

Council should not be concerned with matters in business life unless they are of such a character that on very few occasions—on almost no occasions—would the use of particular words be allowed. The words "Royal" and "State" would not, I think, be allowed by the Governor-in-Council on any occasion. This is, no doubt, a good provision for all the other names suggested, but every company carrying on trustee business calls itself a trustee company.

Hon. C. G. Latham: Just as a banking company calls itself a bank.

Hon. N. KEENAN: Each of these companies carrying out this type of business in Australia calls itself a "trustee" company.

The Premier: All those people who did that class of business would receive permission, but other than trustee companies might call themselves trustees.

Hon. N. KEENAN: I have not heard of any such company calling itself a trustee company.

The Premier: Money-lending companies call themselves "trustee and mortgage loan companies."

Hon. N. KEENAN: In that case I will not press the objection.

Clause put and passed.

Progress reported.

House adjourned at 11.1 p.m.

Legislative Council.

Tuesday, 25th November, 1941.

	PAGE
Assent to Bill	2088
Questions: State hotels, as to number, cost, and revenue	2088
Railways holiday service, goldfields lines	2088
Bills: Land Drainage Act Amendment, 3a.	2088
Lotteries (Control) Act Amendment, 3a.	2088
Broome Tramway Extension, 3a., passed	2088
Rights in Water and Irrigation Act Amendment, 2a., Com.	2089
Factories and Shops Act Amendment, 2a.	2090
Main Roads Act (Funds Appropriation) (No. 2), 2a.	2100
Metropolitan Market Act Amendment, 2a., Com.	2102
Plant Diseases (Registration Fees), 2a., Com.	2111

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

ASSENT TO BILL.

Message from the Lieut.-Governor received and read notifying assent to the Profiteering Prevention Act Amendment Bill.

QUESTION—STATE HOTELS.

As to Number, Cost and Revenue.

Hon. J. J. HOLMES asked the Chief Secretary: 1, The number of State hotels? 2, Where situated? 3, Capital cost of each? 4, Net revenue from each for the year ended the 30th June, 1941?

The CHIEF SECRETARY replied: 1, Seven. 2, Bolgart, Bruce Rock, Corrigin, Dwellingup, Gwalia, Kwoyin, and Wongan Hills. 3, Total amount of capital invested in the State hotels to the 30th June, 1941, is £86,385 18s. 7d. 4, For trade reasons it is not deemed advisable for these figures to be made public, but they can be supplied to the hon. member himself.

QUESTION—RAILWAYS.

Holiday Service, Goldfields Lines.

Hon. H. SEDDON asked the Chief Secretary: In connection with the forthcoming holiday season will the Government make available one of the diesel electric coaches in order to provide a fast service between Kalgoorlie and Esperance, and on the Kalgoorlie-Leonora-Laverton section?

The CHIEF SECRETARY replied: The Railway Department has only six diesel rail cars and as they are fully occupied on other routes it is not possible to comply with the hon. member's suggestion.

BILLS (2)—THIRD READING.

- 1, Land Drainage Act Amendment.
Returned to the Assembly with amendments.
- 2, Lotteries (Control) Act Amendment.
Transmitted to the Assembly.

BILL—BROOME TRAMWAY EXTENSION.

Third Reading.

THE HONORARY MINISTER (Hon. E. H. Gray—West) [4.41]: I move—
That the Bill be now read a third time.

HON. C. F. BAXTER (East) [4.42]: This Bill has passed the second reading and Committee stages, and I am informed that the tramway which it proposes to authorise has been already constructed.

Hon. J. J. Holmes: The Bill makes provision for that.

Hon. C. F. BAXTER: It provides for the extension of a tramway, and I understand the extension has already been carried out. I am not objecting, but it is rather a peculiar procedure to carry out a work first and then ask Parliament for authority to do it. I would like the Honorary Minister to explain whether that is the position.

THE HONORARY MINISTER (Hon. E. H. Gray—West—in reply) [4.43]: The line has already been constructed, the reason being that it was an urgent work. Members will, I think, agree with me that the action was justified.

Hon. C. F. Baxter: I am not objecting.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a third time and *passed*.

BILL—RIGHTS IN WATER AND IRRIGATION ACT AMENDMENT.

Second Reading.

Debate resumed from the 19th November.

HON. C. F. BAXTER (East) [4.44]: This is only a small Bill, but if passed as printed it will have far-reaching effects. Clause 3 will materially alter the working of the parent Act. When considering a Bill of this kind we have to bear in mind that we are dealing with the assets of various people who, firstly, have riparian rights. Many of them have taken up their holdings because of those rights. Others have acquired land for the simple reason that there is a stream running through it for part of the year or perhaps the whole of the year; and they rely on that running water to make a livelihood on the properties they have bought. It must be conceded that irrespective of those rights the best use should be made of the waters of the State. That is why the parent Act appears on the statute-book. The Act lays down the procedure for protecting rights; and if it is proposed to make use of waters and control them, the course of action specified must be observed. The Bill proposes to set aside that procedure, and to

place in the hands of the Minister such control that he will be able to construct minor works irrespective of the protection afforded to the owners of the land by the parent Act. The question arises, what is a minor work?

Hon. G. B. Wood: A work the cost of which does not exceed £1,000.

Hon. C. F. BAXTER: Even if the limit was £1,000, that £1,000 could be spent and then another £1,000. The £1,000 limitation does not influence me one iota. Neither do I agree that the Bill will have the effect indicated. I believe it will have the opposite effect. Parliament in its wisdom has placed an Act on the statute-book, and now this Bill asks us to interfere with the security and livelihood of many people as guaranteed to them by the Act. A meeting of ratepayers was called, and my information is that notices were sent to all the ratepayers affected in a portion of Arndale, Gosnells and Kelmscott. The meeting was attended by 170 people. Of those 170 people only a very small minority expressed themselves in favour of the Bill—something like 2 per cent. A large majority passed a motion objecting to the Ministerial control proposed until they knew more precisely what the cost of that control would be.

Hon. J. J. Holmes: What is the date of the notice you refer to?

Hon. C. F. BAXTER: The 30th April. I am dealing with Clause 3. Let us take the Act as it stands, and see how far-reaching the effects of this amending measure will be. Section 33 provides—

(1) Subject as hereinafter provided the Minister may from time to time, either before or after the constitution of the board, construct and maintain irrigation works within any district.

(2) Before undertaking the construction of such works the Minister shall—(a) Cause to be prepared plans, descriptions, books of reference, and an estimate of the cost of the proposed works . . .

Here the amending clause proposes to insert the words—

except such minor distributory works as the Governor may exempt from the operation of this section.

The amendment thus gives the Minister tremendous power. That which is provided by the 1914 Act is what the objecting ratepayers are asking for. However, those things will not be done. If the Bill passes, nothing at all will be done. Section 33 of

the principal Act also provides that the Minister shall—

(b) Cause an advertisement to be published in the "Gazette" and in a newspaper generally circulating in the district, specifying—
(i) the description of the proposed works;
(ii) the times when and the places at which the plans, books of reference, and estimates may be inspected.

(3) The plans, descriptions, books of reference and estimates so deposited shall be open to inspection by any person interested, and every such person shall be allowed to make copies of and extracts from the same free of charge.

(4) If within a period of one month after such publication a petition against the proposed works is presented to the Minister, signed by persons who constitute a majority of the owners of irrigable land within the district, the Minister shall not carry out the proposed works

(6) For the construction and maintenance of such works, the Minister may exercise all the powers conferred on the board by this Act, except the power to borrow money conferred by Section fifty-two

I want to draw attention to the formula set down, which the Minister must follow before he can declare a district. The House will do a great injury to those persons if it passes the amendment to add to Section 33 after the word "works" in line 1 the words "except such minor distributory works as the Governor may exempt from the operation of this section." That allows the Minister a free hand to carry out those minor works. In the Act there is no definition of the term "minor works," so who would define it? It would lie in the power of the Minister to say that certain works were minor works. We should stand four-square behind the existing Act and allow the principles set down in the wisdom of Parliament in the past to apply in the future, even if the undertakings should be minor works, as they might interfere with the livelihood and assets of a fair number of people. Even if they interfered with only one person's assets, something would be done that we should not countenance.

Hon. J. J. Holmes: How does a minor work in this Bill differ from the corresponding provision in the Land Drainage Act Amendment Bill we have just passed?

Hon. C. F. BAXTER: That Bill was limited to a work costing £1,000. In this instance there is no definition. The decision will rest with the Minister. We should not accept this amendment because the existing position is very sound, and before we inter-

fere with people's assets we should observe what is already on the statute-book so that justice will be done to everyone affected by works that may be undertaken. I propose to vote against the second reading because the other two amendments are not of any great importance. One of them seeks to include in the definition of "irrigation" land under cultivation. At present the application is to pasture land. However, my main objection is to Clause 3 which proposes to amend Section 33 of the Act. I hope the House will vote against the second reading of the Bill.

THE CHIEF SECRETARY (Hon. W. H. Kitson—West—in reply) [4.53]: I am somewhat surprised at the tenor of the remarks of those who have spoken against the Bill. I think it is a remarkable state of affairs. I can hardly imagine that any member who has opposed the measure has made serious inquiries either from the people affected or likely to be affected or from any other quarter, as to what the Bill really means.

Hon. A. Thomson: We are trying to find out.

THE CHIEF SECRETARY: They have shown very conclusively that notwithstanding my introductory remarks they think this Bill means the exact opposite of what it really does. The remarks of Mr. Hamersley, for instance, were astounding. I cannot imagine for one moment that he has compared the Bill with the Act, or that he knows anything about the Bill.

Hon. J. J. Holmes: He has. I saw him do it.

THE CHIEF SECRETARY: If he did, he does not understand it. The hon. member said—

Under this Bill the settlers will lose their right of bringing their case before the authorities and pointing out what their holdings are capable of bearing in the way of annual rates. They will have to accept whatever works the Minister and his officers choose to undertake, without reference to them.

Then he went on to say—

The settlers are entitled to know what new works are contemplated and what the cost will be. By passing the measure, we shall be taking away the right of a majority to protest against the construction of new works, which would be a serious matter The wiser course to adopt would be to vote the Bill out.

I venture to say that if the hon. member submits his views to the settlers concerned, those

settlers will be just as likely to vote him out. As a matter of fact, the purpose of the Bill is to bring methods of irrigation other than gravitation under the principal Act. It has to be admitted that regarding the Canning River there cannot be irrigation by gravitation. It is first of all necessary to pump the water from the river and then to distribute it by various means, such as by reticulation and sprinklers. Under the Act an irrigation district cannot be proclaimed to cover that type of irrigation, and therefore that is the first amendment with which the Bill deals; and it is absolutely essential. Under the Rights in Water and Irrigation Act, as pointed out by one or two speakers, it is necessary if a district has been proclaimed and the desire of the department is to proceed with irrigation works, that it shall comply with the provisions of that enactment, giving full particulars of the proposed scheme, of the estimated cost and the other information already referred to by Mr. Baxter.

Hon. H. Tuckey: That is provided for in the Bill?

The CHIEF SECRETARY: It is provided for in the Act, and there will be no change. Before the department can proceed with any proposed works it will be necessary for it to observe that procedure, and consequently the idea Mr. Hamersley has that these people would not be consulted and would not have the right to deal with such works is erroneous. In that respect there will be no difference under the amending Bill as compared with the existing Act.

With regard to minor works, there again we have some difficulty. It is very hard indeed, as I explained on a previous measure, to define what is meant by minor works, but the Bill mentions minor distributory works. I understand from the department that it would be very hard to find a better definition than that. The department is often faced with the necessity of undertaking some small work which has to be carried out immediately, and in the past it has taken a risk and done things it was not entitled to do under the Act—not in the interests of the department but of the settlers. Surely it is only right that the departmental engineers and others responsible to the Irrigation Commissioners should have the power to instal or proceed with what are described as minor distributory works rather than hold them

up for six weeks or two months, as the case may be, by which time all the damage feared would be done or perhaps there would be no further need to continue with the work for the time being.

To come now to meetings that have been held. Mr. Wood and Mr. Baxter have spoken about a meeting some time ago at which 170 people were present. I think that was at the beginning of this year. From the way they have referred to the matter, one would imagine that the people concerned were opposed to this proposal, but I think I will be able to show they are not.

Hon. A. Thomson: Some of them are.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: The ground of their opposition at the time was that they did not know what it was going to cost them. They were concerned about the question of licensing. I pointed out that in some instances those settlers had been drawing water from the Canning River for many years. They had the idea that some prohibitive license fee, which they considered unfair, was to be imposed. I am advised that, since they have been told the license fee is to be 5s. in the case of those people who were drawing water from the Canning River prior to the proclamation, and a higher sum in the case of those who have been drawing water since, they are quite satisfied.

