

structed his officers to do certain work on this very land which had already been cut up for group purposes. And now the Conservator has the temerity to tax the Minister for Lands with putting groups on an area on which forestry work had already been begun. In reality, the position is the exact opposite, and the Conservator began reforestation work on land which had already been surveyed for groups. An officer holding such a high position should have been much more careful in making such an assertion. While supporting the Bill, I take the opportunity to draw the attention of the House to a mis-statement which should never have been made, and which I hope will be withdrawn in the immediate future.

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

### ADJOURNMENT—SPECIAL.

**THE COLONIAL SECRETARY** (Hon. J. M. Drew—Central) [6.17]: I move—

That the House at its rising adjourn until Tuesday, the 6th October.

Question put and passed.

*House adjourned at 6.19 p.m.*

## Legislative Assembly,

*Wednesday, 23rd September, 1925*

	PAGE
Personal Explanation ... ..	999
Questions: Forty-four Hour Week ... ..	999
Motor Lorries, Wanneroo Road ... ..	999
Motion: Experimental Plots ... ..	1000
Bills: Narrogin Soldiers' Memorial Institute, 1a. ...	1000
Metropolitan Water Supply, Sewerage, and Drainage Act Amendment, 1a. ... ..	1000
Electoral Act Amendment, Report ... ..	1000
W.A. Trustee, Executor, and Agency Co., Ltd. Act Amendment (Private), 2a. Com. Report	1000
Cottesloe Municipal Beach Trust, 2a. ... ..	1000
Racing Restriction Act Amendment, 2a. ... ..	1004
Entertainments Tax Assessment, 2a., Com. Report	1006
Entertainments Tax, 2a., Com. Report ... ..	1008
Primary Products Marketing, 2a. ... ..	1009

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

### PERSONAL EXPLANATION.

*Mr. J. H. Smith and the Primary Products Marketing Bill.*

**MR. J. H. SMITH** (Nelson) [4.31]: I desire to make a personal explanation. When the member for Swan (Mr. Sampson) was speaking on the Primary Products Marketing Bill last night I remarked, by way of interjection, that 99 per cent. or 100 per cent. of the fruitgrowers in my electorate were opposed to the Bill. There were many interjections at the time and perhaps my remark was not plainly heard. The "West Australian," however, reported me as having said that 99 per cent. or 100 per cent. of the growers in my district were in favour of the Bill. Early to-day I received a telegram from electors in my constituency drawing my attention to the report in the "West Australian" and asking me to correct the statement in Parliament this afternoon. I beg to do so now.

### QUESTION—FORTY-FOUR HOUR WEEK.

*Estimate of Cost.*

**Mr. LINDSAY** (for Mr. Thomson) asked the Premier: 1, What is the estimated increased cost of the 44-hour week policy? 2, As the Government's action in introducing the 44-hour week in the various departments and industries may automatically bring outside industry under the 44-hour conditions, have the Government an estimate of the increased cost to the State? 3, If not, will they instruct the Statistical Department to prepare an estimate?

The PREMIER replied: 1, A reliable estimate of increased cost, if any, cannot be furnished where so many factors of such a complex nature are involved. 2 and 3, No, for the reasons stated in answer No. 1.

### QUESTION—MOTOR LORRIES, WANNEROO-ROAD.

**Mr. MILLINGTON** asked the Minister for Works: 1, Is he aware that the Wanneroo-road from Cape-street northwards for about 48 chains is in such a bad condition that the local authorities have declared it closed? 2, Is he aware that the damage was caused by heavy motor lorries carting material for the reconstruction of the Wanneroo-road north-

wards from the point complained of, which smashed the planks and made the road nearly impassable? 3, Will he cause an inspection to be made with a view to having the necessary repairs effected, or, alternatively, having the road reconstructed?

The MINISTER FOR WORKS replied: 1, I understand the section of road referred to was advertised as closed in the "West Australian" of 22nd inst. 2, No. The useful life of the road expired long before the cartage of material by the Public Works Department. In fact, the department had to use some of the metal carted to fill the holes in the plank road referred to, before the material could be safely carted. 3, The Government have nothing to do with the upkeep of this road. It is entirely a matter for the road board, and in view of the fact that £6,000 has been provided by Government grants, in two years, for improvements to this road, it is not considered reasonable that the road board should expect the Government to pay for any damage which might have been occasioned by the cartage of material required in connection with the improvements referred to above.

#### **MOTION—EXPERIMENTAL PLOTS.**

Order of the Day read for the resumption of the debate from 9th September on the following motion moved by Mr. A. Wansbrough:—

That all papers in connection with the experimental plots at Marbellup, Young's Sid-ing, and King River be laid on the Table of the House.

**THE MINISTER FOR LANDS** (Hon. W. C. Angwin—North-East Fremantle) [4.37]: I suggest that the hon. member withdraw his motion. I have no objection to the papers being laid on the Table, but they are in use in the department and it would be inconvenient to table them at the present juncture. We have under consideration several matters relating to experimental work in the district, and it is essential to have the papers in the department. The hon. member, or any other member interested, may see the papers at the department at any time.

**Mr. A. WANSBROUGH:** I have no objection to withdrawing the motion.

Motion by leave withdrawn.

#### **BILLS (2)—FIRST READING.**

1, Narrogin Soldiers' Memorial Institute. Introduced by the Minister for Lands.

2, Metropolitan Water Supply, Sewerage, and Drainage Act Amendment.

Introduced by the Minister for Works.

#### **BILL—ELECTORAL ACT AMENDMENT.**

Report of Committee adopted.

#### **BILL—WEST AUSTRALIAN TRUSTEE, EXECUTOR, AND AGENCY CO., LTD., ACT AMENDMENT (PRIVATE).**

##### *Second Reading.*

Order of the Day read for the resumption of the debate from 16th September.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

##### *In Committee, etc.*

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

#### **BILL—COTTESLOE MUNICIPAL BEACH TRUST.**

##### *Second Reading.*

**MR. NORTH** (Claremont) [4.43] in moving the second reading said: This small Bill deals with a subject not often before hon. members for their consideration. It relates not so much to work, as to pleasure. This question has been before the residents of the Cottesloe district for many years. They desire to cater for the pleasure of the public on Saturday afternoons and Sundays on the beach in an up-to-date and convenient manner, as is done in other countries. For many reasons it has been impossible to equip the beach in such a fashion, or even to arrange for the money necessary for that purpose. Several attempts have been made during the last 20 years to place the beach at Cottesloe on a proper footing. We have attempted by means of the local life saving clubs to raise money to improve the beach, but those attempts have proved abortive.

Some years ago an effort was made to launch a company having for its object the improvement of the beach and provision of the necessary equipment so that it would be possible to cater for the public, but sufficient money was not subscribed. An amount of several thousand pounds was raised, but it had to be returned to the subscribers because the total was insufficient to finance a comprehensive scheme. Some £20,000 was required at that time to inaugurate a fun city. When private enterprise did not respond, other methods were tried. The local council attempted to meet the demands of the public, but on each occasion there was opposition from the ratepayers. When it was suggested to spend a few hundred pounds on improving the promenade, the approach, or the jetty, and so forth, ratepayers objected on the ground that it would benefit not the residents of the district, but the people of the State generally. There has also been difficulty in the matter of transport. The railways, being a monopoly, have been able to offer inducements to the people to travel wherever the department wished. If the department preferred to encourage visits to Como or elsewhere, they had only to lower the fares or provide tramway facilities to those places. The Premier has told us that there are many activities that could well be handled by local trusts, and we consider the present time opportune to launch this measure in order that the Cottesloe Beach might be well equipped to minister to the pleasure of the thousands of people who patronise it. If we are successful in getting the Bill passed, we may be able to show the way to other bodies to improve the beaches. The local council have certain powers under the Municipal Corporations Act, but have not the power that we desire. When they undertake a comprehensive scheme they must go to the ratepayers for a loan and comply with the provisions of the Municipal Corporations Act. In nearly every instance when the ratepayers have been consulted on the question of raising a loan, they have refused. Members serving on local bodies know how hard it is to get the public to agree to a loan for any purpose, and they will realise how difficult it is to get them to approve of expenditure that would cater for patrons from other districts. The Bill is a simple machinery one, but the gist of it lies in the powers of the proposed trust for which we are asking sanction. The trust

will really be permitted to borrow money to an extent limited only by what the public will subscribe on debentures to improve the assets they will take over. The assets consist of the beach proper and certain reserves abutting on to it. The trust will be empowered to handle the money in such a way as to produce revenue and show a return to the debenture holders, and meanwhile gradually to carry out improvements to the beach. No provision is made in the Bill for payment to members of the trust. It was considered desirable to omit such a provision as it might arouse opposition to the Bill. If the measure reaches the Committee stage, however, I hope that some suggestion for the payment of the members of the trust will be offered. My suggestion is that the profits made in the preceding year might be earmarked for the payment of members of the trust. The Bill provides that each of the seven members of the board shall serve for two years after the first year has elapsed and the scheme has been got under way. So long as the trust functioned satisfactorily, developed the improvement scheme and showed a surplus, it would be a fair thing to offer members of the trust some emolument for their services. If there was a profit of £500, the members could be remunerated so far as it accrued from their term of office. That is merely my suggestion. There is no provision in the Bill for the payment of members of the trust and, as the measure stands, the only inducement offered to them would be the glory and honour attaching to the position. It is considered that for at least 20 years the trust will be kept busy in building up and making the beach a resort worthy of the State. At Durban, which is situated in latitude a couple of hundred miles north of Cottesloe, a beautiful seaside resort has been created. If that can be done at Durban, there is no reason why success should not attend similar efforts at Cottesloe, provided that proper control is given to the trust and that the assets are handled in a right way. To-day we have a sorry spectacle of thousands of people going to the beach with shillings to spend and practically no means of spending them, except on a cup of tea and a scone. Such people are out to enjoy themselves and I cannot see why, when we are so proficient in making provision for other forms of recreation and amusement, we cannot cater better for the people at our beach resorts. Some of our recreation reserves,

parks and racecourses are first-class, especially the racecourses, but in the matter of beach resorts, Western Australia is very backward. Personally, I am averse to spending an afternoon on an up-to-date beach, because I prefer to get away from the crowd, but there is no doubt a general demand by the public for better accommodation at our beaches. So long as local governing bodies handle the beaches and amusements, there must be a lack of continuity of policy. That has been the experience at Cottesloe. Although there are four grandiose schemes in the archives of the Cottesloe Council, estimated to cost up to £30,000, they do not carry us any further along the road to getting those schemes put in hand. So long as we have the ward system of local government, it will be impossible to create a desire to cater for the needs of outside patrons. This is an age when private enterprise is not greatly to the fore. Some years ago a syndicate offered to spend many thousands of pounds on putting the beach in order, provided they were given control for 30 years. The local council were unable to agree to that condition, and thus things have drifted on for 20 years and Cottesloe Beach to-day is very little better than it was when nature left it to man. It may be urged against the Bill that no one would subscribe money to such an object because the only assets involved are the existing facilities on the beach and others proposed to be provided, but I consider there is no reason why the trust should not raise the rate of interest on the debentures in order to make the scheme attractive. The trust would not be limited by any Act of Parliament in regard to interest rate and, if money were not forthcoming at seven per cent., it might be, say, at nine per cent. No one will gain anything from the trust except the public. It is difficult to get people to come forward to serve in a public capacity unless some inducement is offered. At the same time a great need exists for improving this beach.

Hon. W. D. Johnson: How do you propose to raise the nine per cent.?

The Minister for Lands: By letting reserves belonging to the people.

Mr. NORTH: We shall tell the public we have an asset producing in round figures £1,000 per annum. That amount is derived from the gimcrack sheds already erected on the beach. On that income the trust will propose to erect perhaps a concrete prom-

enade, dancing halls and other accommodation to the value of, say, £5,000, as a commencement.

Mr. George: I hope they will be respectable, anyhow.

Mr. NORTH: I am sure they will be. If the trust then offered eight per cent. or nine per cent. for the money, I think it would be forthcoming. I do not think they would get it at 6½ per cent. or 7 per cent., but seeing that the public will patronise this resort, I cannot see what objection there can be to the trust paying a higher rate for the money. The trust, having obtained the necessary money, would proceed to expend it and charge the public on the days when amusement was provided. If at the end of 12 months there remained any profit after paying all expenses, it could be carried forward to the next year and used either to provide more extensive improvements or to make amusements available at a cheaper rate. It may take fully 20 years before the outlay is finished, provided this Bill is passed. The alternative to the Bill is possibly to amend the Municipalities Act. We might have some extension of the powers contained therein so as to provide for something of this sort, but there has already been a long delay concerning that. Owing to the large crowds which now have to be handled, the time has come for the introduction of the Bill. I should think the Government will be inclined to support it. There is very little choice nowadays in the matter of enterprise. We have private enterprise on the one side, and this is not altogether welcome in activities of this kind. There are only 5,000 residents at Cottesloe, but in one year one million passengers passed in and out of that municipality. In 20 years' time the crowds may be even more vast than they are to-day. If we handed the beach over to a private company, something might be said about the large profits that were being made by such a monopoly. It is not the desire of the Government to take over the beach, although it is purely a matter of catering for the public. We now come to this proposed via media, a sort of emasculated communistic effort. I would call this an innocuous trust, for those who compose it will derive no benefit from it, all the benefit going to the people. This trust will have to make provision for working in with the Railway Department and other transport agencies for the conveyance of people to and from the beach. I feel sure I shall receive support from those members who

have seaside resorts in their electorate, and that in time they will be able to put forward similar measures for their own people. Point Walter has gained considerably as a result of an Act which partly incorporates the proposals contained in this Bill; I refer to the Point Walter tramway. No doubt that tramway has been of great assistance to the district, and has helped the residents very materially.

The Minister for Lands: That was as a result of power given to the local authority under a special Act. The whole district stands as security.

Mr. NORTH: In this case the whole district will not be security for the money

Mr. Hughes: What security is there?

Mr. NORTH: The territory taken over by the trust, which consists of the beach and the buildings thereon (returning £1,000 a year), and the adjacent reserves. The reserves will, of course, not be a security.

Mr. Hughes: If the trust fails, the mortgagee can then take over the assets.

Mr. NORTH: If the trust fails a receiver will be appointed to handle the assets, and will have a right to the buildings.

Mr. Hughes: And the foreshore.

Mr. NORTH: He could not run away with the foreshore. I am sorry to hear anyone talk of failure in connection with Cottesloe Beach. I am sure members wish it to be handled properly, and that there might be an opportunity to derive revenue from the thousands of people who frequent the beach with money in their pockets. At present all that the visitors can get, speaking figuratively, is a cup of tea and possibly a stale scone. In other parts of the world there are properly conducted beaches where there is good organisation for providing amusement for the large crowds who frequent them. Western Australia is second to none in respect to certain of the amusements given to the public, but in the matter of beaches the State is behind other countries. If we had a sum of £20,000 invested in the Cottesloe beach, it would be money well spent. There would be no return to anyone except to the public to be amused.

Mr. Mann: The Fremantle electors will support you.

Mr. NORTH: I think so. The Bill is purely an unselfish measure. It is the wish of the Cottesloe council that it should be introduced. It was framed at the instigation of Mr. Le Quesne, who is from the Eastern States, the mayor of Cottesloe, and others.

