

Legislative Council.

Wednesday, 15th September, 1948.

CONTENTS.

	Page
Address-in-reply, presentation	1054
Question : Gold, as to requesting increased price	1054
Motions : Electricity Act, to disallow radio workers' regulations	1054
Electricity Act, to disallow cinematograph operators' regulations	1064
Bills : Prices Control, Assembly's message	1068
Building Operations and Building Materials Control Act Amendment (Continuance), 1r.	1064
Interpretation Act Amendment, report	1066
Brands Act Amendment, 2r.	1067
Prevention of Cruelty to Animals Act Amendment, 2r., Com.	1067
Gold Buyers Act Amendment, 2r.	1068
Marriage Act Amendment, 2r., Com. report	1068
Registration of Births, Deaths and Marriages Act Amendment, 2r., Com. report	1068
Land Alienation Restriction Act Amendment (Continuance), 2r., Com. report	1069
Feeding Stuffs Act Amendment, 2r.	1071
Fisheries Act Amendment (Continuance), 2r., Com. report	1075
Factories and Shops Act Amendment, 2r.	1078
Licensing Act Amendment, 2r....	1078

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

ADDRESS-IN-REPLY.

Presentation.

The PRESIDENT: I have to announce that, in company with several members, I waited on His Excellency the Governor and presented the Address-in-reply to His Excellency's Speech. His Excellency has been pleased to make the following reply:—

Mr. President and members of the Legislative Council: I thank you for your expressions of loyalty to His Most Gracious Majesty the King and for your Address-in-reply to the Speech with which I opened Parliament.

(Sgd.) James Mitchell,
Governor.

QUESTION.

GOLD.

As to Requesting Increased Price.

Hon. G. W. MILES asked the Honorary Minister for Agriculture:

Has the attention of the Government been drawn to the statement appearing in "The Daily News" of Saturday, the 11th September, under the heading "Murchison Gold Towns 'Dying' "? If so, will the Government take immediate steps to urge the Commonwealth Government to increase the price of gold in order to save the gold-mining industry of this State?

The HONORARY MINISTER replied—

Yes. The State Government early this year, in collaboration with the Chamber of Mines, put the case for assistance to the goldmining industry before the Commonwealth Government. Again recently, at the State Government's request, the matter was fully discussed at the Premiers' Conference at Canberra.

The Commonwealth Government has advised that the price of gold is determined by the International Monetary Fund, of which Australia is a member, and that the only unlimited buyer of gold is the United States of America. The latter country is not prepared to pay an increased price.

The Commonwealth Government has further advised that it is prepared to consider applications for assistance from individual mines claiming to be marginal. It has already approved of assistance to three Kalgoorlie companies and is considering a fourth, a Murchison one.

In the case of Triton, the Commonwealth Government was not prepared to further assist because it claimed that the mine was quickly approaching the end of its economic life. The Commonwealth Government had financially assisted it during, and since the end of, the war.

The Wiluna mine closed down because its payable ore bodies were exhausted. Financial assistance by both the State and Commonwealth Governments was rendered it to permit of all useful arsenical ore being raised before closure took place.

MOTION—ELECTRICITY ACT.

To Disallow Radio Workers' Regulations.

Debate resumed from the previous day on the following motion by Hon. A. L. Loton—

That Regulations Nos. 113, 117, 118, 119, 123, 124, 129, 130, 131, 132, 138, 139 and 142 made under the Electricity Act, 1945, as published in the "Government Gazette" of the

25th March, 1948, and laid on the Table of the House on the 27th July, 1948, be and are hereby disallowed.

HON. G. FRASER (West) [4.39]: I oppose the motion. For the life of me I cannot see why the hon. member should have moved to disallow the regulations. They appeal to me as being quite fair and reasonable, and I think that a quick run through them will prove that statement to be correct. The first regulation sought to be disallowed is No. 113, which merely empowers the Commission to remove any member of the board. I consider that the Commission ought to have that power if a member of a board is not doing a satisfactory job. When we consider of whom the board consists, and that it includes a representative of the employers and of the employees, I think we can agree that the Commission should have the right to remove any of these persons.

Hon. A. L. Loton: Who makes the appointments?

Hon. G. FRASER: The Minister.

Hon. A. L. Loton: No, the Electricity Commission does.

Hon. G. FRASER: The Electricity Commission does not make the appointments to the board. I said that the Minister did; but the Commission appoints its representatives to the board and the other interests appoint theirs. So the Commission should have the right to overrule any person not doing his job. Regulation 117 reads—

Application to be examined under this Part shall be made on Form No. 21 in the Appendix hereto. The examination shall consist of a general knowledge of the section or sections appropriate to the license of which the applicant has made application, and in the cases of applications for licenses for Radio Servicemen, General Servicemen, Workshop Servicemen and Bench Assemblers, a knowledge of the safety principles of electricity. Licenses may be issued by the Board in respect of the following sections:—

The regulation then sets out three sections. What objection can anyone make to that? Surely no-one can object to the form on which the application is to be made, or take exception to the fact that the examination is only one on general knowledge of the section or sections appropriate to the license which is applied for! The next regulation—No. 118—reads—

The examination for a Radio Worker's License may at the discretion of the Board

consist of written, practical and oral tests of such nature and scope as the Board considers necessary.

Hon. A. L. Loton: On a point of order, I think the hon. member is referring to the regulations gazetted on the 27th June, 1947, and not to the new regulations published in the "Government Gazette" on the 25th March, 1948.

The PRESIDENT: That is not a point of order, but a correction.

Hon. G. FRASER: I have a copy of the regulations, and I can only be guided by the notice paper and the numbers set out therein. If the hon. member will let me have his copy of the regulations, I will deal with them.

Hon. A. L. Loton: You might as well speak on fact instead of fallacy.

Hon. G. FRASER: The regulations are so nearly alike that it is a case of Tweedledum and Tweedledee.

Hon. A. L. Loton: That shows how much notice was taken of our disallowance of the regulations last session!

Hon. G. FRASER: Regulation 113 and Regulation 117 are the same in this list as those I have read out. No. 118 is the same as I have already quoted.

Hon. A. L. Loton: No, it is not.

Hon. G. FRASER: Regulation 118 reads—

Examinations for Radio Workers' Licenses shall consist of written practical and/or oral tests; and such examinations shall be held at such times and places as may be required.

If that is not the same as what I have previously read—

Hon. A. L. Loton: The wording is different.

Hon. G. FRASER: Regulation 123 is the same. I do not think that anyone will disagree with it. It says—

No license shall be issued under this Part in contravention of any award issued by a Court of Industrial Arbitration.

We all realise that the Arbitration Court should be the supreme body so far as anything of that description is concerned. If regulations issued by some body contravene an award issued by the Arbitration Court, the Arbitration Court award should prevail.

I see no reason for the disallowance of that regulation. No. 124 reads—

After a period of twelve months from the gazettal of these regulations, no license will be issued under this Part unless the applicant can produce proof of having had five years' experience in the radio trade. A period of experience in radio work in any of the services during the recent war shall be taken into account when assessing total experience.

I think that is a very generous gesture. I see nothing wrong with a person's having to serve not five years' apprenticeship but five years in the trade. A man can enter the trade as a junior worker and, so long as he has had five years' experience, he does not have to be articulated, but can sit for the examination. Furthermore, if a man has had a period in the Services, that will be taken into consideration. What could be fairer than that? Regulation 129 reads—

Any candidate who fails to pass an examination under this Part may be issued with a license or permit confining the validity of the license or permit to such conditions as may be endorsed thereon.

