

fellows. The amendments provided in this Bill are designed to give power to the department to take action on the discovery of such fraudulent practices and they will undoubtedly tend to minimise such practices in the future. I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

On motion by Hon. W. J. Mann, debate adjourned.

*House adjourned at 8.22 p.m.*

## Legislative Assembly.

*Tuesday, 3rd October, 1933.*

	PAGE
Assent to Bills ... ..	1169
Orders of the Day, postponed ... ..	1169
Annual Estimates, Com. of Supply ... ..	1169
Bill: Fruit Cases Act Amendment, 2d., Cont. ...	1186

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

### ASSENT TO BILLS.

Message from the Lieut.-Governor received and read, notifying assent to the undermentioned Bills:—

- 1, Health Act Amendment.
- 2, Mining Act Amendment.
- 3, Road Districts Act Amendment (No. 1).

### ORDERS OF THE DAY POSTPONED.

**THE MINISTER FOR WORKS** (Hon. A. McCallum—South Fremantle) [4.34]: I move—

That consideration of Orders of the Day Nos. 1 and 2 be postponed.

These two Orders of the Day refer to the financial emergency legislation. I regret the necessity for moving their postponement, but the Premier has suffered rather a bad turn in health. When I spoke to him over the telephone this morning, he was hopeful

of being able to attend Parliament on Thursday next, I think it would be to the advantage of everyone concerned if the Premier were here to take charge of the financial measures, as he has had control of them from the commencement. Should the Premier be unable to attend here on Thursday, he is anxious that both measures should nevertheless be finalised this week. In view of the possibility of the Premier's being here on Thursday, I ask for postponement of the two Orders of the Day.

Question put and passed; the Orders postponed.

### ANNUAL ESTIMATES, 1933-34.

*In Committee of Supply.*

Debate resumed from the 28th September on the Treasurer's Financial Statement, and on the Annual Estimates: Mr. Sleeman in the Chair.

*Note—Legislative Council, £1,442:*

**MR. TONKIN** (North-East Fremantle) [4.36]: There is no provision on the Estimates for anticipated expenditure to deal with a problem that is facing us, and that is the problem with which the subject of technocracy deals. Very little attention is being given to that problem in Australia, but I understand that it is attracting considerable notice in the United States of America. Just recently Mr. Hemingway, an accountant and solicitor who spent, I believe, the last 10 years in America, delivered a series of lectures on business subjects to Perth audiences, and one lecture dealt with the subject of technocracy. I take the following extract from the report of his remarks which appeared in the "West Australian":—

The technocratic movement had its origin in Columbia University, U.S.A. Its votaries had investigated at great pains and on a scientific basis (deriving their statistics from the U.S.A. Department of Labour and the Department of Commerce), the extent to which machines were ousting men from gainful employment, the consequences of the changes that were being wrought, and the possibilities of the future.

That shows that considerable attention is being paid to this problem, which is decidedly pressing. The lecturer went on to quote certain figures showing the astonishing

results from the introduction of machines into industry. He declared that the displacement of labour in America was positively staggering. Between 1919 and 1930, production had increased there by 31.6 per cent., whilst during the same period of 11 years, factory employment had decreased 12.2 per cent.; and so there was no denying the development of a serious situation. The productivity of labour due to the introduction of labour-saving devices and improved methods has been increasing enormously. In connection with this increased productivity three things should be particularly noted. Firstly, there is the enormous increase in the product; secondly, the infinitesimal increase in wages; and thirdly, the simultaneous displacement of labour to an alarming extent. With no displacement of labour the disposal of the increased product with a slight increase of wages would be impossible, because we have had such a tremendous increase in the product of industry. Thus with the very small increase in wages it has not been possible for industry to dispose of its increased product. But now let us take in connection with the increased product the fact that men are thrown out of employment, causing a reduction in the purchasing power of the people, and we soon gain an idea of the extent to which economic depression has been accentuated by the introduction of machinery. It is no wonder that the technocrats aver that chaos will result under the present system of production and distribution. Mr. Hemingway said that technocrats believed that the present price system was doomed and that the relationship of workers to industry and society generally would have to be recast. One need not be a technocrat to be fully convinced of the soundness of that view. The whole burden of the transition stage when machinery is introduced should not fall upon the shoulders of labour. There are two reasons for this which stand out distinctly to my view. The first is that it is morally wrong to expect labour to carry the whole burden of the introduction of machinery, because unquestionably one section of the community should not carry all the burden while the other section receives all the benefit.

Mr. North: It should not be a burden at all; it should be a benefit.

Mr. TONKIN: I agree with the hon. member. Secondly, it is economically unsound

that one section should have to bear the burden of the transition stage because the distress which is inflicted at each advance means the partial frustration of that advance, as the displaced labourers cease to consume beyond the barest necessities. When machinery is introduced, men are thrown out of employment. They immediately cease to be consumers of so-called luxuries, becoming consumers of only the barest necessities.

The Minister for Mines: And limited in quantity at that.

Mr. TONKIN: The result is that the lesser purchasing power brings about a partial frustration of the advance which should have been made as a result of the introduction of machinery. This check to consumption naturally reacts on production, and we find as a result that other men lose their employment and that the unemployment situation is thus accentuated. I state definitely that insofar as unemployment arises from the introduction of improved methods in industry it is manageable, because it has been established beyond doubt that the introduction of labour-saving devices and new methods means a decided increase in the national wealth. Now the experts argue that when the national wealth is decreased we should pay the workers less wages. They go further than arguing that, and put it into operation. When wages were cut 20 and 22½ per cent., it was as the result of what the experts said in connection with the reduced income of the country. They pointed out, "The national income is being reduced by so much, and therefore it is impossible that wages should carry on at the same level." In fact, a professor in the Eastern States contributed to the Press a series of articles entitled "Letters to John Smith" in which he was at some pains to point out that because national income had been so terribly reduced it was impossible that workers should go on taking the same amount of wages as previously, and that in their own interests they would have to agree to a reduction. Governments acted upon that idea, and wages were reduced. If it is logical to argue that when the national income is reduced, wages ought also to be reduced, it is likewise logical to argue that if the national income is increased wages should be increased as well. The argument should cut both ways. The introduction of machinery has definitely increased the national income.

There is no doubt about that. And that addition to the national wealth ought to bear the burden of any readjustment rendered necessary by the displacement of labour. So I say that insofar as unemployment is the result of the introduction of machinery, it is manageable; because the increased national wealth should bear the burden of readjustment. This increase in national wealth will permit of an increased wage all round. But the same thing would be attained by keeping portion of the increase and spreading it over a larger number of men by reducing the working hours of those in industry. It would mean that, instead of giving the whole of the increased national wealth to the workers, they could get some benefit by having their hours reduced without a consequent reduction in pay. That would leave the way open for the absorption of a number of men, instead of their being thrown out of work as the result of the introduction of labour-saving devices. So the introduction of machinery would lead to more national wealth, more wealth for the people, which would enable us to bring about a consequent improvement in the standard of living and also a shortening of the hours of labour. But the majority of people argue that we cannot do that, because we are up against international competition; in fact, competition seems to be the all-absorbing thought with a number of people, and they give no thought at all to the question of distribution of national wealth amongst the people. Their main idea is that they must enter into competition with somebody, and undersell someone; hence their almost insatiable desire to keep on reducing wages. A little thought will show that such a policy is suicidal. I have here a cutting from the "West Australian," as follows:—

#### Japanese Competition.

According to a report issued by the British Embassy at Tokio more than the depreciation of the yen has enabled Japan to undersell competitors in the foreign markets. The two main factors are better methods of production and low wages. The report states that the quality and the variety of the manufactures of Japan show remarkable improvement. It combats the suggestion that the Japanese are lacking in mechanical skill and precision. Regarding cotton piece goods, the report states that while the falling exchange undoubtedly stimulated exports, Japan could not have achieved the remarkable expansion that took place last year without a high standard of

efficiency, combined with surprisingly low costs. The growth of local manufacture of woollen and worsted yarn and cloth is reflected in the increase in the imports of raw wool, which, from Australia and New Zealand, increased from 520,000 bales in 1929-30 to 620,000 bales in 1931-32. Meanwhile the import of yarns has been halved, and that of cloth has been slightly decreased. It is feared that the import of ordinary weaving yarns is ended, but there is still a market for knitting yarns (though this is threatened) and for special yarns, and, to some extent, for lightweight serge yarns. On an exchange value of the yen at  $1\frac{1}{2}$  in sterling, the average wage of a female operative in a silk filature works out at about 9d. a day. The highest recorded—in December last—was approximately 7s. a day; the highest recorded average wage in any trade was 5s. a day, and the lowest recorded average  $7\frac{1}{2}$ d. a day, the latter being paid to girl workers in match factories.

That gives some idea of Japanese competition. It enables Japan to undersell competitors. Those competitors which Japan is underselling must in their turn undersell Japan, or go out of business. They previously had the market. Japan comes in with reduced costs and undersells them and takes their business. So they have either to reduce their own costs that they can recapture the business, or else they go out of business altogether. Whichever policy is pursued, the results to the worker are equally disastrous. If those countries which have been undersold by Japan make a bid to regain their market, they do it by reducing wages, which is disastrous to the workers; if they decide that they cannot follow Japan down to so low a standard of living, and so must allow their markets to go, that also is disastrous to the workers. And so it goes on. If that is going to be the only idea in the minds of industrialists, it is useless to think of the problem of displaced labour; it is useless to think of dealing with it if we are only going to consider the problem with our minds preoccupied with the idea of underselling somebody in a foreign market. Many years ago, John Stuart Mill, who did not hold the view that the introduction of machinery displaced labour and caused hardship, but held the contrary view, said—

If the sinking of capital in machinery were ever to proceed at such a pace as to impair materially the fund for the maintenance of labour, it would be incumbent on our legislators to take measures of moderating its rapidity.

And again, by the same author—

Since the improvements which do not diminish employment on the whole, almost always throw some particular class of labourers out of it, there cannot be a more legitimate object of the legislators' care than the interests of those who are thus sacrificed to the gains of their fellow-citizens and of posterity.

Unquestionably it is our job immediately to deal with this problem. I was able to come across an instance where a private firm had made some effort to deal with the question. There is a pamphlet entitled "Productivity of Labour after the War," written by B. Ellinger. In that pamphlet is an account of an arrangement entered into by the Bradford Dyers' Association, and the trade union which covered the operatives. Arrangements were made whereby the association agreed not to discharge in any one year more than 5 per cent. of its hands as the result of the introduction of labour-saving devices. And they went further, for they agreed to pay through the funds of the union an amount equivalent to that which was paid out by the union as unemployment benefits for the men so displaced. I have not been able to find out whether any other such experiments were tried, but if this pamphlet is authentic, and the instance given a true one, then we have something upon which to go: we have the idea as a commencement. It is of no use postponing the problem and waiting until absolute chaos overtakes us. The problem is an immediate one, and we in Western Australia are having it brought before us very clearly and distinctly. It is proposed to introduce the bulk handling system in Western Australia, and it is said that it will mean the permanent displacement from the waterfront of over 500 men.