It is a difficult matter for the council to handle the beach themselves and provide the needs required there. The machinery at present in existence is too cumbersome to deal effectively with the question at issue. If members oppose this Bill and are not prepared to amend the Municipalities Act in the way I have suggested, they will force a third alternative upon the authorities. I refer to the spectre or the bogey of private enterprise. I am sure the Government are not anxious for that to step in. I would not object to it myself, but in these times one has to endeavour to cut one's coat according to one's cloth, and to deal with things as one finds them. According to the Premier this is an age when trusts should have some support. There is no desire to benefit the ratepayers under this Bill. They will merely be relieved of the duty and bother of handling an asset which at present they are mismanaging. The Cottesloe beach is a monument to lost opportunities. It is one of the finest beaches in Australia. All we have on it to-day are a few jarrah sticks, a half broken-down jetty, and a few yards of concrete representing a promenade, which was put down recently, as a sort of suggestion to the public as to what could be done. I am not personally anxious that the beach should be modernised. I should prefer to see it left as nature made it, but when we have large communities to deal with we must cater for the needs of the people. Besides the beach we have a perfect climate. We also have a Government which is doing all it can to reduce the hours of labour and increase the hours of leisure. Here is an ideal way in which the workers can enjoy their leisure when they get it at practically cost price. The Government are also attempting to increase wages all round.

The Minister for Lands: This is not a Government measure. Do not worry about the Government. I shall oppose it.

Mr. NORTH: The Government are endeavouring not only to shorten the hours, but to increase wages. Here is an opportunity for the wage-earner when he gets his increase, to spend his money in a beneficial way and in a happy and open-air fashion.

Mr. Angelo: And in mixed bathing.

Mr. NORTH: The Bill contains powers to resume land and to purchase and lease land. The trust would in due course become a very influential and important body. I hope it will become a body like the Fremantle Harbour Trust. It will have enormous powers. Figures I have seen show that one

million persons have alighted at Cottesloe station in 12 months. If the Bill becomes law and the money is spent wisely, and the crowds are properly handled, and facilities are given to them for pleasure and amusement, the trust will fulfil an important duty. I am sure members would rather see the beach under the control of a trust than under private management. Whether the trust will show the same acumen, and capacity to move with the times, as a private corporation would, it is not for me to say.

Mr. Davy: How far north will the territory of the trust extend?

Mr. NORTH: It will go to the south of North-street, and the northern boundary of the Cottesloe district.

Mr. Davy: It will take in the ocean beach?

Mr. NORTH: Yes. There may be some room for argument on the question of reserves. Provision has been made so that the Parks and Reserves Act shall apply to the trust. The trust will be able to improve the grounds and fence them and keep off trespassers, as under the Parks and Reserves Act. It will even be able to run a zoological gardens, although that is not yet contemplated.

The Minister for Lands: Will they be able to grant leases?

Mr. NORTH: Yes. I am unable to produce any precedent in the British Empire for this measure. I trust it will receive consideration and will not be shelved. One of the sad aspects of legislation in this State is the usual cry, "What shall we follow and take up that has been done elsewhere? Let us always be last." If Parliament is able to show something novel, some departure from the Municipalities Act which is both necessary and beneficial, I should say members will be pleased to think that this State has achieved something. No one would be more pleased than I if the other States took a leaf out of the book of this Parliament. It may be that some other similar body to this trust is already in existence elsewhere, but inquiries I have made in the department have not brought anything like that to light. There are provisions in the Bill showing how the trust will be appointed, and what its constitution will be. The members will be elected by the people, with the exception of the Government nominee.

The Minister for Lands: So that the Government shall carry the responsibility.

Mr. NORTH: There is nothing about that in the Bill. I am sorry the Minister takes up that attitude. The idea of the Government nominee is to ensure that the Government shall know at first hand what is going on.

The Minister for Lands: It is more likely that it was to give confidence to the people to put their money in.

Mr. NORTH: I am astounded at such a super-businesslike attitude on the part of the Minister. The existing situation on the beach is hopeless, and this new method of dealing with it is put forward. As I look over the ocean and think of Durban, with all the facilities that are offering there and the black labour and so on, I feel ashamed to think that with our superior climate, white labour, and inventiveness we have made such a shocking attempt to handle this beautiful beach. When I look at the measure I regard it as so simple that I feel sure it will go through with hardly any discussion. I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

On motion by the Minister for Lands, debate adjourned.

## BILL—RACING RESTRICTION ACT / AMENDMENT.

### *Second Reading.*

MR. SLEEMAN (Fremantle) [5.16] in moving the second reading said: This little Bill is practically the same as the measure I introduced last session. It provides that 12 trotting meetings per annum shall be permitted within the Fremantle district, two of the meetings to be for charity. I do not, however, wish the charity aspect of the Bill to enter into the picture at all. Another point which I do not desire to stress is that if the Bill passes quite a large sum of money will be circulated in the Fremantle district in getting the track put into order. Fremantle is entitled to some form of recreation. At present Fremantle residents have neither a racecourse nor a trotting track.

Mr. Clydesdale: They could not support one when they had it.

Mr. SLEEMAN: It is only rarely that we have a football match at Fremantle. In fact, Fremantle is the only port in Australia which is not provided with either a racecourse or a trotting track.

The Premier: It is fortunate in that respect!

Mr. SLEEMAN: It might be fortunate for some people, but for those who had to travel week after week, and year after year to find the sport they desired, it was not fortunate. It was interjected that Fremantle residents could not maintain a race-course when they had it. That remark came with bad grace from the interjector. If it had been a registered course, instead of an unregistered course, it would have succeeded. However, as it was an unregistered course run by a proprietary club, the less said the better. The parent Act provides that the metropolitan district may have annually 76 galloping meetings, six of them for charity, and 35 trotting meetings, with five extra for charity. I cannot imagine why a restriction should be placed on the metropolitan area more than on any other part of the State. In this respect other districts have a free leg.

Mr. Clydesdale: There are restrictions on the goldfields.

Mr. SLEEMAN: What restrictions?

Mr. Clydesdale: As regards trotting meetings.

Mr. SLEEMAN: There are no restrictions on any other part of the State. Other districts can have any number of meetings they like.

Mr. J. H. Smith: That is wrong.

Mr. SLEEMAN: So far as the law goes, they can.

Mr. J. H. Smith: Permission has to be obtained from the Western Australian Turf Club.

Mr. SLEEMAN: There is nothing in the law to stop meetings from being held, and the W.A.T.C. should have no right to dictate to the people. Why should proprietary clubs be allowed to operate here and send their profits out of Western Australia to the moneybags in the Eastern States? We are continually talking about the way the Eastern States are fleecing Western Australia, and yet we allow the proprietary clubs to fleece us week after week.

Mr. Clydesdale: They are not paying 5 per cent.

Mr. SLEEMAN: We know that the proprietary clubs are philanthropic institutions.

Mr. Clydesdale: I can prove what I say.

Mr. SLEEMAN: We know that the proprietary clubs are here simply for the benefit of the sport! Their one object is to make the sport progress! They are not in the game for the sake of profit! I ask

hon. members to take certain assertions with a grain of salt. As regards the sport of trotting, I have at times attended meetings, and a trotting meeting is a place to which one can well take his best friend. One phase of the sport on which I must congratulate the trotting authorities is that no children are allowed on the courses, whereas on the courses of the proprietary clubs one can see boys in knickerbockers making bets—a thing that should be stopped. I commend the trotting clubs for keeping children off their courses. They employ efficient staffs, and I defy anyone to say that children are ever allowed on trotting courses. The Bill provides that "Fremantle district" shall mean within a radius of five miles of the Fremantle Town Hall, which is a very reasonable distance. The Fremantle Trotting Club have a fine ground, which they have kept for many years in the hope that with the removal of wartime restrictions they would come into their own and be able to hold meetings in their own town. The course is an ideal one. At present Fremantle people who wish to patronise trotting or racing have to come to Perth on Saturday evening to attend a trotting meeting, or else travel beyond Perth or even far into the country if they wish to patronise galloping. The money so spent should be spent in the Fremantle district. Quite a number of race-horses and trotting horses are trained in Fremantle without any provision for meetings on the spot. I know that the fairness of hon. members will support me when I say that I am only asking that to which Fremantle is entitled. Two sections of people are opposed to the Bill. The opinions of one section I respect. They are people who do not believe in gambling of any kind, and who are opposed to racing. Such people, I admit, have a perfect right to their opinions. Another section opposed to the Bill consists of people who are practically living on the proceeds of gambling, and people who are running proprietary racing clubs. I hope the objections of the latter will not weigh in this House, and that Fremantle will at last come into its own. Such objections are mere hypocrisy, and designed to prevent Fremantle residents from enjoying a little recreation in their own town. I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

On motion by Mr Clydesdale, debate adjourned.

## BILL—ENTERTAINMENTS TAX ASSESSMENT.

### *Second Reading.*

Debate resumed from the previous day.

**MR. SAMPSON** (Swan) [5.27] : I regret that I find myself unable to support the Honorary Minister for Health in respect of this Bill. I am aware, of course, that the tax was originally imposed by the Federal Parliament. The impression I had then and have now is that that action was an invasion of State rights. Whether the tax was justified or not is a point that has always been open to question. I recall that the justification urged at the time was that the country was at war. It cannot be denied that the provision of funds for the maintenance and equipment of hospitals is a Government duty. I have often wondered why hospitals should be regarded in a different light from other Government activities, education, for instance. If a school is required, the public are not called upon to provide the funds. As regards hospitals throughout the State, moreover, there is unfair discrimination. We have a variety of hospitals: Government hospitals for which funds are provided by the Government, plus amounts collected from patients; committee hospitals, in connection with which the different committees have to provide funds, for which purpose they arrange entertainments, and are called upon to exercise a good deal of thought in order that the hospitals may keep open. One must recognise that the advantage is all on the side of the Government hospital. In my opinion, the position is utterly unfair, and I acknowledge that a Bill to amend the Hospitals Act is necessary. Unfortunately this Bill contains no suggestion for providing what is necessary in that respect. During the 1922-23 session of Parliament a Hospitals Bill was brought down to this House, and was passed here after strong opposition, it being claimed that the Government had a duty to provide the funds necessary, and that the proposed imposition of a tax to secure funds was improper. The Bill was not approved in another place. To-day the need of hospital construction and hospital maintenance and equipment is as great as it has ever been, or even greater. I sympathise with the Honorary Minister in his effort to secure the funds required. Nevertheless

there is a widespread feeling that the imposition of a tax on the small sums suggested in the Bill, from 9d. to 2s. 5½d., being the charges for admission to entertainments, is not justified.

**Mr. Marshall**: This is not a new tax.

**Mr. SAMPSON**: So far as this Parliament is concerned, it is new. I am aware that the Federal Government propose to relinquish this particular avenue of taxation up to the point of 2s. 5½d.

**Hon. S. W. Munsie**: Where does the widespread opposition come in?

**Mr. SAMPSON**: I am strongly of opinion that a definite tax, whereby all sections of the community would contribute, would meet with greater favour than a tax under which, as in this case, a section only would provide the necessary funds.

**Hon. S. W. Munsie**: It is optional. People need not pay the tax unless they like.

**Mr. SAMPSON**: I listened carefully to the speech delivered by the Honorary Minister, and I recall his mentioning that for the concluding part of this financial year it is estimated that a sum of £16,000 will be collected, and that in future years an amount up to £25,000 is expected to be recovered. But, with all respect, it seems to me that this effort is merely paltering with a big subject requiring a considerably larger sum than the tax is estimated to produce.

**Hon. S. W. Munsie**: This will get for the hospitals at least £13,000 per annum more than your Bill would have got.

**Mr. SAMPSON**: Very well, let us have a measure that will provide sufficient. One of the most important things a community can furnish is hospital service for the people. It has been well said that by hospital treatment shall the civilisation of a people be judged. Money could not better be provided than for the establishment of hospitals. The Minister said the use of the money would afford greater relief than if there were no such collection and application of the tax. That is a specious argument.

**Hon. S. W. Munsie**: I do not think I said that.

**Mr. SAMPSON**: I have taken that from the report of the Minister's report.

**Hon. S. W. Munsie**: I am positive I did not say that.

**Mr. SPEAKER**: The hon. member is not in order in quoting speeches made during this session.

**Mr. SAMPSON**: From memory, the Minister said the money the tax would provide



would do a greater amount of good than its collection would do harm.

Hon. S. W. Munsie: Now you are getting nearer.

Mr. SAMPSON: I do not know that I have cleared up the position very much. However, I am glad to have met with the approval of the Minister. Still, as I say, that is superficial reasoning and is not quite convincing. Why did the Federal Treasurer decide to abandon this tax?

Mr. Marshall: He was going to the people, and had to do something.

Hon. S. W. Munsie: Principally because of deputations that waited on him and on the Minister for Home and Territories, asking that the Federal Government should relinquish the tax to hospital purposes.

Mr. SAMPSON: Then the Federal Treasurer relinquished this so that hospitals throughout the Commonwealth might benefit? I was under the impression it had been abandoned because it affected a section of the people who, in the opinion of the Federal Treasurer, could not afford the tax. Quite apart from that aspect, the imposition of this tax has always been burdensome and irritating. In small country centres there is a very strong feeling against it. While we claim to be doing all in our power to encourage residence in country districts, nevertheless no matter how small the local entertainment, if the admission charge amounts to 1s. a tax has to be paid. I realise that the tax proposed in this measure starts with an admission fee of 9d. I do not think the tax is justified, and I do not believe sufficient money will be provided under it to meet what is necessary in the hospitals. I would support the Minister with a good deal of enthusiasm if he were to bring down a Bill having for its object the taxation of income at its source in order to provide necessary funds for hospitals. Then the tax paid would be in accordance with the income.

Mr. Marshall: Did your Bill put that up?

Mr. SAMPSON: Yes.

Mr. Marshall: No, it did not.

Mr. SAMPSON: More money would have been necessary than was provided in my Bill, but I hoped that the amount would be increased from time to time.

Mr. Marshall: Would the admission charge for entertainments be reduced if this tax were dropped?

Mr. SAMPSON: Because of the introduction of the Federal amusement tax, ad-

mission charges to small entertainments were increased, thus passing on the tax. I am opposed to the Bill. I do not think it will do what it purports to do. I will vote against the second reading.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

### *In Committee.*

Mr. Lutey in the Chair; Hon. S. W. Munsie (Honorary Minister) in charge of the Bill.

Clauses 1 to 3—agreed to.

Clause 4—Tax on payment for admission to entertainments.

Mr. SAMPSON: I hope further consideration will be given to this. I do not think the funds required for hospitals will be provided by the proposed tax. It merely means an additional taxation measure without securing the desired object.

Clause put and passed.

Clauses 5 to 7—agreed to.

Clause 8—Entertainments exempt from tax:

Mr. SAMPSON: I move an amendment—

That the following paragraph be added:—  
“When the entertainment is intended only for the amusement of children, and when the charge is not more than 1s. for each person.”

This is on all fours with a provision in the Federal Act.

Hon. S. W. MUNSIE: I hope the Committee will not agree to the amendment. The hon. member said there was something similar to it in the Commonwealth Act. I have read the Commonwealth Act, but cannot find anything of the sort. If this amendment were agreed to we should require two or three additional inspectors in the Taxation Department to determine what entertainments were exclusively for children; because nine out of 10 entertainments would then be advertised as being specially for children.

Mr. SAMPSON: There certainly is in the Federal Act a provision for exemption from tax when the entertainment is intended only for the amusement of children.

Hon. W. D. Johnson: But can you amuse children without educating them? If not, paragraph (b) covers it.

Mr. SAMPSON: That provision in the Federal Act will be found in paragraph (c)

of Section 12, prescribing that entertainment tax shall not be charged where the Commissioner is satisfied that the entertainment is intended only for the amusement of children and the charge is not more than 6d. each person. The only difference between that and my amendment is that in the amendment the admission charge is made 1s.

Hon. S. W. Munsie: There is no tax at all on entertainments the admission to which is 6d., and I think children can get all the amusement required at sixpenny entertainments.

Mr. SAMPSON: But suppose it were the break-up of school, and the charge for admission were made 1s.?

Hon. W. D. Johnson: Then paragraph (c) of the Bill would operate.

Mr. Angelo: It would literally be the break-up of a school if such a charge were made for such an entertainment.

Mr. SAMPSON: Consideration was given in the Federal Act to entertainments designed exclusively for the amusement of children, and there was no obligation on the part of those conducting the entertainment to show that its purposes were educational. In the Bill consideration to the extent I suggest might well be given.

