

there would be some justification for the Government to come forward and do what they propose doing in the Wiluna Water Board Loan Guarantee Bill that came before us this afternoon, and provide something in the nature of a guarantee for those who are asked to bear the burden of the other section who are asking to be relieved.

Hon. J. Cornell: That would be worse than paying sustenance.

Hon. J. NICHOLSON: We provide sustenance for unemployed workers. Here is another instance of people who are, shall we say, impecunious. The impecunious are equal to the unemployed workers, and so it is only fair for the Government to recognise their responsibility in circumstances such as these. But there is still another reason why we should not agree to a clause such as that to which I have referred; it is the effect it will have on trade in general. There is a duty upon us here to do what we can to extend credit and facilities for business and trading. If we can do that, we are doing something to assist the Government in relieving the stress of unemployment. It is very bad policy indeed for any Government to pass legislation of a highly restrictive character such as this. Instead of being beneficial to the worker, it will only mean less work, more unemployment and more destitution. Take, for example, a man who is prepared to invest his money in the building trade. Is he going to invest money in that way, with restrictive legislation of this nature hanging over him? Restrictive legislation is very much like heavy taxation, and Governments who impose heavy taxation as well as restrictive legislation find soon that it does harm, and instead of helping towards a happier and better position of affairs it usually ends in a worse. Holding these opinions, I can only say that I cannot see my way to do more than support a reasonable extension of the Act; when the Bill goes into Committee I shall certainly vote against the contracting out clause.

On motion by Hon. J. Cornell, debate adjourned.

*House adjourned at 7.50 p.m.*

## Legislative Assembly,

*Thursday, 28th September, 1933.*

	PAGE.
Questions: Bulk handling, rolling stock ... ..	1137
Mother Hubbard appeal ... ..	1137
Spark arresters ... ..	1138
Bills: Purchasers Protection, 1A. ... ..	1138
Police Act Amendment, 3A. ... ..	1138
Employment Brokers Act Amendment, 2A. ... ..	1148
Feeding Stuffs Act Amendment, 2A. ... ..	1150
Plant Diseases Act Amendment, 2A. ... ..	1151
Goldfields Allotments Revestment, returned ... ..	1151
Supply (No. 2), £1,201,000, returned ... ..	1151
Financial Emergency Tax, Assessment Act Amendment, Council's Message ... ..	1151
Financial Emergency Tax, Council's requested amendments ... ..	1151
Annual Estimates, Com. of Supply ... ..	1141

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

### QUESTION—BULK HANDLING, ROLLING STOCK.

Mr. GRIFFITHS asked the Minister for Railways: What are the average and approximate operating costs of (a) the steel trucks converted for bulk wheat, (b) the balance of the steel trucks, for the eight months period December, 1932, to July, 1933, inclusive?

The MINISTER FOR RAILWAYS replied: The costs are not recorded, nor is it practicable to record them.

### QUESTION—MOTHER HUBBARD APPEAL.

Mr. MOLONEY asked the Minister for Police: 1, Has permission been granted by the Commissioner of Police for the conduct of the Mother Hubbard Golden Orange Appeal? 2, Does this come within the meaning of the Lotteries Control Act, and have the Crown Law authorities ruled that it is a lottery? 3, Is the manager of the appeal a member of the Lotteries Commission? 4, Is it a fact that the manager of this appeal has been warned to discontinue the appeal as it is at present being conducted? 5, What action, if any, does the Minister propose to take?

The MINISTER FOR POLICE replied: 1, No. 2, It has been ruled by the Crown Law authorities that it is a lottery and as such would come under the Lotteries Control Act. 3, No. 4, Yes. 5, The position is being considered.

**QUESTION—SPARK ARRESTERS.**

Mr. DONEY asked the Minister for Railways: 1, What type of spark arrester is at present in use on the State railways? 2, Is it regarded as quite satisfactory? 3, What royalties, if any, are being paid annually in regard to this arrester, and to whom is payment made? 4, Has the present or any previous Government offered a reward for an acceptable spark arrester? 5, If so, was the reward ever paid, to whom, and in what amount?

The MINISTER FOR RAILWAYS replied: 1, H.D.D. baffle plate, together with wire mesh. 2, Yes. 3, None. 4, No. 5, Answered by No. 4, but the inventors—Messrs. Hadlow, Davenport, and Downing—were awarded £1,000.

**BILL—PURCHASERS' PROTECTION.**

Introduced by the Minister for Justice and read a first time.

**BILL—POLICE ACT AMENDMENT.**

*Third Reading.*

**THE MINISTER FOR EMPLOYMENT**

(Hon. J. J. Kenneally—East Perth) [4.35]: I move—

That the Bill be now read a third time.

**MR. MARSHALL** (Murchison) [4.36]:

I wish to protest against this measure, although it is going to another place in a very modified form. Many desirable amendments have been made to it, but the principles contained in it are practically the same. It is the principle which causes me to offer a final protest against the Bill. I can only say I am particularly pleased that the punishment originally intended to be inflicted has been materially reduced. No doubt this legislation will be welcomed in another place because it is class in character. It will apply only to those who are in search of work. It should therefore meet with the whole-hearted approval of another place. No one will be punished except those who have to seek hard work in order to live. I anticipate in consequence that it will receive a warm welcome where it is going, and will finally become law. This does not prevent me from making a final protest. I know there is no hope of having it defeated now.

Members have decided upon the attitude they propose to adopt. I am making my protest on the ground that it is wrong in principle to punish anyone who makes a false declaration in order to get work.

**MR. RAPHAEL** (Victoria Park) [4.38]:

I also desire to enter a protest against the Bill. It is a measure that would have been put through the last Parliament if it had been so sorely needed. I agree with the previous speaker that it will be welcomed with open arms in another place. I would not like to say it will be welcomed by all members there, but those who are opponents to Labour, knowing full well that the Bill is hitting solely at Labour men in straitened circumstances, will assuredly welcome it.

Mr. Stubbs: That is ungenerous.

The Minister for Justice: I would not say that. That is not right.

Mr. Stubbs: And it is unfair.

Mr. Sampson: It is a serious reflection on another place.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. RAPHAEL: Certain cases of malpractice on the part of those who have been getting sustenance are known, but I claim that the success which has attended previous prosecutions should have been sufficient warranty for allowing the law to remain as it is. Many innocent people have been sent to prison, people who have not wilfully done wrong, and there is a stain against their character for the rest of their lives. The Act is fairly elastic as it stands, and this Bill will not allow the authorities to go very far. The measure is designed more for intimidation purposes than to assist in the administration of the Act. The Minister for Employment knows the position as well as other members do. Perhaps he was actuated by his own experience in bringing down the Bill. I have been silent all through the debate up to now. My electors, however, have brought it home forcibly to me that they do not want this Bill to become law. I am not referring to any people who have transgressed, but to those who regard the measure as a hit at the very people the Government represent, namely, the Labourites. It is for that reason I protest against the Bill becoming law, as undoubtedly it will do. I trust when the Minister is clothed with this additional authority he will tem-

per justice with mercy in every case in which it is intended to take action.

