

The Hon. S. T. J. THOMPSON: I will support Mr. Willmott's proposition if he thinks the Bill is going to interfere with the co-operation which we have at present.

The Hon. L. A. Logan: Who is the senior man if neither the chief officer nor the deputy are present.

The Hon. S. T. J. THOMPSON: The captain of the brigade.

The Hon. L. A. Logan: Under your present set-up?

The Hon. S. T. J. THOMPSON: I have been the control officer for a number of years, and with the six captains that we have it has always been my policy, when a fire is burning in a particular captain's area, to allow him to give the orders, and I accept those orders. I do this because of his knowledge of the district; and I carry out any instructions he may give in regard to the fire unless there is some question of policy involved when it would require some overriding authority. We have found that this system has worked out very well. Someone mentioned that it is a matter of commonsense prevailing, and we believe that this is the commonsense way of doing things.

Brigades in country areas are very highly organised now, and they give the shire councils no trouble at all; as a matter of fact in a number of respects they give the shire councils orders, and we are happy to take them. If Mr. Willmott feels that the question of seniority is being objected to in his area I will support him in having it removed, because I feel that under the existing set-up we have got along very well, and we will continue to do so.

I think that Mr. Willmott left off reading page 30 of the principal Act too soon when he was speaking to the Bill.

The Hon. F. D. Willmott: I had to leave something for you to do.

The Hon. S. T. J. THOMPSON: The honourable member should have carried on a little further because he had quite an audience upstairs at that stage. I think what follows on page 30 is far more important because it says that a person shall not dispose of a burning cigarette, cigar, tobacco or match, and so on. It gives a list of the circumstances, and I think they are very appropriate at the moment.

The Hon. F. D. Willmott: I was making a different point.

The Hon. L. A. Logan: That is the one that Mr. Lavery mentioned.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: The difficulty, of course, is to catch them.

The Hon. S. T. J. THOMPSON: As Mr. MacKinnon has pointed out, the difficulty, of course, is to catch people, but it is possible to catch them on occasions. However, we are not out to catch people, but

we are out to educate them not to light fires; and that is what this legislation sets out to do.

We had an unfortunate situation in our district in regard to the linesmen. Country people will know that linesmen always boil their billy twice a day on the side of the road to make their tea when they are working on the lines. We appealed to them time and again, and asked the department to issue its men with some other means of making their tea, but all our requests were refused. Ultimately they lit a fire in our district and we sued them and got a conviction against them. The department promptly stopped the practice. We do not want to have to do that sort of thing, but these people learnt the hard way, and consequently we do not expect others to carry on the same practice.

I believe that all these amendments will improve the principal Act, and we can discuss Mr. Willmott's amendments when we come to them in Committee. With those few remarks I support the Bill.

Debate adjourned, on motion by The Hon. L. A. Logan (Minister for Local Government).

House adjourned at 9.22 p.m.

Legislative Assembly

Wednesday, the 26th September, 1962

CONTENTS	Page
QUESTIONS ON NOTICE—	
Allawah Grove Native Camp—	
Alternative Camping Areas	1279
Requisition by Civil Aviation Department	1279
Bentley Primary School: Toilet Facilities	1284
Blair Street, Bunbury: Extension—	
Alternative Route	1280
Use of Railway Department Land, and Cost	1280
Bunbury Town Planning Scheme No. 4—	
Government Assistance for Land Purchase	1280
Preparation, Fees, and Cost of Roads and Resumptions	1280
Chemists: After-hours Trading—	
Legislation for Roster System	1283
Dam Sites: Surveys on Gascoyne and Lyons Rivers	1281
Fluoride—	
Addition to Water Supplies	1282
Chemical Analysis and Sale Price	1282
Percentage Required for Water Supplies	1282
Gypsum: Rail Freights on Norseman to Esperance Line	1283
Industrial Development: New Industries for Western Australia	1288
Industries at Collie: Report by Mr. C. Adams	1282
John Curtin High School: Average Marks for Maths A and Maths B	1284

CONTENTS—continued

	Page
QUESTIONS ON NOTICE—continued	
Kokardine-Dalwallinoo Water Main : Route, and Provision for Kalannie	1287
Metropolitan Board of Water Supply and Sewerage : Interest and Sinking Fund Charges on Work Transferred	1284
Midland Junction Abattoir and Robb Jetty— Disposal of Midland Abattoir	1286
Killing Charges	1286
Milk : Treatment Licenses	1286
Mines Department Drilling Plants— Number and Present Use	1281
Use for Gold Drilling	1281
Norseman-Hyden Road : Upgrading	1283
North-West Doctors— Engagement Through Immigration Committee	1281
Number Required	1281
North-West : Irrigation Projects— Loan Allocations	1281
Petrol : Coin-operated Bowsers	1283
Police Station at Albany : Reason for Non- erection	1286
Rottneet Island Fish : Netting by Profes- sional Fishermen	1282
School Buildings— Report of International Conference	1283
Representation at International Con- ference	1283
State Electricity Commission Accounts : Interest and Redemption of Loans	1285
State Shipping Service— Alliance with the Australian Coastal Shipping Commission	1284
Supersession by a Shipping Commission	1284
Superphosphate : Conditions of Road Haul- age	1285
Water Bags : Provision on Metropolitan Railway Stations	1279
Water from Mundaring Weir : Use for Metropolitan System	1287
Water Piping : Cost, and Use of Non-cor- rosive pipes	1286
Water Rates— Easement of Rates for Urban Con- sumers	1287
Transfer of Hills Consumers to Metro- politan System	1287
Western Australian Government Railways : Loss of Revenue from Backloading Con- cessions	1285
QUESTIONS WITHOUT NOTICE—	
Electricity Supplies : Prevention of Break- downs	1289
Goldfields Aged Welfare Association : Gov- ernment Grant	1288
Industrial Development : New Industries for Western Australia	1288
BILLS—	
Education Act Amendment Bill : Report	1289
Health Act Amendment Bill : Returned	1289
Judges' Salaries and Pensions Act Amend- ment Bill : Returned	1289
Land Act Amendment Bill : 3r.	1289
Metropolitan Market Act Amendment Bill : Returned	1289
Totalisator Agency Board Betting Act Amendment Bill : 2r.	1289

CONTENTS—continued

	Page
ORDERS OF THE DAY—	
Postponement	1289
MOTION—	
Tobacco Industry : Inquiry by Select Com- mittee	1295

The SPEAKER (Mr. Hearman) took the Chair at 4.30 p.m., and read prayers.

QUESTIONS ON NOTICE**WATER BAGS***Provision on Metropolitan Railway Stations*

1. Mr. BRADY asked the Minister for Railways:
 - (1) Are water bags provided at metro-
politan stations during summer
for patrons requiring cool drinks?
 - (2) If not, will he take action to see
that on stations where school-
children patronise railways such
amenities are provided, bearing in
mind that visitors from overseas
would also expect such facilities?

Mr. COURT replied:

- (1) Water bags are generally supplied
at suburban stations, but con-
tinued vandalism at certain
stations has restricted their use.
- (2) Answered by No. (1).

ALLAWAH GROVE NATIVE CAMP*Requisition by Civil Aviation Department*

2. Mr. BRADY asked the Minister for Native Welfare:
 - (1) Has the Civil Aviation Department
requested the use of the area
occupied by Allawah native camp?
 - (2) If not, how long will it be before
the area is required?

Alternative Camping Areas

- (3) Are any plans being prepared for
alternative camping areas or
homes for those requiring same?

Mr. LEWIS replied:

- (1) No.
 - (2) Not known, but it is expected that
it will be some years before the
area is required. The department
has an annual lease which can be
terminated with a month's notice
by either party.
 - (3) No.
3. *This question was postponed.*

BUNBURY TOWN PLANNING SCHEME

No. 4

Preparation, Fees, and Cost of Roads and Resumptions

4. Mr. OLDFIELD asked the Minister representing the Minister for Town Planning:

- (1) Who requested the Town Planning Board to prepare Bunbury's Town Planning Scheme No. 4?
- (2) Has the Government accepted responsibility for town planning in country areas?
- (3) What fees were charged the Bunbury Council for the preparation of the scheme?
- (4) Why did the Town Planning Board employees encroach on the town planning responsibilities of Miss Margaret Feilman (Bunbury's town planning consultant) by preparing Planning Scheme No. 4?
- (5) What is the estimated cost of road construction and land resumption under the scheme?
- (6) If no estimate of costs was prepared, why has the Minister for Town Planning (Mr. Logan) approved a scheme, the costs of which could financially embarrass the council, without first obtaining some idea of the costs involved?

Mr. LEWIS replied:

- (1) The Town Planning Board did not prepare Bunbury Town Planning Scheme No. 4. It was prepared by the Bunbury Town Council.
- (2) No. Technical advice is available to local authorities from the Town Planning Department and other Government departments in town planning matters.
- (3) No fees are charged for such advice.
- (4) The terms of engagement of Miss Feilman as consultant are matters between her and the council. Reference in the question to encroachment on her responsibilities is not understood.
- (5) The Bunbury Council estimated the cost of land acquisition associated with immediate stages of the scheme at approximately £80,000. No estimate has been given to the Minister, of road construction costs.
- (6) The Minister approved the scheme because he was satisfied it represented a sound long-range plan for developing a satisfactory road system, and that its implementation was in scale with the resources of the council now and in the future.

BLAIR STREET, BUNBURY: EXTENSION*Use of Railways Department Land, and Cost*

5. Mr. OLDFIELD asked the Minister for Railways:

- (1) In view of the limited area of land at Bunbury owned by the Railways Department, does the Government support the proposal to surrender a one-chain strip of its present owned land for the extension of Blair Street, thereby causing a severance of its property and reducing its area?
- (2) If so, what is the estimated cost to the railways of the proposed road extension and replacement of buildings?

Mr. COURT replied:

- (1) A proposal is under discussion to exchange railway housing land opposite the station for three blocks to be subdivided in Nature Park and on which the State Housing Commission would be asked to build three houses for railway departmental use.
- (2) If the proposal is accepted the Railways Department will meet the additional cost of the three new houses, which is estimated to be in the vicinity of £10,000 but will have no liability for road works.

I would like also to add that these are purely proposals placed before the Railways Department and are not commitments on either side.

BUNBURY TOWN PLANNING SCHEME No. 4*Government Assistance for Land Purchase*

6. Mr. OLDFIELD asked the Premier:

- (1) Does the Government propose making money available to assist the Bunbury Council to purchase land required for road purposes under Town Planning Scheme No. 4?
- (2) If so, is it proposed to assist financially with the purchase of all land for road purposes involved in the scheme?

Mr. BRAND replied:

- (1) and (2) Although a deputation has been received by the Minister for Works on this matter, no decision has been made.

BLAIR STREET, BUNBURY: EXTENSION*Alternative Route*

7. Mr. OLDFIELD asked the Minister for Works:

Regarding the Blair Street proposal for an access road to the land-backed wharf at Bunbury,

has the Government fully examined the alternative route suggested by the Main Roads Department to the Bunbury Council on the 10th August, 1962, or any other alternative route?

Mr. WILD replied:

The Blair Street proposal cannot be regarded as an access road to the land-backed wharf at Bunbury. It is merely an alternative route through part of the town. Other alternatives have only been accorded cursory examination by the department.

8. *This question was postponed.*

DAM SITES

Surveys on Gascoyne and Lyons Rivers

9. Mr. NORTON asked the Minister for Works:

(1) What investigations and surveys have been carried out in respect of the following dam sites on the Gascoyne and Lyons Rivers—

(a) Kennedy Range;

(b) Lyons River Homestead;

(c) Chalby Chalby;

since the Scott and Furphy report was received?

(2) What was the cost of each investigation and survey?

Mr. WILD replied:

(1) (a) The basin of the dam site at Kennedy Range has been surveyed by aerial photography and sufficient levels taken on the ground to enable the size of the basin to be determined for various heights of the dam.

(b) Nothing has been done at the site near Lyons River Homestead.

(c) The same work has been done for the Chalby Chalby basin as for (a).

(2) The cost of these surveys has been approximately £3,000. Stream gauging stations are scheduled for construction this financial year to assist in determining the total water potential of the river.

NORTH-WEST: IRRIGATION PROJECTS

Loan Allocations

10. Mr. NORTON asked the Minister for Works:

Of the loan allocation of £585,500 for irrigation in the north-west what amount has been allocated for—

(1) the Liveringa project;

(2) Ord River Diversion Dam;

(3) Ord River Main Dam investigations;

(4) Gascoyne River development?

Mr. WILD replied:

(1) £50,000.

(2) £494,500.

(3) £11,000.

(4) £30,000.

NORTH-WEST DOCTORS

Engagement Through Immigration Committee

11. Mr. NORTON asked the Minister for Health:

(1) In view of the difficulty of obtaining doctors for north-west towns has any consideration been given to requesting the Immigration Committee now in England to seek suitable doctors?

(2) If not, will urgent consideration be given to requesting this committee to seek suitable doctors for the north-west?

Number Required

(3) How many doctors are required by the Health Department for the north-west?

Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON replied:

(1) No; but positions have been advertised recently in the United Kingdom and already several inquiries have been received.

(2) Arrangements will be made for applicants to be interviewed in England.

(3) Three.

12. *This question was postponed.*

MINES DEPARTMENT DRILLING PLANTS

Number and Present Use

13. Mr. KELLY asked the Minister representing the Minister for Mines:

(1) How many drilling plants are being operated by the geological section of the Mines Department?

(2) What work are these plants engaged upon at the present time?

Use for Gold Drilling

(3) Is there any proposal under consideration for one of the plants to concentrate on drilling for gold in the—

(a) Yilgarn;

(b) Coolgardie;

area?

Mr. BOVELL replied:

- (1) and (2) The Mines Department has, at the present time, the following drilling plants in operation—

- 1 diamond drill on hard rock at Wilgie Mia.
- 1 percussion plant on water at Gosnells.
- 1 rotary plant on water at Mandurah.
- 1 diamond drill plant on water at Australind.

In addition, three plants are operating under contract on water search; one is at Byford and two are at Lake Allanooka.

- (3) Not at present.

FLUORIDE

Addition to Water Supplies

14. Mr. KELLY asked the Minister for Water Supplies:

- (1) Has fluoride been added at any time to the supply of water reticulated—

- (a) metropolitan area;
- (b) country area?

- (2) If so, when, to what areas, and for what period?

Chemical Analysis and Sale Price

- (3) What is the chemical analysis of fluoride, and by whom manufactured?
- (4) Is fluoride for sale on the normal retail market, and at what price?

Percentage Required for Water Supplies

- (5) If the answers to Nos. (1) and (2) are in the negative, what quantity or percentage of fluoride would be required in the—

- (a) metropolitan area;
- (b) country area;

if a decision to add fluoride were reached?

- (6) Is there any foundation to the suggestion that fluoride would have to be added roughly every seven miles of distribution mains?

Mr. WILD replied:

- (1) (a) No.
(b) No.
- (2) Answered by No. (1).
- (3) Fluorine is a chemical element and is introduced into water either as acid (fluo-silicic acid H_2SiF_6) or as salts, the principal salts used being sodium fluoride NaF or sodium fluosilicate $NaSiF_6$. These chemicals are produced by many of the world's major chemical manufacturing companies.

- (4) Yes. Prices vary according to the chemical used. In November 1961 local prices were:—

Sodium fluoride—£147 per ton.
Sodium fluosilicate—£51 10s. per ton.

- (5) (a) and (b) The amount required varies with climatic conditions and the source of the water. The normal amount is one part per million parts of water.
- (6) No.

ROTTNEST ISLAND FISH

Netting by Professional Fishermen

15. Mr. KELLY asked the Minister for Fisheries:

- (1) Is he aware that early in the 1962 herring season up to 23 professional fishermen repeatedly carried out netting on the south side of Rottneest, using beaches for dragging and emptying nets, and that similar conditions prevailed for many weeks?
- (2) What regulations govern netting adjacent to Rottneest?
- (3) Is he aware that as a result of excessive netting which took place during May, June, and part of July, 1962, normal tourist fishing was spoilt?
- (4) As Rottneest is wholly tourist, will he take steps to prevent this situation developing at any future period?

Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON replied:

- (1) Professional fishermen—I am not aware of the actual number, but I believe it did not exceed 15—worked at Rottneest for a short time during the open season last winter.
- (2) Netting is wholly prohibited at all times of the year in Parakeet, Geordie, Longreach, and Thompson Bays. Netting is permitted elsewhere at Rottneest only during the months of May, June, and July each year. These regulations have been in existence for 15 years or more without change.
- (3) The information available to the Fisheries Department indicates that professional fishermen found tommy ruff scarce this year and operated only for a very limited time.
- (4) The position will be closely watched.

INDUSTRIES AT COLLIE

Report by Mr. C. Adams

16. Mr. H. MAY asked the Minister for Industrial Development:

- (1) Has he received the report compiled by Mr. C. Adams, who was sent to Collie by the department

to make a survey of the various industries for the purpose of gauging their prospects for expansion?

- (2) Will he say what industries his department has in mind?
- (3) Will he supply a copy of the report submitted by Mr. Adams?

Mr. COURT replied:

- (1) and (2) The officer from the Department of Industrial Development who is investigating industrial prospects for Collie has not yet completed his inquiries.

He will be visiting Collie again this week after which a report will be submitted.

- (3) Consideration will be given to this when the report is to hand and I am able to study how much is confidential and refers to particular businesses.

SCHOOL BUILDINGS

Representation at International Conference

17. Mr. TONKIN asked the Minister for Education:

- (1) Was Western Australia, or Australia, represented at the International Conference on School Buildings held in Britain last July?

- (2) If so, who were the representatives?

Report of International Conference

- (3) Will any reports on the conference be available in Western Australia for public information?

Mr. LEWIS replied:

- (1) Western Australia was not represented. It is not known whether Australia was represented.

- (2) Answered by No. (1).

- (3) I will endeavour to obtain a report of the conference when available.

CHEMISTS: AFTER-HOURS TRADING

Legislation for Roster System

18. Mr. GRAHAM asked the Minister for Health:

- (1) Is there any intention on his part to introduce a system of rostering of chemists for service after normal trading hours?

- (2) If so, will he give details?

Mr. WILD replied:

This question was incorrectly asked of the Minister for Health and should have been addressed to the Minister for Labour. The replies are as follows:—

- (1) and (2) This matter has not yet been officially referred to me, but I understand that

conferences are in progress between the Pharmaceutical Guild and the Chief Inspector of Factories.

PETROL

Coin-operated Bowsers

19. Mr. GRAHAM asked the Minister for Works:

Is there any intention to introduce legislation for the purpose of allowing the introduction and operation of coin petrol bowsers?

Mr. WILD replied:

No. It is the service station proprietors' responsibility to give service to the public, and the introduction of coin-operated petrol bowsers could only give fuel and provide no other service whatsoever. Recent investigations in the Eastern States indicated that other than in Victoria there are relatively few coin-operated bowsers and the failure to give the service required was the paramount reason for there not being any large-scale installations.

NORSEMAN-HYDEN ROAD

Upgrading

20. Mr. GAYFER asked the Minister for Works:

- (1) Is it intended to upgrade the road from Norseman to Hyden?

- (2) If so, when?

Mr. WILD replied:

- (1) No. The road was last reported as being adequate for the traffic needs.

- (2) Answered by No. (1).

21. This question was postponed.

GYP'SUM

Rail Freights on Norseman to Esperance Line

22. Mr. MOIR asked the Minister for Railways:

- (1) Have rail freights been increased or proposed to be increased on gypsum on the Norseman-Esperance line; and, if so, what is the increase?