The Minister for Lands: How many entertainments are there exclusively for children?

Mr. SAMPSON: Fairly many, but the exemption would not cost the State much.

Hon. S. W. Munsie: Counting in those that will be said to be exclusively for children, but which really are for adults as well, it would cost a good deal.

Mr. SAMPSON: It will not be necessary to police those little shows.

Hon. S. W. Munsie: Under the amendment some big ones would require policing.

Mr. SAMPSON: I am opposed to the whole measure; I do not like it, but I hope that the little consideration I am asking for the children will be granted.

Mr. DAVY: I regard the amendment as reasonable. The Minister for Lands asked how many children's entertainments were likely to take place, the cost of which would be 1s. I suggest that a type of entertainment to which the amendment might apply would be children's fancy dress balls. The tax was never intended to apply to that form of enjoyment. If a subscription dance is held, the Commissioner of Taxation makes it the subject of taxation. There may be

occasions when children may put in their shillings, and in those it might be reasonable to grant the exemptions.

Mr. ANGELO: I am not in favour of the amendment, because in my opinion it will be open to abuse. The avenue of revenue is sufficiently small and the tax to be imposed is legitimate, and I compliment the Minister on introducing it.

Hon. S. W. MUNSIE: In regard to dances such as those to which reference was made by the member for West Perth, the Commissioner of Taxation has always made it a practice to exempt them.

Hon. W. D. JOHNSON: The amendment is superfluous, because what the hon. member desires is covered by paragraphs (b) and (c). The entertainments referred to will, under those paragraphs, be exempt from taxation. I have been associated with children's entertainments that have been given under the auspices of Parents' and Citizens' Associations, and all could be declared to be educational. The words contained in the amendment would therefore be superfluous. I am not opposing the granting of exemption, and neither is the Minister.

Mr. SAMPSON: I do not agree with the previous speaker that the Bill makes it clear that the limitation applies only to those cases where no expense is involved. If there is any expense the paragraph will not apply.

Amendment put and negatived.

Clause put and passed.

Clauses 9 to 15—agreed to.

Title—agreed to.

Bill reported without amendment and the report adopted.

## BILL—ENTERTAINMENTS TAX.

### *Second Reading.*

Order of the Day read for the resumption of the debate from the previous day.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

### *In Committee.*

Mr. Lutey in the Chair; Hon. S. W. Munsie (Honorary Minister) in charge of the Bill.

Clauses 1 to 3—agreed to.

Clause 4—Entertainments tax:

Mr. SAMPSON: I take it that Subclause 2 means that there will be no tax imposed on a charge for admission which exceeds 2s. 3d.

Hon. S. W. Munsie: Exceeding 2s. 5½d.

Mr. SAMPSON: That will mean that you will bring it within the scope of the Federal tax. Will there not be a chance of the Federal people coming in and taking the tax?

Hon. S. W. Munsie: No.

Mr. SAMPSON: Has the question been considered?

Hon. S. W. Munsie: It has.

Clause put and passed.

Bill reported without amendment and the report adopted.

## **BILL—PRIMARY PRODUCTS MARKETING.**

### *Message.*

Message from the Governor received and read recommending appropriation for the purposes of the Bill.

### *Second Reading.*

Debate resumed from the previous day.

MR. LINDSAY (Toodyay) [6.0]: The question of marketing primary products has been before us for some considerable time, not necessarily in this Chamber. During the last 12 months there has been a lot of controversy through the columns of the Press regarding the benefits or otherwise of the Queensland Marketing Act. The member for Swan (Mr. Sampson) has informed us on many occasions of the benefits derived from that legislation, and we have also had information from Mr. McGregor, the officer in control of those operations in Queensland. We have read a good deal in the Press emphasising the disadvantages as well as the benefits of this marketing scheme. I confess that the more I read the more confused I become. At the same time I am not satisfied that the Queensland Marketing Act is satisfactory. The compulsory marketing of primary products, which represents an innovation in this State, may be a good thing, but we must remember that we have here some co-operative organisations that are dealing in a big way with the marketing of some of our primary products. I have re-

ceived a number of protests against the Bill. While the provision that two-thirds of the growers interested must vote in favour of coming within the scope of the measure before it can operate in any particular industry, is a precaution, at the same time the organisations with which I have been connected have always opposed these methods in the past. The reason is that we are afraid of Government control. It might be a good thing for some primary producers if the Bill were applied to their industries. I understand that those engaged in the dried fruits industry have no organisation, co-operative or otherwise, strong enough to control their activities and therefore the Bill could be well applied to them.

Mr. Sampson: According to a resolution forwarded to the Minister for Agriculture, the Western Australian Fruit Advisory Board is in favour of the Bill.

Mr. LINDSAY: I have no doubt regarding the correctness of the hon. member's statement, but the fact remains that the organisations with which I am connected are unanimously opposed to the Bill. As to the fruitgrowers, particularly those engaged in the production of apples, a co-operative organisation is in existence that to a certain extent controls the export marketing of their products. A big organisation has been built up at great expense. I have received information from the Westralian Farmers Ltd. that plans have been prepared for furthering the marketing of primary products. If the Bill becomes law, it means that the business of these co-operative organisations and the plans they have formulated for future development will be lost. On the other hand, while the Bill is before us those plans will be hung up. As to the suggestion that wheat growers might be brought within the scope of the Bill, this question has been discussed at more than one conference and delegates have always been opposed to a compulsory pool.

Hon. W. D. Johnson: Some welcomed it.

Mr. LINDSAY: One reason for the opposition has been that we already have an organisation in existence that is marketing our products more efficiently and more cheaply than a compulsory pool was ever able to do.

The Minister for Lands: That is an admission.

Mr. A. Wansbrough: But the circumstances were different.

Mr. LINDSAY: I will give a few figures to prove what I have stated. The compulsory pooling of wheat was brought into force in the years 1915-16, 1916-17, and in 1917-18. In those particular years the agents acting for the compulsory pool received from the pool 4d. per bushel for handling charges.

Member: No.

Mr. LINDSAY: I am making a distinct statement regarding a subject about which I know something. I had an opportunity of perusing the agreement and it laid down distinctly that the agents were to receive 4d. a bushel in 1915-16. In 1914, the year when the Government acquired the whole of the wheat in Western Australia, the agents appointed to acquire the wheat also received 4d. a bushel for handling it from siding to siding. That payment did not include oversea charges. We know that costs have increased because of the augmented wages and improved conditions generally, yet the cost of handling last year, according to the pool's balance sheet, was only 2.205d. per bushel.

The Minister for Lands: What was it during the last year of the compulsory pool?

Mr. LINDSAY: I am not sure. The balance sheet shows that administrative charges, insurance and sundry charges were calculated at .206d., making the total local charges, exclusive of railway freight, 2.411d. per bushel. Thus we have reduced the cost compared with 1914-15.

The Minister for Lands: But the same organisation, comprising largely wheat growers, can collar the position under the compulsory pool.

Mr. LINDSAY: I quite understand that. If we get the vote of 66 per cent. of those concerned we can carry on, but what we are afraid of under a compulsory pool, such as is proposed, is that the Minister can override anything done by the board. I would not suggest that the present Minister would do anything detrimental to the producers, but he might decide that the price of wheat was too high for local consumption. Last night the Leader of the Opposition made certain statements regarding the price of wheat for local consumption compared with the export prices. When he made his statement I, having been closely in touch with this question, knew that the impression that might be created from that statement was that the pool had charged particularly high prices for wheat for local consumption.

Hon. W. D. Johnson: That is what he conveyed.

Mr. LINDSAY: In order to find out exactly what the position was I made inquiries from the trustees of the Co-operative Wheat Pool of Western Australia and in response I have received the following letter:—

Last wheat season the millers required 5,000,000 bushels from the trustees of the wheat pool, who contracted to supply them with this quantity.

I might explain that the wheat pool is not an outside buyer because a good deal of the wheat sold last year in Western Australia went through the pool. The pool handled considerably more than half the wheat and the trustees made an agreement to supply the millers with wheat for local consumption on London parity prices from day to day. When the wheat season commenced, supplies dribbled in very slowly and the trustees were not aware as to how much wheat they would receive. However, they had contracted to supply the millers with the 5,000,000 bushels and they did so besides, in addition, providing wheat for export. The letter continues—

Deliveries were very slow indeed from the farmers, and the trustees were afraid that they might not get sufficient to fulfil millers' requirements and to leave wheat for export. They were therefore obliged to cancel charters, which were purchased from them by the Western Australian Farmers, Limited, and the trustees made a profit of £2,000 on those charters. In order to ensure a supply to the millers, the trustees held wheat back until the slump came, when wheat began to pour in from farmers and enabled the trustees to export the wheat. Consequently that which was sold to millers was wheat which, normally, would have been exported had the trustees not been under an agreement with the millers, and it would have fetched the same prices as those paid by the millers. In addition, however, the trustees would have shipped wheat which they were obliged to hold for the millers for later in the season, and consequently would have sold even more wheat at these high prices.

Thus we have honestly endeavoured to carry out the agreement on behalf of the pool. The letter proceeds—

The millers received very fair treatment from the trustees; the prices charged are the equivalent of London parity, and the method of arriving at this figure is as nearly as is humanly possible exact, as the attached table will show.

The table sets out the particulars regarding the realisation of cargoes as compared with the prices on the mill's basis and shows how the prices would have worked out for the millers if the policy of using the daily prices

had been fixed for the cargoes. In addition to this I want the House to realise how liberal we have been towards the consumers in Western Australia. On that point the trustees state—

In addition to this, the trustees trucked wheat to the millers, and left it there for their convenience, only charging them up when they actually gristed the wheat, and the miller pays no interest.

Mr. Panton: That does not say that the consumer got any great benefit from it.

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

Mr. LINDSAY: The letter I received from the trustees of the wheat pool continues as follows:—

Moreover, the trustees paid railage into the mills. Last season, when the slump occurred, millers were unable to sell flour overseas, and overseas banks refused to put up credits. The millers were then in a very serious position as they were unable to fulfil their contract with the trustees, and to get them out of the difficulty we chartered ships for them, arranged credits overseas for them and shipped wheat on their account, thus enabling them to get over the financial crisis which at that time was very serious from the millers' point of view. Under the co-operative pool, therefore, the mill owners of Western Australia are very well treated indeed.

The organisation we have at present is a very strong one, inasmuch as it was able to go to the assistance of the millers when their position was very serious. Let me explain how that serious position arose. When there was no wheat in the State the millers had a great number of orders for flour overseas, and the pool devoted practically the whole of their wheat to the millers for the first two or three months. The price of wheat overseas was high, and the millers had to pay that overseas price. Later on a big slump occurred in prices and the millers could not finance the overseas selling of flour. Fortunately for them the pool was able to come to their assistance. The pool operates only seven months in the year, and under the agreement the millers on 30th June must specify the quantity of wheat required for the remainder of the year, and must pay for it. This season it was peculiar that towards the end of June the market price for overseas wheat went up, and in consequence the millers have to pay more. Last year the millers actually paid more for their wheat than we got for it overseas. But when they actually bought that wheat the price paid was London parity, and we as a pool were

able to hold that wheat for some months, charging them no interest. If we did not provide wheat for the millers, the millers would have their own agents at the sidings competing against the pool, and that would mean an increased cost of handling, for it is only by acquiring large quantities of wheat that we can keep down handling charges. Although it has operated well this year, yet in 1922-23 the price of wheat in London on 17th April was very high and the pool wished to sell all their surplus wheat. They approached the millers and asked them to state the quantity required by them for the remainder of the year.

The Premier: All this wheat pool history is very interesting, but has it a bearing on the Bill?

Mr. LINDSAY: Well, I do not wish to labour my point, so I will let it go at that. The Bill is an experiment and so should be restricted to a small scale at the start. We are afraid that under it the organisations we have built up will have to be scrapped and their cost lost to us. Although I still have the idea that the Bill will be good for some primary industries, yet there is no great demand to have it operating in respect of all primary industry. It certainly would be beneficial to the dried fruit industry. If it were restricted to that industry and proved successful, it might afterwards be extended to include other primary industries. However, in the meantime the co-operative organisations are perfectly well able to deal with the two industries to which I have referred.

HON. W. D. JOHNSON (Guildford) [7.40]: I welcome the Bill as an evidence of the Government's determination to fulfil the election promise that they would endeavour to assist in organising the marketing of our primary products. As I have said before, land settlement in itself is not a problem. Land settlement is comparatively easy; the problem is land development. When we develop land, it is then the individual settler experiences his difficulties and it is then the Government should particularly function. Land settlement is purely an individual action; the individual selects the land and in most instances in this country the Crown supplies the land. Land development is a collective activity, and where we have collective activities the Government should assist the community to get the maximum results for those interested. The indication

of development is of course production, and the problem of production is marketing. This is the most important and most difficult phase of development. The problem of marketing is not limited to Western Australia or even to Australia, but is world-wide, and has occupied the best minds and the attention of many Governments in practically all countries of the world. The member for Avon (Mr. Griffiths), speaking the other night, gave us some valuable information regarding co-operative action and methods in Denmark. In that country special attention had to be given to marketing. Denmark at one stage was practically down and out. What she was then producing was difficult to market owing to competition from other parts of the world where they could produce more cheaply and where the marketing was better organised. Denmark, setting to work to organise the agricultural industry, soon realised there were other products she could produce more satisfactorily and with which by organisation she could successfully compete in the markets of the world. From that time onwards Denmark has been a wonderfully progressive country. Her progress was not in land settlement, but in production and in the marketing of that which she produced.

Mr. Mann: What percentage of producers made good in Denmark?

Hon. W. D. JOHNSON: I advise the hon. member to look that up or, alternatively, give notice of the question. I am not in a position to answer it.

Mr. Griffiths: I will lend him "Rural Denmark," and he can turn it up for himself.

Hon. W. D. JOHNSON: It is sufficient for me to emphasise that it was organised marketing and co-operative effort that saved Denmark from disaster. America also, as the member for Avon has already pointed out, is devoting special attention to the organising of markets. California has been leading the way for many years. Only recently there was an article in our morning paper outlining the wonderful progress made by co-operative effort in organising the markets in California. In recent years considerable effort has been made and a great deal of valuable progress has been achieved by the wheat growers of the United States. During the war they found that the huge elevator companies were not necessary to the good marketing of their wheat, so they set to work to organise and do their own marketing, and wonderful progress has

resulted from that organisation. I do not wish to enter into outside matters any further. The member for Avon (Mr. Griffiths) gave a good deal of information, and what he has placed on record in "Hansard" is well worthy of being read by hon. members. Marketing in Western Australia has been only partially organised. Really the only organised marketing we have is that of wheat. The member for Toodyay (Mr. Lindsay) has given the House some information regarding the great progress made in the co-operative marketing of wheat, but the hon. member was not altogether fair in claiming for the present voluntary co-operative pooling system more effective and cheaper handling as compared with the State handling in the initial stages of the pool. The hon. member knows that a duplication of book-keeping was necessary when the State conducted the pool. The State had to keep certain records, and, in addition, the handlers—the Westralian Farmers, Limited, the co-operative organisation—also had to keep records to check their association with the pool. When it became necessary to fix up the voluntary pool by which the Westralian Farmers, Limited, dealt practically direct with the producers, the duplication of books was not necessary, and the whole of the work could be done on a cheaper basis. I agree with the hon. member that wheat farmers have just cause to be proud of the position in Western Australia. I question whether wheat farmers in any part of the world are better organised than are those here, and the fact that the great co-operative movement of Great Britain has financed the pooling system of Western Australia demonstrates that it is on a sound co-operative basis, and that its financial standing is beyond question. Previously the pool was financed by the Commonwealth Bank. I know the member for Toodyay will agree that the position to-day is due, not to the voluntary pooling of wheat, but to the fact that in the initial stages we had compulsory pooling and were able by compulsion to educate the farmers to the advantages of pooling and marketing their own wheat. Once having educated them in that way, it was comparatively easy to carry on under a voluntary system. The marketing of other products of Western Australia that may become controlled products under this Bill is largely organised by private exploiters. We have middlemen who do a considerable amount of work by going around amongst the pro-

ducers and leading them to believe that the only possible way to market their products is through the individuals, firms, or combinations of firms at present doing the work. Those men have big influence, and they do not hesitate to use it. They try to convince the producers, as the wheat handlers and wheat kings of Australia tried to convince the farmers of Australia, that they cannot possibly do without them in the marketing of their wheat. The wheat handlers of Australia were even able to convince the Hon. Mr. Hughes at the time that pooling could never be a success, unless associated with it were those men who for years had studied the handling of wheat. The business had been handed down from father to son for generations, and they had become so expert in the business that they considered they were the only ones who could do the job. But under the compulsory system, we gradually weeded them out, and by having a compulsory pool at the outset, we were able to show the farmers that they could co-operate and do their own handling.