I can see nothing wrong with that either. It provides the hon. member with something he is after. It gives the candidate who fails to pass an examination the right to work. Yet the hon. member objects to it. I gathered from the tone of his remarks that he wants to do away with all examinations so that anybody can enter the trade.

Hon. Sir Charles Latham: That has been the case in the past.

Hon. G. FRASER: What has been the case in the past is that these regulations, or similar ones, have been in operation for years.

Hon. A. Thomson: That does not say they are right.

Hon. G. FRASER: When electricity supply was under the control of the Public Works Department, exactly similar regulations were in force.

Hon. A. Thomson: Not all of them.

Hon. G. FRASER: When the Electricity Commission took over the job, it was necessary to gazette new regulations, and these are almost a copy of others that were in operation for many years. No objection has ever been taken to them, except in this Chamber last year.

Hon. H. Tuckey: Did the Public Works Department conduct examinations?

Hon. G. FRASER: Yes. I have had cases of men who had been five years in the trade and were not apprenticed, but they were examined by the Public Works Department. That was pre-war. So examinations were held when the Public Works Department had charge. The next regulation is No. 130. It reads—

(1) Every application for a Radio Workers' License shall be made on Form S.E.C. 21 or S.E.C. 21A; with the original application for any license a fee of 2s. 6d. shall be paid.

I do not think anybody can object very much to that. In Clause (2) various charges are set out in connection with the issuing of licenses. The fees are small. I think the highest is about 10s., and I do not feel that anybody could raise any valid objection on the ground of financial obstacles. Regulation 131 reads—

The license of any radio worker may be suspended or revoked by the Board if the licensee has been convicted of any offence against these regulations.

I admit that is a pretty wide power because some offences might be of a minor character. However, the position is safeguarded by the provision that the worker may be suspended or have his license revoked. So if the offence is a minor one, a minor penalty could be imposed and not necessarily the cancellation of the license. I do not suppose that any member would seek to defend someone who had committed breaches of the regulations or argue that he should not be fined or otherwise dealt with. I can see no great objection to that regulation. Regulation 132 states—

Before suspending or revoking any license the Board shall cause to be sent to the holder thereof by registered letter a statement of its intention and shall afford him an opportunity to give an explanation, personally or in writing. Every person whose license has been revoked shall forward such license to the Board within 14 days of such revocation.

I can see nothing wrong with that. Only last night I took the Honorary Minister to task because some individual had something taken from him without having been given an opportunity to make his explanation. I am in favour of this regulation which lays down that the man concerned shall be given the opportunity to defend himself before sentence is passed upon him. Surely the hon. member does not wish to take away the right of any man to defend himself. I see no reason why that regulation should be disallowed. Regulation 138 states—

Any person to whom a license has not been granted or to whom a renewal of a license has been refused may appeal to the Commission.

That is something else of which I think the hon. member should be in favour, instead of wishing to delete it. It gives the right of appeal to the Commission against the board's refusal to issue a license or renew a license. Regulation 139 states—

Any person who produces evidence satisfactory to the Board of having been registered or licensed as a Radio Worker by any State authority in any other State of the Commonwealth of Australia may be licensed under this Part.

I see no objection to that. If a man has been doing the job in another State, why should we shut him out here?

Hon. A. Thomson: Why not make it read "shall"?

Hon. G. FRASER: I am prepared to leave that decision to the board because there may be certain things about which it wishes to be satisfied. The board may wish to ascertain that the person concerned has done the work he claims to have done. "Shall" would make it mandatory, and I think the board should be given that discretion.

Hon. A. Thomson: You know that we cannot amend any of the regulations.

Hon. G. FRASER: Why cut out those that are of benefit?

The Honorary Minister for Agriculture: We need not disallow the lot of them.

Hon. G. FRASER: Why disallow those that favour the people for whom the hon. member is agitating?

Hon. A. L. Loton: This gives members a chance to debate the regulations.

Hon. G. FRASER: Regulation 142 reads—

The Board may appoint any Technical College, Institution or Association which carries out examinations for Proficiency Certificates for Radio Workers to conduct examinations or supplementary examinations for the Board under such conditions and terms as the Board may arrange.

There is an extra provision made for these people to qualify. I can see no objection to that. How can the hon. member object to a provision of that description? Those are the regulations that the hon. member seeks to have disallowed, but I can see no

objection to any of them. It must be remembered that this is a dangerous trade.

Hon. Sir Charles Latham: In what way is it dangerous?

Hon. G. FRASER: We must provide protection for the public.

Hon. Sir Charles Latham: These men are not allowed to handle electricity.

Hon. G. FRASER: We must provide protection for the men themselves. Quite a lot of people are dead today because they tried to look after themselves in matters such as this. We do not want every Tom, Dick and Harry messing about with work of this kind.

Hon. Sir Charles Latham: You know that the sets will not be connected with the current.

Hon. G. FRASER: Whenever radio workers have a job to do there is a likelihood of their coming into contact with current, and there should be some board with standards that the people in the trade must observe. There have been examples in the past of how dangerous this work is.

Hon. A. Thomson: Give us the examples.

Hon. G. FRASER: I can quote two or three cases of deaths through faulty installations. Radio workers and electricians are so closely allied that there is not much difference between the two.

Hon. Sir Charles Latham: You know radio workers are not allowed to touch anything connected with electricity.

Hon. G. FRASER: I know they do so when they are on the job, and the hon. member knows it also.

Hon. Sir Charles Latham: I do not.

Hon. G. FRASER: Let the hon. member get a radio worker to do a job for him, and see what is done. That man can do whatever is necessary in any house to which he goes.

Hon. L. A. Logan: Then he is breaking the law.

The Honorary Minister for Agriculture: He does not do any more than does the person who owns the machine.

Hon. G. FRASER: That is the point I am getting at. There are few of these jobs that can be done without some contact with electricity.

Hon. A. L. Loton: Could he be killed by a six volt current?

Hon. G. FRASER: There have been instances of people fiddling round with electricity, which have resulted in death.

Hon. A. L. Loton: That is what you are doing with these regulations, fiddling with them.

Hon. G. FRASER: Some of the jobs from which death has resulted may have been done by men who knew the work, the danger lying in faulty installation. There was the case of the little boy who ran into a fence when riding his bicycle along Mounts Bay-road.

Hon. Sir Charles Latham: What has that to do with radio work?

Hon. G. FRASER: It shows that anyone who fiddles with anything to which electricity is connected is doing a dangerous job. Then there is the case of the woman who was killed at Osborne Park. Another fatality was at Leederville where the job was done by a son who was an apprentice of five years' standing.

Hon. A. L. Loton: These workers do not interfere with electric irons.

Hon. G. FRASER: If such a thing could happen where the boy had had five years' experience of electricity, what could happen in the case of men with no experience of it?

Hon. Sir Charles Latham: If that is your argument, let us stop using electricity.

Hon. G. FRASER: It is not my argument, but I think we should support the body that has set out to examine the men or issue licenses to those who are able to do the job safely. We should support that course not only from the public point of view but from that of the men concerned. Members should examine each regulation separately and see whether they can honestly discover any objection to it. If members do that, I have no doubt what the decision of this House will be. I oppose the motion.