Mr. Wansbrough: In Fremantle alone!

Mr. TONKIN: That is so. Is it right that those men should carry the burden of the transition stage if the whole of the State will benefit from the introduction of that scheme? I say definitely, no. If the whole of the State is to obtain a benefit from the introduction of machinery in any direction then it is the business of the State to see to it that no one section is to carry the whole of the burden of the transition stage. The House should give attention to that problem. We could well keep our eyes on America and Great Britain and Europe, and see what developments are taking place in this regard. We

could follow the work of the technocrats and endeavour to see if what they are finding out is applicable to Australia. I see no reason why it should not be.

Mr. North: Have they published any reports on their work?

Mr. TONKIN: I have not seen them if they have, but from what Mr. Hemingway has said, I take it they have published fairly extensively the result of their findings, and that these publications have aroused considerable interest in Great Britain and Europe. We are faced with the problem, and it is our job to be up and doing, and tackle it properly. It does not affect one town only, one State only, or one country only; it affects the whole world. If it were possible to get international agreement whereby wages were trebled in every country, we would find that we could raise the standard of living three times in every country, and people would be able to buy three times as much as they can buy now. But of course we cannot get international agreement. There are nations that would sign one thing and then do the opposite; they would take advantage of being able to produce their goods by paying a lower wage, and would go into the market and undersell—all being obsessed with the idea that it is essential to oust someone from the market in order that one's own people might do fairly well for themselves. We have to get over that idea as being the only way of carrying on trade. We have to do as Japan has set out to do in some respects, that is, to cease buying goods from other people when we can easily make them for ourselves; to continue to buy them only so long as we need them, and then, when we can produce an article which will take the place of the imported article, we must produce it and use it. We cease to be a buyer in that market. Japan used to import all sorts of goods, but these gradually dropped out of the market. They stopped purchasing them, and as they increased the local manufacture of those goods, they themselves became suppliers. They will only continue to buy our wool as long as they need it, and as long as they are unable to supply their own requirements at a cheaper rate from some other country. They do not buy our wheat because they expect us to buy their rice; they buy it because they want it and because it suits them to purchase at that price. When it no longer

suits them to buy our wheat, they will not put it up to Australia that we should first buy their rice before they buy our wheat, but they will buy their requirements elsewhere. They will supply what they can supply, and will purchase from other countries what they cannot supply. That will be the extent of international trade. We cannot keep pressing down countries and depressing the standard of living, and giving people less money with which to buy things and expect them to buy more goods than ever with that money. The movement has to be in an upward direction. There must be additional spending power, and additional wages paid so that people may buy more goods and provide more work for the factories. In this way we shall get the necessary upward tendency.

**MR. WISE** (Gascoyne) [4.52]: I wish to deal with several matters affecting the North-West which can best be discussed on the general debate. I have no wish to work the parish pump, as it applies to the North-West, but we have a good case, and will endeavour to justify it in the arguments we are able to bring forward. Many measures have been brought down to Parliament intending in all sincerity to apply to every part of the State. Owing, however, to the peculiar needs and disabilities of the extremities of the State, much of that legislation has not applied to them. When I raised the subject recently of certain disabilities suffered by the North-West, and pointed out that the only consideration we had received had been from Labour Governments, the leader of a certain party opposite said that though the only crumbs which had fallen from the rich man's table had come from a Dives clothed in labour garments it was useless to labour that point. I insist upon labouring that point. Every particular need for the North-West has been recognised only by the present Government or a previous Labour Government.

**Mr. Sampson**: I thought it was the question of a bridge over the Gascoyne.

**Mr. WISE**: I will deal with that later. In case an accident occurs and there is a miscarriage of justice, and the hon. gentlemen opposite are again sitting on this side of the House, I hope they will, as a result of our persistence and endeavour, realise their past neglect of the just claims of this particular part of the State. Transport represents the

great problem in the North-West; transport to and from ports. Probably it represents the greatest cost in production in that area. Around Carnarvon there are thousands of miles of roads controlled by the road boards. It is a remarkable tribute to the members of those boards that they have been able to perform the work they have carried out in the past. When scanning the Estimates, I was pleased to note several remarkable increases which have been made possible by the present Government. One item, the maintenance of jetties, repairs to tramways, etc., shows an increase in the vote from £600 to £12,000. There are several other items which previously did not exist, several amounts of £1,000 for urgent needs in the North-West. Probably this is due to the neglect of previous Governments, but the need is urgent whether there was neglect or not. Probably in the near future, consideration must be given to the expenditure of a large sum on the reconstruction of the tramway from the town of Carnarvon to the jetty. The line traverses three miles of an island which, through erosion, is in danger of being carried away. Within a few years it may be necessary to spend many thousands of pounds there, and I hope to find some provision made for that expenditure. At present temporary repairs only are being effected. It is probable that this year wool to the value of over half a million pounds will travel over the jetty. Carnarvon is a very important port. The wharfage collections there last year amounted to nearly £3,500. This port is contributing largely to the national wealth of the State, and, as it is the only outlet for a very large district, serious consideration must be given to this matter. The maintenance of lights at various danger points along the coast is a matter that is always exercising the minds of members representing the North-West.

**Mr. Stubbs**: That is a Federal matter.

**Mr. WISE**: Yes, but we need the co-operation of our own Harbour and Lights Department in order to keep the Federal Government moving in the matter. There is one point north of Carnarvon on Koks Island where, owing to the set of the tide, which is of tremendous volume, boats frequently find themselves 15 miles off their course. A light is badly needed there. I feel sure that North-West members will receive the assistance of the Harbour and Lights Department in order

to have this disability removed. The Minister for Works has done a great deal to alleviate the difficulties of transport in this part of the State. His actions since assuming office on the present occasion speak volumes when compared with the actions of previous Ministers. Unfortunately, he cannot do all he would wish to do. I hope the member for Nedlands (Hon. N. Keenan) is listening to my remarks. When the present Minister for Works was in office on a previous occasion the amount allowed per year from the Federal Aid Road Grant to the North-West was no less than £2,000 for each individual road board. In addition to that, two or three fine bridges were built in the North-West, and several fine cement crossings were put over the rivers. Up to the time when the Minister resumed office again, not one penny-piece had been granted to the North-West by the intervening Governments, from that particular source. No wonder we feel we must labour the point that one Government saw the necessity of allowing £30,000 for one year for this neglected part of the State, when other Governments had not seen fit to give us anything. No wonder we claim that the only assistance we have had has been from Labour Governments. The allocations we have received have been most niggardly in recent years. I want members to realise the conditions under which people live in the North-West. There are no railways and no roads worthy of the name. The roads are only bush tracks forming approaches to the various towns. With many thousands of miles of roads of this character to look after, the local authorities are confronted with many difficulties to surmount for which they require Government assistance. Tremendous expense has also to be incurred in the haulage of material and in the payment of wages to the employees. There is an enormous cost of breakages and maintenance, because of the state of the roads which have to be traversed. I should like to direct attention to the schedule appertaining to the Federal Aid Roads Grant. When that grant was originally made in 1926, the allocations were for a 10-year period at £2,000,000 a year. When the present Minister for Works was in Melbourne he secured some consideration for Western Australia, so that instead of the grants being on the per capita basis the allocations were to be on the population and area basis. When the £2,000,000 allocation was apportioned out, three-fifths on the

population basis and two-fifths on the area basis, it was found that the total for this State was £384,000 a year. Out of that sum the North-West received about £40,000 a year. Since then the schedule has been amended so that the receipts come from the petrol tax. This tax of 7½d. per gallon is divided into 5d. for the Commonwealth, which they keep, and 2½d. for distribution amongst the States. That is bad enough. But the allocation to the States is on exactly the same basis as when £384,000 was granted. In recent years it has worked out that Western Australia receives £350,000 per annum. I suggest that if the Commonwealth Government thought it good enough to decide that the allocation was to be on the basis of three-fifths population and two-fifths area, it should be good enough for Western Australia to adopt a similar practice. Members can imagine what would happen if that were done. If out of any future grant paid to Western Australia, payments were made on the basis of area as well as population, there would be a vast difference. In the second year of the allocation under the Commonwealth basis, Western Australia was in receipt of the second largest amount. New South Wales received the largest amount, namely £5,525,000 and Western Australia came next with £3,840,000. As I have already pointed out, if it is good enough for the Commonwealth to fix the allocation on that basis, then I submit the allocation of Government money in Western Australia should be in the same ratio. Every member, I am sure, will agree that that is a reasonable suggestion. If it were adopted, many of the difficulties of the North-West and the North would disappear. If the allocation were on the district or area basis, the same thing would apply, and my argument would still stand good. If the allocation were on the basis of the amount of money we contribute or on the amount of petrol consumed, it would work out in the same way. Carnarvon alone consumes 600,000 gallons of benzine per year. If the amount were worked out on the correct allocation, it would mean that the Carnarvon district would receive £20,000 per annum. When the whole scheme is re-modelled—I believe the Minister will be sympathetically inclined to such a proposal—I trust that adjustments will be made so that people who are living and working far distant from railways and the seaboard, who have to go

to such great expense in taking their goods to and from the ports, will be those who will receive proper consideration. There are many bridges urgently needed on our main roads in the distant northern parts. There are several places where one inch of rain means that all traffic has to cease. During the wet season it is impossible to get along until some of the more important bogs dry up. Members can imagine the difficulties confronting any one travelling by car or otherwise unless consideration is given to the provision of bridges across rivers. That is a point I want particularly to mention to the Minister. I wish to emphasise the necessity for a bridge over the Wooramel River. There is a direct road from Carnarvon passing through Northampton and Geraldton. In my opinion it would be better if that thoroughfare were gazetted as a main road. There is a lot of traffic passing over the road, and at times vehicles are held up for weeks at a time when they come to the Wooramel River.

Mr. Patrick: You have a weekly service to Geraldton now.

Mr. WISE: Yes, and the man who is running it is to be commended upon his industry, but nevertheless he is in danger of losing a large amount of money should an inch or so of rain fall in that part of the country. He may be held up for a week or a month simply on account of one river. I commend to the Minister the proposal to make provision as soon as possible for the construction of a bridge across that particular watercourse. The station people have been faced with the necessity to cater for 20 or 30 people at one time, and ultimately have had to pull trucks and cars across the river by means of camel teams to assist those people on their way. If a better basis of allocation of moneys received by the State were arrived at, many of these troubles would disappear, and there can be no denial of the fact that the North has been robbed of tremendous sums of money in recent years, due to inconsiderate Ministers or the inconsiderate attitude of past Governments. I trust my suggestion will appeal to the Government, and if the allocation of £350,000 received by the State is on the basis I have indicated, let us hope that the Minister will see to it that the North gets its proper share. The next matter I will touch upon is something of vital importance to every person who lives in the North

and North-West. I refer to the imposition of the 20 per cent. surtax on all goods that pass over wharves in Western Australia. That surtax was imposed during the war period. To give an indication of how far-reaching it is in its effect, we will assume that someone living in the North-West has imported from Scotland certain pipes necessary for watering his stock. That individual finds that he has to pay the surcharge of 20 per cent. at Fremantle on the wharfage, pilotage, and other charges. When the goods are put aboard the ship for transference to the North, he has to pay a further 20 per cent. and then when the goods are taken off the ship at the port of destination, he has to pay still another 20 per cent. That is a matter that should receive the urgent consideration of the Minister. It means that any produce that a settler in the North desires to send away is affected similarly.

