

Hon. J. Cornell: You can get a revised version of the Bible.

Hon. W. J. MANN: Yes. We often find revised versions of members' opinions in the same session, if not in the same sitting of the House. Parliament thinks it has made a mistake.

Hon. G. W. Miles: Not Parliament but the Government.

Hon. W. J. MANN: It is the duty of Parliament to rectify it. I am not concerned about persons or about the Lotteries Commission. We should pass the second reading of the Bill, extend the operations of the Act to December, 1934, and suggest that the Government should bring down legislation making it clear and definite as to what does constitute an office of profit. It is due to every member and to the country that this should be done, and I do not think any exception could be taken to it. With a little alteration Clause 2 could be made to fit the whole position. The door should not be thrown wide open for any member of Parliament to be appointed to an office of profit, but in this instance I am prepared to protect the member who finds himself in an embarrassing position. In Committee my vote will be given against Clause 3.

On motion by the Honorary Minister debate adjourned.

BILL—METROPOLITAN WHOLE MILK ACT AMENDMENT.

Assembly's Message.

Message from the Assembly received and read notifying that it had agreed to the amendments made by the Council.

House adjourned at 8 p.m.

Legislative Assembly,

Thursday, 16th November, 1933.

	Page
Questions: Orchard Inspectors, transport ...	1972
Sustenance workers, compensation payments ...	1972
Annual Estimates: Report, Com. of Ways and Means ...	1973
State Trading Concerns, report ...	1973
Bills: Lotteries (Control) Act Amendment (No. 2), 1s.	1973
Fremantle City Council Lands Act Amendment, 2s. ...	1973
Permanent Reserve (A 1102), 2s., Com. report ...	1973
Reserves, 2s. ...	1975
Forests Act Amendment, returned ...	1976
Metropolitan Whole Milk Act Amendment, Council's amendments ...	1976
Motions: Fruit fly pest ...	1977
Dairying industry ...	1977
Lotteries Commission, position of members of Parliament ...	1978
Bees Act, to disallow regulation ...	1979

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

QUESTION—ORCHARD INSPECTORS, TRANSPORT.

Mr. SAMPSON asked the Minister for Agriculture.—1, What is the method adopted by the department to provide for transport of district inspectors to orchard properties? 2, Are inspectors of orchard districts cramped or limited in their work in any way because of limitation of funds for transport purposes? 3, Where railway transport is non-existent, or where its use would involve loss of time, do the department's arrangements provide for the use of motor 'bus facilities?

The MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE replied: 1, Inspectors use motor cars for which they receive a mileage allowance. 2, The expenditure of each inspector, having regard to efficiency is, of course, kept within reasonable limits. 3, Motor buses are used only in cases of emergency.

QUESTION—SUSTENANCE WORKERS.

Compensation Payments.

Mr. RAPHAEL asked the Minister for Employment, 1, Is he aware that when sustenance workers are injured, compensation payments are withheld for as long as six weeks? 2, Will he make arrangements to see that their wives and children are provided with sustenance until insurance is paid?

The MINISTER FOR EMPLOYMENT replied: 1, I am aware that some delay has

occurred in making compensation payments, but cases such as are indicated by the hon. member are exceptional. Strenuous efforts have been and are being made to avoid delay, but it is not possible in all cases, owing to special circumstances. 2. Such arrangements, where practicable, have been in operation for several months. An amicable working plan is in force between the State Insurance Office and the department controlling sustenance payments.

BILL—LOTTERIES (CONTROL) ACT AMENDMENT (No. 2.)

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

ANNUAL ESTIMATES, 1933-34.

Report of Committee of Supply adopted.

In Committee of Ways and Means.

The House having resolved into Committee of Ways and Means, Mr. Withers in the Chair,

THE PREMIER (Hon. P. Collier—Boulder) [4.35] I move—

That towards making good the Supply granted to His Majesty for the service of the year ending 30th June, 1934, a sum not exceeding £5,419,087 be granted from the Consolidated Revenue Fund, and £1,026 from the Sale of Government Property Trust Account, and £713,807 11s. 10d. from the appropriation of interest in the Suspense Trust Accounts.

Question put and passed.

Resolution reported.

ANNUAL ESTIMATES—STATE TRADING CONCERNS, 1933-34.

Report of Committee adopted.

BILL—FREMANTLE CITY COUNCIL LANDS ACT AMENDMENT.

Second Reading.

THE MINISTER FOR LANDS (Hon. M. F. Troy—Mt. Magnet) [4.38] in moving the second reading said: This is a Bill to authorise the Fremantle City Council to sell portion of Fremantle Lot 1508 to the Fremantle Municipal Tramways and Electric Lighting Board. In 1929 an Act was passed

entitled the Fremantle City Council Lands Act, to authorise the Fremantle City Council to sell to the Fremantle Municipal Tramways and Electric Lighting Board all its estate and interest in the southern portion of Fremantle Town Lot 1508. It would appear that it was afterwards discovered that the northern portion was more suitable, and the building was actually erected on that portion of the land. The council now desire that authority be given to sell the portion of the lot on which the building is erected. The necessary power is provided in the Bill. The department has no objection to the proposal. I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

On motion by Mr. Latham, debate adjourned.

BILL—PERMANENT RESERVE (A 1162).

