

passed, the Geraldton branch of the R.S.L. will have no difficulty in raising the money necessary to erect a hall worthy of themselves and of the town. The Bill goes further than giving powers of mortgager in regard to the land which is the subject of the Bill, it provides similar powers in relation to any other land which the trustees may hereafter acquire. It will be noticed, however, that any lease, mortgage or sale—all of which are covered by the Bill—is made subject to the approval of the Governor-in-Council. I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

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.

Read a third time and *passed*.

House adjourned at 12.17 a.m. (Thursday).

MOTION—BULK HANDLING SITES.

Departmental Committee's Notes of Evidence.

HON. C. G. LATHAM (York) [4.33]: I move—

That there be laid on the Table of the House a copy of the notes of evidence taken by the departmental committee on bulk handling sites which was the subject of papers tabled pursuant to a motion moved by the member for Fremantle (Mr. J. B. Sleeman) on Wednesday, the 5th December, 1934.

When the departmental committee's report was asked for I pointed out to the Government that it was wrong to discuss the matter, which was then the subject of a libel action before the court. It appeared to me that this was staged to ensure that the information contained in the report would reach the jury. It might be said that the evidence is privileged; then so also should be the report. The Minister was anxious to make the information available, for he had the report in his pocket. We should know who gave the evidence, and whether the report is a fair one. The committee, in referring to conditions operating during the present season, stated:—

The unsatisfactory transport position has been largely, if not entirely, due to two factors—the unusual marketing conditions under which the normal seasonal sales were very greatly restricted, and the absence of adequate storage facilities at the Port.

Yet the company offered to lend the Harbour Trust or the Government £150,000 to £200,000 with which to equip the Port with a plant conforming to official requirements. The only condition attached was that the lenders were to have some form of security over the structure until it was paid for. This offer was not accepted, nor could any definite permission be obtained for the use of bulk facilities on the wharf. The company in desperation decided to rely upon using equipment on board vessels, and storage at Leighton, and proceeded accordingly. After the company had gone to considerable expenditure, the Harbour Trust agreed to the company converting a second gantry, one gantry, converted at the cost of the bulk handling company, having been in use the previous season. Nevertheless the Port equipment is not what the company desired, but what it was forced to adopt to overcome

Legislative Assembly,

Wednesday, 19th December, 1934.

| | PAGE |
|--|------|
| Motion: Bulk handling sites, departmental committee's notes of evidence | 2191 |
| Return: Lotteries Commission, charitable organisations assisted | 2197 |
| Question: Wheatgrowers, Federal payment to Western Australia | 2197 |
| Bills: Cremation Act Amendment, 2a., etc. | 2197 |
| Administration Act (Estate and Succession Duties) Amendment, Council's amendments | 2203 |
| Dairy Products Marketing Regulation, Com. | 2203 |
| Financial Emergency Tax Assessment Act Amendment, Council's further message | 2208 |
| Mine Workers' Relief Act Amendment, Council's amendment | 2208 |
| Electoral Act Amendment (No. 1), Council's message | 2209 |
| Constitution Acts Amendment, Council's message | 2209 |
| Discharge of Orders | 2209 |

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

the final resort of official antagonism to bulk handling, namely, delay. The management of it all was to be left entirely in the hands of the Harbour Trust, so the departmental committee cannot blame Bulk Handling Ltd. because the facilities were not provided at the port.

The Acting Premier: They did not blame Bulk Handling Ltd. They simply said the facilities were not there.

Hon. C. G. LATHAM: But that was not the fault of Bulk Handling Ltd.

The Acting Premier: They did not say it was.

Mr. SPEAKER: I do not think the hon. member is in order in discussing the report. His motion asks that a copy of the notes of evidence taken by the departmental committee be laid on the Table. He is in order in giving reasons why this should be done, but he is not in order in discussing the report.

Hon. C. G. LATHAM: If you, Sir, are going to restrict me, I cannot tell the House why I want the evidence.

Mr. SPEAKER: If the hon. member proposes to connect up the report with his reasons for wishing for the evidence, it will be all right, but I do not want a lengthy discussion on the report.

Hon. C. G. LATHAM: I wish to find out why this report was put up. A grave injury has been done to Bulk Handling Ltd. by this report being made available without any evidence to show that it was an unbiased report.

Mr. SPEAKER: If the hon. member is going to connect up his remarks with the motion, it will be all right.

Hon. C. G. LATHAM: Yes, I wish to ascertain whether the file was perused for the purpose of getting this evidence.

The Acting Premier: The notes of evidence will not show that.

Hon. C. G. LATHAM: They ought to show that from such-and-such a file the evidence was obtained.

The Acting Premier: Of course not.

Hon. C. G. LATHAM: I do not know whether the committee took evidence from Bulk Handling Ltd. It is of no use having reports laid on the Table which are going to do an injury to a company that is striving its best to save costs to the primary producers. I should like to find out from the evidence where they

got the information that 4,000,000 bushels of wheat was placed in bins. That statement is not true. The quantity of wheat held in bins was 2,236,000 bushels, which is considerably less than the report states. They deal with the protection of wheat in bulk, and I should like to find out whether they went into the question of the protection of wheat in bags. Bagged wheat was in exactly the same condition as bulk wheat, and at Geraldton it was worse. I read an unbiased report in the Geraldton newspaper showing the condition of the wheat in bags at that port, so I should like to find out where the committee got the evidence about the condition of bulk wheat. A report like that on the Table shows that the committee evidently were biased.

The Minister for Justice: No, no.

Hon. C. G. LATHAM: Well, why pick out bulk wheat, since there was a lot less bulk wheat than bagged wheat, yet both were in the same condition?

The Minister for Justice: The committee were dealing exclusively with bulk handling. That is why the committee were formed.

Hon. C. G. LATHAM: Why should they tell of the damage to bulk wheat, instead of saying it was due to the fact that the season was abnormal?

The Minister for Justice: They were dealing with an application for bulk handling facilities all over the State.

Hon. C. G. LATHAM: But why should this report deal with bulk wheat alone, instead of with bagged wheat also? This report probably has done a great deal of injury to the company. I do not think the Minister has any desire for that. Then there were the complaints about the insect pests. Why did the committee particularly pick out bulk wheat for that complaint? The bagged wheat in Geraldton was in a shocking condition when I was up there.

The Minister for Justice: They were dealing with nothing but bulk wheat.

Hon. C. G. LATHAM: I should like to see the evidence on which the committee led the people of the State to believe that only bulk wheat was affected in this way.

The Minister for Justice: That is all they were asked to consider.

Hon. C. G. LATHAM: If we are to have reports framed on that basis, I hope that in future, if the Government want a de-

partmental inquiry, they will restrict the papers to the departmental files, and not lay them on the Table of the House. The condition of bulk wheat and bagged wheat was identical in regard to pests, and also destruction by fire. If there were losses by fire and by water, they might also have applied to bagged wheat. The committee must have known that both bagged wheat and bulk wheat were insured. It looks as if they selected bulk handling particularly, to endeavour to expose the weaknesses of it. That is unfair. I believe the Government will lay on the Table the evidence, so that we may get more than a one-sided view.

The Minister for Justice: You will not get anything about bagged wheat, whatever happens.

Hon. C. G. LATHAM: Let us see what leading questions were submitted to the witnesses, and what the evidence was.

The Acting Premier: How do you know there are any notes of evidence?

Hon. C. G. LATHAM: The committee said that notes of evidence were available.

The Acting Premier: Where?

Hon. C. G. LATHAM: In their report.

The Acting Premier: Not notes of all the evidence.