Mr. Stubbs: It is wicked.

Mr. WISE: It certainly is. There is no sense of proportion in such an imposition. If it could be shown that the surtax had been paid in respect of particular goods, no matter by whom the goods had been handled, it should be an easy matter to provide by regulations that the goods should be exempt from the payment of any additional 20 per cent. surcharge. I commend that suggestion to the Minister.

Mr. Marshall: If the goods were sent overland, they would not have to pay so much; it is only when the goods are shipped.

Mr. WISE: Yes, but the hon. member surely does not suggest that we should do away with the State ships on the northern run.

Mr. Marshall: No; I want to see the service improved.

Mr. WISE: This disability is of tremendous importance to the people in the North, whose goods have to pass through Fremantle in the first instance. Irrespective of where the article has to go, three separate levies of 20 per cent. have to be paid on it. On reading through the Estimates, I was astounded at the smallness of some of the Votes, and I intend to have quite a lot to say on some of the items when we reach them. In the meantime I want to direct members' attention to a very serious happening affecting my constituency in particular. I refer to the introduction of the blow-fly pest. It is assuming alarming proportions and, in fact,

it is becoming the most serious factor adversely affecting primary production in that part of the State. Its introduction in my electorate is of recent date. I know of one instance in one part of the electorate where perhaps the best bred and best cared for flocks in the State are to be found, where the loss on account of the blow-fly was about 10 per cent.

Mr. Ferguson: Perhaps the good breeding represented one of the reasons.

Mr. WISE: No, that does not follow.

Mr. Ferguson: More wool, more blow-fly.

Mr. WISE: In a flock, with a capacity of 35 bales of wool to the thousand sheep shorn, that loss was experienced and, in fact, it meant a decreased clip and decrease in the flock representing 70 bales, worth £20 a bale.

Mr. Stubbs: There was one man who lost a tremendous quantity of wool.

Mr. WISE: That is the instance I have in mind.

Mr. Mann: For how long have they had blow-fly in the North?

Mr. WISE: For eight or ten years.

Mr. Mann: Then the pest is on the increase.

Mr. WISE: Yes, to an alarming extent. One disturbing feature is that in our district there is no officer of the Agricultural Department. Unfortunately, for the North, during the past three years the experience has been that the stock inspector has been transferred from where he was formerly located. There was one stationed at Carnarvon where his services were appreciated. New activities elsewhere required attention; the stock inspector was needed further north and was accordingly transferred. Our need was as great as the need of the people in that district.

Mr. Mann: The department is being starved regarding veterinary officers.

Mr. WISE: The whole department is starved.

Mr. Mann: Quite right.

Mr. WISE: The Minister should recognise the urgent need for something more to be done than is apparent now. The possibilities attending the spread of the blow-fly pest are enormous. In our part of the State it is not possible to muster the sheep in order to cope with the pest. It is not the same as in more closely settled, open areas. The country I refer to is covered with scrub and it is impossible to muster the sheep except towards the end of the year when the

flocks can be trapped on the waters. In those circumstances it will readily be understood that it is impossible to combat the blow-fly pest except by scientific means.

Mr. Mann: Have the members of the Council for Scientific and Industrial Development done anything regarding the matter?

Mr. WISE: That institution is at Canberra?

Mr. Mann: I thought they were experimenting at Tootra.

Mr. WISE: Yes. But that is of little use to the station owners in my constituency. The trouble is that our own Agricultural Department has not awakened to the extent of the problem.

Mr. Latham: But the Agricultural Department has been carrying out experiments for a long time.

Mr. WISE: That may be so, but when I referred the matter to that department and protested against the transfer of the stock inspector, the only suggestion I could get from the department was that when his duties terminated at Wyndham, he might be transferred to deal with the blow-fly pest in my district. I suggest that that is of little use in the circumstances.

Mr. Marshall: Do you think the State officials would know anything about the blow-fly pest?

Mr. WISE: I know that a stock inspector named McDonald, when in our district, did much to control the small outbreak of blow-fly. He was a very painstaking and efficient officer. To deprive our district of the services of such an officer is certainly not to the benefit of the community, but to the benefit of the blow-fly. With reference to the stock routes in the North, I notice that some provision is made on the Estimates for that undertaking, but I suggest that that work will have to exercise the mind of the Minister to a great degree in the near future. Probably 50,000 sheep will travel over the stock route this year from the district I have in mind, and the condition of that route represents a matter of great moment. If the present route is to be followed, severe losses will be experienced, as in the past, from poison plants. It is considered that, owing to the present condition of many of the wells, some of which are not worth repairing, an entirely new route should be surveyed. Should at any time a new stock route



be surveyed, it would be a good idea if a botanist were to be included in the survey party, so as to have some say in the decision of the direction to be taken. It is possible, for instance, to avoid a certain highly poisonous route by deviating slightly from the track originally surveyed. For instance, the route could be taken a little further inland from the Murchison district and so avoid much of the trouble. I commend to the Minister the suggestion that a botanist should be attached to the party engaged on any trial surveys of new routes. Hundreds of thousands of pounds have been lost through poison plants in the North-West, and with the assistance of the botanist, a considerable proportion of that loss could be obviated in deciding upon a new route.

Mr. Latham: Is there very much poison in the North-West?

Mr. WISE: Quite a lot. A few months ago 500 sheep were lost in the Upper Gascoyne in a definitely recognised poison area. The plants are not all identified as being poisonous, though many are recognised. Making this passing reference to the Government Botanist brings me to a matter which I wish to bring under the notice of every member of the Cabinet, namely, the making of proper provision for the priceless collection that is housed in the ramshackle structure called the Department of Agriculture. That department has been starved in many directions, not the least of which is its housing. It is perhaps the worst equipped in that direction of any department in the Commonwealth.

Mr. Latham: It is a historic building.

Mr. WISE: If it is, let us preserve it as such, but we should not desire those whom it houses also to be classed as historic. The Government should give serious consideration to the housing of the priceless botanical collection that is in the building. This collection is to be found in a room about 12 feet x 12 feet. The room has no shelves, and the specimens, which would be difficult to replace, are to be seen anywhere between the floor and the ceiling. It would be a conservative estimate if we said that those specimens were worth £100,000. Some of them could not be replaced. There are specimens there collected by Robert Brown 120 years ago. Between 1896 and 1915 very few additions were made to the

collection, but since then thousands of specimens have been added. The herbarium as it exists in this State is a disgrace. If there is a "best" officer in the Department of Agriculture we have him in the Government Botanist. This officer willingly gave up his three weeks' leave to go on a botanical expedition in search of rare plants, and so rendered valuable service to the State. He collected specimens which are invaluable, which, in fact, cannot be valued, and to place upon him the responsibility of having to house those specimens in the room that I have described, and to keep his books of reference on the floor, is a crying shame. I should like the Minister himself to pay a visit to the botanist's room after he has returned from a collecting tour. The Minister would find the whole room, from floor to ceiling, littered with specimens that could not be replaced if any damage were done to them. A fireproof building is necessary in which to house botanical and entomological specimens. The Government Entomologist has a verandah, and if one treads on it very heavily he is liable to go through it. This officer also has specimens which cannot be replaced, and their housing also is a disgrace.

Mr. Latham: They ought to be sent to the Museum.

Mr. Marshall: They ought to be sent to Government House, which is close by.

Mr. WISE: They certainly require to be placed in a fireproof building, or premises entirely set apart for them. I suggest also that the Botanist himself should be where the herbarium is located. I notice there is nothing on the Estimates to suggest that anything might be done to improve hospital facilities in the North-West. There is a little spot in my electorate which will appeal to anyone who has been there—I refer to Shark Bay. On one occasion I was there with the Leader of the Opposition and he will agree with me that it is a place that is calling for assistance. It might be described as the most isolated part of Western Australia. It is cut off entirely from the rest of the State except for a monthly visit from the "Koolinda." It has a road in name only, a road that at times it is almost impossible to traverse. The sandhills have been negotiated by laying down pig netting for many miles. Then nothing whatever has been done for the convenience of the

couple of hundred people who live there in the event of any of them falling ill. There is no hospital at all in the town. There is a doctor, and there is a building which was once occupied by the Inspector of Fisheries. This could admirably be converted into a hospital. There is a qualified nurse available. She is a married lady and for a small remuneration would undertake to look after the hospital. I understand that a number of beds could be obtained from further north along the coast and all that it would cost the Government to fit up the building as a hospital would be the expense of conveying those beds to Shark Bay. If anyone were in pain, or required surgical treatment, no accommodation could be provided; the doctor would be obliged to treat the cases just as an ambulance man might do, and then order their removal to Carnarvon or Perth. The removal of a sick person from Shark Bay is a big and painful undertaking. It would be necessary to convey him by lighter to the steamer several miles out, and perhaps place him in a coal basket to be lifted on to the ship. The only alternative would be for the sufferer to endure untold agony over 200 miles of very rough track. I assure the Minister for Health that he would perform a most humane action if he converted the Government building into a hospital. There is one more item to which I wish to allude, and it is in respect of that isolated area of Shark Bay. There is the necessity for a reappraisal of the pearling leases. Pearling at Shark Bay is at a wretchedly low ebb, prices having gone to rock bottom. Pearling there is on a plane entirely different from pearling further north. The shell is raised by dredges, those engaged in the industry trawling a cheap type of wire dredge, and very many of the leases which are operated are now not easily worked. Without being accused of working the parish pump in this direction, I would suggest that the Chief Inspector of Fisheries should visit Shark Bay and assist the industry by reappraising the leases on their proper basis. Many of the leases are over 1,000 acres in extent, just to protect perhaps 50 acres of shell area. Some of the boundaries of the leases extend to the highland, to protect a very small area of productive shell. I trust the few requests I have made will receive the favourable consideration of the Government.

**MR. F. C. L. SMITH** (Brown Hill-Ivanhoe) [5.41]: It is some 12 months now since we previously discussed the Estimates, and I recollect on that occasion it was suggested that we were about to turn the corner. Since that time we have either missed the corner we were about to turn, or we took the wrong turning. Things certainly have not improved very much during the past 12 months. The difficulties confronting us to-day are just as great as the difficulties that confronted us 12 months ago.

Mr. Seward: Greater, if anything.