- (2) Does he not consider that the export of commodities should be encouraged from the port of Esperance?

- (3) In view of the fact that the exporter of this mineral is possibly conducting operations on a small profit margin and any increase in costs will make his operations unprofitable, will he have the position reviewed with a view to preserving this industry in the Esperance area?

Mr. COURT replied:

- (1) A special rate of 32s. per ton (including wharfage and handling) was approved for the railing of gypsum from Norseman to a stockpile at Esperance using normal services, thence to ships' sides. The gypsum has been despatched direct from Norseman to ships' sides, this involving the railways in special working, protracted delays to wagons, and additional expense. As contracts had been entered into, the Railways Department agreed to the special rate applying until the 31st December, 1962.

An extension of the 32s. rate was requested to permit of further contracts being gained during 1963, it being stated that shipments from the port of Esperance would cease by the end of 1963, future supplies being from the north-west. Ordinary rates with a special rebate of 12½ per cent. were offered during the heavy haulage period of January to May, 1963 (42s. 8d. per ton including wharfage and handling) with a further reduction to 40s. per ton (including wharfage and handling) in June-December, 1963.

It will be seen that concession rates have been and will be available until the time when the firm concerned will transfer its activities from the Norseman-Esperance area.

- (2) Yes; and this has been done.
- (3) The position has just been reviewed and the concessions detailed in No. (1) above have been granted.

METROPOLITAN BOARD OF WATER SUPPLY AND SEWERAGE

Interest and Sinking Fund Charges on Work Transferred

23. Mr. TONKIN asked the Minister for Water Supplies:

- (1) At what rate are interest and sinking fund contribution charges being made against revenue in respect of all works transferred from the control of the Metropolitan Board of Water Supply and Sewerage?
- (2) In what way are the requirements of section 126, subsection (3) being met by the charges which have been imposed by direction of the Treasurer?

Mr. WILD replied:

- (1) Interest charges at 4½ per cent., sinking fund charges at 10½ per cent.

- (2) By virtue of provisions contained in sections 3, 5, and 12 of the Water Supply, Sewerage and Drainage Act, 1912.

JOHN CURTIN HIGH SCHOOL

Average Marks for Maths A and Maths B

24. Mr. FLETCHER asked the Minister for Education:

What were the average Maths A and B term marks for students in A, B, and C classes of Junior year students at John Curtin High School during the academic years 1961 and 1962?

Mr. LEWIS replied:

Information of this type is not kept at the department.

BENTLEY PRIMARY SCHOOL

Toilet Facilities

25. Mr. JAMIESON asked the Minister for Education:

- (1) Is he aware of the inadequacy of the toilet facilities at the Bentley Primary School?
- (2) Are there any proposals in hand to provide additions to these facilities?
- (3) If not, will he request his departmental officers to make the necessary arrangements with the P.W.D. for an early improvement to these facilities?

Mr. LEWIS replied:

- (1) The toilet facilities provided for the boys of the primary and infants' school are adequate. However, those provided for girls are slightly below standard.
- (2) and (3) The Public Works Department has been asked to bring the toilet facilities to the required standard.

STATE SHIPPING SERVICE

Alliance with the Australian Coastal Shipping Commission

26. Mr. BICKERTON asked the Minister for the North-West:

- (1) Would there be any advantage to the State Shipping Service, or to Western Australia, if our State Shipping Service were allied to the Australian Coastal Shipping Commission?
- (2) If so, what advantage would be likely to be derived?

Supersession by a Shipping Commission

- (3) Has an offer been made and accepted for the position of chairman of a proposed shipping

commission to supersede the present management of the State Shipping Service?

Mr. COURT replied:

- (1) and (2) It is not desirable to generalise on this subject as so many factors of operational and other significance are involved. There could be advantages which include access to a much larger fleet if special needs arose and it may also be possible to employ State Shipping Service vessels more economically by integration into a larger fleet.

However, there would of course be disadvantages, not the least of which would be the fact that State Shipping Service vessels are now devoted primarily to the needs of our north.

- (3) No.

STATE ELECTRICITY COMMISSION ACCOUNTS

Interest and Redemption of Loans

27. Mr. TONKIN asked the Minister for Electricity:

- (1) At what rate per cent. is the charge made annually in the accounts of the State Electricity Commission to cover interest and redemption of loans raised by public subscription?
- (2) If a uniform rate is levied irrespective of the source from which the loan funds have been derived, what is the rate?
- (3) What is the present total of loan funds employed and what amount has been derived from moneys from time to time appropriated by Parliament for the purpose?

Mr. NALDER replied:

- (1) and (2) The actual rate of interest paid to subscribers of each particular loan is charged to the accounts each year. A sinking fund at the rate of 1 per cent. per annum on the value of each loan is provided towards redemption.
- (3) Figures at the 30th June, 1962, were—

£36,269,400 net.

£17,724,260 net.

28. *This question was postponed.*

WESTERN AUSTRALIAN GOVERNMENT RAILWAYS

Loss of Revenue from Backloading Concessions

29. Mr. D. G. MAY asked the Minister for Railways:

- (1) Will he advise the anticipated loss of revenue over a period of twelve months to the W.A.G.R. resulting

from the decision of the Government to extend the transport licenses for backloading of fruit and vegetables from 5 cwt. to 10 cwt.?

- (2) Does he agree that inroads into railway revenue, such as this further concession, could have an adverse effect on the Government's case to the Grants Commission?
- (3) Are the present concessional telegraphic freight rates applicable to long distant hauls dependent on the retention and continuity of the shorter hauls, up to say 150 miles?

Mr. COURT replied:

- (1) £7,000.
- (2) No.
- (3) In a general way, yes, but not necessarily when it comes to relatively small amounts of freight such as that involved in No. (1).

SUPERPHOSPHATE

Conditions of Road Haulage

30. Mr. D. G. MAY asked the Minister for Transport:

- (1) What are the present conditions applicable to the road haulage of superphosphate from the works for—
 - (a) primary producer's own vehicle;
 - (b) private road haulier;
 - (c) carrier?
- (2) What is the permissible radial mileage for road haulage of superphosphate without a Department of Transport license or permit?
- (3) Will he advise particulars of any alterations to mileage per question No. (2) since 1959?
- (4) Is any extension to the present mileage contemplated within the near future?

Mr. CRAIG replied:

- (1) (a) A primary producer, using his own vehicle, may transport his own superphosphate from the manufacturing point to his farm irrespective of distance.
- (b) and (c) All other road users may transport superphosphate without license to any place within a radius of 50 miles from the place where such fertiliser has been manufactured.
- (2) Answered by No. (1).

(3) In March, 1960, the transport of fertiliser within a radius of 40 miles from its place of manufacture was exempted from the licensing provisions of the Transport Act. In September, 1960, the radial distance was increased to 50 miles.

(4) No.

MILK

Treatment Licenses

31. Mr. HALL asked the Minister for Agriculture:

(1) Is it the intention of the Government to amend the Milk Act and the Dairy Cattle Compensation Act to give the board power to grant to an applicant more than one-quarter of the total number of treatment licenses?

(2) If it is the intention of the Government to amend the legislation, what is the proposed percentage of treatment licenses that one licensee can hold?

(3) Would holders of treatment licenses be compelled to take supplies from local producers where milk deliveries are made?

Mr. NALDER replied:

(1) to (3) The Government is studying the application of the Milk Act to see whether any modification in the method of issuing treatment licenses is desirable. The Dairy Cattle Compensation Act does not apply.

MIDLAND JUNCTION ABATTOIR AND ROBB JETTY

Killing Charges

32. Mr. HALL asked the Minister for Agriculture:

(1) What are the killing charges at the Midland Junction Abattoir for sheep, cattle, calves, pigs?

(2) What are the killing charges at Robb Jetty for sheep, cattle, calves, pigs?

Disposal of Midland Abattoir

(3) Has the Government any intention of disposing of Midland Junction Abattoir?

Mr. NALDER replied:

(1) The killing charges at the Midland Junction Abattoir and at Robb Jetty are identical and are

gazetted under Regulation 19 of the Abattoirs Act as follows—

(i) Cattle—

	Per Head
s. d.	
From 201-249 lb. dressed weight	32 6
From 250-400 lb. dressed weight	39 0
From 401-600 lb. dressed weight	45 6
Over 600 lb. dressed weight	52 6

(ii) Calves—

Up to 100 lb. dressed weight	8 9
From 101-150 lb. dressed weight	11 9
From 151-200 lb. dressed weight	24 6

(iii) Sheep 5 0

(iv) Lambs 4 6

(v) Pigs—

Suckers—up to 22 lb. dressed weight	3 0
From 23-110 lb. dressed weight	11 3
From 111-179 lb. dressed weight	13 9
Over 179 lb. dressed weight	16 3

(2) Answered by No. (1).

(3) No.

POLICE STATION AT ALBANY

Reason for Non-erection

33. Mr. HALL asked the Minister for Police:

Can he advise why the new police station was not built at Albany, when same had been agreed to in the general Loan Estimates for 1961-62, as stated by the then Minister for Works?

Mr. CRAIG replied:

Lack of funds; but plans are now being prepared and it is anticipated that the building will commence in this financial year.

34. This question was postponed.

WATER PIPING

Cost, and Use of Non-corrosive Pipes

35. Mr. JAMIESON asked the Minister representing the Minister for Housing:

(1) What is the estimated cost, per average dwelling—

(a) galvanised water piping;

(b) cement-lined piping;

(c) copper piping;

being used for internal service?

- (2) Is it now policy for the S.H.C. to specify cement-lined or copper internal service?
- (3) If not, in view of the necessity of early replacement of G.W.I. piping (between five and seven years), would the S.H.C. insist that all future contracts specify non-corrosive piping?
- (4) What is the approximate cost of replacement of internal service of an average dwelling?
- (5) What is the present cost per foot for $\frac{3}{4}$ -inch—
 - (a) G.W.I. piping;
 - (b) cement-lined pipe;
 - (c) copper pipe?

Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON replied:

- (1) Estimated cost per average dwelling—

	£	s.	d.
(a) Galvanised water piping	31	0	0
(b) Cement-lined piping	39	1	0
(c) Copper piping	42	16	0

Note: The above figures are inclusive of all pipe fittings and installation.

- (2) Copper piping has been specified for some time for State Housing Commission houses.
- (3) Answered by No. (2).
- (4) Estimated cost of replacement for an average dwelling of the internal water service in copper piping on a labour and material basis would be £55.
- (5) Cost per lineal foot of $\frac{3}{4}$ in. piping is—
 - (a) G.W.I. piping—1s. 0 $\frac{1}{2}$ d.
 - (b) Cement-lined—2s. 0 $\frac{1}{2}$ d.
 - (c) Copper—2s.

KOKARDINE-DALWALLINU WATER MAIN

Route, and Provision for Kalannie

36. Mr. CORNELL asked the Minister for Water Supplies:

- (1) Has the route of the water supply main from Kokardine to Dalwallinu been determined?
- (2) If so, has provision been made to serve the Kalannie area on the way?

Mr. WILD replied:

- (1) Yes.
- (2) No.

WATER RATES

Transfer of Hills Consumers to Metropolitan System

37. Mr. CORNELL asked the Minister for Water Supplies:

- (1) Have representations been made for consumers in the hills districts: at present rated under the Country Areas Water Supply Act to be transferred to the metropolitan water supply system?

Easement of Rates for Urban Consumers

- (2) If and when these representations are made, will he give consideration to granting some easement in the rates paid by other urban consumers within the Goldfields Water Supply system?

Mr. WILD replied:

- (1) This has long been under consideration and transfer date from the country areas water supply to the metropolitan water supply system will be made shortly.
- (2) Rates will continue to be determined annually in accordance with the provisions of the appropriate controlling Act.

WATER FROM MUNDARING WEIR

Use for Metropolitan System

38. Mr. CORNELL asked the Minister for Water Supplies:

- (1) Is he aware that on the 25th February, 1952, the then Minister for Water Supply (*vide* File M.W.S. 126/51) advised the Parliamentary Country Party as follows:—

"Mundaring Weir was designed and constructed to conserve the maximum quantity of river flow which would be economically possible, and it was considered that the storage would provide for slightly more than the estimated demand of the Comprehensive Water Supply Scheme when fully developed, and when the mining industry operated in vigorous condition. It is the considered opinion of the departmental officers that it will be many years before the total demand for the Goldfields and Comprehensive Scheme will use the storage already provided at Mundaring, and therefore the excess water which will be accumulated for some years can, without embarrassment, be made available to the metropolitan area, thus avoiding duplication of storage and greater demands on

finance, labour and materials for the time being in the metropolitan area.

Restrictions which have been imposed at times on the Goldfields Water Supply consumption have not been the result of lack of water in the storage at Mundaring, but due to limitations of the existing pumps, pipelines and storages?"

- (2) Do the three points, as above, then made, still apply, or are there any reservations? If so, what are they?
- (3) Is water from Mundaring Weir still made available to the metropolitan system? If not, on what date did the practice cease?

Mr. WILD replied:

- (1) Yes.
- (2) (a) The storage position as outlined is still applicable.
- (b) Since the above advice was given the modified Comprehensive Water Supply Scheme has been completed and further extensions are being made. The Serpentine Dam has been completed and other major improvements made to the metropolitan system. Only under cases of extreme emergency is it envisaged that water might be transferred in large quantities from Mundaring reservoir to the metropolitan area.
- (c) There have been no major restrictions on the goldfields system during the past five years. At present the pumping and pipeline capacity is satisfactory.
- (3) Transference of water in the quantities envisaged in the letter ceased in April, 1959. Water is still made available in small quantities on a few days of peak summer demand.

39. *This question was postponed.*

INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT

New Industries for Western Australia

40. Mr. HEAL asked the Minister for Industrial Development:

- (1) In relation to a statement he made last week that £1,000,000 worth of new industries per week are coming to W.A., will he name the new industries which have come to W.A. over the past eight weeks at the rate of £1,000,000 per week?

- (2) What are the proposed new industries at the above rate expected to come to W.A. during the next eight weeks?

Mr. COURT replied:

- (1) and (2) The actual extract from my address to the sixth Australian conference of the Australian Regional Council of the Royal College of Obstetricians and Gynaecologists is:

Western Australia today is a State on the move. We are getting new investment at the rate of more than £1 million a week.

This was accurately reported in "The West Australian" on the 21st September, 1962 as:

Giving the ninth Arthur Wilson memorial address at the University, Mr. Court said that W.A. was getting new investment at the rate of more than £1,000,000 a week.

The purpose of this statement was to illustrate the accelerated pace of development in the State and its great potential.

In fact, during the Government's term of office investment decisions have been made involving expenditure of more than £200 million, an average rate of more than £1 million per week.

From the foregoing it will be apparent that reference to any specific period of eight weeks is irrelevant.

QUESTIONS WITHOUT NOTICE

INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT

New Industries for Western Australia

1. Mr. HEAL: The Minister for Industrial Development has given weak answers to the question I asked on today's notice paper. I asked him for specific names of the industries which had come to Western Australia. I mentioned the figure of eight weeks. I now extend that period to cover the past six months. Will the Minister be good enough to supply at the next sitting of the House the names of those industries which have come to Western Australia during that period?

Mr. COURT: With the greatest of pleasure, I will table a list of industries which have come here since the Government came into office.

GOLDFIELDS AGED WELFARE ASSOCIATION

Government Grant

2. Mr. MOIR asked the Premier:
 - (1) Is he aware that the Goldfields Aged Welfare Association is seriously concerned that the State

Government's annual grant of £1,000 to that organisation has not been forthcoming this year?

- (2) As the grant is subject to yearly review, will he indicate whether it is the Government's intention to discontinue the grant? If not, will he make the grant available as soon as possible?

Mr. BRAND replied:

- (1) and (2) The honourable member gave me notice of this question. The answer is that a cheque is being forwarded to the association.

ELECTRICITY SUPPLIES

Prevention of Breakdowns

3. Mr. JAMIESON asked the Minister for Electricity:

In view of the widespread disruption of industry, commerce, and domestic concerns yesterday due to the breakdown at the Bunbury Power House, has the Minister taken action to make sure that a recurrence of such a fault will be minimised?

Mr. NALDER replied:

Yes.

BILLS (3): RETURNED

1. Health Act Amendment Bill.
Bill returned from the Council with an amendment.
2. Judges' Salaries and Pensions Act Amendment Bill.
3. Metropolitan Market Act Amendment Bill.
Bills returned from the Council without amendment.

LAND ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Third Reading

MR. BOVELL (Vasse—Minister for Lands) [4.59 p.m.]: I move—

That the Bill be now read a third time.

I wish to make a further comment in connection with this Bill. The member for Merredin-Yilgarn raised the point about the vesting of additional Crown land. As a further explanation to what I have already said I asked the department to give me a hypothetical case. It does happen at times that where a road has been closed or a railway closed—and, in future, it could affect a rabbit-proof fence—there is a small pocket of Crown land which would remain Crown land, and often the area consists of only a few square yards, which, to straighten the boundaries, should be included in the portion of the land that has been closed and added to the adjoining holding. The action can only be taken

under this proposed new section 118A. To clarify the position I thought some further explanation was necessary, and I have given that explanation in answer to the query raised by the member for Merredin-Yilgarn.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a third time and transmitted to the Council.

EDUCATION ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Report

Report of Committee adopted.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

Postponement of Nos. 3 to 5

MR. BRAND (Greenough—Premier) [5.2 p.m.]: At the request of the Deputy Leader of the Opposition, and with the support of members opposite, I move—

That Order of the Day No. 6 be taken prior to Order of the Day No. 3.

Question put and passed.

TOTALISATOR AGENCY BOARD BETTING ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Second Reading

MR. TONKIN (Melville—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) [5.4 p.m.]: I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

I wish to express my appreciation to the Premier, and the private members who have really been inconvenienced by the priority which has been accorded to me in connection with this order of the day. I would not have sought this privilege if I had been able to be present later on this evening; but an official engagement makes it necessary for me to be absent, and that would necessarily have meant a postponement of this item for three weeks, as the House will not sit on Wednesday of next week. Therefore I am grateful for the opportunity of dealing with this matter this evening.

The proposal is for a very small amendment to that section of the Totalisator Agency Board Betting Act which deals with unclaimed money. There is an amount of almost £30,000 which has fallen into the lap of the Totalisator Agency Board, and which will ultimately find its way to the racing and trotting clubs. Although legally this money belongs to the board it has no other right to it, because it is money which really belongs to persons who have been successful with their investments, but who have lost their tickets; and, because they have lost their tickets, not only do they fail to collect the amount which is due to them as winnings, but they also lose their stake as well.

In this regard the Totalisator Agency Board is very different from the bookmakers on the racecourse, although I think it will be generally acknowledged now that the Totalisator Agency Board is a misnomer, and the organisation is really a bookmaker. If one is on the racecourse and one supports with the bookmakers the winning horse, and loses one's ticket, that does not mean that one loses one's stake and the winnings as well. It is necessary to report the matter to the bookmaker concerned, and I think a period of three months is insisted upon during which, if no one presents the ticket, the bookmaker is obliged to pay the winning bet, and does pay, and the racing club requires that that be done.

It has been argued on behalf of the Totalisator Agency Board that it is a totalisator, and that totalisators do not pay except upon the production of a ticket. By and large that is perfectly true, and it would be a sound argument if the Totalisator Agency Board were in fact a totalisator. But it is not; it is a bookmaker.