Hon. A. Thomson: Is that the full charge, or per acre?

The CHIEF SECRETARY: That is the license fee. Mr. Thomson's interjection shows that he does not know the purport of the Bill. I have already said it would be necessary for the proposals to be advertised giving all the particulars settlers might desire; and the proposal in the event of a majority of the settlers being against it, would not be proceeded with.

Hon. C. F. Baxter: Not in the case of minor works.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: I am not dealing with minor works, but works on the Canning River to enable use to be made of the water, in view of the circumstances in which the settlers are placed at the present time.

Several deputations from the people living near the Canning River have waited on the Minister during recent years urging that the only adequate method of safeguarding their properties is by conservation of water below the Canning dam. I

am further told that the settlers' association again approached the department to discuss the subject of providing storage weirs, and it was pointed out in reply that the Minister had no authority to consider the construction of such works until this amending Bill had been approved by Parliament. Arising from the point I made a few moments ago, that our present irrigation laws do not cover irrigation other than by gravitation—

Hon. C. F. Baxter: These people are served by the Kent-street weir.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: It does not matter where they are. All the settlers on the Canning River are entitled to obtain whatever water is available from it in order to irrigate their holdings, in one form or another. Before the department can agree to provide the head works, which are necessary, it is essential that this Bill, or the principle contained in it, be agreed to. The department cannot otherwise construct such weirs. In any event, having decided to construct the weirs, it cannot proceed with them except with the consent of a majority of the settlers concerned. Nobody could make a plainer statement than that.

Hon. C. F. Baxter: That is, if it is a minor work.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: That is entirely beside the argument put forward by Mr. Wood, Mr. Hamersley and, to some extent, Mr. Baxter.

Hon. W. J. Mann: Are the head works likely to be charged against the settlers?

The CHIEF SECRETARY: The settlers are charged a rate on the land irrigated. It comes under the Irrigation Commission.

Hon. W. J. Mann: They do not pay the capital cost?

The CHIEF SECRETARY: I would not say whether they do or do not in this case. I have here a precis of the file dealing with what has taken place respecting the various settlers and authorities concerned in this proposal. The Canning Road Board—this is a summary of its letter—stated it was definitely opposed to the proposed action of the Minister in so far as it affected that area between Royal-street and the Kent-street weir. The board stated also that a petition was being signed by settlers opposing any alteration to the existing agreement, and that it had supported the petition. Since then the position dealing with the nominal license fees, which

I have explained, has been made clear to that board, and no further opposition has been raised.

Hon. G. B. Wood: We do not represent those people.

THE CHIEF SECRETARY: No, of course not. I think Mr. Wood was, perhaps, debating without his book when he spoke in the manner he did on this measure. The Gosnells Road Board and the Armadale-Kelmscott Road Board called a meeting—the one referred to by Mr. Baxter—at which no less than 170 persons were present. The meeting decided that an objection be lodged against control until the people knew more fully what the cost of that control would be. They have been told now that the license fees are to be 5s. and 20s. respectively.

Hon. G. B. Wood: Tell us about the meeting held at Roleystone!

The CHIEF SECRETARY: In a Press cutting relating to that particular meeting it is reported that the chairman stated the Darling Range Road Board had decided to welcome the proposal. Next on the file is a letter from Mr. W. Orr in which he claims to speak on behalf of the orchardists who depend on water from the Canning River. He said they would respectfully urge that the Minister go right ahead with the proclamation, thus serving the interests of the people of the district. The whole district can be adequately served by conservation and control if the Minister proceeds with this proclamation. As the position has been definitely getting worse, they expressed the sincere hope that the Minister would proclaim the river forthwith.

Hon. C. F. Baxter: He does not use the Canning River.

Hon. G. B. Wood: What has the Darling Range Road Board got to do with the Canning River?

The CHIEF SECRETARY: I know Mr. Orr.

Hon. C. F. Baxter: So do I.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: I do not think he would write a letter to the Minister purporting to speak on behalf of the settlers and many orchardists dependent on the Canning River in these terms unless he had authority so to do.

Hon. C. F. Baxter: He does not use the water.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: He was speaking on behalf of the many orchardists dependent on that river. I do not question his bona fides—even if Mr. Baxter does. I next have the views of the W.A. Fruit-growers' Association supported by Mr. R. S. Sampson, M.L.A. A precis of their position is this: That a committee was appointed at a meeting of property owners abutting the Canning River. It has fully investigated the proposal and definitely approves such a proposition as the only means by which the whole district can be adequately supplied with sufficient water. It is emphatically of the opinion that sufficient water can be conserved to meet requirements, and that the only way it can be conserved and controlled is by means of the proposed proclamation. That committee held three meetings after which it was decided it would support this proposal. The file later contains a letter from Mr. Sampson himself in which he states that he is definitely in favour of control, and believes that if the settlers are advised of the approximate cost of the proposed preliminary action, the result would be almost complete unanimity of approval. This has been done, as I have already advised the House. So much for the criticism of the Bill.

Clause 3 deals with minor works and states that Section 33 of the principal Act is amended by inserting in Subsection (2) after the word "works" in the first line the words "except such minor distributory works as the Governor may exempt from the operation of this section." What better phraseology could be used? First of all, what does "distributory works" mean? They are those smaller undertakings that become necessary once the main works have been completed. The department, apart from the question of expense, would not worry very much if it had to go through the whole process, but I think it would worry the settlers. So far as the department is concerned, the necessary authority exists and the object of the Irrigation Commissioners is to assist and not to impede. The legislation which has been on the statute-book for many years, and was passed at a time when, perhaps, it was not possible to appreciate what the developments would be in future years, has been proved to be deficient. It is unfair to ask the officers of the department to take risks, which they have done in the past, simply because our

legislation does not satisfactorily cover the position.

Hon. J. J. Holmes: Members complained when the officers took a risk up North in the case of a tramline extension!

The CHIEF SECRETARY: That risk was overlooked. That was a railway matter, and it is necessary to have an Act of Parliament to authorise the construction of all railways and extensions of railways.

Hon. J. Cornell: It is necessary to condone the evil.

Hon. C. F. Baxter: Nobody objected to it.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: In this particular case, the department is anxious to assist settlers who have been experiencing a very hard time over a period of years, and if the only way they can be assisted is by conserving water in the Canning River below the Canning dam, it is not likely that the Government or the department would go ahead with any such proposal unless the settlers affected approved of the scheme. The Government is not looking forward to an expenditure of some thousands of pounds which will not be appreciated. It must have some regard for the interests of all the settlers, and if, by this Bill, we give the necessary authority whereby irrigation, other than by gravitation methods, can be covered, and the settlers along this river can secure the water so necessary, I do not think this House should raise any objection.

Notwithstanding the statements made by those members who oppose the Bill, if they had consulted the people directly concerned in this matter it would have been difficult for them to have given utterance to their criticisms. Let me reiterate that this amending Bill will not alter the position respecting the procedure so far as the main works are concerned. The Government cannot possibly proceed with any work of that type unless the settlers approve and are provided with all the information necessary for them to have. Regarding the minor distributory works, if we cannot trust our engineers in matters of this kind, it is a pity. My knowledge of the officials associated with the Irrigation Department is that they are just as keen as, and perhaps more so, than even some of the settlers to get the best possible results from the water available. In view of the correspondence, the number of meetings held and the representations made to the Minister from time to time dealing with this very vexed question, I feel that the House

ought to approve of the Bill because it is the only way whereby we shall be enabled to put the necessary works in hand.

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

Ayes	17
Noes	7
Majority for	10

AYES.

Hon. L. B. Bolton
Hon. L. Craig
Hon. J. A. Dimmitt
Hon. J. M. Drew
Hon. G. Fraser
Hon. E. H. Gray
Hon. E. H. H. Hall
Hon. J. J. Holmes
Hon. W. H. Kitson

Hon. J. M. Macfarlane
Hon. W. J. Mann
Hon. G. W. Miles
Hon. T. Moore
Hon. H. V. Plesse
Hon. H. Tuckey
Hon. C. B. Williams
Hon. H. Seddon
(Teller.)

NOES.

Hon. C. F. Baxter
Hon. Sir Hal Colebatch
Hon. J. Cornell
Hon. A. Thomson

Hon. F. R. Welsh
Hon. G. B. Wood
Hon. V. Hamersley
(Teller.)

Question thus passed.

Bill read a second time.

To Refer to Select Committee.

HON. V. HAMERSLEY (East) [5.20]: I move—

That the Bill be referred to a select committee; that the committee may adjourn from place to place and have power to call for persons, papers and records; that three members shall form a quorum, and that the committee report on Tuesday, the 9th December.

HON. J. CORNELL (South) [5.21]: In view of the vote taken on the second reading, there is not the slightest need to refer the Bill to a select committee. All said and done, what is in the balance? Practically no more than was in the balance in connection with the amendment to the Land Drainage Act. Therefore to submit the Bill to a select committee would be only a waste of time and money. I believe the measure can be amended along the lines of the Land Drainage Act Amendment Bill. There must be a motive for everything, and I think the motive of the hon. member in moving for a select committee is to block this proposed legislation.

Hon. J. J. Holmes: Is the hon. member in order in making a statement of that sort?

The PRESIDENT: The hon. member must not reflect on any other member of the House.

Hon. J. CORNELL: I withdraw the statement. What evidence could be called that has not already been put forward in con-

nection with the parent Act? I hope the Bill will not be referred to a select committee, particularly in view of the large majority by which the second reading was passed. That vote represented the decision of the House on the Bill. When we examine the measure, we find that there is very little in it. As the House was so emphatic that the Bill should be read a second time, we should proceed with consideration of the measure in Committee.

THE CHIEF SECRETARY (Hon. W. H. Kitson—West) [5.23]: I, too, suggest that there is very little necessity for an inquiry by a select committee. We have the parent Act, and this amendment has been brought forward for the purposes I have explained. If we agree that it is necessary to take control of irrigation areas so that all settlers in a particular area may be treated fairly, I cannot see the need for an inquiry. Only two points are involved in the Bill. The first is whether irrigation by other than gravitation shall be controlled, and the second is that of exempting minor works from the provisions of the Act which require certain formalities that occupy six to eight weeks and are rather expensive, especially in the matter of advertising, etc. Why anyone, in view of those facts, should want an inquiry by a select committee is beyond my comprehension. Therefore I shall vote against the motion.

HON. V. HAMERSLEY (East—in reply) [5.25]: In moving for a select committee, my desire was to obtain evidence from a number of settlers in order to satisfy the House. I cannot follow the argument of the Minister; nor can the settlers affected. They look to their representatives in this House to protect their interests, and I have taken what I consider to be the right course in endeavouring to get an inquiry so that the House may have better knowledge as to how the proposed amendments will affect the settlers. A large number of the orchardists feel that they have difficulties enough to eke out a living on their holdings without being involved in further responsibilities. Many of them have been irrigating their holdings for years, but according to my reading of the Bill, these proposals will take control from them and empower the Minister to instal works and make charges against which they will have no opportunity to protest. This

is the last chance to get evidence from the people who will be directly affected, and that was my object in moving for the appointment of a select committee. I have made an effort on behalf of those settlers, and I hope the House will view the matter in the same light as I do.

Question put and negatived.

In Committee.

Hon. H. Seddon in the Chair; the Chief Secretary in charge of the Bill.

Clause 1—agreed to.

Clause 2—Amendment of Section 2:

Hon. J. CORNELL: The question to be decided on this clause is whether the law shall remain as it is or whether the rights of settlers shall be taken away and superseded by something else.

Hon. J. J. Holmes: The Minister said this clause will not take away their rights.

Hon. J. CORNELL: Then there is no need for the clause and it should be struck out. The first proposal is to delete from the definition of "irrigable" the words "by gravitation." This will permit of something that is not provided for in the Act. It will give the irrigation authorities greater control than they have at present, and the question is whether the control of the settlers affected will not thereby be lessened.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: I cannot understand why members should be under any misapprehension. The Act provides for the proclamation of irrigation districts where irrigation is by gravitation, but not for the proclamation of districts where irrigation is by any other method. The only method by which land can be irrigated from the Canning River is by pumping the water from the stream and distributing it. The Bill is designed to provide that irrigation districts may be proclaimed in those areas where that method of irrigation is adopted. In the past, trouble has arisen from the fact that certain settlers from time to time were taking more than their share of water.