Mr. Wansbrough: He will not administer the Act.

Mr. RAPHAEL: He will have a say in the final prosecution.

Mr. Latham: He will not always be there.

Mr. RAPHAEL: I trust while he is in office he will temper justice with mercy in all such cases. I hope he will occupy that position for the rest of his life, but it is possible, seeing that the electors often have short memories, the time will come when he will not occupy a position in which he can administer this legislation. When that time comes, how can we, as Labour men, appeal to those who are then administering the law? How can we ask for mercy for some misguided person when it can be hurled at us that it was our party that brought this law into existence, and that it is only being administered as it was originally put through? It would have been better if the Government had decided to let the law remain as it is. I am no advocate for those who wilfully rob the Government, and deprive people of the extra amount of money they would otherwise have received.

The Minister for Employment: That is just what your actions point to.

Mr. RAPHAEL: That may be the Minister's opinion. I know what is in my mind, and he does not. Although he is pretty shrewd, he cannot read my mind.

Mr. Sampson: Would you give him a prize if he could?

Mr. RAPHAEL: The hon. member would not get a prize in a dog show.

Mr. Latham: That is a compliment.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! The hon. member must address himself to the question.

Mr. Sampson: The hon. member could not get a prize as the principal goat.

Mr. RAPHAEL: Prosecutions have already been launched under the Act. If the Crown Law authorities desire to take proceedings in other cases, they have the requisite power to do so. I am not blaming either the present Government or the past Government. A man may desire to earn his own living instead of living on the earnings of his children. In some misguided way he may apply for sustenance purely for the purpose of getting a job. He may be unlucky enough to be caught before he gets work, and when he is

caught he has to go to prison and suffer a perpetual disgrace. For these reasons, I must enter a final protest against the passing of the Bill. My remarks are not made in any personal way. I have every respect for the Minister, and I imagine he thinks he is doing the correct thing. His opinion, however, does not coincide with mine. When the Bill becomes law, if we are lucky enough to be still in this Chamber, it will be very hard for us when we have to appeal to members of the Opposition to show a little mercy to those who are downtrodden and in want, and have made application for sustenance.

MR. LATHAM (York) [4.45]: I would not have risen to speak in opposition to the third reading of the Bill, had it not been for the remarks of the member for Victoria Park (Mr. Raphael), who asserted that members of the Opposition would support such legislation. I pointed out previously that the Bill was not a party measure, and that members of the Opposition were allowed to exercise freedom of thought respecting it, as they have always been allowed to do regarding legislation. Personally I shall vote against the third reading, should it be taken to a division, on the grounds that I have previously stressed. I am prepared to repeat my protest at this stage. I say emphatically that members of the Labour Government may live to be sorry that they introduced legislation of this description, which will become part and parcel of a permanent statute. It is not the present Administration that we need worry about. The trouble is that the powers provided in the Bill may be used for purposes not intended by the Government. I thought the Minister would have been reasonable enough to withdraw the Bill and introduce another measure that could have died with the passing of the depression. He has been adamant, and desires the amendments to be incorporated in the Police Act, which stands for ever until repealed. I am of opinion that there is no need for this legislation, and certainly not as much need as there may have been two or three years ago. There will be very few instances in which action need be taken. I agree with the Minister that the person who obtains sustenance by means of false representations, should be punished. But in this instance the Government will receive value for the money paid and that makes

it a different matter. There can be but a small percentage of offences of the description complained of, and I do not think any good purpose will be served by placing on the statute-book a provision that Ministers, as representatives of Labour organisations, may be sorry for in the future. I make a final appeal to the Minister, and shall oppose the third reading of the Bill.

#### THE MINISTER FOR EMPLOYMENT

(Hon. J. J. Kenneally—East Perth—in reply) [4.49]: I do not propose to reiterate the statements I made in speaking during the earlier stages of the consideration of the Bill, but I deem it necessary to reply to some remarks by the member for Victoria Park (Mr. Raphael). He said that he opposed the Bill for a few small reasons. The majority of members will agree with him that it is for very small reasons that he has opposed it. As a matter of fact, it does not matter which Minister may be in office, or to which party he may belong, it is a Minister's duty, and his sworn obligation, to protect the revenue of the State.

Mr. Latham: But in this instance the Minister will get value for the money.

The MINISTER FOR EMPLOYMENT: I am not dealing with that phase at the moment, but I remind the Leader of the Opposition that while value may be obtained for the money spent, it will be at the expense of a person who has not sufficient, that the individual, who has sufficient, will benefit. I agree with the Leader of the Opposition when he says that only a small number of persons will be guilty of the offences the Bill seeks to deal with. All the statutes of this or any other country are based on the principle of protecting the community against the few. The majority of our citizens are prepared to do the right thing. While we have a few people who are unscrupulous enough to allow others to starve while they have plenty, and are prepared to make sworn declarations in order to take that which may be available from persons who are starving, legislation of this description is necessary.

Mr. Latham: If a man makes a false declaration, you can deal with him.

The MINISTER FOR EMPLOYMENT: That is not so, and the hon. member knows it.

Mr. Latham: Most decidedly you can deal with a man who makes a false declaration.

The MINISTER FOR EMPLOYMENT: Then the Leader of the Opposition is pitting his knowledge against the knowledge of those members of the legal fraternity who have dealt with this problem. The hon. member's own Government were told that they could not deal with the position.

Mr. Latham: There was a doubt.

The MINISTER FOR EMPLOYMENT: Not at all.

Mr. Raphael: Then why have prosecutions been successful in the past?

The MINISTER FOR EMPLOYMENT: The member for Victoria Park opposed the Bill for small reasons, but had he gone into the matter more closely, he would have known that past prosecutions that had been successful concerned men who had obtained sustenance. The Bill was introduced because the advice tendered to the Government by the Crown Law authorities was that a sworn declaration submitted by a man in his desire to obtain work, is not one that is required to be made by law, and, therefore, the individual so doing does not render himself liable. There have been no successful prosecutions against men who have £10 or £12 a week coming into their homes, and who have made false declarations in order to obtain work that rightly belonged to others who had nothing.