Second Reading.

THE MINISTER FOR LANDS (Hon. M. F. Troy—Mt. Magnet) [4.39] in moving the second reading said: The Bill is the result of a decision by the House Committee to grant portion of Parliament House grounds for the widening of Malcolm-street. The Joint House Committee and the City Council have come to an agreement in regard to the widening of Malcolm-street by excising about 50 links from the Parliament House grounds, and the Bill is presented with the object of obtaining Parliamentary sanction to that agreement. Members are well aware of the necessity for widening Malcolm-street, and my only regret is that the existence of the Public Works Department buildings will prevent the carrying of the extra width right to St. George's-terrace. Certainly it is very desirable that Malcolm-street should be widened, and I agree with the House Committee. I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

MR. LATHAM (York) [4.40]: I am not going to oppose the Bill, which proposes to excise a piece of land from the Parliament House grounds in order that Malcolm-street might be widened, but I am afraid the City Council will do exactly the same as they did in regard to the widening of Hay-street. They made no attempt at that time to continue the widening of Hay-street, for they permitted new build-

ings to come out to the old alignment. They think that because the Crown has a piece of land here, they might as well have a pick at it. They cannot continue the widening of Malcolm-street to the Terrace corner, because of the Public Works Department buildings. They simply desire to get hold of a piece of land which the Crown is holding.

Mr. Stubbs: That is not correct. The House Committee approached the council.

Mr. LATHAM: I am surprised to hear that the House Committee has any authority to do such a thing. This gives me some information which probably will make me take a totally different view of the proposal. I have yet to learn that the House Committee has any authority to go around offering our land, and I am surprised to know that they should take such a responsibility upon themselves.

The Premier: The Public Works Department buildings will spoil the widening of the street altogether.

Mr. LATHAM: Yes, but I am surprised to know that the House Committee should have offered the land.

Mr. Stubbs: Some time ago the City Council asked the House Committee if they could see their way clear to inducing the Government to part with the land. It was shelved for a long time, but all the trees along our fence are dying now and we have taken advantage of that.

Mr. LATHAM: I know the hon. member is a very careful man. I can see now that the House Committee did not want the expenditure involved in getting rid of the dead trees, and did not want to have to erect a nice new fence along the alignment, so they went along to the City Council and offered a piece of our land for the widening of Malcolm-street.

The Premier: It would cost a lot to erect a new fence there.

Mr. LATHAM: Yes, and I am glad our representative has told us all about it.

The Minister for Lands: I think the member for Yilgarn-Coolgardie was the instigator.

Mr. LATHAM: Perhaps that is why he is not here to-day. We have a very good, careful man on this side of the House to watch the proposal, and now he has told us all about it in order to prevent any further opposition to the Bill. I hope

the City Council will not think they have any right to a part of a Class A reserve, but I do not know that they can ask for very much more until the Public Works Department building goes, when probably they will ask for a further piece.

The Premier: We have to give away nearly a chain.

Mr. LATHAM: It is a fair slice of land. The trees will have to be taken out when they die, and a new fence erected. No doubt the House Committee will see that the Government are not put to any expense, and that the cost of the erection of a fence or wall falls upon the City Council.

The Premier: There would have to be a retaining stone wall as well.

Mr. LATHAM: A nice wall will have to be put up. The matter may now be left in the hands of the House Committee to see that the necessary improvements effected are of a substantial nature, are pleasing to the eye, and of that architectural beauty that must necessarily be associated with the environments of Parliament House.

The Premier: Have the City Council undertaken to erect a wall there subject to the approval of the House Committee?

Mr. Stubbs: To erect a suitable fence.

The Premier: Has it to receive the approval of the House Committee?

Mr. Stubbs: Yes. It will be a concrete pillar-and-chain fence.

The Premier: Must it receive the approval of the committee?

Mr. Stubbs: Yes.

Mr. LATHAM: I hope the fence will be sufficiently solid to keep people out of the grounds. Not long ago the gates were locked in order to keep people from trespassing in the grounds. I hope this wall will keep out intruders.

Mr. Wise: Does not the Town Planning Commissioner object to fences?

Mr. LATHAM: It will be one of those walls—

Mr. Wise: With glassbottles on top?

Mr. LATHAM: No, with standards upon it. I am glad to have the information which has been supplied, otherwise I could not have accepted the Bill. The member for Wagin (Mr. Stubbs) will probably give us all the facts of the case.

MR. STUBBS (Wagin) [4.48]: The Leader of the Opposition has criticised the attitude of the City Council in regard to this strip of land. When permission has been granted by Parliament for this strip of land to be taken from the Parliament House reserve the City Council intends to plant a row of trees to be approved of by the House Committee. I think the Conservator of Forests is already giving consideration to the type of tree best adapted to the locality. The pine trees that were planted on the western side of the reserve are showing signs of decay and some are dead and unsightly already. The House Committee thought it would be a good idea to approach the City Council concerning the request that was made by the municipality some two or three years ago, and which was shelved for the time being. The Leader of the Opposition suggested that the City Council had been trying to get a piece of ground out of the Government in order to widen one of their streets, and were not giving sufficient consideration to the widening of other streets, in accordance with the plan agreed to. I am confident that the City Council are sincere in their desire that this beauty spot shall be maintained in a proper fashion, and that whatever is done will be well done. I do not think any member will have any cause for complaint when the work is completed.