Hon. G. B. Wood: We have not heard of that trouble.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: They have prevented other settlers from getting what those settlers considered to be their share. That will always happen in districts where there is an absence of control. Persons who first settle in such districts say, "The water is ours and the other persons can go to

blazes." After the Bill is passed, nothing else can happen until such time as a proclamation is issued. When introducing the Bill, I said it was the desire and intention of the department in the near future, if the Bill passed, to proclaim an irrigation district for the Canning River. After the proclamation has been issued, it will be necessary, before the department can proceed with any proposed work, to advertise it, giving estimates of the cost and setting out the land that will be affected and rated. The persons concerned will get all the information they could possibly wish for. At that stage, if the settlers decide they do not want the work proceeded with, they can say so, and the department will not proceed with it. The settlers cannot expect to have more power than that.

Hon. G. W. Miles: You are not taking any power away from the settlers, except as to minor works?

The CHIEF SECRETARY: That is so; except this—I do not want to be accused of misrepresentation—that those settlers do not come under the Act because they are pumping water from the Canning River. The water is not obtained by gravitation.

Hon. H. Tuckey: The whole matter will then be under control.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: Yes. It will be controlled as fairly as it is possible to control matters of this kind.

Hon. L. CRAIG: There is nothing wrong with the Bill. It merely seeks to put irrigationists using sprinklers on the same basis as those obtaining water by gravitation. It is necessary that certain minor works should be undertaken and completed without the necessity for advertising; we discussed that point when dealing with another measure. People living in irrigation districts represented by some members in this Chamber have no objection at all to the measure.

Hon. G. FRASER: When this legislation was before us a couple of years ago, I said that one river which required bringing under the Act was the Canning River. What has happened since then has strengthened my statement. I am interested in an orchard property in that district. We draw water from the Canning River and last year was the first occasion when we experienced a shortage. It may have been due to the dry season or because more water was

drawn from the river by people in the higher reaches.

Hon. V. Hamersley: The water did not all belong to the Canning River.

Hon. G. B. Wood: Are you au fait with the position?

Hon. G. FRASER: Yes. The Bill will provide some method of controlling the people higher up the river. That is the point I make.

Hon. G. B. Wood: Where is your property, at Kelmescott?

Hon. G. FRASER: About half way between Maddington and Gosnells. I repeat that if any river needs controlling, it is the Canning River. It is not a large stream and many people are drawing water from it. Those on the higher reaches are taking a larger quantity than they are entitled to. Those lower down should get a fair share.

Hon. J. CORNELL: The Bill does not deal with the Canning River. The clause seeks to amend the definition of "irrigable" in the parent Act. It also seeks to amend the definition of "irrigation" by the inclusion, before the words "of tillage," of the words "of cultivation of any kind or." I cannot understand what orchardists on the Canning River have to be afraid of regarding the Bill.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: I again say that I do not want to be accused of misrepresentation in any shape or form. The Bill will apply to the whole State.

Hon. J. M. MACFARLANE: As a representative of people in one portion of the district through which the Canning River runs, I say that what the Minister has told the Committee is correct. The settlers who were opposed to the draining of water away from them until the Kent-street weir was constructed now favour this measure and that is the reason I voted for it. I would like the people in the whole district to know that we have given the matter serious consideration and are not supporting anything that will be detrimental to them.

Clause put and passed.

Clause 3—Amendment of Section 33:

Hon. J. CORNELL: In a previous Bill dealing with a kindred subject there is a clause very similar to this one. That clause was amended to define the particular class of work involved. I do not know whether the Minister intends that the same qualification should be inserted in this clause.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: Much difficulty has been experienced in finding some means of defining works that are of a minor nature. We should be prepared to trust our irrigation experts in small matters of this kind. I do not know that I would raise any very strong objection to some limit being imposed as a means of defining what minor works would be.

Hon. J. Cornell: I suggest £500.

Hon. G. W. Miles: Why not have the same provision as we had in the other Bill?

The CHIEF SECRETARY: If any objection is raised to such an amendment, another place can raise it. I have done my best to define what shall be regarded as minor works. After all, such works would only be of a distributory nature and would not constitute head works.

Hon. W. J. MANN: Last week members of the South-West Province had an opportunity to meet many people who were interested in irrigation matters. We did not note a single instance in which objection was raised to this measure. They also were prepared to accept a minor work as one the expenditure on which would not exceed £1,000.

Hon. J. CORNELL: The principle involved in this Bill is the same as that involved in the other Bill. I move an amendment—

That in line 4 the word "minor" be struck out.

Amendment put and passed.

Hon. J. CORNELL: I move an amendment—

That in line 4 after the word "works" the words "the estimated cost of which shall not exceed £500" be inserted.

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

Clause 4, Title—agreed to.

Bill reported with amendments.

BILL—FACTORIES AND SHOPS ACT AMENDMENT.

Second Reading.

THE HONORARY MINISTER (Hon. E. H. Gray—West) [5.52] in moving the second reading said: This is a small Bill, which seeks to amend the Factories and Shops Act, 1920-1937. Its main proposals may be summarised as follows:—

(a) To provide that the Minister shall have

authority to grant a permit to the owner of a factory to operate two shifts for female workers in one day.

(b) To establish a uniform maximum working week of 44 hours in factories, warehouses and shops for all employees irrespective of sex and age.

Hon. G. W. Miles: Is this some more non-contentious legislation?

The HONORARY MINISTER: It is not very contentious in view of the developments that are occurring. I continue the summary of the Bill—

(c) To extend the definition of "factory" to the end that any building in which any unnaturalised person is engaged shall be regarded as a factory, and to alter such definition for the purpose of including any building in which lead processes are carried on or in which paint is manufactured or mixed or applied by the spraying method.

I imagine that this provision will have the support of those members who expressed similar ideas when we were dealing with a Bill in which potato growers were interested. The summary of the measure continues—

(d) To insert in the Act a definition of the term "paint" to allow for regulations to be made in respect of those industries in which paint is manufactured, etc., or applied by spraying.

There has been a lot of research work in connection with this part of the measure, and I think that portion of it will be passed without opposition.

(e) To amend the Act in respect to the maximum period which may be worked in any one day by increasing that period by 18 minutes.

(f) To provide a substitute holiday in respect to any statutory holiday falling on a Sunday.

(g) To amend that part of the Act dealing with the provision of fire escapes and adequate fire appliances in factories.

One of the most important of the proposals in the Bill is that dealing with the granting of a permit to the owner of a factory to operate two shifts for female workers in one day. This is designed to meet any conditions arising as a result of the present national emergency, and will operate during the continuance of the war and for a period of 12 months thereafter, but no longer. This important provision of the Bill we must pass in order to give effect to the necessity for working females in shifts in the factories. It may be argued that the National Security regulations will come into force in this respect, but the Government

feels that it is better to have legislation of this kind embodied in our own Act.

Hon. J. J. Holmes: You cut down the working hours by four per week and you then provide for double shifts.

The HONORARY MINISTER: I will explain that in Committee. This is essentially a Committee Bill.

Hon. J. M. Macfarlane: Will the Bill operate only during the period of the war and no longer?

The HONORARY MINISTER: Certain provisions will operate for that period.

Hon. J. Cornell: Why not leave it to the Arbitration Court to grant preference to unionists?

The HONORARY MINISTER: Many of those concerned are not registered, so that they cannot appear before the Arbitration Court.

Hon. J. Cornell: Do you say that preference of employment will be given to members of organisations registered with the Arbitration Court?

The HONORARY MINISTER: All these arguments can be dealt with when the Bill is discussed in Committee.

Hon. L. B. Bolton: It is possible that the Bill may not reach the Committee stage.

The HONORARY MINISTER: I should be very surprised if a Bill of this nature did not pass the second reading stage.

Hon. J. Cornell: It goes outside the war effort altogether.

Hon. G. W. Miles: To what clause are you referring now?

The HONORARY MINISTER: I am dealing with the question of amending the Act to provide that females may be permitted to work two shifts. The Act does not allow the employment of females for more than one shift in any one day, and in that respect it over-rides the Arbitration Court and any award or industrial agreement issued by the court. It is the one and only part of the Factories and Shops Act which does over-ride that court. Certain factories in this State have had great demands made upon them by urgent defence requirements, and considerable difficulty has been experienced in coping with the demands, mainly for the reason that the factories are unable to work female employees during a second shift.

A small-arms munitions factory which is being erected at Welshpool and will be

operating early in 1942, will employ a large number of female workers, and will require to work them a second shift; but under the Act that will not be possible. The Commonwealth Government, under its National Security regulations, could doubtless meet the position, but it is preferable that the matter be dealt with through the ordinary industrial legislation of the State.

The Bill sets out several safeguards in connection with any permit that may be granted for the purpose of enabling a factory to work females on a second shift. It provides that the Minister may allow women to be employed on shift work in any factory between the hours of 7 o'clock in the morning and 11 o'clock in the evening on the same day. Permits may be granted for such period or periods and upon such terms and conditions as to starting and finishing times of shifts, meal times and overtime, as the Minister may determine. No permit shall authorise the employment on shift work of any woman under the age of 18 years at any time between 6 o'clock in the evening and 7 o'clock in the following morning.

In any factory where workers are employed on shift work the occupier shall, in addition to payment of wages, overtime and any other allowances prescribed by the Act, pay such worker the sum of 12s. per week. That allowance is a special one and is in accordance with the general industrial practice in Australia, and with decisions made by industrial tribunals in other States besides Western Australia. The Bill provides, too, that where a permit is granted by the Minister in this respect, preference of employment in factories shall be granted to trade unionists. That provision has been inserted in order to keep in step with modern conditions and to preserve industrial peace.

Hon. W. J. Mann: That would be good in the Army too.

The HONORARY MINISTER: There are many good solid unionists in the Army. Another important proposal is that which aims to establish a uniform maximum working week of 44 hours in factories, warehouses and shops. Under the Act the maximum working week is 48 hours for male workers and 44 hours per week for females and for boys under the age of 16 years. Every female employed in a factory, warehouse or shop can be worked for no longer than 44 hours per week, except under special overtime provisions. Every male worker over

16 years of age can be worked to a maximum of 48 hours per week in any factory, warehouse or shop, and may be worked more than 48 hours per week under special overtime provisions.

The proposal to establish a uniform working week of 44 hours, irrespective of sex or age, is considered by the Government to be highly desirable. The 44-hour week has become general in Western Australia where approximately 90 per cent. of the Arbitration Court awards and industrial agreements provide for such a working week. The 44-hour week is the basis upon which the Industrial Arbitration Court works.

The provisions of the Act are operative only in respect to factories, warehouses and shops where no award or industrial agreement is operating, and they do not override any award of the Arbitration Court. The Factories and Shops Act only applies where Arbitration Court awards and industrial agreements are not applicable. Where an Arbitration Court award or industrial agreement is applicable, the provisions of the Factories and Shops Act have no effect. It is hoped that Parliament will approve of this amendment so that the working week may be made uniform for all.

It is proposed to amend the definition of "factory" for three purposes. Under the Act any building in which a Chinese or member of any other Asiatic race is engaged, is regarded as a "factory." The Bill seeks to bring within that definition any building in which any unnaturalised person is employed.

Hon. L. Craig: Even an American?

The HONORARY MINISTER: Well, yes! There are many buildings in which unnaturalised persons are operating and by reason of the fact that four or more individuals are not employed there, the premises in question are not factories for the purposes of the Act and are not therefore subject to investigation and control.

Hon. J. Cornell: That is exactly what we said about the issuing of licenses to potato growers.

The HONORARY MINISTER: I do not think there is any similarity whatever between this Bill and that relating to the licensing of potato growers.

Hon. J. Cornell: The same reasoning applies.

The HONORARY MINISTER: This Bill will mean that aliens will have to operate under trading conditions similar to those

applying to our own people, whereas the amendment proposed to the Potato Growers Licensing Bill was to shut out unnaturalised aliens altogether.

Hon. H. V. Piesse: Not shut them out altogether; they were to be permitted to work.

The HONORARY MINISTER: The purpose of the present Bill is to place everyone on a proper footing and allow a fair opportunity for equal competition in trade.

Hon. J. J. Holmes: What about unionists?

The HONORARY MINISTER: The question of unionists does not arise.

Hon. Sir Hal Colebatch: What do you mean by "any unnaturalised person"? You and I are not naturalised.

The HONORARY MINISTER: That is not the same.

Hon. Sir Hal Colebatch: We are native born, not naturalised.

The HONORARY MINISTER: That is so.

Hon. Sir Hal Colebatch: The term "unnaturalised" would include any natural-born Australian or Britisher.

The HONORARY MINISTER: It would exclude everyone who was not an Australian or a Britisher.

Hon. Sir Hal Colebatch: An Australian is not a naturalised British subject.