Mr. Mann: Those men were brought in and their experience was used to manage the pool.

Hon. W. D. JOHNSON: That was done at the outset, but the fact remains that it was demonstrated ultimately that we could do without them, and we have done remarkably well without them. I do not wish to cast any reflection upon those men. It was their job, and naturally they tried their best to retain it. But I wish to emphasise our experience with wheat, and to point out that it is quite possible that other products controlled as wheat was controlled could be so marketed by the producers themselves as to bring about that better result to them that has accrued to the producers of wheat. Take the potato crop: Anyone who has studied potato production knows that the marketing of the product has been anything but satisfactory.

Mr. Mann: Because the market is controlled by Victoria.

Hon. W. D. JOHNSON: It is controlled to an extent by importations from the Eastern States, but there are other forms of control, and the member for Nelson (Mr. J. H. Smith) and others who have lived in the South-West know full well that a great deal of dissatisfaction exists amongst beginners of potato production and growers in a small way. They all complain of the difficulties they experience in marketing

their product. Oftentimes they are forced to dispose of their crop through one channel and, unless they do so, the ordinary market is not open to them. Consequently, even with potatoes, I am of opinion that if we could once demonstrate to growers, as it was demonstrated to wheat farmers, how beneficial would be the result of co-operative marketing, we could overcome a great many of the difficulties of potato marketing, much to the advantage of the consumer and equally to the advantage of the producer.

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: There is no compulsion in regard to wheat. It is a voluntary pool.

Hon. W. D. JOHNSON: It was compulsory originally; but for compulsion in the initial stages, we would not have had a successful wheat pool to-day. From what one can read apple growers, with cool storage accommodation, principally at Mt. Barker and Bridgetown, are fearful of some possible interference with the advantages they hold as compared with other apple growers. Some members may consider I am unfair or wrong in making that statement.

Mr. J. H. Smith: They are the two important centres for export.

Hon. W. D. JOHNSON: Yes, and all credit to the growers for their wonderful organisation. I wish to pay a tribute to the wonderful organising ability of the Mt. Barker and Bridgetown growers as displayed in their co-operative movement, but when they oppose a Bill of this description one can come to no other conclusion than that they hold a position superior to the position of other apple growers in the State. Because of their superior position from a marketing point of view they say, "Hands off; we do not want any measure that is likely to interfere with our position." That is perfectly human, and no doubt it represents their point of view. I do not say that this Bill should operate for the apple growers. If the apple growers in other parts of the State are as satisfied as those at Mt. Barker and Bridgetown evidently are, I am pleased to know it; but I submit that it is only from those two well-organised and well-entrenched centres that we have had any comment against the Bill. I ask members whether the extent of apple growing possible in this State has been reached.

Are there no other areas to be planted? Are there no other portions of the State that will produce apples? Of course there are other centres, and this would be a poor old State if it did not continue to increase its apple production. Western Australia can produce apples second to none in the world. Our apples command respect on the world's markets. We have a commodity that can compete so successfully on the world's markets that we would be wrong if we failed to encourage an expansion of the industry and an increase in the export section. That being the case, it is a purely selfish attitude for Mt. Barker and Bridgetown growers to say that because of their stage of organisation they do not want the Bill. If they had said so much in moderate language, I would not have minded, but the very extravagance of the wording of their resolution goes to show that they had not given the Bill the serious thought that it deserved. The Bill is designed to assist Western Australia; it is not a Bill to injure Mt. Barker. There is no fear of the Bill applying to Mt. Barker unless two-thirds of the apple growers who are registered declare that they desire it to be applied. I am of opinion that the whole of the opposition has been caused through the Mt. Barker people not having carefully read the speech of the Minister when he introduced the Bill, and of their having accepted the view expressed in the leading columns of the "West Australian."

Mr. J. H. Smith: They had the Bill before they saw that article.

Hon. W. D. JOHNSON: Then it must have been placed in their hands mighty quickly. I thought at the time that the rather extreme view expressed in the Mt. Barker resolution was more likely to have been influenced by the reading of the leading article in the "West Australian" than by the reading of the Minister's speech. One cannot say that the "West Australian" article was incorrect, but it did convey the feeling that it was a dangerous Bill. I remember the leading article in the "West Australian" on the report of the Group Settlement Commission. Everybody got a scare. The article was not untrue, but it conveyed an impression that the Commission's report did not convey when it was read impartially. Just as people formed an opinion on the Group Settlement Commission's report from reading a newspaper article rather than from the report itself,

I am afraid something of the kind has happened in regard to this measure.

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: What right have you to say we have been influenced by anyone outside?

Hon. W. D. JOHNSON: I am speaking of the public; not of hon. members. I do not think anyone here has been influenced by the article.

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: Certainly not you.

Hon. W. D. JOHNSON: Only a casual investigation is necessary to show that the Bill is overdue with respect to the marketing of our dried fruits. The member for Toodyay (Mr. Lindsay), if he did not entirely condemn the Bill, condemned it with faint praise. He expressed the view that it was at all events necessary in the interests of producers of dried fruits.

Mr. Sampson: And these producers are also producers of fresh fruit.

Hon. W. D. JOHNSON: There has been an agitation for many years for a measure of this kind to deal with dried fruits. Special consideration has been given to the control of that product. Legislation has been passed by the Federal Government to assist producers in the marketing of dried fruits. It is extraordinary that this commodity should receive special consideration from that quarter. Dried fruits are not plentiful in point of view of production as compared with other products. The same amount of attention has not been paid to dairy products by the Federal Government that has been paid to dried fruits. They have not given the same attention to wool that has been given to this other commodity. One is justified in asking why dried fruits are singled out for special consideration. It is a repetition of what we got with respect to wheat. The dried fruit producers have had an experience of organised markets. For a term they had compulsion. They had an organisation that controlled the markets of Australia and New Zealand, and to a large extent controlled the export. The producers had an experience of that. They gained a knowledge of its advantages. From that experience, although ultimately the organisation, which was a voluntary one, broke up, they were not prepared to allow organised marketing to go by the board. They have been agitating in the State and the Federal Parliaments for legislation to assist them in reorganising. Legislation has been passed in South Australia and Vic-



toria to act in conjunction with that passed by the Federal authorities. This was done because the people, like the wheat growers, had had experience of organised markets. I am not greatly concerned about what has been done in Queensland. In my speeches here and elsewhere I have referred to the fact that they have accomplished something in Queensland. I am proud to know that the party with which I am associated was the first to introduce legislation along these lines. What has been done or left undone in Queensland will have no influence upon Western Australia. It has, however, had an influence towards inducing people to ask for a Bill like this. The actual operations of this measure will not be influenced one iota by what has happened in Queensland. I know that vested interests will get to work here, just as they have done in Queensland. The work accomplished here will be misrepresented in other States of the Commonwealth, just as was the case with Queensland. Vested interests have to protect their particular preserves, and they will do so. Unfortunately for the producers they have a more effectual channel by which they can misrepresent and distort the views expressed by those who patronise their advertising columns. The producer is always at a disadvantage as compared with the man who has become established in some way with a given product. While we have all this, and while those who represent that kind of view in Parliament, will raise their voices, I say that this Bill, when it becomes law, will depend largely upon the work that is accomplished under its provisions. There are certain commodities that will come under the Act immediately the opportunity offers. I refer to dried and fresh grapes. Growers of both kinds of grapes have been agitating for some time. I do not think they will become organised and present a petition for their products to be controlled, but certain definite districts, as permitted under the Bill, will take advantage of the provisions contained in it, and within a given limited area the industry will be controlled. The result of that control from the producer's point of view will decide whether this Bill will extend or not. It will be from practical experience of this special measure that we shall find out whether it will be extended to growers of other products who seem to be of the opinion that it is at present not necessary from their point of view. Speaking generally, I should say the products of Western

Australia—we can exclude wheat only—are woefully deficient from the point of view of an organised market. The member for Toodyay (Mr. Lindsay) expressed the opinion that the co-operative movement can do all this. I say it cannot do so, although it can assist the individual to market his produce. It can even assist certain groups of individuals to market their produce, but it is too much to expect the co-operative movement to induce the whole of the State to combine and give it the whole of their business.

Mr. Mann: You suggested the movement could do it when we endeavoured to have central markets established.

Hon. W. D. JOHNSON: I said that if the co-operative movement could have the monopoly proposed to be given the City Council, they could raise the necessary money, and that such money could be raised and controlled by the producers rather than by the city fathers. I am still of that opinion. That is the practical way of approaching that subject. Much as I should like to see it, I am afraid it is too much to expect the co-operative movement to do all this. It could not undertake the marketing of any particular products. At the same time, it does a certain amount of marketing.

Mr. Mann: Why should not the directors of the movement do it as well as a board?

Hon. W. D. JOHNSON: They have not the legislation required to assist them. The directors would never do it, and companies and firms would never do it. There must be legislation of this kind to enable it to be done. This is recognised in other parts of the world, and must be recognised here.

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: Do you want it for wheat, then?

Hon. W. D. JOHNSON: No. We have had previous legislation in regard to wheat and the compulsory pooling of wheat. This legislation has had the effect of convincing the wheat growers that it can be done. Give the grape grower and the apple grower experience of this kind of legislation, and it will be a matter of only a few years when they will see that it is to their own interests to band together and keep together, just as it has induced the wheat growers to band together and keep together. The fine results achieved by the pooling of wheat is due to legislation of this description. It made it possible to force the growers for a time to work along these lines, and educated

them to a knowledge that it could be done. The producers of Western Australia, apart from wheat, are not organised. They are at a greater disadvantage than producers in any other part of Australia owing to the fact that marketing elsewhere in the Commonwealth is largely a matter of competition between individuals within the States. Queensland is largely self-contained and is not dominated by the other States. New South Wales, Victoria, and, to a certain extent, South Australia, are in much the same position. Western Australia, however, is dominated commercially by the other States. The trouble we have to face here is that Western Australia in its early days was forced into the grip of Eastern States firms, and these firms and the merchants have maintained that grip up to now. We have to fight against that as well as against importations from the Eastern States that are brought here by these firms, which are operating in Western Australia, out whose interests are mainly of an Eastern character. They are more concerned about properly marketing the products of eastern Australia than they are about those in this State. We always have had to suffer from that disadvantage. In any part of the world the producer has a big struggle to establish his markets. He is always opposed by vested interests. The man who farms the farmer is always the man who keeps down the farmer. It may be a very difficult matter to drag him off the farmer's back. Eastern firms are constantly propping him up so that the difficulty of getting rid of him becomes great. Legislation of this kind is more necessary in Western Australia than possibly in any other part of the Commonwealth. The individual cannot fight this type of opposition and competition; therefore, we have to give individuals the opportunity to combine so that they may fight collectively instead of alone. Members may ask why the producers do not in their own interests combine. They have not done so because of the selfishness of certain individuals, who are always able to undermine any effort in this direction. We are having opposition to the Bill, not from the producers as a result of their knowledge of it, but rather from the views expressed by travellers throughout the country districts. Every commercial traveller makes it his special business to misrepresent the position in order to scare the producers. This is always done. I know what happened in regard to the wheat pool. They became active

in every part of the State. They even tried to influence State members. They tried to influence Federal members and endeavoured by various means, to intimidate the producers making them feel that the slightest interference by Governments in the marketing of their produce would bring about disastrous results. For a time that effort had its influence because those men received hundreds of thousands of pounds for retaining their connection with the pool, although the actual work they did for it was slight indeed. When I inform hon. members that a considerable proportion of the wheat in the pool during the early stages was sold as between Government and Government, and that these men had nothing whatever to do with the transactions, yet drew their commission on the sales, it will be realised what an enormous amount of money went their way, simply because they were able to create the impression that it was impossible to do without their assistance in marketing the wheat. Exactly the same thing is going on to-day. I will guarantee that in the Nelson electorate every commercial traveller, or other person interested in the big commercial houses of the city, has been engaged in issuing warnings to every farmer encountered against this legislation.

Mr. J. H. Smith: It would be a bad lookout for the growers if those people were not in the field.

Hon. W. D. JOHNSON: The hon. member considers them as an asset in the country; I do not. Speaking generally regarding the Bill, I would advise fruitgrowers, and particularly apple growers, that if they do not desire to come within the scope of the Bill, the Minister cannot force them to do so. They can only come within the scope of the Bill at their own request. I believe that the 66 per cent. necessary in those districts would be difficult to obtain. I do not think there will be any serious attempt to bring the apple growers under the Bill, and they are not likely to come in until the Bill has been tried by other producers for some considerable period. That which is condemned and rejected to-day may become useful to-morrow, and there is no harm in leaving the necessary provisions in the Bill so that, should the apple growers find, as the result of the operations of the Bill, that marketing of products has been effected under better conditions, they will be able to come in at a later stage. Even in connection with the marketing of apples there has been a considerable amount of adverse criticism. When Sir Tabot Hobbs

came back from the Wembley Exhibition, he complained about those marketing methods. Anyone who has visited the Old Country, and has gone into the marketing question, has condemned it and complained regarding the want of proper organisation for the marketing of apples. Although the growers may consider that they are getting the maximum prices for their commodities to-day, ultimately, they may be able to take advantage of the legislation to improve their position. Some have expressed the opinion that the Bill should be more restricted, as, in their opinion, its provisions are too comprehensive. On the other hand, I commend the Minister for making the Bill comprehensive, while at the same time providing the elements of safety embodied in the provision making it necessary for a majority of two-thirds to be favourable before the Bill can operate in any particular industry. I believe certain amendments are necessary and I have placed several on the Notice Paper, with the object of making some of the provisions of the Bill better and safer from the point of view of the Opposition. I believe that some qualification should be included in the definition of a "grower" as set out in the Bill. I do not think that the grape grower, who has a dozen or so vines in his backyard, should be recognised as a grower, or should have any right to direct how the commercial grower should market his produce. Such backyard growers should have no right to interfere with those who are compelled to depend on the marketing of their products for their living. While I am not wedded to the terms of my amendment, I have suggested dealing with this matter on an acreage basis, and also that no one producing fruit on an area of less than five acres shall be a registered grower. By that means we shall have a guarantee that those voting will be men dependent upon the production of fruit for their living. The member for Swan (Mr. Sampson) stated that there was nothing compulsory about the pooling under the Bill.

Mr. Sampson: I said it was not limited to pooling.

Hon. W. D. JOHNSON: I understood the hon. member to say that it was not compulsory under the Bill.

Mr. Sampson: I said that was not the only method.

Hon. W. D. JOHNSON: I consider that the wording of Clause 10 conveys that the fruit has to be pooled, but a simple amend-

ment can overcome that difficulty. I agree with the Leader of the Opposition, who stated that it was impossible to pool fresh grapes and distribute the result of the marketings over operations throughout the year. It would be distinctly unfair. If that were the basis on which the Bill was to operate, I question whether the growers in the Swan Valley would take advantage of the measure. As the Leader of the Opposition pointed out, some growers, by reason of special advantages, produce certain varieties of grapes that come on the market much earlier than others. It would be unfair to say to those producers of early varieties, which bring high prices, that they must pool the results with those obtained by other growers whose crops come on the market when the great bulk of the production is available.