Hon. C. G. LATHAM: On the second page of the report they say, "Notes of the evidence were taken and are available for reference." We ought to have those notes. It is not fair that the company should be injured in this way. I should like to see the notes. The public will then have information from which they can judge whether the report was fair or not. Bulk handling has rendered great assistance to the people concerned in Western Australia. It has meant a tremendous saving in corn-sacks and so on.

The Acting Premier: In the case of some people.

Hon. C. G. LATHAM: Those who had the benefit of it. The Minister has not had the benefit of bulk handling.

The Acting Premier: I have had to pay for others to get the benefit.

Mr. SPEAKER: The Leader of the Opposition is being led astray by interjections, and is discussing bulk handling generally.

Hon. C. G. LATHAM: I should like to see what led up to the report, and I want to know the source of the information upon which it was framed. The committee refers

to two shiploads of wheat being sent away. It would be interesting to find out where they got the information. Reliable information supplied to me is that there was no dockage, as is said in the report, upon that wheat. The firm who bought it in London cabled for two more shipments, and paid a premium on the Western Australian wheat. We have to be careful that the evidence submitted to departmental committees does not injure our exporters. I see the Minister for Lands is shaking his head. No one but he can tell the truth. We had a happy time while he was away in the Eastern States, and I want to have a happy time until the session ends.

The Minister for Lands: I heard a great deal in the Eastern States.

Hon. C. G. LATHAM: The committee said it was damaged wheat, and referred to two shipments from Western Australia. That is not fair to exporters.

The Minister for Justice: Do you say the statements are not true?

Hon. C. G. LATHAM: Many of them are not true. Such things apply to bagged wheat as well as to bulk wheat.

The Minister for Justice: The committee had nothing to do with bagged wheat.

Hon. C. G. LATHAM: The people in the country are concerned about this. They want to know whether they should put their wheat through in bulk, and where the evidence was obtained. I think it must have been picked up in some hole-and-corner manner. It may be all right from a departmental point of view, but it may do a great deal of injury, not only to the company and the farmers, but to the exporters.

The Minister for Justice: You know the personnel of the committee. Do you think the officers concerned would take any notice of hole-and-corner evidence?

Hon. C. G. LATHAM: Some of their ideas do not coincide with mine.

The Acting Premier: Some of the hon. member's ideas are not in accordance with mine.

Hon. C. G. LATHAM: Most extraordinary! The table would not be dividing us if that were otherwise.

The Acting Premier: Then why complain about these officers holding different views from your own?

Hon. C. G. LATHAM: We should know who the Bank officer was who gave the information about the scrip.

The Acting Premier: Why?

Hon. C. G. LATHAM: It is not different from any other scrip that is given for wheat, and is guaranteed by a substantial company. We should have the notes of evidence so that we may judge whether the report is fairly and reasonably based on the evidence, and we should know whether the evidence was called from reasonable people. It would be possible to go along the Terrace and get witnesses who would condemn even the present Government.

The Acting Premier: Oh, no!

Hon. C. G. LATHAM: The Minister for Lands said he had heard a great deal in the Eastern States. If he is referring to merchants who have been unable to dispose of wheat, he should give us their names.

The Minister for Lands: You are merely making a speech on behalf of Wellington-street.

Hon. C. G. LATHAM: I ask for a withdrawal of that remark.

Mr. SPEAKER: The Leader of the Opposition asks that the Minister for Lands should withdraw the statement that he is making a speech on behalf of Wellington-street.

The Minister for Lands: I suggest he is not making it on behalf of Wellington-street. He can deny the statement, if he likes. Of course, I was disorderly in making the interjection. I will withdraw the statement.

Hon. C. G. LATHAM: I did not speak on the previous motion before the House. I thought it should not have been brought up and that it was an improper thing to do. The farmers are my principal concern.

The Minister for Lands: That mob down there!

Hon. C. G. LATHAM: I refer to those who have put in their wheat having confidence in the company. It will give more confidence to the farmers if they know the reason for the report being framed on its present lines.

The Minister for Mines: Why did not you object to the report being tabled?

Hon. C. G. LATHAM: I did. I drew the attention of the Acting Premier to the case before the court.

The Minister for Mines: Only for that reason?

Hon. C. G. LATHAM: It was the best reason I could submit. I do not think the

Acting Premier knew there was a case before the court.

The Acting Premier: Not until you told me.

Hon. C. G. LATHAM: Probably he thought it was only a minor case, but it has proved to be one of the biggest cases heard before the court for some time. I am sure the Government will agree to submit the evidence on which the report is based. It has always been the practice, when a report has been laid upon the Table of the House, to accompany it with a copy of the evidence taken. I have had a full search made, and nowhere can I find a case of a report being tabled without the evidence.

Mr. Marshall: The report of a departmental committee?

Hon. C. G. LATHAM: Reports by departmental committees are not tabled. It is generally the file that is tabled, and this contains all the facts of the case. I am depending upon the Government to treat us fairly, and to do what has always been the custom ever since this House has existed.

THE ACTING PREMIER (Hon. A. McCallum—South Fremantle) [4.57]: Some time ago the Government received an application for further leases for sidings for bulk handling installations. Before deciding what to do with the application, the Government appointed a departmental committee of officers who were entirely disinterested. No one could say those officers were interested in any way. They are all holding high positions in the Public Service. We appointed them to advise us whether the operations of the bulk handling system during the last wheat season would warrant the Government in extending it to other sidings. That was the only business they had to inquire into. There was no suggestion about looking into the whole problem of wheat handling, bagged versus bulk.

Hon. C. G. Latham: They looked into the financial side.

The ACTING PREMIER: They were to advise the Government whether the application was warranted or not. The committee submitted their report, and upon it the Government acted. The Leader of the Opposition has dealt with the merits of the report.

Hon. C. G. Latham: I had to do that to justify the request for production of the evidence.

The ACTING PREMIER: I wish to point out the difference between persons giving evidence before a departmental committee, and before a Royal Commission or a select committee. A person giving evidence before a departmental committee comes forward voluntarily, and without compulsion, and gives his evidence under arrangement with the committee. He has no privilege or protection of any kind. On the other hand, a person giving evidence before a Royal Commission or select committee is privileged, and has the protection of the law. The moment the hon. gentleman's motion appeared in the Press, I was waited upon by a number of Perth businessmen and some bank officials who protested against the suggestion contained in the motion and told me that they had appeared before the departmental committee and made statements there on the distinct understanding that the matter would be treated as strictly confidential.

Hon. C. G. Latham: Then the report ought to be treated as confidential also. Will you agree with that?

The ACTING PREMIER: I sent for the chairman of the departmental committee and asked him whether the statements that had been made to me were correct. The chairman replied that they were correct, that such an undertaking had been given to the businessmen and the bank officials. To agree to the motion would be to break the promise of confidence given to the witnesses—a distinct breach of confidence. The names of the members of the departmental committee appear on the report. They are all public servants with years of experience and holding high positions. Before the report was tabled here, the chairman of the departmental committee was asked whether he or any other member of the committee objected to its being produced. In the result each member of the committee declared that he had no objection. Had any one of them objected, the report would never have been produced here.

Hon. C. G. Latham: They ought to have drawn your attention to the fact that the evidence was privileged.

The ACTING PREMIER: The hon. gentleman knows that the only form of inquiry where evidence is ever privileged is a Parliamentary inquiry.

Hon. C. G. Latham: Well, I mean confidential.

The ACTING PREMIER: Parliament gives no protection whatever in the case of what may be termed a more or less private investigation such as this was. If the Leader of the Opposition wants an opportunity of having the evidence for or against bulk handling published, he will have that opportunity within a few weeks, I hope. The Government have undertaken to appoint a Royal Commission to inquire into the question of the handling of our wheat harvests. A Royal Commission will be appointed, and the evidence taken by it will be available to the public.

