops. Having regard to the market price in the Eastern States and the quantity of potatoes available in Western Australia, growers have agreed that they would sell at a certain price, one that provided only a reasonable return. We find, however, that some growers, for their personal benefit have, to use Australian phraseology, "hopped in," taken advantage of the price fixed and ruined the market for those honestly endeavouring to carry out what might be termed a gentlemen's agreement.

Hon. Sir Hal Colebatch: Will the Bill prevent that?

Hon. A. THOMSON: No, but if all the growers were licensed we should know who was engaged in the industry and perhaps ultimately out of the license fees imposed—

Hon. J. J. Holmes: Is there a charge for a license?

Hon. A. THOMSON: For an area exceeding $1\frac{1}{2}$ acres, but not exceeding five acres, the fee is 10s. Over five acres, but not exceeding 10 acres it is £1. Exceeding

10 acres, but not 20 acres, £2, and exceeding 20 acres but not 30 acres, £3. When apple growers were able to export fruit and place it on the world's markets they were in a position, by virtue of having a strong organisation, to levy on each case of fruit handled in Western Australia, the sum of one halfpenny. That has been a great benefit to the industry. Money has been raised for publicity purposes and for meeting the expenses of delegates to conferences in the Eastern States. I am just as keen a believer in co-operation as is Sir Hal Colebatch, but I consider that this measure is a step in the right direction.

I trust the second reading will be agreed to and when the Bill is in Committee I hope to be able to persuade the Committee to agree to substitute "one-quarter acre" for "one-half acre" in Clause 3. My reason for suggesting the amendment is that there are men who are working on small holdings, perhaps with the assistance of their families, and they do not desire to put the whole of their eggs in one basket. They grow a number of different crops such as cabbages and turnips, etc., and provision should be made that if they engage in the production of potatoes and have a quarter acre under crop, they should be licensed. The license fee is so nominal that it is not likely to hurt anyone. I hope also that Mr. Piessé's amendment will be accepted. It should remove some of Mr. Cornell's objections to the Bill.

The PRESIDENT: Order! The discussion on proposed amendments might be left to the Committee stage.

Hon. A. THOMSON: I have no desire to delay the House. I feel confident that the Bill will be passed. It is what might be termed the first step towards enabling the potato industry of Western Australia to be organised, and I am sure that if the measure is passed it will be helpful and not detrimental to the producers. The consumers will not be affected because for the duration of the war we have a Price Fixing Commissioner who will ensure that no excessive prices are charged. I support the second reading.

THE HONORARY MINISTER (Hon. E. H. Gray—West—in reply) [5.12]: I am grateful that Country Party members in this House and the Government are working together on this occasion. The objections to

the Bill may be attributed to misapprehension. The measure does not propose the formation of a board to control the industry and fix prices. I would like to impress on members the fact that the Bill is the result of consultation between the Agricultural Council, the Commonwealth Council of Scientific and Industrial Research and the Ministers in each State. The measure brings this State into line with other States.

Hon. J. J. Holmes: The trouble is that there is nothing in the Bill!

The HONORARY MINISTER: It is a beginning and the measure has been requested not only by the people I have mentioned, but also by the growers themselves.

Hon. G. W. Miles: What about the carrot growers and the turnip growers?

Hon. H. V. Piessé: Carrots are good things for donkeys!

The HONORARY MINISTER: Measures applying to them could be introduced later on, if necessary. I hope the Bill will be accepted.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Hon. J. Cornell in the Chair; the Honorary Minister in charge of the Bill.

Clauses 1, 2—agreed to.

Clause 3—Potato growers to obtain license:

Hon. A. THOMSON: I move an amendment—

That in line 3 of Subclause 1 the word "one-half" be struck out and the word "one-quarter" inserted in lieu.

A large number of small producers grow potatoes and other vegetables which are sent to the market, and as they may not grow half-an-acre of potatoes, the area should be reduced to bring them within the measure.