The Minister for Lands: That is not co-operation, you know.

Hon. W. D. JOHNSON: Co-operation does not operate to the advantage of one individual against another. The slight amendment that is necessary to Clause 10 is that, instead of saying that the distribution shall be on the operations throughout the year, we should provide that it should be on the operations over a period. If that were done, and the board were left to determine the period, it might be from day to day or from week to week, or even from month to month. The annual basis would be so unfair that it would not receive the approval of growers. I do not think the Minister will object to a slight alteration that will make the Bill apply as fairly and equitably as possible. During my election campaign I found that the position along the Swan Valley was deplorable, and I pledged myself to devote special attention to this question, exercising influence upon whichever Government happened to be in power to pass legislation of the description now before us. From one end of my electorate to the other grape growers expressed themselves in favour of legislation on the basis of that passed in Queensland. I have heard nothing from them since to indicate that they are opposed to the Bill now before us. The Returned Soldiers' Association have asked me to move amendments to make the Bill more drastic than it now is, and to make it impossible for a small percentage to interfere with the decision of a two-thirds majority. They desire to see the Bill passed, and they are not afraid of the drastic provisions in it.

Mr. Mann: Do you think it will be their salvation?

Hon. W. D. JOHNSON: I do not say that, but I believe it will be of wonderful assistance to them. It will make it possible for them to compete, whereas to-day it is impossible.

Mr. Sampson: Their position is hopeless under existing conditions.

Hon. W. D. JOHNSON: That is so. The Swan Growers' Association have written to me outlining certain amendments they desire, and I agree with their proposals. It was largely on the representations made by the soldier settlers in the Swan Valley and the Swan Growers' Association that I have framed the amendments appearing in my name. The Swan grape growers have not relied solely upon legislation. They decided to embark upon a voluntary effort and at a meeting called to consider the question the proposition was received with the utmost enthusiasm. For some time the scheme worked successfully but one or two growers kept out and they were able to take advantage of the sacrifices made by the others and were able to gain special advantages in certain ways because of the movement.

The Minister for Lands: One or two got in and did not pay for the grapes and under-sold them.

Hon. W. D. JOHNSON: That is one of the misfortunes that overtake Ministers at times.

Mr. Griffiths: The Slav growers were the greatest offenders.

Hon. W. D. JOHNSON: I would not say that. Some of the growers have been fairly well established for years and have formed certain connections. If they were in the pool those connections would be subject to competition, while individuals would probably have gone around and offered grapes at reduced rates. When the pool was established those individuals were able to maintain their connection because it was not possible for those who were under control to operate freely. They informed me that it was their superior business judgment that enabled them to make a success of their business. It was nothing of the kind. It was on account of their ability to stand out and take advantage of the work of the majority.

Mr. Davy: You mean that the individual is at an advantage against a combine?

Hon. W. D. JOHNSON: Yes, if by controlling everyone but the individual, the in-

dividual is free to take advantage of certain markets in certain ways free from competition. Those men, although they struggled on for a time saw the advantage the few were reaping, and so dropped out one by one until the whole of the organisation was undermined.

Mr. C. P. Wansbrough: The Bill proposes to give a similar advantage to a minority.

Hon. W. D. JOHNSON: But I intend to ask the Minister and the Committee to delete that provision. The Swan growers did not ask for compulsory legislation without having first tried the voluntary system. Give the Swan growers the advantage of this Bill, bring them all under it, and get them marketing on an organised basis, after which you can take away the Bill and they will continue on, as the wheat growers have done. The Swan growers, who have been the chief agitators for the Bill, have not asked for it without first trying to assist themselves. They were very earnest about the voluntary system, but were prevented from making a success of it through the disloyalty of a minority. The Bill is required to overcome that difficulty. The fact that those producers were able to market successfully under a voluntary system is sufficient evidence to convince members that under the Bill it will be possible to make satisfactory progress in point of marketing. Some members have asked what is to be done with fruit when there is a glut. It is during a glut that the Bill is most required. If there were no glut organisation would not be necessary, there being more consumers than producers. But unfortunately, during a glut period the producer suffers, while in many cases the consumer reaps no advantage. It is during glut periods that the Bill is most required to enable us to organise. We must recognise that there is a continual glut in the Swan valley, due largely to the action of members of this House. When we were settling returned soldiers it was agreed that one of the most progressive and lucrative callings or industries was that of grape growing and drying. During the war period, and earlier, a number of growers in the Swan valley were making a very nice income from their vineyards. We acquired large areas of land, subdivided them and induced returned soldiers to take up blocks with a view to becoming, like the pioneer growers, successful grape producers. The trouble was that we got over-production as soon as the new vines came into bearing. For a limited number of growers

the market had been good, consumption being just about equal to production, but the soldiers increased the production by 100 per cent., and so not only made it impossible for themselves to market their products, but also ruined the men who had been in the game for years. So when we say to-day that the settlers in the Swan Valley are having a bad time, it is not limited to the returned soldiers, but includes also the old producer, the man who for many years previously was doing remarkably well with his vineyard. His position has been undermined by the increased production due to the activities of returned soldiers.

Mr. Teesdale: But you don't suggest that the Bill is limited to vine culture.

Hon. W. D. JOHNSON: No. Where we failed was in not realising that the market was limited unless organised, and that just as we increase production so we must increase marketing facilities. Had we had the Bill four years ago, we should not have the sad spectacle to be seen in the Swan Valley to-day.

Mr. Mann: Is it not that they planted the wrong kind of grapes?

Hon. W. D. JOHNSON: Mistakes have been made in that regard, but they are small as compared with the difficulties of marketing. It is an ordinary experience for a grower in the Swan Valley to take 30, 40, or 50 cases of fruit into market, and have to bring them back again. Imagine that to a new settler. He goes out and, with the assistance of his wife and family, gathers the grapes and packs them, takes them away to market, travelling all night to get them there in the early morning. Then, having stayed at the market all day, he has to put his cases on the van once more and take them back home. Imagine his disappointment. Yet what is it as compared with the disappointment of his wife and family? There are some heart-breaking experiences to be met with out there, and we must organise the marketing to get the industry right. The returned soldiers eagerly came into the organisation, recognising that something of the kind was their only salvation. But that organisation was undermined, not by returned soldiers, but by others that might well have been more loyal both to the organisation and to the returned soldiers.

Mr. Teesdale: You will admit there has been some awful rubbish marketed in the shape of dried fruit.

Hon. W. D. JOHNSON: That again is want of organisation. You cannot overcome those difficulties other than by organisation and by the pooling and the control of the marketing of the produce. For instance, eggs come within the scope of the Bill. The other day I asked some questions in the House about eggs. Those questions were ridiculed by the "West Australian," but nevertheless they were very pertinent. A great deal of care was exercised in a trial shipment of eggs from Western Australia to the London market. Favourably commented on, those eggs sold very well. But immediately a satisfactory market was thus established as the result of good organisation, a firm got to work and bought eggs everywhere with a view to exploiting that market. Their troubles about the class of eggs they sent Home! On the strength of the trial shipment that firm will get their price, but that will be the end. The Minister has no power to protect the market against that sort of thing. It is deplorable. It will throw us back for 10 years. Yet there is no way to prevent it except by legislation such as that before us. So, there is a pressing need for the Bill. I trust hon. members will realise that and will not be influenced by those who say, "We are all right; we can get through. We are marketing successfully." That is no reason why others should be denied the right to achieve success. If the Bill was intended to be forced on those who do not want it, I could understand the opposition to it. But it is not to be forced on anybody, and so will not affect people unless they desire it. I hope members will assist the Minister to get the Bill through. A few amendments are necessary, but only a few. Generally speaking, the Bill is a good one and I congratulate the Minister on its drafting. It is comprehensive in a way that satisfies Western Australia's needs and, being comprehensive, it will enable all producers to come under it if they so desire. The problem of Western Australia is production and marketing. I know that production and marketing have been held subservient to land settlement; that we have all become obsessed with the idea of bringing migrants here at great expense and settling them on the land. Some people are satisfied once they succeed in putting somebody on the land. They then think they have accomplished something to the advantage of the State. Actually we

are working the wrong way round. What Western Australia requires is production and the organised marketing of the product. If we could do that successfully we should not have to go cap in hand to other parts of the world for assistance in getting people to come here; because those people would flow here as the result of information sent Home by those who have achieved success here. The trouble is that we are settling people on the land in the truest sense of the phrase. We are not organising their marketing, neither are we devoting special attention to production. We are producing commodities difficult of marketing. We are repeating the experience of Denmark where, after many years of difficulties, it was realised that they were producing that which they could not successfully market. They then turned round and produced that which was easily marketable in competition with other countries of the world, and in addition they carefully organised their marketing. Western Australia has to do the same thing. I am not an enthusiastic supporter of immigration. I want production and marketing. I want to make a success of that which we have, without spending a lot of money on trying to get more. Unless we are very careful in looking after production and marketing we shall do so much injury to this country that the gaining of increased population, much as we want it, will be retarded instead of being accelerated. I commend the Minister on having introduced the Bill. It is required in relation to group settlement just as much as it is in the Swan Valley. As a matter of fact we know that an effort was made by a private company to exploit the production of group settlements. They tried to form a huge combination that would have a monopoly of the production, and strange to relate, Eastern money was coming into that very combination. Thank God we had a co-operative movement that protected the group settlers against that kind of thing, and the proposed company, I hope, is as dead as Julius Cæsar. Nevertheless we have dairy products organised to-day, and with a little sympathetic encouragement and assistance from the Government, I think it will be possible to work under this measure on a basis that will give a brighter outlook to the group settlers. The growing of vegetables will never make group settlement successful. We can have mighty big swedes and any

number of potatoes, but these things are not going to be attractive lines of produce and will not induce people to come to Western Australia. If we produce dairy products and organise and market them as will be possible under a measure of this description, we shall be doing for Western Australia that which Western Australia wants.

**MR. J. H. SMITH** (Nelson) [8.47] : I have listened with great interest to the remarks of various speakers and more especially those of the member for Guildford (Hon. W. D. Johnson). The Minister, in introducing the Bill, was doubtless absolutely sincere in the belief that it would confer upon primary producers a very great benefit. I regret that I cannot see eye-to-eye with him, and shall have to oppose the second reading. I thank the Minister for his courtesy in having allowed sufficient time to elapse between the first and second readings of the Bill to give the fruit growers an opportunity to study the Bill in detail. Fruit growers in my district held public meetings and every grower was notified of them, and they were unanimous in their opposition to the Bill. May I read a wire I received from the Bridgetown fruitgrowers:—

At a public meeting held last night at Bridgetown, fruitgrowers of the Manjimup and Bridgetown districts unanimously agreed to support the resolution forwarded to the Minister for Agriculture by the Fruitgrowers' Association of Mt. Barker, namely, "That we the Mt. Barker fruitgrowers, having considered the Fruit Marketing Bill as submitted by the Hon. the Minister for Agriculture, do hereby publicly protest that such a Bill should have been introduced. We fail to see one single clause or part of it that would be anything but a danger to the industry."

I have also a wire from the Manjimup Fruitgrowers' Association, and letters confirming the wires. I shall confine my remarks to the fruitgrowing industry, though I know that the Bill will affect growers of grain and vegetables. Every member of the House recognises the difficulties of marketing that have confronted us in the past. The Minister, in presenting the Bill, expressed the belief that the measure would have the effect of relieving the difficulties in future. The Minister, in my opinion, is arrogating to himself too much power. If the Bill becomes law, the producers will pay and the Minister will call the tune. The Minister will be the deciding

factor. He will say how many members representing each product shall constitute the board. He will say what machinery shall be employed for the appointment of the board. He will say what remuneration shall be paid to members of the board. In fact, the Minister will be the controlling influence, while the growers will be taxed to pay for the board. I realise that if the measure becomes law the board will be constituted from fruit growers. Having experience of the past and knowing the problems of marketing, I should like to see the Government introduce a simple measure to give the growers in any particular industry powers to meet the difficulties that might arise at any time, difficulties such as those occasioned by the war and its aftermath.

Mr. A. Wansbrough: This Bill will do that.

Mr. J. H. SMITH: It will not. The fruit-growers would like power to constitute boards, backed by the necessary statutory authority to carry the idea into effect. I have had experience of voluntary co-operation. I was struck with the remarks of the member for Guildford. No doubt members appreciated his remarks last year when he lauded to the skies what co-operation had done for the wheat growers. Many of us were sceptical about the co-operative movement. We wondered how it would be possible to prevent members of a co-operative organisation from breaking away. There is only one means to prevent them from breaking away and that is by statutory law. The Bridgetown and Manjimup fruitgrowers are in the happy position of having last year experienced one of the best seasons on record for export apples. In the fruit growing industry, as in other walks of life, there are to be found unscrupulous individuals. We have an advisory board, and an examination is made of fruit for export. What we desire is standardisation, and we require powers to ensure that nothing but prime fruit is exported to other parts of the world, so that we may retain the good name we have established in the Old Country for our fruit. Under our system of exporting we have agents. I have heard it said that the opposition to this Bill has been stimulated by paid agents. It has been mooted from one end of the country to the other that the agents or their representatives have primed up the fruit growers to disapprove of the Bill. I consider that to be a gross libel upon a very intelligent section of the community,

who in the past have been hard up against difficulties, and who through their own efforts have survived those tribulations. The agents have been a great factor in the saving of the industry. They have made considerable advances to the growers and have assisted them in every possible way to get markets for their produce. The member for Swan (Mr. Sampson) was not quite fair in his remarks last night. He extended his sympathy on the extreme weakness and disorganisation that existed amongst fruitgrowers and on the lack of knowledge of the conditions in the industry from which they made their livelihood.

Mr. Sampson: The conditions prevent them from making a living.

Mr. J. H. SMITH: We do not want the sympathy of the member for Swan. We appreciate the efforts he has made, and I give him credit for them. He came to my electorate imbued with the advantages of the Queensland Act, and was convinced that legislation of the same kind should be placed upon our statute-book. The hon. member certainly has the courage of his convictions. We in Bridgetown were pleased to welcome him. Our fruitgrowers on that occasion were not conversant with the provisions of the Queensland Act, and they concluded that it was something wonderful.

Mr. Pantou: It must have been the way he put it.

Mr. J. H. SMITH: They gathered the impression that, if they accepted a similar measure, all their troubles and trials would be gone forever. There is a great difference between the marketing of bananas and pineapples in Australia, and the marketing of Australian apples overseas. Bananas and pineapples are distributed through the Commonwealth; our apples are exported to other parts of the world. While it is possible to control the marketing of bananas and pineapples in Australia, it is impossible to control the marketing of fruit exported to other parts of the world. The problem, as I view it, could be solved if the growers organised and had simply a compulsory measure—

Mr. Sampson: Here it is.

Mr. J. H. SMITH: Yes, a cumbersome measure that will not serve any purpose. The Minister says he proposes to divide the State into districts. Say Donnybrook, Argyle, and Boyanup agreed by a two-thirds majority to accept the Act and come under a compulsory marketing

scheme, and suppose my district opposed it, how would it be possible to get any uniformity of marketing? This proves how useless it would be to set about dividing the State into districts. If the measure is going to be made compulsory, it must be made to apply from one end of the State to the other. Last year I spoke about the war and how the fruit growing industry was disorganised by it. The member for Swan last night was not quite fair in endeavouring to influence members to vote for this Bill. I hope it will not be made a party measure. The hon. member said that the area of orchards in this State was decreasing, and to prove his statement he quoted figures relating to the years 1916 to 1923.

Mr. Sampson: According to the latest Commonwealth Year Book.