Mr. F. C. L. SMITH: I believe they are. Various methods have been tried for the purpose of finding a solution of those difficulties, and in every instance they have failed. Thus, to-day, we have to look out for new ideas and new methods of dealing with the difficulties that are facing us, in the hope of solving them by means other than those we have been trying since the depression first came upon us. Whatever satisfaction holders of fixed money claims may derive from the fact that the Commonwealth and States have so far weathered the storm, and met their commitments in the way of interest payments on loans by increasing the burden upon future production and upon posterity generally, there is little satisfaction to be gained by the masses generally from the course of events of the past three years. True, experience has shown that under the existing capitalistic system in countries that have defaulted with regard to their commitments the result of that failure has often involved a set of conditions far worse than that which has to be undergone in meeting the commitments. To that extent, presumably, we have reason to congratulate ourselves on having been able to meet our commitments and prevent a conflict between, on the one hand, the holders of fixed money claims and such satellites as would follow them, and, on the other hand, the producers of the Commonwealth generally. But, after all what might have happened had this country defaulted is purely speculative; and people generally are concerned rather with what is than with what might have been. Farmers and pastoralists who in the main have only nominal titles to wealth in this country and who are producing largely on behalf of mortgagees, and the workers who, notwithstanding the productive capacity of mankind, still have to barter their services for a

mere subsistence, cannot possibly derive any satisfaction from existing conditions, nor from any promise of improvement shown by those conditions. Farmers generally are working for a bare subsistence. Practically all of them are tied to mortgages. At the conference now being held in Perth the soldier-settlers have pointed out that many of them are working for less than the basic wage, and the general opinion—one which I think will be endorsed throughout the farming community—is that none of them can hope ever to own his holding. Such workers as are working are obtaining a low standard of living, when account is taken of the general productive capacity of mankind. Then there is the vast army of unemployed and part-time workers, representing a large proportion of workers in Western Australia and in the Commonwealth also. The part-time workers are working for an existence much under the low standard we have set up as the lowest at which any man or woman should be called upon to live. With due allowance for all the failings of human nature, for its limitations, fears and passions, I submit that we cannot pride ourselves upon the civilisation we have reared. It is a civilisation which denies to many of our fellow-beings the right to live. If we accept the dictum of the historian Buckle, that the history of every country is the history of its intellectual development, then we cannot contend that, in general, we have reached a high stage of intellectual development. The present depression is not the outcome of an ordinary phase of the trade cycle, nor is it altogether the result of the panic which arose out of confidence outrunning discretion during a favourable period of production for profit. Usually the effects of such panics have in the past been minimised and overcome. By long and hard experience the Bank of England and other financial institutions have learned how to deal with, and overcome, such panics. They have learnt to realise that the free flow of accommodation of all kinds is the means for meeting such a panic. But this is no ordinary panic. The present depression arises not only out of reaction following a phase of the trade cycle, but out of a reaction following the prosperity phase of that cycle aggravated by currency inflation and by vast borrowings and mortgages on production in return for mortgages on future production carrying with them a relative increase by way of in-

terest; and another factor is the vast expenditure undertaken for the purpose of successfully prosecuting the war. So we have to-day a position resulting from conditions due to the war and the consequent repatriation measures, and due also to general inflation of currency to which recourse was had in order that Governments in all the countries involved might meet the need for goods and services required for the prosecution of the war. As a result, finance and currency have been unsettled throughout the world. I do not desire to-day to delve into banking and currency problems, although I am satisfied that without someone delving into those problems and the people generally taking sufficient interest in them to produce a decisive public opinion in favour of a change in our monetary system, we shall never overcome our present difficulties and things will probably become even worse for the great mass of the people. The experience of the past few years has shown us that it is possible to make credit available from a central institution at least to the extent of softening the worst effects of reaction following upon abnormal injections of capital into the economic life during the war period. The credits issued to Governments for the purpose of carrying on governmental activities have obviated for those Governments the necessity of imposing further taxation to raise amounts equal to those extended to them by credits from the central banking institution. These credits, have come to us by way of loans, and are obligations which we are expected to meet in the future, paying interest upon them until such time as they are met. In my opinion, they should have come in an entirely different way. During the war period the Commonwealth Government found means to increase their credit in the Commonwealth Bank to the extent of £50,000,000 without that credit coming in the form of a mortgage on future production or in the form of a loan representing a continuous obligation to be met ultimately, with interest being paid on it until maturity. I refer to the method by which the Commonwealth Government raised that credit, namely inflation of the note issue. The Commonwealth Government demonstrated that it was possible to create credit for themselves to the extent of £50,000,000, drawing drafts on existing production—not future production—free of obligation as regards repayment,

and free of interest to the people to whom the credit was extended. Although perhaps it would not be right to call that credit the people's credit, yet it is a credit established by the activities of the people. In my opinion, the change in the monetary system—and some change must come—should be of a revolutionary character. I do not think it is a sound contention that under the existing system the national credit of the country is the people's credit. Whenever I delve into the question it appears to me that the credit of the country, while some may belong to each and everyone of us, is largely the credit of those who hold the titles to the means of production and to the factories where value is added in the process of manufacturing. Although I admit that the credit belongs to those people, yet I must recognise that the national credit, by whomever owned, is established by the activities of the people, and that at least some of it should be made available so that those activities may be availed of under all economic circumstances. In my opinion if the system of private ownership is to continue and the titles to ownership are to be mainly the preserve of a favoured few—as is the position under capitalism—while the majority offering to barter their services have an existence that can only come through being employed upon the means of production, to which others hold the titles, the least the people who hold the titles must be made to do is to see that opportunity is afforded to all those who have services to offer. I do not wish to be regarded as a currency crank, but I have given some study to the subject of banking and currency. The late W. E. Gladstone said that the study of that subject would drive one to the lunatic asylum. I have a great deal of diffidence in venturing opinions upon the subject, because there are so many exceptions and qualifications to anything one might have to say, that it can be made to appear later that whatever one might have said was wrong. But in my opinion the essential work for any Government, or the most urgent phase of the problem with which we are faced to-day, is to endeavour to set up some kind of mechanism whereby we can avail ourselves as a nation of the services of the people in that nation. In order to do that, I feel that where services offered cannot be availed of by private enterprise it should be a responsibility

of the Government to find work for those offering the services, or at least to find a living wage for those people. The time has arrived when the whole of our governmental activities, and the national works that are within the province of the Administration, should be financed through the medium of credits issued from a central bank, free of obligation for repayment and free of interest charges. And concurrently with that there should be an abolition of all taxation.

Mr. Doney: Hear, hear!

Mr. F. C. L. SMITH: I have come to the conclusion that with the development of banking and credit generally, the unwieldy, anomalous and iniquitous systems of taxation which we impose upon the people for the purpose of raising the revenues of Governments are out of date and antediluvian. The whole of that money should be raised through the medium of credit issued from a central bank, free of interest and free of obligation for repayment, just the same as the £50,000,000 which the Hughes Government raised through the inflation of the note issue during the war period.

Mr. Latham: They charged the State 6 per cent. interest for it.

Mr. F. C. L. SMITH: They did not charge the State interest on any money which they used for their own purposes; they simply took the notes to the bank, paid them into their own credit, and drew cheques on them as they required. In a proposition of this kind, the first thing that will be said is, "Oh, that is inflation, and inflation will run riot under a system of that kind." I feel that in such a system properly organised and not under political control, but under responsible control—

Mr. Marshall: What's the difference?

Mr. F. C. L. SMITH: I do not know that political control is so very responsible. What I mean is, free from political control, and I venture to say that things could be so organised that on the one hand we would have the credit issues, and on the other we would have production going hand in hand with those credit issues, and so there would be a balance preserved between production and credit issue. Consequently there would be very little inflation, or fluctuations in the value of the units of the currency that were circulating at the time. Another aspect of that is that it would tend to do away with the difficulties arising out of the trade cycles with which we are faced to-day in our

economic life, those periods of depression, recession, revival and prosperity and then back to depression again; it would tend to minimise all those, because in periods of prosperity there would be less necessity for governmental expenditure to keep surplus men employed, and more necessity for governmental expenditure to keep men employed in bad times. Consequently under such a system there would be a better balance preserved between both the good and the bad times. However, whatever change may take place, some change there has to be. The great mass of the people are not going to stand for ever for a system that compels their fellow-men to starve in the midst of plenty, and in the midst of a potential production capacity that can more than supply the needs and desires of all. The Great War in itself should have been sufficient to open the eyes of everyone to the productive capacity of mankind. With 20 million of the world's best producers out of production, all were well supplied with necessities and comforts, there was plenty of food and clothing for all, plenty of guns and plenty of ammunition. And it could have been the same if those 20 million men were at the front merely playing cards with one another. As a matter of fact, considering the labour that was employed in the production of weapons of offence and defence, had those weapons not been required we could have had an army of waitresses out at the front, waiting and attending upon the comfort of the men. The productive capacity of mankind during that period was proved beyond dispute. There is not very much one can say on the Budget itself. I agree with the Leader of the Opposition that it does not differ very much from the Budget we had 12 months ago. The total indebtedness during the past year increased by £3,806,745. In June of 1932 it was £79,707,953, and in June of 1933 it was £83,514,698. This indebtedness represents a debt of £193.185 per head of population, the average interest rate of which is 3.90 per cent. Fortunately we have had some reductions in interest rates during the past couple of years, and to that extent the burden of our heavy loan indebtedness has been relieved. In 1929 the average interest rate was 4.56 per cent.; in 1930 it was 4.60; in 1931 it was 4.55; in 1932 it was 4.11, and in 1933 it was 3.90 per cent. So there has been a reduction of not quite 1 per cent.

That lower interest rate has so affected the interest payments that although our total indebtedness increased, our annual commitments in the past three years have decreased. In 1931-32 the interest payment was £3,268,775; in 1932-33 it was £3,238,627, or a decrease of £30,148, although our indebtedness increased from 1931 to 1932 by £3,143,068. I notice that this year we are budgeting for an increase in interest payments on loan indebtedness of £84,759. Of this amount, £50,000 is the estimate for new money on which we shall have to pay interest during the current year. But even then, there is shown an increase of £34,759 in interest payments between this year and last year.