Hon. J. Cornell: The word "alien" would be the better term to use.

The HONORARY MINISTER: If that is the only objection Sir Hal can raise to the Bill, we can easily overcome that difficulty. It is considered very desirable that the required supervision and control should be exercised in the direction I have indicated so as to ensure necessary protection for the public and to establish a reasonable basis of competition.

The other amendments to the definition of the term "factory" are for the purpose of including any building in which lead processes are being carried on, or in which paint is manufactured or mixed or applied by the spraying method. Closely related to this amendment is a proposal in the Bill to insert in the Act a definition of the word "paint." Much research work has been undertaken in regard to paint, particularly in view of the new spraying method that has been adopted. Medical experts and others consider it desirable that the amendments outlined should be included in our legislation.

These amendments are necessary to enable special regulations, for which the Act makes provision in respect to special industries, to be applied to the painting industry and to buildings in which paint is manufactured or mixed or applied by the spraying method. Some industries are already covered by regulations for the purpose of protecting the health of employees. These regulations allow for close supervision, and they aim at the establishment of the best possible preventive methods so that the health of the workers concerned may be safeguarded as far as possible.

Another amendment included in the Bill seeks to make it possible for 44 hours to be worked in five days in cases where an agreement to do so is arrived at between employer and employee. In this regard the aim is to increase the present maximum working period per day by 18 minutes and thereby to increase an already agreed-upon maximum by three minutes. Several factories already operate the 44-hour week in five days by an arrangement between employers and employees, and in order to make such an arrangement legal under the Factories and Shops Act this small amendment is proposed.

The principal Act provides that where Christmas Day, Boxing Day, New Year's Day, Anzac Day or the birthday of the reigning Sovereign falls on a Sunday, then the whole holiday shall be allowed on the next ensuing Monday. Under the Factories and Shops Act, however, there are a number of other holidays for which no substitute holidays are provided, should any of them fall on a Sunday. The Bill seeks to make that particular provision uniform.

Another proposal in the Bill seeks to make an advance in connection with the provision of fire escapes and adequate fire appliances in factories. It also aims to provide for fire escapes and fire appliances being installed in warehouses and shops. Under the Act it is not necessary for such fire escapes and appliances to be provided in warehouses and shops, only factory buildings having been covered. In some instances warehouses and shops are larger than are many factories that come under the provisions of the Act in this respect. It is considered highly desirable, therefore, that shops and warehouses should be covered by the Act, so that the necessary safety measures against fire may be enforced.

Hon. J. Cornell: Why reduce the number of employees from 15 to 10 with reference to the provision of safeguards?

The HONORARY MINISTER: We can discuss that phase later on.

Hon. J. Cornell: That is the catch.

The HONORARY MINISTER: There is no catch in that at all. At the present time a number of factories are not subject to the Act in this connection. It is proposed under the Bill that the maximum number of employees necessary before any safeguards will have to be made available shall be 10 instead of the present number 15.

There are some other amendments included in the Bill. For instance, there is one which provides that an inspector may enter upon any factory or shop by night as well as by day. At the present time an inspector has power to enter only during the day. There is also an amendment which deals with the early closing of butchers' shops, the idea being that retail butchers within 30 miles of the General Post Office, Perth, shall not be open until 7 o'clock in the morning on each week day from Monday to Friday, and shall be closed at 5 o'clock in the evening of such week days.

Hon. H. Seddon: How will the worker be able to get his breakfast?

The HONORARY MINISTER: This provision will not affect him at all. It is further proposed that on Saturdays shops shall not be open until 6 o'clock in the morning and shall be closed at 12 noon. These provisions have been agreed upon by the master butchers and the employees.

Hon. H. Seddon: What about the consumers?

The HONORARY MINISTER: They will not be affected.

Hon. J. Cornell: Who are the master butchers? The retailers or the wholesalers?

The HONORARY MINISTER: The retailers. I am not trying to put a joke over members! As I say, this provision has the support of the Master Butchers' Association and it is considered that no unnecessary inconvenience will be caused to the general public.

Hon. T. Moore: The master butchers have written to members of this House about the matter.

Hon. J. M. Macfarlane: That only applies to the 5 o'clock closing, not to the opening at 7 a.m.

The HONORARY MINISTER: My information is that the master butchers have agreed to this provision. I have briefly explained the outstanding features of the Bill, further details of which may be made available during the Committee stage. I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

On motion by Hon. C. F. Baxter, debate adjourned.

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

Second Reading.

Debate resumed from the 20th November.

HON. C. F. BAXTER (East) [6.12]: Once again the Government has displayed its consistency in bringing forward legislation to take traffic fees. There is no question about the Government regarding its desire to amend industrial legislation and invade all possible avenues to secure revenue. Ministers do not miss any opportunity in that direction. Last session two Bills were presented for like purposes. The object of one was to take into Consolidated Revenue 75 per cent. of the metropolitan traffic fees. That Bill was defeated in the early part of the session. Later on another Bill was introduced. It was passed by the Legislative Assembly and made its appearance in this Chamber. In consequence of a motion I moved, the Bill was discarded as being out of order. That ended the efforts made by the Government last session. Now during the progress of the present session we are confronted with similar legislation. The object of the Bill is to take traffic fees.

Hon. G. W. Miles: To enable the State to secure a higher grant from the Commonwealth Grants Commission.

Hon. C. F. BAXTER: Will it have that effect?

Hon. G. W. Miles: Yes.

Hon. C. F. BAXTER: Mr. Miles says it will have that effect. In the first place I want to know what the Commonwealth Grants Commission has to do with the directing of the policy of this State. Apparently it has something to do with it.

The Chief Secretary: It has in this regard.

Hon. C. F. BAXTER: And what is the Government doing about it? The Premier has stated that the Commonwealth Grants

Commission decreased the amount made available to Western Australia because traffic fees are not dealt with here as they are in other States.

Hon. T. Moore: What do you advise the Government to do?

Hon. C. F. BAXTER: We have had no word from the Premier regarding this Federal encroachment upon his direction of the policy of the State Government.

Sitting suspended from 6.15 to 7.30 p.m.

Hon. C. F. BAXTER: The Commonwealth Grants Commission was appointed for the purpose of making recommendations regarding the disabilities under which this State claimed to labour. I do not see how those commissioners had any right to interfere in the policy of Western Australia. In the present connection, their recommendation is that traffic fees should go to meet interest on loans expended upon main roads; but I am just wondering what the Federal Government or the Grants Commission would have to say regarding the juggling of moneys by taking funds available under paragraph (2) of Clause 2 of the Federal Aid Roads Agreement and paying out those funds to take the place of what is to be extracted from main roads funds. It is only a juggling of moneys, after all; and where is the difference? I fail to see it, and I do not for a moment believe that either the Federal Government or the members of the Grants Commission will take a favourable view of the proposal, since the procedure would be absolutely wrong in a matter of Government finance.

Expenditure of main roads funds in this State has been substantial, but the larger proportion of the expenditure has not come out of State funds. In point of fact, the expenditure on main roads has proved very costly indeed, because it meant the providing of work for the unemployed. If we are to turn round now and say that interest and sinking fund on loans thus expended should be borne by the motorists, it would be rather an unfortunate state of affairs, because the fact of the money being spent to provide employment for the workless meant that the capital cost must be heavy.

Traffic fees were levied to provide money for maintenance of roads. That is to say, the people who used the roads had to pay for their maintenance. Now the position is that that money has to be paid

into revenue, and that to replace it for application to its original purpose funds must be extracted for local governing bodies from the petrol tax receipts. If the House agrees to the proposed transfer, the time is not far distant when the Federal Government will no longer be able to supply funds under the Federal Aid Roads Agreement but will be compelled to amend that agreement. The truth is that in view of the enormous amount of money required for war purposes, such benefits as Federal Aid Road Grants must go by the board. Then what will be the position of local governing bodies, having given away, through their Parliamentary representatives, part of the funds derived for them from the petrol tax?

Hon. L. Craig: Is not that subject only to the Federal Aid Roads Agreement being renewed?

Hon. C. F. BAXTER: The point is: Once we agree to apportion the funds coming in, how many sessions will pass before an impecunious Government will make further inroads upon those funds? And Governments will become impecunious; the present expenditure within Australia cannot continue with the revenue Australia is furnishing today. The money expended on main roads and provided by the Federal Aid Roads Agreement has amounted to approximately £5,500,000 in Western Australia. State loan funds applied to the same purpose have amounted, to the best of my recollection to about £1,000,000. So that we have benefited greatly from the agreement in question. It has been asserted that the State Government should benefit by the collection of the fees, but it is already benefiting by securing £40,000 odd out of the traffic fees, including £7,400 provided by fees from motor drivers' licenses, which amount is applied to the payment of interest on certain loan money expended in the metropolitan area.

Then there is the profit over and above the cost of collecting traffic fees through the Traffic Branch of the Police Department. Again, there is the substantial amount derived from fines imposed by State courts under the Traffic Act. Prior to the introduction of the high license fees on local vehicles, which are justified because money had to be found for the maintenance of roads, the taxation was naturally placed on those using the vehicles. In a short space of time Western Australia

has established a wonderful road system, though unfortunately some of the roads run in competition with the railway system, thus causing serious loss.

Hon. A. Thomson: Country towns had to be connected to the railway system.

Hon. C. F. BAXTER: There are other ways of connecting country towns. However, I will not discuss that phase just now. Prior to the imposition of the fees such vehicles were licensed, in common with all other vehicles, by the local governing bodies. If we gradually whittle away the revenue received from motor taxes, serious injury will be inflicted on local governing bodies. In fact, the position has now been reached that many of those bodies look to the traffic fees to carry them through. If those fees are taken from them, many Western Australian road boards will cease to exist. In view of all these facts, strong exception must be taken to our being forced into such a position by a body like the Commonwealth Grants Commission, which has no right whatever to interfere in the affairs of a State. Viewing the future and what it holds financially, more particularly with regard to local governing bodies, I can only say that this Bill represents the thin end of the wedge, and that its passage would be a sorry day for those bodies. Therefore I cannot look upon the measure with favour, and I shall vote against the second reading.

On motion by Hon. Sir Hal Colebatch, debate adjourned.

BILL—METROPOLITAN MARKET ACT AMENDMENT.

Second Reading.

Debate resumed from the 19th November.

THE CHIEF SECRETARY (Hon. W. H. Kitson—West—in reply) [7.43]: Here is another case where some members have expressed opposition to a Bill without having really considered what the measure provides, and the case put up by the Minister in introducing the measure. The opposition has emanated from one or two metropolitan members, who state that as a result of inquiries they have made, they find they cannot support the Bill. In the course of their remarks they have quoted information which has been supplied to them from certain sources. It is a pity that those members did not check up on the information they gave

to the House. Unfortunately, so many of the points raised by them in opposition to the Bill are based on information supplied to them that it is necessary for me to speak at greater length than I think should be required in a case of this kind.

Hon. L. B. Bolton: Don't you think it was right that both sides of the question should be given?

THE CHIEF SECRETARY: If the hon. member had checked up on the information supplied to him—as he could easily have done while in the markets—he would never have made the speech he did make on the Bill. It is all very well to accept information from interested parties, who possibly have axes to grind; but I shall make statements in the course of this reply which I believe will cause those hon. members to change their opinion and support the Bill. The first statement I desire to make is that the Metropolitan Market of Perth is cheaper for the producer than any other market in Australia.

Hon. L. B. Bolton: Did I say that or not?

THE CHIEF SECRETARY: Mr. Macfarlane tried to prove the opposite on the opinions or evidence supplied to him. Let me first of all deal with Mr. Macfarlane's remarks. He stated—

The measure has been introduced to bring all private treaty business within the Metropolitan Market—that is, the ordinary trading between man and man.

Hon. J. M. Macfarlane: On prescribed lines.

THE CHIEF SECRETARY: This has not been asked for and the proviso to paragraph (d) of Subsection 2 definitely states that—

Nothing in this paragraph shall prevent any person (not acting as an agent for a producer) from selling or exposing for sale in his own shop or warehouse any prescribed produce, products or provisions.

The amendment asked for simply requests that persons selling prescribed products on commission as agent for the producer must sell through the market. All auctioneers of prescribed products have to operate in the market and it is not fair to make conditions for one form of selling without their applying generally to the other.

A lot was said by Mr. Macfarlane about the finances of the trust. Members will recall that I gave information showing the capital that was or is invested in the market and I endeavoured to use that fact not only as a reason why some form of protec-

tion should be provided for the market, the purpose of which is to provide services for the people in this State, and particularly the producers, but also as a reason why there is a need to give protection to producers who use the market. In view of the remarks of some members, I think that is a very essential point. Mr. Macfarlane said—

The trouble with the trust is that it has over-capitalised its interest and the high rates being charged to tenants have led to the growth of outside competition.