The Premier: What type of wall is it intended to erect?

MR. STUBBS: I think it will consist of concrete posts and chains.

The Premier: There is a high bank that will require a retaining wall.

MR. STUBBS: We have not yet seen the final plan. When it comes before the House Committee it will be thoroughly criticised, and will be available to members. It will, in fact, come before the House in due course, when I think it will be agreed that it represents a first-class job.

The Premier: Is it subject to the approval of the House Committee?

MR. STUBBS: Yes. Members will be able to see the plan as soon as it is available. I support the second reading of the Bill.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

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

BILL—RESERVES.

Second Reading.

THE MINISTER FOR LANDS (Hon. M. F. Troy—Mt. Magnet) [4.50] in moving the second reading said: It is usual at this time of the year to bring down a Bill for parliamentary sanction to deal with the change of control, alteration of purpose, and other matters appertaining to various reserves. This Bill deals with five separate subjects. It asks for authority to place the Dongarra recreation and show grounds under the control of the Irwin Road Board: to enable the Peppermint Grove Road Board to lease for 21 years portion of a Class A reserve to the local tennis club; for the inclusion of a Class A reserve for park lands at Denmark in the new school site; to revest in the Crown Lot 655 at Boulder, which was set apart many years ago for the use of the Caledonian Society, but never utilised; and to place the Dongarra cemetery under the control of the local road board.

The Irwin Road Board desire to obtain control of the recreation and show grounds at Dongarra. The original portion of this land was purchased from a private estate with Government money and transferred to certain trustees. This comprises the larger part of the ground, and was held by Messrs. W. B. Mitchell, Thomas Hughes and Francis Kelly, all now deceased. The other portion that was added was held by Messrs. Waldeck, Clarkson and Thurkle, as trustees of the Irwin district agricultural society, who have signified their willingness to surrender their portion with a view to its being vested in the Irwin Road Board. As there are no means of getting a surrender of the original portion, the purpose of the Bill is to revest the whole of this land in the Crown so that a Crown grant may be issued to the road board in trust for the purposes of "A recreation and show ground."

Class A reserve 7802 at Peppermint Grove is under the control of the Peppermint Grove Road Board, according to the provisions of the Parks and Reserves Act, 1895. The board has received a petition from a num-

ber of residents, who are forming themselves into a tennis club, for portion of this area to be set apart for tennis courts. The road board have no money to spend on this portion of the reserve, as all they have for this class of work is required for the upkeep and improvement of the eastern portion, which is used largely as a picnic ground during holidays. The western portion that is required for tennis courts has no particular value as a camping ground. The tennis club is prepared to carry out the necessary improvements by building a club house and constructing and maintaining courts, and desires to obtain a lease of 21 years, which the road board are willing to grant. As the board have no power to grant this lease, the purpose of the Bill is to vest that portion of the reserve in them with power to lease, with the consent of the Government, for 21 years. After inquiry, the department have no objection to this power being granted.

The Education Department have requested that an area shall be declared a school reserve at Denmark, as the accommodation on the present site is unsuitable. The proposed site includes a small reserve Class A for park land. This is not required as it is proposed to cancel the subdivision included in the proposed school site. The purpose of the Bill is to cancel the Class A Reserve, so that the school site may be set apart as required by the Education Department.

An application has been made to throw open for sale Boulder Lot 655 which is vacant and unimproved. It has, however, been held under a 999 years' lease by the trustees of the Boulder City Caledonian Society for a hall site, but owing to its unsuitability the society abandoned it in 1908. The 999 years' lease, however, was not surrendered, and, as it is the subject of a certificate of title, and two of the trustees have died and the third has left the district, it is necessary to re-vest the land in the Crown by legislative action, which is the purpose of the Bill.

With respect to the Dongarra cemetery, this area is used by the Church of England, the Roman Catholic Church and the Methodist Church, and the Crown grants for these lots are held by the respective churches as set out in the schedule to the Bill. The Irwin Road Board are desirous of obtaining control of these cemeteries under the provisions of the Cemeteries Act, 1897. The

respective denominations have agreed to surrender the land on condition that these lots are set apart exclusively for denominational burials in connection with the church that held the land. The purpose of the Bill is to re-vest these lands in the Crown, subject to the conditions named, to the intent that they, together with the reserve lots, shall be declared a cemetery under the Cemeteries Act, 1897, and controlled by the Irwin Road Board under the provisions of that Act. I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

On motion by Mr. Ferguson, debate adjourned.

BILL—FORESTS ACT AMENDMENT.

Returned from the Council without amendment.

BILL—METROPOLITAN WHOLE MILK ACT AMENDMENT.

Council's Amendments.

Schedule of two amendments made by the Council now considered.

In Committee.

Mr. Withers in the Chair; the Minister for Agriculture in charge of the Bill.

No. 1. Clause 2.—Strike out all the words after the word "by," in the first line of the clause, and substitute the following: "deleting the definition of 'Milk' and substituting the following: 'Milk' means the natural lacteal fluid product of an animal, intended for human consumption as milk, notwithstanding that such product has been chilled, pasteurised, or concentrated, but shall not include such product when converted into condensed milk; the term includes fresh cream, and cream which has been scalded or pasteurised, but does not include cream used in the manufacture of butter.'"

The MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE:
I move—

That the amendment be agreed to.

It makes the definition clearer, amalgamating the meanings of "milk" and "cream," but excluding cream used for the manufacture of butter. The words "intended for human consumption" have also been inserted by another place.

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

No. 2. Clause 8.—Delete the proposed new Section 23A and substitute a section as follows:—

Persons producing or bringing into the metropolitan area for sale milk, other than milk to be used as whole milk, to give notice thereof to the Board and to furnish returns.

23A. (1.) Every person who, in any year, intends to produce for sale in the metropolitan area, or to bring into the metropolitan area for sale, any milk other than milk for use as whole milk shall give notice thereof in writing to the Board on the proscribed form, and during such year, or thereafter, shall submit to the Board, at such times and places, as may be specified, such returns, giving information as to the quantities of milk handled and to the manner of its disposal as the Board may require.

(2.) Any person who fails in any respect to comply with the provisions of subsection (1) hereof shall be guilty of an offence against this Act.

Penalty: Fifty pounds (£50).

THE MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE:

This amendment involves little difference. Its principal effect is to tighten up the powers of the board. There has been some debate as to the inclusion of concentrated milk within the scope of the board. In my opinion, that inclusion is necessary. The chairman of the board has furnished the following statement on the subject:—

Concentrated milk is milk from which water only has been extracted, and no other chemicals have been added other than the .5 per cent. of boracic acid as a preservative. Its constituents are specified on page 13 of the Food and Drug Regulations, and the product is such that the addition of water makes an article not greatly differing from the whole milk. It is, in fact, capable of being used for practically all of the purposes for which whole milk is suitable.

The idea of the Board is that this milk should be under its control, for the reason that the price-fixing activities of the Board in regard to whole milk are such that there is a constant endeavour on the part of dealers to buy milk at low rates in the country, and to market it under one guise or another in the metropolitan area, taking advantage of the minimum prices fixed by the Board and their effect upon the ultimate selling values, but not paying to the producer such minimum prices.

As an instance, if concentrated milk is to be excluded from the authority of the Board, it would be possible for any condensing factory to establish customers in Perth for this product. Such factory could operate at a country centre and purchase whole milk at butterfat rates, say 4½d. per gallon, instead of at 9d. per gallon country centres, which is approximately the Board price for whole milk. Such factory could then market the produce in Perth at prices which would entirely eliminate ordinary milk from certain sections of the trade, such as large tearooms, hotels, etc.

In the absence of the reference to concentrated milk, there would be difficulty in policing the provision. I move—

That the amendment be agreed to.

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

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

MOTION—FRUIT FLY PEST.

Order of the day read for the resumption, from the 18th October, of the debate upon the following motion by Mr. Lambert—

That in the opinion of this House, owing to the prevalence of fruit fly, it is advisable for the Minister for Agriculture to call for a report by a competent authority as to the advisability of destroying all stone fruit and other trees, which are acting as a breeding ground for this pest, within a given radius of the metropolitan area in the interests of the fruit-growing industry of Western Australia—

and upon the following amendment by Mr. Sampson—

That the words "within a given radius of the metropolitan area in the interests of the fruit-growing industry of Western Australia" be struck out, and the following inserted in lieu:—"in all instances where the trees are not receiving the attention required under the Plant Diseases Act."

Amendment put and negatived.

Question put and negatived.

MOTION—DAIRYING INDUSTRY.

Debate resumed from the 18th October on the following motion by Mr. J. H. Smith—

That in the opinion of this House the Government should give urgent consideration to the position of dairy farmers in the South-West in their relations to the Agricultural Bank, and more especially in the Bank's relations to the group and soldier settlers.

MR. J. H. SMITH (Nelson—in reply) [5.13]: There is no need for me to reply at length to the debate on this motion, which was accepted in its entirety by the House. The Minister controlling group settlement has given an assurance that he will, as soon as the session closes, personally visit the districts and make full inquiry into the disabilities mentioned in the motion. The

House appreciates the difficulties of dairy farmers, soldier settlers, and Agricultural Bank clients not only in the South-West but throughout the State. A Royal Commission is now inquiring into Agricultural Bank affairs. I am grateful for the manner in which hon. members have received the motion. The Minister, in his speech on the subject, covered a great deal of ground, and touched upon not so much the difficulties of Agricultural Bank clients in the South-West, as the difficulties of pioneers and old settlers in Western Australia, New South Wales, Victoria and New Zealand. It is not much consolation to distressed settlers to know that the Minister at one time had patches in his trousers. There is no advantage in reverting to the bad old days. Our farmers want to be assured that they have a chance of working out their own salvation. The Minister stated that in New Zealand butter fat was at a much lower price than in Western Australia, and that some of the New Zealand farmers had as many as 16 mortgages on their holdings. That is heart-breaking. We do not want 16 mortgages on a holding here. Some of our dairy farmers are indebted to the extent of £1,800 and £2,000. That fact alone would break the heart of a stone, to say nothing of a human being. Agricultural Bank clients in some cases find themselves in a worse position than Russian peasants, whose work does bring them food and clothing.

The Premier: You are stone-walling your own motion.