THE HONORARY MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE (Hon. G. B. Wood—East) [4.57]: The mover for the disallowance of these regulations put up no case at all. He did not mention any of the regulations but

built his case on the fact that he objected to control and various other things relating to the regulations and—from memory—the right or desirability of the Electricity Commission coming into this sort of thing. I see little harm in these regulations. The only member who has examined them thoroughly during the debate is Mr. Fraser. I think members must have been convinced by what he had to say. While a lot of good could come from the regulations, no harm could result from them. Though there may be some difference of opinion about one or two of them, that does not prove that they are all undesirable. It is hard for me to agree with those who say there is no link between radio work and electricity. I do not think there is any doubt about it and I do not believe those members know much about the question.

Hon. Sir Charles Latham: Tell us what the link is.

The **HONORARY MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE**: I have been in workshops where such work was going on. Radio is electricity, and that is the link. The worker must come in contact with electricity in some way when engaged on radio work. The State Electricity Commission was constituted in April, 1946, under the State Electricity Commission Act, No. 6 of 1945. It is the statutory authority in connection with all electrical administration, generation and distribution in Western Australia, resultant upon which the Commission is required to give effect to the provisions of the Electricity Act, No. 19 of 1945, which superseded the Electricity Act, No. 45 of 1937, and provides for the promulgation of regulations and bylaws, subject to the Governor's approval, for facilitating the operation of the Acts.

With the advent of the Commission, the regulations, which had been made under the Electricity Act of 1937 and had been administered by the Public Works Department acting on the advice of the Electricity Advisory Committee, had to be re-gazetted. The opportunity was taken, therefore, to amend such regulations as had caused difficulty from the standpoint of interpretation and to give effect to the requests of various organisations by the inclusion of additional regulations to cover the advancement made in the various sections of the

electrical trade. That is the main point. These regulations were made necessary in order to cover the very considerable advance that we all know has taken place in connection with electricity. They were necessary to cover radio workers to a very great extent, as Mr. Fraser has already pointed out, and we cannot have the radio without electricity.

For the most part, the regulations included in the gazettal were first drafted at the request of the parties immediately concerned, were submitted to the Crown Law Department and were approved by the Executive Council in accordance with the procedures laid down, the Commission's main functions during such actions being based on the requirements of the Acts and the protection and safety of the public generally. I want to emphasise that point—they were for the protection and safety of the public generally as well as of the workers concerned.

As far as the radio workers' board regulations are concerned, these, while being new regulations, do not introduce a new system of licensing, as those connected with the radio trade previously were required to take out a license issued under the authority of the Electrical Workers' Board, but they did, at the request of interested parties, place the control of such radio workers under a board more conversant with the desires of the trade. Thus there is nothing new about that. The radio workers had to take out a license under the old board and there is the link up.

Hon. A. Thomson: They may have got a fairer deal from that board.

The HONORARY MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE: A brief history of the radio workers' regulations indicates that a deputation representing the Radio Traders' Association, the Radio Trades Union and the Association of Radio Technicians approached the Under Secretary for Works during August, 1944, resultant upon which radio workers were recognised—I hope members will listen particularly to what I am saying—as coming within the scope of the definition of "electrical worker" and protection was afforded them by the issue of an endorsed "B" grade license by the Electrical Workers' Board.

Hon. G. Fraser: You cannot divorce them from coming under the definition of "electrical worker."

The HONORARY MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE: Of course not, and I am showing that there is nothing new about this. On Monday, the 5th August, 1946, in view of the formation of the Commission and also the fact that the Electrical Workers' Board had amended its definition of "electrical worker" to exclude radio workers and thereby give them the right of their own control, the Commission called a meeting to discuss draft regulations to cover the interests of the radio trade. This meeting was attended by Mr. Orr, the secretary of the Electricity Commission, Mr. McMahon for the radio technicians, Mr. F. Beames for the radio traders and Messrs. Kitcher and Massingham for the Radio Union. The general discussion that took place gave rise to the regulations that were gazetted under the Electricity Act in 1947.

The regulations provide for the appointment of a radio workers' board to be comprised of one member representing the Commission who was to be the chairman, one member representing the employers of radio workers and one member representing the radio workers, such board being appointed for a period of three years. The solidity of the support of these regulations was later emphasised by the bodies mentioned and, additionally, by representatives of the Institution of Radio Engineers when they collectively approached the Minister and earnestly solicited his support for the retention of the gazetted regulations. That the regulations were disallowed is now an acknowledged set-back to all concerned and even at this stage it is difficult to ascertain any definite motive that created opposition, unless those opposing them were not appreciative of the purport of the regulations as a whole and based their opposition on a single point here and there, little realising that the regulations are administered for collective interpretation rather than by single phrases or regulations. I think that is very true.

I do not think that those who opposed the regulations were really appreciative of the position. I agree that there might be one or two regulations to which some objection might be taken, but the attitude on the part of those who opposed them was to do away with the whole lot.

Hon. E. H. Gray: And that was not reasonable.

THE HONORARY MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE: It was not. Those who opposed them did not understand the position nor did they appreciate the great benefits to be conferred upon the people concerned. The board has carefully watched the effect of the introduction of the radio regulations and the interests of personnel already recognised as being in the trade. Very few of the older servicemen can claim the advantage of having served an apprenticeship, but they have acquired their knowledge by practical work and experience over the years. Indeed, they have grown up with the trade till it is now so placed that junior workers and apprentices are able to reap the benefit of their work and organisation. To insist that the older personnel should qualify for license by examination appeared unfair, so the board decided to accept a period of experience in the trade, inclusive of war service if any, as being sufficient to enable it to grant a license without examination. We have always insisted upon experience in a trade being necessary.

Hon. Sir Charles Latham: No-one objects to that.

Hon. G. Fraser: The hon. member himself objected to it.

The HONORARY MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE: What could be fairer than what I have outlined?

Hon. Sir Charles Latham: No-one is objecting to it.

Hon. A. Thomson: The Commission did not put it into practice, and that is the trouble.

The HONORARY MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE: How does the hon. member know that? The Commission is not out to hamper the work of the industry but is doing everything possible to safeguard the situation. Those who in their keenness for radio generally have become members of recognised institutes, are also granted licenses without examination if the institutes support their claims of practical experience, while University graduates who have majored in electronics, trainees and probationers under the rehabilitation scheme are also subject to special consideration.

All these people are covered by a special regulation which enables them to make application within a prescribed time, thereby exempting them from the general provisions of the remaining regulations which, in time, will require applicants to submit proof of apprenticeship, or of a specified term of training before permission can be granted for them to acquire a license by examination. It is generally thought that the regulations as framed and re-gazetted by the Commission will meet the desires of all organisations connected with the trade. I think I need say no more than that. I submit that no case was made out by Mr. Loton for the disallowance of the regulations. One or two of them may not be altogether desirable, but there is no justification for disallowing them in toto. I oppose the motion.

HON. SIR CHARLES LATHAM (East) [5.10]: I certainly believe we should have in this industry trained men. I do not object to that, but I do object to the Electricity Commission being the judge whether men should be trained or not.

Hon. G. Fraser: It is not.

Hon. Sir CHARLES LATHAM: The Commission appoints the board, which is under its control. I want to correct the statement by the Minister who said that radio workers come under the heading of electrical workers.