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

MR. F. C. L. SMITH: There are several items in the Estimates bearing on interest payments on loan funds where the principal and interest rates do not differ from those of the previous year, and yet the amount that it is estimated must be paid this year is greater than that which was paid previously. I presume there is some explanation for this, though I do not know what it is. There is an item for interest on a loan maturing in June, 1944-45, of £750,000. It is indicated that this is debenture stock covering a migration loan. Last year the interest rate was given at 1½ per cent., but this year it is shown as 1½ and five per cent. Last year the interest payable was £12,500, but this year it is £28,000, a difference of £16,000 on this one loan. This comes at a time when we understood interest rates were being reduced. There is an increase in the rate on this loan. Possibly there is a reason for it. I merely draw attention to the matter in the hope that some member may enlighten me upon it. The value of our production for 1931-32 was £25,013,547. This on a population basis represents a production of approximately £58 or £59 per head. We have a small population, and the State is one which calls for great expenditure in development if ever we are going to have a population that will be a fraction of the potential population-capacity of the State. The interest burden of £7 10s. per head on the huge indebtedness represented by our loans is an enormous sum for every man, woman and child in the

State to carry. It shows the position we have got into through borrowing money for the provision of public utilities with a view to increasing the actual population capacity of Western Australia. We have been borrowing on the credit established by the people for the use of the people, and have then placed the people under an obligation to repay the loans and the interest upon them, although that credit would never have existed but for the activities of the people arising out of the expenditure of the credit itself. The most satisfactory feature of our production is in connection with gold mining. Since 1929 there has been a steady increase in the volume of gold produced. In 1929 we produced £377,176 ounces, in 1930 we produced 417,518 ounces; in 1931 we produced 510,572 ounces; in 1932 we produced 605,561 ounces, and for the first six months of this year we produced 299,807 ounces. The last six months of any year in the gold mining industry usually produce a greater volume of gold than the first six months, and we have every reason to believe therefore that the total number of ounces produced during the current year will exceed that of last year. Owing to the rise in the price of gold, the value of the production has increased in a greater proportion than has the output. In 1929 the value of the gold production of this State was £1,602,142, in 1930 it was £1,864,442, in 1931 it was £2,998,137, in 1932 it was £4,403,642, and for the first six months of this year it was £2,234,521, equal to nearly the total value of the production in 1931. Not only has the output increased, but the value in Australian currency has enormously enhanced. During 1932 the number of men engaged in mining generally was 8,695. This shows an increase of 1.548 as compared with 1931. Actually, 1,639 more men were employed in the gold mining industry during 1932 than in 1931. Since then there has been a considerable increase in the number employed in the industry. A reasonable estimate is that 2,000 more men are employed to-day as compared with 1931. That is satisfactory for the State in general. An interesting feature disclosed in the report of the Department of Mines is that the tonnage raised per man increased from 171.55 tons to 172.55 in 1932, the latest figures available. The average value of gold production per ton, although lower in 1932 than in 1931, was higher in terms of Australian cur-

rency, in which the wages of the employees are paid. These facts should be impressed upon the minds of employers engaged in the industry, particularly those who are flushed with the success of their ventures. They should realise that the employees are doing a fair thing by them, and the least they can do is to reciprocate the fair deal the employees are handing out to them. Gold mining never has been a very attractive industry from the employment point of view. The conditions inseparable from it are such that the men have to work in subterranean tunnels and drives, where the sun never shines and the light of day never enters. A certain amount of unhealthy condition must always prevail. From whatever point of view we look at it the industry is not a good one. There are risks to life and limb inseparable from it, and also a great amount of disease. I was pleased to see that the figures relating to the latest laboratory examinations showed the best results that have yet been achieved. Of the 4,285 men examined on that occasion, 3,835 were found to be normal or 89.5 per cent. There were 375 who were found to be suffering from silicosis, or 8.7 per cent.; 53 suffering from advanced silicosis, or 1.2 per cent.; 16 suffering from silicosis plus tuberculosis, or .4 per cent., and eight suffering from tuberculosis only, or .2 per cent. It always strikes me as a remarkable feature of the figures that each year we find men suffering from tuberculosis only. On the latest occasion the results show that eight were afflicted to that extent. Twelve months ago they were examined by means of the most up-to-date plant and with the advantage of the latest methods of radiographic technique and were found to be absolutely normal. Yet, at the end of a year, those men were found to be suffering from tuberculosis. That indicates one of two things. It may be that tuberculosis can exist and be very difficult to diagnose, or, on the other hand, it may be that conditions in the mining industry are extremely favourable for the development of tuberculosis. The improvement shown in the statistics is not due solely to improved conditions prevailing in the mining industry because we have to realise that other factors operate towards that improvement. First, there is the fact that the mines themselves have been cleaned up with respect to the men who had been working

in them for 30 years without the privilege and advantage of the annual examination. They were not prohibited during those years from working in the mines although suffering from tuberculosis, nor were they compensated if totally incapacitated as the result of advanced silicosis. It will be seen that in the earlier years of the examinations, a vast amount of work had to be done with respect to what may be regarded as the wrecks of the industry. That factor is accounted for in the original figures. Since then those men have been withdrawn from the industry, and to-day men who are engaged in mining operations go in with a comparatively clean bill of health. In later years those employed in the industry have been added to by a large number of younger men. In consequence, with the advantage of the vigour of youth, they have possibly many years in front of them before they become affected by the dusty conditions inseparable from mining under the best of conditions. It is satisfactory to know there has been an improvement and to the extent that the improvement has taken place as the result of better conditions, I give that fact due recognition. I know some improvement has taken place in the direction of making working conditions better in the mining industry, but notwithstanding that, there is still plenty of room for greater improvements. The industry generally has been particularly helpful to Western Australia during a very trying period. I suggest the solvency of the State has been preserved as a result of the buoyancy of the gold mining industry. Owing to the aleatory character of the industry, it attracts more capital to the State than does any other industry. Certainly the industry may not be so secure and safe from the standpoint of investment, as are some other industries, but nevertheless it offers some tempting prizes. A vast amount of capital has been invested in the gold mining industry. It is commonly said, with a great deal of truth, that every ounce of gold produced in Western Australia has cost not less than £6. That fact in itself really represents a tax on the capital that has been invested in the industry. Incidentally, a proposal to impose a tax on gold was raised recently in another place by a former Minister of the Crown, whose utterances, in view of his standing, would be regarded, in other parts of the world at any rate, as of a responsible character. I sug-

gest that no one having a proper sense of responsibility, and a knowledge of the gold mining industry of Western Australia, would entertain for one moment a proposal to impose a tax on gold. I know that such a tax is levied in South Africa, but the conditions there are totally different from those operating in Western Australia. In South Africa the lodes are such that the tonnage to be produced, can reasonably be estimated and the cost of extracting that tonnage can be estimated to within a fraction of the actual cost of excavation. There is to that extent a degree of certainty in regard to gold mining in South Africa. There are possibilities present by which the profits can reasonably be estimated before the ore is taken out, and, in consequence, the investment in gold mining in South Africa is perhaps safer than in Western Australia. The gold occurs in Western Australia in a formation different from that of South Africa. There is plenty of gold in this State, and the industry offers great opportunities for investment. As a matter of fact, there are better opportunities for investors here than in South Africa, but the risks are greater here than there, which makes all the difference with regard to the imposition of a tax on gold. In my opinion, rather than suggest a tax on gold, a man of responsibility should advocate that Western Australia should do all in its power to assist the industry, so that capital will be attracted to the many promising avenues for investment that gold mining offers at the present juncture. While promising, they nevertheless involve some speculation. I am surprised that during the past three years the Workers' Homes Board have not included the Eastern Goldfields district within the scope of their activities. A wonderful opportunity has presented itself in that centre for the erection of workers' homes. Even if during a period when the gold-mining industry was denied the right of the full value of its products, and was fleeced to the extent of £3,000,000 resulting in the industry being in the doldrums, that does not represent any reason why the security respecting building investments should be regarded as suspect. There is every security for building investment in Kalgoorlie and Boulder. There has always been comparatively good security in those towns, and I suggest that no investment in Western Australia has

shown a better return than those associated with the building of houses in Kalgoorlie and Boulder. We have always heard it said that those who invest their money in gold mining concern themselves with a wasting asset. Is not every other industry a collection of wasting assets too? For instance, there are plenty of wasting assets in the agricultural industry. It is surprising to think, when we hear of gold mining represented as a wasting asset, that the industry has flourished since the days of King Solomon. It is surprising how new units arise and new developments take place on old units, so as to give a permanent character and prosperous outlook to the industry generally. With regard to the mines on the Golden Mile, pessimists predicted a little while ago that the end of the Golden Mile was in sight. Developments during the last three years have forced recognition of the fact that only now have people begun to realise what wealth that rich area really contains, and its value has been properly recognised. I submit there is ample security available for the Workers' Homes Board should they erect homes in Kalgoorlie and Boulder now. The demand for houses is unlimited. People are being fleeced because of the rents charged for houses, the supply of which is inadequate to meet the demand that exists. Another feature of the industry, and of the manner in which its prolonged life can be gauged, is the fact that the high price of gold we are enjoying at present will be a permanency. It will be absolutely necessary to reduce the gold content of the sovereign and consequently fix a new mint price per ounce for gold. That in itself increases or gives an advantage to the gold-mining industry and indicates its possible permanency. If workers' homes are built, the houses will be new and they will be an advantage over the houses that have been there for 30 or 40 years. Those houses would be better security than many that are there at present. The people do not want mansions; they want substantial houses such as I referred to the other night, weatherboard houses that can be built with the assistance of the State Sawmills at a cost of approximately £300. This would represent an investment to be paid back at the rate of 15s. a week on the sinking fund method, the payments extending over a period of ten or 15 years. There was never a time or a place in this State

when the benefits shed by the Workers' Homes Act were more needed than on the eastern goldfields at the present time. The State owes a lot to the mining industry, and there should be a greater recognition of disabilities and disadvantages under which many ratepayers on the eastern goldfields are labouring. I trust therefore that money will be made available to the Workers' Homes Board so that that institution might be able to extend to Kalgoorlie and Boulder its sphere of operations, which already have been enjoyed by most of the country towns of the State.

**MR. CUNNINGHAM** (Kalgoorlie) [8.5]: We are meeting under much happier circumstances than on the occasion when the Budget was delivered last year. For instance, we have had beneficial rains throughout the State, and this fact will mean quite a lot, not only to the people of the State, but also to the tax-gatherers of the Commonwealth. Further, we must take into consideration the upward price of gold, but the hon. member who has just resumed his seat made a mistake when he remarked that the reference to the increase in the price of gold was the most important item in the Budget speech. It will be realised generally that right through the ages whenever gold increased enormously in prices, commodity prices dropped correspondingly. That is what is wrong with the world to-day. Only a few years ago the Treasurer of a Labour Government in the Commonwealth Parliament introduced a Bill to provide for what was known as a fiduciary issue, that is to say, money backed by the confidence of the people. It will also be remembered that on that occasion we were not privileged to have that money made available. Since then, however, we find that the money magnates of the world, those who control monetary prices, have manipulated prices to such an extent that to-day the world value of gold on the London market is at least £6 4s. 6d. per ounce, or, in Australian currency, approximately £8 per ounce. I have heard most important discussions here and very interesting matters have been mentioned in connection with the new order of things respecting currency, but when we find that the financiers of the world so manipulate the price of gold that we have to-day an inflation from £4 4s. 11d. to £8 per ounce, we can realise just what has brought the nations