Mr. Latham: I do not think the matter has ever been before a court.

The MINISTER FOR EMPLOYMENT: The Crown Law authorities were requested by the hon. member's Government to take action, but they replied that no offence had been committed under the law as it stood. They recommended that if the Government desired to protect the revenue in that direction, amending legislation was necessary. If Ministers or ex-Ministers are prepared to stand aside and allow revenue to be depleted, as in the past—

Mr. Latham: It has not been depleted.

The MINISTER FOR EMPLOYMENT: It has. I have given instances that are recorded in "Hansard," and I do not desire to repeat them. Revenue has been depleted on a number of occasions. If the Leader of the Opposition or any other ex-Minister is prepared to let that go unchallenged, he cannot take umbrage when the Government decide to take action.

Mr. Latham: Would you have supported such a measure if we had introduced it? You know you would not have done so.

The MINISTER FOR EMPLOYMENT: When people are in want and there are other unscrupulous persons who have plenty but are prepared to take from those who are not in such a fortunate position, I will at all times be prepared to support action taken to protect the distressed. The whole of my record shows that I am prepared to support any legislation of that description. I mention that because I have made it very clear throughout the debate on the Bill that its objective is to protect the men who are down and out against others who are sufficiently unscrupulous to make sworn declarations enabling them to avail themselves of what should properly belong to those who have nothing. I hope the Bill will be passed by both Houses, in order to place the Government in a position to act along those lines. It will permit us to provide additional work for those who are down and out at the present juncture.

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

Ayes	..	..	..	..	18
Noes	..	..	..	..	14

Majority for Ayes .. .. 4

#### AYES.

Mr. Clothier	Mr. North
Mr. Collier	Mr. Piasse
Mr. Coverley	Mr. Rodoreda
Mr. Doney	Mr. Sampson
Mr. Kenneally	Mr. Thorn
Mr. Lambert	Mr. Willcock
Mr. McCallum	Mr. Wise
Mr. Moloney	Mr. Withers
Mr. Munsie	Mr. Wansbrough

(Teller.)

#### NOES.

Mr. Brockman	Mr. J. H. Smith
Mr. Cross	Mr. F. C. L. Smith
Mr. Griffiths	Mr. Stubbs
Mr. Hegney	Mr. Tonkin
Mr. Latham	Mr. Welsh
Mr. Marshall	Mr. Wilson
Mr. Sleeman	Mr. Raphael

(Teller.)

Question thus passed.

Bill read a third time and transmitted to the Council.

### ANNUAL ESTIMATES, 1933-34.

#### *In Committee of Supply.*

Debate resumed from the 26th September on the Treasurer's Financial Statement, and on the Annual Estimates; Mr. Sleeman in the Chair.

*Vote—Legislative Council £1,442.*

[41]

MR. GRIFFITHS (Avon) [4.58]: I desire particularly to stress the fact that if we are to look forward with any degree of hope regarding the future, strict attention must be paid to our export trade, the principal lines of which are our wheat and wool, backed up by gold.

Mr. Raphael: You will have plenty of that when the next war comes along.

Mr. GRIFFITHS: I followed the Premier with close attention when he introduced the Estimates, and also the Leader of the Opposition when he discussed them. I am sure I will have the Premier with me in the remarks I am about to make.

Mr. Raphael interjected.

Mr. GRIFFITHS: I wish someone would get some fly-tox and settle the member for Victoria Park.

Mr. Raphael: Rat poison for you.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The member for Avon will address the Chair.

Mr. GRIFFITHS: I believe the Premier will be in accord with what I have to say because, on the 16th December last, he himself stressed the fact that in the interests of the wheat-growing industry, something drastic would have to be done. He pointed out that within the next two or three years possibly there would be a reduction of 50 per cent. in the acreage under crop, and he appealed to the people of Western Australia to try to visualise what that would mean. He also said it was only right that the distressed farmers should be given at least three years security of tenure. He remarked that it had been said that many men on the land were round pegs in square holes, but he thought the proportion of such men was not very large, and he considered that all alike should be given security. With all that I heartily agree. He also contended that the men who were producing wheat, a product essential to life, were at least entitled to some reasonable share of that commodity, and he stated that many farmers were not getting as much as was allowed to sustenance workers. Further than that, he said the position was tragic, a conclusion that was assented to by the present Minister for Mines. Mr. Collier was proposing that the then Premier should default to the extent of £100,000 if necessary, to help those

distressed industries. 'This is what the hon. member said—

I assure the Premier that he will have plenty of company, with the other five Premiers in the same position.

Mr. Marshall: He will have a majority with him.

Hon. P. Collier: I know this is a drastic action to suggest, but the position in Western Australia is drastic.

Hon. M. F. Troy: It is desperate.

That is all I intend to quote of the passage. But whatever may be the ideas in regard to the proposed defaulting to the extent of £100,000, when recently the member for Pingelly (Mr. Seward) asked certain questions about sustenance and reasonable security of tenure, the present Premier replied that those matters would be considered when the Farmers' Debts Adjustment Act Amendment Bill was being submitted to Parliament. I presume that Bill will come down. But I have had rather a bitter experience of last session, for I found that what occurred last session was used against one when going amongst one's people; I found that certain charges were made against Country Party members to the effect that they had not been alive to the troubles of the farmers, and were not advocating sustenance allowance and security of tenure. My experience was that, when asking various questions, one was continually put off. I should be glad if the Premier would give us a definite assurance that, when the Farmers' Debts Adjustment Act Amendment Bill does come along, we shall get something of what we have been promised. I believe the Premier is genuinely sincere in what he said. I am going to point out briefly the parlous position of the wheat and wool industries, and the vital necessity that something of a very drastic nature should be done to rehabilitate those two industries. What we have to consider regarding those industries is the question whether they are worth preserving. The Leader of the Opposition the other evening pointed out that the exporting industries provided the sinews of war for the payment of our overseas debts. I turned up the "Commonwealth Year Book" to see if I could find there any arguments clearly that those export industries were worth preserving. I have here some figures I obtained from the "Commonwealth