Hon. C. B. WILLIAMS: I hope the Committee will waste no time on the amendment. To impose such a limitation would be ridiculous.

Hon. H. TUCKEY: I oppose the amendment. Has Mr. Thomson considered that institutions, such as the Fairbridge Farm School, grow potatoes, and would probably have to obtain a license?

Hon. H. V. PIESSE: Provision for the smaller area would certainly be preferable.

Many people in my province have suggested that anyone who sells potatoes for profit should be required to obtain a license. When people are competing in the market, a big difference might be made by the quantities offered by small growers. Some years ago South Australia permitted table grapes to be sold by growers in the metropolitan area, and later it was found that more table grapes were being produced on small areas within the metropolis than in the rest of the State. If we exempt small areas, the aggregate production from them might be considerable. I hope members will support the amendment. If a person has one fruit tree, he has to register his place as an orchard.

The HONORARY MINISTER: The reason why a garden having one fruit tree has to be registered is that it must be inspected for fruit fly. The Government is opposed to the amendment because the desire is to get the industry established. Experience might show that it was necessary to include smaller growers, but an area of half-an-acre is a fair thing for a start.

Hon. A. THOMSON: Mr. Williams is inconsistent in his attitude. Nobody may work on a gold mine unless he has a union ticket. Why should the hon. member object to the amendment? All the organisations in my province have requested the smaller area, which is only reasonable. The average production in this State—the highest in the Commonwealth—is about six tons per acre, so it would be possible for 100 men on quarter-acre blocks to market an additional 200 tons of potatoes. Anyone growing potatoes in competition with registered growers should contribute his quota.

Hon. G. Fraser: What would one-quarter of an acre produce?

Hon. A. THOMSON: From 1½ to two tons, dependent upon the quality and suitability of the soil.

Hon. C. B. WILLIAMS: I object to Mr. Thomson's reference to the goldfields. This Chamber has repeatedly thrown out legislation proposing preference to unionists and the court grants preference only under certain conditions. Whenever we ask for preference for certain people, Mr. Thomson opposes it. Anyone with intelligence knows there is no preference to unionists, and anyone who likes may enter the goldmining industry and remain there, even if he has not a union ticket.

Hon. J. J. HOLMES: I understand that the Bill follows an agreement between the Government and representatives of the growers and is the limit to which the Government is prepared to go. Now a section of the community, which unfortunately is never satisfied, wants to go a bit further. Members who support that section should be careful not to wreck the Bill. Notice has been given of another amendment. I do not know whether the sponsor thinks the measure will be approved without Royal assent, and to get that will take some time. Why should not a man grow potatoes if he wants to? There are two crimes that may be committed in this country; one is to succeed and the other is to fail. If a man succeeds, he is a scoundrel; if he fails, he is a fool. I oppose the amendment.

Amendment put and negatived.

Hon. W. J. MANN: I move an amendment—

That the following proviso be added to Sub-clause 1:—"Provided that a license shall not be issued to a person engaged in growing or employed in growing potatoes unless he is a British subject."

There is an element in the industry that ought to be exposed, and there are people that need protection. From a great majority of the farms eligible sons have enlisted in one or other of the services, and the growing crop, in some instances, was put in by them while they were on leave. In other cases the crop was put in by farmers and their younger children. The young men who have enlisted feel that, while they are giving up a comfortable life with all its amenities, hundreds of unnaturalised persons, many of whom cannot speak English, are gradually worming their way into the industry. Are we to stand idly by and see the heritage of those young men taken from them? Had members been with me yesterday, they would have seen able-bodied men, most of them of enemy origin, digging potatoes while our own people are struggling to keep their places going.

As to the constitutional aspect, we should not worry about that but leave it to someone else to prove its unconstitutionality. Let us do what we should if it is at all possible. For the love of God let us show these young fellows who are fighting for us that we are not content to sit idly by and allow what they

rightly consider should be their heritage—I am not putting over any sob stuff but am speaking the sober truth—to be usurped by aliens who have been admitted to the State and who are now taking away the livelihood that should be that of the soldiers when they return.