Hon. C. G. Latham: We ought to bring here the people who gave that evidence.

The ACTING PREMIER: The Royal Commission will be able to call whom they please. I have no doubt whatever that the Royal Commission will call the chairman of the departmental committee.

Hon. C. G. Latham: I do not want the members of that committee, but the people who gave evidence before it.

The ACTING PREMIER: The Royal Commission will be able to ascertain who gave evidence before the departmental committee. The scope of the Royal Commission's inquiry will be quite broad enough to suit the Leader of the Opposition. The only fear I have is that he may complain of its being too broad. The Government want all the information and all the facts and the full truth of the position laid bare. We propose to give the Royal Commission very wide powers to investigate. Therefore, if it is just from that aspect the hon. member wants information, he will be able to obtain it shortly. If any damage has been done to Bulk Handling Ltd., there will be every opportunity of righting the wrong before the Royal Commission. I cannot conceive that the House, or that the hon. member, would be a party to the breaking of confidence.

Hon. C. G. Latham: No; but I do not think, in view of that admission, that you ought to have laid the departmental committee's report on the Table.

The ACTING PREMIER: I repeat, that report would never have come here if any member of the committee had raised objection. But here in this Chamber we have had a request from the two sides. One member evidently thought that the departmental committee's report was in favour of bulk

handling, and the other that it was against bulk handling.

Hon. C. G. Latham: There was only one speech.

The ACTING PREMIER: The member for Guildford-Midland (Hon. W. D. Johnson) spoke in support of the motion, but from the opposite standpoint to that of the member for Fremantle (Mr. Sleeman).

Hon. C. G. Latham: No one on this side of the House spoke on the motion.

The ACTING PREMIER: That is so; but those were the two main speakers, and they spoke from entirely different viewpoints, though they both asked for the report. If the Government had objected to its being tabled, we would have been told that we had something to hide and would have been asked why we had decided not to increase the number of sites this year. The request coming from two members holding directly opposite views on the question, we could do nothing but lay the report on the Table, always provided the members of the departmental committee did not object. That is the whole situation. A departmental committee can give no protection to witnesses. We have had one lawsuit that has lasted for weeks; and if the evidence were disclosed, there might be a crop of lawsuits. But what I object to most strongly is the breaking of confidence, a breach of the undertaking that was given.

Hon. C. G. Latham: I agree with you that the undertaking should not be broken. At the same time, in view of that undertaking, I consider you ought not to have laid the report on the Table.

The ACTING PREMIER: Had we been advised at the time that certain evidence was given in confidence, we would probably have objected to tabling the report. However, no one suggested that the report of the evidence would be called for. The motion merely asked for a report which is only a report of departmental officers. I submit that the desires of the Leader of the Opposition in moving the motion will be met when the Royal Commission inquires. If any damage has been done to any individual in connection with the departmental inquiry, it can be rectified before the Royal Commission, under the gaze of the public. But to agree to the motion at this moment, would brand every one of us associated with it as untrustworthy. I do not think the Leader of the Opposition wants to place

either the House or himself in such a position. I had scarcely read the hon. member's motion, I had hardly got to my office, when the telephone rang from someone making objections—

Mr. Doney: I can quite believe that.

Hon. C. G. Latham: I can quite understand that. All the more reason why the evidence should see the light of day.

The ACTING PREMIER: Witnesses before the departmental committee told me they had given evidence vitally affecting their own business, evidence which should not go out to the public. Not that there was anything untruthful in it, or anything that would not bear investigation; but it was evidence relating to their confidential business, the business of banks and so forth. They did not want that information disclosed to the world. They had disclosed it to a departmental committee investigating on behalf of the Government. The carrying of a motion of this kind would be a serious reflection upon men acting on behalf of the Government, with the responsibility of reporting to the Government. Undertakings given in such circumstances should, I consider, be respected by everyone. Therefore the Government cannot in any circumstances agree that the evidence should be produced here. I believe that the Leader of the Opposition, knowing now that the undertaking was given, will not press his motion, as the carrying of it would constitute a distinct reflection on Parliament.

HON. C. G. LATHAM (York—in reply) [5.12]: I quite agree with the Acting Premier that if the witnesses in question volunteered to give evidence—to use the hon. gentleman's own words—on the understanding that it would be treated as confidential, it should not be supplied to the House. I do not ask the Government to allow people to give evidence on the understanding that it is confidential and then, immediately upon its being obtained, reveal it to the public. However, that does not excuse the fact that an injury was done by tabling certain papers dealing with the outcome of that confidential evidence. I accept the Acting Premier's word that he was not aware that the evidence on which the report was based was confidential, and that if he had possessed this knowledge he would have considered whether the report

ought to be tabled. To me personally it does not matter a great deal. I am not affected, but people in the country are affected. As regards the Acting Premier's statement about banking business, I do not see how that enters into the question of sites. The hon. gentleman referred to bank officials having given evidence. I am prepared to admit that in view of the information supplied by the hon. gentleman it is not fair to ask the House to carry the motion; but I do hope that if in future departmental inquiries are held and witnesses are told that their evidence will be treated as confidential, the reports resulting from such inquiries will be retained within the departmental files. I ask leave to withdraw the motion.

Motion by leave withdrawn.

RETURN—LOTTERIES COMMISSION.

Charitable Organisations Assisted.

MR. NEEDHAM (Perth) [5.14]: I move—

That a return be laid on the Table showing—
(1) the names of the charitable organisations in Western Australia that have been assisted by the Lotteries Commission during 1934; (2) the amount granted to each organisation.

On motion by the Minister for Agriculture, debate adjourned.

QUESTION—WHEATGROWERS.

Federal Payment to Western Australia.

Hon. W. D. JOHNSON asked the Minister for Lands: 1, Will he, in view of the small payment made to the wheatgrowers in Western Australia as compared to the payments in other parts of Australia, particularly Queensland, as disclosed by a return supplied to Senator Johnston in the Senate, explain—(a) why the W.A. payment is less than that of other States; (b) whether any wheatgrower having a taxable income in Western Australia has received any payment? 2, If so, (a) how many; (b) amount paid? 3, Have payments been finalised in this State? 4, If not, what amount is still available and when will it be distributed? 5, In addition to the above questions, could he make a statement to the House generally explaining his methods of payment as compared to others as disclosed in the Federal return?

The **MINISTER FOR LANDS** replied: 1, (a) The amount allocated to this State under the Wheatgrowers' Relief Act, 1933, was £639,493. The basis of allocation was the same for each State on the estimated acreage to be harvested for grain. Such allocation was based on the acreage under wheat in each State, as published by the Government Statistician. The Western Australian allocation was on the Government Statistician's estimate of 3,178,000 acres, but the State paid on claims covering 3,268,588 acres. Assuming the figures quoted in the Federal return embrace only the Commonwealth grant, the payment of a higher rate by some of the other States would be due to the fact that the circumstances of a larger percentage of growers in these States rendered them ineligible for the bonus, thus enabling a larger payment to be made to those who were considered to have just claims to assistance. (b) No; payment only made when certificate received from Taxation Department that settler had no taxable income. 2, See (b). 3, No. 4, £43,596; distribution is being made daily to farmers whose yields have been below average; also finality has not been reached in all cases with the Taxation Department and beneficiaries under Section 11 of the Act. 5, Section 5 of the Act provides that the moneys shall be applied by the State for the assistance of wheatgrowers, it being left to the discretion of the State authority to decide if a grower is entitled to assistance. In this State growers have received a flat rate of 3s. 6d. per acre on the acreage harvested for grain, leaving a balance of approximately £70,000 to further assist growers whose yields have been well below the average. This has enabled payments to be made in a number of cases of an additional 2s. per acre. I have no knowledge of the method of distribution adopted in the other States beyond that disclosed by the Federal return.