Mr. J. H. SMITH: Let me point out that during the years 1917, 1918 and 1919 we had no export. People who were dependent upon fruit and a few sheep had to turn their sheep into their orchards, which were thus destroyed. There are some orchardists in my district living nearly 50 miles from a railway, and because they did not receive an adequate return from their fruit and had no organised overseas market to which to send it, they could not afford to continue fertilising and cultivating their orchards, and so had to allow them to run to pasture. The member for Swan (Mr. Sampson) forgot to tell the House that thousands of fruit-trees were planted in my district this year. If he had ascertained the facts he would not have misrepresented the position to the House.

Mr. Sampson: If they do not get control, they might as well pull up their trees forthwith.

Mr. J. H. SMITH: The hon. member is a wonderful champion of this Bill. At one time he had an orchard, but that is not now in operation.

Mr. Sampson: It is not.

Mr. J. H. SMITH: He is now only interested in his electors. He has given up growing fruit, but is giving advice to fruitgrowers through another channel, and telling them how they can make a living. He himself has made a failure of fruit growing. Many growers in my district have made small fortunes, and most of them have their own motor cars. They are still growing fruit, while the hon. member is giving them advice through his newspapers.

Mr. Lambert: Are you an orchardist?

Mr. J. H. SMITH: Yes.

Mr. Sampson: How can you afford it?

Mr. J. H. SMITH: I do not know. Mine is a new orchard and I know that a lot of money will have to be spent in fertilising and cultivating it, but I know I shall get it back in the long run.

Mr. Sampson: You will need plenty of hope.

Mr. J. H. SMITH: It may be that organisation will benefit grape growers and the growers of dried fruits. I suggest, however, that if the grape growers come together as a co-operative organisation and will put up some reasonable proposition, different agents or firms will establish cool stores for them. The member for Swan told us that if cool stores were provided we could carry apricots for three months. People in my district have given up any hope of marketing apricots, peaches, plums, etc.

Mr. Sampson: What does the disorganised grower do with his products?

Mr. J. H. SMITH: We have pulled up our soft fruit trees, and have planted export varieties of other fruits. There is a man in my district who made a net profit of over £500 last year from five acres of 12 year old trees. Can any other part of Australia show such a fine result? The success of our group settlers depends upon their being able to export a few hundred cases of fruit each year in conjunction with dairying, pig raising, poultry and suchlike activities. There will be no difficulty about marketing the fruit. This Bill will not do any good. Growers in my district are opposed to it. They say that compulsory marketing will be ineffective. The Minister has kept faith with the growers in that he is not making it compulsory but if one part of the district accepts the compulsory clause and another rejects it there will be no uniformity. The Bill also deals with vegetables. People who grow vegetables know that in the flush part of the season they cannot give away their cabbages and other things. They are usually given to the pigs or the cows. The same thing would apply to the growers of apricots and other soft fruits. We cannot control the price of potatoes. That is governed by the law of supply and demand. To-day, owing to the shortage, potatoes are bringing a fabulous price. Next month they may be down to normal or below that price. If we had control of that commodity we should not



be able to keep away the potato fly and other pests.

Mr. Lambert: The potatoes could be dehydrated.

Mr. J. H. SMITH: There is no necessity to do that. The Leader of the Opposition, through his officers, showed that potatoes could be grown in Manjimup and other parts of the South-West all the year round. If this Bill is read a second time I hope we shall be able to modify it in Committee. I should like to see more louvered vans used on the railways. In the past our fruit has been sent to the port of shipment in open trucks instead of in louvered vans. It has arrived at Fremantle or Bunbury heated to 90 or 100 degrees instead of the temperature being not more than 50 degrees. The Minister should induce the Treasurer to advance enough money for the construction of louvered vans for the transport of our fruit. I intend to oppose the second reading of the Bill. The growers in my district, who are directly affected, do not want to see it passed. There has been a cheap sneer at the expense of the fruit-growing industry, but I would point out that these are the people who have kept the industry alive during a lean period.

MR. MANN (Perth) [9.9]: I oppose the second reading of the Bill on the ground that it will not have the beneficial effect anticipated by the Minister. He has framed the Bill on the lines of the Queensland Act. The conditions in Queensland and in this State are not parallel. No comparison can be made correctly between the two States. The class of fruit grown in Queensland is different from that grown here. Bananas, one of the principal fruits grown in the northern State, carries a protective duty of 10s. a cwt. This enables the growers of bananas to export them to the other States of Australia in competition with the fruit grown there.

Mr. Lambert: We do not grow bananas here.

Mr. MANN: That duty enables the Queensland growers to ship their bananas to this State in competition with the fruit that is grown here. We cannot, however, ship our fruit to Queensland under any conditions, in competition with the bananas. In the very beginning we are up against different conditions.

The Minister for Agriculture: What are you trying to prove?

Mr. MANN: This Bill will not assist us in any way. The other principal fruit of Queensland is the pineapple. The Queensland Government has been subsidising a canning factory, and in three years went to the bad to the extent of £70,000.

Mr. Lambert: That is the cost of establishing the industry. It is better to do that than to allow the Japanese to grow pineapples for us at Honolulu.

Mr. MANN: The conditions under which the Act is operating in Queensland cannot be applied to this State. We cannot ship our stone fruits to the Eastern States in competition with the growers there, and we have to sell them in the local markets.

Mr. Sampson: This Bill does not provide for shipments to the East.

Mr. MANN: No, and therefore it does not assist us. We have to be satisfied with our markets for our stone fruits.

Mr. Panton: We do not get much for them.

Mr. MANN: I cannot find anything in the Bill for the better control of stone fruit or anything to enable the growers to get a better price. As soon as the fruit ripens it has to be consumed.

Mr. Lambert: Do you think the object of the Bill is to get a better price for the producers?

Mr. MANN: That is the object of the Bill.

Mr. Lambert: It is a Bill to organise the business.

Mr. MANN: The interjection is wide of the mark.

Mr. Lambert: I would not expect you to appreciate it.

Mr. MANN: We are asked to pass this Bill for the benefit of primary production in this State. No one has yet shown in what way it will benefit production. The member for Guildford (Hon. W. D. Johnson) said that at times of glut we required such a measure. He stopped there, and did not explain how the Bill would assist us on such occasions.

Mr. Panton: There were too many interjections.

Mr. MANN: He did not say how he would induce people to eat more fruit, or how the consumption could be increased.

Hon. W. D. Johnson: That is not a function of members of Parliament but of the board that will be created.

Mr. MANN: The member for Guildford (Hon. W. D. Johnson) was speaking in sup-

port of the Bill and was endeavouring to influence members by pointing out the benefits that would be derived from it. He did not show how those benefits would be obtained. As for stone fruits, when a glut occurs we have to do the best we can and sell the fruit to the buyers who may be available. The Bill will not remedy those difficulties.

Mr. Marshall: Do you think it will do any harm?

Mr. Lambert: Do you think it will assist as much as your precious Bill dealing with the Perth markets?

Mr. SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. MANN: The member for Guildford spoke about potato growers. There is no doubt that the market is controlled from Victoria and Tasmania. If prices in this State are such as to allow the buyers to add the cost of freight and permit them to land supplies at a smaller price than is demanded for local produce, Eastern growers can compete successfully in the Eastern markets. We growers are at times able to add the freight to the cost of their potatoes and yet compete successfully in the Eastern markets. We have done that during several seasons. At present the carrot crop in South Australia has practically failed and we have been able to ship large supplies of carrots to South Australia and to compete favourably in that market. The question of supply and demand operates to control the position. The Bill will not assist us in that direction. Lack of population accentuates our difficulties. If the population of the metropolitan area were doubled the people would consume twice the quantity of vegetables and fruit. Mr. C. W. Harper, who has had wide experience in connection with markets, gave evidence before the select committee dealing with metropolitan markets last year. He told us that he had spent considerable time investigating markets and the control of fruit. He told us that the wrong type of apricot has been grown in Western Australia.

Mr. Sampson: It has been nobody's business to advise the growers.

Mr. MANN: Mr. Harper said that the type grown here was one that would not keep and it had to be consumed immediately the fruit was ripe. If the fruit were placed in cold storage in order to overcome the glut period, the last position would be worse than the first.

Mr. Sampson: What type of apricot did he refer to?

Mr. MANN: I do not know the name but it was not suitable for manufacturing into jam.

Mr. Marshall: Surely the apricot here would be as good as the pumpkin put into apricot jam in Tasmania!

Mr. Sampson: Mr. Harper is in favour of control.

Mr. MANN: It is due to Mr. Harper that we have markets for fruit that we did not have before. It was explained to the select committee by some witnesses that one of the troubles confronting the fruit-growers here is that fruit consumption is looked upon as a luxury rather than as a diet. We are a people of meat eaters and have confined ourselves to meat rather than to fruit. To-day fruit is not even regarded as a luxury, because whereas we used to consume 75 per cent. of fruit and 25 per cent. of confectionery as luxuries, now the percentage is 25 per cent. fruit and 75 per cent. confectionery. The Bill before us will not assist consumption, rather will it add to the cost of distribution.

Mr. Stubbs: What did Mr. Harper tell the select committee?

Mr. MANN: He dealt largely with the question of gluts. He told us that if we put apricots into cold storage, with a view to preserving them, the apricot glut would be followed by the plum glut, which in turn would be followed by the peach glut, lasting three or four weeks at a time. He emphasised the fact that it was useless hanging on to one crop while the others were coming along.

Mr. Angelo: And yet you could not buy the fruit for much under 6d. a lb.

Mr. MANN: I have received a copy of a paper published in Brisbane and known as "Nicko's Fruit Journal."

Mr. Sampson: That is published by Mr. G. F. Nicklin of Brisbane.

Mr. MANN: It gives an account of the experiences under the auspices of the Committee of Direction in selling fruit during the glut season at Rockhampton.

Mr. Sampson: What is the date of the article?

Mr. MANN: The 19th February, 1925. The article is as follows:—

Just when the time was deemed most expedient, viz., at the commencement of the Stanthorpe season, and also when the local crops of fruit were in best condition, the announcement was made that the Committee of

keting of all fruit coming to Rockhampton for sale there, and with dramatic suddenness the official advertisement was published indicating that the monopoly was impending, and that not even a parcel dropped from an aeroplane would escape the eagle eye of the Committee of Direction. Some time elapsed while looking around for a suitable building, and after a diligent search the Committee of Direction achieved its first fame by selecting the most unsuitable building available, and advertisement notified growers that they must deliver all their goods to "the floor." The goods came, to the great surprise of the fully informed organisation. Watermelons came, pine apples came, bananas came, and a great variety of oddments arrived in the shape of paw-paws, passions, etc. Fruit came from Stanthorpe also. For a time it was poured in. Shortly also grapes came from around Brisbane, and it was only a few days ere the cry came that the local merchants, who had been asked to give their support to the floor, were not doing their duty, and the wonderful organisation which was to redeem the fruitgrower from the greedy maw of the merchant was appealing to that merchant to give the floor a chance. At this time, also, the cry was raised that the scheme had been started at the wrong time, but, as a matter of fact, it could not have been started at a better time for effective business to be done. When the floor began to do things, the Rockhampton market was almost bare of Southern fruits of all descriptions and had been so for some months, hence people were hungering for supplies. Further, there was almost an entire absence of local mangoes, which is about the most difficult crop to handle here, and in the absence of the charmed Committee of Direction and the presence of the Christmas holidays there would most certainly have been a vastly greater turnover of fruit than was achieved. The horrible waste of those days was sickening to behold. Bananas, watermelons, and pineapples were knocked about and laid in sickening masses frequently, the staff being unequal to its job and badly organised.

Very quickly the manager made some kind of an agreement to let local growers recommence the hawking which they had been thoughtlessly prevented from continuing, and that began to ease matters. On all hands, however, there were outcries against the grossly indifferent returns received from the floor. In one case a party who stated that he had been used for years to getting excellent prices for his watermelons, stated that the returns received from the floor were only quarter of the sum received in previous seasons, and bore the same proportion to the previous week's receipts. Pineapple men complained that what they had been used to 4s. for only returned them 6d. under the new scheme, while one man who sent in the choicest fruit, for a consignment of 14 cases of pines received the handsome return of 4s. nett, the worst return he ever had. Banana men comforted themselves in some cases with the reflection that although they were losing now it might come all right by and by, but few of them seemed Direction was preparing to take over the mar-

to be aware of the conditions under which their fruit muddled.

The effect of the growers near to town has been exceedingly unsatisfactory. These people have very expensive land, but the nearness to market and, at times, better prices which they were able to obtain, were some compensation. First, their stuff was commandeered; then, when it was found that the floor could not handle it, terms were made with the growers to hawk their own goods, paying a commission to the floor for permission to do so. At the start, it is stated that they had to buy their own produce and then retail it, but later there seems to have been some sort of a rough and ready method of valuing the stuff, and growers have had a slightly better chance to get the fruit to their customers. With reference to fruit coming in by rail, under the old conditions the merchants used to have their fruit on sale in the early forenoon; since the inauguration of the floor, merchants or their representatives have to be in attendance at the floor nearly all day long if they are to get their requirements there, and it is simply too expensive a place to do business at. In short, the floor has dismally failed to serve the public; its action has been to curtail sales rather than to expand them; it has produced a waste of fruit which has never previously been paralleled in Rockhampton; indeed, so notable has this waste been, that it has often been the common talk of the crowds waiting at the street corners for their trams or buses. Besides the waste of goods, the waste of time has almost compelled dealers to put on an extra hand to cope with the position, meaning a further impost on the customer and a further shrinkage in consumption. Further, it has encouraged the introduction of South Queensland fruits, to the detriment of local production; and the introduction of fruits from Southern States, to the detriment of South Queensland growers. And finally, it has filched away the liberty of all Queensland growers to deal with their own products in the best interests of their families and themselves, and has placed a premium on the production of poor stuff.

Mr. Sampson: That is absolutely out of date.

Mr. MANN: That is what the trade representative has to say of the marketing of fruit in Queensland, and if that is what we are asked to agree to here, it seems to me that the position is not satisfactory.

Mr. Lutey: But those conditions prevail here now.

Mr. MANN: How can we ask the people to consume more fruit when gluts are in progress? Is it better for the grower to sell 2lbs. of grapes for 6d. or for the board to direct the grower to market only 1lb. of grapes for which he will receive 6d., leaving the other 1lb. to rot in the orchard? Is that the intention of the Bill?

The Minister for Lands: The intention of the Bill is that the merchant shall not get 4d. and the producer 2d.

Mr. MANN: That is a very cheap interjection on the part of the Minister.

Mr. Sampson: But it is very true.

Mr. MANN: The auctioneer charges five per cent. commission on the sale of fruit, so it makes no difference to him whether the fruit brings 10s. or £10. How then can it be possible that he should get 4d. while the grower got only 2d.? Moreover, I doubt whether the cost of the proposed board will be any less to the grower than the commission charged by the auctioneer? The Minister is not likely to contend that the cost of selling will be less than five per cent. I am unable to see in the Bill any benefit either to the grower or the consumer, and so I will vote against the second reading.

Mr. ANGELO (Gascoyne) [9.32]: We have heard a great deal of criticism directed against the Bill. Not representing a fruit-growing electorate, it was with an open mind that I went through the measure. I fail to see any justification for the criticism. Let us look at the genesis of the Bill. Why was it brought down? I have been in the House for eight years, and I can safely say that in that period scarcely a month has gone by with the House sitting without complaints from representatives of fruit-growers, both as to the poor prices received for fruit and the big prices paid by the consumer. I have read accounts in the Press of dozens of deputations to successive Ministers asking for legislative power to control the marketing of produce. The Bill is the result of that continued agitation on the part of producers. The Minister has given them a Bill on the lines he thought they required.

The Minister for Agriculture: They wanted the Bill last year, but they had to wait.

Mr. ANGELO: What sort of a Bill has the Minister given the producers? It does not say to the producers, "The whole of your produce has to come into a scheme under Government control." The Bill merely represents machinery enabling the producer to control his own interests entirely.

Mr. Davy: And against the interests of the public.