I have nothing against the naturalised foreigner. Yesterday's "West Australian" attributed a statement to me in this respect that I have never made. Sir Hal Colebatch is reported to have said that I would not allow any person to be employed in the potato industry unless he was a Briton. I did not use the word "Briton" at all. I quite understand that that was not what Sir Hal meant, but the statement attributed to me may have repercussions. There are many good citizens in the South-West who are naturalised British subjects and I have no complaint to voice against them, but I have a very definite complaint against the State allowing unnaturalised persons to take away the livelihood of those we should protect.

Hon. Sir HAL COLEBATCH: I oppose the amendment, not from the standpoint of its unconstitutional aspect, but because it asks us to agree to something that is absolutely and entirely wrong. When people are admitted to Australia, they are supposed to enjoy freedom to live and work. It is all very well for Mr. Mann to talk about foreigners being unnaturalised, but the hon. member knows that those people must live here for a considerable period before they are able to apply for naturalisation, and during that period they must live. Let the hon. member consider our small population and the fact that our birth rate is declining to such an extent that it will not maintain our population. For that reason alone we must encourage foreigners to come here.

Hon. W. J. Mann: Encourage people here to take away our boys' heritage! Is that what you want?

Hon. Sir HAL COLEBATCH: That is practically a suggestion that there is no room in Western Australia for more than 460,000 people, and that is absurd. There is room for a million people here.

Hon. W. J. Mann: Of course, under normal conditions, but not under the conditions to which I object.

Hon. Sir HAL COLEBATCH: The more people we admit the better it will be because

they will make more work for the rest of the community and thereby help to build up the State. In the course of his second reading speech Mr. Mann made references to the tobacco industry. Let me tell him that, were it not for the work of foreigners, there would be no tobacco industry in the State today. It was foreigners that commenced the industry here.

Hon. W. J. Mann: Most of those people are naturalised.

Hon. Sir HAL COLEBATCH: A great many of them are unnaturalised and have not yet learnt to talk English. The amendment is entirely opposed to British principles. People should be encouraged to come here. If we encourage them, are we to then tell them that they must not grow potatoes?

Hon. W. J. Mann: Who encouraged them?

[Hon. G. Fraser took the Chair.]

Hon. Sir HAL COLEBATCH: If the hon. member desires to adopt that attitude, is he going to search the shops in Perth and say that the foreigners are not to be allowed to work there unless they are naturalised, even though many of them may not have been here long enough to enable them to obtain naturalisation papers? The principle is utterly wrong. If the Bill is passed with Mr. Mann's proposal embodied in it, I am positive the Lieut.-Governor would refuse to assent to it. The Bill would be sent Home for consideration, and I should think it fairly certain that the Home authorities would refuse to assent to the Bill. Many of those foreigners are nationals of countries that are fighting for us.

Hon. W. J. Mann: And many of them are nationals of countries fighting against us.

Hon. Sir HAL COLEBATCH: If these foreigners are objectionable, there is another way of dealing with them. It would be practically impossible to carry on our mining industry were it not for foreigners. I do not know how the people would fare with regard to vegetables were it not for those grown by foreigners. Yet most of those people started off as unnaturalised aliens. In due course they became naturalised and, generally speaking, they are just as good Australians in the course of a generation or so as many of us can claim to be.

Hon. C. B. WILLIAMS: I oppose the amendment. Only those who have been as-

sociated with the mining industry know how this problem affects the national policy. As I said during my second-reading speech, in two or three generations the Italians and Jugoslavs become good Australians, with the result that today we have a man named Matulich calling for recruits to fight for the Empire. That is not an Australian name; it is that of a Slav.

Hon. W. J. Mann: Of a Yugoslav.

Hon. J. A. Dimmitt: But he was born in Australia.