The Honorary Minister for Agriculture: They used to. I made that plain; you could not have heard me when I referred to that point. They do not come under it now.

Hon. Sir CHARLES LATHAM: It is most remarkable that people who have been engaged in radio work and in repairing radio sets have made complaints about this matter and have written no end of letters to members of Parliament. Perhaps the Minister himself has received some.

The Honorary Minister for Agriculture: No, I have not.

Hon. Sir CHARLES LATHAM: Possibly the people concerned considered they could not convert the Minister. From the material supplied to me, I think the regulations are unnecessary.

The Honorary Minister for Agriculture: Would you read some of the letters the radio workers have written to you?

Hon. Sir CHARLES LATHAM: Yes.

The Honorary Minister for Agriculture: Then will you do so?

Hon. Sir CHARLES LATHAM: If the President would allow me to go outside so that I could get them, I would be prepared to do so.

Hon. G. Fraser: I did not get one.

Hon. Sir CHARLES LATHAM: The hon. member knows I cannot leave my place to get the letters. In my opinion, this is a matter of union control and the whole thing originated in the Trades Hall. I make that statement because of information supplied to me.

The Honorary Minister for Agriculture: You should produce your information. It is useless making a bald statement like that.

Hon. Sir CHARLES LATHAM: The Minister knows that I cannot leave my seat to get the letters, and I regard his interjection as a cheap jibe.

The Honorary Minister for Agriculture: It is not.

Hon. Sir CHARLES LATHAM: Of course it is.

The Honorary Minister for Agriculture: You make a statement, but you do not produce any proof.

Hon. Sir CHARLES LATHAM: If the Minister doubts my word—

The Honorary Minister for Agriculture: I do not.

Hon. Sir CHARLES LATHAM: I shall not give him an opportunity to do that because, when I get the letters I shall read them.

Hon. G. Fraser: We do not doubt your word, but we want the information.

Hon. Sir CHARLES LATHAM: I will produce the information later. It will interest members to know what is meant by "electrical worker." The definition in the regulations is as follows:—

"Electrical worker" means any person engaged on electrical work if such is connected to or is to be connected to a pressure exceeding 40 volts, and includes any person who alters and/or repairs any electrical apparatus, any person who fits any electrical apparatus to any cord, cable, or wire or terminal, any person who connects or disconnects any electrical apparatus from any fixed wiring where such fixed wiring is subject to a pressure exceeding 40 volts.

The term shall not include any person who is required to hold a license under the Electricity Act Regulations as a cinematograph operator, or a radio worker, to the extent of where such electrical work is confined to the operation of the apparatus covered by such license.

So, under the definition, the radio worker is excluded from being an electrical worker. If you, Mr. President, had lived in the country, as I have, you would know that we frequently have to take our radio sets apart.

The Honorary Minister for Agriculture: And put them together again?

Hon. Sir CHARLES LATHAM: Yes.

The Honorary Minister for Agriculture: I have tried that, but could not do it.

Hon. Sir CHARLES LATHAM: That was to the disadvantage of the Minister himself. Had he been on a farm as long as I have, he would be able to do it.

The Honorary Minister for Agriculture: Radio work is not included in farm technique.

Hon. Sir CHARLES LATHAM: The people concerned are not permitted to touch any wiring. What is covered by the regulation is the handling of receiving sets and so on. On former occasions we have agreed to a number of stupid regulations and, if I may be permitted to mention one, I would refer to that which prevents any householder from attaching a washer to a tap in his house. He must call in a qualified plumber to undertake the task.

Hon. R. J. Boylen: Have you always done that?

Hon. Sir CHARLES LATHAM: Washers cost about 3d. a dozen, and it would involve an expenditure of at least 7s. 6d. to secure the services of a plumber to put one on a tap—merely because the regulations say that must be done.

Hon. R. M. Forrest: More like £1.

Hon. Sir CHARLES LATHAM: It all depends upon where one lives. There is a plumber who lives close to me and he does the work for 7s. 6d.

Hon. R. J. Boylen: Do you never do the work yourself?

Hon. Sir CHARLES LATHAM: No. I would not break a regulation for anyone. What is the use of asking Parliament to adopt regulations if members themselves break them? I think that is awful!

The Honorary Minister for Agriculture: Stick to the radio workers.

Hon. Sir CHARLES LATHAM: I do not like opposing the Minister, but doubtless he has been advised by the Commission. I consider these regulations to be unnecessary. There are many geniuses; I have seen lads at school making radio sets.

Hon. A. Thomson: Yes.

Hon. Sir CHARLES LATHAM: They make the sets for themselves.

Hon. E. H. Gray: Not for sale?

Hon. Sir CHARLES LATHAM: No. What risk do people, other than the workers, take? Answer that! They take a risk which is hardly one at all. I was highly amused at Mr. Fraser's effort to bolster up his case by telling the House about a little girl who ran against a wire, and about a young fellow who was electrocuted while repairing an iron. He had the cord connected to a high-voltage supply. People who do that sort of thing will certainly be killed. He was probably a qualified lad; as far as I remember, he was an apprentice. As I pointed out in connection with another set of regulations, the danger is just about as great as that which a woman runs when she connects her iron to a point, or when she uses an electric stove. Are we going to make every householder pass an examination set by a board typical of the one in question? If so, the whole position will be ridiculous.

The Honorary Minister for Agriculture: This is not comparable with an electric stove.

Hon. Sir CHARLES LATHAM: I challenge the Minister. I shall make this statement and we shall check it: There have been far more deaths resulting from accidents while using electric irons than there have been in connection with radio sets.

Hon. G. Fraser: Because of protective regulations.

Hon. Sir CHARLES LATHAM: Oh, that is it! Many people do not know the regulations exist. They do not know they must not go to the next-door neighbour to get a wireless set repaired.

The Honorary Minister for Agriculture: It is a pity there are not a few regulations covering electric irons.

Hon. Sir CHARLES LATHAM: Let us regulate everything! I am tired of regulations. At one time we were a free people.

The Honorary Minister for Agriculture: What about the regulations under the Health Act?

Hon. Sir CHARLES LATHAM: I have implicit faith in the present Government, but it is going to control us more and more.

Hon. E. M. Heenan: When was that happy time?

Hon. Sir CHARLES LATHAM: It was before the hon. member was born, but I recollect it. I recall that I could do many things then that I am not permitted to do today. I also recollect that I could drive a motorcar without being licensed.

The Honorary Minister for Agriculture: Do not forget that we live longer now than people did then!

Hon. Sir CHARLES LATHAM: Not on account of regulations, but because of medical science.

The Honorary Minister for Agriculture: That is wrapped up with regulations.

Hon. Sir CHARLES LATHAM: Wrapped up with regulations?

The Honorary Minister for Agriculture: Of course it is. What about the Health Department?

Hon. Sir CHARLES LATHAM: What does the Honorary Minister mean?

The Honorary Minister for Agriculture: Because under the Health Act you must do certain things.

Hon. Sir CHARLES LATHAM: When I came on this earth there were no registered midwives. I was brought into the world by an unregistered midwife, as I dare say many other old people were. Does the Honorary Minister mean to tell me that children are any better today because of the registration of midwives?

The PRESIDENT: Order! We are discussing the regulations sought to be disallowed.