For example, one cannot bet with a totalisator on credit, but one can bet on credit through agents with the Totalisator Agency Board. One cannot lose one's ticket if one bets on credit, because there is no ticket; so if one supports the winner when one bets on credit one must be paid. It is only the cash bettors who are inconvenienced by the Totalisator Agency Board.

If one goes into a totalisator agency and bets for cash and loses one's ticket that is the end of it so far as the punter is concerned. He neither collects his stake nor his winnings, because he cannot present his ticket. But that does not happen if one bets with a bookmaker on the racecourse, because the bookmaker is obliged to pay, as members who have attended the racecourse well know.

The bookmaker is obliged to pay after the effluxion of a certain period of time; and of course he pays under the guarantee that if the ticket is subsequently found and presented by somebody else, then the person who received the money will have to indemnify the bookmaker if the ticket is genuinely presented. It is extremely unlikely that a person who was not entitled to the dividend would claim that he had lost his ticket and should be paid, because he runs the risk of being up on a false pretences charge if the owner of the ticket subsequently presents it and asks for payment.

The fact I want to establish is that bookmakers on the racecourse are obliged to pay bettors who support the winner, even though they are unable to present their tickets through having had them destroyed, or having lost them. Although the Totalisator Agency Board goes through

the motions of permitting a bettor who has lost his ticket to make a claim, I do not think that a single claim has ever been paid.

I know the procedure is that the person who has lost his ticket makes a claim, and a statement is required from the agent in charge of the agency who says what he thinks about it, but I have never yet met one person who has succeeded in being paid; nor do I think I ever will, because the board has already stated publicly that it is acting on the same principles as a totalisator, and unless a ticket can be produced the dividend will not be paid.

Because of that attitude, which I say is quite wrong under the circumstances, a large sum of money has already fallen to the funds of the board, and of course will continue to fall because it is inevitable that many people will lose or destroy their tickets. It happens every day.

Members well know that in various countries throughout the world there is legislation known as the Unclaimed Moneys Acts, and these Acts invariably provide that money which is unclaimed shall not go to the person who has had the handling of it for the time being, but it shall be paid into Consolidated Revenue. If, subsequently, the owner of the money is able to establish his right to it then it is paid out of Consolidated Revenue to the person concerned.

That applies to banks, trustees, and all sorts of businesses which may have money belonging to other people. If the people to whom the money belongs have not claimed it, Governments do not agree that in those circumstances the people holding the money should keep it, and so there is legislation providing what shall be done with unclaimed money.

What justification can there possibly be for handing over to the racing and trotting clubs money which really belongs to investors who have not been able to collect it because they have lost their tickets? Provision has been made in the costs of running the T.A.B. for the amount of money which is to be returned to successful bettors, and it is fortuitous for the T.A.B. when the tickets are not presented, but it is not revenue in the true sense of the word. Therefore I am proposing to Parliament that this money should not go to the racing clubs under the circumstances, but that we should send it where it will do far more good.

We have in the community many very old people, and I read in *The West Australian* this week that we are likely to have these old people in increasing numbers. I quote from *The West Australian* of the 24th of this month. The heading is

"Hospital Problems: Aged and the General Practitioner" and I should like to quote a few extracts from the article—

The most important and insistent pressure on any community's hospital and medical services is the snowballing advance of medical knowledge and techniques. But there are two secondary factors that could play a big part in shaping Western Australia's hospital system in the future. The first is the increasing number and proportion of old people in the community.

Then further down there is this statement—

The blunt truth is that modern drugs and medical skill are keeping many old people alive too long in a community that is not yet organised to look after them.

The step which I propose to take is one in the direction of organising the community to care for these aged people. I think we should be glad to know they are likely to be with us longer than they would have been years ago. I had the misfortune to lose my mother a short time ago—in the last 12 months. I had the good fortune to have her with me for a long time, because she was nearly 79 when she died. But it would have been better still if I could have had her with me until she was 80 or 81.

So I do not deplore the fact that science and medical skill have enabled old people to be with us longer than they did in the past, but I recognise that their being with us does present a problem to which we should give some attention. We have it in our power to give it some attention and my proposal this afternoon is a move in that direction.

On the same day as the article from which I have quoted was published in *The West Australian*, there was also a leading article of that issue from which I intend to quote. It reads as follows:—

WE SHOULD BE STUDYING HOW TO COPE WITH AGE

In this State the problem has not been allowed to reach a stage where seriously ill people are unable to get proper treatment because of too many hospital beds being occupied by old people who are simply frail and have nowhere else to go. What has been achieved is due to more C-class hospitals, institutions and flats and the work of voluntary organisations. But plans should be put in hand now to cope with the growth in the numbers and proportion of old people in need of help.

One of the first steps should be to investigate to what extent elderly people could avoid hospitals and other institutions if the Government built on the work of voluntary bodies to

provide a widespread home-nursing service. This would cater for those who could live alone or with relatives if they had trained help and it would be relatively cheap. It should go beyond the proposal now before Parliament to allow local authorities to contribute to home-care services.

I interpolate here to say that the reference made in that article is in the mental health legislation which the Minister for Health introduced to this House a short time ago and which makes provision to enable local authorities to do something in the direction of assisting in the after-care of these old folk.

Mr. Ross Hutchinson: The provision was in the Health Act Amendment Bill, and not in the Mental Health Bill.

Mr. TONKIN: I thought it was the Mental Health Bill.

Mr. Ross Hutchinson: No; it was the Health Act Amendment Bill.

Mr. TONKIN: I stand corrected if it is so, but I am not sure whether it is.

Mr. Ross Hutchinson: Will you take my assurance that it is the Health Act Amendment Bill?

Mr. TONKIN: If the Minister wants to put it on that plane I will have to have another look at it. I quote further from this leading article in last Monday's issue of *The West Australian*—

Beyond that, there is a need to examine the practicability of building special geriatric hospitals for those who need active hospital care, though not in high-cost hospitals such as Royal Perth. And there is a need to find the best ways of providing further institutions for those who are not hospital cases but are enfeebled and cannot be cared for at home.

Those newspaper extracts support the proposal which I have had the privilege of placing before the House, because my proposition is simply to make available money which does not rightly belong to the Totalisator Agency Board for the benefit of old people, and probably a number of them have ownership to the money which would be so used. I can recall my grandmother saying, many years ago—

If young could know what old would crave,

Would never spend but always save. How very true that saying is! But I do not think we will change people very much; and we will have large numbers of people who, when they become elderly, will be short of funds. However, they still have to be looked after, and the proposal I have submitted will be a way of looking after them adequately. I can envisage that with such a regular income as would come from this proposal, the organisation to which I propose the money should go

would be enabled to do an outstanding job in this State, the like of which has not been done anywhere else in the world. I would think that we could make history and set an example which could be followed by others elsewhere, which example would be to the greater advantage of the State generally.

There is in existence an organisation known as the Old People's Welfare Council of Western Australia. I have here the third annual report of that organisation for 1961-62. It is part of the Old People's Welfare Council of Australia, and the patron of that organisation is His Excellency the Governor-General, The Right Honourable Viscount de L'Isle. Affiliated with that Australian organisation are the following:—

The Old People's Welfare Council of Victoria.

The Old People's Welfare Council of New South Wales.

The Old People's Welfare Council of Queensland.

The Old People's Welfare Council of South Australia.

The Old People's Welfare Council of Western Australia.

My inquiries have led me to the conclusion that these councils are finding it extremely difficult to carry out their objects because of the shortage of funds, and if they could have guaranteed to them a source of income they would be able to do a marvellous job for this section of the community. According to this report, the patron, office bearers, and executive committee are—

Patron:

His Excellency the Governor
Sir Charles Gairdner, K.C.M.G., K.C.V.O.,
K.B.E., C.B.

Vice-Patrons:

The Right Hon. Lord Mayor of Perth,
Sir Harry Howard, J.P.,
Minister for Health, The Hon. Ross
Hutchinson, M.L.A.

Chairman:

Dr. C. S. Harper, M.B.B.S. (Melb.).

Vice Chairmen:

Mr. J. H. Keirle,
Brig. D. Hewitt.

Hon. Treasurer:

Mr. Wesley G. Moore,
Public Accountant.

Secretary:

Mrs. G. Wilson.

Executive Committee: The office-bearers with the following:—

Miss G. E. Bryce,

Mrs. D. J. Davies,

Mrs. V. M. Fairbrother,

Mrs. J. H. Keirle,

Mrs. E. Meddes,

Mr. J. W. Cornwall, J.P.,

Mr. R. T. Hanlin,

Mr. G. McPherson,

Mr. T. E. Robinson,

Mr. Picton-Warlow.

Hon. Solicitors:

Messrs. Robinson & Cox.

Hon. Auditor:

Mr. G. R. McPherson.

The aims and objects of this Old People's Welfare Council are as follows:—

- (a) Generally to promote and assist the welfare and good of all old people in the State of Western Australia.
- (b) To assist the work of statutory governmental municipal and other bodies and voluntary organisations which are engaged in respect of old people in providing facilities for physical and mental recreation, developing physical improvement, furthering health, relieving poverty, distress or sickness or in pursuing any objects which now are or may hereafter be deemed by law to be charitable.
- (c) To promote and organise co-operation in the achievement of the above purposes and to that end bring together in Council representatives of the bodies and organisations engaged in the furtherance of the above purposes or any of them within the State of Western Australia.
- (d) To promote and carry out or assist in promoting and carrying out surveys relating to the needs of old people and arrange for forwarding to the proper bodies and organisations the relevant facts regarding such cases and causes of distress as it appears to be within the power of those bodies and organisations to alleviate.
- (e) To arrange and provide for or join in arranging and providing for the holding of exhibitions, meetings, lectures and classes calculated directly or indirectly to further the objects of the Council or any of them.
- (f) To co-operate with federal and other conventions and to assist in the promotion of similar Councils in the other States of the Commonwealth of Australia or elsewhere.
- (g) To do all such things as may seem to the Council incidental or conducive to the attainment of the above objects or any of them.

Next month Old People's Week is to be opened by His Excellency the Governor and attention will be focussed upon this important aspect of charitable work. What better opening to Old People's Week could we have than to be able to hand to the people this regular income which would enable them to do such a marvellous job for this section of the community without hurt to anybody, because the

money to be used will be money which rightly belongs to people who have failed to establish their claim to it? They have no hope of getting it, but they may get some indirect benefit from that money in their later years by virtue of the fact that they will have the advantage of the provision to be made by this Old People's Welfare Council.

I know it is likely that there has arisen in the minds of some members the thought that possibly some other worthy organisations might have benefited from a proposal of this nature. I thought of that myself originally, but I decided against it because I felt that once we divided up the sums, whilst it would be of material benefit to quite a number of those who would obtain some money, there would not be enough to enable any of them to do a worth-while job; and as this section of the community is already a large section and, to some extent, has been greatly neglected in the past, I consider that a good deal of money, and a regular source of income are required in order to ensure the proper realisation of the objects of those people who form the membership of this organisation.

Mr. Cornell: Would not this be repugnant, perhaps, to some of the members of the Old People's Welfare Council?

Mr. Hawke: The Salvation Army would take it.

Mr. TONKIN: I feel that this gives us the opportunity to set a very fine example to others and, at the same time, to do a worth-while job for a section of the community which has played its part in the State's development; those who now, in the twilight of their lives, find themselves up against all sorts of problems and difficulties at a time when they need help.

I have seen some distressing cases because of circumstances over which the people concerned had very little control. In some instances the circumstances have been due to an accident that has taken place as a result of which the children of the family have been killed and the old people have been left without relatives to look after them.

Such people depend on the kindness and generosity of strangers. Often this is forthcoming, but sometimes it is not; and I am gratified to think there is in existence in Western Australia an organisation which has set out with such great objectives, and is composed of persons who, without thought of payment, are anxious to do their utmost to help this important section of our community. If, without doing any hurt to anybody, we can make a regular source of income available, then I suggest to members that we have indeed done something worth while, and that is the proposal which I now submit.

Mr. O'Neil: How much money did you say was now available?

Mr. TONKIN: The amount is £30,000.

Mr. O'Neil: Now?

Mr. TONKIN: Yes. Some of it has already been paid over in the 15 months or so that the T.A.B. has been in existence. It has accumulated under this section of the Act. The money is not paid out straightaway. I will read the section of the Act. It is as follows:—

Any moneys payable by way of dividends, whether by the Board or a racing club through the Board, which are unclaimed for one month by any person entitled thereto, other than moneys which are credited by the Board into a trust fund banking account to be called the "unclaimed dividends account."

So if the money is unclaimed for one month it goes to the unclaimed dividend account; and after being in that account for six months, according to the next section of the Act, it forms part of the funds of the board. It is provided that any amount standing to the credit of that banking account for a period longer than six months shall be carried to and form part of the funds of the board and thereafter the owner of the money has no claim.

As soon as it becomes part of the funds of the board, and after the board has made its application to the Government for its 5 per cent. of turnover and its 1½ per cent. for its special fund, the balance of this money goes to the racing and trotting funds. That means the money eventually finds its way to the clubs, which will use it for building grandstands, or putting in new gates, or building new roads and the like. Admirable as those things might be for racegoers, I consider that a far better use for the money would be in endeavouring to meet the objects of the Old People's Welfare Council.

This money really is not revenue in the proper sense of the term so far as the board is concerned, because if the people did not lose their tickets they would have to be paid the money by the board, and it is only fortuitous that it is still there. It really belongs to people who cannot substantiate their claims. The board knows they have won the money all right; there is no doubt about that. The board knows it has issued the tickets against a winner and the tickets have not been presented. I repeat that if one is on a racecourse and loses a ticket he can still get paid.

Mr. Burt: On the tote?

Mr. TONKIN: No; not on the tote. But this is not a tote. The T.A.B. is a book-maker.

Mr. Cornell: What happened to the unclaimed dividends before the T.A.B.?

Mr. TONKIN: The unclaimed money remaining with the totalisator went to the racing clubs. In Victoria, unclaimed dividends from the T.A.B. go into Consolidated

Revenue, not to the racing clubs: unclaimed dividends do not form part of the revenue of the T.A.B. in that State.

The Government has not made a claim on this money in this State. It was prepared to let it go to the racing clubs, and therefore it should not quarrel if Parliament decides that instead of giving the money to the racing clubs we use it for the benefit of old people.

Mr. Lewis: It would be an unreliable source.

Mr. TONKIN: No; it would not. I would be prepared to accept as a gift all money that will accrue to this fund over £20,000.

Mr. Lewis: What I mean is that the amount would vary considerably from year to year.

Mr. TONKIN: The amount will only vary by increasing.

Mr. Lewis: I have never had it to throw away so I would not know.

Mr. TONKIN: We can safely assume that there will be approximately £20,000 a year from this source. But suppose it did vary. Suppose it was a couple of thousand pounds less, or £5,000 or £6,000 more. I am sure the Old People's Welfare Council would not object to receiving the money on that account. I can visualise that they could do a marvellous job with this money in such a way as to make the old people in this State the envy of old people in other parts of the world. We could provide for their recreation and enjoyment, and their care and hospitalisation—matters which are of considerable concern indeed to various organisations and Governments.

This source of income would not be a worry to the Government but it would enable these people really to get busy in the attainment of the object which they have set out to reach. I repeat: It would commence a new era for this section of the community, and I can think of nothing better for this State at a time when visitors are coming here for the Empire Games, than for us to advertise what we are prepared to do for our citizens. It would become widely known throughout the world as a deliberate attempt on the part of the community to shoulder the responsibility and to do in a magnificent way a worthwhile job: no fiddling about with it; no token help, but substantial assistance in a way never before possible. What an example and encouragement for others to do likewise!

It could be that those persons who have made a contribution to this fund will ultimately derive some benefit from the money that they failed to collect. That would be some recompense to them for the dissatisfaction they experienced at the time when they were unable to collect.

I commend the proposal to the Assembly in the hope that it will find favour with members and that this amendment will be made.

Mr. O'Neil: Before you resume your seat, tell me this: Before this money is held in the trust account all undistributed dividends are paid into the account of the T.A.B. Is the money further taxed by the State?

Mr. TONKIN: No. This money is treated straightout as revenue. If it is unclaimed for a month it goes to the Unclaimed Moneys Account and then it is transferred to the second account where it remains for six months, and if it is not claimed at the end of that period it forms part of the funds of the board.

Members will appreciate that once it has been unclaimed for a month there is little likelihood of its being claimed subsequently, because punters do not generally wait for a month before they collect their winnings. However, they cannot establish their claims because they cannot produce the tickets; and I have seen statements from the chairman of the T.A.B. that, because he is a totalisator—that is his opinion—because he is governed by the rules of the totalisator, dividends can only be paid out on the production of winning tickets.

That is true enough so far as totalisators are concerned; but, of course, it is well known that with regard to the money obtained for Eastern States betting—and that is about half of the total—not a penny is put on the totalisator. The board holds it as a bookmaker and pays out on the odds declared on the course. So it is purely a bookmaker. With regard to money invested on the local races, the board puts only a small proportion of it on the totalisator and operates as a bookmaker on the balance; and, of course, anyone who bets with an agent on the basis outlined in last night's *Daily News*, whereby an agent lends money to the punter so that he can bet on credit—well, that is a strange type of totalisator. So surely one cannot claim that lost tickets on that system of betting should be treated in the same way as lost tickets on the totalisator.

I do not think we need to be worried by the aspect that totalisators generally do not pay out on lost tickets. I am not concerned with that aspect at all. I am concerned with the aspect that this money really is not revenue. It belongs to the people who won it, and a large proportion of it is the money which has been wagered as a stake. Never at any time was it revenue of the board. Why should that money go to racing clubs and trotting clubs to build extra horse-stalls, and gates, and grandstands?

Mr. Graham: And bars.

Mr. TONKIN: Why should it be spent that way when it could be used to a far greater advantage in the direction I suggest? The racing clubs will still get their income from the proceeds of the board. That will not be interfered with in any way. It will mean that they will not get this unclaimed money.

Mr. O'Neil: If anyone claimed after the money had been distributed what would be the position?

Mr. TONKIN: That part of the Act still remains. If it is not claimed within six months, instead of becoming part of the funds of the board it will be paid to the council. The Act states that if the money is not claimed after six months then it cannot be claimed at all.

The only alteration I am suggesting Parliament should make is that when the necessary time has elapsed, instead of the money being paid to the funds of the board, whence it will ultimately be transferred to racing clubs, it shall be transferred to the Old People's Welfare Council. That is the alteration and there is no danger in it for the board. It cannot in any way affect the stability of the board or affect its operations. It simply diverts this money, which is not strictly revenue, from racing clubs to a place where I think it will be more worthily spent.

Debate adjourned, on motion by Mr. Craig (Minister for Police).

TOBACCO INDUSTRY

Inquiry by Select Committee: Motion

Debate resumed, from the 5th September, on the following motion by Mr. Rowberry:—

That in view of the importance of the tobacco industry to Western Australia and to the tobacco growers of Manjimup, a Select Committee be appointed to fully inquire into and examine all factors which have produced chaos in the tobacco industry and to make recommendations as to what remedial measures should be undertaken to enable the industry to survive.

MR. NALDER (Katanning—Minister for Agriculture) [5.44 p.m.]: Perhaps I might be forgiven if I repeat what was said by the member for Warren when he opened the debate on this motion. He said he regretted the necessity for moving this motion. I might endorse those sentiments and add that I have taken a considerable amount of time to go through the speech of the honourable member and to analyse the points he raised when producing an argument as to why the House should agree to the setting up of a committee of inquiry into the tobacco industry.