Hon. C. B. WILLIAMS: I realise that he was born in Australia, but I mention that matter to indicate that we must be careful. Are all Australians patriotic? Do they breed like these foreigners breed? Certainly not. We are relegating that function to Southern Europeans and giving them the right to people this country. The average Yugoslav breeds 50 per cent. more than the Australian or the Britisher.

Hon. W. J. Mann: To what do you ascribe that?

Hon. C. B. WILLIAMS: To the fact that he is living in a better country than formerly and because this Parliament has passed good legislation such as the Industrial Arbitration Act to enable him to work under good conditions. That is why such people are perfectly satisfied. Why is there trouble in the mining industry today? It is because there are not Australians prepared to cut the wood necessary for the mines and there never have been—at the price offered.

Hon. W. J. Mann: They would not do it.

Hon. C. B. WILLIAMS: What will happen if the work is not done? If the Australians and the Britishers are not prepared to work, then they will develop into wood and water joeys for the Italians and Jugoslavs. I do not say they should be required to work the hours that the foreigners do, but it is useless to blind our eyes to facts. When the present war is over and 250,000 of our finest young men have been deprived of the opportunity to breed, and that task rests more and more with the foreign element, the result will be that in the course of another 25 years or so Australia will be more polyglot than America ever was.

The Australian and the Britisher are too selfish to breed. Those willing to breed up our population are the aliens we have allowed to come here from oversea countries, and now Mr. Mann says that we should not

allow them to grow potatoes! If we adopt that attitude, what will happen? We will encourage nefarious practices under the lap. There will be dummying going on all over the place. Look what happened in the Spearwood district, where produce had to be buried simply because someone else got in under the lap and sold at a profit. I agree with the objective Mr. Mann has in view, but there is the aspect to which I have drawn attention. Many of these foreigners will inter-marry with Australians and in a few generations they will be as good Australians as any others in the country.

Hon. J. CORNELL: I support the amendment, which seeks to achieve something that an organisation I have been associated with for many years has been striving for ever since the declaration of war. I support the amendment for exactly the same reason that I was against the extension of the law dealing with refugee doctors. I know the difficulties confronting people in the South-West, particularly the diggers from the last war. They are concerned because while their sons and other young men are away with the armed forces, the foreign element is digging in and securing the best of the productive land in the South-West. For the past 18 months the R.S.L. has been endeavouring, with Senator Collett, to secure an amendment to our land laws, making it impossible for foreigners to hold land while our men are oversea. It is all very well for Sir Hal Colebatch and Mr. Williams to say this and to say that. Under the existing National Security Regulations no alien, naturalised or un-naturalised, can secure the transfer of land, unless he is approved by the Commonwealth Attorney General.

Hon. Sir Hal Colebatch: If that is so, what are you worrying about?

Hon. J. CORNELL: That has not proved satisfactory. A method of evading that provision has been found by way of dummying and sub-leasing.

Hon. H. Tuckey: A lot of that is going on.

Hon. J. CORNELL: Slowly but surely, these foreigners are getting a firm grip on what I consider should be preserved for our men when they return from the war. It is all very well to talk about the foreigners being anxious to serve in this war, and so on. I know the position in

the Swan Valley when that area was just two miles beyond the call-up boundary. I know how many men volunteered there. The number was practically nil. I do not think an unnaturalised alien should be permitted to engage in this industry.

Hon. Sir Hal Colebatch: What should he do?

Hon. J. CORNELL: How could he grow potatoes unless he had the land to plant them, and where is he to get the land?

Hon. Sir Hal Colebatch: What is the use of this clause if he cannot get land?

Hon. J. CORNELL: He could be employed in the industry. That is what I understand Mr. Mann wants. I counsel the Committee to protect our men oversea.

Hon. J. J. HOLMES: I gathered from Mr. Cornell's second reading speech that he was entirely opposed to the Bill.

Hon. J. Cornell: I was; I voted against the second reading.