The figures I refer to with regard to capitalisation of the market show that £174,065 was invested. The policy of the trust ever since it has been established has been, in order to provide for maintenance and renewals to buildings and roads, to put aside in an account an annual amount at fixed percentages on cost. This account is debited with expenditure each year. In the ordinary course of events, where new markets are concerned, a credit is built up in the earlier years but the expenditure will increase as the buildings deteriorate and require renovation. The credit balance of this account at the present time is £21,849 and this amount has been invested in the undertaking in order to save interest. This has enabled the trust to make extensions to the fish and meat sections without raising additional capital and as a result the rents in the main market have been reduced. Comparing the rents levied in the first leases from 1929 to 1932 with the leases for 1941 to 1944, there has been a reduction of 26.37 per cent., or in terms of money £3,744 4s.

Hon. L. Craig: And much better facilities have been provided.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: I am going to deal very forcibly with that before I have finished. In view of the experience in regard to rents, I would ask members to consider whether the Market Trust has or has not been dealing fairly.

Hon. L. B. Bolton: Do not forget the year 1929 was a peak year. Everything was pretty high.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: I might have something to say about that, too. I would like the hon. member to compare rentals in Perth today with those that were charged between 1929 and 1932.

Hon. L. B. Bolton: They would be higher in those years.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: If the hon. member will listen patiently until I have

finished, he may have something to say when the Bill is in Committee. As a result of Mr. Macfarlane's remarks regarding buildings, I was under the impression that the tenants of the Market Trust must be seething with discontent, that they must be utterly dissatisfied with the treatment received, with the rents they were called upon to pay, and with the services rendered to them, but I am inclined to think now that the opposite is the case. He referred to certain shops forming part and parcel of the Market Trust buildings and spoke of a large number of shops—which he inferred had been built somewhat recently—one or two being occupied and doing very little business, and a large number being empty and not at all a credit to the Market Trust. For the information of members I would point out that those shops were included in the original building and they are all occupied with the exception of two.

Hon. L. B. Bolton: Pardon me! Your information is wrong. But continue.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: This information is supplied by the secretary of the Market Trust, so that if it is wrong the hon. member might take the matter up with him.

Hon. L. B. Bolton: I counted more than that today.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: That is the position today. There are two vacant shops, the rentals of which are £1 and £1 5s. respectively. Anyone knowing the district and the facilities available at the market cannot say those rents are too high. Much of the profit of the trust has been received from the old buildings on the estate when it was purchased. All of these are occupied and returning their fair share of the revenue. Mr. Macfarlane makes statements which I find it necessary to refute. Again I point out that the Bill will affect only those people who are selling certain prescribed goods of producers on commission. The amendment referred to by the hon. member will not affect persons carrying on merchants' ordinary businesses and Mr. Macfarlane's statement about its affecting two or three meeting in the street is ridiculous.

There is no intention of persecuting people and the amendment will protect the producer who has little or no redress from commission agents outside the markets. All the agents who operate in the Metropolitan

Market have to keep records of prices and purchases, and that is a very valuable by-law so far as the producers are concerned. The bylaw provides that a producer, if he is dissatisfied with the return from an agent, can apply to the Market Trust to have his account examined, without any fee or cost to himself. This is not availed of as much now as in times gone by, when very frequently producers were not at all satisfied with the return they received from the sale of their products. This bylaw provides a check upon agents and an opportunity for growers to test the accuracy of their account sales. In addition, an agent operating in the markets cannot act in the dual capacity of agent and merchant without informing the grower of this fact and exhibiting on his notice board, letterheads, etc., the fact that he is operating as a merchant as well as a commission agent. In that way there is protection for producers which, I am informed, is considered of very great value.

In his speech Mr. Macfarlane referred to the Apple and Pear Board and said that this amendment would affect those people who had to have dealings with the board. But the board is not affected in the slightest degree by the Bill. It is a fact that the board has its floor in the markets.

Hon. J. M. Macfarlane: And does business outside, too.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: Reference was made to jam makers also. By some stretch of imagination it was claimed that they would be seriously affected, because they buy their fruit direct in many instances. Mr. Macfarlane's interpretation was that jam makers would be forced to operate in the markets. I think members will agree that it is ridiculous to state that jam manufacturers buy fruit on commission for themselves. I reiterate that this amendment deals only with those persons who are selling prescribed lines on commission. The hon. member suggested it would, generally, upset the whole of the trading community. There is nothing in that contention. All that this amending Bill will do, if agreed to, is to give more security to those persons against possible opposition that might be started on the other side of Wellington-street or in the vicinity of the markets. Meat is not affected, and Mr. Macfarlane ought to know that all meat not previously inspected must be inspected at the branding depot.

Hon. J. M. Macfarlane: I said that matter was not mentioned in the Bill.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: To my way of thinking the hon. member used that point as an argument against this measure. I listened with amazement to some of his remarks, and I wondered whether I had been advised wrongly in regard to the effect of this Bill; or whether there had been some mistake respecting what is contained in the Bill. I find that Mr. Macfarlane was hopelessly at sea. While he was discussing that phase of the matter he said something about the trust being too ambitious. If he thinks the trust is too ambitious in erecting the new sections of the market, I cannot agree with him. It has provided modern up-to-date facilities for two sections. While these two sections cost a good many thousands of pounds, that did not tend to increase the rentals in the older parts of the markets. It had a tendency to reduce the rentals because the building of those new sections utilised some of the area which previously was not returning anything like its fair share of revenue, as it is now doing. The whole of the space provided in these new sections is fully occupied.

Hon. J. M. Macfarlane: Since when? I was there last Friday and a good deal of it was empty.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: I do not know how far we will get under these circumstances.

Hon. J. M. Macfarlane: The matter can be easily proved by walking there to-morrow.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: The whole of the new section is fully occupied.

Hon. J. M. Macfarlane: I thought you said the old section.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: The facilities provided are all used. The tenants in the new poultry and egg section pay rents at the same rate as those in similar portions of the main market, and, in addition, have all the facilities which have been specially provided to suit their convenience. The latest building has been completely let and not one section is vacant at the present time. They are all let on a three-years lease. In regard to the egg and poultry section, Mr. Macfarlane has, apparently, been misinformed. The area has all been let at the same rental as was received from the previous egg and poultry tenants.

Hon. J. M. Macfarlane: Are they tenanted now?

The CHIEF SECRETARY: Yes.

Hon. J. M. Macfarlane: My eyes do deceive me!

The CHIEF SECRETARY: There was a delay in letting the first section owing to producers asking the trust to hold the area for them to start another co-operative company.

Hon. J. M. Macfarlane: There is a story attached to that.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: The trust was anxious to assist the producers and gave them the area desired, but owing to the company not being able to finance the project, the space was divided and let by the trust to other tenants. Again I reiterate this space is all let.

In regard to eggs, Mr. Macfarlane has not stated the position fairly. The Egg Stabilisation Board has arranged to fix the local floor price of eggs at 2d. per dozen more than the export advance. The 2d. covers all the charges an agent would usually make, including stabilisation. For instance, the present advance for export eggs is 1s. 11d. per dozen, the floor price being fixed at 1s. 1d. Mr. Macfarlane gave the impression that even he would be affected by this Bill. In answer to a question he stated he bought his eggs direct or purchased them outright. So long as he continues to do business in that way he will not be affected in the slightest by this measure.

Hon. J. M. Macfarlane: I said that stabilisation was something new, and that commission came into it

The CHIEF SECRETARY: If Mr. Macfarlane proposes to change his method and sell eggs on commission, then, if this Bill is agreed to, he will be affected. He knows that there is no intention, or power, to interfere with commodities being exported. In that connection Mr. Macfarlane referred to the five per cent. commission. I find it somewhat difficult to follow his remarks in that matter, but he inferred that because there is a five per cent. commission to which he, and others, are entitled under their arrangement with the board, he would be affected by this proposal. He does not sell eggs to the Commonwealth Government at five per cent. commission, and neither does anybody else.

Hon. J. M. Macfarlane: It is allowed to the main body of producers.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: It is something he is allowed, apparently, for handling these eggs and it is included in the charges the producer has to pay. He is not selling on commission.

Hon. H. Tuckey: That is fair business.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: Yes. I am not complaining, but Mr. Macfarlane suggested that because he receives his five per cent. commission he would come under this particular Bill. I have here a copy of the account sales dealing with the egg and poultry auctioneers. There is nothing in it to indicate that there is any commission at all. The hon. member will admit that what I say is correct. He went further afield and suggested that other people would also be affected because of some arrangement whereby, on contra account, they supply goods to their customers. That is not selling eggs on commission, and such firms will not be affected in the slightest degree.

It should be of advantage to the producers to see that this Bill is agreed to in order that they may have the protection they will undoubtedly derive from it, as against the lack of protection they have when dealing with persons who are operating outside the market. Another point is this, that if any of the producers have complaints to make representing the treatment they receive from the people selling their produce outside the market, they can only have their grievances investigated by reference to the police. If these people are tenants of the markets they come under the bylaws and regulations of the Market Trust, which I have already clearly described.

Another interesting subject raised both by Mr. Macfarlane and Mr. Bolton dealt with the question of fish. Several statements were made, quite contrary to the information I have supplied to this House. I have been particularly careful to see that I received the actual information. One does not care to go into detail unless compelled to do so when dealing with some matters, and this is one. I thought I had indicated to the House that a serious state of affairs had arisen respecting fish, and that if this Bill were agreed to, while it would not be a cure-all it would at least assist in certain directions. Something was said about a fisherman who was alleged to have bought a block of land in Wellington-street.

Members will remember that I referred to the fact that a certain fisheries company, had, some time ago, purchased land outside the market premises and proposed to erect certain buildings thereon in opposition to the market. The reply I received on that account was to this effect: "Oh yes, but while the City Council would not grant a license in the first place, after an appeal was made to the Health Department it was called upon to grant the license." Listening to the references to that matter one would imagine that my statement was hopelessly incorrect. I propose to give members the actual facts, and we will see whether it is advisable to pass this Bill. The fisherman referred to—not by me—could hardly be described correctly as a fisherman.

Hon. J. M. Macfarlane: That does not describe him.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: No, of course not. He is really the managing director and holder of most of the shares in National Fisheries Ltd. He is a man who has done remarkably well out of the fish and poultry business. Originally he was established in the old city markets. At his request the Market Trust erected special hygienic buildings to suit his trade, and when the old markets were demolished, he transferred to the trust's area. I am told that the reason why this company wished to transfer out of the market was that the officials of the trust would not allow the company to carry on its business in a filthy manner. Although the buildings were constructed under the supervision of the Principal Architect to make the cleaning of them as easy as possible, it was exceedingly difficult—in fact, it was one of the hardest tasks the trust has had—to get this man to keep the premises in a reasonably decent condition.

The officials of the trust have had considerable trouble in this connection. On numerous occasions fish traps were removed and all the refuse was allowed to run into the sewer. The company was warned by the Market Trust on repeated occasions and it became necessary to charge the company with the cost of removing the blockages. The manager allowed the interior of the premises to become so bad that the trust's inspector requested him to clean the premises on repeated occasions, and in the end the trust had to put on a man to do the job of washing out the place from top

to bottom. I do not think anyone will complain of the attitude of the Market Trust in matters of this kind.

Hon. L. Craig: What is the man's name?

The CHIEF SECRETARY: I am referring to the managing director of National Fisheries, Ltd.

Hon. L. Craig: Is his name Silver?

The CHIEF SECRETARY: No, Silver-ton. This gentleman purchased some land on the other side of Wellington-street and attempted to have plans passed by the City Council providing for fish and poultry gutting and cleaning, a fish and poultry shop and, in addition, flats. All these activities were to be located on a block with a frontage of less than 40 ft. The plans were prepared by a city architect.

Hon. J. Cornell: Is he the fellow who designs all the flats?

The CHIEF SECRETARY: The health committee of the City Council received a petition from all the residents in the locality with the exception of those occupying this man's premises and, in consequence, made a special inspection of the site of the proposed building and the existing premises in the market. Reference was made to the City Council. A member of the City Council is a member of the Market Trust, but he was not a member of the health committee and did not take part in the inspection. The inspection was made by the Lord Mayor, the Chief Health Inspector and three councillors. The council refused the application on the 17th February, 1941, and an amended plan was submitted. The company lodged an appeal with the Commissioner of Public Health and he granted the appeal, but only for a fish shop, and not for the flats or the poultry and fish gutting establishment. I am advised that under the law the commissioner could do nothing else, as he considered that the Perth City Council was not able to refuse the license, but could cancel it subsequently if the health bylaws were not carried out. Members will agree that this is an entirely different story from the one given in this House in opposition to the Bill.