Mr. ANGELO: No, for the Minister retains the right to veto any measure against

the public interests. The Minister gives the grower the whole responsibility for the administration of the Bill. The Bill does not say that everyone must come within its scope. The Minister says to the producers, "Here is the Bill; you can take it or leave it." He goes further and says the same to the growers of each variety of produce; he goes further and says the same to every district. Then finally he says the same to the individual producers in every district. Could anything be fairer? And they need not take it unless a two-thirds majority ask for it. To make it still more liberal, he says that if 25 per cent. of the growers in any district declare against the Bill, the other 75 per cent. have to bow down to the minority—and they have a month in which to do it. I do not know what else the representatives of the growers could ask for.

Mr. Davy: Nothing in the world.

Mr. ANGELO: The Minister has given them the machinery. If they do not like it, let them produce better. There are in the Bill certain points of objection but they can be rectified in Committee. The Minister has carried out the wishes of the producers in bringing down the Bill. I am glad the Bill gives the producers the right to raise money, for, after all, they must have storage houses and probably will have to lease their own shops to enable them to sell their product at a reasonable price. I do not agree with the member for Perth (Mr. Mann) in saying that the producer gets his price less the five per cent. commission that the auctioneer gets. That is not so. It is not the auctioneer who gets the undue profit, but the purchaser, who afterwards retails the fruit through his shop. We have had instances of growers receiving only 1d. a lb. for fruit ultimately sold at 6d. and 7d. in the shops. The Bill in other countries fruit is to be seen not only of the grower, but also of the consumer. The question of wheat has been raised. No member can seriously think that wheat will ever be brought under the Bill. The wheatgrowers have their own organisation and I cannot believe they will ever ask that their product should come under the Bill. All members must agree that some better organisation for the disposal of fruit is quite necessary. It is said that with our small population we can consume but a very limited quantity of fruit. I hold that with proper organisation of

marketing and the resultant inducement of attractive prices, we could and would consume three times as much as we do to-day. In other countries, fruit is to be seen not only in private houses, but in all restaurants and hotels, provided at every meal. Here, in Parliament House, where if only to set an example we should have fruit at every meal, we never see so much as a Cape gooseberry on the table except by special order. Is that the way to assist fruit-growers and cultivate a taste for what should be regarded as a necessity of life? In the State railway dining cars there is to be found a little fruit, looking like windfalls bought at a specially low price. Even on the Great Western railway the fruit supplied is a disgrace to the States through which the line runs, instead of being, as it should be, a fine advertisement. With visitors from all parts of the world on that railway we have a splendid opportunity of showing them what wonderful fruit we can grow. Yet what do we find? I have looked at the fruit on the tables in the dining car and felt ashamed to think that visitors from other parts of the world should have to accept that fruit as a sample of what Australia can produce. I will support the Bill for the reason that it has been asked for by the producers. If it should be found unsuitable, it will be very easy to bring down a short amending measure.

**MR. DAVY** (West Perth) [9.41]: I am unhappy in having to take up an attitude strongly in opposition, not only to members on the Government side, but also to members on this side. The Bill runs contrary to the constantly expressed views and principles held by both Government and Opposition members. I find it difficult to understand how members like the member for Swan (Mr. Sampson) and the last speaker, can see in the Bill the virtues that they do. I could perhaps understand members on the Government side supporting the Bill; because after all their political creed has much more regard for the State as a whole than for any individual and is prepared to sacrifice the rights of individuals in favour of the State. That is their point of view. But even they have always believed that the right to dictate should be in the hands of a majority. Yet here is a Bill that proposes to put in the hands of a small minority the right to dictate to the

rest of the population of the State. It is proposed in the Bill to confer on a section of the community a monopoly such as has never existed in the history of man, not only the sole right to deal with a certain article, but the right to make it a criminal offence for any other person to break that monopoly and want to cancel contracts in existence at the time the powers are given. That results from powers expressly given to growers of any particular product in Western Australia. I have always understood that the Government members of this House are more hostile towards a monopoly or combine than towards any other phase of our social life. Yet they have deliberately brought down a Bill that proposes to confer this monopoly with these extraordinary powers. Suppose the growers have asked for this. In the first place it appears they have not asked for it; because the member for Nelson (Mr. J. H. Smith), one of the chief representatives of the fruitgrowers, has told us that his constituents are not in favour of the Bill. So it is by no means the unanimous view of the fruitgrowers that these extraordinary powers should be given to them. This Bill from the first clause to the last does not mention anything about fruit growing. It will give to any section of producers in Western Australia, growing anything from wheat to potatoes and from Cape gooseberries to apples, the right to this extraordinary monopoly, provided they can get a majority of their number to agree to it. I do not pretend for a moment to be an expert in fruit growing. I do not represent a fruit-growing district, except in so far as my constituents grow a few grapes in the backyard, and incidentally they will have to be expressly exempted or they will come under the measure. While I do not pretend to be an expert in fruit growing, I do pretend to hold certain principles that guide me when I am not particularly au fait with the details of any proposition submitted to the House. My principles tell me, as I always thought they told members on the Government side, that if we are going to confer a monopoly on anyone, we must guard it with all possible care and have very definite control. What control do we get here? The Minister is the person who can veto. We are going to give the power to a monopoly to fix prices at what they like, and the Minister is going to be a price-fixing commissioner to see that they do not get too high.

With the greatest respect to the Minister I do not think he has the time or the knowledge to perform that function. I do not think any man occupying the position of Minister could be safely left to see that the growers did not take advantage of the powers proposed to be given them. The Bill contains an extraordinary clause, that as soon as the Act is extended to any product, all existing contracts for the delivery of fruit, except bona fide interstate contracts, are forthwith null and void. Whether it has been considered how far the clause will operate, for instance on a contract made between a London buyer and a Western Australian seller to take the whole of his fruit for say five years, I do not know. It seems to me it might well be that the London buyer would have an action for damages against the Western Australian seller, although the unfortunate man in Western Australia was forbidden by Act, under the pain of the severest penalty, from continuing to fulfil the contract. In any event I can imagine that it is going to be no particularly good advertisement for Western Australia if we find that existing contracts are to be wiped out by a vote of the majority of growers. At this juncture I do not propose to proceed further. I think this is a very bad Bill indeed. It offends the principles I hold most strongly, and I have no alternative to voting against the second reading.

**MR. BROWN** (Pingelly) [9.49]: When this Bill was introduced I was under the impression that it was going to meet a long expressed wish for the betterment of marketing, more especially in the fruit industry. The more I have considered it and the more I have read of the conditions under which fruitgrowers are working, the more strongly I am convinced that the Bill will not have the effect that the framers hoped it would. The Bill will embrace any products of the soil. Speaking particularly of wheat, I do not think it would be desirable to have that commodity brought under the control of a board. Last season we had a wheat pool, and side by side with it private enterprise also operated. Overseas buyers came along and created keen competition, the results of which we know. Those who sold to the overseas buyers are getting something like 8d. or 9d. per bushel more than the pool wheat will realise.

**Hon. W. D. Johnson**: That is not a fair statement and it is not correct.

**Mr. BROWN**: It is a true statement. Some of my friends put their wheat into the pool and whereas they are realising about 6s., others who sold to outside buyers are getting 7½d. and 8d. a bushel more. One of the greatest objections entertained by producers is to Government control. In the past we have had Government control and it has not been a success.

**The Minister for Lands**: It was not bad when you could not sell your wheat anywhere else.

**Mr. BROWN**: I was about to refer to that. For staple products such as wheat, butter and wool, there is always a demand from the world's markets. There is no need to put them under a board, because there will always be buyers for them from countries where those products are required. There has never been any difficulty in financing in respect to those commodities because, when the demand exists throughout the world, finance is always available. Our principal trouble has been in the fruit industry and more particularly in respect to perishable fruit. There is a period of the year when soft fruits ripen quickly. Those fruits will not keep, and if the supply on the market is greater than the demand, they sell very cheaply. How could the board control that? What would they do with the surplus fruit? Would they decide to take only a certain quantity for the market, and dump the balance into the ocean? I do not think that such a course would be either feasible or desirable.

**Hon. W. D. Johnson**: Surely you are not blind to the fact that it is possible to cultivate markets.

**Mr. BROWN**: That is true, but soft fruits will not keep for any length of time.

**Mr. Sampson**: The trouble is that the industry is so disorganised.

**Mr. BROWN**: The only solution apparently is to have jam factories to deal with the surplus fruit.

**Mr. Marshall**: Where is your private enterprise?

**Mr. Sampson**: A board would be more likely to undertake that than would private individuals.

**Mr. BROWN**: If the Board had power to erect factories and so use the surplus fruit, there would be something to commend the Bill, but I do not see that the board would have power to do that.

**Mr. Lambert**: The Americans say, "We eat what we can, and can what we can't."

Mr. BROWN: If we canned the fruit, it would be necessary to find a market for it. Western Australia has only a small population.

The Minister for Lands: Your argument is against developing the South-West because we have not the population to consume the produce.

Mr. BROWN: No; Australian butter is always in demand in some part of the world. A good class of apple could always be sold overseas. It has been remarked that the board would have power to supervise the grading of apples and see that no inferior fruit was exported. I believe that at present we have inspectors empowered to reject any fruit for export if it is not up to the standard. The only means of transporting fruit to the Old Country is in the refrigerator and yet we often read of considerable losses occurring. The great distance from Australia to England and the varying climatic conditions experienced on the voyage result in much of the fruit reaching its destination in other than the best condition.

Mr. Lambert: The great trouble is that unsuitable trees have been planted in unsuitable places.

Mr. BROWN: I do not know whether that is the reason. From my little experience of fruitgrowing, I know that it is essential to plant the right variety and that very often fruit trees have been planted in unsuitable soil. I believe that Western Australia is the garden of the Commonwealth and that it can grow a better variety of fruit than can any other country. Our grapes are equal to those produced anywhere else, and if they were turned into wine we would always find a market for the product. The wine produced in this State is of such good quality that it would always be in demand and would always command a fair price. A few months ago there was a glut of potatoes. The price offered to growers in some instances would not pay for the bags, and some growers did not even bag their crops. Yet to-day potatoes are selling at something like £15 per ton.

Mr. Lambert: If there is one vegetable that lends itself to dehydration, it is potatoes. Potatoes can be treated at about £1 per ton, and it is a scandal that there are not dehydrators to deal with them. They are better when dehydrated than when fresh.

Mr. BROWN: I know something of dehydration too. In a store at Pingelly there are 2,000 tins of dehydrated potatoes from

Kendenup. I asked the secretary of the company the other day why they were not being sold, and he replied that the only demand for them came from the North-West. He said he was selling about half a ton at a time and that at the present rate it would take two or three years to dispose of the stock. Yet the dehydrator had worked only a few weeks to treat that quantity.

Mr. Angelo: He should send them up North.

Mr. BROWN: But there is only a limited demand from the North.

Mr. Lambert: They could be sent to the Malay States and Singapore.

Mr. BROWN: Evidently other outlets will have to be found for them. Probably those potatoes could be fed to the pigs. There is always a great demand for dairy produce. It is the same with the wheat pool. A big mistake has been made there. Too much wheat has been sold out of Western Australia, with the result that most of our mills are idle. We could easily export our flour and keep the offal here for feeding our pigs and cattle. That would have been of great benefit to the State, and we could have exported all the flour we gristed.

The Minister for Lands: That is easier said than done. People want offal as well as flour.

Mr. BROWN: Our mills are closed because there is no wheat to grist. In my district there are usually between 80 and 100 pigs marketed because there is no offal for them to eat. It would be better that we should put offal into pigs and into feeding our cattle.

Mr. Sampson: Organisation would help there.

Mr. BROWN: Probably. If the board can regulate supply and demand in a small community like ours, it will be a remarkable thing. The people for whom the Bill was introduced are the greatest opponents of it. Probably those who grow and dry fruits offer no objection. About 90 per cent. of the vineyards in the Swan were planted purely for currants, sultanas and rasins.

Mr. Sampson: And fresh grapes as well.

Mr. BROWN: There is only a local demand for fresh grapes.

Mr. Sampson: And an export demand also. They are sent away in cork dust.

Mr. BROWN: Only a small quantity is exported.

Mr. Sampson: They have been exported for years.

Mr. BROWN: At a tremendous cost.

Mr. Lutey: More could be exported if there was organisation.

Mr. Sampson: At a meeting held lately a unanimous vote was passed in favour of the control of grape marketing.

The Minister for Lands: That resolution goes further than this Bill.

Mr. BROWN: I was struck by the remarks of the member for Perth. I sat with him on the select committee appointed to inquire into marketing questions. In the course of his speech he stated only what had been previously said by witnesses. He came right down to tin tacks.

Mr. Marshall: He spoke for a long time but said nothing.

Mr. BROWN: There was a great deal in what he said. It was the truth, and it is happening now.

Mr. Sampson: Did he advocate a continuance of the present position?

Hon. W. D. Johnson: It is nice to have it on record that the agents in Perth and the producers in Pingelly are in accord.

Mr. BROWN: I commend the Minister for introducing the Bill. No doubt he was actuated by a desire to do something for the producers, but the experiment is one we should conduct in a small way to begin with. We should hesitate before we deal with all the products of the soil. We should confine the Bill to the dried fruits industry and see how it works. It would be safer to do this than to adopt the Bill as printed.

**THE MINISTER FOR LANDS** (Hon. W. C. Angwin—North-East Fremantle) [10.5]: I have listened with a certain amount of interest to the speeches in opposition to this Bill by those who are supposed to represent the primary producers.

Hon. W. D. Johnson: Did the Minister say "represented the primary producers"?

The MINISTER FOR LANDS: I said they were supposed to represent them. I thought they would have received the Bill with open arms. The member for Pingelly (Mr. Brown) and the Leader of the Opposition said they thought the Minister should be congratulated upon introducing the Bill. The member for Pingelly said it should be applied to dried fruits only, but the Leader of the Opposition said it required drastic alteration. The Country Party whip took up the yes-no attitude. I did not know what he intended to convey when he had finished. The principles of the Bill were put clearly

by the member for Gascoyne (Mr. Angelo). If members think the Bill is good in one direction, why should they not let those people who want it have the advantage of its provisions? The member for Pingelly said the greatest opposition to it had come from the fruitgrowers. In all probability they have had notices from one or two persons who have made arrangements regarding the sale of their apples, and that this opposition does not come from the majority of growers. There would be no fear for the growers if the majority did not favour it.

Hon. W. D. Johnson: Hear, hear!

The MINISTER FOR LANDS: I was also struck by the remarks made concerning the effect upon the markets. They made me wonder whether this country is adopting the right attitude in opening up large areas of land. Members opposite have repeatedly said that certain things cannot be provided for here, because we have not the population for their consumption. They say we must have canning facilities, we must have jam factories and other things; otherwise it will be impossible to control the markets. Do they forget that there are markets overseas which a board such as this would endeavour to open up? Have they forgotten that when the compulsory wheat pool was introduced some of the strongest supporters of their party tried to induce the farmers to refuse to send their wheat to that pool? Have they forgotten that the farmers have since blessed the pool, because they would not have had 1s. a bushel for their wheat had it not been for the backing of that organisation by the people of the country?

Mr. Brown: That was under war conditions.

The MINISTER FOR LANDS: Have we not war conditions to-day so far as fruit is concerned? We know there are private persons who are making fortunes out of fruit, because they are at war with the producers.

Mr. Angelo: And there are certain difficulties of transport.

The MINISTER FOR LANDS: I have heard the ex-Minister for Works (Mr. George) say that he sold his own apples for 1d. and that the same apples had been retailed out of the case at 5d. a lb. Do members wish that sort of thing to continue for all time? The Minister for Agriculture has made special inquiries as to what has happened in the other States. A few



weeks ago when I was in Melbourne a message was sent to me by the Victorian Minister for Agriculture requesting me to remain in Melbourne to attend the conference connected with fruit. The authorities there found it necessary to take joint action so as to deal with the marketing of fruit. I could not stay, but asked that the results of the conference should be sent to the Minister for Agriculture here. They realise the difficulties over there and the position in which they are placed, and find it necessary to take action for the protection of the fruitgrowers. My colleague desires to make this Bill general. There is no necessity for the growers to take it if they do not want it. Members have said they will vote against the second reading because the Bill does not suit someone, who need not adopt it if he does not desire to do so. Members know that the majority of people engaged in the fruitgrowing industry will probably accept the Bill. It is the minority who are pressing members to oppose it. If any person should complain against it, it is the consumer.