Hon. J. J. HOLMES: I think the hon. member is going the right way to wreck it. If this amendment is agreed to, the Bill will have to be reserved for Royal assent. Sir Hal Colebatch will remember that when the Licensing Act was amended years ago, a provision was inserted that Chinese working on licensed premises before the passing of the Act would be allowed to continue in their employment; but that after the passing of the Act, Chinese were not to be permitted to be employed on licensed premises. Members were told, as I am telling the Committee today, that the Royal assent would be required to that enactment. The then Government was between the devil and the deep blue sea. What happened is that the measure was sent to His Excellency the Governor, who struck out the offending clause. Even if the clause is agreed to here, it will be struck out. One would think that Mr. Mann was the only person in the State who had the welfare of Australia at heart.

Hon. W. J. Mann: I did not say that; nor did I infer it.

Hon. J. J. HOLMES: I have no sympathy for foreigners, but, as I pointed out the other evening, our fishing industry is in the hands of foreigners. If we were to license people to deal in fish and refuse a license to those foreigners, the public would be without a fish supply. If Mr. Mann and Mr. Cornell desire to wreck the Bill, they are going the right way to do so.

Hon. H. V. PIESSE: Mr. Mann has voiced the opinion of every potato growers' association in the State. Whether legal effect can be given to those opinions is another matter. After listening to Mr. Holmes and Sir Hal Colebatch, the point seems to me to be doubtful. Nevertheless, the three members for the South-West Province represent two-thirds of the potato growers of the State. I have had letters from potato growers' associations at Donnybrook, Torbay Junction, Albany, which represents Elleker, Denmark, and Young's Siding, as well as at Marybrook and from the combined associations of Busselton, Dardanup and Manjimup. These associations have written to me asking me to assist my colleagues representing the South-West Province to get this important provision included in the Bill.

Hon. J. J. Holmes: I understand the Minister said it could not be done. Why waste time on it?

Hon. H. V. PIESSE: We are not wasting time in putting before the Committee the opinions of men who have elected us to represent them. Mr. Holmes himself asked for advice as to how to deal with foreigners in the fishing industry. We are asking the Committee to assist us in this matter. I make no apology for doing so, even to the hon. member who has given us such good advice about the fishing industry. I commend Mr. Mann for having brought this matter forward. If, for constitutional reasons, the provision cannot be inserted in the Bill, that is another matter. As Mr. Mann has pointed out, the labour question is serious. We have foreigners in an internment camp who could grow hundreds, perhaps thousands, of tons of potatoes, sufficient to feed the people of the State. I am aware the Government is doing its best to curtail the production at that camp, and I commend the Government for its action. We are here to put before the Committee the requests of people vitally interested in the measure.

The HONORARY MINISTER: The amendment is definitely not acceptable to the Government. I have not consulted legal authorities upon the point, but I imagine there would be no possible chance of obtaining the Royal assent to the Bill if this provision is included in it. I shall deal with the matter from the moral aspect. I agree with what Sir Hal Colebatch said,

that once a man is admitted to our country he has the right to work, provided he obeys our laws. He has also the right to be protected. The only hope we have of absorbing these foreigners and their children is by intermarriage, and so they must be spread throughout the State. An action such as this would drive them together, and so we would have a foreign community with a grievance. As regards finding work for our returned soldiers, I hope the brains of this Committee will do something better for them than put them to growing and digging potatoes.

Hon. W. J. Mann: You know a lot about it.

The HONORARY MINISTER: I do. I think the amendment is wrong. Even foreigners who have been naturalised for five years would be prevented from growing potatoes.

Hon. J. Cornell. Some foreigners have been here for 40 years and are not naturalised.

The HONORARY MINISTER: Would tomatoes and other vegetables be grown in the metropolitan area if it were not for these hardworking foreigners? As Mr. Williams said, provided they obey our laws, they and their children should be given every encouragement. What encouragement will the children get if their fathers and mothers are crucified? I hope the Committee will vote against the amendment.

Hon. G. W. MILES: I, too, hope the Committee will not agree to the amendment. We should bear in mind what the President of the United States and Mr. Churchill said in the Atlantic: They were out to win this war for the benefit of all peoples.