Hon. H. Tuekey: Why did not they do that down at the market?

The CHIEF SECRETARY: Mr. Silver-ton was not satisfied to have merely the fish shop; he wanted his original scheme, and when that was not forthcoming, he abandoned the idea, advertised his land for sale

and begged the trust to grant him a lease. Since that date, on two occasions, he has been charged for the cost of cleaning out his premises. It is well known that Mr. Macfarlane had a close interview with this gentleman.

Hon. J. M. Macfarlane: I told you I had got into touch with the secretary.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: The trust fixed a penalty rent of £2 a week for National Fisheries, Ltd., which is rebated if the premises are left reasonably clean. This is the only tenant in the market who has had to be so drastically controlled. I think the trust is entitled to some credit for the attitude adopted and the action taken in the matter.

Hon. L. B. Bolton: Do you mean if the premises are left or are kept reasonably clean?

The CHIEF SECRETARY: They are supposed to be left reasonably clean, but either word would do.

Hon. L. B. Bolton: The whole of the premises was spotlessly clean when I inspected them on two occasions.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: I am pleased to hear that; I believe that the efforts of the trust have been successful.

Hon. L. B. Bolton: I am pleased to hear that, too.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: On the question of fish Mr. Bolton expressed concern because his reading of the Bill seemed to indicate that an importer of frozen fish from overseas would be compelled to sell all his fish through the market. That is not the intention. If the hon. member reads the Bill carefully, he will find that the importer of fish under these conditions is exempted. As the first owner of the fish under the measure, he would have the right to sell wholesale as at present and would not be affected in any way. I made a statement earlier that the market, in the matter of the charges made, was as cheap as or cheaper than any other similar market in Australia. That is perfectly true. The trust has supplied the following statement—

It is interesting to point out that the auctioneers and agents' charges levied in the Metropolitan Market are the cheapest in Australia and the standard of the trade in the Metropolitan Market is higher in every way than in the Eastern States. In Melbourne and Adelaide the charges are 10 per cent. compared to 7½ per cent. here for fruit and vegetables. In only one State are the charges

the same and it is in Sydney where the maximum is fixed in the Fruit Produce Agents Act, and the recent Royal Commissioner, J. E. McCulloch, LL.B., S.M., on the fruit industry, after fully investigating the position, recommended that the 7½ per cent. should be increased to 10 per cent. It can be shown that the producers sending their goods to the Metropolitan Market are charged the lowest commission rates in Australia and receive the best services.

Hon. J. M. Macfarlane: That was so before the trust came into existence.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: Then why the complaint made by the hon. member?

Hon. J. M. Macfarlane: I was referring to the rents charged.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: The hon. member referred to the services rendered by the trust, and I think I have dealt effectively with that point.

Hon. L. B. Bolton: You say the importer of fish would be regarded as the original owner. I would like you to deal with the proposed new Subsection (2a).

The CHIEF SECRETARY: I think the hon. member would be well advised to raise that point in Committee.

The PRESIDENT: There are many points in the Bill that might well be left to discussion in the Committee stage.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: I am prepared to give the hon. member all the information he desires. I have dealt very fully with the main points raised on the Bill, and I say definitely that if there had been anything in the arguments advanced against the Bill, the House would have just cause to consider whether it would be reasonable to pass the measure. I have demonstrated that the Bill does not mean anything like what has been attributed to it by members opposing it, and I think I have shown conclusively that the measure is in the interests of the producer.

Hon. J. J. Holmes: Have you any explanation of the monopoly in fresh fish?

Hon. L. B. Bolton: No, there is none.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: Fish is a subject on which we could talk for a long time. I have little to add to what I have said. An effort was made by those who control large fish in the city to prevent people patronising the fish section of the Metropolitan Market from obtaining supplies of large fish.

Hon. J. M. Macfarlane: They failed over two years ago.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: Then another method was adopted and it was possible, to the detriment of certain people, to fix prices in such a way that only some people could benefit. The fisherman got no benefit.

Hon. A. Thomson: I hope this measure will help the fisherman.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: I say there is one way to help improve the present position—

Hon. J. Cornell: If this Bill is passed, will it have any effect on the aroma in Barrack and Murray Streets?

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The CHIEF SECRETARY: I am reminded now of another statement that was made. I was contradicted regarding my statement about the activities of National Fisheries, Ltd., and others interested in the wholesale sale of fish in the city. Mr. Macfarlane had something to say about the auctioneer at the market. The lessee of the market is A. J. Langford, Limited, and the directors of this company asked for protection from the Geraldton Fisheries when its operations in large fish were becoming a menace to the trade. Despite Mr. Macfarlane's statement to the contrary, in my opinion this company ceased operations only when Italy came into the war. This replies effectively to Mr. Macfarlane's remarks.

No doubt members will desire to speak further to the Bill when it reaches the Committee stage; I am mainly anxious that it shall pass, in order to afford protection to three sections of the community. One is the Metropolitan Market Trust, which has a large amount of capital invested in the market; the second, those who are carrying on business in the market and who can be quite easily affected seriously if persons are allowed to compete with them in the vicinity of the market; and the third—perhaps the most important of all—the producers and the consumers. The Bill is absolutely in the interests of the producers. So far as the consumers are concerned, I have said enough with respect to fish alone to indicate that distinct benefit will accrue to them. Notwithstanding the opposition to the Bill, I hope it will pass the second reading and will eventually become law.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Hon. J. Cornell in the Chair; the Chief Secretary in charge of the Bill.

Clause 1—agreed to.

Clause 2—Amendment of Section 12:

Hon. J. M. MACFARLANE: I move an amendment—

That in lines 14 and 15 of proposed new paragraph (c) the words "products or provisions" be struck out.

I admit that the sending of products and provisions to the market to be sold by auction is in conformity with the Act; but products and provisions are sold by private treaty. If they are to be sold in the market in the way proposed by the Bill, that will constitute an interference with trade. Most of the traders to whom I have spoken fear that this will be the result.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: I oppose the amendment. "Products or provisions" come within the same category; they must all be prescribed.

Hon. J. M. Macfarlane: I do not want them prescribed.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: If not, they will not come within the Bill.

Hon. J. M. Macfarlane: That is right.

Hon. A. Thomson: Section 11 of the Act makes provision for them.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: Mr. Macfarlane has not compared the Bill with the Act.

Hon. J. M. Macfarlane: I have.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: I have explained the position clearly. The Bill indicates that the fears expressed by Mr. Macfarlane are groundless. His arguments are not in accordance with the facts. The parent Act has proved of benefit to everyone concerned. I ask the hon. member to explain again what the effect of striking out the words will be.

Hon. J. M. MACFARLANE: I have said that if products and provisions are sold at the market, there would be interference with private treaty, and that would constitute interference with freedom of trade. I submit that my tale is quite as convincing as is the Chief Secretary's. Products or provisions are goods which can be stored on a shelf. I mentioned jam, and the Chief Secretary twitted me for doing so. Jams are the product of fruit and, with kindred lines, are nearly all sold on commission by travellers. Jams and kindred lines would

be affected by the words "products and provisions."

The CHIEF SECRETARY: Again I remind the hon. member that this Bill only affects those agents who are selling on commission.

Hon. J. M. Macfarlane: Yes.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: The hon. member referred to travellers selling on commission.

Hon. J. M. Macfarlane: The provision will affect the fruit from which jam is manufactured.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: That is an indication of the way in which the hon. member is regarding the Bill. It is stretching the imagination to such an extent that I do not think any further reply from me is called for.

Amendment put and negatived.

Hon. L. B. BOLTON: I would like to refer to proposed new Subsection (2a). Will the Chief Secretary give the Committee a clearer explanation? I am sure he takes no exception to Mr. Macfarlane, myself or any other member trying to do the best he can for his constituents. Fish imported by companies like Boans, Foys and Bairds may in turn be sold to smaller retailers. According to my reading of the proposed new subsection, such fish would have to be sold through the market.

Hon. G. Fraser: If it were prescribed.

Hon. L. B. BOLTON: It is definitely prescribed.

Hon. J. M. MACFARLANE: The Committee should bear in mind that there are many kinds of fish. Fresh fish are sold at the market, but many firms import dried fish from England, Africa and New Zealand. It is not necessary to put such fish in cold storage, nor is it necessary to sell it by auction in the market.

Hon. J. J. Holmes: The first owner of the fish can do as he likes. The question is what the second owner can do.

Hon. L. B. Bolton: It is the second owner I am trying to protect.

Hon. J. M. MACFARLANE: It has been mentioned that fish are not prescribed, but I refer the Committee to proposed new paragraph (d) of Subsection 2 of Section 12. I contend it goes too far and would bring within the market fish that are sold by large city firms that have their own cold stores. They also market fish and send supplies to country centres.

Hon. J. J. Holmes: Cannot the second owner sell the fish at a profit if he does not operate on a commission?

Hon. J. M. MACFARLANE: No, the fish would have to go through the market.

Hon. L. B. Bolton: And that would increase the cost to the consumer.

Hon. J. M. MACFARLANE: I think the position would be met by striking out the words "from any waters and includes the first owner of any imported fish after the landing of such fish." The effect would be to cut out the reference to imported fish.

Hon. L. B. Bolton: Why not move for the deletion of paragraph (b)?

Hon. J. A. DIMMITT: In Perth there is a definite practice in the handling of dried and smoked fish. One agent imports practically the whole of the fish bought here and he is the original owner. He cannot be classified under the Bill as anything else. He supplies the merchants who, in turn, distribute the fish to retail stores. If paragraph (b) is agreed to, the fish will have to go through the markets for resale and that will add to the cost to the consumer. I shall move to delete paragraph (b).

The CHAIRMAN: I think the paragraph must remain as it is, for I cannot see how it can be amended.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: It must remain as it is or else be struck out. It cannot be amended.

The CHAIRMAN: That is so.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: A similar provision appears in the New South Wales Act. It arises out of the difficulty experienced in defining certain things. We are dealing with imported fish, whether frozen, dried or in any other form. It is necessary to place someone in the same position as the fisherman who catches and disposes of fresh fish. Consequently the Bill provides, with regard to imported fish, that the original owner shall be the man who first receives any imported fish after it is landed in the State. I am advised by the market authorities that the Bill will have no effect whatever on the large retail emporiums which in many instances constitute the original owners.

Hon. L. B. Bolton: And in many instances they do not.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: In other instances the fish is imported by others who are allowed to sell to whom they like.

Hon. L. Tuckey: And you are not concerned about such fish.

Hon. L. B. Bolton: But we are concerned about it.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: Those people will have the right to sell wholesale and the Bill will not require them to have anything to do with the markets.

Hon. J. A. Dimmitt: I cannot understand your reasoning.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: It must be remembered that the Act covers only the City of Perth exclusive of Victoria Park. The person importing the fish is the original owner.

Hon. L. Craig: And he is not restricted.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: He can sell to whom he pleases. That applies to firms like Boans.

Hon. J. J. Holmes: There are agents who import fish and sell to Boans.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: Yes, I believe so.

Hon. J. J. Holmes: Then Boans becomes the second owner.

Hon. J. A. Dimmitt: The firm sells to many storekeepers on a wholesale basis, and we want to give the necessary protection.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: I do not know that the hon. member's suggestion will give much protection.

Hon. Sir Hal Colebatch: To what type of imported fish do you wish the Bill to apply?

The CHIEF SECRETARY: To all frozen and dried fish.

Hon. Sir Hal Colebatch: What circumstances could you imagine would make that necessary?

The CHIEF SECRETARY: Large quantities are imported from New Zealand and South Africa and also from the Old Country in times of peace.

Hon. Sir Hal Colebatch: Why should the fish go through the market?

The CHIEF SECRETARY: The fish does not. We are providing for the sale of fish and suggest a method of control of the fish business in a manner that will be beneficial. As to imported fish, we must place someone in the same position as the man who catches fish and places his catch on the market. Therefore the man who imports fish is considered to be the original owner. If he wishes to sell wholesale, he may do so, but once that fish has been sold wholesale the Bill provides that if it is sought to sell the

fish again, it must be done through the markets.

Hon. L. B. Bolton: Now we have got it at last.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: The hon. member has not got anything that has not been made plain since the first introduction of the Bill.

Hon. J. A. Dimmitt: And that is what we object to.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: Does the hon. member say that Boans is a wholesale firm?

Hon. J. A. Dimmitt: Yes.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: And are the other firms dealing in fish also wholesalers?