Year Book" of 1932 which, of course, gives the figures for the year 1930-31. According to that authority, all exports overseas amounted to £90,000,000 odd. Out of that, primary products provided 86¾ millions, while manufactured goods sent overseas amounted to £3,419,000. Wheat and wool provided over 80 per cent. of the total sent overseas. Pastoral comes first with £42,000,000 agriculture £25,000,000, dairying and farmyard 9½ millions, mines and quarries £8,000,000 and fisheries and forestry something over a million. The wool industry leads the way with 56.55 per cent., wheat being next with 24.62 per cent. I have submitted those figures in order to give a general idea of the importance of maintaining our wool and wheat exports. Members are aware that the wool industry is carried on without assistance from Governments in any part of Australia. But the position is such that the pastoralists are now unable to pay interest, or alternatively those who are paying interest are neglecting maintenance. I propose to submit some figures which were given by the Commonwealth Wool Committee and laid before the Prime Minister a few months ago. Those figures will show that the wool industry is in a most precarious and tragic position. Let us consider the land crops and the shrinkage that has taken place. The selling price of wheat to-day is 2s. 4d. per bushel, and we see in the Press that apparently the big conference that sat recently had no intention of helping the wheat-growers of the Dominions. That is a most serious position. In 1926-27 the land crops amounted to something like £98,000,000, but in 1930-31 the figure had shrunk to 70½ millions, or a shrinkage of 27½ millions in those crops on which we are depending for balancing our accounts overseas. So it will be seen that the position is most alarming. I am not going to follow the fall in the price of wheat from 5s. 6d. down to its present quote, for that has already been done by the Leader of the Opposition. But we find that wool, which in 1927 was 20.49d., has now dropped to 8.97d., or less than half of what was being brought into Australia in 1927. The wool exports also have shrunk since 1927-28 from £66,000,000 to £32,000,000, or a drop of £34,000,000, which is greater than the drop in all the other industries combined. I will give the decline in our wheat. The Premier in his very able

speech last December pointed out how serious it would be if we were going to get a decline of 50 per cent. in our acreage. The decline in the wheat yield this year, owing to the light rainfall, will be over 9,000,000 bushels. As compared with our record year, it is down 21,000,000 bushels. I should like the House to realise what that means. It makes one wonder how we are going to get on in balancing our accounts during the coming year. The Premier pointed out that the position was most serious. This year it is estimated we shall be down 10,000,000 bales of wool, again owing to the light rainfall, which has militated against the production of wool, and also against the fat lamb business. For the Commonwealth, various estimates are given, from 400,000 bales to half a million bales reduction in the yield of wool. I think I have emphasised sufficiently what this means to our exporting industry. On the Address-in-reply I said that next time I spoke I should say something about the cost of production. The Minister for Mines interjected, "In what way can we reduce that cost?" I think it was in October of last year when this wool committee came into operation. They continued their investigations and finally presented their report to the Prime Minister. To show that that committee consisted of men that might reasonably be looked to as authorities, the personnel was, Hon. John Gunn, chairman; Sir Graham Waddell; Mr. J. Brigden; Mr. W. L. Payne; Mr. B. A. N. Cole; Hon. E. Grayndler, M.L.C.; Mr. R. A. Ramsay; Mr. James Clark, and Mr. R. C. Field. In their report they point out that in 1932 wool was at about 5d. per pound. Since that time the price has been higher, owing to depreciated currency and depreciated sterling. The gold value of wool exported during the last two years has been about one-half of what it was three years ago. I have already stated that the value of wool exported is down some £34,000,000 a year in Australian currency, but in spite of that large decline, wool represents one-third of our exports overseas. This is the third year of calamitous prices, and I think I have stressed in no uncertain terms that this state of affairs cannot continue. Something drastic must be done. I intend to mention briefly a few of the suggestions made by the Wool Inquiry Committee. I intend to deal with wheat afterwards. I shall deal with wool first because it is so important. I think it

was Mr. Bruce who said recently that we were getting home on the sheep's back. There has recently been a slight rise in the price of wool as compared with the two previous seasons, but we must not be too optimistic, because the losses sustained have been so enormous that many years will be needed to recover the position once held. One point was stressed by the Wool Inquiry Committee as follows:—

We are hopeful that world conditions will improve. We do not share the foreboding that future prices will not be higher than pre-war prices, but we do not anticipate a return of the average prices in the last two years. The problem is therefore not only a temporary one, but it involves a revision of the costs imposed on the industry during those years of prosperity.

The committee particularly stressed the gap between costs and prices during the last two years. The average price has been in the neighbourhood of 8½d. per pound. The prices obtained recently have been somewhat higher, not because the market has been higher, but because growers have received the assistance of our depreciated currency and of sterling depreciation. On the price obtained for wool there has been an average loss of about ½d. per pound plus interest. That does not sound very much, but the figures, together with a diagram included in the report, show how big is the item in the aggregate. A half penny per pound plus interest run into enormous figures. The committee based their estimates on the returns of 668 different stations representing well-developed, medium-developed and poor stations, and they took the average right through. Costs varied much, but many of the stations, particularly those controlled by companies, were under much heavier costs. The costs, exclusive of interest, amounted to 8½d. per pound—working expenses, exclusive of interest, representing 6¾d., and maintenance 1¾d. The addition of 1d. per pound for railway and brokerage charge brought the total to 9½d. When the proportion of interest is added, an alarming state of affairs is revealed, and we are able to realise how difficult it is to carry on the industry at a profit. The interest paid attributable to wool averages 1¾d. per pound. Interest payments, in many instances, are being made instead of the money being devoted to maintenance and to provision for drought conditions. In station life, as the member for Murchison and other

know, provision for drought conditions is important, though perhaps not so important here as in the other States. We have been blessed with good seasons during the last few years, and have not suffered to any great extent from drought conditions. Where interest is being paid and where it cannot be paid, the equity of the grower is being largely swamped. The amount required to pay interest at 5 per cent. on a £3 per sheep area is  $4\frac{1}{2}$ d. per pound, and thus wool is costing no less than 14d. per pound at the point of sale. When we recall that wool has brought as low as 5d. a pound—it averaged 5d. in one year—and has recovered to only  $8\frac{1}{2}$ d. latterly, we can understand that something must be done to help the growers who have to pay interest. During the years of prosperity and high prices, costs, whether by tariff or otherwise, have been piled on to the primary industries generally, and the trend of working expenses has been upward. In 1915, the cost was  $8\frac{1}{2}$ d. per pound; in the drought year of 1920, which I presume applied more particularly to the Eastern States, the cost was 1s.  $11\frac{1}{2}$ d.; in 1925, it was 11d., and in 1930,  $11\frac{1}{2}$ d. What reductions have been effected in production costs have been brought about on the stations. There has been a reduction in the cost of labour. In some instances, no amount is shown for management expenses, nothing is allowed for maintenance, and no provision is made against the recurrence of drought conditions. I was rather struck with the committee's remarks about Western Australia. They pointed out that Western Australia had led the way in reducing rail freights on wool. I thought Western Australia was singular in that respect, but it appears that our example has been followed by the other States, and in most of them, according to information I received yesterday, rail freights on wool have been reduced. The reduction of costs mentioned by the committee is necessary not only for the immediate present but for the permanent rehabilitation of the industry. The present necessities, the committee said, had to be met. I have mentioned the reduction of rail freights on wool, but information supplied to me shows that livestock freights are higher here than in Eastern Australia. The same charge is made for 20 miles as for 600 miles, there being no sliding scale such as obtains in the Eastern States, and