Hon. H. V. Piesse: With potatoes?

Hon. G. W. MILES: Yes, with potatoes. As the Minister has said, these foreigners have been admitted to the country and we should not deprive them of the chance of earning a livelihood.

Hon. L. B. BOLTON: Before I support the amendment, I have to ask myself a question. We have admitted these foreigners to the country. Surely we should not take away from them the right to live. I do not hold a brief for them; but, particularly under present conditions, it is but right that we should allow them to engage in this industry under the same conditions as other growers. As was pointed out by Mr. Williams, where would the State be today were it not for foreigners engaged in the fire-

wood industry on the goldfields? Consider the settlements in and around the metropolitan area! Could we get young Britishers to develop the land in the way it has been developed by foreigners? I say definitely, no. I am totally opposed to the amendment.

Hon. A. THOMSON: I am rather surprised at the attitude adopted by some members. We are not denying foreigners the right to work. We say that if they are naturalised they may be licensed. I shall make one or two comparisons. Suppose an unnaturalised alien were to apply to the Licensing Court for a license for a hotel, would he have a chance of obtaining one? No objection would be raised in that case. Recently Parliament passed a Bill providing for the registration of builders. The object of that measure was to cope with foreigners who were undercutting prices.

Hon. J. Cornell: A Sunday labour Bill was also introduced.

Hon. A. THOMSON: The Industrial Arbitration Act and the Factories and Shops Act also contain strict provisions relating to foreigners.

Hon. J. J. Holmes: But those measures do not prevent a foreigner from working.

Hon. A. THOMSON: These foreigners can also work. They can work for licensed growers. On the one hand we say we will not allow a foreigner to become a member of the Public Service or of the Education Department. I have no objection to these people; they are entitled to work, but the Federal Government by its National Security Act has laid down that no foreigner is entitled to obtain land while the present war continues.

Hon. J. J. Holmes: You are dealing with people who already own this land.

Hon. A. THOMSON: No, I am not! We have a duty to perform to the sons of men who are potato growers to see that their heritage is protected for them, if they are spared to return. The Minister said he hoped we would be able to give our soldiers something better than potato digging when they return. It is a pious hope. Good money is to be made from potato growing and digging. I have no desire to prevent these men from working. If they are to receive a license under our laws they should be in the same position as a Britisher. If our people went to their countries, would they be granted licenses? I agree with Mr. Williams that their children will be good citizens of this State, and I welcome them.

We know how slowly but surely the Italian infiltration has obtained control of the sugar cane industry in Queensland.

Hon. C. B. Williams: They are doing all the woodchopping in this State.

Hon. A. THOMSON: This amendment does not deny them the right to chop wood work in the mines, or grow potatoes for men with licenses.

Hon. C. B. Williams: Or their sons, who fight for this country.

Hon. J. J. Holmes: Where are the white potato growers?

Hon. A. THOMSON: There are plenty of them.

Hon. H. V. PIESSE: The Minister asked Why settle returned soldiers on the land as potato growers? Potato-growing land is today the forerunner of the greatest grazing land in this State. I visited Donnybrook and stayed overnight with a man who had a foreign name. In one year he took £5,000 off his property.

Hon. V. Hamersley: That is more than a pastoralist can.

Hon. H. V. PIESSE: He also has one of the biggest cattle herds and is producing for the milk factory.

Hon. J. J. Holmes: Did you accept a foreigner's hospitality?

Hon. H. V. PIESSE: I slept the night in his house, and was delighted to do so. I have no objection to the employment of a man with a foreign name. I have such a man employed in one of my companies as an engineer, and he is a very good man. If we can settle returned soldiers on our land between Spearwood and Norralup, with an assured rainfall, it will be a good move.