I trust, Mr. Speaker, that you will bear with me, because I want to take the House back over the history of the tobacco industry and quote a considerable number of figures which I feel should be given to members. As a matter of fact I rather welcome this opportunity to give the House the details which I feel it should know in reference to this motion, and also to detail the value which the State has placed on the tobacco industry—not only the value to the State but, as the honourable member has said, to the district of Manjimup.

In giving this information I feel I will be able to prove to the House that a committee of inquiry would not help the tobacco industry at all, and the figures I will produce, giving details of the action the Government has taken in dealing with this problem, suggest that no good purpose whatever would be gained by an inquiry. As a matter of fact, because of the action already taken by the Government to deal with this situation, a committee of inquiry could do more harm than good to the industry in this State.

The Government, as I have said, has been fully conscious of the value of the tobacco industry to Western Australia and to the people of Manjimup in particular. For that reason the Government has taken every possible action to ensure that the tobacco produced at Manjimup has been of a suitable quality for the manufacturers. It has made every endeavour to ensure not only that the leaf it produces is of the highest quality, but also that it will meet the requirements of the manufacturers and those who purchase it.

Since the early 1920's tobacco has been grown in many parts of the State, but mainly in the south-west portions; and the majority of the sites which were selected proved to be quite unsatisfactory. I can recall that when the war service land settlement scheme first came into being it was felt tobacco growing would be a suitable occupation for the settlers, and consequently an area was selected for that purpose. However, it was not very long before it was proved conclusively that tobacco growing by the war service land settlers was doomed to failure despite the fact that a great deal of money had been spent on the project and a number of settlers had been selected from applicants.

There were several settlers in the Manjimup area who had made a success of the venture up to this point. However, the area which was selected at Pemberton proved to be a failure; and this proved that even as recently as after World War II, some of these areas were just unsuitable. This was mainly because of the quality of the soil; secondly, because of the lack of moisture or irrigation; and, thirdly, because of the excess fluoride which appeared in the soil. I think members know that fluoride in the soil has a detrimental effect upon the quality of the leaf.

All this information has been available to the Government over the years, proving that Manjimup was the only district in the south-west which was suitable for growing the type of tobacco which the manufacturers were prepared to buy.

It is most interesting to note that the commercial production of tobacco in Western Australia commenced in 1930-31 when the total area grown was 25 acres. From then until 1936 the total acreage planted each year was fairly constant—about 300 to 400 acres—and the yields of the leaf sold varied from 500 lb. to 1,100 lb. per acre. So as to encourage the production of Australian leaf, the Commonwealth Government introduced, in 1936, the customs duty rebate to manufacturers who incorporated a statutory percentage of Australian leaf in their products.

The percentages which were applied at that time were 13 per cent. for tobacco—that is, pipe tobacco and 2½ per cent. for

cigarettes. This incentive resulted in more than doubling the planted area in 1936-37 to a total of 1,067 acres. Over the next few years plantings remained at just over 1,000 acres and then, in 1943, a peak of 1,580 acres was achieved. For the whole of the period 1930 to 1940 the average price received by the growers varied little from a constant 24d. per lb.

From the peak planting in 1943 until the end of the war, the acreage declined to the low level of 296 acres in 1945-46. At the end of the war, the areas gradually increased so that in 1949-50 a total of 671 acres was cropped. In 1952-53, over 1,100 acres were planted and further increases resulted in a peak planting of 1,550 acres in 1959-60.

The following table shows the production figures for Western Australia over the past decade:—

TOBACCO PRODUCTION—WESTERN AUSTRALIA

Year	Acreage	Total Leaf Sold (lb.)	Gross Value £	Average Price per lb. (Pence)	Average Return per Acre £	Average Yield per Acre (lb.)
1949-50	671	418,404	103,830	59.5	155	624
1950-51	967	672,301	226,236	81	234	696
1951-52	987	789,230	228,558	69.5	231	800
1952-53	1,109	811,549	304,683	90.1	274	731
1953-54	1,056	674,070	322,222	118.3	314	638
1954-55	1,115	635,489	306,804	115.8	275	570
1955-56	1,022	631,637	342,436	130	335	618
1956-57	1,150	789,907	413,178	125.5	356	681
1957-58	1,270	1,023,142	526,634	123.5	414	805
1958-59	1,456	1,144,000	566,878	114.6	392	821
1959-60	1,550	1,017,414	434,619	100.7	280	656
1960-61	1,483	629,702	165,816	63.1	112	430
		(658,240 unsold)				

Mr. Graham: Are you discussing the motion or delivering a history lesson?

Mr. NALDER: I am discussing the motion.

Mr. Graham: I was just wondering; that is all.

Mr. NALDER: The above figures exclude acreage and production by Michelides Ltd. That firm planted the following acreages:—

	Acres.
1951-52	243
1952-53	282
1953-54	310
1954-55	250
1955-56	104

After 1956 the firm ceased growing tobacco leaf. During this period, local production

more than doubled whilst the gross returns increased from £103,830 in 1949-50 to the maximum of £566,878, in 1958-59.

Mr. Hawke: Which period is that, in terms of years; from which date to which date?

Mr. NALDER: It is the period from 1949-50 to 1955-56—about seven or eight years.

Mr. Hawke: Are you speaking of Michelides?

Mr. NALDER: No; I am not bringing Michelides into this picture at all. These are the total figures I mentioned in the previous set of figures. With the exception of one season, 1955-56, when the average price realised was 130 pence per pound, the average prices were never high and were frequently below those obtained

in the Eastern States. A comparison of Western Australia's average prices with those received in the other States are—

and members should take some notice of these figures because they are most important—as follows:—

AVERAGE PRICES AT AUSTRALIAN AUCTIONS

Pence per Pound

	1954-55	1955-56	1956-57	1957-58	1958-59	1959-60	1960-61
North Queensland	169.3	134.8	130.5	135.7	129.9	150.6	139.6
South Queensland	153.2	143.3	123.1	123.6	143.9	135.5	100.9
Victoria	152.6	129.0	126.3	121.5	135.8	134.5	102.5
Western Australia	115.9	130.1	125.5	123.5	114.6	100.7	63.2
Australian Average	152.0	130.5	126.6	127.2	132.9	137.5	114.7

It is quite obvious that the sale of Manjimup tobacco leaf in past years has depended on two main factors. The first of these is that the leaf was of a very bright colour and had considerable advantages for blending in with darker leaf so that a more attractive appearance would be given to the tobacco. However, it is well known that much of the leaf had a high chloride content. As the member for Warren pointed out, this varied from 1 per cent. to 5 per cent.; and while the percentage of Australian leaf going into tobacco manufacture was small, the chloride in the Manjimup leaf was so diluted by other tobacco that it was not a serious factor in affecting the smoking quality.

As the tobacco industry developed in Australia and more leaf with a higher chloride content became available, it did become progressively more difficult to blend high chloride tobacco into the manufactured article. At the same time, of course, we witnessed the introduction of filter-tip cigarettes, and this meant that a tobacco with more body and more flavour of its own was required.

The member for Warren, when he was speaking to his motion, indicated that returns from tobacco-growing areas were about £800 per acre. I feel that this figure is far too high and that we must think in terms of the more recent years when we find that between 1957 and 1959 the average was about £400 per acre. However, irrespective of the figure we do appreciate that the decline of tobacco growing at Manjimup is a very serious problem for the district.

In the 1954-55 season an unusually high quantity of Western Australian leaf—27 per cent.—remained unsold because of an adverse growing season which resulted in a high proportion of immature leaf going on to the market. However, worse was to follow in the 1959-60 season, when 26 per cent. of what was regarded as a good quality crop was unsold. In the next season, 1960-61, the sales were a catastrophe when the unsold leaf amounted to 51 per cent of the total crop, and only an average price of 63 pence per pound was realised on the leaf that was sold.

Disastrous sales, coupled with the advice of manufacturers and the buyers that Western Australian leaf was no longer usable in modern tobacco blends, had the effect that very few growers were willing to continue in the industry. In spite of this, the Government believed that tobacco could be further improved, and last year it undertook to support a limited number of growers who had the requirements of suitable soil, adequate facilities, and suitable irrigation water, so that it could be determined whether tobacco acceptable to the buyers could be produced.

I am convinced that with the co-operation of the growers and the advice of tobacco officers a vastly improved product was obtained, and a great deal of leaf of satisfactory quality was offered for sale. I do not think it is necessary to remind the House of the results that followed. We all know what happened—only 3 per cent. of the tobacco was actually sold at the auction sale; and the most important aspect was that after the sale 40 per cent. of the offering was sold by private negotiation; and the highest price which was eventually paid for the tobacco was then received for a lot that had not obtained a single bid at the auction. In other words, the highest price was offered for a bale that did not receive a single bid at the auction.

The Government, on behalf of the growers, made representations to the Commonwealth Government to have the leaf which was rejected appraised to determine its value, but was not successful in having any action taken. The rejected leaf—about 40 tons of it—still remains in Western Australia in spite of the fact that this follows a season in which the total amount of tobacco leaf produced was below the requirements of the quantity of Australian leaf needed for blending with imported tobacco.

I am sure that in any consideration of the tobacco industry in Western Australia, or elsewhere, we must take into account what is really the crucial point of the whole tobacco situation; namely, that tobacco growing in Australia as a whole is a very profitable industry and is expanding at a very rapid rate.

Sitting suspended from 6.15 to 7.30 p.m.

Mr. NALDER: Prior to the tea suspension I was saying the tobacco-growing industry in Australia as a whole was a very profitable one and was expanding at a rapid rate. In spite of this fact, action has not been taken to adequately protect the expansion at its present rate, with the result that manufacturers at the auction sales are able to express preference for tobaccos from different areas. I think this is well covered by the figures I gave to the House earlier.

In such a situation, and because there is a surplus to the immediate requirements set up by the Commonwealth for planting, some areas must suffer. I refer to the areas of the Commonwealth where tobacco growing is carried out. It is quite obvious that buyers have decided Manjimup should be the first district to feel the effect of this expansion of tobacco growing in Australia. As I indicated earlier, the reason they gave was that the tobacco grown in Manjimup has a high chloride content. I am suggesting that this situation could possibly have been prevented from developing by a combined grower-Commonwealth Government control of the production side of the tobacco-growing industry.

I do not say some effort has not been made; but I feel that a more determined effort could have been made in this matter, and had that been done it could have resulted in a situation better than that which has developed at the moment.

I believe that if this had happened the present position could have been obviated. As soon as it became evident that the buyers were discriminating against the Manjimup tobacco, the Government took immediate action to obtain information which was necessary to protect the continued improvement of the type of tobacco which was produced and which was required by the manufacturers.

As part of its programme the Government sent a research officer from the Department of Agriculture to the United States of America. He visited some of the tobacco-growing areas there for a period of some months. Not only was the officer concerned able to see tobacco grown under varying conditions in the United States, but he was also able to further his knowledge of tobacco quality; a field in which he had already done important work.

I would go so far tonight as to say that I believe this officer is as well informed on the whole of the production of quality tobacco as anyone in Australia at the moment; and the information he collated has been of immense value to the industry in this State. I have also been informed that some of the organisations in the

Eastern States are eager to obtain his advice and have approached the department to see whether that can be made available. However, we have a sufficient programme here to keep him fully occupied. As a matter of fact, the officer in question is assisting at the present moment in advising particularly on cotton growing in the north. But that is by the way.

One of the components of tobacco which is most difficult to control is the chloride content. Work on this has been in progress for a number of years; and when the officer to whom I referred went to the United States he was not able to learn anything new in relation to the problems that already faced us in Western Australia. Nevertheless, by a careful selection of sites and by a better use of water supplies the over-all chloride content of tobacco grown at Manjimup has been vastly improved.

Mr. Rowberry: And sales have gone down correspondingly.

Mr. NALDER: That is so, as was indicated by the figures I gave to the House earlier. A few years ago a great deal of tobacco was grown which had this chloride content, and which the honourable member referred to earlier as being 4 to 5 per cent. It must be admitted that this tobacco had a very poor burning quality; and, in fact, I am told that some of it was very difficult to smoke. I must, however, accept the advice of people who are experienced in these matters. But in referring to some of the suggestions made by members I would only say that I would rather those suggestions came from them than from me.

In recent years we have been able to improve the average percentage of chloride content; and it has now been lowered to 2.2 or 2.3 per cent. Unfortunately, this figure is higher than the average over several seasons for other Australian tobacco-growing areas. In particular it is higher than the content in the tobacco leaf from the Mareeba-Dunbulah area in North Queensland where expansion is taking place very rapidly.

Western Australia has suffered in comparison with the Eastern States in the expansion of the tobacco industry and this can be realised from the fact that in 1955-56 the total Australian acreage was 11,289 acres, of which Western Australia had just over 1,000 acres.

In 1960-61 the Australian acreage had climbed to over 30,000 acres; whereas the Western Australian share of this figure was only 1,480 acres. The following table indicates the Australian acreages, production and imports, as related to statutory percentages:—

Year	Acreage	Production lb.	Statutory Percentage	
			Cigarettes	Tobacco
1936-37 to 1938-39 inclusive	9,960	5,139,000	2.8	14.2
1952-53	11,525	5,633,000	3.0	5.0
1953-54	11,434	6,480,000	4.5	7.5
1954-55	11,418	5,805,000	6.0	6.0

I might add here also as a matter of interest that at this stage the import of unmanufactured leaf was 43,578,000 lb. To continue with the table—

Year	Acreage	Production lb.	Statutory Percentage		Imported Unmanufactured Leaf lb.
			Cigarettes	Tobacco	
1955-56	11,280	6,515,000	7.5	17.5	45,815,000
1956-57	12,180	9,660,000	12.5	21.0	40,766,000
1957-58	13,715	11,500,000	15.5	16.5	43,029,000
1958-59	15,087	13,937,000	22.0	23.5	38,742,000
1959-60	21,210	20,630,000	28.5	24.5	37,000,000
1960-61	30,200	29,880,000	35.0	32.0	35,710,000

In 1961-62 the crop had been reduced to 28,374 acres. The estimated production—the official figure is not available—was 26,000,000 lb. The percentage at this particular time had risen to 43 per cent. for cigarettes and 40 per cent. for tobacco. The import figures were not available, but I did hear that until recently the statutory percentage of local tobacco in cigarettes had been reduced from 43 per cent. to 40 per cent. and in tobacco from 40 per cent. to 37 per cent.

Mr. Rowberry: Why?

Mr. NALDER: I will refer to that matter in a minute. Investigations were also undertaken to improve the other components of tobacco, in particular to increase the nicotine content, so that a full-bodied leaf with character would be produced—and the information obtained was passed on to the growers. Growers were warned by the manufacturers of the changes in tobacco requirements and of the difficulties which lay ahead.

Many of them made a sustained effort to improve the quality of their tobacco; but it must be admitted there were many others who, because of the lack of knowledge or means of applying that knowledge, produced tobacco which was very little better than the tobacco obtained in previous years. We all know that last year, when there was a surplus of Australian tobacco with the necessary requirements of manufacturers as laid down by the Customs Department, the sales at Fremantle were a complete fiasco; and, in consequence, many growers suffered disastrously.

I would point out here that in its efforts to help the tobacco growers, the Government paid for the storage of tobacco rejected at the 1961 sales until such time as it became evident that no sale was possible in spite of many inquiries being made overseas as well as within Australia. I know the tobacco growers at Manjimup were appreciative of the action of the Government in this regard. I have not the figure here to inform members what the Government paid out in storage, but if any member would like this information it is readily available and I will be pleased to let him have it.

The Government has endeavoured by all means at its disposal to find a way whereby this tobacco could be sold; and it has

made strong recommendations to have action taken to ensure that all usable tobacco as needed in the whole of Australia would be used by the manufacturers and that its usability be not determined solely by what the manufacturers were willing to accept at the time.

I was astounded to read in the newspaper the other day that the Commonwealth Government had decided to lower the percentage of tobacco which could be used by manufacturers in order to meet their requirements and obtain the rebate of import duty with respect to tobaccos obtained from overseas.

Mr. Davies: Did you protest?

Mr. NALDER: Yes.

Mr. Rowberry: To whom?

Mr. NALDER: To the Commonwealth Government.

Mr. Oldfield: Not too loud; we cannot hear you.

Mr. NALDER: I protested by letter to the Minister for Primary Industry concerning this action and asked for an explanation.

Mr. Oldfield: Did you get one?

Mr. NALDER: At this point of time I have not received a reply.

Mr. Bickerton: The letter has probably gone up in smoke.

Mr. NALDER: I have heard no protest from members opposite. I do not know whether they took any action or not. In regard to future proposals it did appear that there was little point in continuing extensive research in the Manjimup area. As all members know, we have a research station at Manjimup which has been occupied for quite a number of years by qualified officers who have given of their time and effort in experimental work. The experimental programme planned for the coming season was initially limited to obtaining further information basic to the production of good tobacco.

One of the reasons for this decision was that there was no assured means of marketing the tobacco grown. Certainly, with the very limited quantity which may be expected, it would not be feasible to hold a sale in Western Australia. The limited quantity that would be offering would not

be sufficient to attract any buyers to Western Australia. The last sale suggested that if they did come they would not be interested in bidding for the leaf. That is the main reason I intend to give the House as to why a committee of inquiry at this time would not be able to obtain any further information or help the industry in any way.

During the last week or so we have received information from the Victorian Tobacco Growers' Association suggesting that body would be willing and prepared to assist Western Australia to place Western Australian tobacco on the floor at the sales next year in competition with their own tobacco. This is being done as a last or determined effort to see whether or not our tobacco will compare with the tobacco grown in Victoria, and whether the manufacturers will be prepared to operate under those conditions.

We took action immediately in this regard and we intend to continue an experimental area to include production on a farming scale. The proposal will enable a number of growers at Manjimup who are keen to continue tobacco production to have an interest in those areas. The tobacco will be planted on their own properties. They will, in fact, be experimental areas whereby additional information will be obtained concerning the production of a better quality tobacco; and by conducting this plan on a share-farm basis, the growers will be able to obtain an adequate reward for their part in the programme. All this depends on whether the tobacco is received favourably by the manufacturers when it is produced and offered for sale.

Mr. Rowberry: Are you going to market it as Western Australian tobacco or are you going to sell it amongst the Victorian tobacco?

Mr. NALDER: It will be sold as Western Australian-grown tobacco. I cannot see any reason why it should be sold in any other way. If it cannot stand up to competition on the market I cannot see the value of continuing under these conditions.

Mr. Hawke: Will the growers be guaranteed against loss?

Mr. NALDER: I will give further details of the proposal being put up by the Government.

Mr. Rhatigan: If you cannot grow good tobacco at Manjimup why not try the Kimberleys or the Ord?

Mr. Hawke: You sound a bit like the member for Mt. Hawthorn.

Mr. NALDER: The programme has involved urgent action on the part of the Department of Agriculture; and within two days of receiving this information we had a conference. It was necessary to immediately sow seed in order that the plants

would be at a sufficiently advanced stage, and to allow for the period of growth which is necessary in order to obtain an ordinary average crop. The seed for tobacco was planted in the metropolitan area with a view to supplying sufficient plants to grow from 25 to 30 acres of tobacco this year.

Not only further information of the type needed will be obtained, but—and this is of particular importance—there will be an opportunity to compare, as I said in reply to an interjection a moment ago, the two tobaccos—one grown in Victoria and the other grown in Western Australia. Because of that, the nucleus of an industry would still be retained in this State. This means that should there be developments within Australia whereby a substantial acreage can be grown again at Manjimup, the basic information will have been obtained and will be available to the industry.