what cost 4s. for a 600-mile trip here costs 2s. 8d. in the East. I commend those figures to the consideration of the Minister for Railways, in the hope that he may be able to make some alteration. A friend of mine engaged in the pastoral industry told me that he had forwarded 3,000 sheep to Perth and had had to find 1s. 10d. per head after sending them. Hence the transporting of sheep was not a paying proposition for him. Speaking in general terms of State and private business charges generally, everything that can be done should be done to ease the burden and help to build up primary industries, because their continuance is a matter of life and death to the State. As the Premier said in his speech, we must encourage the people to remain on their land, keep them from coming to the city, and keep the land employed. The committee mentioned that some of the financial houses had been generous and far-seeing in their treatment of clients and this had helped materially, but there had been no uniformity, and in many instances the relief that should have been given had not been forthcoming. Undoubtedly any relief given by the Government, no matter what form it may take, will influence the financial institutions and business people, and encourage them to rally to the assistance of these harassed industries. Complaint has been made that the banking and financial institutions have not reduced their interest charges as rapidly as they should have done. Many of the financial institutions, as mortgagees of various holdings, treat their transactions purely as business from which they look to make not only expenses but profit, and therein lies much of the trouble. Reserves should not be regarded as funds to be kept intact, but should be utilised to assist the industries over the most troublous times. Handling and selling charges have not been reduced proportionately. There has been a reduction in wages, but various charges that should have been reduced, have not been lowered. According to "The Australasian," representations on this score were made by the Victorian Government to the Prime Minister, who said—

It is understood that in the event of our obtaining an agreement from the private banks to reduce the interest rates on mortgages and fixed and savings deposits and overdrafts, the Government will be prepared



to grant a greater amount of taxation relief in the Budget.

Some relief is foreshadowed in the Budget, but I do not know whether it will affect us much—

For some time the Government have been concerned with the disparity between interest rates prevailing here and abroad. In England to-day the rate on certain securities is 7s. per cent. Nothing like that low rate obtains here, and the Government do not expect such a rate to operate in Australia, but do consider that it is time some of the higher rates were cut down.

The committee felt that Governments should not do all the cutting; they should not be asked to do everything. Interest is the largest item of expense for all except a few fortunately-situated growers, and they will have to come lower than they are now. There is one direction in which the State Government might assist, and that is in regard to port charges. In regard to overseas freights, port charges and other expenses involved in the getting of cargo away from this country are reflected in those freights. The distance from Europe is not the chief reason for high freights. A recent issue of the "Bulletin" refers to Australia's high cost of exporting. The paper rather jumped on Western Australia for port charges made here, particularly emphasising the charges at Fremantle; and this, I am sure, will highly interest you, Mr. Chairman. I understand that in the Eastern States income tax is levied on gross revenue. Upon reading the "Bulletin" article I communicated with the Commissioner of Taxation, and from that gentleman learnt that the article was wrong in stating that one item charged here to overseas shipping companies was income tax. Mr. Black informs me that duty is paid only on dividends, apart from the 4½d. emergency tax. The cost of loading and the time spent around our long coast line are stated to be contributing factors to the high freights. Dues paid by overseas ships are stated to be twice the dues paid by interstate ships, which latter also escape high pilotage dues. Further, interstate ships escape light dues. The aggregate of all the charges quoted is substantial. Hence it is that we are stigmatised as charging probably the highest harbour dues in the world. I quote some figures which I have copied from the "Bulletin" article. Freight rates on wool are much higher from Australia than from other wool-exporting countries. The Aus-

tralian rate is 1¾d. per lb. for greasy wool, plus five per cent. primage and less 10 per cent. rebate, the net rate being .062d. per lb. The "Bulletin" article begins with Australian Federal charges. Every overseas vessel bears a charge of 9d. per net register ton for upkeep of lighthouses, representing on a 10,000 ton vessel an amount of £375. Duty on ship's stores is estimated at £180. Customs dues, including pilotage, are estimated at £88. Then there is the sales tax of six per cent., representing in the case quoted £19 5s. 11d. The total is £107 5s. 11d. Furthermore, six per cent. sales tax is payable on all fuel or oil not bunkered within the Commonwealth and used in Australian ports or within the three-mile limit. In addition, there is four per cent. primage on oil and coal used within Australian waters. The article continues—

Let a ship come into Fremantle. This is what a vessel helping to sell Australia's produce overseas pays (in addition to charges at the London end, Federal taxes as above, and 10s. per ton per voyage Suez Canal dues and European taxes). State charges under Financial Emergency Act, 1932, 5 per cent. on outward earnings at 4½d. in the pound; dividend duties; Fremantle sea pilotage to bring vessel from inside Rottnest to the Mole, £25 4s.; pilotage inside and out of harbour (this is charged as State tonnage dues); 1d. or 2d. per ton gross according to circumstances for use of Woodman's Point light as a lead; Fremantle berthing dues, based on gross tonnage plus 20 per cent. It cost the "Strathnaver" £112 14s. 8d. to lie alongside Fremantle Wharf for 24 hours.

Mr. Latham: The freights could be reduced if we took off those charges.

Mr. GRIFFITHS: The argument is that these heavy charges are reflected in the heavy overseas freights Australia has to pay on its exports, wool and wheat, for instance. It is alleged that the charges incurred in kicking about Fremantle are about double those incurred at South African ports. I have not figures to prove the contention that our ports are extremely dear, but I have heard it asserted so often that I would like to see it disproved. It is certain that Fremantle charges are decidedly high—in fact, this has never been contradicted—and that the Fremantle Harbour Trust has become, as I have heard the member for Fremantle say, a good revenue-producer.

Mr. Wansbrough: How would you suggest the cost of the harbour should be met?