Mr. J. H. SMITH: I am not stone-walling it. I wish to impress upon the Government the position of the farmers, many of whom are not now getting decent food. The Minister knows the position of one of our best farmers, and I am sure he will inquire into it when he visits the South-West.

The Premier: Are you making out a new case now?

Mr. J. H. SMITH: No. I am replying. I have heard the Minister for Railways in the course of a reply almost put up a new case altogether; and so does the Premier at times. However, I am not going to be put off the track of my argument. I know that the Government realise what the settlers are up against, and will do what they can for them. The Minister has given the House an assurance that the Government will deal with the difficulties, and he has promised to personally inspect the group districts. If he does that, I know he will see that

justice is done to the settlers. It is no satisfaction to them to know that settlers in other parts of Australia and elsewhere have had more mortgages on their property than is the experience here. Perhaps our settlers have to shoulder a much higher capitalisation than the men the Minister referred to. I appreciate the attitude of the House and trust the motion will be agreed to.

Question put and passed.

MOTION—LOTTERIES COMMISSION.

Position of Members of Parliament.

MR. RAPHAEL (Victoria Park) [5.16]: I move—

That, in the opinion of this House, no member of either House of Parliament should be appointed a member of the Lotteries Commission.

From the remarks that have been made by members, I do not think there is any necessity for me to dwell on the motion at any great length. Public opinion seems contrary to the idea of a member of Parliament being appointed to a seat on the commission. The member of Parliament who is at present a member of the commission, Mr. Clydesdale, is a man for whom I have every respect. In my opinion, however, the money provided for the payment of fees to members of the commission, would be better spent if those positions were made available to men who are out of work. There are any number of men now unemployed who could carry out the duties attached to a position on the commission, just as ably as the present commissioners. I hope the motion will be agreed to, and will be accepted by the Government as a guide when future appointments are made to the commission. I hope it will be accepted as an intimation that future commissioners should be drawn from the ranks of the unemployed. Other members of the commission, too, have, I believe, remunerative positions and are not in need of the money they receive from their association with the Lotteries Commission.

Point of Order.

The Minister for Police: On a point of order, I would like your ruling, Mr. Deputy Speaker, regarding the motion. On Tuesday last, the House, by an absolute majority, agreed to a Bill embodying the principle of appointing members of Parliament to seats on the Lotteries Commission. Is the mem-

ber for Victoria Park in order in proposing to disagree to something that the House has already approved of in a Bill?

The Deputy Speaker: I must uphold the objection of the Minister for Police. The House has already this week passed a Bill agreeing to a member of Parliament being a member of the Lotteries Commission; therefore, I cannot accept the motion moved by the member for Victoria Park.

MOTION—BEES ACT.

To Disallow Regulation.

MR. SAMPSON (Swan) [5.20]: I move—

That the regulation amending Regulation 6 of the regulations made under the Bees Act, 1930, as published in the "Government Gazette" on the 20th October, 1933, and laid on the Table of the House on the 24th October, 1933, be and is hereby disallowed.

The regulation that has been amended was framed to give effect to Section 14 of the Act which reads:—

No person shall introduce into the State, either by land, sea, or air, any bees, hives, honey, or beekeeper's appliances, that have been used in connection with beekeeping, unless accompanied by a certificate in writing as prescribed from a Government apiculturist or the Department of Agriculture in the country or State of origin, certifying that such bees, hives, honey, or appliances, come from a district in which foul brood and Isle of Wight disease do not exist.

There is a proviso that does not affect the position, and I shall not quote it. The interpretation of "district" was published in the "Government Gazette" of the 6th March, 1931, and included the following:—

Where any bees, hives, honey, or beekeeper's appliances are introduced into the State and are accompanied by a certificate as required by Section 14 of the Act, such certificate shall define the boundaries of the district mentioned therein, or otherwise disclose that such district comprises an area contained within a circle having a radius of not less than five miles from the apiary or place from which such bees, hives, honey or appliances are introduced into the State as the centre of such circle; and such certificate shall not be sufficient for the purposes of the said section unless it discloses that the district therein mentioned comprises an area contained in a circle as hereinbefore described.

The main anxiety of the beekeepers is in connection with foul brood. It is claimed that the proposed reduction of the radius from five to three miles is insufficient. Bees gather

their stores generally within three miles of the hive. The beekeeper makes it a rule to place his apiary as closely as possible to the main flows of honey, some of which may be two or three miles away. It sometimes happens, generally once or twice at least in seven years, that there is a dearth of nectar for miles around and the bees consequently have a bad time. In those circumstances, they are forced to travel greater distances. At such times they will travel far in search of stores and a flight of five miles along a gully is no great distance for a bee. It has been proved with marked bees, that they travel that distance or more. Bees are thieves by nature. That seems a harsh thing to say about such hard workers.

The Premier: It is not complimentary.

Mr. SAMPSON: That statement breaks down some of the glamour and reputation that the bee enjoys, but the fact remains the bee is a thief by nature.

The Minister for Justice: He is a worker within the meaning of the Act.

The Premier: Yes, you have heard about the busy bee.