Hon. Sir CHARLES LATHAM: I have been led astray by the Honorary Minister. He gets me into trouble, but I shall not let him do so in future. We are seeking to control everything by regulation. The more we regulate people, the less chance will this country have of progressing.

Hon. A. Thomson: Hear, hear!

Hon. Sir CHARLES LATHAM: Do not make any mistake; the more restrictions that are placed on people, the less will they attempt to do the things that were done by

people in the past. These regulations will not help anyone. All they will do will be to restrict the number of people to be employed in this class of work. The regulations originated from people whose idea was to make a close preserve for themselves.

The Honorary Minister for Agriculture: Oh!

Hon. Sir CHARLES LATHAM: I can quite understand the Minister defending the Commission. That is what he is here for, and I am not blaming him. He did not sign these regulations; they were probably signed by the Minister for Works. The Honorary Minister has put up a good defence for the Minister for Works; I give him that credit. However, it will be of no avail as far as I am concerned. Give the people freedom. If these regulations were designed to protect people from danger, I would be the first to support them. But there is no danger whatever. There is no more danger in this work than there is to a woman who plugs in her wireless set or iron to a power point or a light point, whichever she uses.

Hon. E. H. Gray: Who is to judge whether they are competent?

Hon. Sir CHARLES LATHAM: Now we are getting at what the regulations mean! Who is to judge whether they are competent? Probably in the mind of my friend, Mr. Gray, the incompetent person is the individual who does not belong to a trade union. One does not need to be a trade unionist in order to be a competent person.

The Honorary Minister for Agriculture: There is nothing about trade unionists in the regulations.

Hon. Sir CHARLES LATHAM: Mr. Gray suggests that the regulations would make the workers more competent. A person who has the initiative to learn how to handle a receiving set is probably much more highly qualified than a person who passes an examination. The world is no better off because of people who pass examinations. I have known many highly qualified people who have failed at examinations. One of the best doctors in the world failed to pass examinations.

The Honorary Minister for Agriculture: This is quite a new theory. Do you say doctors ought not to pass examinations?

Hon. Sir CHARLES LATHAM: I did not say anything of the sort. What an awful

man the Honorary Minister is becoming! I know of one instance. I will give the Honorary Minister a book to read about a doctor who became very highly qualified, but could not pass examinations.

The Honorary Minister for Agriculture: Where was he allowed to practise?

The PRESIDENT: The hon. member had better stick to the regulations.

Hon. Sir CHARLES LATHAM: Yes. I can take a wireless set to pieces and put it together again.

The Honorary Minister for Agriculture: We are not all as clever as you are.

Hon. Sir CHARLES LATHAM: But I would not be permitted to do so under these regulations, as I would first have to pass an examination. I would have no more hope of doing so than I would of flying from Perth to Melbourne without wings.

On motion by Hon. C. H. Simpson, debate adjourned.

BILL—PRICES CONTROL.

Assembly's Message.

Message from the Assembly received and read notifying that it had agreed to amendments Nos. 1, 2, 3 and 5, and had disagreed to No. 4.

In Committee.

Hon. J. A. Dimmitt in the Chair; the Honorary Minister for Agriculture in charge of the Bill.

No. 4—Clause 12, page 5: Delete subparagraph (iii) of paragraph (d) as contained in lines 37 to 42, inclusive.

The CHAIRMAN: The Assembly's reason for disagreeing is—

That it is advisable for the Commissioner to have authority to give all pertinent information to the Commissioner of Taxation where he considers the revenue of the Crown is being or has been defrauded.

The HONORARY MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE: I move—

That the amendment be not insisted on.

There are various reasons why the Council should not insist on its amendment. One is that the other House has accepted all our amendments except this. I have examined the amendment since and find that little harm will be done if we do not insist upon it. Another reason is that we run

a big risk of not getting this measure on the statute book if it is not passed quickly. I hope the Committee will not insist on the amendment.

Hon. C. F. BAXTER: The Minister has given a very weak reason for not insisting on the amendment. The position is that various Government departments are now being called upon to do extra work by supplying information to the Taxation Department. The principle is wrong and should not be tolerated. I share the Minister's view that there is danger of losing the Bill if the Committee insists on the amendment. However, I am not going to force the issue, as I realise we have secured the majority of the amendments made by the Council. Far more than that, I do not know that I would get any support at all. I regret that we have included a provision in this Act whereby the efforts of persons appointed under the measure will be diverted to another department, which has every power to exercise its own functions. I do not wish to protect anyone who is evading taxation.

Hon. G. Fraser: That is what you are doing.

Hon. C. F. BAXTER: When such a person is caught he pays dearly for his evasions. I regret that I have to submit to the motion moved by the Honorary Minister.

Hon. G. FRASER: I hope the Committee will not insist on the amendment. Whether intentionally or otherwise, it really protects rogues.

Hon. C. F. Baxter: That does not come into it at all.

Hon. G. FRASER: I think it does.

Hon. C. F. Baxter: Not to my mind.

Hon. G. FRASER: I do not think it is intentional, but that is what this amendment does. I am sorry that this is the only amendment that has come back. I believe we would have had more if the two little baby bears down below had not been frightened of the big bad wolf!

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The hon. member must not reflect on the actions of members in another place.

Hon. C. F. Baxter: He should withdraw that.

Hon. G. FRASER: I have not said anything that I should withdraw. I have not named any members.

Hon. C. F. Baxter: You have reflected on two members of another place.

Hon. G. FRASER: Which two?

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I have called the hon. member to order.

Hon. G. FRASER: I am sorry this amendment was carried in the first place. We are now doing the right thing by not insisting on it.

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

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

BILL—BUILDING OPERATIONS AND BUILDING MATERIALS CONTROL ACT AMENDMENT (CONTINUANCE).

Received from the Assembly and read a first time.

MOTION—ELECTRICITY ACT.

To Disallow Cinematograph Operators' Regulations.

Debate resumed from the previous day on the following motion by Hon. Sir Charles Latham:—

That Regulations Nos. 71, 80, 86 and 104 made under the Electricity Act, 1945, as published in the "Government Gazette" of the 25th March, 1948, and laid on the Table of the House on the 27th July, 1948, be and are hereby disallowed.

HON. R. J. BOYLEN (South) [5.36]: I oppose the motion. I am astounded that an attempt should be made to disallow these regulations because they protect the interests of all those either directly or indirectly associated with the motion picture industry. They are regulations similar to those in South Australia, Victoria and Tasmania, which were introduced by Liberal Governments. On two different occasions reciprocity was sought for cinematograph operators in this State with those of South Australia and Victoria. But the powers-that-be in those States had to refuse because they regarded the standard of cinematograph operators in Western Australia as being far below theirs. In

South Australia there is an examination set by a board of examiners, and the candidates have to pass a test in electrical apparatus, projectors of sound equipment, and also in safety, first aid and firefighting apparatus. The authorities in those States have said that when they consider the standard of the cinematograph operators in Western Australia to be as high as theirs, they will be only too pleased to enter into some reciprocal arrangement. The standard in this State was particularly low during the war years, but it is much higher now, and that is due to lectures which have been given by qualified operators and technical school teachers.

Hon. H. Tuckey: You are wrong there.

Hon. R. J. BOYLEN: It is advocated as the result of a conference between the Commission and technical school representatives that a two-year course be adopted. To my way of thinking it is a very short one. There are few apprentices who serve less than four years.