BILL—CREMATION ACT AMENDMENT.

Second Reading.

Debate resumed from the 5th December.

HON. C. G. LATHAM (York) [5.18]: The introduction of the Bill was remarkable in view of the fact that the original Act when it was presented contained the provision that the member for Northam

(Mr. Hawke) has included in the amending Bill. The Government of the day, the members of which were almost identical with those included in the present Government, opposed the proposal on the ground that they would not allow outside people to control cremation within the State. On account of that opposition, the member for Claremont (Mr. North), who introduced the Bill that is now an Act, withdrew the clause that dealt with that phase. In my opinion the Government of the day were perfectly right, and if crematoria are to be built in Western Australia they should be erected in cemeteries and not outside such areas.

The Minister for Health: Apart from one exception, can you tell me of any crematorium in the Eastern States that is built in a cemetery?

Hon. C. G. LATHAM: The fact that a certain course is adopted in the Eastern States does not furnish any reason why we should act similarly in Western Australia. When I was Minister for Public Health, an application came before me from people who were prepared to form a company for the purpose of erecting a crematorium in Western Australia. I did not believe it was in the interests of the public to have such an institution erected in the middle of the city. In consequence, that application was refused. I believe the proper authority to carry out such work in the metropolitan area is the Karrakatta Cemetery Board. It may be that the board had not sufficient money at the time, but they have tangible assets to enable them to raise funds and so give effect to the wishes of the member for Northam. The board already possess the necessary authority under the Act, if thought necessary. It would be unwise to reverse the decision arrived at previously by Parliament and I shall oppose the second reading of the Bill. If there were any justification for the Bill, I would support it, because I am not at all against cremation.

The Minister for Health: Are we ever likely to have cremation instituted in this State unless the Bill be agreed to?

Hon. C. G. LATHAM: Yes.

The Minister for Health: No, never.

Hon. C. G. LATHAM: In other parts of Australia cremation is practised. The only time I saw a body cremated was in

London. The work was carried out by the East Finchley Cemetery Board who had erected a private crematorium attached to the cemetery. It would be regrettable if a crematorium were erected in the heart of the city.

The Minister for Health: Who says it will be erected in the heart of the city?

Hon. C. G. LATHAM: It is quite likely it will be.

The Minister for Health: Not at all; the site has to be approved of.

Hon. C. G. LATHAM: And who can say the site approved of will not be in the middle of the city?

The Minister for Health: The site will have to be approved by the Commissioner of Public Health.

Hon. C. G. LATHAM: And that officer may hold the same opinion as the member for Northam; he may not mind where it is erected, so long as effect is given to the proposal embodied in the Bill. I hope the House will abide by the view expressed by the Premier (Hon. P. Collier). When the original measure was under discussion, he said the Government would not allow any private company to build a crematorium.

The Minister for Health: Any undertaker has that right now.

Hon. C. G. LATHAM: Yes, so long as the crematorium is built on cemetery grounds. We should not vary our previous decision, and I am rather surprised to know that a new member like the member for Northam can introduce such a measure and have the support of the Minister.

MR. CROSS (Canning) [5.22]: For once I am in agreement with the Leader of the Opposition.

Hon. C. G. Latham: Then I must be wrong.

MR. CROSS: I shall not have much to say on this subject, but I claim that the principle of giving a private corporation the right to cremate bodies is wrong. I subscribe to all the views expressed by the Leader of the Opposition, and I hope that in Committee the Bill will be amended along the lines suggested by his remarks. If a crematorium were conducted by the Government or by the Karrakatta Cemetery Board, it would be all right, but to give that privilege to two or three people would be wrong.

The Minister for Health: It can be given to one under the law as it is now.

Mr. CROSS: And that is wrong. If a crematorium were provided at Karrakatta, any undertaker could make use of it, and that is as it should be.

MR. NORTH (Claremont) [5.24]: I hope the introduction of the Bill will revive interest in the subject of cremation. The operations of the Bill that was previously introduced and became an Act were confined to cemeteries because the Government of the day would not agree to private enterprise entering into the matter. I understand that the proposal in the Bill is not to extend the right to private companies, but only to incorporated bodies. That would mean that if a cemetery board refused permission, ground could be taken elsewhere and the work carried out only by a body not conducted for the purpose of making profit. If I remember aright, that is one consideration—the incorporated body must be one that is not out to show profits. It is rather surprising that no action has been taken under the Cremation Act to establish a crematorium. At the time the Act was passed, the women's organisations, particularly the Women's Service Guild, had approached me on the subject. They were anxious that cremation should be fostered in Western Australia. We know that a woman likes to be sure, but that is as far as they got with this matter. The women's organisations showed their desire, but went no further with it. I think the real reason for that was the opposition of the Karrakatta Cemetery Board to the construction of a crematorium at that juncture. I had no desire to thrust new theories upon persons whose religious beliefs did not enable them to approve of those theories. I am aware that there is a certain amount of controversy about cremation, but the State has reached a stage when it is large enough to enable that method of disposing of the dead to be available to those who believe in the system. A rather interesting story of the classical period is told about Darius who got together two sets of people in his court. One set believed in burning bodies after death and the other section believed in eating them. Darius asked those who believed in eating the corpses if they would agree to burn their ancestors, in consequence of which they fell to howl-

ing aloud. On the other hand he asked those who believed in burning the remains if they would eat them, and the lamentations from the persons concerned were truly terrific. So it is to-day. Throughout the State different ideas are held with regard to the disposal of the dead. I believe, with the member for Northam (Mr. Hawke), that it should be possible for those who believe in cremation to dispose of bodies in accordance with their desires. If it is not possible for a local cemetery board to undertake the necessary action, I cannot see why incorporated bodies should not be permitted to undertake the task, seeing that it is done elsewhere. If it will give practical effect to the provisions of the existing Act, the Bill should receive the support of the House. Nevertheless, I believe it should not be a task available for private companies. I support the Bill and I hope it will lead to effective action being taken.

THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH (Hon. S. W. Munsie—Hannans) [5.28]: As Minister for Public Health, I hope the Bill will be agreed to. I do not desire to force my opinions upon those whose views are different from mine, but I do not want those who do not believe in cremation to say to those who do believe in it that they shall not have the right to dispose of bodies as they desire. The Bill does not contain any provision forcing the principle; it is purely optional. The Act has been in existence for about five years, and nothing has been done so far. Personally I believe that if the Act remains in its present form on the statute-book for the next 20 years, still nothing will be done. Under the existing Act it is possible for any undertaker to negotiate with a cemetery board to build a crematorium within a cemetery and conduct it as a business. As a matter of fact we shall never get an undertaker to do that. If cremation came into vogue he would lose that on which he makes his profits. That is why undertakers do not want cremation. With its introduction, all the frills from which they make their profits would be gone. Hence there has been no application under the existing Act.

Mr. Patrick: They could put the ashes in a nice box.

THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH: Statistics of other States and countries show that crematoria are increasing in number. I

New South Wales about 30 per cent. of the people who die are cremated. It is only a few years since cremation was made possible in that State, and the same argument was used in opposition to it, namely, that no one wanted it. Recently I discussed cremation with a man who had been strongly opposed to it. He had been to Sydney and had an appointment with a friend, but the friend rang regretting his inability to keep the appointment because he had to attend a funeral. He told the visitor that if he had no objection to attending the funeral, they could spend some time together afterwards. When the visitor got to the cemetery he found that the body was to be cremated. He attended the ceremony and his conversion to cremation as against burial was an eye-opener to me. There is no comparison between the two methods of disposing of the dead. With cremation everything is more appropriate.