At the same time, preliminary experiments will be commenced in the northern part of this State, although at this stage, in view of the rapidly increasing production in North Queensland and in Victoria, there is no intention to attempt the establishment of an industry in the north. Experiments will be carried out with the idea of obtaining important information so that if necessary we can eventually switch to growing tobacco in that part of the State, provided acceptable leaf can be grown as a result of the experimental work to be carried out in the north.

I would point out that last year a most extensive investigation of the tobacco industry in each State was undertaken by a committee appointed by the Tobacco Growers' Council of Australia. The committee began its activities in Western Australia and made a much more comprehensive study of the Manjimup production area than of any other tobacco-growing centre. Therefore I do not believe that further investigation at this stage would be of any help or value whatsoever.

Furthermore, after the disastrous sales last year, an arrangement was made whereby rejected tobacco was appraised by the representatives of the tobacco buyers, representatives of the Commonwealth, and representatives of the State, and by growers. Those interested will recall the remarkable divergence of opinion. The buyers decided that practically none of the tobacco was usable. The Commonwealth and State officers were of the opinion that quite a substantial proportion of it—somewhat less than 50 per cent.—was usable; and the growers' representatives decided that a much larger proportion could have been used in blends. The outcome of all this meant absolutely nothing. We sold no more tobacco. The buyers had the last say, and no alternative opinions carried any weight.

Mr. Hawke: Was not some of it sold privately after the auction sale?

Mr. NALDER: No; that was at the sale held this year. At last year's sale an appraisal took place and the buyers took no action whatsoever. This year the buyers approved of some of the bales and they were sold. The opinions of the growers could carry weight only if the Commonwealth Government, in its wisdom, decided to increase the percentage of Australian tobacco which must be used by the manufacturers—and that was not done.

The member for Warren, further on in his speech on the motion, suggested the establishment of a tobacco factory to use Western Australian leaf.

Mr. Rowberry: Not Western Australian leaf alone.

Mr. NALDER: I am sorry if I have not stated that correctly.

Mr. Rowberry: In a blend.

Mr. NALDER: That is quite right—in a blend. To illustrate this position I will cite the enormous sums of money needed for that purpose. Most members will recall that a firm commenced operations in Australia some seven years ago. That firm had assets of over £1,000,000, together with overseas backing. However, in 1956 it lost £196,000 for the year; and although its assets had increased during the following year to more than £2,250,000, its loss was over £220,000. It is now known that following a cancer scare which was published in detail during that year, and the resultant development of a filter cigarette, this firm is now making large profits.

However, a firm without such financial resources would never have survived; and the huge amount of money required to face the intense competition in the tobacco market is just not available to the Government, even if it were interested in such a venture. I think that evidence is sufficient to answer the honourable member's suggestions. From what I have said, members will be aware of the important bearing which concerted efforts by the tobacco growers of Australia to obtain control of the industry, and sympathetic understanding by the Commonwealth Government, can have on the future of tobacco growing in Western Australia.

It is impossible to say if and when such action will be taken, but it is believed that the steps taken this year within the State will retain the opportunity to take advantage of any developments which might put the tobacco grower in a more advantageous position than that which now prevails.

I hope I have made clear the facts relating to the industry and its value to Western Australia. I have given details of the investigations which have taken place; and I believe that from the facts which have been presented, and in view of the action that the Government has

taken in a final effort to preserve the industry in Western Australia, no value could come from an inquiry at this time. Action was warranted and action has been taken by the Government to try to keep the industry on its feet.

Mr. Hawke: Does the Government propose to guarantee against loss those growers who will come in under this proposed experiment?

Mr. NALDER: I have not given details of the arrangements which are being made because they have not been completely worked out. The growers have been offered this proposal on a share basis. The Government is making available the plants and advice; all the growers have to do is, firstly, to work the area, and then plant. When the tobacco is sold, the income from those sales will be shared on a basis which will be sufficient to cover the department for the work entailed. Its share will be about one-quarter, and the share of the growers will be three-quarters. On that basis the growers are prepared to go on with the experiment.

Mr. Hawke: On the basis of that explanation, growers will take all the financial risk.

Mr. NALDER: No, not all the financial risk.

Mr. Hawke: Practically all.

Mr. NALDER: They are prepared to accept it on that basis. I might say that in choosing the farmers who will carry out this experiment every effort has been made to interest those who have had good results in the sales—in other words, they have produced the type of tobacco in which manufacturers have shown some interest. As I have said, I do not believe any good purpose could come from the investigation suggested by the honourable member and I therefore ask the House to vote against the motion.

MR. BRADY (Swan) [8.5 p.m.]: I feel I should have something to say in connection with this matter. I will take the opportunity of reading to the House what the member for Warren has moved. It is as follows:—

That in view of the importance of the tobacco industry to Western Australia and to the tobacco growers of Manjimup, a Select Committee be appointed to fully inquire into and examine all factors which have produced chaos in the tobacco industry and to make recommendations as to what remedial measures should be undertaken to enable the industry to survive.

That is a pretty plain motion, and the matter is vital to those people who are engaged in this industry. As the industry at one stage got up to a production point of nearly £750,000, I think the State can

ill afford to see it go out of existence without some searching inquiry being made; and the appointment of a Select Committee would have that effect.

I cannot help feeling that this State is going back with regard to the tobacco industry, when it should be going forward like the other States of the Commonwealth. It is rather strange that other States like Queensland, Victoria, and South Australia can continue to expand tobacco growing, and we are on the way out.

Mr. Nalder: They do not grow tobacco in South Australia.

Mr. BRADY: I understood, from a speech made by the member for Darling Range last year, that tobacco is grown in South Australia. However, I will stand corrected; but the Minister's interjection will not affect my argument.

Mr. Nalder: They do grow some tobacco in New South Wales.

Mr. BRADY: The fact remains that some 15,000,000 lb. is, if I remember correctly, produced in Australia, and our proportion produced in 1960 was 15,528 short tons. Production figures are as follows:—Queensland, 7,900 tons; N.S.W., 2,006 tons; Victoria, 5,947 tons. We then come to Western Australia, which produced the small amount of 675 tons—not even reaching the 1,000 mark. This figure represented 4.3 per cent. I feel that this is where a Select Committee might do some good. It could ascertain why this is happening.

I know the Minister has made the statement here tonight—and other speakers have made similar statements from time to time—that the reason why tobacco in Western Australia has not been successful at the auction sales is the chloride content. Would it not be the task of a Select Committee to ascertain what is happening with regard to this matter, and to see why the chloride content in Western Australia should be higher than in the other States? There could be a multiplicity of other matters to be inquired into.

We know that the dry leaf in its natural form contains sugar, organic acids, drugs such as nicotine, minerals, and other burning qualities which would encourage the use of the local leaf. I know that at one time it was said that many tobacco manufacturers put saltpetre in the leaf to accelerate its burning qualities. Whether that helps to do so, I do not know.

Mr. W. Hegney: They put more than saltpetre in it.

Mr. BRADY: In addition to local manufacture, many millions of pounds' worth of tobacco is imported into Australia. A lot of that tobacco is imported from countries where it is grown cheaply—cheap labour countries. It might be reasonable to assume that manufacturers are getting their tobacco from countries where the

tobacco is grown cheaply; at the expense of Australia and particularly of Western Australia.

Some years ago woolbuyers did not want to come to Western Australia to buy their wool. I think the growers were successful in forcing their hand, and they were made to come here. The same thing could apply to the tobacco industry. It could be that manufacturers and buyers do not want to come to Western Australia; and it is up to the Government, as far as possible, to try to force their hand and to see that they do come here. The Government should also force the hand of the Commonwealth to see that a much higher percentage of tobacco which is manufactured in Western Australia is used in the making of cigarettes, and so on.

Let us see what happened in 1948. In that year the percentage of Australian-grown tobacco in cigarettes was 3 per cent.; in other tobaccos it was 5 per cent. In 1960 the percentage of Australian-grown tobacco in cigarettes was 35 per cent.; and in other tobaccos, 32 per cent. In 1961, it was, as the Minister pointed out tonight, 43 per cent. with respect to cigarettes, and 40 per cent. with respect to other tobacco. Last year the local growers advocated that these figures could be much higher. I understand that in South Africa they use 100 per cent. of their own locally-grown leaf.

All these matters could be gone into by a Select Committee and ultimately the Government could be presented with a report which would reveal where the weaknesses lay. We cannot, as a primary-producing State, let anything slip out of our hands. Time and time again we have seen industries in this State—primary and secondary industries—built up, and the next thing which happened was that manufacturers came over here; bought up the industries; and transported them lock, stock, and barrel, to the Eastern States. We do not want to see that state of affairs continue. We want to see primary industry in Western Australia built up, and we want to see secondary industries built up. A lot of these industries have taken the best part of 40 or 50 years to develop and we do not want them to slip back.

The tobacco industry in Western Australia was bringing in revenue in the vicinity of £750,000, and we cannot see that industry go down by default. I was pleased to hear the Minister say tonight that he would like to see the industry commenced and furthered in other parts of the State. That is a logical viewpoint. I have heard that people grew tobacco in the Swan area some years ago. While I do not wish to be parochial and advocate that tobacco should be grown at Caversham or around that area, I would not be averse to making that suggestion.

But the fact remains that if tobacco cannot be grown successfully in Manjimup we should look towards some other area. It may be that soil deficiencies are such that tobacco cannot be grown successfully. It may be that the moisture content of the area is so high that tobacco cannot be grown successfully. I remember being on a Jardee tobacco plantation in 1930 which was operated by a relative of mine by marriage, Mr. Fred Coombes. I know that the industry has existed in that area for over 30 years.

Families have given their all to the growing of tobacco and to the tobacco industry generally. There is not only the immediate loss to consider, but also the over-all loss of the assets of those people. Therefore I believe that the member for Warren is on the right track in advocating a Select Committee, in order that all aspects of the difficulties involved may be gone into.

I was surprised to read the speech of the former member for Darling Range, which appears in last year's *Hansard*, in which he said that the number of buyers coming into this State had been reduced to three. I think there are only a small number of manufacturers now. In 1956 there were 29 factories; and in 1960 the number of factories producing tobacco, cigars, and cigarettes was 20, according to statistics prepared by the Commonwealth Government. It is strange to relate that the number of people employed in 1956 was 4,630, and in 1961 the figure was 5,178.

So it appears that in the tobacco industry—as with most other industries—combines, monopolies, and cartels are taking over and making themselves into smaller units in order to wield greater power, and that was probably the reason why only three buyers came here to buy at the auctions in recent times.

But there is another strange thing to relate in regard to the sales in 1961. The sales started on the 8th August, and on the first day 1,021 bales were sold; and about half of those bales were sold at an average price of 61d. The sales continued and on the last day only 189 bales were offered and only half of them were sold. The three buyers between them bought the best part of 4,000 bales, but one buyer bought 3,417 bales, which represented 87 per cent. of the sale, at a price of 59.76d.; whereas buyer B bought a minimum of 115 bales—19,000 lb—costing £9,000, at a price of 112d. per lb. Apparently for this prime tobacco he paid twice as much as buyer A paid for his tobacco.

I do not know whether, when the auction was over, those buyers went away and swapped some prime tobacco for some second-grade leaf, or *vice versa*, but the fact remains that some of the tobacco at the sales in 1961 brought a price of 112d. per lb., and that seems to be getting close

to the maximum prices paid during the boom years of this industry. The reason why, at the 1961 sales, certain bales brought only 59d. a lb. while others brought 112d. a lb., could be investigated if a Select Committee were appointed; and the Government, and the Minister in turn, could be given a well-reasoned report which could be thoroughly examined by all people connected with the industry.

In addition to the growers, who must be suffering considerably as a consequence of the auctions in Western Australia, the business people in Manjimup, who were getting a considerable amount of business from the growers, must be feeling the pinch. Therefore not only would the growers benefit from the appointment of a Select Committee, but also the business people of Manjimup would benefit from it. For over 30 years the Department of Agriculture has made research into the tobacco industry, research teams have been built up, and research stations have been established. All these things will have to go overboard now because the Government apparently does not intend to pursue the matter to its logical conclusion.

I believe the Minister should be going to Canberra with the growers from Manjimup and endeavouring to get some immediate action; because it does not appear that the writing of a letter wanting to know why the Commonwealth has not done something is pursuing the matter sufficiently and urgently in view of the dire circumstances of these people.

Mr. Nalder: We want to know why they did something and not why they did not do it.

Mr. BRADY: We in Western Australia want to know why the industry has been allowed to go out of existence, when we can ill afford to have that happen. We know that other industries in the south-west are suffering. We know that employees in the timber industry are being retrenched because that industry is suffering in regard to its retail sales. That must be creating unemployment.

Mr. Rowberry: The great leap forward!

Mr. BRADY: We know that the apple industry is also suffering, and that state of affairs is not beneficial to Western Australia. We know, too, that the effect of Britain's entry into the European Common Market is staring everyone in the face and the producers in the tobacco industry, the apple industry, or any other industry will be looking for an outlet for their primary products when the Old Country does enter the European Common Market, which may be overnight.

We have to try to do something to plug the holes where we are losing outlets for our primary production to other States, because we are losing avenues for employment. The only way to plug these holes, and retain these avenues of employment,

is to appoint a Select Committee to make a comprehensive inquiry so that every aspect of the tobacco industry will be inquired into and a report can be made to the Government in respect of it.

If as the member for Kimberley said, the production of tobacco should be transferred to the East Kimberleys, well and good; but if it is found that some other part of the State lends itself more suitably to the growing of tobacco, we should transfer the industry to it because it will be for the good of the State. However, the fact remains that there is an enormous amount of money involved in the tobacco industry. On page 8 of the Commonwealth manufacturing industries return, to which I referred earlier, manufactured tobacco coming into Australia in 1960-61 totalled 611,000 lb., and unmanufactured tobacco which came into Australia from overseas—and these figures are very important in the light of what is happening in this State—totalled 35,000,000 lb. Therefore, if we add the 35,000,000 to the 611,000 lb. of manufactured tobacco that was imported into Australia, it would give us in the vicinity of 36,000,000 lb. That is not something to be sneezed at, and the value of that tobacco must be in the vicinity of £150,000,000.

Early in 1961 the *Weekend News* published an article in which it was shown that the money spent on tobacco in Australia each year was in the vicinity of £150,000,000. That is a lot of money, and it appears in the final analysis the manufacturers were able to handle £12,000,000 of that sum. We know, of course, that by excise duty the Commonwealth Government derives an enormous amount of revenue. Therefore, having regard to what this industry means to the Commonwealth Government, and what it means to the growers in Manjimup and the business people in Manjimup who are affected, I think our tobacco growers are entitled to special treatment. They are entitled to more than the normal treatment which Select Committees might hand out; they are entitled to special treatment. Any industry in Australia in which a sum of £150,000,000 per annum is involved is entitled to special consideration and treatment, and we should try to ascertain why the paltry amount of tobacco that we grow in Western Australia is gradually being squeezed out of the market.

It would appear that the manufacturers are really enjoying themselves over the way the sales have gone in Western Australia over the last two years. If people in the Eastern States had their way the same thing would apply to the wool industry, and they would have all the wool exported to the Eastern States, so that the woollen manufacturers' representatives would not have to come over here to appraise the wool and buy it at auction.

I will be very disappointed if the motion for a Select Committee is turned down. In my opinion, if the Liberal Party and Country Party members decide not to agree to the appointment of a Select Committee they will do themselves a disservice; they will do the State a disservice; and finally they will do the growers of Manjimup a disservice by letting them be thrown to the wolves, when we should be getting some advantage from this industry being established in Western Australia.

Mr. Crommelin: How much do you spend on tobacco each year?

Mr. BRADY: I do not spend anything on tobacco. I do not want the honourable member to get personal in regard to this matter, because I do not know what he may spend on tobacco—

Mr. Rowberry: Nothing.

Mr. BRADY: —but if he is any indication of what a smoker looks like, then I do not want to be a smoker. If the honourable member wants to get down to personalities then I am prepared to do so; but I do not think we should descend to that level. I do not drink, either; but I would not deny a man who wants to have a drink the right to do so. I do not use cosmetics, but I do not mind women who want to use them doing so. There are a lot of things I do not do that other people do, but I do not deny them the right to do it.

Mr. H. May: What do you do?

Mr. BRADY: To get back to the question of a Select Committee, the fact remains that this Government is letting the matter slip badly. It has been inconsiderate to the growers, and apparently it does not appreciate what the loss of this industry will mean to the State. I believe the growers in Manjimup, and the people of Western Australia who have some regard for our economic disabilities and our future, are looking forward to something more from the Government than for it simply to allow the industry to die a natural death. This is an industry that has great possibilities having regard for the fact that people will continue to smoke.

If people want to smoke, and that is one of their relaxations, they are entitled to do so; and provided they do it in moderation there is possibly no harm in it. Tobacco smoking is like everything else: if one does it to excess a great deal of harm can be done. If one drinks alcohol to excess damage can be done; if one gambles to excess damage can be done; and if one smokes to excess damage can be done. I do not think everybody goes to excess, even in the matter of smoking; but I hope the House will agree to the appointment of a Select Committee.

All I can say finally is that anybody who analysed what the Minister said would find that actually he made a speech in favour of the appointment of a Select Committee instead of putting up any sort of a case against it.

Mr. W. Hegney: And then he finished up by opposing the motion.

MR. W. A. MANNING (Narrogin) [8.27 p.m.]: I think every member in the House will agree that if he had a problem in his own area, and production in some industry happened to be falling, and the people were concerned because of the lack of income, he would seek to take some action in regard to it. Therefore we cannot blame the member for Warren when he seeks to do something for the people in his area; because there is no doubt that the tobacco industry has been an important one, and the loss of the business has affected not only the growers, and the people of the town of Manjimup in particular, but also the economy of the State to a degree. So there is occasion for us to be concerned when an industry like this wanes to such a degree, and obviously the member for Warren feels that something should be done.

However, I would like to point out that of the two members who have spoken in favour of the motion, neither one has shown that the appointment of a Select Committee will do anything to alleviate the position that has been outlined.

Mr. W. Hegney: It won't do any harm.

MR. W. A. MANNING: I do not think we are here just to pass motions because they will not do any harm. We could agree to such motions all day long; but unless we can see that some good will come from them there is no purpose in appointing Select Committees and sending four or five members out to gather information and to have a good look around and waste a lot of time. It certainly would not do any harm, but I believe we have to show that some good will come from it, and some very definite results will be achieved.

As I have indicated, in view of its effect on the industry, an inquiry by a Select Committee into this problem would have to be an extremely deep and long one because of the detail involved and it would certainly need, as members, people who knew what they were inquiring into.

I have had a look around this Chamber to see what experts there are in growing tobacco, or manufacturing cigarettes; and, unless I am mistaken, I cannot see anyone who knows a great deal about the industry, either about the growing process or the manufacturing process.

Mr. W. Hegney: There are plenty here who have a good deal of commonsense.

Mr. W. A. MANNING: I quite agree with the honourable member, but one needs more than commonsense to inquire into this subject. One also needs a wide knowledge of the industry.

Mr. Rowberry: Were you not a member of the Select Committee that inquired into the licensing laws?

Mr. W. A. MANNING: Yes, I was.

Mr. Rowberry: Do you consider yourself an expert on drinking?

MR. W. A. MANNING: One does not have to be an expert on drinking to inquire into the licensing laws, and one does not have to be an expert on smoking to inquire into the problems that are faced by this industry. The motion seeks to appoint a Select Committee to inquire into all factors in the industry. If a committee had to examine all factors it would have to start from the soil and investigate the planting process, the curing and treatment of tobacco, and the handling of the leaf.