Hon. A. Thomson: Do you really think this occupation requires apprenticeship, to learn to turn a handle?

Hon. R. J. BOYLEN: The hon. member's knowledge of what goes on in a cinematograph projection room is either very small or very ancient. What he talks of occurred 30 years ago, but now there is no such thing as a handle to turn.

Hon. A. L. Loton: Oh!

Hon. R. J. BOYLEN: It is a highly dangerous occupation and one where a knowledge of electricity is essential, with all due respect to Mr. Loton. Many different types of apparatus are to be found in the theatres in Perth, the suburbs and the country areas. Many operators would probably not see two cinematograph projection machines which would be the same. Even if an operator saw only one, I doubt whether twelve months' experience would be sufficient for him to understand it. A two-year course would give these people the opportunity to attend lectures and have practical experience in projection rooms other than where they earn their own living. They would then be in a position to pass examinations similar to those set in the other States.

Hon. A. Thomson: Where would they get that experience in the country districts?

Hon. R. J. BOYLEN: At present all country projectionists are licensed. They

do not have to come to the metropolitan area to take their examinations. They take them locally.

Hon. Sir Charles Latham: They are evidently satisfactory.

Hon. R. J. BOYLEN: Yes.

Hon. Sir Charles Latham: They do not need these examinations.

Hon. R. J. BOYLEN: Of course they do. Provision has been made for these people to take them, and the supervision has been carried out by the clerk of courts or the police constable in the district. There is a correspondence course at the present time provided by the Technical College and adopted by the Cinema Board. People in the outer districts following this trade are not debarred from the benefits of lectures or from taking examinations in the same way as those in the metropolitan area, and the cost is no greater for them than it is for people in Perth. Their work is specialised. In 1947, when Mr. Thomson was speaking on the deletion of certain regulations, he said, "Operators are specialists in the particular branch of electrical science to which they apply their work." I heartily agree with him.

To become a specialist in any trade or profession cannot be done in five minutes, five weeks or even five months. I do not think two years is an exorbitantly long period in this case, particularly when we make a comparison with the term of apprenticeship in other trades. Candidates do not have to be 21 years of age before taking the examination. An impression has gained ground that they have to be 21 years of age before being licensed. But that does not mean to say that if a man passes his examination before actually reaching the age of 21 years he cannot be employed. He can, because he can obtain a license to work under a qualified operator. Then, after reaching the age of 21, he can become licensed and do the operating himself, and supervise other workers.

Another misapprehension is this, that before one can take the examination he has to be a member of the union. That is not so. Probably 90 per cent. or more are members of a union, but it is not a necessary qualification before sitting for the examination for a cinematograph operator's license. This morning I took the op-

portunity of looking at one of these projection rooms. It is one of the latest, I understand, as far as being fire-proof is concerned, but it is not 100 per cent. fire-proof. That would be impossible. There have to be apertures through which the pictures are shown. As there are four machines in this room, there are necessarily four apertures. They have, of course, glass in front of them but in the event of a fire the glass would crack and break, and the fire would spread over the film. The flash-point of film is lower than that of petrol, so it can be seen that it would be a simple matter for a fire to occur in one of these projection rooms, and the knowledge of a skilled operator would be necessary to prevent it from spreading.

An instance occurred recently in the metropolitan area where a film caught alight. An assistant was at the machine at the time, and instead of doing what should have been obvious, he called the operator. By the time the operator arrived, 1,000 feet of film had been destroyed. Fortunately there was no damage either to life or property. Had only the assistant operator been present, as would be possible if the regulations were disallowed, the danger would have been much greater. The companies all have clauses in their contracts whereby licensed operators must be employed to deal with their films. They appreciate the capabilities of the operators since licensing has been in force in recent years.

Hon. Sir Charles Latham: They have inspectors of their own.

Hon. R. J. BOYLEN: Apparently they have not.

Hon. Sir Charles Latham: They have.

Hon. R. J. BOYLEN: That may be so. I am not discussing inspectors, but the operators handling the films. They have licensed operators. There are only two firms in Western Australia which supply cinematograph equipment and have agents that regularly service it. It is important, particularly for country projectionists, to be able to effect electrical and mechanical repairs to the outfits on which they are working. Even if a regular service is in existence it may not be available if a breakdown occurs. The people who are objecting to the regulations are not the big exhibitors

throughout the metropolitan area, but the smaller suburban exhibitors as well as those in the country districts. The industry would suffer and the patrons attending the shows would also suffer. There would probably be a danger to life and property through fire because the people handling films would not be qualified men.

I have a cutting from a newspaper which gives an account of a fire that occurred recently in a picture theatre in Halifax. The article is headed "Operator Dies in Cinema Fire. Boy Tries to Save Him," and goes on to state—

Raymond Farrar, a twenty-five years old cinema operator, of Old Lane, Halifax, died last night when fire broke out in the projection room at the picture house, Ward's End, Halifax.

Malcolm Place, fifteen years old apprentice operator, also of Halifax, who gave the alarm and endeavoured to rescue Farrar, was overcome with fumes near the emergency exit to the projection department, but recovered later.

A large audience filed out quietly at the request of the manager and the brigade confined the fire to the projection room.

There have been fires in many places such as Victoria, India, France, England and America and I consider that with the disallowance of these regulations there would be more opportunity of that occurring in Western Australia. It is the duty of all members of this Chamber, now that we have an opportunity of recording a vote, to see that there is no chance of this happening in this State. I suggest to members that if they wish to satisfy themselves on the complexities that exist in operating these machines they may have an opportunity of doing so by viewing a plant which has recently been installed at the Metro Theatre in Perth. The management would welcome any inspection by members as this plant is valued at £5,500 and is the most modern in Western Australia. If members view this machine they will realise that it takes more than a matter of months to be able to train men to operate it. I oppose the motion.

On motion by Hon. E. H. Gray, debate adjourned.

BILL—INTERPRETATION ACT AMENDMENT.

Report of Committee adopted.

BILL—BRANDS ACT AMENDMENT.*Second Reading.*

THE HONORARY MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE (Hon. G. B. Wood—East) [5.48] in moving the second reading said: This is a small agricultural Bill which deals with administration. The proposed amendments to the principal Act are primarily concerned with the cancellation of brands, and the creation of a means for periodically clearing obsolete registrations in the Brands Register. Preliminary work has been commenced for the opening up of an up-to-date brands directory as the last to be published was for registrations up to the end of 1925. In the register there are 54,000 registrations which have been made since 1925 and about one-quarter of them are not required owing to the death or retirement of the owners. It would therefore be a waste of time and money to include this obsolete information in the new register, so provision is made in the Bill to remove the names of people who, when it is found on inspection, do not want their brands, have died or have gone out of the industry.

To avoid the danger of incorrect cancellations it is proposed to give three months' notice by registered letter. These letters will contain a full description of the brand, and will also serve as reminders to those persons who have lost their certificates and who are using their brands incorrectly. In the course of this over-all inspection these people will be notified and if they wish to continue using their brands, it will be necessary for them to notify the registrar within three months. In all instances where no reply is received at the expiration of that period, the registrar will be required to publish a further 30 days' notice in a local newspaper before the cancellation can be effected. The letters will be addressed to the last known place of business, which would be the address shown in the register.