Mr. Wilson: Do they have a jazz band?

The MINISTER FOR HEALTH: The hon. member may joke about it, but there are thousands of people in Western Australia who believe in cremation, and I am one of them. It is not right that those who do not believe in cremation should prevent me and others who think with me from having the right of cremation. There is not the slightest doubt that cremation is preferable to the present degrading practice of burial.

Mr. Lambert: What does Dr. Atkinson think of it?

The MINISTER FOR HEALTH: Whatever he thought it would influence me more than would the hon. member's opinions, which are of little value to anyone.

Mr. Lambert: That is a wonderful tribute to me.

The MINISTER FOR HEALTH: I favour the Bill and hope it will become law. If it be passed, it will merely give the opportunity to those who desire it, whereas it is not possible to put the existing Act into operation. Some people are so strongly in favour of cremation that on three occasions within the last two years bodies have been sent from Western Australia to New South Wales for cremation.

Mr. Lambert: And the ashes used as tooth powder!

The MINISTER FOR HEALTH: The hon. member might like to use the ashes as

tooth powder, but no sensible man would. That remark by the hon. member was on a par with his previous interjection. The cremation society of Western Australia includes a large number of leading citizens. It is an incorporated body and is prepared to put into operation something in which its members believe and not to make profit. I hope that an opportunity will be given to establish a crematorium in a cemetery or elsewhere. If they cannot get permission to erect a crematorium in a cemetery, they will have the right to use ground outside a cemetery, but it will be dedicated as a cemetery.

Mr. Marshall: Give them the old East Perth cemetery.

The MINISTER FOR HEALTH: That site is too valuable. In justice to those who believe in cremation, we should pass the Bill.

MR. LAMBERT (Yilgarn-Coolgardie) [5.36]: The Minister's speech reminds me of the story of a certain person who took exception to the formalities associated with burial—hearse, mourning coaches, flowers, pall bearers, etc. After the burial of a friend, he returned to his club and expressed the hope that there would be no fuss of the kind when he died. A candid friend replied, "No, there will be no fuss over you; they will merely pour you back into the bottle." He was a man who imbibed Scotch whisky freely and frequently. Parliament should not be asked at this stage of the session to consider crank-like legislation of this kind. The practice of burial has descended through the ages and no exception has been taken to it. True, a few cranks have objected, but they would be cranks on any other subject. The Minister said that for health reasons, if for no other reason, cremation was desirable. The Principal Medical Officer could tell him of the 300,000 million microbes that are floating around in the atmosphere and might attack any human being. Of course there are human beings that no self-respecting microbe would attack.

The Minister for Health: Two more have been discovered since you counted that number!

Mr. LAMBERT: If Dr. Atkinson discovered the other two, he has not discovered anything else.

The Minister for Health: You do not know his views.

Mr. LAMBERT: I thought the Minister's views were his views.

The Minister for Health: They were my own views. I do not know his views on cremation.

Mr. LAMBERT: The Bill is an affront to those who hold definite views on the burial of those dear to them. True, it is not sought to make cremation compulsory, but when legislative sanction is obtained, it is a direction to people to follow the lead.

The Minister for Health: You know that Parliament has already passed legislation.

Mr. LAMBERT: Yes, at the instigation of the member for Claremont. The member for Claremont holds other views that are not accepted as orthodox. We have heard him on Douglas Credit proposals and vegetarianism.

Mr. SPEAKER: Those matters have nothing to do with the Bill.

Mr. North: The hon. member is becoming very conservative in his old age.

Mr. LAMBERT: Some people are prepared to depart from orthodox forms.

The Minister for Health: A good thing, too.

Mr. LAMBERT: Parliament would be better employed in looking after the living than in trying to provide a formula for the dead. The practice of burial has been observed since the dawn of civilisation, and certainly since the Christian era people with respect for their dead have adopted it. Parliament should reject the Bill as an emphatic protest against fantastic legislation of this kind to meet the whims of one member of this House.

Mr. North: Why insult the Eastern States where cremation is in force?

Mr. LAMBERT: Recently the hon. member did not hesitate to offer a pronounced insult to the Eastern States.

The Minister for Health: All the other States have cremation. Why should not we have it?

Mr. LAMBERT: Other States have many things that we do not possess, including a Jack Lang.

Mr. Hawke: They have not any George Lamberts.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! The hon. member must discuss the Bill.

Mr. LAMBERT: If the member for Northam desires a discussion on the merits of cremation versus burial, he should intro-

duce the subject at an opportune time and not in the dying hours of the session.

Hon. P. D. Ferguson: The dying hours should be the appropriate time.

Mr. LAMBERT: If Governments tolerate the introduction of nonsensical legislation of this kind, we may expect much more of it to be introduced. The member for Northam professes to have a great regard for the living, industrially and economically. If his professions were put into practice, he would be doing something for his constituents and for the State.

MR. HAWKE (Northam—in reply) [5.45]: The speeches on the second reading of this measure have for the most part been at least related to the Bill, but the last one delivered had no connection with it whatever. The member for Yilgarn-Coolgardie (Mr. Lambert), indulged in his usual bad habit of making speeches supposed to be dealing with a certain proposition, but instead he gave us a very jumbled explanation of his very jumbled views of the whole problem. The speech he made might have been to a small extent appropriate had it been delivered when the Act of 1929 was before this Chamber in the form of a Bill. On that occasion the Bill was passed by the Chamber without any opposition at all. So, as I said in introducing the Bill, this House and another place unanimously agreed to the principle of cremation on that occasion. Yet this afternoon we have this guardian of the public morals, the member for Yilgarn-Coolgardie, rising in his seat and in righteous indignation pouring contempt upon the proposal. Where was he, I ask, in 1929?

Mr. Marshall: Being poured back into the bottle.

Mr. HAWKE: The member for Murchison to an extent has taken from me a comment that I had made a note of. What I was going to suggest was, after listening to the speech of the member for Yilgarn-Coolgardie, the very erratic member for Yilgarn-Coolgardie—

Mr. Lambert: Don't get so damned insulting, or I will be insulting to you, too.

Mr. HAWKE: —that the most appropriate form of burial was—

Mr. Lambert: I will bury you, politically and otherwise.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. HAWKE: The member for Yilgarn-Coolgardie takes a remarkable delight in condemning other people and ridiculing proposals seriously brought forward by them, and when he is politely and delicately rapped over the knuckles for his bad habit in that respect, he loses control of himself and makes statements that are out of place, and which bring down upon him the censure of the Speaker.

Mr. Lambert: Your idea of politeness and delicacy is the use of the nigger's waddy.

Mr. HAWKE: The hon. member referred to this as a crank-like proposal. Cremation is in practice in most parts of the British Empire, in London and other parts of England, in Scotland and in every capital city of Australia with the exception of Western Australia, and so the only conclusion we can come to is that in various parts of the Empire, and in every city of Australia the people who have taken in hand this question are cranks and only concern themselves with crank-like proposals! I suppose, unless a proposal receives the approbation of the member for Yilgarn-Coolgardie as would, say, a dentists Bill, or something of that character, it cannot be a gem of wisdom. Therefore I do not think that the unreasonable speech delivered by the member for Yilgarn-Coolgardie will have the slightest effect upon members of this Chamber. I am wondering why the hon. member, if he has studied this question so deeply and is so vitally concerned about it, failed entirely in his speech to make any reference to the Bill. I pay the hon. member the compliment of believing that had he given serious consideration to the provisions of the amending Bill, and, instead of making a speech that was inappropriate and incorrect, risen in his seat and regaled us with a dissertation that might have contained much wisdom, he would have assisted us to a careful understanding of the Bill and in that way helped it to become an established fact. Thus the people who believe in cremation would have the opportunity of being buried after death in the manner they desired.