All these factors would have to be examined to ascertain what was wrong with the industry. The fault may not lie in the growing process of tobacco. It might be some detrimental climatic factor, or it could be the fault of the manufacturers in that they cannot produce the best from the leaf. On the other hand, perhaps the manufacturer, for economic reasons, does not want the leaf. It might be the marketing methods that are at fault, or the fault could lie in the auction system or other systems of selling.

Mr. Fletcher: Let us have an inquiry to find out.

MR. W. A. MANNING: I am pointing out to the House all the factors that would have to be considered, and the details that would need to be investigated in dealing with a matter of this kind.

Mr. Nalder: What is to happen to the industry while all this is going on?

MR. W. A. MANNING: That is just what I am leading up to. It will take an extremely long time to ascertain the great volume of detailed information. A Select Committee can only carry out its investigations whilst Parliament is in session. Do members really believe that a Select Committee could inquire into this matter in the short time that is available to it this session?

Mr. Nalder: The members of the committee would certainly have to visit the Eastern States.

MR. W. A. MANNING: Of course they would. I am not denying that something ought to be done; but I think a Select Committee is not the proper body to inquire into the problem. The appointment of a Select Committee at this stage of the proceedings would not be advisable.

Mr. Rowberry: What would you suggest?

Mr. W. A. MANNING: The Minister for Agriculture has suggested many alternatives which could be followed in making an investigation. The Minister pointed to the experiments and trials that are being conducted, together with inquiries that are being made into marketing. After these steps have been taken some sort of deep inquiry could be instituted by a Royal Commissioner who knows something of the industry itself and who would be able to make recommendations concerning the industry through all the tobacco processes, from the growing of it to the manufacturing of it. However, what is sought in the motion will only draw out the situation a little further.

I think we all agree that something should be done, but the plans which have already been made and which are taking effect must produce some evidence that will be valuable next year. At that time if a Royal Commissioner with some expert knowledge of the industry were appointed to make an investigation we might get somewhere. I would be right behind the member for Warren in seeking the appointment of a Select Committee if it were to achieve results. To appoint a Select Committee to inquire into all this detail would be useless because it would not have a hope of concluding its investigations if they were to be of any value.

Unless we could appoint a committee which could show that its appointment was worth while it would be useless to agree to this motion. The member for Swan suggested sending a few growers over to Canberra. There is nothing to stop that being done, either, without appointing a Select Committee. I would point out to the member for Warren that I doubt whether a Select Committee would do what is required to be done. We agree that the industry requires rehabilitating and a new lease of life. But the question is: How are we to do it? In my opinion the appointment of a Select Committee now will be just a waste of time on the part of the members appointed.

Mr. Nalder: We would lose one season.

Mr. W. A. MANNING: Yes; and in fact the committee could not conclude its inquiry before this Parliament rose.

Mr. Hawke: The Government sleeps for 12 months.

Mr. W. A. MANNING: It is on the ground of the inability of a Select Committee to accomplish the important task of rehabilitating this industry that I consider we must oppose, at this stage, the appointment of such a committee and have in view the appointment, perhaps later, of a Royal Commissioner to inquire into the more scientific side of the industry, such a commissioner being a man who has a

good knowledge of the industry so that he will be able to pinpoint all the causes of the trouble; answer all the queries that are being made; and, finally, rehabilitate the tobacco industry in Western Australia.

Mr. Moir: What are the growers to do in the meantime?

MR. GRAYDEN (South Perth) [8.37 p.m.]: I join with the member who has just resumed his seat in opposing the motion by the member for Warren for the appointment of a Select Committee to inquire into the tobacco industry. I do so for the same reason as that advanced by the member for Narrogin; namely, that no good purpose would be served by appointing a Select Committee to inquire into this question.

Let us have a look at the motion to see how absurd it is. We all know Select Committee procedure. Members are appointed from all parties, and the mover of the motion is appointed chairman. The committee, in the aggregate, is absent for a few days, spread over a few weeks or months; it makes investigations into an industry, and then submits its report to the House. The result is that nobody knows any more about the situation. The report of the Select Committee is then either accepted or rejected, and no further steps are taken in the matter.

The tobacco industry of Western Australia has been established in this State for 32 years and it has been struggling since its inception. Over this period authorities on the subject have visited this State to examine the position, and officers of the Department of Agriculture have gone overseas in an endeavour to find the answer to our problems. We have had at our disposal all the scientific knowledge on the subject that is available in the world.

We have had individuals, connected with the industry itself, one after the other losing their life savings in an attempt to make a success from their labours in the industry. For 32 years people have been struggling to find an answer to the question; and now, at this late stage, the member for Warren moves a motion for the appointment of a Select Committee to inquire into an industry the problems of which have remained unanswered, such answers eluding not only the growers but also the best world experts on the subject. I oppose the motion for that reason.

I oppose it for other reasons, too. In moving the motion, the member for Warren made a long speech and produced all sorts of facts and figures to substantiate what he said. Many of his statements were incorrect.

Mr. Toms: You point them out! It is easy to make statements.

Mr. GRAYDEN: I do not want to point them out. The member for Warren made a lengthy speech based on premises which are not correct. The member for Bayswater is now asking me to point to these incorrect statements. To do that I would have to go through the whole of his speech. However, if he wants a couple of examples I will give them to him, and they will demonstrate clearly the point I have made. For example, I will take this statement, which is virtually the crux of the speech which he made. He said—

I wish to say that the tobacco industry is, with one exception, the most lucrative type of farm industry known in Australia. Only one other type of industry earns more per acre than the tobacco industry and that is the banana industry which is carried on at Carnarvon. The banana industry there aggregates something like £1,300 per acre to the grower, which is slightly above the earnings in the case of tobacco.

The tobacco industry in its best years—some two or three years ago—was averaging to the grower something like £800 per acre;

The official figure quoted by the Minister for Agriculture of the average return per acre is less than half the figure quoted by the member for Warren. Therefore, this figure of £800 per acre quoted by the honourable member is entirely fictitious and it is on that basis he states that it is a most lucrative industry. He said, in effect, it is the second most lucrative type of farm industry in Australia. If that is true we can feel very sorry for the other types of farm industries established in this country because for 32 years, at Manjimup in the south-west, this industry has been striving to become firmly established.

That is one instance of the member for Warren quoting figures of the average yield which, in fact, did not agree with the figure quoted by the Minister, which was less than half of the figure quoted by the honourable member.

The member for Maylands said, "Give us some more points." I will mention another merely to illustrate that the speech made by the member for Warren, in support of his motion, was based on statements which were not correct. This one is not relevant and does not really alter what he had to say. It is merely an illustration of what I am trying to prove and I quote it simply because the member for Maylands has asked for it.

Mr. Toms: The member for Maylands has not said a word.

Mr. GRAYDEN: I apologise; I mean the member for Bayswater.

Mr. Guthrie: It would seem that they are not very proud of the member for Maylands.

Mr. GRAYDEN: This is another statement made by the member for Warren, and we will see how true it is. I think the member for Warren will admit himself that it is incorrect. He said—

In point of fact the effort made by the Scullin Government in 1949 to bring this about failed, because the States could not agree.

At the time I thought he had merely made an error in saying that about the Scullin Government in 1949. He then went on to say—

I would now like to read from a report issued at that time. It reads as follows:—

Tobacco Board

From 1941 to 1948 the marketing of the Australian tobacco leaf crop was undertaken by an Australian Tobacco Board constituted under war-time powers.

Then he comes back to this subject again. This is in the process of quoting this report, and he says—

As I have said, the Commonwealth Government at that time was the Scullin Government.

We all know that in 1949, the period to which he was referring, the Chifley Government was in office, and prior to that the Curtin Government was in office. This matter is not of any great consequence, but his inaccuracy does illustrate that his statements are not factual. I make the assertion that the speech of the member for Warren contains many inaccurate statements of that kind.

I am concerned with the propositions which the honourable member put forward in support of his motion. His speech was based on four propositions, and to some extent we can agree with two of them. His first proposition dealt with the importance of the tobacco industry to Western Australia, and he went on to deal with that aspect at length. We all recognise that had the tobacco-growing industry been successful in Western Australia it would have been of tremendous consequence; no one disputes that. To some extent it has played some part in opening the south-west area of Western Australia particularly around the Manjimup district; but we must not overlook the fact that whilst the industry attracted a lot of money to that district—much of which was Government money—literally hundreds of people lost their life's savings in trying to keep the tobacco industry going. Whilst we agree with his first proposition, we must do so with some qualification.

The second proposition to support the motion of the honourable member is based on the importance of the tobacco-growing industry to Manjimup. Again we can agree with him, because naturally it has attracted a lot of money to the Manjimup

area; and the honourable member, as representative of the electors of Manjimup, must put forward the views of his constituents on matters of this nature.

The honourable member said that under the third proposition in support of his motion we should examine all the factors that have produced chaos in the industry. This is a matter which we can well query. I am sure some of us would qualify his third proposition, because I can well recall the circumstances of the tobacco-growing industry as I found them in 1937 in the Manjimup area. That was seven years after the industry had first been established there. When I visited the Manjimup district in 1937 I stayed with a friend of my family, and he was the manager of one of the plantations belonging to Michelides Limited.

I well remember the position which obtained in the tobacco-growing industry in 1937. At that time Michelides Limited was manufacturing cigarettes and cigarette papers in Western Australia. It established a number of plantations in the Manjimup area, which were well conducted. The practice adopted was based on the concept of tobacco growing which prevailed in other parts of the world. These were extremely large tobacco plantations. Michelides Limited felt it had the complete answer to the problems which beset this industry.

Before proceeding to establish the tobacco-growing industry in Western Australia, Michelides Limited scoured the world for information on the subject. Michelides himself was of Greek origin, and he did not have far to travel from his homeland to obtain that knowledge and information, because tobacco is grown in Greece, Turkey, and other countries around the Mediterranean. For generations his forebears had been associated with tobacco growing or with people growing tobacco.

After obtaining all the information and expert knowledge, Michelides Limited set out to prove that tobacco could be grown successfully in Western Australia. All the ills which beset the industry were known to the company at that time. I recall that in 1937 the tobacco crops were subject to the disease known as blue mould, and to another one which I cannot recall at the moment. The company also had to overcome the insect pests. It experimented with the different varieties of tobacco, and it was comparatively successful. The company raised tobacco in a large way and manufactured it into cigarettes in its own factory in West Perth. It produced the Luxor cigarette.

Mr. W. Hegney: And also Marvel Pipe tobacco.

Mr. GRAYDEN: I think so. The Luxor cigarette was not popular. During the war when other brands of cigarettes were

not readily available in Western Australia, this brand of cigarette was smoked. Subsequently the Luxor cigarette could not compete with the more popular brands and the company's factory in Perth had to close down.

When Michelides Limited conducted a flourishing tobacco-growing industry in Manjimup, many migrants and Australians were also engaged in the industry on their own account there, and the migrants particularly were looked upon as the experts in the field of tobacco growing. Australians in that district who were attempting to grow tobacco sought the knowledge of these European migrants, rather than the knowledge from Michelides Limited which had all the experts available. The Australians who were trying to raise tobacco at that time grew tobacco one year, and if the crop was only a partial success, they would grow onions in the following year. When they had saved a little money they would make another attempt at growing tobacco. Unfortunately that has been the pattern in the tobacco-growing industry since its inception in this State over 30 years ago.

After the war there was the spectacle of a large number of ex-servicemen establishing themselves on small farms in the Manjimup, Pemberton, and Karridale districts, all trying to grow tobacco. Almost all of them subsequently walked off their properties. Most of them invested all they owned in their tobacco-growing ventures. In some cases those settlers grew tobacco for several years, incurred huge debts, and subsequently walked off their properties.

I recall the case of a Mr. Maley, who was highly qualified in the electronics field. He went directly out of the Air Force into tobacco growing, and approached the venture in a scientific way. After five years of working night and day virtually, and after using up all the capital he had accumulated in his life, he had to walk off his property to take on work in the electronics fields with the Commonwealth Government at Woomera. He was a typical example of the person who decided to take up tobacco growing.

There are numerous instances of the same kind. I recall the case of a man who, way back in 1937, was employed in the Department of Agriculture. He left his position to take on tobacco growing, because he considered it had a great future in Western Australia, and he was an expert in this field. He did not stay long in the industry, and after a couple of years he dropped out of it.

A comparatively recent instance concerns another officer of the Department of Agriculture, who was recognised as an authority on tobacco growing, and who for years had been advising the men engaged in that industry. He decided to

give up his position to go into the tobacco-growing industry. He survived only two years, and now he has taken on the position of manager of one of the timber mill clubs in the south-west.

These were not men who went into the tobacco-growing industry with only hope and without knowledge. They were men who had the necessary capital, who were prepared to learn, and who had the best scientific information at their disposal. After a few heartbreaking years they all had to admit defeat, and reluctantly had to leave their properties.

When we become aware of all that has been going on in the tobacco-growing industry in the last 32 years, we realise no purpose will be achieved in appointing a Select Committee to inquire into the industry. It would only be a committee comprised of members from the three parties in this House. These members would make investigations for a few days from the very people to whom I have referred—the growers and the officers of the Department of Agriculture. They could not approach any other bodies than those two. After that the members of such a committee would be expected to arrive at some decision to overcome the problems in the tobacco-growing industry. I cannot think of anything more futile than this proposal. It would be a waste of time to expect the members of that committee to arrive at a solution after a few days of inquiries, especially when tobacco growers and experts in the field have not been able to find one in the past 32 years.

The member for Warren made some suggestions as to how this industry can be given a new lease of life. He made a suggestion—this is the only practicable or concrete one he made; but as far as I am concerned it is absolutely impracticable—that a tobacco factory be established in the State to manufacture cigarettes. That was the proposition he put forward as a solution to the problem.

We should realise that for 30 years Michelides Limited had a cigarette and tobacco factory established in this State. With all the years of experience behind the company, because it was first established 32 years ago when there was very little competition in Western Australia, it was not able to make very much progress. How then can one expect a factory to be established here in these days to compete with the huge tobacco monopolies which operate throughout the world? That cannot be done, and it is a ridiculous suggestion.

We can take the case of established tobacco-manufacturing firms which have produced popular brands of cigarettes up to recently. They were all huge tobacco companies and had a firm grip on tobacco sales within Australia; but they could not compete against firms which were newly

established in Australia, and which produced the filter tip cigarettes. They just could not compete; and now the Rothman group, for example, has captured a tremendous portion of the market for cigarettes.

Mr. J. Hegney: They tell me there is no difference between any of them.

Mr. GRAYDEN: I do not know about that. As far as smoking them is concerned, I can assure members there is a tremendous difference. Some firms have the secret of making cigarettes which make them attractive to those who smoke them.

Mr. Rowberry: With exactly the same tobacco!

Mr. GRAYDEN: It is all very well for the member for Warren to say that it is with the same tobacco. I do not know whether he smokes; he probably does not, and that is all to his credit. However, he says that it is all the same tobacco. If it were, I would imagine that everyone in this State—because we are fairly State-minded—would still be smoking those Luxor cigarettes manufactured by Michelides in Western Australia for about 30 years.

But what do we find? We find that that factory has closed down because the firm could not sell its products. No-one would smoke its cigarettes if it were possible to get any other type. I do not say that with the intention of casting a reflection on Michelides. That firm did a tremendous job for Western Australia. It put the industry such as it is—or was—on its feet in this State. However, reluctantly, after 30 years it could not compete. It discovered that Western Australia was just not suitable for the growing of tobacco and the firm could not compete with the tobacco from the Eastern States, and, more particularly, from overseas.

Is anyone in this House going to suggest that Michelides, before it gave up the struggle, closed down its factory, and sold its plantations at Manjimup—they were the best plantations in the area, because one must bear in mind that the firm was in that area first and had selected the most suitable land for the purpose—sustaining a great loss as a result, would not first of all have attempted to grow tobacco in every part of Western Australia where it could conceivably have been a success?

Representatives of this firm made inquiries throughout the State; and particularly, of course, in the south-west. However, they found that Western Australia is just unfortunate, inasmuch as it is impossible to grow a leaf which will fill the bill so far as the manufacture of cigarettes is concerned.

Mr. Rowberry: Do you know the tobacco that was being used in the blend?

Mr. GRAYDEN: I do not know what they were using; nor do I consider it is very relevant to this discussion. The point

is that they used tobacco which they grew on their own properties. In the days of the depression when they were growing this tobacco they were able to grow it extremely cheaply because there was any number of youths from the city and from Fremantle who were looking for work, and the pay in those days would have been as low as £1 a week.

The conditions were very unsatisfactory, as we know, because I can recall the long lines of people going through the fields just as the coolies do, in other countries. They were naked to the waist in the hot sun, with their backs bent, picking the leaf—it is a back-breaking task—and the leaf then had to be carried to the sheds and strung up on the racks which were used for the purpose. Then, of course, others had to sit up night after night curing the tobacco.

But the point is that Michelides in that period could produce tobacco extremely cheaply under those conditions and was manufacturing it in Western Australia. Therefore, it was not going to buy overseas leaf—and I think that is what the member for Warren is suggesting; that there was a proportion of overseas leaf in its tobacco—but it would not have done that unless it had been forced to do so. Obviously if it had been doing so, it did not use enough of the overseas leaf, because the cigarettes were simply not saleable in comparison with other brands on the market.

I do not want to keep on talking on this particular motion; but there is one other point to which I would like to refer before I conclude. Some statements were made in regard to the action taken by the Commonwealth Government on this matter. Some of those statements would give the impression that the Commonwealth Government was not very interested in preventing the overseas leaf from coming into Australia, and in protecting the growers in Australia. That, of course, is absolute nonsense, and there is not a vestige of truth in such assertions.

Mr. Hawke: That is what the Minister for Agriculture said tonight.

Mr. GRAYDEN: The Minister said nothing of the kind.

Mr. Hawke: He did, indeed.

Mr. GRAYDEN: If the Leader of the Opposition would just examine the question he would realise there could not be any truth in his interjection. He has to realise, for instance, that there is a tobacco industry in Queensland and in Victoria. I can recall going to Mt. Buffalo in Victoria in 1935 and seeing the tobacco kilns and huge acres of plantations in the Ovens Valley.

Members from both those States were consistently making representations to the Commonwealth Government to obtain

greater protection for the tobacco growers in Australia. The tobacco-growing areas in Queensland are represented by Labor members. I can recall that in 1954 Labor members went from the north of Queensland to the Commonwealth, insisting on protection for their tobacco-growers. They insisted that the tobacco manufacturers should be forced to use a greater percentage of Australian leaf in their products. Those representations made by the Labor members from the north of Queensland were sincere and were not to be taken lightly by the Commonwealth, and they in turn would not lightly take "No" for an answer.

I can recall meeting after meeting which took place between representatives such as the ones I have mentioned; and members of the Country Party, who also came from Queensland were concerned at the plight of the tobacco growers in that State. Country Party members, Labor Party members, and Liberal Party members—particularly from Victoria—were extremely active and held meeting after meeting in an effort to find a solution. That process has been going on year after year, yet at this time members of the Opposition here believe it is a problem which can be solved merely by the appointment of a Select Committee. By making statements of that kind they are giving no credit to the tobacco growers in Western Australia.

Mr. Graham: You thought the natives' problem could be solved by a Select Committee.