The Bill has been introduced in an endeavour to clean up the registration of brands. There are many good brands listed in the register which are not being used at present. When I say good brands I mean brands which are easily made and easily distinguished. When we consider that there are 54,000 registrations, it will be realised

that there are some complicated and ugly brands, and it is desirable that the register should be brought up-to-date. Provision is made in the Bill so that if anybody wants the registration of his brand to remain, it will not be removed from the register. I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

On motion by Hon. Sir Charles Latham, debate adjourned.

BILL—PREVENTION OF CRUELTY TO ANIMALS ACT AMENDMENT.*Second Reading.*

Debate resumed from the previous day.

HON. H. TUCKEY (South-West) [5.53]: I have given careful consideration to the Bill and have no objection to the proposed amendments. It clearly gives the inspectors of the R.S.P.C.A. and police officers more authority to carry out their work. I support the second reading of the Bill.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Hon. J. A. Dimmitt in the Chair; the Honorary Minister for Agriculture in charge of the Bill.

Clauses 1 to 3—agreed to.

Clause 4—Amendment of Section 4:

THE HONORARY MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE: I move an amendment—

That at the end of paragraph (c) the words "notwithstanding the provisions of Section one hundred and sixty-six of the Justices Act, 1902-1942, and of Sections nineteen and six hundred and sixty-nine of the Criminal Code, 1913," be added.

These words will safeguard the matter. The Chief Secretary did not consider that the words "irreducible in mitigation" covered the point, and requested that these words be put in to clarify the position.

Hon. Sir CHARLES LATHAM: I presume that the amendment is designed to fix a maximum and minimum penalty, but we should give some latitude to magistrates. In many Acts where a minimum penalty has been inserted as well as a maximum, no option is given to magistrates in trivial cases. We do not know what the

fine is to be, and I would like the Minister to report progress so that the Bill can be given further study.

The Honorary Minister for Agriculture: The amendment has been on the notice paper.

Hon. Sir CHARLES LATHAM: Yes, but it has only been placed on the notice paper today.

The HONORARY MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE: I have no objection to progress being reported.

Progress reported.

BILL—GOLD BUYERS ACT AMENDMENT.

Second Reading.

Debate resumed from the previous day.

HON. E. M. HEENAN (North-East) [6.0]: I moved the adjournment of the debate to have an opportunity to consider the Bill. At first sight it appeared to be rather lengthy, but in effect it contains only a few important provisions. The definition section is to be amended in order to rectify a weakness which was revealed in cases that came before the court some years ago, and most of the other amendments proposed are really consequential on that main alteration.

The second important amendment provides that the general penalty of £300 stipulated in the Act shall be reduced in a number of cases to £100, which I consider to be a sensible proposal. We must admit that the Act is one of the most drastic laws on our statute book. The intent was to make it drastic for the specific purpose of curtailing gold stealing, and a perusal of the Act discloses how drastic many of the provisions are. However, I consider that a maximum penalty of £100 or six months imprisonment in certain cases will be an improvement. Another amendment is proposed to Section 36. I suggest that members peruse the section carefully. In Committee I intend to oppose the amendment because I consider it goes further than circumstances warrant. With that one exception, I support the second reading.

On motion by Hon. G. Bennetts, debate adjourned.

BILL—MARRIAGE ACT AMENDMENT.

Second Reading.

Debate resumed from the previous day.

HON. E. M. HEENAN (North-East) [6.4]: The Minister, in moving the second reading, said that this was a measure we could support, and I agree with him. It is really a Bill that can best be dealt with in Committee. The proposed amendment to Section 9 meets with my approval. I notice that a women's organisation is opposed to the proposal, but I cannot see any good reason for the opposition. The effect of the amendment would be to give minors who are refused the necessary permission to get married the right of appeal to a court, and "court" is defined as the Supreme Court or a judge thereof, or a court of summary jurisdiction constituted by a stipendiary magistrate or a police magistrate.

The Honorary Minister for Agriculture: Is that what the women's organisation is objecting to?

Hon. E. M. HEENAN: I think the objection was based on the ground that people would be involved in a lot of expense and that the courts would be cluttered up with a lot of unnecessary work. Such a contention, to my mind, is a gross exaggeration. The Act as framed does not permit minors any appeal where a parent, guardian or other specified person refuses consent to their marrying, and I know from my own experience that this has been responsible for young people on occasion making false declarations. They overcome the difficulty arising from lack of consent by making false declarations that they are over 21 years of age and get away with it. The amendment appeals to me as being a wise one, and ample protection is provided for all parties concerned.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

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

BILL—REGISTRATION OF BIRTHS, DEATHS AND MARRIAGES ACT AMENDMENT.

Second Reading.

Debate resumed from the previous day.

HON. L. A. LOGAN (Central) [6.11]: I have given this Bill some study and considered the effect of the proposed amendments. I have been unable to find anything contentious in them. The measure provides for an alteration to the definition of "district registrar," and proposes various amendments to bring the Act up to date by including reference to cremation. Of course, when this legislation was originally passed, cremation was not in vogue. The Bill is essentially one for consideration in Committee, and I shall content myself at this stage by supporting the second reading.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

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

Sitting suspended from 6.15 to 7.30 p.m.

BILL—LAND ALIENATION RESTRICTION ACT AMENDMENT (CONTINUANCE).

Second Reading.

Debate resumed from the previous day.

HON. A. L. LOTON (South-East) [7.32]: This is only a continuance Bill. It was first passed in 1944 as an emergency measure; but after it has been in existence for four years, we now propose to continue it for another twelve months. I think the Honorary Minister has lost sight of the fact that if this country is to make progress, the time for the removal of some of these wartime emergency Acts and regulations is long overdue. The only land for which the Minister will give a clearance is mentioned in Section 4 of the principal Act which states—

Whenever the consent of the Minister or of the officer authorised by the Minister as aforesaid is required by this Act to the sale of land such consent shall not be granted unless the Minister is of opinion that such land would be unsuitable for the settlement of a member of the Forces or a dependant of a member.

If the land were so classified by the Minister or the officer appointed by him, one can have very little doubt as to the type of

land it would be. It seems rather peculiar that the whole of this land is going to be tied up to this extent. I think that under the Closer Settlement Act the Minister has all the powers required, because Section 4 provides—

If the Board is unanimously of the opinion that any land is unutilised within the meaning of this Act and has so continued for upwards of two years and should be made available for closer settlement the Board should report in writing to the Minister and shall state in such report what, in the opinion of the Board, is the reasonable use to which the land should be put.

I think that gives the Minister all the power he requires if he wants land for settlement, and I fail to see why it is necessary to continue this measure for a further period. For that reason I oppose the second reading.

HON. A. THOMSON (South-East) [7.34]: While there is a certain amount of truth in the statement made by Mr. Loton, this Bill extends the Act for a year only. I am of the opinion that it should not be operative for a longer period. I rather fancy that when this measure was introduced in 1944 most of the decent land had been alienated. If the Minister can give an assurance that there is a need for this measure being continued, I will not oppose it. I think there is a general feeling that as far as possible land should be brought under production. I know there is a large area in the Albany district which has been lying idle for many years; but owing to the investigations made by a subcommittee of practical men, appointed by the Government, much of the land that in days gone by was deemed to be practically valueless has been clearly demonstrated to be of great productive value.