Hon. L. B. Bolton: Of course.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: I do not think the hon. member will find those firms claim that they are wholesalers.

Hon. L. B. Bolton: We are fighting their case for them.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: The hon. member is apt to fight any person's case so long as he is approached with that object in view. The Bill contains nothing that cannot be clearly understood. I do not see how members can amend paragraph (b) at all.

Hon. Sir HAL COLEBATCH: I would agree to support the Chief Secretary but I cannot conceive of any circumstances in which it would be desirable that imported fish should be forced into the market at any stage and by anyone. I cannot see that it would serve any good purpose. The Minister admits that the original owner can do what he likes with his fish. What good purpose can be served by providing that the next person to sell the fish shall put them through the market? This is not a matter of compelling the owner to do certain things by regulation; it is being done by the Bill itself.

The Chief Secretary: That is so.

Hon. J. A. DIMMITT: I move an amendment—

That paragraph (b) be struck out.

The Chief Secretary has not cleared this matter up. For his benefit I will repeat that there is a firm that acts as agent for practically the whole of the cured fish supplies. That agent imports for Batemans, Sara & Cook, Bairds and other firms, and is the original owner. The other firms re-sell to retail stores. After that sale to the retail stores, sales must go through the markets if paragraph (b) be agreed to.

Hon. J. J. HOLMES: The first part of the paragraph deals with local fish and the second with imported fish. Prior to the war hundreds of tons of dried and frozen fish were imported from the Old Country. There were two or three agents representing the English owners and they accepted orders from local firms. On arrival of the fish, they distributed the orders to the firms concerned. If we accept the paragraph, who is the original owner? The man who imports the fish or Foy & Gibsons, Boans and the other firms? I think the man who imported the fish would be the first owner.

Hon. L. Craig: He would act on behalf of the firms.

Hon. J. J. HOLMES: If fish is to be sold on commission, the sale must take place through the markets. If Boans or Foy & Gibsons sold fish in the ordinary way of business at a profit and not on commission, where would those firms be? How is the second owner to be permitted to dispose of the fish?

Hon. J. A. Dimmitt: Not by wholesale?

Hon. J. J. HOLMES: There should not be any limitation on the second owner.

Hon. J. M. MACFARLANE: My firm is concerned in the importation of fish.

Hon. J. A. Dimmitt: The proposed amendment deals with all kinds of fish, whether imported or otherwise.

Hon. J. M. MACFARLANE: I want to deal with local fish from local waters. That fish is already going to the market, and no objection is raised to the position. With imported fish it is quite a different thing. More than one agent is buying and selling.

Hon. J. A. DIMMITT: I ask leave to withdraw my amendment.

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

Hon. J. M. MACFARLANE: I would suggest that after the word "waters," in line 11, all the words of paragraph (b) be struck out.

Hon. C. F. BAXTER: Where do preserved fish come from? Paragraphs (c) and (d) speak of "produce, products, or provisions," and I think those words would include fish.

Hon. Sir HAL COLEBATCH: Mr. Macfarlane's suggestion will not serve the purpose at all. We want to exempt imported fish from the provision altogether. As it stands now, no second buyer could by auction sell tinned fish. That cannot be the Minister's desire.

Hon. J. M. Macfarlane: Fish is fish.

Hon. Sir HAL COLEBATCH: The object is to exempt from the operation of the measure such fish as will never be sent to the market.

Hon. L. B. BOLTON: We might provide that the words "any fish taken from any waters" shall not include any imported fish.

The CHAIRMAN: The Committee might say "any fish other than imported fish."

Hon. L. B. BOLTON: That would answer the purpose.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: There appears to be some confusion as to the effect of the clause. Apparently my interpretation of it is not acceptable to some members. In order to devise means of overcoming the difficulty, progress might be reported.

The CHAIRMAN: The only question before the Chair now is that Clause 2 stand as printed.

Progress reported.

BILL—PLANT DISEASES (REGISTRATION FEES).

Second Reading.

THE HONORARY MINISTER (Hon. E. H. Gray—West) [9.9] in moving the second reading said: This is a Bill, as the Title implies, to repeal the Plant Diseases (Registration Fees) Act, 1939, and to make provision for authorising the prescribing of special registration fees for the registration of orchards under the Plant Diseases Act, 1914-39, in certain cases. The existing Act lapses on the 31st December, 1942; but it is desirable that provision be made now for the continuance of the registration of orchards, and to obtain the necessary funds for "fruit fly" eradication. This measure will commence as from the 1st day of July, 1942.

The main purpose of the Bill is to enable protection to be given to the State's fruit growing industry. At one time, the incidence of fruit fly seriously threatened the sale of all our export fruit to certain countries. The pest was to be found in many parts of the State; but owing to the application of the energies of the Agricultural Department, which was made possible through the registration fees collected under legislation, the position has been largely cleared up, to the benefit of the industry generally. The value of the fruit industry to this State is approximately £1,000,000 annually.

Organisations representing the fruit growers have requested that the provisions of the Act be continued. The Western Australian Fruitgrowers' Association, with its headquarters at Mount Barker, representing in the main the largest apple producers in the State—and notwithstanding the fact that the Mount Barker growers have absolute freedom in their district from incidence of the fly—has requested a continuance measure providing that a flat rate of 2s. per acre be charged. These growers have had absolute freedom from the fly menace, but nevertheless they recognise that they are growing susceptible crops, and in order to protect the district from any possible infestation they are prepared to place a levy upon themselves at the rate mentioned. Grape growers are also favourable to the measure, although they have not as yet had their crops infested by the fly. They are, however, in the midst of an infested district.

The Bill provides that registration fees are to be at the rate of 1s. 6d. per acre for all orchards, except in the case of orchards consisting wholly of grape vines used for the manufacture of wines. In such orchards the maximum amount to be collected shall be the present maximum of £2 10s. Even though the Western Australian Fruitgrowers' Association has requested a rate of 2s. per acre, departmental inquiries show that 1s. 6d. per acre will meet requirements for the effective policing of the Act, and the consequent protection of the industry.

Under the Bill, a nursery or an orchard or any part of an orchard, the area of which is not less than one acre, if and while all the fruit trees or vines planted therein are less than four years old, is exempt from the acreage rates, but shall be liable to a registration fee of 1s. only. This proposal is the result of representations made by nurserymen and orchardists who have been paying the acreage rate. The matter has been contentious on occasions, and an endeavour is being made by this Bill to remove what may be termed existing anomalies in the legislation.

Provision is made for the continuance of the registration of backyard orchards. This particular matter has had a considerable amount of publicity in the last year or two. People in suburban areas now recognise the need for the charging of a small registra-

tion fee. Much has been done to compel careless people to destroy neglected trees in suburban areas. Fig, apricot and loquat trees, which are very susceptible to fruit fly, are common to these areas. Fruit has been left to rot on the ground year in and year out, and this has in the past constituted a menace to the whole of the fruit industry.

With the legislation now operating, much has already been accomplished to minimise the incidence of the pest through backyard orchards. Metropolitan residents used to treat the matter very lightly, but now they are being educated along the right lines by departmental officers. Much credit is due to the officials of the Agricultural Department for their efforts to see that the required precautionary methods are adopted to cope with the fly menace. I trust the proposals in the Bill will have the support of all members, so that the care and attention now being exercised may continue, and the pest coped with to the utmost possible extent. I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

HON. L. CRAIG (South-West) [9.16]: This is a Bill of which I am sure the House will unanimously approve. The fruitgrowers, who are the people concerned, are asking that they should be taxed to protect their industry from the ravages of the fruit fly. Western Australia has been infested with fruit fly for more than 50 years, but until recent years the pest had not spread south beyond Pinjarra. It then started its southward move and eventually reached as far as Bridgetown, to the consternation of the commercial fruitgrowers. Immediate action became necessary as otherwise the fruit industry in this country was in danger of being ruined. Already some countries had made representations that they were not prepared to accept fruit from Western Australia because it was suspected of being infested with fruit fly. Luckily that was overcome by a strict inspection prior to shipment, and a guarantee that it had been so many days or weeks in cold storage which would ensure that the maggot of the fly was killed.

It was after that period that the Act was introduced imposing a levy for the destruction of fruit fly. That has been in operation for some years and I am glad to say it has been very effective. Fruit fly has been eliminated from the Bridgetown

area, I think, and last year there was no sign of it in the Donnybrook district. Donnybrook is about 26 miles north of Bridgetown so that by tackling the problem properly, progress has been made in dealing with this dreaded pest. As the Honorary Minister pointed out, the Western Australian Fruitgrowers' Association, the headquarters of which are at Denmark, decided that orchardists should be taxed to the extent of 2s. per acre, which was an increase on the previous tax. Although the Mt. Barker district has never been infested with fruit fly and in view of its climate was not likely to be infested, the growers were so frightened that the fly might visit the district that they said, "Tax us in order that we may fight this pest away from our own district." I wish, Sir, that members behind the President's Chair should not talk so much.

The PRESIDENT: Order!

Hon. L. CRAIG: Toodyay is an infested area, but although wine grapes are not affected because the grapes are picked before the fruit fly becomes a menace, and all the grapes are picked, none being left for the fly to infest, the growers in that district also are willing to be taxed to keep the menace away from their area. Everybody concerned is asking to be taxed.

Certain alterations are proposed. Under the Act all orchards, whether bearing or not, and nurseries are taxed. The Bill proposes that nurseries and orchards not in bearing shall not be taxed. That is reasonable because they could not become infested and no inspection or treatment is necessary. Backyard orchards are still to be taxed at 1s. A new rate fixed in the Bill is 1s. 6d. per acre, although the fruitgrowers themselves asked that 2s. should be the rate. It is felt that 1s. 6d. will be sufficient, that additional inspectors can be engaged and the fee collected will provide sufficient for emergencies. There has been some criticism concerning the building up of funds which are not spent, but it is necessary in cases of this sort that there should always be a considerable amount of money available in the event of an outbreak occurring in a particular district and requiring drastic treatment. If such an outbreak occurred money would be in hand to employ many extra inspectors and to engage men to spray and for other purposes of that kind. Consequently a fund has been built up totalling I think, £500.

Hon. G. B. Wood: £1,200!

Hon. L. CRAIG: Even were the figure £2,000, I would agree to its being accumulated if the fruitgrowers think it is necessary. A considerable sum is essential in order that we can attack, like a panzer division, any outbreak that requires special treatment. Since this legislation was first introduced there has been a marked decrease in the incidence of fruit fly, and it is hoped that by further concentration the decrease in infestation will continue. I hope the House will support the second reading.

HON. G. B. WOOD (East) [9.21]: I do not intend to go right through the Bill as the Honorary Minister and Mr. Craig have already done so, but I do commend it to the House. For some years there have been two factions amongst the fruitgrowers, one wanting a tax of 2s. per acre and the other 1s. per acre. I take a little credit for having brought the two factions together. One big section of fruitgrowers for a long time wanted to be taxed only at the rate of 1s. but I told them that we would never get away with that and urged them to agree to 1s. 6d., which was a compromise. This they did. The sections have been brought together and have agreed to that figure. I have always fought against 2s. I consider that is too much because a big fund of £1,200 has been built up.

I do not believe in the principle of a section of producers being taxed to police themselves. That is wrong, but I am prepared to admit that we have to agree to it because the fruitgrowers themselves have done so. When they say they are willing to be taxed, I think it is right that Parliament should agree. It is all a matter of whether the tax should be 1s., 1s. 6d. or 2s. I notice that Mr. Craig is very agreeable to 1s. 6d., but in 1939 when I sought to amend the Act to make the figure 1s. 6d., I received very little support in this House. The only assistance I had was from Mr. Hamersley. I was asked by people in the Swan and Toodyay electorates to have the figure amended to 1s. I said that I would not do that but would try to have it changed to 1s. 6d. I received very little support. I commend the Minister for introducing what I call a compromise Bill, providing for a fee of 1s. 6d. per acre. The Bill has other desirable provisions and I think it will suit everybody. I do not imagine any producer will object.

Hon. A. Thomson: It is a matter of insurance against disease.

Hon. G. B. WOOD: The fruitgrowers are very unselfish people. They are prepared to say, "You can tax us to do this work." There is no other section of the producers of Western Australia or elsewhere that says, "Tax us to please us," but the fruitgrowers are a very unselfish lot of people. I commend the Bill to the House and hope it will pass the second reading.