**Mr. GRIFFITHS:** The Fremantle Harbour Trust, instead of paying the money they make into Consolidated Revenue, should utilise it to reduce charges, for one thing. Further, the trust should not come on Loan moneys to repair damages. Some little time ago there was a certain amount of kite-flying in Canberra with regard to exchange. Exchange, of course, is the price we pay for the use of British money overseas. An exchange rate of 25 per cent. now prevails. It was 30 per cent., but was brought down to 25 per cent. But for the action that was taken, the exchange might have gone above 30 per cent. However, that would have been balanced as time went on, according to conditions of trade. I now propose to quote an official announcement made by the president of the Graziers' Association of New South Wales in regard to the exchange kite-flying at Canberra. Certain people had been saying that because there was a slight rise in wool, exchange should be brought down. The president of the Graziers' Association said—

We should have a free and uncontrolled exchange. That is what the Graziers' Association asks for, subject to tariff revision, pending which policy being carried into effect, exchange should operate on such a level as will bring the price level of our export industries into equality with the price level of non-exporting industries.

The Prime Minister was approached on the subject, and said that as far as the Government were concerned, they had no hand in the matter and were leaving it entirely to the Commonwealth Bank. The bank board, therefore, are really the people controlling the matter; and so I do not think we need worry much about it. Recently quite a song was being made about the increased prices being received for wool, whereas not 95 per cent. of that first rise had actually benefited the woolgrowers, whose clip had all been sold except to the extent of about five per cent. However, they will benefit by the latest rise, and that will help the position just a little. I cannot do better than quote the words of Sir Norman Kater when speaking at a deputation to the Prime Minister. After outlining the ideas of the Graziers' Association of New South Wales as fair and reasonable so far as the tariff is involved, he stated—

My remarks have been reinforced by the Tariff Boards, namely, "The board considers

it necessary again to comment upon the disturbingly high costs in Australia of essential plant and raw materials."

In earlier reports the board had dealt with the general position in terms of grave warning—

A very modest assessment of these costs would be not less than 2d. per lb. of wool, 18 per cent. of the cost of production other than for land. This is £8,000,000 a year on wool, and 22 per cent. of the estimated total cost of tariff protection in 1927-8. Until that year Australia had been borrowing heavily overseas, and export prices were still able to bear the costs imposed.

Sir Norman Kater then went on to say—

The borrowing and the prices made the tariff costs negligible, but in the last 10 years after the war tariff cost has been added to tariff cost as tiny particles are added to make an anthill. Then the foundations gave way; wool fell to less than half its former value, and overseas lending stopped. Yet tariff protection has been greatly increased. In consequence there exists an economic structure which is singularly precarious.

Concluding an eloquent address, Sir Norman Kater made pointed reference to Western Australia, saying—

Country people hope for a general reduction of the Scullin tariff. Feeling in the rural districts is evidenced by the Western Australian referendum on secession. I ask you to consider very earnestly the appeal of the primary producer for reduction of tariff. It must come sooner or later.

Hon. members may ask, "Why bring up these questions of the tariff, and why talk about bank interest and other things outside our control?" Those factors, as I view the position, are of the gravest moment, and State Governments can assist with regard to them even in the Federal arena. Certain representations could be made to influence the merchant, the banker, and the general trader in regard to their charges. While during the past year of high prices costs after costs have been added, not only by way of the tariff but in other directions, labour has come down without other charges falling proportionately. That is why I emphasise that though these things may not be within the particular scope of this Chamber, yet they should be voiced. If this Parliament has any influence at all with the Federal Parliament, that influence should be used, and the strongest possible representations made, on the other side of this continent for some measure of relief in regard to what

I may term tools of trade, and also in regard to maintenance and improvement of properties and the building up of farms and runs, I was extremely disappointed that from the Minister for Lands there had been no mention of any legislation relating to the position of debtors. Proposals have been laid before the Minister by the Primary Producers' Association and by the Wheat-growers' Union of this State. It has been pointed out to the hon. gentleman that it is impossible to expect men to pay back 2,000 or 2,500 bags of wheat in settlement of a debt that, when it was incurred, represented only 1,000 bags of wheat. It can, of course, be fairly stated that the man who puts money into a mortgage on a property is not looking for accretions and bonuses like the man who buys shares, but is content with a fair return for his money. I read in one of the financial papers a little while ago that immediately things go wrong the mortgagee is called upon to forego something of what is due to him. That is all very well. But we have been passing through a state of affairs of an exceptional nature, and whilst it may be that a mortgagee may claim his pound of flesh, you cannot tell me that the spirit of the thing is correct, when that man is getting back double the amount of the produce because of the little bit of yellow metal that he advanced. With regard to the conditioning of debts, something definite should be stated. I do not want to find the end of the session approaching, as was the case last year, without a definite declaration being made by the Government as to what it is proposed to do. When going around the country I learned that my opponent was telling the people what was going to be done immediately Labour got into power. I believe that it is intended to do something, but I should like to have an assurance that steps are really being taken in the direction of rehabilitating the farmers and giving them some encouragement for the future.

The Minister for Works: What was done during the last three years?

Mr. GRIFFITHS: We were told last year that the conditioning of debts could not be carried out immediately. Now it is repeatedly being said by opponents of mine, that as Labour is in power, it is too big a question to tackle. It seems to me that the same objection exists to-day as existed then.

What a lovely whip I have now to use. We were all told what Labour was going to do when it came in, and I hope now that this reminder of mine will spur on the Government to fulfil their promise.

The Minister for Works: You will be the sorriest man in the State if we do.

Mr. GRIFFITHS: I am not much worried about that. There is no necessity to go outside our own State to learn what things are like respecting these two industries. Sometimes one wonders whether it is all really worth while. One emphasises here what is known to be true—

Mr. Wansbrough: And no one takes any notice of it.

Mr. GRIFFITHS: Exactly. One goes on year after year, but soon all will wake up and be compelled to take notice.

Mr. Raphael: A lot are taking notice on your side of the House.

Mr. GRIFFITHS: Before concluding, I should like to read a letter to show the spirit that exists amongst the farmers. This letter is from a cultured, intelligent and hard-working man, who has been fairly successful, but who finds the going a little too hard. He writes under the nom-de-plume of Agricola, as follows:—

How long is the farming industry going to be allowed to drift? Individual farmers' equity is gradually being swallowed by banks and mortgage holders. Merchants who give credit to allow farmers to be carried on have benefited the mortgage holder in that his capital has gone into the security, and the half-yearly interest debit will soon swamp the farmer's equity and he will be left with the option of a species of serfdom or walking off. Each year sees more and more abandoned farms. In many districts cropping areas are decreasing by reason of economic conditions, and we will wake up soon to find a much greater exodus from the land than has been going on quietly for the past two years.

I said a little while ago that we should all wake up.

Meetings of unsecured creditors have submitted offers to farmers to reduce accounts by 50 per cent. to induce them to carry on. Even a 50 per cent. reduction of debts would induce some to go back to a semi-starvation slavery of underfed and ill-clothed existence.

Wise: Let us take it as read.