of the world to the existing financial depression. I represent a mining constituency which to-day is prosperous. Our people are working and our business people are thriving, but at the same time, as a sensible community, we know that the remaining portion of the population of this country is suffering as a result of the inflation of the price of gold. The member for Claremont (Mr. North), who is a very studious man, has devoted hours of thought to financial questions, and particularly has he given a lot of time to the Douglas Credit System. What I should like to ask is, why are we in this State and in the Commonwealth, and why are the nations of the world at the moment so anxious to bring about an alteration in currency and credit? It is simply because we have had an enormous inflation in the price of gold. There is insufficient gold in the world and the result is a development of an international greed for it. We are prosperous to-day at the expense of the world. So also is South Africa prosperous. That is one of the worst features confronting the people at the present time. A most important paragraph in the Premier's speech was that in which he said that great care would have to be taken to husband our resources and to exercise a closer supervision over expenditure in the hope of effecting greater economies if we desired to live up to the deficit conditions imposed by the Loan Council. Therefore, irrespective of what we might think, and quite apart from the suggestions advanced by the various members who have spoken on the Budget, we are not going to get very far beyond the decision of the Loan Council. We are tied up; we voted ourselves into it, and therefore, as part and parcel of the Loan Council, it appears to me that we shall have to shoulder the responsibilities imposed upon us until, of course, something tangible arises from the proposals advanced by the member for Nedlands and others to get us out of that authority and away from the control of the Loan Council. As the result of the recent abundant rains we can look forward to a bountiful harvest. That will mean quite a lot, provided of course we get a fair price for our product. It will be agreed that during the last few years those who grow wheat have had to face a siege. Three years ago the farmers were called upon to sacrifice their product at 1s. 11½d. per bushel. In the

following year, with the bonus made available by the Commonwealth Government, the farmers received about 3s. 3d., whilst last year those that were fortunate received 2s. 4½d. per bushel. This year, not one member in this House is able to outline what the opening price is likely to be for the coming harvest. I am pleased to know, however, that the Premier has agreed to the overtures made by some of the other States to call upon the Commonwealth Government to make provision for the payment of at least 3s. per bushel to assist the wheat-growing community. If that is done, it will be realised that many farmers who are to-day on the land as the result of assistance given by banks and other institutions, will certainly have to abandon their holdings. After four years of siege, they cannot go on to the fifth year. We must get for the people of this country substantial financial assistance to enable them to carry on. It was my intention to mention that one of the happy circumstances in connection with the general discussion on the Budget was the advance in the price of wool. A few months ago we were all afraid there would be no increase in the price of this commodity, but fortunately the opening sales have proved otherwise. I wish to mention one or two roads-and-bridges matters concerning my electorate. I thank the member for Brown Hill-Ivanhoe (Mr. F. C. L. Smith) for the capable assistance he has rendered me in taking up the question of workers' homes for Kalgoorlie, which name I use as embracing both his electorate and mine. For some time past the people of those two electorates have been called upon to pay an increase of 100 per cent., and in some cases as much as 200 per cent., for homes in which to live. We have certainly presented the case for our electors, and why there should be any demur or hesitancy on the part of those in authority to provide the goldfields people with workers' homes I do not understand. Those people have paid their way up to date, and are prepared to continue to pay their way. They do not ask for substantial dwellings, but merely for serviceable homes, and up to date they have not obtained these. Evidently there is some difficulty in the way. I would like the Treasurer to give the matter further consideration. During my election campaign I was questioned as to the policy of Labour concerning the basic wage for workers on the goldfields. I well remember the discus-

sions which took place in this Chamber on the original financial emergency measure. My contention, as I told the people, was that they should at least receive the basic wage fixed by the Arbitration Court; and I stand by that, either on the platform or in this Parliament. Under the provisions of the Financial Emergency Act, Government employees on the goldfields have been reduced by not less than 8s. 8d. per week; as an effect of the 18 per cent. cut the basic wage was reduced from £3 18s. to £3 9s. 4d. per week, plus the district allowance of 2s. 4d. per week. I think it was the intention of the party to which I belong to introduce the necessary amending legislation, so as to pay to those workers the basic wage fixed by the Arbitration Court. Therefore I am rather disappointed at the delay which has taken place. Still, I am not going to make any charge of negligence against the Government. I know the difficulties with which they have been faced during the last two months. Another place has apparently set itself not only to harass the Government but also to humiliate the Treasurer. That is the reason why matters of importance have not received that consideration which they should get. In my opinion, the time is overdue for this Chamber to bring to the notice of another place the fact that the people of Western Australia are not prepared to go on tolerating the policy of dictation by that other place in matters of finance. We are called the popular Chamber.

Mr. F. C. L. Smith: And the other one is the unpopular Chamber.

Hon. J. CUNNINGHAM: We are the popular Chamber in the sense that we are elected by the adults of the State. Nevertheless we are working under a Constitution which permits the election of another set of people to obstruct the work of this popular Chamber. Some hon. members may be surprised to learn that while for this Chamber no Asiatic, even if naturalised, or national born, is permitted to vote, an Asiatic who holds freehold property of a clear value of £50 is entitled to vote for the Legislative Council. The member for Kimberley (Mr. Coverley) who has interested himself closely of late in the affairs of the aborigines, may be interested to learn that while a full-blooded aborigine is not entitled to vote for the Legislative Assembly, he can get full representation in the Legislative Council on be-

coming a landed proprietor to the extent of £50 clear value. What do the Government propose with regard to an amendment of the Constitution so as to give the full adult franchise to the people of Western Australia in connection with the making of the laws under which they are called upon to live? I believe the Government have the question under consideration, and I do not think my remarks are either amiss or remiss, for we have to face the issue. We hear of an agitation outside the walls of Parliament to reduce the number of members drawing salaries. Apparently some people are under the impression that the expenditure on Parliament is altogether too great. Here is an opportunity to economise. We can well rid ourselves of at least 30 members of this Parliament and carry on quite successfully, perhaps giving a little more mature consideration to Bills and various questions. When it is known that there is another Chamber, Bills and other matters of importance perhaps do not always receive that full measure of mature consideration which they would receive if this were the only Chamber. We are often told, when a deadlock occurs, that there must be a conference of managers representative of both Houses. Surely some alteration should be brought about in this respect. We want no third House. We want one Legislature. We want a reduction in the cost of government and in the cost of administration. After the various Ministers have made their statements, I may have a few remarks to offer upon Votes.

Progress reported.

## BILL—FRUIT CASES ACT AMENDMENT.

### *Second Reading.*

Debate resumed from the 26th September.

### THE MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE

(Hon. H. Millington.—Mt. Hawthorn—in reply) [8.26]: I understand that exception has been taken to the amendment proposed by the Bill. In moving the second reading I stated that the sole object of the measure was to remove disabilities now imposed on the Railway Department. It seems that objection has been raised because motor transport is acting detrimentally to the fruit industry. That may be true, but the difficulty is not overcome by leaving the Rail-

way Department in a disadvantageous position. Certainly the difficulty can be overcome by tightening up administration and inspection as regards transport of fruit by road. As to the area over which this Bill would operate, I have pointed out that fruit is permitted to be carried by road as far south as the 33rd parallel of south latitude. On examining the map I find that that parallel runs this side of Brunswick and Collic, takes in the districts of Williams and Narrogin, and comes out at Lake Grace. Therefore to-day trucks would not be permitted to carry fruit in second-hand cases below that line; and to members who are nervous, and quite naturally so, as to those fruit-growing districts becoming affected, I point out that there is no danger of infection so far as the railways are concerned. Although there is difficulty in policing the Act and enforcing regulations with regard to motor traffic, there will be no deviation from either the Act or the regulations so far as railway transport is concerned. The Railway Department would studiously observe the law. Therefore it seems to me that the whole objection is that motor transport does not observe the law. Surely it is desirable that railway transport should not be at a disadvantage. If it is suggested that no fruit whatever should be transported in second-hand cases, that is a different question altogether. In the interests of the industry it has been deemed desirable that to some extent the use of second-hand cases should be permitted. Certainly I shall do my best to ensure that in future a stricter supervision obtains. I do not know how it comes about that we have to wait until a measure such as this is introduced for an agitation against the transport of fruit in motor trucks. If it is true that motor trucks have been acting in contravention of the regulations, and adversely to the fruit industry, that matter could have been dealt with long ago. There is not an army of inspectors, but I guarantee that if any of those who infringe the law can be caught, steps will be taken to ensure that the law is observed. In any case, the districts regarding which exception has been taken to the proposal covered by the Bill, will receive adequate protection. I have already informed members regarding the distance within which the railways are permitted to carry fruit in second-hand cases, and the extent

to which we propose to limit motor transport in the same direction. As to the Bill itself, when the Act was passed in 1919, the conditions operating were entirely different from those apparent in 1932. In 1919, it was not considered that fruit would be conveyed any great distance by road, in consequence of which, paragraph (a) of Section 8 read—

When any fruit contained in a case has been sold or otherwise disposed of, the case may again be used as an open case to contain fruit to be carried by road only . . . .

That concession was granted in respect of road transport only, and the railways were at the same time prohibited from carrying fruit in second-hand cases. Since then the practice has been extended with regard to motor transport, which is a cheap and convenient method by which the growers can take their produce from the orchard to the market. In the old days, the fruit would be conveyed from the orchard to the railway station and railed to the metropolitan market. Growers find motor transport a more economical method of conveying the fruit to market.

Mr. Ferguson: And it means less handling, too.

The MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE: That is so, and, in consequence, the practice has grown. I pointed out the position with regard to tomatoes, with which a big trade is transacted in the metropolitan market. After the tomatoes are sold at the markets, large quantities are sent to the country and can be sent by rail. The tomatoes can be transported in second-hand cases because that is permissible, and they can be transported by motor trucks, within the limits I have already mentioned. On the other hand, if the Act is not amended, and tomatoes were to be consigned to Narrogin, it would be necessary for the tomatoes to be re-packed in new cases if they were to be despatched by rail. Such a position would be ridiculous, because it would simply mean penalising the railways in a direction that did not apply to motor trucks. It must be remembered that although it will be permissible to use second-hand cases, the law must be complied with. The cases must be clean and in a sanitary condition. Naturally, the department take the necessary steps to ensure that the cases used are clean. It has not been suggested that because the cases are second-

hand, they will necessarily be in an insani-  
 tary condition. The Bill is introduced with  
 the simple object of removing the unfair  
 competition by road, which has operated to  
 the detriment of the railways, and not with  
 the object of securing to the railways an  
 advantage over road transport. The mem-  
 ber for Nedlands (Hon. N. Keenan) took  
 exception to the fact that Clause 2 of the  
 Bill represents practically Section 8 of the  
 Act in a re-casted form. I did not draft the  
 Bill, but I understand that the easiest way  
 by which we can secure what was desired in  
 1932 is represented by the clause, the alter-  
 native to which would be a number of  
 amendments to the section. The clause in  
 its present form represents what we desire  
 in simple and plain language. What I am  
 concerned about is whether the clause, as it  
 stands, represents what we desire. Will it  
 give us the necessary power and remove the  
 restrictions at present operating against  
 railway transport?

Hon. N. Keenan: Does it give you any ex-  
 tended powers?

The MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE:  
 Yes.

Hon. N. Keenan: In what respect?

The MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE:  
 It removes the distinction between road and  
 rail transport.

Hon. N. Keenan: That is not an exten-  
 sion of power.

The MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE:  
 There is extended power in that at the pre-  
 sent time it is not permissible for the rail-  
 ways to carry fruit in second-hand cases.