Hon. C. B. WILLIAMS: If potato-growing is all the new order will bring forward the Returned Soldiers' League of Australia will not be able to dun and bluff the present-day returned soldiers as it did in 1918. We had a big strike in the mining industry in that year, about which Mr. Cornell knows. The league had the audacity to ruin many men's lives. Those men earned the worst name in the working-class vernacular—"scab." They were termed special constables and today that name has just as bad a meaning in Kalgoorlie as it had then. The returned soldier will get a heritage all right. At that time the heritage they wanted for the returned soldier was to bog 3,500 feet underground. Nothing will change the men-

tality of the present-day Yugoslav or Italian. The fact that he has lived in this country for a fairly long period has not changed his outlook. When the Onion Board was formed in this State, it buried thousands of tons of onions grown by the decent fellows, while the other fellows, naturalised and unnaturalised, sold them outside.

Hon. W. J. MANN: We are having a show-down. Members would never dare to make the same speeches at a recruiting rally.

Hon. Sir Hal Colebatch: To whom are you referring?

Hon. W. J. MANN: To Sir Hal Colebatch.

Hon. Sir Hal Colebatch: Do you say I make speeches here which I would not dare to make anywhere else?

Hon. W. J. MANN: Yes.

Hon. Sir Hal Colebatch: That is absolutely false! I have never yet made a statement in this House that I was not prepared to make outside. I suggest that Mr. Mann ceases being personal, or I might be tempted to remind him of something he said.

Hon. C. B. Williams: Our soldiers are dealing with the Italians now; what are we doing to help them?

Hon. W. J. MANN: Many years ago Mr. Holmes made a similar attempt to this, but at that time conditions were altogether different. We were then living in normal times, and had no National Security Act.

Progress reported.

House adjourned at 6.15 p.m.

Legislative Assembly.

Thursday, 13th November, 1911.

	PAGE
Questions: Kalgoorlie Hospital, firewood supplies	1878
Industries Assistance Act, as to regulations	1878
Bills: Main Roads Act (Funds Appropriation) (No. 2), 2R., Com. report	1878
Child Welfare Act Amendment, 2R.	1889
Broome Tramway Extension, 2R.	1802
State Government Insurance Office Act Amendment, 2R.	1893
Factories and Shops Act Amendment, 2R.	1900

QUESTION—KALGOORLIE HOSPITAL.

Firewood Supplies.

Mr. SEWARD asked the Premier: 1, What is the name of the contractor who supplies wood to the Kalgoorlie Hospital? 2, How much wood is he called upon under his contract to deliver weekly? 3, What distance has the wood to be carted? 4, Is it possible to use the railways at all in transporting the wood? 5, If so—(a) Are the railways so used? (b) What distances is the wood carted by rail? (c) Does the contractor receive concession rail freights? 6, On that part of the distance for which road transport is necessary is producer gas or petrol the propellent force? 7, What is the road vehicles' fuel cost per ton of wood delivered? 8, Does the contractor hold all other contracts for the supply of wood to Government activities? 9, If so, what are they?

The PREMIER replied: 1, T. Kosovich. 2, Approximately 42 tons per week. 3, Green wood obtained 16 miles south of Boulder. Dry wood obtained 30 miles east of Boulder. 4, No. 5, Answered by No. 4. 6, Neither. Diesel motor truck is used. 7, No information available. 8, No. 9, Answered by No. 8.

QUESTION—INDUSTRIES ASSISTANCE ACT.

As to Regulations.

Hon. C. G. LATHAM (without notice) asked the Premier: 1, Can the Premier inform the House whether it is proposed to promulgate regulations under the amendment to the Industries Assistance Act of last year? 2, If so, when are they likely to be gazetted?

The PREMIER replied: 1, Yes. 2, The regulations are awaiting the approval of Executive Council at its next meeting and will be gazetted at the first opportunity thereafter.

BILL—MAIN ROADS ACT (FUNDS APPROPRIATION) (No. 2).

Second Reading.

THE MINISTER FOR WORKS (Hon. H. Millington—Mt. Hawthorn) [4.36] in moving the second reading said: This is the Bill I am submitting to comply with

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