Mr. Marshall: With good justification.

The MINISTER FOR LANDS: I do not think the Bill will affect the consumer, but it will affect the middleman.

Mr. Sampson: There should be greater consumption under this Bill.

The MINISTER FOR LANDS: Yes. If the consumer pays only the same price that he pays now he will know that the money is going into the pockets of the growers. He will derive some consolation from the knowledge that the man who has spent his time working early and late to get his land in order will reap some compensation for his work. The man who walks up and down Hay-street or St. George's-terrace to-day gets all the plums, and the other man gets only dry bread. I am astonished at the opposition put forward to this Bill by those who claim to represent the primary producers. I could have understood it if members had opposed the Bill on the ground that it increased the price of fruit to the consumer. It is the policy of the party on this side of the House to see that the producer gets a fair return for his labour, equal to that of the consumer.

#### THE MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE

(Hon. M. F. Troy—Mt. Magnet—in reply) [10.13]: If I have not been very much encouraged by the reception of the Bill at the

hands of members opposite I have at least derived a considerable amount of amusement from their attitude. There is a lack of consistency amongst them. Some have opposed the Bill from one angle and others have taken up an entirely different attitude. It is impossible to find the real cause of the opposition to the Bill from the expressions of opinion that have been offered. It is evident that certain people have influenced them to vote against the measure. I thank members for the admission that I have not been influenced by any other consideration than my regard for the producer. Not one word of censure was passed concerning my attitude, and for this I am grateful. Apart from the strong and consistent support given to the Bill by the member for Swan (Mr. Sampson) the most pertinent remarks upon it came from the member for Gascoyne (Mr. Angelo). The latter member expressed briefly the essential clauses and provisions of the Bill. He said in a few words what it provided for. If I repeated what he said I could not better describe what the Bill contains. What has struck me about the position is the almost unanimous desire on the part of members to try the Bill on the dried fruit people. They say the Bill is no good. The Leader of the Opposition says it is a bad Bill. The member for West Perth (Mr. Davy) repeated that it was a bad Bill. The Leader of the Opposition claimed that it was bad for the producers, while the member for Swan (Mr. Sampson), sitting cheek by jowl with his leader, claimed that it was good for the producers. It all depends upon the point of view from which the Bill is regarded.

Hon. W. D. Johnson: One section asked for the Bill and the other opposed it.

The MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE: All this indicates a want of real sincerity in the opposition to the Bill. If all sections had asked for the Bill, it would have been supported. An influential section of the growers has opposed the Bill and therefore it is opposed here. Another section desires the Bill and therefore it is supported. Either the Bill is bad all through or it is good. If it is good for the dried fruits producer, it should be good for the grower of fresh fruits and should assist him in the marketing of his products. The question must be approached with some sense of conviction and the indications are that members are influenced by the attitude adopted by one section or another of the community. I know that several Opposition members were en-

thusiastic about the Bill until certain influences were brought to bear upon them. I do not complain, because I realise it is a natural thing in politics. In discussing the Bill, however, some members have not discussed its provisions on their merits, but in the light of views expressed by other people regarding the measure. The Leader of the Opposition was illogical regarding many of his objections. Although he described the Bill as rotten, he said he was in favour of its being confined to the dried fruit producers.

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: I said it was a rotten Bill.

The MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE: Yet the hon. member would hand the dried fruit producers over to the controlling influence of this rotten Bill.

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: Not this Bill, but a Bill.

The MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE: That is a remarkable attitude to adopt. Then the Leader of the Opposition said that it was impossible to have a pool particularly regarding highly perishable products, and in order to make a comparison he instanced bananas and pineapples in Queensland and said they were easier to deal with than apples.

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: I said nothing of the sort.

Mr. Sampson: It was another member who said that.

The MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE: He said that, in his opinion, bananas and pineapples were fruits that would keep for a longer time than apples.

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: Who said that?

The MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE: That was what the Leader of the Opposition said.

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: I did not. No one would be such a fool as to make a statement like that.

The MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE: The hon. member said that pineapples and bananas were capable of being kept for a long time and that they were grown in sufficient quantities to constitute a glut, and also that there was no variation in the supplies. I recognise that the Leader of the Opposition was at a disadvantage in that he did not know his subject. As a matter of fact, the most highly perishable of fruits would include bananas and pineapples, and certainly apples will keep ten times longer than either bananas or pineapples.

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: I never suggested anything of the sort. Why don't you keep to the Bill?

The MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE: In Queensland there are fruit gluts; bananas in particular are heavy producers and the fruit is perishable. In view of the success that followed the creation of the pool in Queensland, when dealing with bananas and pineapples, a similar proposal should be even more successful here when dealing with apples.

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: Yes, but talk to us about pears, peaches and so on.

The MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE: The Leader of the Opposition said that under the provisions of the Bill the man who produced the highest quality of fruit would be penalised.

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: So he would.

The MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE: What about the wheat pool? Are not the wheats graded? Does the man having poor quality wheat receive the same price as the man with high quality wheat? Is there no f.a.q. standard or dockages? If the wheatgrower having the highest quality wheat in the pool does not suffer, is it reasonable to suppose that the fruitgrower will suffer under the provisions of the Bill? To my mind the position of the wheatgrower represents an unanswerable argument to the objections taken to the Bill. Wheat is classified and graded, and whether the wheat be early or late the grower receives a fair price. We have been assured by those who have been closely associated with the wheat pool that it has been successful and has conserved the interests of the producer.

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: I did not hear anyone say that.

Mr. Lindsay: I said it.

The MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE: Then the Leader of the Opposition said, "Under the Bill God knows how many men will be employed." He suggested that the Bill provided for a lot of men who would have to be a charge on the industry. Because of that he claimed the Bill should be opposed. Has the Leader of the Opposition considered how many people will be displaced under the operations of the Bill? Does he realise how many agents and middlemen will be thrust aside because of the operations of the Bill?

Hon. W. D. Johnson: That is what he is concerned about.

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: I know about how many there are.

The MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE: If the organisation proves efficient, it will mean that a lesser number will be employed and the growers will receive a larger return for their product. The Leader of the Opposition also said that the trouble regarding the fruit industry was that the people in the mining, agricultural and pastoral industries could not get half the fruit that they wanted. He urged that better marketing arrangements were needed. That was clearly an admission that things were not right at present. He also spoke about gluts, and other members spoke about the law of supply and demand. Because of these things apparently nothing must be done! The remark of the Leader of the Opposition regarding people in the country not getting sufficient fruit indicated the necessity for organisation.

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: But the Bill will not make any difference. They will not be retail sellers.

The MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE: While we have gluts in local areas, the people in the country districts cannot get supplies.

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: The Bill does not propose to assist them either.

The MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE: If the Bill be agreed to, the growers, through their organisation, can make inquiries and by acting together can ascertain where the markets are and get into touch with them. At present it is no one's business. The grower sends his fruit to the agent, the agent charges commission, and that is the end of it. The agent does not care what price he gets for the fruit. So the market is not organised and there are no means by which people who are hungering for fruit can have their requirements met. That in itself is a good argument for the Bill.

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: But the Bill will not deal with that position.

The MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE: It has done so in Queensland.

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: It has not.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order!

The MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE: The Queensland authorities have sent their agents to New Zealand and through the other States to Western Australia. They have done that in order to extend their markets. That was not done before.

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: Of course it was.

The MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE: The Leader of the Opposition could not have considered the Bill to any extent because he made some startling misstatements. He said with reference to the election of the members of the board of control that the Minister really wanted to say who should manage the farmers' business, and that he might even appoint members of Parliament on the board. He considered that was quite wrong.

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: And that is what your Bill says, too.

The MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE: Where does it say that?

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: The Bill says what manner of men shall be on the board.

The MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE: It does not do that.

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: Yes, it does.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order!

The MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE: The Bill states that only primary producers can be appointed to the boards and that such men as are appointed must be elected by the people engaged in the industry concerned. There is not in the Bill any such suggestion as that conveyed by the Leader of the Opposition. Then he said that the Minister claimed that two wheat growers might be on a board dealing with apples and oranges. That again is not correct. The Bill does not provide for any such thing. Wheat growers will deal with wheat matters and orange and apple growers will deal with oranges and apples respectively.

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: Clause 5 gives you the power.

The MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE: That is an erroneous statement.

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: You are wrong.

The MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE: No, I am right. The only people who can be on a board dealing with wheat will be wheat growers and so on.

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: Then you do not know your own Bill.

The MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE: That is a feature of our Bill that is contrary to the Queensland measure. I am dealing with the statements made by the Leader of the Opposition because what he said has been dealt with in the "West Australian" as being absolutely correct.

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: Well, you be correct in your statements.

**THE MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE:** The Leader of the Opposition said that the Minister would have to approve of any financial arrangements or accommodation received from financial institutions. That is not correct at all. The Minister has no power to approve of any such thing. The Minister has power only to approve of the institution, not of the arrangements made, and so on. It was also stated by the Leader of the Opposition that the Minister had the power to prohibit the sale or export of produce. The Minister has no such power; that is entirely a function of the boards to be created under the Bill.

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: The Minister has that power.

**THE MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE:** There are persons who seek to find danger in the proposed Ministerial veto. But in a measure such as this that veto is imperative. It was said by the Leader of the Country Party that if the primary producers now engaged in handling their products through their co-operative concern created a pool, they could compel all producers to fall into line. They could, subject of course to the laws of the country. But under the Bill they get certain statutory rights. Under the co-operative movement they have no statutory right, but do those things at their own risk. They would have no right of compulsion over any person who might decide to sell outside the pool. Under the Bill they will have that necessary power of compulsion, will have power to do what they like. It is because of that, that the interests of the country would not be properly served unless there were a Ministerial veto. Members who take exception to that veto are not approaching the matter reasonably. It would be most unreasonable to give any body of people the opportunity the producers will have under the measure without taking some safeguard, and the Ministerial veto is the only one practicable. The Minister has the right to call in advisers to advise him, and it is not reasonable to suppose that any Minister would exercise the veto without necessity arising for his action. There would be occasion when the organisation under the Bill would be found so efficient that the people controlling the pool could fix any price they liked. Therefore the Bill should not pass without that provision for Ministerial veto. It is a vital feature of the Bill. Ministers will not interfere unnecessarily, but they will and ought to interfere when necessity

arises for it. As an indication of what might happen, I may say that a little while ago an embargo was imposed in the South-West in order to protect those areas against the introduction of disease. Recently it was learnt that the potato growers down there had utilised the protection afforded by that embargo to bear the market and raise the price against the community. I was assured that had occurred in only one or two instances, but to-day I have received evidence satisfying me that it has occurred and is still occurring. I have warned the potato growers down there that if they use the protection of that embargo to exploit the community they will be in danger of seeing the embargo removed.

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: Even at the cost of letting in disease?

**THE MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE:** The hon. member let in disease, for it was his Government that removed the embargo. This Government had to reimpose it. I warned the growers that the embargo was not given to them except for the purpose of keeping the areas free from disease. If they use that embargo to exploit the people, I will have no hesitation in taking steps to protect the consumers. A similar position could arise under the Bill, and because of that it is necessary that there should be means by which the Minister can protect the community. The member for West Perth (Mr. Davy) sees that danger and declares that the Ministerial veto is not sufficient. We have one side saying that if the Bill passes, the producers will be in the Government's hands; while on the other side it is urged that the consumer will be in the hands of the producer. I say that under the Bill the producer will get a fair deal, will get his market organised, while the middleman will have to give way, and so the consumer will get an advantage through the wiping out of the middleman's charges, and there will be general good to the community all round. The member for Perth (Mr. Mann) read a long statement from a newspaper, purporting to represent the appalling conditions under which the Committee of Direction operate in Queensland. The hon. member did not tell us from what newspaper he was quoting.

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: It was a Labour paper.

**THE MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE:** No, it was not. Nor was it the "West Australian," even though that paper sent a

special ambassador to Queensland to find out the position of affairs. I think I know the newspaper from which the hon. member quoted. It was a paper run in the interests of the middleman. I have seen it dozens of times. Even that paper has now admitted that the success achieved in Queensland would not have been possible but for the legislation operating there. However, we might just as well expect a reasonable opinion from that newspaper regarding this measure as we might expect reasonable opinions from the Press of Australia during the next few months regarding the Federal elections. Then we come to the law of supply and demand. We are told that potatoes and apricots are a glut in the market to-day, and that the gentlemen who brought about those gluts represent the primary producers, who, we are given to understand, are impoverished by gluts. It never occurs to some people that potatoes can be carried over from a glut period to a scarce period. Last year there was a glut in the South-West and the growers came to me and asked to be assisted to place 1,000 tons of potatoes in cold storage. We provided at the Westralian Meatworks storage for 1,000 tons of potatoes, and the growers stored 150 tons. They could have stored 1,000 tons and carried them over had they so wished. Members on the Opposition side apparently are content that these gluts should continue to occur. They have no view as to how the gluts may be overcome, even though a measure of this description provides that growers themselves shall have the opportunity to investigate markets and the problems of gluts, scarcity and cold storage. Yet members opposite say they must not have such opportunities but that gluts must occur. We are told there are periodical gluts of stone fruits. Is it not possible for a board organised for the marketing of dried fruit to make inquiries abroad or arrange for the fruit to be supplied to the goldfields, the farming and pastoral areas where according to the Leader of the Opposition, people cannot get the fruit they want? No, the gluts must continue. The agents are not concerned about gluts. As the fruit comes to them, they sell it and realise their profit. The person concerned about gluts is the producer. A board organised by the stone fruits section of the industry would naturally seek means to turn such perishables into jam, or into dried fruits such as I saw a few days ago on the River Murray settlements in South Australia. On

the soldier settlements there were hundreds of tons of perishable products in store: apricots, peaches and figs. They had had a glut, but the settlers did not sit down hopelessly and bemoan the glut. They dried the fruit. This Bill will give our producers an opportunity to use their intelligence and get rid of the middleman if they so desire. The Bill has been conceived in a fair spirit. It has been introduced as a result of a promise made by the Government at the last general elections, and at the urgent request of people engaged in the primary industries. While I appreciate the manner in which members have approached the subject and their remarks about me, I regret that they have not seen fit to give to the Bill the support of which I think it is deserving. The measure will confer on the primary producers of this State privileges and opportunities which hitherto they have not enjoyed, and which if used intelligently must be for their welfare and prosperity.

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

Ayes	..	..	..	..	27
Noes	..	..	..	..	11

Majority for .. 16

#### AYES.

Mr. Angelo	Mr. Lutey
Mr. Angwin	Mr. Marshall
Mr. Chesson	Mr. McCallum
Mr. Clydesdale	Mr. Millington
Mr. Collier	Mr. Munzie
Mr. Corboy	Mr. Pantou
Mr. Coverley	Mr. Sampson
Mr. Cunningham	Mr. Sleeman
Mr. Denton	Mr. Troy
Mr. Heron	Mr. A. Wansbrough
Mr. Hughes	Mr. Willcock
Mr. W. D. Johnson	Mr. Withers
Mr. Lambert	Mr. Willson
Mr. Lamond	

(Teller.)

#### NOES.

Mr. Davy	Mr. North
Mr. Griffiths	Mr. Stubbs
Mr. E. B. Johnston	Mr. Teesdale
Mr. Lindsay	Mr. C. P. Wansbrough
Mr. Mann	Mr. J. H. Smith
Sir James Mitchell	

(Teller.)

Question thus passed.

Bill read a second time.

House adjourned at 10.50 p.m.