HON. W. J. MANN (South-West) [9.25]: It is so rare that we have an occasion when people engaged in an industry offer to tax themselves in order to preserve the industry, that I think the House will have no hesitation in passing this measure. The attitude of the fruitgrowers in the past has always been one of great helpfulness to the State. The amount of money that was returned to the State for our fruit sent oversea in peace time was very considerable, and the credit for that can be given without any hesitation to the splendid way in which the fruitgrowers themselves saw that their industry was conducted on right lines. They have not waited for the odd inspectors to tell them things. The moment they saw any danger they immediately notified the authorities, quarantined the areas and in a number of instances went so far as to agree to the pulling out of the trees altogether. That is very commendable and the fact that the growers are anxious to preserve their industry and are prepared to pay for it is also commendable. Their example is one that might well be followed by others.

HON. H. V. PIESSE (South-East) [9.27]: I support the Bill and at the outset desire to congratulate the Western Australian Fruitgrowers' Association on the great work it has carried out. This association proved what primary producers can do when they band together for the benefit of an industry. The welfare of this industry has been well protected, not only by the Fruitgrowers' Association, but also by the Viticulturists' Union in the Swan area. It is through that very fine organisation—the Fruitgrowers' Association—that, I take it, the growers when in conference recommended that they should be taxed. This is a proof that they are determined to watch their own interests. Mr. Craig referred to the outbreak of fruit fly in the Mt. Barker district.

About two years ago I reported an outbreak in Katanning.

Hon. L. Craig: I did not report an outbreak at Mt. Barker.

Hon. H. V. PIESSE: I beg the hon. member's pardon. It was Bridgetown. I think the fruit fly has gone further south towards Mt. Barker and Katanning and it is essential that the whole of the State shall be protected, particularly as we today are the largest exporters of fruit in Australia. I commend the Minister for Agriculture for having been such a great help to this particular industry. With his technical knowledge he has been able to assist very much, and his department has also been extremely helpful. I commend the Bill to members.

HON. H. TUCKEY (South-West) [9.31]: The fact that the fruitgrowers were prepared to raise the rate from 1s. 6d. to 2s. indicates the serious view they take of the fruit fly menace. While there is such a large reserve, it should not be necessary to increase the rate to 2s. It may surprise members to know that so much money is in reserve. Although the position is much improved in the Bridgetown district—at one time the fruit fly had travelled a good deal further than Bridgetown—the fact remains that it is bad in other parts of the State, and particularly in the case of backyard orchards. While plenty of money is in hand, more inspectors should be employed to deal with the menace.

Fruit fly will attack wild fruit or berries in the bush. Where instances are known steps should be taken by the department to deal with them. If the fly breeds in that manner, it is just as bad as breeding in an orchard. I know of some backyard orchards which are infested with fruit fly, and have not been subject to any inspection. It would be a step in the right direction if the department increased the number of inspectors. This is a valuable industry to the State. If the fly is dealt with systematically it can be stamped out. It is a big job, and one in which everybody must play his part. Much of the trouble arises in the case of some of these backyard orchards. One man will keep his two or three trees perfectly clean, while the man next door does nothing at all. The former gets the fly every year, no matter what steps he takes.

HON. A. THOMSON (South-East) [9.33]: We can congratulate ourselves on

the fact that we are freer from pests, so far as the fruit industry is concerned, than are any of the other States in the Commonwealth. We also grow better fruit and are much closer to the London market under normal conditions. It can truthfully be said that one of the main reasons why we are so free from pests is because of the initiative and activities of the fruitgrowers themselves. The member for Albany (Mr. Hill) in another place stated that he preferred to fight the fruit fly in the metropolitan or other areas than on the banks of the Kalbar where the fruitgrowing industry was situated in his district. That is the spirit animating the fruitgrowers—to prevent the spread of the pest. Like Mr. Wood, I agree that the principle of growers taxing themselves is wrong.

The control of these pests should be the duty of the Government. Mr. Craig shakes his head, but there are diseases affecting health, and the whole community subscribes towards their control. After all, the fruit industry is of vital importance to Western Australia. It is of importance not only to the grower himself but to the State because, under normal conditions, by the export of fruit we are able to maintain the balance of trade, and a considerable amount of fresh capital is brought in every year. I have pleasure in supporting the second reading of the Bill. While I appreciate the help the Minister has given he is, after all, only putting into effect what the growers have said, that they are willing to pay the costs of orchard inspection. If a small amount of accrued money is lying in a trust fund, I hope it will continue to increase and that there will be no necessity to spend it on the destruction of any pest.

HON. V. HAMERSLEY (East) [9.37]: I am not going to scratch anybody's back, except the settlers' who have been providing the money. It is a tragedy that this fruit fly menace was not stamped out 30 or 40 years ago. The pest has increased in spite of the fact that in the early days Western Australia and California clubbed together to pay the expenses of Mr. Comper to travel the world in order to find a remedy. The other States would not join in. It is to the credit of the people of Western Australia that they took part in making an attack on various pests. That man was a strong advocate of the parasite to combat

the different scales, insects and other troubles. Most plants have their pests and most pests have their parasites.

The PRESIDENT: Order!

Hon. V. HAMERSLEY: He was particularly successful. Unfortunately the department did not keep a good grip on some of the parasites, but we do know that the settlers themselves have taken a very earnest interest in combating the various pests, particularly the fruit fly. I have been called into certain centres and found they have not seen an inspector, nor heard of one being in that locality. Trees can be seen reeking with this pest and spreading it all round the district.

The Honorary Minister: Where is that?

Hon. V. HAMERSLEY: I was told in one centre that the inspector's salary was reduced during the depression by 22½ per cent. and he decided he would not bother about any further inspections; but he still remained the inspector for that district. All that the growers of fruit have done in the way of building up funds has been undermined by the absence of inspection in certain localities. Mr. Tuckey referred to backyard orchards. The department, in many instances, has been strict with some people. We all know of the case of the lady who was fined for not registering her orchard, which she brought with her to the court. It consisted of one vine. Many people are very careful, but because inspections years ago disclosed the presence of fruit fly, the whole of the trees affected had to be destroyed. Only last season Mr. Baxter and I saw any amount of fruit fly.

I hope the request for more inspectors will be granted. The growers are prepared to pay so that there will be a rigid inspection and more inspectors to cover a wider area. Unless this pest is rigidly controlled it will get out of hand. Some countries practically refuse to purchase our fruit, and rightly so. It is not, however, the fault of the fruitgrowers but of those with the backyard orchards where, in some cases, the trees hang over the fence into their neighbour's yard. The neighbour does not own the orchard and it is a question as to who is responsible in a case like that, if the fruit is rotting in the neighbour's yard. People are put to a lot of trouble in paying the fee of a shilling once a year at the Agricultural Department. Many are put to great expense in travelling

many miles to the department to pay their shillings. I should have thought the Government could have devised some simpler method of collecting the fees.

Hon. H. Tuckey: They could send stamps.

HON. J. M. MACFARLANE (Metropolitan-Suburban) [9.43]: I would not have spoken on this measure were it not for the statements made by Mr. Hamersley and others, that the pest was increasing largely because of the backyard orchardist—the man who has one tree, or something of that description—and because the inspector was not doing his duty in going round to inspect these backyards. My experience in the Metropolitan-Suburban Province is that the inspector does go around, and the Honorary Minister will assure members that the department is quite active in the metropolitan area in that respect. The number of fines and prosecutions in the case of people neglectful of their duty is quite considerable. I am not aware of any lack of activity since the Act was first passed. I do know that there was a time when people were called upon to pay 2s., and I do not think they would object to paying 2s. now for the pleasure of keeping a tree or two in their backyards and enjoying the fruit they produce. The fruit trees in my province are inspected by the department. The wholesale charges made against the backyard orchard are not justified.

HON. J. CORNELL (South) [9.45]: I question the last clause of the Bill which provides that the Act shall continue in operation for five years from the date of the commencement thereof and shall continue in operation thereafter until otherwise determined by Parliament. The first part of the clause is either right or wrong and the same can be said of the second part of the clause. Standing Order 175 provides—

The precise duration of any Bill, the provisions of which are intended to be temporary, shall be inserted in a distinct clause at the end thereof.

Hon. V. Hamersley: One would be an optimist to believe that the fruit fly will be completely cleaned up in five years.

Hon. J. CORNELL: The clause should read—

This Act shall continue in operation for five years and no longer.

If the other words are included, the duration of the measure will not be temporary.

Hon. G. Fraser: A Kathleen Mavourneen?

Hon. J. CORNELL: The clause as printed is neither one thing nor the other. The question is whether the measure is to remain in operation for a limited period or whether it is to be permanent. If it is not to be permanent, an amendment along the lines I have indicated is desirable.

THE HONORARY MINISTER (Hon. E. H. Gray—West—in reply) [9.47]: If the House desires an amendment along the lines suggested by Mr. Cornell, I shall have no objection. The balance of money in the reserve fund at the 30th June, 1941, was £1,181. Of this sum £500 is in reserve, and the balance of £681 will be used to provide for two additional inspectors, making a total of 10 inspectors. The two new inspectors will be placed in the Mundaring and Pinjarra districts. I was pleased to hear Mr. Macfarlane's references to the work of the metropolitan inspectors. There is no doubt they have educated the people to a realisation of the danger. In the Fremantle district we have a very fine man, who pointed out to householders the menace of the fruit fly, and the people there have awakened to a realisation of the position. The department has certainly succeeded in securing the co-operation of the people.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

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

Clauses 1 to 4—agreed to.

Clause 5—Duration of this Act:

The CHAIRMAN: This clause has either to be amended to give it a definite five-year period or struck out.

Hon. W. J. MANN: I propose to move the following amendment—

That the words "and shall continue in operation thereafter until otherwise determined by Parliament" be struck out with a view to adding the words "and no longer."

The CHAIRMAN: This is a provision for making the measure a temporary one. If its operation is restricted to one, two or three years, it need not within that period be reviewed by Parliament, but at the end of the term it must be reviewed or renewed by Par-

liament. There is no need for the insertion of the words "and no longer."

The HONORARY MINISTER: Do you rule, Mr. Chairman, that the clause is out of order?

The CHAIRMAN: It is against Standing Order 175. Is the measure intended to be temporary?

Hon. G. B. WOOD: I shall oppose the suggested amendment. I prefer to see the clause struck out so that the measure will be permanent.

Hon. W. J. Mann: I will not move my amendment.

Clause put and negatived.

Title—agreed to.

Bill reported with an amendment.

House adjourned at 9.52 p.m.

Legislative Assembly.

Tuesday, 25th November, 1941.

	PAGE
Questions: Industrial, loss by strikes and unemployment	2117
Road construction, as to supply of bitumen, etc.	2117
Education, nutrition investigation report	2118
Licensing Act, provisional certificates	2118
Bills: Licensing (Provisional Certificate), 2r.	2118
Land Drainage Act Amendment, returned	2123
Broome Tramway Extension, returned	2123
Lotteries (Control) Act Amendment, 1r.	2123
Companies, Com.	2136
Loan Estimates, 1941-42, Com.	2123

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

QUESTION—INDUSTRIAL.

Loss by Strikes and Unemployment.

Mr. NORTH asked the Minister representing the Chief Secretary: 1, In view of the fact that the time lost by strikes is often shown in terms of financial loss of wages, will he, with a view to clarifying much of the current controversy as to what is possible or not possible regarding credit expansion, cause to be published with unemployment tables, the loss to the com-

munity caused by unemployment in terms of the current wages lost by the men concerned? 2, If not, will he give his reasons why such valuable data should be withheld from those who are striving to assist in this problem?

The MINISTER FOR THE NORTH-WEST replied: 1, No State has, as yet, devised a complete and continuous means of recording and dissecting unemployment. For Australia the only unemployment figures available which are comparable for the various States are those showing the percentages of unemployment amongst members of certain trade unions, which furnish quarterly returns to the Commonwealth Statistician. These figures, however, are only a "sample" and should not be taken as a measure of the relative degree of unemployment amongst the "population available for employment." For this State, the only figures of unemployment available in addition to the quarterly trade union percentages are the Labour Exchange and Department of Employment registrations. What incomes these unemployed persons would earn if working is purely a matter for conjecture. In view of the importance of securing adequate records of employment and unemployment, the Commonwealth and State Statisticians are endeavouring to widen the field of their collections, and they are now increasingly collaborating for that purpose. 2, Answered by 1.

QUESTION—ROAD CONSTRUCTION.

As to Supply of Bitumen, etc.

Mr. SAMPSON asked the Minister for Works: 1, In view of the difficulty which has existed for many months past because of the impossibility of securing sufficient bitumen or equivalent substances for road surfacing purposes, is he able to advise that the position has improved and that supplies are now, or are likely to be, available in the near future? 2, If such is not likely to be available at an early date, is he able to advise the use of any near quality substitute which would mean protection of surface to those roadways not yet completed?

The MINISTER FOR WORKS replied: 1, No. 2, No.