Mr. GRAYDEN: Nor are the members of the Opposition giving any credit to the Agricultural Department in Western Australia. For 32 years growers have been studying the subject, and yet the members of the Opposition claim that something could be done after a few days if a Select Committee were appointed. But these growers have not been able to achieve anything in a lifetime. The members of the Opposition would have us believe that by the appointment of a Select Committee something could be done in three, four, or five days, or a few weeks, although officers of the Agricultural Department have not been able to solve the problem in 32 years.

Mr. Graham: Give us a go!

Mr. GRAYDEN: I appreciate the reasons the member for Warren has introduced this motion. He represents a constituency where tobacco was grown extensively. He has put the views of his electors before members of this House and he must endeavour to do everything possible for the industries within his constituency. Therefore I believe he has put this motion forward with that purpose in mind. However, I do not think that even he would really believe that if this motion were passed and this Parliament went to the trouble and expense of setting up a Select Committee

to examine the plight of the tobacco industry in Western Australia, in accordance with the terms of his motion, anything at all would be achieved.

Mr. Graham: You pessimist, you!

Mr. GRAYDEN: I do not want to continue. It is getting fairly late and I know that the member for Warren will be anxious to deal with some of the points which have been raised during the debate. But I feel that irrespective of what he says, and if he does stick to the facts on this occasion and not make statements of the kind I mentioned earlier, he will have a great deal of difficulty in establishing the case for the appointment of a Select Committee.

I believe that on reflection he will have regard for the statement which has been made by the Minister for Agriculture; namely, that the Victorian growers have offered space on their sales floor for tobacco from Western Australian growers. He will take this into consideration and realise that that offers a very practical way out for our producers.

We should feel very grateful indeed to Victorian growers for this particular gesture, because it means the industry can still survive in Western Australia. We can still have those southern European migrants growing tobacco; and if they can grow it on a restricted scale and sell it in the Eastern States under the scheme put forward by the Minister for Agriculture, they will at least have the same opportunities as the Eastern States growers—and surely that is all that the growers in this State could ask.

MR. HAWKE (Northam—Leader of the Opposition) [9.13 p.m.]: I had intended to say a few words on this motion earlier but rather fortunately I was beaten to the gun by the member for Narrogin and the member for South Perth. It is perhaps significant that of the five speakers so far only one has been a smoker.

Mr. Nalder: You are not improving the percentage.

Mr. HAWKE: And I add to the number of non-smokers who have participated in this debate. We heard the member for South Perth adopt his usual method of trying to prove or disprove something with which he does not agree. He took a figure quoted by the member for Warren as being the average value of tobacco leaf production per acre in Australia, and then he took a figure which the Minister for Agriculture gave us this evening for a particular year in Western Australia. He then wanted us to believe that as the two figures differed, the claim made by the member for Warren was wrong, hopeless, and unreliable; and that therefore all the rest of the things said by the member for Warren were also unreliable.

Of course the comparison made by the member for South Perth was most unreasonable and illogical and was no comparison at all to be used for the purpose of proving what he was trying to prove, as the two figures he chose were not related at all. Very briefly I would like to put the record a little straighter in regard to Michelides tobacco factory in Western Australia. It is reasonable to say that industry finally failed after many years mainly because it was out-advertised by the great manufacturing combines of Eastern Australia—

Mr. O'Connor: That would not agree with your statement during the Bunbury election.

Mr. HAWKE: —and also to some extent because of local prejudice in Western Australia against what was being produced by a local tobacco and cigarette-making factory. As a matter of fact I am prepared to confess that at one stage I did smoke three cigarettes a day, and I smoked Michelides President, Capstan, Turf, and Craven A cigarettes; and, frankly, I could not see any difference in them.

Mr. Hall: That is why you gave up smoking.

Mr. HAWKE: I think most people find a difference because of the power of advertising which, of course, is used very intensively by the tobacco-manufacturing companies in these days.

The member for Narrogin is always interesting to listen to when he speaks, and usually he puts up a fairly logical case; but unfortunately tonight he was hopelessly off the rails, mainly because he spoke out of sheer loyalty to his colleagues in the Cabinet. He told us that we could not support this move for a Select Committee because the problem is too big and could not possibly be handled or investigated, and therefore we should not make any attempt thoroughly to investigate it; that we should allow time to pass by for a year and then, if the problem was worse, or no better, we should have a Select Committee as now desired by the member for Warren. I think I need say no more at all in regard to the reasoning—or lack of reasoning—used by the honourable member.

Obviously this is a very grievous problem for the people particularly concerned at Manjimup, and a quite serious problem for Western Australia at a whole. As far as I understand the situation, there is no problem at all in the actual growing of tobacco leaf at Manjimup. The member for South Perth sort of led us to believe that men went down there and put in their life savings and worked day and night, and did everything it was humanly possible to do and finally failed. But they did not fail to produce tobacco leaf. They produced good tobacco leaf, and they produced it in considerable quantities; and

until recent years the tobacco leaf they produced was acceptable to the tobacco manufacturers in Australia.

The Minister in his speech this afternoon proved that to us because he told us that in a number of consecutive years up to, I think, about the year 1959-60, the growers in this State received good prices for what they produced; and I think it is fair to say that the practical experience of the growers in that period was such as to encourage them to expand their production, and was also such as to encourage new people to go into the industry at Manjimup to produce tobacco leaf; so that is not the problem.

It is not a problem of not being able to produce a considerable quantity of tobacco leaf per acre; the great problem seems to be to produce each year the type of tobacco leaf which the manufacturers in each year say they need. That seems to be the problem. From what I have been able to gather from visits I have made to Manjimup periodically, the type of leaf which is acceptable to the manufacturers in one year is not acceptable to them in another year. One year they refuse to buy leaf because there is too much of this content in it, and the growers during the next growing season set out to remedy the defect. They produce a leaf with an amended quantity of the particular content—either higher or lower—and the buyers then put up some other excuse as to why the leaf is not acceptable.

Frankly I am of the opinion that the Australian tobacco manufacturers do not want to come to Western Australia at all. They can get all the Australian leaf they require from Victoria, New South Wales, and Queensland, and they can do that the more easily now by virtue of the amended policy of the Federal Government, about which the Minister for Agriculture has protested to the appropriate Federal Minister.

In this regard I am reminded of what has happened in some parts of Australia in respect of the auction sales of wool. We know that during the war growers made representations and indulged in agitation to have the auction sales of wool held in the various States decentralised to some extent; and I think we can all remember how the wool-selling brokers were very much opposed to that proposition. However, the Federal Government of the time, in co-operation with the growers' organisations, did establish decentralised wool-marketing auction depots. One, for instance, was established at Albany in Western Australia, and another was established—at least the buildings were established—at Geraldton; but, as far as I am aware, no auction sale of wool ever actually took place at Geraldton, and the reason for that, I imagine, is that the wool-selling brokers or buyers would not go there.

Mr. Lewis: It was not the brokers but the buyers who would not go there.

Mr. HAWKE: They would not go to Geraldton, because it was too far away and too inconvenient, I suppose, or because of some other excuse; and I have read in the newspapers from time to time—on one occasion, fairly recently—where, at the town of Portland, the buyers—presumably the buyers—blacklisted an auction sale of wool. On the basis of what happened in that regard, I would think the Australian buyers of tobacco leaf do not want to bother coming to Western Australia to look at tobacco leaf or to buy it because, to an almost total extent, they can obtain their requirements from overseas and from the States in which they are centered and in which their headquarters are established.

I think this problem is not too big for a Select Committee to look at and investigate thoroughly. We have heard it said this afternoon that it would be impossible to expect the members of a Select Committee, within a few days or a few weeks, thoroughly to investigate the whole matter and to find reasonable answers to the problems.

I have never heard anyone say the Select Committee should complete its investigations within a few days or a few weeks. It is true a Select Committee, as such, ceases to exist when Parliament goes out of session, but I think most members of the House would know it is then within the province of the Government to turn a Select Committee into an Honorary Royal Commission which would enable it to continue when Parliament was in recess.

I think this is a question of whether we really consider this problem to be one which should be thoroughly investigated so that we might try to find the real trouble or some answer to the problem. I have given my impression of what I think the major part of the problem is, but I could be wrong. If, as a result of this suggested investigation, the major problem could be disclosed and we could know the truth about it, it might be possible to provide some remedies which would revive this valuable industry in Western Australia. There can be no doubt about its great value. We have been told this evening, quite truthfully, that the practical experience of the growers in more recent years has been more or less disastrous, and so it has.

However, if the tobacco-growing industry could be assessed on a financial basis from the time it commenced until this day, it would be found it has produced more wealth than the total amount of money put into the industry. We would be foolish to overlook the good years which the industry enjoyed when the Australian tobacco manufacturers did come here and did buy almost all of the crop and paid

good prices for it, and we do know of the great lift which this industry has given to the town and district of Manjimup, or did give to it until the more recent and difficult years.

I was greatly intrigued at what happened at the auction sales in Perth during the last selling season. As the Minister told us this evening, only a small proportion of the total crop was sold at the auction. The fact that the buyers for the tobacco companies bought only a small proportion of the crop at auction seemed to indicate that the balance of the crop, for which bids were not received at the auction sales was of poor quality; was not acceptable to the manufacturers. Yet we know that subsequent to the auction sales a good deal of the remainder of the crop was not only sold privately to the manufacturers, but also was sold to them at very high prices.

So it seems to me that everything is not fair and reasonable and above board and straight going as between the manufacturers who come here to buy and the growers in our State who produce the tobacco leaf.

Mr. Lewis: Suppose the Select Committee's conclusions were the same as your own; namely, that it was due to the reluctance of the buyers to come here that caused the industry to suffer. What do you suggest could be done about that?

Mr. HAWKE: On the marketing of this primary product I say the same as I say on the marketing of wool, wheat, and other products, for we must have organised marketing of the product on an Australia-wide basis—if it can be so organised—to get for the growers the reasonable reward to which they are entitled for their labour. I would hope that would find some acceptance by at least some of the members on the Government side.

Mr. Nalder: But I understand that growers, on previous occasions, have preferred the auction system of marketing to any other system.

Mr. HAWKE: As the Minister suggests, it may be true that on other occasions growers have preferred the auction system. I suppose it is natural, with a system of marketing that is proceeding smoothly and which gives the producers of a product a reasonable return for what they have to sell, that most of the growers would be reasonably satisfied. But when they feel the auction system is being used to exploit them, their views can change very rapidly as we have seen in Australia, during the war years, in regard to other primary products.

However, the question which the Minister for Education asked me was: What could we do should a Select Committee, as a result of its investigations, arrive at approximately the same conclusion as I

have in my thinking in regard to the subject, and my answer to that question would be that in that situation some steps would have to be taken to organise all of the Australian tobacco-leaf growers on a basis which would give them some reasonable protection covering the total tobacco-leaf crop they would have to sell.

It would be necessary, in a situation of that kind, to have the interest and the protection of the Commonwealth Government covering the quotas of tobacco leaf which could be imported into Australia from overseas countries. I thoroughly agree with what the Minister for Agriculture had to say tonight on that angle of the situation and I support 100 per cent. the letter of protest which he has sent to the Commonwealth Government on the matter. I think there is every reason to protest about a situation in which the total quantity of tobacco leaf in Australia cannot all be sold, or cannot be sold satisfactorily and, at the same time, having the Commonwealth authority reducing the quotas of Australian leaf to be used in the manufacturing process which, of course, means the quotas of imported leaf are increased.

So I think there is every justification for the motion and that a good deal could emanate from it. I am not saying the proposed investigation would solve the major problem for the growers of Western Australia. One speaker said, "What is to happen during the time the investigation is proceeding?" Surely everything else in the industry is not going to be brought to a standstill during the period of investigation. Surely the Government would continue to do whatever was in its power to do. Surely no-one would suggest the Government would bring to an end a scheme it proposes to use during the forthcoming season should the majority of members in this House vote for the appointment of a Select Committee.

Surely no-one is silly enough or vicious enough to suggest that the Government, in a burst of spite, disappointment, or rage, would say, "If a majority of members of the House agree to vote for the appointment of a Select Committee, as they have done, we, as a Government, will bring to an end all our efforts to revive the industry." I do not think there is one member who would do that or one Minister in the present Government who would do it.

Mr. Nalder: There is no suggestion of it.

Mr. HAWKE: Yet we had the idea foolishly peddled in the Chamber this evening as to what would happen in the meantime in the event of an investigation being authorised by the House; and what would go on until such time as the committee made its recommendations and they were considered and decided upon by members in this House. I support the motion.

MR. MITCHELL (Stirling) [9.36 p.m.] : I did not intend to speak on this matter; but I would like to make a few comments. I being one of the non-smokers, like those members who have already spoken, perhaps it is not my place to make these comments; but being also a producer and knowing something of what producers in many fields suffer, I do not think the House can lightly pass over a matter which has had the effect of ruining, in Manjimup, an industry which has made a valuable contribution to the State as a whole.

As members know, Manjimup is in an area adjacent to my own electorate; and as a matter of fact some of the earliest work in tobacco production in Western Australia was done in the Mt. Barker district, and I know the trouble and expense involved in the production of tobacco. I also know the heartaches that must have been experienced when the people found their market slipping away from them.

But the remarks made by the Deputy Premier tonight have indicated to me so clearly the reason for this failure in the market that I feel a Select Committee could do no more than confirm those remarks.

Members will have noticed that when the Minister was giving us certain figures there was a very small percentage of Australian tobacco included in the quantity necessary for the manufacturers to use; and there is quite a ready sale for the tobacco produced in Australia and Western Australia. But as the percentage of tobacco increased, it reached the stage where nearly half of the tobacco required was local tobacco; and we suddenly found, as the Leader of the Opposition mentioned, that the manufacturers were not so anxious to accept the type of tobacco produced.

We all know that in the production of primary products that is one of the worst features of trying to sell. In one year one may produce something, and the buyer will decide he does not want it. So the next year one produces something else, only to find that the buyer in turn wants something else again. That is one of the great difficulties that producers experience.

I feel the remedy is so simple that any decision of this Parliament can have little effect on the question. It is, after all, a matter of Federal policy, and concerns the amount of local tobacco that should be used in cigarettes and in loose tobacco in Australia. It is not necessary for us to be mind readers to know that the present position has arisen because manufacturers are of the opinion that too much Australian tobacco is being used; and it suits their purpose to use imported tobacco.

If the Federal Government did what it should do in this case, it would call the bluff of the manufacturers and say, "We will not import any tobacco. We will use Australian tobacco." The manufacturers would accordingly have to produce, from tobacco grown in Australia, a proper type of loose tobacco, and cigarettes for sale to the public.

Possibly the fault lies in the manufacture. We know tobacco can be produced in Australia, and produced satisfactorily—it is indeed produced in great quantities. I think this problem would be solved if manufacturers were told, "You produce from Australian tobacco the amount of cigarettes and loose tobacco required."

Being a non-smoker, I do not know whether that would be possible. If I had my way I would say that 100 per cent. Australian leaf should be used; and then if we needed more tobacco to make up the difference we should import the necessary quantities. The reason is so simple that a Select Committee could do no more than confirm what we already know is the reason for the failure of sales in Western Australia. As the Leader of the Opposition has said, it is easier to get the tobacco in the Eastern States, and accordingly the buyers do not want to come here. This means that Western Australia is the first place they cut out.

I do not think I could support the appointment of a Select Committee; because, as I say, the remedy is so simple that we do not require a Select Committee to tell us what it is, or the reason for the failure of the industry.

MR. ROWBERRY (Warren) [9.41 p.m.] : I desire at the outset to thank the Minister and the various members who have spoken for their contributions to this debate. It is a strange fact that, with the exception of the member for South Perth, all the speakers to the motion, including myself, have been non-smokers. Like the Minister who began by regretting, I will end by regretting. It seems to me that this motion has been nothing more nor less than a series of regrets from start to finish.

My initial regret was that the Government allowed the motion moved by the member for Darling Range to go out the window at the end of the last parliamentary session. That was my first regret. My second regret is that the Government has regrets—and it uses the past tense, as if this industry has already gone out the window, like the motion for the appointment of a Select Committee moved during the last session of Parliament.

I want to thank each member individually. I will begin first with the member who spoke last—the member for Stirling. He wants to call the bluff of the manufacturers, and to insist that they use 100

per cent. Australian-grown tobacco before any other tobacco is included in the blend. That proposition, of course, is one that is reviewed each year by the Minister, by the Tobacco Growers' Council, and by the Department of Primary Production.

An estimate is made of the amount of tobacco that is likely to be grown in Australia and then of the amount of Australian tobacco to be included in the blend, with the object of using all Australian tobacco. So that is already being done. I do appreciate the fact, however, that the honourable member thinks it desirable to call the bluff of somebody. At the same time he is not prepared to do anything about calling the bluff himself. He does not indicate how we are to call anybody's bluff. Had the honourable member said he would support the motion he would have gone some way towards calling the bluff of the manufacturers.

The member for South Perth started his speech on quite a good note, but he then degenerated into a series of reminiscences. In the last issue of the *Listening Post* I read of advice given to presidents of local branches on how to make their meetings interesting. The article was particularly severe on those members who persisted in reminiscing. I let the suggestion run.

A common phrase used by the member for South Perth was "I should imagine". He does imagine, and he gets most of his facts from his imagination. I shall deal with only one point he raised when he tried to pour scorn on my suggestion for the establishment of a tobacco-manufacturing factory in Western Australia. He tried to prove the impracticability of such a proposition.

In this respect, if I err I do so in very good company, because recently a party of industrialists from the United Kingdom visited this State and made some suggestions to the Minister for Industrial Development and to his department. I have a list of those eminent gentlemen, but I do not intend to read out their names. However, I drew attention to the fact that they suggested it would be quite economic and feasible to set up a factory for manufacturing tobacco in Western Australia, because they had visited some small countries which have been successful in manufacturing their own tobacco—tobacco of a very much lower grade than that grown in Western Australia, and with a much higher chloride content. They said there was a complete embargo on the import of tobacco; and, as the member for Stirling said, there had to be Government support to put such a proposition into effect.

The member for South Perth referred to the Scullin Government. I did not intend to turn this motion into a political matter, but I do want to quote from a

report given to me by the tobacco growers some time ago, in order to put the record straight. The passage is as follows:—

Tobacco Industry (Issued in 1949)

No government has done as much as the Labor Government to stimulate the production of suitable tobacco leaf in Australia. The government is firmly of the opinion that tobacco growing should be one of our main primary industries.

Many will remember that the Scullin government increased the duty on tobacco with the result that tobacco production increased very rapidly and at June, 1933, over 5,000 growers were engaged in this occupation compared with 680 in 1930. Production rose in two years from 1,500,000 lbs. to 10,000,000 lbs.

However, owing to the unsympathetic policy of the U.A.P.-C.P. (Liberal) Government when it assumed office after the Scullin Government, hundreds of growers were forced out of the industry and production fell to a low level.

When Labor again took office it began to plan for the extension and improvement of tobacco growing in Australia.

It further states that increased prices under the Commonwealth wartime marketing scheme were granted during the war.

I shall not go into details about the prices, but the 1949 price was double the price during the war, because of the subsidy payments. I quoted also the section which was mentioned by the member for South Perth to illustrate that the only State in Australia which had agreed to the orderly marketing and production of tobacco was Queensland; and because of that, Queensland remains the primary tobacco-producing State at the present time. Because of the impetus which the industry received from the Scullin Government, and because of the system of orderly production and marketing which has been adopted in Queensland, it has reached its present position in the growing of tobacco.