Mr. Lambert: I have no desire for anyone to witness my being grilled in a fire.

Mr. HAWKE: That may be, but I point out that under the Act at present on the statute-book, cremation is entirely a question for voluntary decision and individual concern. Thus there is no point whatever

in the extravagant contention put forward by the member for Yilgarn-Coolgardie. I trust the second reading and the remaining stages will be put through as quickly as possible.

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

| | | | | | |
|------|----|----|----|----|----|
| Ayes | .. | .. | .. | .. | 29 |
| Noes | .. | .. | .. | .. | 7 |

Majority for 22

AYES.

| | |
|----------------|--------------------|
| Mr. Brockman | Mr. Nulsen |
| Mr. Clothier | Mr. Patrick |
| Mr. Coverley | Mr. Rodoreda |
| Mr. Ferguson | Mr. Sampson |
| Mr. Hawke | Mr. Sleeman |
| Miss Holman | Mr. F. C. L. Smith |
| Mr. Johnson | Mr. Tonkin |
| Mr. Kenneally | Mr. Troy |
| Mr. McCallum | Mr. Wansbrough |
| Mr. McLarty | Mr. Warner |
| Mr. Mann | Mr. Willcock |
| Mr. Marshall | Mr. Wise |
| Mr. Millington | Mr. Withers |
| Mr. Munsie | Mr. Wilson |
| Mr. North | |

(Teller.)

NOES.

| | |
|----------------|-------------|
| Mr. Cross | Mr. Moloney |
| Mr. Cunningham | Mr. Piesse |
| Mr. Keenan | Mr. Doney |
| Mr. Lambert | |

(Teller.)

Question thus passed.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Mr. Sleeman in the Chair; Mr. Hawke in charge of the Bill.

Clause 1—agreed to.

Clause 2—Amendment of Section 4:

Mr. CROSS: I move an amendment—

That paragraph (b) be struck out.

This paragraph will take away the rights of incorporated associations, and it is what the Leader of the Opposition objected to. Of course, if power is given to a cemetery board, it is all right.

Mr. HAWKE: If the paragraph is struck out, we get back to the original position, because paragraph (a) gives the trustees or controlling authorities of a cemetery the right to have a license. That already exists. The hon. member has advanced no reasons for asking the Committee to delete paragraph (b), and so I ask that the amendment be defeated.

Amendment put and negatived.

Clause put and passed.

Clauses 3, 4—agreed to.

Bill reported without amendment, and the report adopted.

Third Reading.

Bill read a third time and transmitted to the Council.

BILL—ADMINISTRATION ACT (ESTATE AND SUCCESSION DUTIES) AMENDMENT.

Council's Amendments.

Consideration resumed from the previous day of amendment No. 51.

In Committee.

Mr. Sleeman in the Chair; the Minister for Justice in charge of the Bill.

The MINISTER FOR JUSTICE: Progress was reported yesterday on amendment No. 51, which provides that no duty shall be payable in respect of any gift, request, legacy or settlement made or given to or in trust for (a) any public hospital within the meaning of the Hospitals Act, 1927. Objection was taken that the gift might be made to a hospital run exclusively on the basis of paying patients. I move an amendment on the Council's amendment—

That the following be inserted to stand as paragraph (b): "For the maintenance of a free ward in any hospital."

Amendment on the Council's amendment agreed to; the Council's amendment as amended put and passed.

Resolutions reported, and the report adopted.

On motion by the Minister for Justice, a committee consisting of the Acting Premier, the Leader of the Opposition and the mover, appointed to draw up reasons for disagreeing to certain of the Council's amendments.

Reasons adopted, and a message accordingly returned to the Council.

BILL—DAIRY PRODUCTS MARKETING REGULATION.

In Committee.

Resumed from the previous day. Mr. Sleeman in the Chair; the Minister for Agriculture in charge of the Bill.

Clauses 29 and 30—agreed to.

Clause 31—Provisions relating to payments of contributions to expenditure and to the stabilisation fund:

Mr. PIESE: I move an amendment—

That "and" be added at the end of paragraph (b).

Amendment put and passed.

Mr. PIESE: I move an amendment—

That the following be inserted to stand as paragraph (c):—"No producer or manufacturer within the meaning of the Act shall be required in any week to make any contribution under either Section 29 or Section 30 in respect of dairy products manufactured by him for sale in that week when the total weight of such dairy products is less than 20 lbs."

The amendment has been drafted by the Crown Law Department, and I understand the Minister will accept it.

Amendment put and passed.

Hon. P. D. FERGUSON: I move an amendment—

That Subclause 5 be struck out.

The subclause provides that where a manufacturer or dealer inadvertently fails to deduct the amount of any contribution payable by him as required by this section, but nevertheless has paid the amount of such contribution to the board, he shall be entitled to recover the amount so paid by him as a debt due to him from the producer concerned. It is wrong that the Bill should be used to cover up any negligence on the part of a manufacturer. Under ordinary processes of law there is ample opportunity for the manufacturer to recover any debt due to him by the producer. The Minister said the Bill was designed in the interests of the producer. If so, why have in it this provision to molly-coddle the manufacturer, who can safely be left to collect everything due to him by the producer?

Sitting suspended from 6.15 to 7.30 p.m.

The MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE: This subclause makes provision for a recoup by the board in the case of the manufacturer or dealer who has overpaid a producer. There should be no objection to an adjustment of that nature. There is no question of taking down the producer. The different sections of the industry must work together if the results are to be satisfactory. There must be no sharp practice as between one and the other.

Hon. C. G. Latham: Would not the producer have a claim in common law?

The MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE: Probably, but the way provided in the Bill is the best way to overcome a difficulty of this sort. In all probability once the matter is referred to a producer he will agree to the necessary adjustment being made.

Amendment put and negatived.

Hon. P. D. FERGUSON: Apparently the Minister is going to some pains to protect the manufacturer from the consequences of any mistake he may make. Similar measures should be taken for the protection of the producer. I move an amendment—

That the following words be added to Subclause 5:—“Where a producer inadvertently overpays the amount of any contribution payable by him under either Section 29 or Section 30 of this Act, as required by this section, the producer shall be entitled to recover the amount of the contributions overpaid by him as aforesaid as a debt due by him to the manufacturer or dealer concerned.

Mr. PIESSE: The Minister might agree to a limitation being placed upon the time during which the manufacturer or dealer would be entitled to recover from the producer. The subclause should be amended accordingly.

The CHAIRMAN: The Committee have decided that the subclause shall stand as printed.

Mr. PIESSE: The manufacturer or dealer might go back for years in order to lodge a claim.

The MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE: The board collects from the manufacturer and the dealer, and not from the producer. The hon. member now suggests that the amounts paid by the producers to the manufacturers should also be controlled. The Bill does not provide for such a thing. The board will be established only for equalisation and selling purposes. If the manufac-

turer or dealer gets a better price for the butter, the producer will receive the benefit of it. Under the hon. member's proposal a claim could be set up that the right price had not been paid for milled butter. We cannot put something into the Bill that fixes the price to be paid by the manufacturer, for that would be entirely outside the scope of it. It would be setting up too complex a machine to lay down that the producer shall be paid some definite price on the spot. An adjustment will be made through the factories and the merchants, but that will not be made at once. I see no reason why the producer should not obtain the advantage of that adjustment in the price that is paid for his cream. They at present do not know the cost of manufacturing butter. Under the Bill they will know. There will not be adjustment on the spot, but there will be adjustment right through. The amendment would prove dangerous. Matters could not be adjusted to a nicety each week or each month.