Hon. N. Keenan: That is opening the door  
 wider, not restricting transport.

The MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE:  
 Does the member for Nedlands suggest that  
 the railways should continue to operate  
 under the Act as it stands?

Hon. N. Keenan: No.

The MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE:  
 Then the hon. member does not object to  
 the amendment?

Hon. N. Keenan: No.

The MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE:  
 He does not object to the principle.

Hon. N. Keenan: No, but the Bill does  
 not give the Government any extended  
 power to prevent the spread of fruit dis-  
 eases.

The MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE:  
 No, but the clause contains language that I

consider will enable us to deal with that  
 phase by means of regulations covering the  
 transport of fruit by road and rail.

Hon. N. Keenan: Where is that?

The MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE:  
 It is there; the hon. member will see that  
 there is considerably more verbiage in the  
 clause.

Hon. N. Keenan: But is the extra verbi-  
 age of any use?

The MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE:  
 The Government asked the Crown Law De-  
 partment to frame the clause in as concise  
 a form as possible. The clause shows how  
 that has been done. If we desire a matter  
 to be carried out in an approved manner,  
 we must get an official to do it. I think I  
 could have stated more briefly what we de-  
 sire, but when it came to enforcing the mat-  
 ter at law, it might probably be found that  
 my language would not hold good. I am  
 satisfied with the wording of the clause; I  
 think it will provide for just what we de-  
 sire. It is different from the section, and  
 we require it to be different.

Mr. Wise: Will you have an inspection  
 at the particular barrier you referred to?

The MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE:  
 I stated that line to be the 33rd parallel,  
 south latitude. That is what I regarded as  
 a safe line, and within the area bounded by  
 that line, it would be safe to carry fruit in  
 second-hand cases by rail or by road. If at  
 any time we require to be more precise, it  
 can be done, and we can deal with any par-  
 ticular district which we may desire to elimi-  
 nate. By that means we can indicate where  
 we think it will be unsafe to take fruit. We  
 do not arbitrarily fix the line: as conditions  
 are to-day, that is the line suggested.

Mr. Wansbrough: I am not so much con-  
 cerned about the cases; what I am concerned  
 about is that fruit can be railed in those  
 cases and may be taken from the truck at,  
 say, Narrogin, but the truck may go further  
 into the apple areas and may convey diseases  
 as the result of the conveyance of second-  
 hand cases to Narrogin.

The MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE:  
 I realise that difficulty, but I feel we must  
 concern ourselves with protective measures  
 with regard to motor transport rather than  
 with regard to the railways. The law will  
 be strictly administered regarding the rail-  
 ways, and there will be no danger from that  
 standpoint.

Mr. Thorn: You will not be extending the danger by permitting the railways to carry the cases; it is happening every day with regard to motor transport.

The MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE: That is what I have tried to explain. It is because of the difficulty experienced regarding the regulation of motor transport that action has become necessary. Most decidedly there will be a tightening up by means of regulations. The whole thing boils itself down to this: Are the railways to be placed in a ridiculous position compared with motor transport? The Bill proposes to overcome the anomalous position of the railways. As to the objections that have been taken, the various matters can be dealt with. If we could have sufficient inspectors to patrol the line I have referred to and so regulate motor traffic, it might be done by the co-ordination of effort on the part of all interested. We cannot leave all these matters to inspectors of the Agricultural Department. The orchardists themselves are vitally concerned and should assist in policing the law. They and their organisations will be invited to co-operate with the department. That is not unusual. Scarcely any objection has been raised to the proposal to place the railways on terms of equality with motor transport. I have no excuse to offer for the Bill. I was not a violent advocate of the use of second-hand cases, but owing to the conditions operating in the industry, that practice has grown up. It would not be fair to insist upon new cases being used for the conveyance of tomatoes, for instance. To do so would be to impose an additional load on the industry that the growers could not bear. It would be ideal if we could insist upon new cases being used, but, unfortunately, in some instances that would mean that the case would cost more than the value of the fruit marketed in it. We could not possibly penalise the growers to that extent. I believe in the use of new fruit cases, but in the interests of the industry and of common sense, I recognise that second-hand cases should be used under certain conditions. I hope the Bill will be agreed to.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

### *In Committee.*

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

Clause 1—agreed to.

Clause 2—Amendment of Section 2:

Hon. N. KEENAN: Will the Minister tell us what is the necessity for defining second-hand cases? In the principal Act the words "second-hand cases" do not appear. It is simply a question of a case being fit for use or unfit for use. Now a second-hand case is to be defined as a case used once. Is that at all necessary? Why not merely insist on the case being what the Minister calls sanitary, whether it be used three or four times? If it be sanitary, it should be capable of being used any number of times, whereas if it be not sanitary it ought not to be used at all? There is no necessity whatever for defining a second-hand case.

Mr. Coverley: How would you supervise its use?

Hon. N. KEENAN: By regulation, as is done under the principal Act.

Mr. F. C. L. Smith: If you leave out "once," would not that put it right?

Hon. N. KEENAN: I do not think the definition is necessary at all.

Mr. SAMPSON: In Adelaide the cases are used time after time. Since we have it provided that the case must be clean and sanitary, it is of no consequence whether the case be used once or a dozen times. I move an amendment—

That "once," in line 3 of the definition, be struck out.

The MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE: There can be no doubt about the clearness of the definition. The objection is that under it a case could not be used more than twice. I do not wish to give it that interpretation, for the regulations will ensure that the case is fit to contain fruit. I have no objection to the amendment.

Amendment put and passed.

Mr. SAMPSON: I move a further amendment—

That all words after "fruit," in line 2 of the definition, be struck out.

The MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE: I must oppose the amendment, although I would have no objection to the striking-out of "first" in line 3 of the definition.

Mr. SAMPSON: I will withdraw my amendment.

Amendment by leave withdrawn.

The MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE:  
I move an amendment—

That 'first,' in line 3 of the definition, be struck out.

Mr. MOLONEY: There is no necessity for the amendment. The word proposed to be struck out is essential to the meaning of the definition.

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

Ayes	..	..	..	21
Noes	..	..	..	19
Majority for				2

#### AYES.

Mr. Clothier	Mr. Munro
Mr. Cunningham	Mr. Nulson
Mr. Hawke	Mr. Patrick
Mr. Hegney	Mr. Raphael
Miss Homan	Mr. Sampson
Mr. Keenan	Mr. F. C. L. Smith
Mr. Kenneally	Mr. Tonkin
Mr. McCallum	Mr. Troy
Mr. McDonald	Mr. Wansbrough
Mr. Marshall	Mr. Wilson
Mr. Millington	(Teller.)

#### NOES.

Mr. Brockman	Mr. North
Mr. Coverley	Mr. Piesse
Mr. Cross	Mr. Rodoreda
Mr. Ferguson	Mr. Stubbs
Mr. Griffiths	Mr. Thorn
Mr. Lambert	Mr. Welsh
Mr. Latham	Mr. Wise
Mr. McLarty	Mr. Withers
Mr. J. I. Mann	Mr. Doney
Mr. Moloney	(Teller.)

Amendment thus passed.

Mr. MOLONEY: I move an amendment—

That in lieu of the word "first" (struck out) the word "previously" be inserted.

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

Clause 3—Amendment of Section 8:

The MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE:  
I move an amendment—

That after the word "case," in line 2 of paragraph 2, the following words be inserted "or when bananas or pineapples grown within the State have been carried within the State in a prescribed case."

We do not want to penalise the Western Australian banana and pineapple industries.

Hon. N. KEENAN: Will the Minister explain why a special paragraph has to be

provided for bananas and pineapples which are grown in Western Australia? Are they not fruit? I thought the purpose of the Act was to deal with the importation of certain classes of fruit. Is it the Minister's opinion that bananas and pineapples are not fruit?

The MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE:  
It is not so much a question of the fruit as of the case. The Act certainly contains a section dealing with bananas and pineapples that are imported into the State in a prescribed case, but seeing that these fruits are now grown within the State, the cases in which they are packed must also be provided for. Unless this amendment is made, it may be found that the imported fruit case will have a distinct advantage over the local article.

Hon. N. KEENAN: Fruit is defined in the principal Act as including both pineapples and bananas. Provision is made for the carriage of fruit in cases which have been used, and for certain fruit which is imported into the State, namely, pineapples and bananas. Why is it necessary to provide for the cases in which locally-grown pineapples and bananas have been packed? The Act already applies to fruit grown in Western Australia. Is there some dark motive in this amendment for the development of the banana and pineapple industry?

Mr. SAMPSON: The Minister might well reconsider this amendment. It is very confusing in character. If the clause is limited to pineapples and bananas, there must have been an oversight in regard to many other fruits that are imported. At the moment our market in Kalgoorlie is being lost to us by reason of the influx of fruits from the other States. An opportunity is provided here to remedy that situation.

The MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE:  
The paragraphs are set out in such a clear manner that they cannot be misunderstood. If there is anything behind the amendment, the member for Nedlands, with his legal knowledge, ought to be able to disclose it to the Committee. I would point out that the Act will have to be understood by fruit-growers, and not by lawyers. The wording is such that, for the future, growers will know exactly when they are entitled to use a second-hand fruit case. The meaning is clear now, but can an hon. member reduce the number of words while keeping the meaning clear?

Mr. WISE: The clause and the amendment are really superfluous, but as they will do no harm may be admissible. As regards bananas and pineapples, there are no diseases transmissible to other fruits which may be carried in the second-hand cases.

Mr. SAMPSON: By specifying bananas and pineapples, there is an implication that other fruits imported from the Eastern States would not come within the purview of the Bill.

The Minister for Agriculture: That matter is already provided for in the principal Act.

Mr. SAMPSON: On the Eastern Gold-fields I have seen cases of other fruits badly affected with blue mould.

Mr. FERGUSON: What is the need for paragraph (ii) of the proviso to proposed Subsection (1)?

The MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE: Pineapples and banana cases are of certain dimensions. By marketing oranges in a pineapple case, one would be infringing the law.

Mr. Ferguson: Many fruits are marketed in open cases, even in kerosene cases.

The MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE: That will not be done in future. If hon. members will re-read the proposed subsection, they will see the necessity for paragraph (ii). This is the clause that permits the marketing of fruit of prescribed varieties in second-hand cases.

Amendment put and passed.

On motion by the Minister for Agriculture, paragraph (iii) of the proviso to proposed Subsection (1) amended by inserting after "sale", in line two, the words "or for conveying fruit to a packing shed for packing prior to sale or export."

Mr. McDONALD: As regards paragraph (iv), I said on the second reading that it was not clear to me what was meant. The paragraph states that "fruit in second-hand cases shall be sent only subject to certain regulations, which may specify the method of transport. Thus the regulations might be used to wipe out altogether the transport of fruit in second-hand cases. That would open up rather a large question of principle. What are the Minister's intentions with regard to those regulations? The power which the paragraph gives is extremely wide.

The MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE: The Government have not any policy in

regard to this matter. There is no intention to differentiate between motor transport and rail transport. The intention is to introduce equality. There will be power, under the paragraph, to quarantine if necessary. Prohibited areas are now prescribed by regulation, and it may be necessary still further to restrict the areas to which second-hand cases may be carried. Such restriction would apply equally to motors and the Railway Department.

Hon. N. KEENAN: The paragraph goes much further than the Minister states. It is the method of transport, and not transport, that he is given power to regulate. He might prohibit horse transport, for instance. Regulations specifying the places from and the places to which second-hand cases may be sent would give the Minister all the powers he needs.

The MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE: The powers are essential for the protection of the industry from disease. Even with these powers there would be difficulties. The clause deals with the prohibiting of the carriage of fruit in second-hand cases.

Hon. N. Keenan: But not for quarantining purposes.

The MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE: Yes. In certain cases it would be advisable to prohibit altogether the carriage of fruit in second-hand cases. This is not complete prohibition, but prohibition of carriage in second-hand cases. In practice it will be found that the powers outlined will be necessary to achieve the objective. There is no intention to differentiate in favour of the railways as against road transport; it is merely in the interests of the industry.

Mr. SAMPSON: I hope the member for West Perth, who raised this point, will move for the deletion of the words "which may specify the method of transport."

Mr. Marshall: Are you not old enough to do it yourself?

Mr. SAMPSON: The Minister has indicated he has no intention of interfering with road transport in the interests of the railways, and I think the position would be clearly set out if the words I suggest were deleted.

The Minister for Agriculture: You cannot protect a district if the power is not provided.

Mr. SAMPSON: Motor transport must be preserved for the delivery of fruit, and I think the paragraph with the amendment I suggested, would meet the position.

Mr. WANSBROUGH: I hope the paragraph will be agreed to as it stands. Diseased fruit may be found within a few miles of Narrogin and unless these powers are provided, it would be difficult to prevent the disease being taken further south. The department should have power to specify the method of transport.

The MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE: I move an amendment—

That in line 2 of paragraph V, after "not" the words "or being used to contain fruit" be inserted.

The inclusion of those words will make the paragraph clear.

Mr. Ferguson: It is as clear as mud now.

The MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE: It is necessary to provide the inspector with the necessary power to enable him to condemn second-hand cases and prevent them from being used at all. That will apply to cases unfit to contain fruit at all.

Mr. Latham: Who is the genius that thought this out?

The MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE: In the past, inspectors have found it most difficult to carry out the provisions of the Act.

Hon. N. KEENAN: I fail to understand the need for the amendment. It is difficult to understand why the paragraph appears as drafted. All we require to say is that should an inspector find the second-hand case that is unfit for the carriage of fruit by reason of uncleanness, he shall have power to destroy it. It does not matter whether the case contains fruit or does not contain fruit, whether it is being used to contain fruit or whether it is not being used to contain fruit. The Minister merely lumbers up a simple provision with additional words. I understand that on one occasion the question whether the words "or not" should be included in a clause under somewhat similar circumstances, occasioned a debate in this House extending over hours. Why is this extraordinary drafting done? What is wanted is something that the ordinary man can understand.

The Minister for Agriculture: You are putting up a good case for dirty cases.

Hon. N. KEENAN: No, I want the Minister to explain why he requires all this verbiage to deal with dirty cases. Why this extraordinary language? Apparently it has been put up to the Minister, who feels that he must be like a gramophone and repeat it to the Committee.

Mr. HEGNEY: What is the position if the case is found to be containing fruit or not containing it? What is the difference regarding the case? Perhaps the Minister will explain.

The MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE: I will take the Committee completely into my confidence. We have an inspector whose duty it is to exercise power to condemn cases that are unsuitable and when he discovers such a case, we must protect him so that he shall not be liable. For that purpose we must protect officers of the department. Unless this verbiage is agreed to, the inspector will be in doubt as to whether he is entitled to take action and whether or not he will run a risk of an action for damages. I am not repeating a lesson like a gramophone. I have not discussed the matter with the Crown Law Department or with the draftsman. The purpose is to give the inspector the necessary power without incurring any undue liability. That is why this was drafted, and I think very cleverly. Apparently nothing has been left out, nor does it appear that anything could be added.

Mr. FERGUSON: There is no necessity for the amendment, which savours of redundancy and does not add a jot or tittle to the value of the clause. It will not protect the inspector, nor give him any additional safeguard in launching a prosecution against any person using a second-hand case in contravention of the clause. The words of the amendment are entirely superfluous.

Amendment put and negatived.

Clause, as previously amended, put and passed.

Clause 4—New Section:

Mr. MARSHALL: Under paragraph (b) the onus of proof will be on the person charged; in other words, instead of the person bringing the charge proving his case, he simply lays the charge, and the accused has to prove his innocence. That is a principle I have always fought against, and frequently we have prevailed on Ministers introducing such legislation that it is wrong.



The MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE: The regulations already provide that the name of the grower or packer shall be marked on the outside of the case. Under this paragraph the person whose name appears on the outside of the case as the grower or packer of the fruit shall be deemed to be the person responsible.

Mr. Ferguson: And very necessary, too.

The MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE: It is very necessary. The man being charged is aware of this; he is not suddenly faced with the charge that he is the grower or packer of the fruit. He knows that the person whose name appears on the case is held to be the responsible person. It is not unusual, for it obtains to-day. This is the way in which the owner is identified.

Mr. MARSHALL: The paragraph contains a little more than the Minister admits. It provides that the person whose name is marked on a case shall be deemed to be the grower or packer of the fruit until the contrary is proved. Under that paragraph, a man is charged with being, say, the packer, and then the department says to him, "You must now prove that you are not."

Mr. Thorn: There are two persons concerned: the packer buys the fruit from the grower.

Mr. MARSHALL: I do not object to the department charging a man with being the grower or the packer; what I object to is that they should say to him, "You may now prove, if you can, that you are not either the packer or the grower."

Mr. Tonkin: You object to the onus of proof being placed on the man charged.

Mr. MARSHALL: Yes, it is a wrong principle. Under this, a man could be persecuted by an officious inspector. I move an amendment—

That all words after "fruit," in line 4 of paragraph (b), be struck out.

The MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE: The hon. member is under a misapprehension. If these words were struck out, it would prevent an innocent person from proving that he was not guilty.

Mr. Ferguson: Lacking these words, he would be guilty without trial.

The MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE: That is so. It would rob him of his defence. Given the opportunity provided by the words proposed to be struck out, he might be able to prove that he was not the responsible per-

son. Whatever there may be against the clause as a whole, the words proposed to be struck out constitute a safeguard.

Mr. THORN: First of all, the grower markets the fruit. He is compelled by regulation to place his name on the case. It is then purchased by the packer, who may alter the contents of the case, may make it an assorted case, or may be careless in packing and send out the case in an unsanitary condition. But there might be a purchaser from the packer, and he again may alter the contents of the case. So, if the case were found to be in an unsanitary condition, it would be a question of who sent it out in that condition. The inspector would go to the grower who, from his account sales, would prove that he had sold the case to a packer who, in turn, would prove that he had sold the case to a third person. So I think the words proposed to be struck out are very necessary to the accused person. There are bound to be many instances of that kind. Not until an inquiry is made by the inspector will proof of the guilty party be obtained.

Mr. SAMPSON: It is unfair that the original packer of the fruit should carry the responsibility for the contents of the case throughout its life. The difficulty might be overcome by stencilling a date upon the case, or by a regulation being framed whereby an obligation is cast upon the first buyer of the fruit to cancel the label or the stencil on the case.

Mr. FERGUSON: The amendment would place growers in a very invidious position. They must be given the opportunity to prove their innocence of any charge the inspector may bring against them. Every case must be branded with the name of the grower, and it cannot be used a second time unless the original brands are removed. If the brands are not removed a charge may be laid against the wrong person, who must be at liberty to prove that he is not guilty.

Hon. N. KEENAN: The Minister is quite right in insisting upon the inclusion of these words. If the amendment were carried, it would render almost impossible the task of inspection.

Mr. MARSHALL: The person whose name is marked on the case as the grower is deemed to be the grower or packer of the contents. Once that has been determined, it becomes possible for the inspector to prosecute him. When he has been prose-

cuted he waits for the accuser to prove that he is the grower, and then he in turn can offer his proof that he is not the grower. What the Minister wants is that the inspector may accuse the man first, and that the man shall then defend himself.

Mr. Moloney: What else would he do?

Mr. MARSHALL: The hon. member has been about 10 minutes in Parliament and knows all about these things. A principle is contained in this that I have always fought against. I will ask no person to be obliged to go into court to prove his innocence because someone makes a charge against him. Let the accuser first prove his own case! If these words are struck out, and a person is deemed to be the grower or packer and is charged with an offence as such, will not the accused person have the right to defend himself?

Mr. Moloney: He is not prevented from doing so.

Mr. MARSHALL: Into only two Acts has a provision of this nature been admitted.

Hon N. KEENAN: I am not in charge of the Bill, but I assume the Minister's permission to reply to the member for Murchison. If the clause is passed as printed, the effect will be that a person whose name is marked on the outside of the case as the grower or packer of fruit will be *prima facie* deemed to be the grower or packer, but will have the opportunity of proving that he is not. If the clause is passed in the form suggested by the member for Murchison, the grower or packer whose name is marked on the outside of the case as the grower or packer will be deemed to be the grower or packer of such fruit; and that means, conclusively. The fact that the name is on the outside will then be conclusive, and not *prima facie* evidence at all. Probably the defendant might be permitted by the magistrate, notwithstanding such extraordinary language, to prove his innocence; but strictly the language would be conclusive. If the member for Murchison desires, as I know he does, that innocent persons shall have every opportunity to prove their innocence, his amendment will not have that effect, but the very opposite. The effect of the retention of the words will be to protect the innocent.

Mr. WISE: Why should the grower or packer alone be responsible? The grower or packer may be a re-packer.

Mr. Latham: There is provision made for the re-packer already.

Mr. WISE: Then the whole clause is unnecessary.

Amendment put and negatived.

Clause put and passed.

Clause 5, Title—agreed to.

Bill reported with amendments.

*House adjourned at 9.17 p.m.*

## Legislative Council,

*Wednesday, 4th October, 1933*

	PAGE
Bills: Wiluna Water Board Loan Guarantee, 3R. ...	1194
Tenants, Purchasers, and Mortgagors' Relief Act Amendment, 2R. Com. ...	1194
Southern Cross Southwards Railway, 2R. ...	1201
Police Act Amendment, 2R. ...	1214

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

### BILL—WILUNA WATER BOARD LOAN GUARANTEE.

Read a third time and *passed*.

### BILL—TENANTS, PURCHASERS AND MORTGAGORS' RELIEF ACT AMENDMENT.

*Second Reading.*

Debate resumed from the previous day.

HON. H. SEDDON (North-East) [4.35]: It is rather interesting to review the legislation that is being continually brought forward arising out of the depression, and to refer back to the report of the select committee that dealt with the Act that will be amended by the Bill before the House. In the course of their report, the members of the select committee made strong reference to the effect that the measure would