Mr. SAMPSON: Particularly in bad seasons are the bees thieves. At such periods should the bees come across weak hives in boxes or in trees, they rob their victims. If infected by foul brood, all of those bees will be contaminated. The effect is that the robber bees make a clean sweep of the honey in such a hive and they are carriers of the germs of the foul brood disease. The robber bees convey the germs to their home hives and the infected honey is fed to the young bees. So the disease becomes widespread. Where it ends is a serious matter. Thousands of apiaries have been decimated in various parts of the world through its ravages. We have been fairly fortunate in Western Australia, although there have been instances of outbreaks dealt with by Mr. Cailes, and by the present expert, Mr. Lance. The Beekeepers' Association are satisfied that the diseases they have to combat were introduced in thrown-out containers of honey from the Eastern States. The association have practically traced the outbreak of foul brood to dumps containing bottles and tins that formerly contained honey and still had some residue left in them. The beekeepers feel justified in urging a fair limit circling round any apiary that sends honey to Western Australia, and it is the opinion of members of the Beekeepers' Association that three

miles is not a safe radius. As a matter of fact, so far from the radius being reduced, they are of opinion that the Act should be tightened up. Recently there was an instance at Fremantle that lends point to the beekeepers' contention. Honey was brought from the Eastern States in poorly-made containers. The result was that some of the honey leaked out and soon thousands of bees infested the locality. The containers were aboard a ship and at that particular time there was a scarcity of nectar. Apparently one bee ascertained the presence of loose honey on the vessel at Fremantle, and spread the news throughout the world of bees. Thousands invaded the ship and had to be destroyed by the use of a fire hose. It would hardly be in order for me to expatiate on that matter to any great extent. The necessity for more substantial containers being used is clear, and the beekeepers desire that, when honey is brought into the State, the authorities shall stipulate that the containers shall be sufficiently substantial to hold the honey without any possibility of waste. The waste is a potential danger. I shall quote from the remarks of Mr. W. A. Goodacre, Government Apiarist, Wauchope, New South Wales. These remarks were made at a conference held in Sydney on the 3rd May, and are reported at page 284 of the "The Australian Beekeeper," 15th May, 1933—

Mr. Goodacre spoke on the present restrictions on importation of honey from other States into Western Australia and Queensland. The Queensland restrictions were especially severe, apparently aiming at protection from disease, but he considered local activity far more effective.

So much for their troubles about us and the precautions which are taken. Mr. Goodacre's remarks may be taken to mean that it is the business of the beekeepers in Western Australia to see that honey imported from New South Wales does not contain foul brood. We should first detect it and then treat it, if possible. When it was originally suggested that a radius of five miles was necessary to secure immunity, we certainly did not go too far. This House agreed to it. The beekeepers do not appreciate the object of the proposed amendment and why it is proposed that the five-mile radius should be reduced. At a committee meeting held last night, a resolution was unanimously carried asking the Minister to give favourable considera-

tion to the retention of the present radius. As I have stated, when the flow of nectar is scanty, bees travel a long way, and since three miles is by no means the limit of a bee's flight—I have already said it is nearly five miles—I hope the House will agree that the regulation, as published, reducing the radius from five to three miles, will be disallowed.

THE MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE

(Hon. H. Millington—Mt. Hawthorn) [5.34]: The actual history of the matter is this: At a conference of Ministers for Agriculture held in Sydney, the question of the nature of the certificate required in connection with honey imported into this State arose. The certificate is as follows:—

This is to certify that the undermentioned consignment originated in a district in the Hundred of..... in South Australia, and that such district has been carefully inspected within the preceding six months by a competent Officer of the Department of Agriculture for a radius of not less than three miles around the apiary from whence the honey originated, and that no disease prohibited under the Western Australian Bees Act or Regulations has been found to exist in the said district.

The matter was brought up by the representative of the South Australian Department of Agriculture. It was considered a matter for experts, and the conference agreed that it should be referred to the Director of Agriculture, South Australia, Professor Perkins, the Director of Agriculture, New South Wales, and the Director of Agriculture of this State. It was also decided to obtain independent advice, and for that purpose to refer the matter to the Director of Agriculture, New Zealand. On the 10th June, 1933, Mr. Sutton, the Director of Agriculture, wrote to Prof. Perkins as follows:—

You will remember that at the Ministerial Conference held in Sydney recently the resolution was passed asking Western Australia to reduce the radius of the area required in connection with the inspection for foul brood from 5 to 2½ miles.

Already protests have been received against such a reduction, and I would, therefore, esteem it a favour if you would write me setting out the reasons why you consider this reduction should be made.

Professor Perkins replied on 24th June, 1933, as follows:—

I beg to acknowledge receipt of yours of the 10th inst. relative to the radius of the area required in connection with the inspection for foul brood.

In this connection our officer in charge of the Apiaries Act reports as follows:—

"The reason advanced by Mr. Ophel (Apiary Inspector) for seeking the reduction of the radius from 5 to $2\frac{1}{2}$ miles is that he declares authorities agree that the normal ranging flight of honey-gathering bees practically never exceeds $2\frac{1}{2}$ miles. Any records of this being exceeded, he states, have been connected with exceptional circumstances, such as starvation in consonance with scents from highly-scented blossoms being carried towards them on the winds.

The Queensland law does not prescribe any radius as constituting a "district" declared to be free from specified diseases. Whilst this latter provision is somewhat lax in the protection afforded the importing State, that of Western Australia seems unnecessarily harsh.