Hon. P. D. FERGUSON: Surely the Minister's reasoning is not sound. If it is fair and equitable to protect the manufacturer as regards anything underpaid, it is fair and equitable to give the producer corresponding protection as regards overpayment. It is provided that the board shall have everything to do with the contribution by the producer. The Minister has failed to realise what the clause means. In his anxiety to get it through, he has lost sight of what is fair to the producer. I hope the Minister will accept the amendment.

The MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE: The clause empowers the board to obtain payment of the levy from the manufacturer, not from the producer. The manufacturer will deduct from the producer's cheque. The clause does not determine how much the manufacturer shall deduct from the producer. The board determines the amount required in order to equalise butter prices. It is the sole responsibility of the factory to deduct sufficient to pay the levy to the board. The producer's interests cannot be conserved as proposed by the amendment. Whether fortunately or unfortunately, the board will not fix the price to be paid by the factory to the producer. The amount by which the producer was underpaid would have to be determined before the amendment could become operative, and there is no

machinery for such determination. What the board collect will be the property of the pool, not of the board. The Bill is not a price-fixing measure for butter-fat.

Hon. C. G. LATHAM: The member for Irwin-Moore points out that a subclause has been passed enabling the manufacturer, if he has made to the board a payment which he has not deducted from the producer, afterwards to deduct the amount of such payment from the producer. The member for Irwin-Moore now asks that if the producer has overpaid the manufacturer, he shall have similar recourse against the manufacturer.

The MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE: Where too great an amount has been levied, the matter will be automatically adjusted. Such adjustment would not be confined to one man. Moreover, what would then occur would be in the nature of adjustment. Subclauses 2 and 5 are complementary to each other. The contribution to the board has to be paid. In order that it may be paid, the manufacturer is authorised to levy a contribution on the producer. The amendment would have nothing to do with the board, but would concern two sections of the industry. This matter will have to be adjusted in some other way. Hundreds of such adjustments are bound to be made. The price realised for butter will be the price eventually paid to the butter factory.

Amendment put and negatived.

Clause, as previously amended, agreed to.

Clause 32—Powers and functions of the board:

Hon. P. D. FERGUSON: I move an amendment—

That in paragraph (a) of Subclause 1, after the word "the," there be inserted "treatment during or for the purpose of manufacture and the."

Subclause 1 would then read, "The regulation and organisation of—(a) the treatment during or for the purpose of manufacture and the sale and distribution of dairy products; (b) the storage of dairy products in storage places" and so on. The amendment is the one thing lacking to make the measure what it should be from the points of view of all concerned. If the board are given power to regulate the manufacture, sale and distribution of dairy

products, the Bill will, in my opinion, be well-nigh perfect, and fulfil the objects the Minister and those associated with him desire.

The MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE: What the member for Irwin-Moore desires is certainly necessary, but not in the present Bill. The powers are already contained in the Dairy Industry Act, and we will not hand over to the board functions that are the responsibility of officers of the Agricultural Department under that Act. We have had some difficulty with the Whole Milk Act, and conflict with the Health Board. We do not propose to have a similar experience in connection with this Bill. We realise the importance of the amendment, but it cannot be agreed to, in the circumstances. It would involve technical matters that should not be a function of the board, but they will be asked to by the officers of the department.

Amendment put and negatived.

Mr. SAMPSON: The powers provided in paragraph (c) appear to be unnecessary. If agreed to, it will mean that the producers will not be able to purchase the plant they consider best suited for their purposes.

Mr. BROCKMAN: I presume the object of the inclusion of the power referred to by the member for Swan is to enable the board to see that the utensils and plant are kept clean.

The MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE: Does the member for Swan suggest that the board should not have the power to inspect plant and utensils? If the paragraph were struck out, it would hamstring the board in their operations.

Hon. P. D. FERGUSON: If the member for Swan desires to take away from the usefulness of the board, he has indicated the best way of going about it. It is essential that the paragraph should remain in the Bill if the board are to function properly.

Mr. SAMPSON: I move an amendment—

That paragraph (c) be struck out.

Amendment put and negatived.

Hon. P. D. FERGUSON: I move an amendment—

That the following subclause to stand as Subclause (2) be inserted:—“(2) Fixing the minimum price to be paid by manufacturers for the purchase of, the maximum charges to

be levied by manufacturers for the manufacture of, and for the marketing of various classes of dairy produce."

If the Minister will agree to the amendment, it will represent the coping stone of the Bill. For many years the manufacturers have had the privilege of fixing the price paid to the producers for butter fat. They have not always treated the producers in a fair and equitable manner, and some of the charges levied have been exorbitant, higher than anywhere else in the world. The manufacturers have had their fling for a long time, and the price of butter fat has been so low that it is surely time the board, which will be representative of all interests, should have a turn in fixing prices. That is the only way by which entire satisfaction can be given to all concerned.

The MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE: If the Bill sought to establish a butter pool, I might be able to agree to the amendment, but it would be impossible to do so under the Bill. In order to achieve what the hon. member desires, elaborate and expert machinery would be required. Does the member for Irwin-Moore really propose to interfere with the course of industry to the revolutionary extent indicated by his amendment? The factories have the necessary machinery to enable them to determine prices.

Hon. P. D. Ferguson: Was it not revolutionary to include such a provision last year with regard to whole milk?

The MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE: Yes.

Hon. P. D. Ferguson: And that has been a complete success?

The MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE: Not such a success as the hon. member thinks. I do not know how long that position will continue, but we are now dealing with factories. If the board were to fix prices, it would mean taking the conduct of their business out of the hands of the manufacturers. There was no suggestion that the board to be created should have price-fixing powers, but that its function should be more that of equalisation. I am afraid the hon. member's proposal is too ambitious, but later on, when the industry has developed, we might adopt the Queensland system and establish a pool.

Amendment put and negatived.

Clause put and passed.

Clauses 33 to 35—agreed to.

Clause 36—Dairy products intended for storage and export:

Hon. P. D. FERGUSON: I move an amendment—

That in line 3 of Subclause (1) after "quantities" the words "classes and qualities" be inserted.

The MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE: I accept the amendment.

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

Clauses 37 to 39—agreed to.

Clause 40—Dairy products for storage to be stored in a licensed storage place:

Hon. P. D. FERGUSON: I move an amendment—

That in line 2 "elsewhere than in a storage place licensed under this Act" be struck out, and the following words inserted in lieu:—"unless—(a) the same are of a standard approved by the Board for storage purposes; and (b) the same are stored in a storage place licensed under this Act."

The effect of the amendment is that no dairy products can be stored unless of a standard approved by the board as fit for storage purposes.

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

Clause 41—Application of moneys in dairy products stabilisation fund:

Mr. HAWKE: Paragraph (a) appears to be extremely generous to the manufacturer and provides an excellent opportunity to make money if he is that way inclined. Most manufacturers are a little inclined that way. Provision is made for compensation for the difference in price, and paragraph (a) stipulates that notwithstanding any compensation paid, if the board, after taking the amount into account, find the net profit realised by the sale less than the net profit which would have been realised had the product on the day of shipment been sold in Western Australia, they may pay further compensation. It would be wise to delete in line 7 the words "on the day of shipment" and in line 9 the words "thereof then," and insert after "board" in line 10 the words "at the date of its purchase." A

manufacturer or dealer could buy a quantity of butter when the price was low, and if on account of some movement in London the price increased, he would be able to dispose of it and the board would be compelled to pay the difference between that and the price ruling in Western Australia. Instead of taking into account the price realised on the day of shipment, we should provide that the price on which compensation shall be paid should have some relation to the price paid for the product on the day of purchase. I move an amendment—

That in line 7 the words "on the day of shipment" be struck out.

The MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE: Has the hon. member studied paragraph (b) which is the converse of paragraph (a)? Both should be studied carefully. This is the equalisation clause, and it has been drafted to ensure that those who export will receive an equal price with those who sell for immediate sale or those who store. This is the legal machinery. Paragraph (a) provides that should there be a fall in the London price between the day of shipment and the day of sale, the manufacturer shall be further compensated after proving to the board that he has incurred further loss. Paragraph (b) provides that should the London price rise between the day of shipment and the day of sale, the difference between the net profit actually realised and the price on which he was compensated on the day of shipment shall be returned to the board. The clause is complicated, but it makes the requisite provision.

Mr. Hawke: The price on the day of shipment may have no relation to the price paid.

The MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE: Then on what day would the hon. member fix the price? We are concerned that the manufacturer or dealer should receive the correct price, and that an adjustment should be made.

Mr. Hawke: It does not take into consideration the price at which the produce was purchased.

The MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE: The hon. member wants the manufacturer to make a refund.

Mr. Hawke: No.

The MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE: That is provided for in paragraph (d).

Mr. Hawke: I am anxious that the price should have relationship to the price paid by the manufacturer.

The MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE: The prices are equalised. The board is designed to equalise the prices. The manufacturer would get the effective price. There will be worse complications if we tinker with the wording of the clause.

Amendment put and negatived.

Clause put and passed.

Clauses 42 to 50—agreed to.

Clause 51—Sale of dairy products by certain persons prohibited:

The MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE: I move an amendment—

That the following paragraph be added to Subclause 1:—“(e) a storekeeper other than in the metropolitan area who proves to the satisfaction of the board that he has purchased the dairy product direct from the producer for sale retail in his store in the ordinary course of business.”

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

Clauses 52, 53—agreed to.

Clause 54—Packages of dairy products to be marked:

Mr. McLARTY: I move an amendment—

That the following paragraph be added:—“(d) the name of the manufacturer of such dairy product.”

Each package of butter should bear the manufacturer's name. People should know where their butter comes from, and if there is anything wrong with it, they should be able to get into touch with the manufacturer and lodge the necessary complaint. The effect of the amendment will be that the manufacturer will no longer be able to take risks. He will have to carry out the interpretation of the Dairy Act and keep the different grades of cream in the grades to which they belong. If the quality of the butter is not up to standard, the consumer will know which factory is responsible, and the effect will also be to prevent that condemnation which is sometimes heard of local butter. If the manufacturer's name appears on the butter, it will not be possible

to do that. We know of cases where Western Australian manufactured second-grade butter has been put into wrappers and called choice Western Australian butter. I hope the Minister will accept the amendment.

THE MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE: If the amendment were agreed to, it would be incapable of being enforced. If the clause is read carefully it will be seen that it does provide for the registered brand or the stamp of the packer to appear on the package. The Bill as framed will prevent the use of a brand so designed as to mislead the purchaser. In times past this undoubtedly has been done. Low-grade Eastern States butter has been sold as Western Australian, but that will not be possible now. It will be a punishable offence to attempt anything of the kind. Every package must bear a mark indicating the grade of the product and that will be a big advantage since people will know what they are buying. At present there is no protection for the purchaser as to the quality he is buying. The proposal of the hon. member would be impossible of enforcement, but I assure him what he desires is already provided for. Factories are anxious that their butter shall be marketed under its particular brand.

Mr. McLarty: I want to prevent false labelling.

THE MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE: The hon. member will find that that is provided for. The placing of the name of the manufacturer on every package will only complicate matters.

Mr. McLarty: It would help us to get good butter.

THE MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE: It would be as well for the hon. member not to press his amendment because all he desires is already provided for and there will be all the identification needed.

Amendment put and negatived.

Clause put and passed.

Clauses 55 to 59, Title—agreed to.

Bill reported with amendments and the report adopted.

Third Reading.

Bill read a third time and transmitted to the Council.

BILL—FINANCIAL EMERGENCY TAX ASSESSMENT ACT AMENDMENT.

Council's Further Message.

Message from the Council received and read notifying that it did not concur in the opinion expressed by the Assembly in Message No. 64 regarding the Financial Emergency Tax Assessment Act Amendment Bill and was therefore unable to accede to the request of the Assembly and consequently returned the Bill.

BILL—MINE WORKERS' RELIEF ACT AMENDMENT.

Council's Amendment.

Amendment made by the Council now considered.

In Committee.

Mr. Sleeman in the Chair; the Minister for Mines in charge of the Bill.

Clause 3—Insert at the end of paragraph (ii) of the proposed new Subsection (3) the following proviso:—

"Provided that where any person referred to in either paragraph (i) or (ii) of subsection (3) of this section does not apply, then upon such person ceasing to work as a mine worker, or becoming prohibited from being further employed as a mine worker by reason of a notice issued and served by the Minister under and in accordance with the second proviso to regulation six (e) of the Regulations made under the Mines Regulation Act, 1906, such person shall be entitled to receive from the Board, and the Board shall repay to him the amount of all contributions then paid by such person to the Board as a mine worker under this Act."

THE MINISTER FOR MINES: I propose to accept the amendment. It will be remembered that when the Bill was being discussed in this House, the member for Brown Hill-Ivanhoe raised the question that the proviso contained in Section 2 of the Act should also appear in Section 3. I promised to make inquiries and if I found it necessary to add the proviso to Section 3 I would have the amendment made in another place. The Parliamentary Drafts-

man agreed that it was necessary to have it in Clause 3, and so with the sanction of the Government it was inserted in another place. I move—

That the amendment be agreed to.

Question put and passed; the Council's amendment agreed to.

Resolution reported, the report adopted and a message accordingly returned to the Council.

BILL—ELECTORAL ACT AMENDMENT (No. 1).

Council's Message.

Message from the Council notifying that it had agreed to No. 1 of the amendments made by the Assembly to the Council's amendment, but had disagreed to No. 2, now considered.

In Committee.

Mr. Sleeman in the Chair; the Minister for Justice in charge of the Bill.

No. 2. Paragraph (c).—Add at end "by virtue of a certificate of naturalisation issued under the laws of the Commonwealth or any State of the Commonwealth."

The MINISTER FOR JUSTICE: According to the Council's message, our amendment No. 2 conflicts with the term "naturalised" in the definition section of the principal Act. Therefore I move—

That the amendment be not insisted on.

Question put and passed; the Assembly's amendment not insisted on.

Resolution reported, the report adopted and a message accordingly returned to the Council.

BILL—CONSTITUTION ACTS AMENDMENT.

Council's Message.

Message from the Council notifying that it had agreed to Nos. 1 and 3 of the amendments made by the Assembly to the Council's amendment, but had disagreed to No. 2, now considered.

In Committee.

Mr. Sleeman in the Chair; the Minister for Justice in charge of the Bill.

No. 2. Paragraph (c).—Strike out "under the laws of the United Kingdom or." After the words "any State of the Commonwealth" strike out "or under the laws of any of the British Dominions."

The MINISTER FOR JUSTICE: The Council has accepted two of the three amendments we sent up. The one the Council has disagreed with is similar to that in the Electoral Act Amendment Bill (No. 1). I move—

That the amendment be not insisted on.

Question put and passed; the Assembly's amendment not insisted on.

Resolution reported, the report adopted and a message accordingly returned to the Council.

DISCHARGE OF ORDERS.

The following Orders of the Day were discharged from the Notice Paper:—

1, Electoral Act Amendment Bill (No. 2).

On motion by the Minister for Justice.

2, Metropolitan Public Utilities Trust Bill.

3, Hairdressers and Retail Tobacconists Licensing.

On motion by the Acting Premier.

House adjourned at 8.50 p.m.