Mr. GRIFFITHS: The hon. member will take it as I read it. The letter goes on—

The Associated Banks stepped in and saved Australia carrying the burden when our Governments were either afraid or incapable of

preventing a catastrophe. It is time now for the people, through their Parliaments, to prevent the small remaining equity being completely swallowed by the professional money dealers. Are the many merchants who took what would be called ordinarily safe business risks to be allowed, by press of necessity, to write off their book debts as wholly bad? Our business firms have shown a wonderful spirit in meeting individual farmers' misfortunes, but the time is ripe for something to be done to give a fair deal to the farmer and the merchant, and prevent the money lender from grabbing all. I trust that pressure will be brought to bear and sentiment aroused sufficiently to force our Government to call a conference of bankers, merchants and farmers to devise some scheme that will result in a fair deal all round.

That is what I advocated three years ago. I shall conclude my remarks by expressing the hope that the Government will look into every phase of the matter in order to render the utmost possible assistance to these two industries. It is vitally important that something should be done to give support to what I might describe as a tottering edifice.

Progress reported.

## **BILL—EMPLOYMENT BROKERS ACT AMENDMENT.**

### *Second Reading.*

Debate resumed from the 21st September.

**MR. DONEY** (Williams - Narrogin) [5.55]: Having regard to the times through which we are passing, and the unemployment existing in the State, this is a very important Bill. I approach it holding the belief that it is the duty of the State to endeavour to find work for its people, but not to the extent of relieving the unemployed individual of the onus of himself seeking work on his own account. It certainly should not be sufficient for any man to just lodge his application with an employment agency or a labour bureau and consider thereby that he has discharged his liability to himself and the State. Plainly, there is a very decided tendency in that direction. I am ready to concede that the existing position is largely due to the depression in industry which, I dare say, has made that tendency more or less inevitable. That, however, does not relieve the Government from the responsibility of endeavouring to check it. Speaking generally, the Bill is quite desirable, though not wholly desirable. There

is one weak spot, and I am hopeful that when we reach the Committee stage, that spot will be excised. I am ready to agree that the 1909 Act should be amended, and I hope the House will assist the Minister to amend it. It permits of too much fraud altogether. Whether it be fraud on the part of the employer, the employee or the broker, I should imagine all three parties would be equally culpable. So there should be Government control and an endeavour made to eliminate that fraud, which means a waste of time, a waste of money and a waste of business. Although I am in general agreement with the Minister, I certainly am not in agreement with certain observations he made in the course of his second-reading speech. Especially may I instance his insistence that because the International Labour Office at Geneva held certain views in regard to the abolition of private employment agencies, we in Western Australia must necessarily embody those views in our legislation, or else carry the stigma of being laggards in the field of progress. The Minister quoted Czecho-Slovakia and Yugoslavia, and about thirty other countries whose legislative example he considered we should follow. But all those countries have an outlook entirely different from ours. In Western Australia, as it will be plain to all members, we have problems peculiarly our own, and quite naturally and properly we should either accept or reject proposals according to whether they suit us or not. Why should we care a snap of the finger what other countries might do? I hope that the time will never come when we in Western Australia will find ourselves doing things merely because the Czechs, the Bulgarians, the Slavs or the Turks happen to do them. We here have sufficient individuality and initiative of our own and we are unlikely to hesitate to use them. Queensland, which I understand has abolished fee-charging agencies, has also been held up as an example to be followed by this State. Not one of the other five Australian States has considered it wise to follow that example. This indicates they do not consider it worth following. It does not even commend itself to New South Wales, and it would certainly have little chance of being followed by the more cautious and conservative States in the south and the west. No obligation is cast upon Western Australia to accept the views

of Geneva although I readily admit it is our duty to treat those views with every respect, and thoroughly examine them. That, I am sure, we shall do. One country with which we have a great many economic and domestic points in common, is the United States of America, comprising some 45 States. So far as I can gather, only one State out of them all has considered it worth while to follow Queensland's example.

The Minister for Works: The United States are not part of the League of Nations, as you know.

Mr. DONEY: I do not know what that has to do with this question.

The Minister for Works: They set out the policy. Surely you have read what I had to say.

Mr. DONEY: I did read it.

Miss Holman: The difference is that we agreed to that Convention and the United States did not.

Mr. DONEY: Anyhow, only one State in America has followed the example of Queensland. Had the Minister drawn his examples from countries whose habits and outlook were more like our own, such as the United States, Canada, South Africa, or New Zealand, we might have lent a more sympathetic ear to his pleadings. When, however, he talks about Yugo Slavia, Russia and other countries of the kind, he leaves us pretty cold, and to some extent uninterested.

Miss Holman: And the employment brokers can do as they like.

Mr. DONEY: What really worries us is not the possibility of loss of the unemployment agencies, but what we are likely to get in their place. If they should be de-licensed, we do not want to see unemployment and everything connected with it nationalised, according to the desires of the Minister. Most of the clauses in the Bill are acceptable enough. I do not know what technical objections may be found by the legal fraternity, but I can see nothing wrong with making the granting of a license to an employment broker the function of police magistrates sitting in petty sessions, instead of the function of the licensing court. I also agree that the two inconvenient situation of the proposed agency might, when

the application is made, be a bar to its being granted. Action in that respect should not be on the initiative of the clerk of courts, but on the initiative of the inspector who would know a great deal more than the other official about the lay-out of the city. Information on any points of consequence would be more practicable and of higher value if afforded by the inspector. I would agree to an employee being relieved of all charges attendant upon his application if this had not the tendency to make the applicant more or less irresponsible. He might enter too light-heartedly into his contract. That which is not paid for is not appreciated. When an applicant for employment is given work at no cost to himself, as often as not he will disappoint his employer even when the job has been secured for him. The 1918 Act provides that no payment or remuneration for or in respect of any hiring shall be charged by the employment broker which is not equally charged to the employer. That might perhaps be qualified. There should be a halving of the costs in the case of a successful application. I agree with the Minister in his objection as to the payment of deposits or remuneration prior to a contract being entered into. I am definitely in accord with the object of Clause 16, which provides that when an employer has engaged more than one broker, he shall inform the other brokers what he has done. When a servant has been secured through the agency of one broker, the Bill makes it mandatory upon the employer to inform the other brokers he has engaged, of that fact. That amendment to the Act will clean up the situation, which has long given rise to much trouble and expense. The only part of the Bill to which I take strong exception is Clause 15. This side of the House will be satisfied if given fair play, but I do not think even the Minister would agree that fair play is meted out equally to all parties under this particular clause. He admits there have been abuses on both sides, but he has framed a clause which leaves the way open for many more abuses. The solution he offers will remove the liability from one side, and double it on the other side. The difficulty will not be solved by that means, but it will create a great deal more trouble than it will cure. We have the strange position of the impostor being rewarded for his imposition, and the victim being mulet in still further charges.