Following on Mr. Quinn's statement, as originally suggested to you when we were in Sydney, I recommend that you refer Mr. Quinn's memorandum to the Apiary authorities in New Zealand. I understand that they have there a fairly well established Apiary Department, and in this connection would be able to give you an unbiased opinion. Obviously, if they support the 5 miles radius, we shall have to accept their decision. I suggest, however, that if they support a smaller radius we should be given the benefit of their recommendation.

I need not add that we have had no communication whatsoever with New Zealand over this matter, so you may take it that their reply could be depended upon as expressing the opinion of their authorities on the subject.

Mr. Sutton then wrote to the Director of Agriculture, Wellington, N.Z., on 8th July, 1933, as follows:—

In this State we have a regulation which requires that imported honey shall have a certificate from a responsible departmental officer in the exporting State to the effect that the honey has been produced in an apiary which is at least 5 miles from an apiary containing foul brood.

Some of the Eastern States who export honey to this State claim that the 5-mile radius is too wide, and suggest that it should be reduced to $2\frac{1}{2}$ miles, but one of them has pointed out that in New Zealand you have a well-equipped Apiary Branch, and that your officers would probably give us an unbiased opinion on this matter. I should esteem it a favour, therefore, if you would refer the matter to them and advise me. I may say that the State suggesting this is quite prepared to accept the decision of your officers in connection with this matter.

A letter was also received from the Under Secretary of the Department of Agriculture, New South Wales, dated 12th July, as follows:—

With reference to your letter of the 21st ultimo, No. 744/24, regarding Resolution No.

48, adopted at the recent Conference of Ministers of Agriculture, it is noted that you have communicated with the Director of the South Australian Department of Agriculture seeking reasons why it is considered that a reduction from 5 to $2\frac{1}{2}$ miles would be justified in the Interstate certificate in connection with the importation of honey, etc., into Western Australia. In support of the representations for a reduction of the radial area, I desire to inform you that this matter has received careful consideration by the Senior Apiary Instructor of this Department, and his views are summarised in the following extract from a report which has been submitted by him:—

"As the usual foraging flight of bees is within a $2\frac{1}{2}$ -mile radius of their hives, it is extremely unlikely that robber bees, the chief agents in the spreading brood disease, would be attracted to a diseased hive beyond this distance without intermediate infection first becoming present, and robbing of bees, or interchange of material, from this nearer source being effected. Surely against the presence of disease within the apiary from which the supply is to be exported, and a clearance over a radius of $2\frac{1}{2}$ miles covering the usual flight range, should offer reasonable protection to the importing State."

The following letter, dated 21st July, 1933, was then received from Mr. M. A. Robinson, Director-General Department of Agriculture, New Zealand.

I have to acknowledge receipt of your letter 744/24 of the 8th instant, in which you request an opinion on the alteration of the regulation in force in Western Australia governing the radius between clean and diseased apiaries in other States exporting honey to your State.

Whilst bees are known to fly a far greater distance than 5 miles for pollen in this country, in the absence of definite data, it is reasonably safe to assume that the same distance would not be covered to attack and rob the stores of other hives. The provision to enforce a distance between clean and diseased apiaries to ensure that only the product from clean apiaries is sound in principle, and should have the effect of stimulating a general clearing of disease in the States desirous of trading with you. However, it is the considered opinion of this Department that the radius could be safely reduced to 3 miles.

Mr. Sampson: The Director of Agriculture, New Zealand, says that under certain conditions the bees would travel five miles.

The MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE: Yes, but his final decision is, "It is the considered opinion of this department that the radius could be safely reduced to three miles."

Mr. Sampson: He is contradicting himself.

The MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE: Mr. Ross of New South Wales gives the

same opinion. As regards Queensland, no distance is specified.

Mr. Sampson: In view of what Mr. Robinson said earlier, is not that a contradiction?

The MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE: No. He does not hide anything. He says bees have been known to fly the greater distance and that the main danger is from robber bees. Ordinarily the bees would not travel more than 2½ miles.

Mr. Sampson: They do sometimes.

Mr. Latham: They do in a dry climate.

The MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE: One thing must be remembered, that Section 14 of our Bees Act deals only with honey imported into the State.

Mr. Sampson: But there is the danger of bringing in foul brood.

The MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE: I notice that in another place the suggestion was made that the small beekeeper in this State would be prejudiced; but our Bees Act contains the necessary provisions for his protection. A district can be declared to be affected.

Mr. Latham: What is the meaning of the word "district"? Is it a road district or some other district? That clause is roughly drafted. The Act does not give power to define a district.

The MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE: It simply says that before honey can be imported to this State, a certificate has to be signed by the chief inspector of apiaries in South Australia that the honey has been carefully inspected within the preceding six months over a radius of not less than five miles of the apiaries in which the honey originated. The Leader of the Opposition wants to know what constitutes a district. A consignment of honey is taken and it must be accompanied by a certificate showing that within five miles—

Mr. Latham: But the five miles is fixed by regulation.

The MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE: We in this State require that imported honey shall be accompanied by a certificate. Section 14 of our Act states that no person shall introduce either by land, sea or air, any bees, hives, honey or appliances that have been used in connection with bee keeping unless accompanied by a certificate in writing as prescribed by a Government apiculturist or the Department of Agriculture in the State of origin; certifying that such bees, etc.,

come from a district where foul brood does not exist. So that, provided within the radius set out, there is no foul brood, we permit the honey to be brought into the State. The question then is, what is a reasonable distance? It was only after obtaining expert advice that the regulation was drawn up, and the distance was reduced from five miles to three miles. Members are aware of the difficulty we had with South Australia regarding the export of our tomatoes to that State. I do not know that South Australia treated us too well, but the fact remains that we will not get on any better with that or any other State if we now impose unnecessary restrictions. We in this State have to accept the certificate of the officer of the South Australian Agricultural Department. It matters not what conditions we may impose because the honey may have been produced where there was foul brood and may have been taken to a clean district and sent out from there.

Mr. Sampson: That would be a wicked thing to do.

The MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE: Even now a five-mile radius does not protect us. There is another aspect that we must consider. Some time back we imposed a fee of £1 a ton for the inspection of potatoes that came from the Eastern States and we were asked why we had done so. I consulted Mr. Wickens, who pointed out that a regulation such as that amounted to an action to prevent the importation of potatoes into Western Australia, and the Commonwealth could step in.

Mr. Latham: The Commonwealth have not the authority now to step in; there is no Interstate Commission.

The MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE: If we impose conditions which, obviously, amount to a restraint of trade between the States, the Commonwealth will soon find a way of stepping in. If we impose any prohibitive restrictions, someone is bound to raise the question. Where the State has good reason for imposing any prohibition, the State authority holds good. The mere widening of the area, as determined in the certificate, does not protect us. We must depend entirely on whether we are getting a fair deal when the honey is certified as coming from a district where no foul brood exists. It is desirable that we should maintain the amicable relations that exist between the States.

Mr. Latham: We will protect you; you have done your share.

The MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE: What we have to depend on is the certificate from the inspector of the Department of Agriculture and on the honesty of the beekeepers. The position does not affect this State only, and so, having agreed in good faith to accept the decision that was arrived at some time back, I shall have to stand by it.

Mr. Latham: You will not be annoyed if the House does not?

The MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE: Yes, I will be. It is a very simple matter to get the beekeepers worried about this. The member who moved the motion is under the impression that the beekeepers in this State will be affected. The regulation deals with one thing only, and since the umpire has given his decision, the best the member for Swan can say is that the beekeepers do not know why the area has been reduced. It is the difficulty of policing it in South Australia.

Mr. Latham: There can be no difficulty in policing an area of five miles radius.

The MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE: In any case, the authority we selected left it to the umpire. In accordance with the finding the regulation was altered, and so I will support the regulation.

MR. FERGUSON (Irwin-Moore) [6.2]: I will support the motion. I am amazed that the Minister for Agriculture should have put up so weak a case. Does the Minister mean to tell us that the Act under which we are operating, and these regulations, are almost wholly and solely in the interests of the beekeepers of New South Wales and South Australia? We have a vivid recollection of the passage of the Act through this House. The beekeepers of Western Australia considered it was going to bring the legislation controlling diseases in bees up-to-date, and that it would be in keeping with the legislation in other parts of the world, where the honey produced has assumed large proportions. At that time the apiculturist of the Agricultural Department approved of a regulation providing for a five-mile radius, and prohibiting the landing in Western Australia of bees and appliances and honey that came from a district within five miles of where any bee disease exists. He said it would serve to clean up foul brood, and cer-

tainly there is no foul brood in Western Australia to-day.

The Minister for Agriculture: But you would have to prohibit all importations.

Mr. FERGUSON: Not so. In the interests of the beekeepers it would be wise to extend the radius from five miles to 10 miles. The Minister says he referred this matter to an independent man in New Zealand, from whom he read a letter indicating that it is normal for bees to travel 2½ miles to collect honey. Suppose we took a hive of bees at Claremont, five miles from here, and suppose the bees travelled 2½ miles this way, where they met bees that had travelled the same distance from Perth. What is to stop those bees getting on to the same tree to collect their honey, in which event the clean bees would almost certainly contract disease from the affected bees. The distance of 2½ miles would be well within the capacity of the bees. I know a man who had bees at a place four miles distant from the nearest water available to them, and it was well known that those bees travelled the four miles to get that water. We do not want regulations devised in the interests of the beekeepers of New South Wales and South Australia. The purpose of the regulation should be to keep our own bees healthy and conserve the interests of our own beekeepers. What is the attitude of New South Wales towards our potatoes? They will not allow one potato from Western Australia to enter New South Wales if it comes from a district within five miles of any locality affected by lucerne flea. While a bee may be able to fly five miles, I have never yet heard of a lucerne flea that could hop five miles. Why do not the authorities in New South Wales give us some consideration, instead of wanting us to take their surplus products to the injury of our own beekeepers, while we run the risk of bringing in some of the diseases they have in plenty in New South Wales? The Isle of Wight disease is the worst in the world, and we do not want it in Western Australia. The Minister is allowing the thin edge of the wedge to get in, and later we shall have a request to reduce the area to two miles. I hope the House will see a danger in this proposal to bring about an amendment of this regulation, and will disapprove of it.

On motion by Mr. Thorn, debate adjourned.

House adjourned at 6.6 p.m.