The member for Narrogin, in a series of negatives, said that we could not blame the member for Warren for introducing the motion. If that is not damning by scant praise I do not know what is. If he had said positively that this House should praise the member for Warren for introducing the motion, because of the impact it will have on the economy of the Warren electorate and the State generally, he would have been nearer the truth—even though I might sound a bit immodest in making that statement.

He also said there were no experts in this field among the members here. It is strange that all through the history of parliamentary government in the western

nations government has been carried on efficiently by people who apparently had no qualifications for the job. But they all had a sound basis: experience and commonsense. It is not so much the ability to find facts in the setting up, the exercise, and the operation of a Select Committee, as the ability to reach conclusions that can be drawn from the facts and the manner in which the facts are handled.

The honourable member said he could not go along with the suggestion for the appointment of a Select Committee; instead, he suggested the appointment of a Royal Commission. He claimed that if a Select Committee were appointed, the scheme which is now being implemented by the Government would lapse, and the growers would lose a season of growing. I do not know how he reached that conclusion. There is no connection between the setting up of a Royal Commission and a refusal to grow tobacco. The appointment of a Select Committee would give added impetus to the growing of tobacco.

I thank the Leader of the Opposition for his masterly handling of some of the points raised. He has an appreciation of the problem of growing and marketing of tobacco which is not apparent in members of the Government or the Minister for Agriculture.

I thank the member for Swan especially for his research into figures appertaining to the sale of tobacco. I refer to his statement concerning the addition of saltpetre to tobacco to make it burn. It appears to give the Minister for Agriculture cause for mirth.

Mr. Nalder: It is generally used for curing pigs.

Mr. ROWBERRY: It may be used in the curing of pigs. I am sure the Minister for Agriculture knows all about that; but we are dealing with tobacco. I know that in my young days it was freely admitted that saltpetre was added to the tobacco to give it burning qualities because in those days tobacco had not reached the standard it has now, when burning qualities are inherent in the leaf as it is grown and after it is cured.

The Minister said that the chloride content of the tobacco leaf prevents it from burning. How does he know this chloride content prevents the tobacco leaf from burning? In answer to my questions he told us that the Manjimup tobacco leaf varies in chloride content from 1.4 to 4.5 per cent. But has he demonstrated, or has anybody else demonstrated that the chloride content of the leaf prevents it from burning? Has that been scientifically demonstrated apart from the assertion by the manufacturers' representatives? The same applies to the other qualities he asked for. We are at the mercy of the manufacturers in regard to these matters; and that is one of the reasons why we asked

for a Select Committee to inquire into these things that have produced chaos in the industry.

During his speech the Minister made certain statements; and if he had been advocating the setting up of a Select Committee, they could not have been more suitable from my viewpoint. He quoted the prices paid for tobacco leaf in each State from the year 1956-57 to 1959-60. From that he adduced that there was a falling off in the desirability of Western Australian tobacco. I think that is the reason why he produced those figures, as well as the prices paid by the manufacturers.

Here again there is no connection between cause and effect. It could have been from quite a different cause. As a matter of fact, we have had tobacco which has been under the expert guidance of the Minister's departmental experts; and it is reasonable to assume that tobacco grown in 1959-60 would be of a far higher quality than tobacco grown in 1957-58. Yet, in 1960-61 the price was the lowest on record. That is one reason why we should have a Select Committee to discover exactly why the manufacturers' representatives were not willing to pay for tobacco that was offering in 1960-61, as it can be reasonably assumed that it would have been of a higher quality than tobacco offered five years ago.

He did not—and I thought this was strange—relate his figures to the percentage which had to be included for qualification for rebate on excise duty during those years. One will notice that as the percentage of home-grown tobacco increased so the price decreased in all of those years. At the time, the Minister did not relate this; but later on he did say that during those years there was a gradual raising of the inclusion of home-grown tobacco in the blend by the manufacturers.

I want to relate these two factors. When presenting my motion I had this to say—

Therefore, we can see there are strong grounds for believing that the manufacturers' allegation that our tobacco is unacceptable because of the high chloride content was not based on fact, and could have been attributed to their objection to the introduction of too high a percentage of home-grown tobacco in their blends. As a matter of fact, I firmly believe that the manufacturers of cigarettes and smoking mixtures in Australia were bitterly opposed to the raising of the percentage of home-grown tobacco leaf in their blends.

That, in my opinion, was one of the reasons why they started this vendetta or tobacco war against the tobacco growers. Some people believe that last year it was Western Australia's turn, and that next year it will be Victoria's

turn, so that the manufacturers can demonstrate, by forcing the tobacco growers out of existence, that Australia is not capable of producing sufficient prime tobacco to supply the needs of manufacturers, or to fulfil the requirement of 42 per cent. of home-grown tobacco in the blend. If they are successful in this, they will then be able to use 100 per cent. imported tobacco leaf which is produced under much cheaper labour conditions than the tobacco grown in Australia.

I said that on Wednesday, the 5th September, 1962. Under the heading, "Tobacco Quota Reduced" in *The West Australian* of Tuesday, the 11th September, the following article appeared:—

Canberra, Monday: The minimum proportions of 43 per cent. of Australian leaf for cigarette production and 40 per cent. for tobacco production for 1962-63 would be reduced to 40 per cent. and 37 per cent. from Wednesday, Customs Minister Henty said today.

The proportions for 1963-64—43 per cent. for both cigarettes and tobacco—would be reduced to 40 per cent. for both products, he said.

(The percentages of Australian tobacco to be used have been gradually increased since 1946, when they were 3 per cent. for cigarettes and 5 per cent. for tobacco. Manufacturers who use the specified percentages in their blends qualify for concessional rates of duty on the leaf they import.)

Senator Henty said that the action had been taken after discussions with Trade Minister McEwen and Primary Industry Minister Adermann. It was necessary because this year's Australian tobacco leaf crop had fallen substantially short of original expectations.

Had I been the prophet Joshua instead of just plain Job I could have not expressed the truth more clearly. To continue—

A Customs Department spokesman said the size of the crop could not yet be assessed exactly because sales had been completed only last week. The Primary Industry Department expected the crop to fall short of the original estimate of 13,125 short tons.

Senator Henty said these adjustments did not in any way relate to the use of the 1963 crop. When reliable indications of the size of the 1963 crop were available early next year, the percentages for the manufacturing year 1964-65 would be determined.

Further to that, one of the Manjimup tobacco growers visited Victoria, and I believe it was because of this visit that

the present scheme of planting 30 acres of tobacco in Manjimup for marketing in Victoria was suggested. Six selected growers from the area are to undertake this work. I did not hear the Minister give a very clear picture as to how the scheme originated, but that is what I have heard from the growers themselves.

It is said that this representative from Manjimup had talks with the Victorians, and it was agreed that they would market a certain amount of Western Australian tobacco with their own crop. During the Minister's speech I interjected and asked him whether the tobacco produced in Western Australia was to be sold separately in Victoria and identified as Western Australian tobacco, or whether it was to have no identification at all but was to be sold with the Victorian leaf, and he said "Decidedly not."

I believe it would be a good test of the buyers' *bona fides* if the Western Australian tobacco was hidden among the Victorian leaf and it would be ascertained then whether or not the assertion is correct that Western Australian tobacco was not bought because it is not prime leaf, has not the necessary nicotine content, texture, and colour, and that it has too much chloride.

I know, despite the Minister's assertions, that nearly every one of the growers in Manjimup believes that the manufacturers' buyers are discriminating against Manjimup leaf because they maintain it is not economic to increase the home-grown leaf in the blend because it would interfere with their profits. The Minister also mentioned the fact, by way of interjection, that the growers are opposed to orderly marketing.

Mr. Nalder: I said there was a period of time when the growers were opposed. I did not say they were now.

Mr. ROWBERRY: I do not think that is quite right either. There may have been a period when the growers were opposed to Commonwealth orderly marketing schemes; and, of course, such a scheme must be a Commonwealth scheme and there must also be a controlled acreage scheme if such a system is to be successful.

I was going to say to the Minister that nearly three years ago, at a meeting of the Australian Tobacco Growers' Council, recommendations were made to the Minister. I thought it was three years ago, but there is a date on this report which appears to indicate that it was not submitted until Saturday, the 3rd June, 1961. However, the following is contained in this report:—

This Council is convinced that in the interest of growers, production of tobacco leaf in Australia should be subject to some form of control. We define "Control" as a regulation of

the annual output in such a way as to ensure that the increase in production each year is proportioned to and measured by the principle factors which govern usage of Australian leaf, namely:—

1. Increase in the proportion of Australian leaf used.
2. Increase in total consumption of tobacco products.

Further on the report states—

We therefore submit:

That there should be a Commonwealth Tobacco Leaf Authority.

This could be a corporation formed with Government sponsorship and financial assistance controlled by a Board of Directors consisting of a Chairman, appointed by Government and representatives of each tobacco growing State who shall be *bona fide* tobacco producers.

Consideration could be given at a later stage to converting this Corporation into a body with Statutory powers.

So it will be seen it is not true to say that the tobacco growers were not in favour of controlled marketing or controlled production. To continue—

We would suggest that the functions and powers of the Corporation would be:—

- (a) To be the ultimate authority for the marketing of tobacco leaf although this would be actually carried out by the State Authorities.

Necessarily the Corporation's directives and policy of marketing would be in the broadest terms.

- (b) To control production, i.e. To set a total production figure for Australia and assign it to each State in terms of weight.

Due consideration to be given to the weight produced in the selected basic year or years in each State.

Consequently it is obvious that there is a desire on the part of tobacco growers for controlled production and marketing.

Mr. Nalder: How far did they go with that? That is the report of the committee I mentioned. But how far did they go with that report? That is only the report. Did they submit it to the Commonwealth Government?

Mr. ROWBERRY: They suggested it to the Commonwealth Government.

Mr. Nalder: It has been submitted to the Commonwealth Government?

Mr. ROWBERRY: Yes. That is a report that was put up at a meeting of the council, and the Minister concerned—

Mr. O'Connor: Was to be put up, or was put up?

Mr. ROWBERRY: It was, so far as I know.

Mr. Nalder: That is what I want to find out.

Mr. ROWBERRY: The point I want to make is that there is a desire on the part of the tobacco growers to have controlled production and marketing. I listened with interest to the Leader of the Opposition when he compared this situation to that which obtains in the wool industry at present, because I am convinced that this problem is not a problem of production at all. We have solved the problems of production. The problem now is that of getting rid of the tobacco produced.

In connection with this, I would draw the attention of members to a circular I received from The Farmers' Union of W.A. (Inc.) on the 7th November, 1960, concerning this exact problem dealt with by the Leader of the Opposition. The circular reads as follows:—

At the last meeting of our Wool Section Executive the question of wool marketing was again discussed and the decision was made that we convey our Section's policy to all parliamentary representatives of this State. We therefore wish to advise you that the following resolution is sent to you for your information:

Mr. Nalder: Is this to do with tobacco?

Mr. ROWBERRY: To continue—

The Wool Section of the Farmers' Union advises that its policy with regard to wool marketing is that a change in the present auction selling system is necessary and that such a change be effected by incorporating a reserve price scheme in the auction system.

The Minister asked whether this had anything to do with tobacco. Part of my motion was that we should investigate all of the factors that have produced chaos in the tobacco industry. One of the principal factors which produced chaos in the tobacco industry is the auction system; another is the fact that there is no control in either the marketing or the production of tobacco. Owing to the disastrous impact of the manufacturers' policy, the production of tobacco this year fell short of the estimated tobacco production figure in Australia by 5,000,000 lb. All of our Western Australian tobacco could have been absorbed.

It has been mentioned that tobacco production in Western Australia equalled 4.3 per cent. of the total production in Australia. I submit that 4.3 per cent. of 26,000,000 lb. would be approximately

1,000,000 lb. of tobacco, which is considerably in excess of any production point reached in this State. We can therefore see that the Government's opposition to the setting up of this Select Committee is not in the best interests of the tobacco growers; nor is it in the best interests of Manjimup, or of the State as a whole.

The Minister assured us earlier in his speech that he had protested in a letter when the percentage of Australian-grown tobacco was reduced from 43 per cent. to 40 per cent. The following is an extract from *The Farmers' Weekly* of Thursday, the 26th October, 1961, which concerns an undertaking given by the Deputy Prime Minister and Minister for Trade, Mr. McEwen. It reads as follows:—

The Commonwealth Government pledges that, as soon as it has had opportunity to study the recommendations of the council, it will consult the tobacco growing industry, State Governments and manufacturers. This will be done to determine what modifications or changes, if any, may be necessary in the present arrangements or in other respects, to give effect to its policy of supporting an efficient tobacco growing industry.

I want to ask the Minister this: Did the Deputy Prime Minister and Minister for Trade (Mr. McEwen) ever approach him on this subject in 1961? I would also ask the Minister whether he read the article in *The Farmers' Weekly*. I suppose he does get *The Farmers' Weekly* and that he reads it assiduously as I do, he being interested in primary production. I am wondering whether he was consulted by the Commonwealth Government on this very vital question.

To sum up, I believe that the people who would be mostly vindicated by a Select Committee would be the officers of the Minister's department—those people who have battled so hard to overcome all of the production difficulties of this situation; and those research officers who have been battling so hard to follow the trends and the desires of the manufacturers' buyers year by year. It would vindicate those people and it would prove to the public that everything possible had been done to place a suitable type of tobacco leaf on the auction floor.

People in Manjimup appreciate the action of the Government in introducing the present scheme to keep the industry alive by planting 30 acres of tobacco this year and selling it in Victoria. However, I would have preferred the identity of the Western Australian tobacco not to be retained so that the buyers' *bona fides* would have been put to a proper test.

Mr. Nalder: Do you know what the manufacturers said to that suggestion? They said that if they found the Western

Australian tobacco in the Victorian sales and its identity were not retained, they would refuse to buy any tobacco in Victoria.

Mr. Hawke: Wonderful, isn't it? The tobacco manufacturers are apparently running Australia in this matter.

Mr. ROWBERRY: The House has heard the Minister's interjection. It is one more reason why I believe that the member for Stirling was very near the truth of the matter when he said we should call their bluff. Who runs Australia?

Mr. Hawke: The tobacco manufacturers, apparently.

Mr. Brady: The Liberal Party runs Australia.

Mr. ROWBERRY: I understood that one of the reasons for disposing of State trading concerns was that the Government would be able to devote itself to the job of government. I wonder who governs this situation! We cannot allow the present Government to get away unscathed, because I am not satisfied it has done everything possible to bring pressure to bear upon the Federal Government to see that something is done about this situation.

Mr. Nalder: You are not satisfied with anything, apparently.

Mr. ROWBERRY: The Minister may himself be satisfied, but he has not satisfied me. I think he suffers very much from the old complaint, complacency. He does not want to be bothered with problems; they give him too many headaches. Let the tobacco industry die; let it go up in smoke; and everyone will be happy.

The tobacco growers of Manjimup are quite willing to carry on provided they can have some assurance that their tobacco leaf will be purchased. One of the reasons why a Select Committee should be set up is that it could discover, freely if possible, why the leaf is not bought. The Minister himself knows the answer.

I will finish on a more personal note, and it may be a low note. In order to find out whether the manufacturers' *bona fides* were above board, and whether the allegations they made about Western Australian tobacco were truthful, I went to a gathering two years ago at one of the prominent hotels in the city. The purpose of the function was to entertain manufacturers' representatives, the tobacco growers, the Premier, and a few more important persons, including myself!

I busied myself with talking to representatives from the various States and various manufacturers' representatives, once the bottle had gone around a few times, tongues had become loosened, and brains were not so clear as they were at the beginning. I cornered a representative of one of the principal tobacco manufacturers in Australia and I said to him

directly, "What is the matter with Manjimup tobacco?"; and he said, "It's no Pygmalion good."

Mr. J. Hegney: Put that in your pipe and smoke it!

Mr. ROWBERRY: Those who have seen "My Fair Lady" will know the adjective to which I am referring. It is sanguinary in the extreme. When he said, "It's no bloody good"—

The SPEAKER (Mr. Hearman): Order!

Mr. ROWBERRY: I will withdraw that, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER (Mr. Hearman): The honourable member has just about exceeded his time anyway.

Mr. ROWBERRY: As he said that, he saw one of the Manjimup tobacco growers standing behind me; and he turned around to him and said, "That does not apply to yours." He was just growing the ordinary tobacco, the same as that grown by other people, but this representative had bought this fellow's tobacco and he did not see him standing behind me when he used that particular adjective in relation to Manjimup tobacco. I have told this story to give members some indication of the standards that manufacturers use when they buy our tobacco. Because of that I think my motion for the appointment of a Select Committee should have the approbation of the House.

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

Ayes—22.

Mr. Bickerton	Mr. W. Hegney
Mr. Brady	Mr. Jamieson
Mr. Curran	Mr. D. G. May
Mr. Davies	Mr. Molr
Mr. Evans	Mr. Norton
Mr. Fletcher	Mr. Oldfield
Mr. Graham	Mr. Rhatigan
Mr. Hall	Mr. Rowberry
Mr. Hawke	Mr. Sewell
Mr. Heal	Mr. Toms
Mr. J. Hegney	Mr. H. May

(Teller.)

Noes—23.

Mr. Bovell	Mr. Hutchinson
Mr. Brand	Mr. Lewis
Mr. Burt	Mr. I. W. Manning
Mr. Cornell	Mr. W. A. Manning
Mr. Court	Mr. Mitchell
Mr. Craig	Mr. Nalder
Mr. Dunn	Mr. Nimmo
Mr. Gayfer	Mr. O'Connor
Mr. Grayden	Mr. Runciman
Mr. Guthrie	Mr. Williams
Mr. Hart	Mr. O'Neill
Dr. Henn	

(Teller.)

Pairs.

Ayes.	Noes.
Mr. Tonkin	Mr. Wild
Mr. Kelly	Mr. Crommellin

Majority against—1.

Question thus negatived.

House adjourned at 10.31 p.m.

Legislative Council

Thursday, the 27th September, 1962

CONTENTS

	Page
QUESTIONS ON NOTICE—	
Coal Mine Workers' Pension Fund: Contributions, Qualifying Period, and Payments	1322
Esperance District Hospital: Extension	1323
"Esperance Flyer": Reintroduction during Christmas Holidays	1320
Esperance Junior High School: Upgrading to Five-year High School	1323
Homes for the Aged: Number Awaiting Entry to Mt. Henry Home and "Sunset"	1322
Katanning-Kojonup Water Supply: Progress of Work on Pipeline	1321
Mine Workers' Relief Fund: Contributions, Qualifying Period, and Payments	1322
State Government Insurance Office: No-claim Bonus	1323
State Rental Homes: Erection Outside Metropolitan Area on Guarantee	1321
Superphosphate in Bulk: Tonnages Hauled and Supply of Trucks	1321
BILLS—	
Education Act Amendment Bill—	
Receipt; 1r.	1335
Land Act Amendment Bill: 2r.	1323
Mental Health Bill—	
2r.	1335
Com.	1340
Town Planning and Development Act Amendment Bill—	
2r.	1325
Com.	1329

The PRESIDENT (The Hon. L. C. Diver) took the Chair at 2.30 p.m., and read prayers.

QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

"ESPERANCE FLYER"

Reintroduction during Christmas Holidays

1. The Hon. G. BENNETTS asked the Minister for Mines:

In view of the large number of miners who travel to Esperance during the Christmas period when they are on annual leave, and because of the limited space available on the railway road bus which operates from the goldfields to Esperance, will he ask the Minister for Railways to reintroduce the *Esperance Flyer* which operated prior to the road bus system, so that a greater number may travel and be able to transport all of their necessary luggage by rail?