If the Minister gets his way, an obligation will be cast upon the employer to pay the fare of the servant from his place of engagement to the place of employment.

Mr. Sampson: That will encourage carelessness on the part of the employee.

Mr. DONEY: The same clause provides that if the service is at any time terminated, for any reason other than wilful misconduct, the employer shall pay to the servant an amount equivalent to the railway fare back to the place of engagement. That is a lopsided idea, and is not entitled to succeed. I do not say it is devoid of merit, but if it has any merits they are well hidden. It may be that a person wishes to go to Merredin. He may happen to see an agency advertisement for a cook in that town. It is easy for a man to say he is a cook. The individual in question may secure the position and ultimately find himself in Merredin. At the end of the day, or after the first meal, the employer may discover that he has shipped the worst cook in the State. What happens then?

The Minister for Works: He gets indigestion.

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

Mr. DONEY: Prior to the tea adjournment, I was endeavouring to illustrate just what a particularly fine time the inefficient servant would have at the expense of his employer in the sense that he would be able to travel and have money in his pocket at the employer's expense. In general, the tendency of the individual of the type I had in mind would certainly be to make a welter of the Minister's all-too-generous proposals. If the Minister gets his way, an impostor of the kind I have referred to, instead of getting a lift with a boot in the proper direction in the time-honoured fashion, will find himself with a pound or two in pocket from the boss, who will certainly swallow a lump or two in the process of paying out. Certainly the Minister makes provision for wilful misconduct, but what does that cover, in the sense that the term is used in the Bill? It does not cover laziness, quarrelsomeness, incapacity, drunkenness or carelessness. It does not cover what one might ordinarily describe as misconduct. When the Minister refers to wilful misconduct, I take it he means something much more drastic, such as

shooting the boss, bolting with the day's takings, and so on. But the term certainly does not cover such offences as ordinarily would result in any employee being discharged from his position. The Minister certainly closes the door against misbehaviour on the part of the employer, but he has left the door wide open to abuses on the part of the employee and the broker, especially if there happens to be, as would be quite easy, a little collusion between them. I hope the Minister understands clearly that this type of legislation will not assist in absorbing the unemployed. I do not desire to labour the matter further. I shall support the second reading of the Bill, but I shall move two or three amendments, particularly to Clause 15, when we reach the Committee stage.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

## **BILL—FEEDING STUFFS ACT AMENDMENT.**

*Second Reading.*

Debate resumed from the 12th September.

MR. THORN (Toodyay) [7.35]: I see no need to take any exception to the Bill the provisions of which are necessary. The object is really to protect people who trade in feeding stuffs for stock, such as the Minister mentioned when moving the second reading of the measure. The Bill will give the inspector the right to enter produce stores and make tests of various lines displayed for sale. The Minister pointed out that the power would apply to such lines as stock licks. That is important and most essential. There are a number of brands of stock licks imported to-day that are recommended as of certain medicinal qualities beneficial to the health of stock. At times I feel that some of the licks are not up to standard, and that stock owners are sometimes inveigled into purchasing rubbish. It is essential that the producers shall be protected, from that standpoint. There is no need to say more regarding the Bill, and I shall support the second reading.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

## BILL—PLANT DISEASES ACT AMENDMENT.

### *Second Reading.*

Debate resumed from the 21st September.

**MR. THORN** (Toodyay) [7.37]: It seems peculiar that most of the proposals advanced by different Ministers, so far, have been such as I have been able to agree to. I am wondering when we shall find something upon which we can disagree!

**Mr. Sleeman**: That shows what good government the country enjoys.

**Mr. THORN**: The object of the Bill, as explained to the House by the Minister for Agriculture, is to amend Section 13 of the Plant Diseases Act. The idea is to give inspectors the right to condemn portions of orchards that have been abandoned. That is an essential precautionary measure in the interests of the fruit-growing industry. It will help in coping with the different diseases that occur in our orchards. It will be understood that parts of orchards may become unprofitable, perhaps because of the age of the trees, and, in those circumstances, growers may abandon an acre or two of their holdings, which are then left to breed diseases and encourage pests. Naturally, fruit trees will go on bearing, even if abandoned and not attended to. The trees will produce light crops of inferior fruit. The Bill will empower inspectors of the Agricultural Department to declare portions of such orchards to be abandoned, and to compel the owners to destroy the trees. The Bill states quite clearly that if portion of an orchard has been neglected for 12 months the Superintendent of Horticulture may, in writing, declare that part of the orchard to be abandoned, and force the grower to grub up and destroy the trees. That is what the Bill amounts to, and I have much pleasure in supporting the second reading.

**MR. SAMPSON** (Swan) [7.40]: The Bill, the second reading of which I support, serves as an indication of the active work carried out by the Agricultural Department. Unquestionably, the measure will have a quick passage through Parliament. Grave danger is apparent regarding the fruit-growing industry because of the existence of many week-end and other orchards that are not properly cared for.

The effect of that is that those who endeavour to produce good fruit under proper conditions, find their task almost impossible because of the neglect of others who do not care for their orchards. Different fungus diseases and insect pests, including fruit fly, are encouraged, and are difficult, in these circumstances, to cope with. In one district not very long ago a community effort was organised to control the fruit-fly. The difficulties of the Fruitgrowers' Association in that district were multiplied by the fact that there were in that area a number of abandoned orchards. Fig-trees, for instance, that were not used for commercial purposes, were neglected and became hot-beds for the breeding of fruit-fly. The work of the association was adversely affected because there was no power to do what was essential, namely, to destroy the infected trees. On the other hand, the owners of the orchards would not agree to do what they should have done. The Bill will bring matters relating to fruit-growing more in accord with proper orchard practice, and I hope that the future will see an absence of the difficulties that have existed in the past.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

### BILLS (2)—RETURNED.

1, Goldfields Allotments Revestment.

2, Supply (No. 2), £1,201,000.

Without amendment.

## BILL—FINANCIAL EMERGENCY TAX ASSESSMENT ACT AMENDMENT.

### *Council's Message.*

Message from the Legislative Council received and read notifying the Assembly that in reply to Message No. 24 from the Assembly it insisted upon all its amendments with which the Legislative Assembly had disagreed.

## BILL—FINANCIAL EMERGENCY TAX.

### *Council's Requested Amendments.*

Returned from the Council with requested amendments.

*House adjourned at 7.43 p.m.*