The Honorary Minister for Agriculture: New methods of clearing have played a big part in that.

Hon. A. THOMSON: Yes. I do not know whether the Minister has come prepared to give an assurance in that direction. It is true, as Mr. Loton pointed out, that the Closer Settlement Act provides for the resumption of land; but if the Government feels that it is necessary to continue this measure, the Bill should be passed. It may be that a considerable portion of the land now considered possible of clearance and of being brought into production in the Albany

area is Crown land, and this measure deals only with Crown land. I would be pleased to have any further information the Minister has to give us.

THE HONORARY MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE

(Hon. G. B. Wood—East—in reply) [7.38]: Mr. Loton did not make out any case at all for opposing this Bill, except that he thinks these emergency measures should go by the board. I consider it very necessary that this Act should be continued for another 12 months at least, and that is all the measure provides for. Mr. Thomson hit the nail on the head when he said that there is a lot of Crown land which four years ago was considered useless. There is such land—not only in the Albany district but elsewhere—which, through modern methods and research into pasture production, is now considered desirable for soldier settlement. A lot of that land will be brought into production following modern methods of clearing.

If the House threw out the Bill, there would be a great outcry from returned soldiers, and rightly so. The measure does no harm. It is no use talking about using another Act. We have this Act to safeguard these Crown lands for soldier settlement. The Government does consider it necessary to continue the Act for another year; that is why this Bill has been introduced. If at the end of that period we find the Act is no longer necessary, we will not ask Parliament to continue it.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Hon. J. A. Dimmitt in the Chair; the Honorary Minister for Agriculture in charge of the Bill.

Clauses 1 and 2—agreed to.

Clause 3—Amendment of Section 5:

Hon. Sir CHARLES LATHAM: This clause continues the operation of the Act for another year. I was hoping that the Minister would tell us when he introduced the Bill what was in the mind of the Government. All the measure does is to empower the Minister for Lands—and he has the power, anyhow—to say whether or not any Crown land should be thrown open for selection. It gives

him the power to say the land should not be made available except to returned soldiers. If I know anything about the land of this State, there is little on which returned soldiers could be successfully settled, except in the South-West.

Hon. L. Craig: They are keen to get pieces of land adjoining their farms.

Hon. Sir CHARLES LATHAM: I want to advise the Minister that although there is a lot of land in the South-West which is suitable for settlement, it is also valuable forestry land; and I hope it is not proposed to set aside for settlement areas of that description.

Hon. L. Craig: This House would have to agree to that.

Hon. Sir CHARLES LATHAM: I know that both Houses would have to agree; but if the same procedure is adopted as I have seen followed with regard to legislation which has been passed today, it will be possible to put any measure through this Chamber. I do not know that there is any need for this Bill. I am worried about the fact that there are many farmers whose sons are growing up and want additional land. I know there is land on the extreme edge of settlement; but we have made marginal country of that, and I do not suppose it is intended to place returned soldiers on land of that kind.

I do not understand why the Government wants to continue the operations of the Act. All that is being done is to debar people from using the land. We must realise that along our existing railways and roads, where we have provided transport facilities, there is a good deal of vacant land; and if we pass this Bill, we will prevent people from selecting it, because first of all authority has to be obtained from the Minister for it to be thrown open to other than returned soldiers.

Hon. L. Craig: He would do it if, in his opinion, the soldiers did not want it.

Hon. A. L. Loton: If it were unsuitable.

Hon. Sir CHARLES LATHAM: If it is unsuitable for soldiers, will it not be unsuitable for other people? Surely it will not be suggested that a person who is not a returned soldier is a better farmer than a returned soldier.

Hon. L. Craig: One requires finance and often the other does not.

Hon. Sir CHARLES LATHAM: That is another angle. I think the point is that one of them requires Government finance. Perhaps another place should look into this matter more carefully than we have. I see no necessity for the provision.

Hon. W. J. MANN: I would point out that this control cannot last indefinitely. In country areas there are many boys who were at school during the war and whose parents are looking for land on which to settle them when they leave college. They must receive some consideration. As much land as possible must be made available in forest areas without sacrificing valuable timber. It must be thrown open for agricultural production. I hope this is the last occasion upon which we will be asked to continue this legislation.

Clause put and passed.

Title—agreed to.

Bill reported without amendment and the report adopted.

BILL—FEEDING STUFFS ACT AMENDMENT.

Second Reading.

Debate resumed from the previous day.

HON. E. H. GRAY (West) [7.48]: I am in favour of the Bill, with the exception of Clause 5, which reads—

Section five D of the principal Act is amended by adding a subsection as follows:—

“(7) The provisions of this section shall not extend or apply to any package when the net weight of the contents does not exceed twenty-eight pounds.”

Why should not the small man who purchases this special stock or poultry food receive some protection and know what he is buying? Would the Honorary Minister explain why this provision has been included in the Bill? Would not the passage of this clause encourage unscrupulous manufacturers to place poor classes of feeding stuffs on the market? There is a grievance among small dairymen and poultry farmers who have suffered severely—particularly during the war years—from the shortage of feeding stuffs. They have received a raw deal also in the price fixed from time to time

for eggs. The modern poultryman has no chance of success unless he installs up-to-date plant for the feeding of his stock. With an up-to-date plant, he can make up the feed cheaper than he can buy it from the manufacturers already mixed. The poultryman who has learned his trade efficiently knows the proper feed for his stock and can mix it in his own machine.

Today the flour mills are making up and selling prepared poultry foods, with the result that the poultry farmer cannot get the bran, pollard and other offal that he requires. In the West Province there is a large number of people engaged in the poultry industry, and it is a real grievance among them that they cannot buy offal. Action should be taken to compel the mills to make available a reasonable quantity of bran and pollard to poultry farmers, who are now forced to purchase the made-up foods containing meal, bran, pollard and so on that they should be able to buy and mix for themselves.

Hon. G. Bennetts: Would not different districts require different mixtures?

Hon. E. H. GRAY: Yes, and the poultry farmer is in a better position to mix his own feeding stuffs than is the mill.

The Honorary Minister for Agriculture: Why do they not do so?

Hon. E. H. GRAY: Because the mills will not supply the ingredients.

The Honorary Minister for Agriculture: Do you want more controls?

Hon. E. H. GRAY: We want more bran and pollard released.

The Honorary Minister for Agriculture: What if it is not there to be released?

Hon. E. H. GRAY: The mills are holding it and are selling it to poultrymen in feed ready mixed. The average poultry farmer can get unlimited supplies of the mixtures from the mills if he is willing to pay the price.

Hon. A. Thomson: The country mills are supplying bran and pollard.

Hon. E. H. GRAY: I am speaking of the metropolitan area and the Fremantle district in particular. I hope the Minister will inquire into this matter, as the mills should be compelled to make supplies available.

The Honorary Minister for Agriculture: It could not be done under this Bill.

Hon. E. H. GRAY: No, but I think the Minister should intervene on behalf of the poultry farmers. The amendment contained in the last clause of the Bill would make the position worse because a merchant could sell a ton of supplies to the poultry farmer without a guarantee, simply by placing it in 28-lb. packets. The Act has been amended many times and provides elaborate precautions to ensure that the poultry feed and its ingredients are properly registered and that there is a guarantee as to what the mixture contains. Under the Bill, the manufacturer, by selling the commodity in 28-lb. packets, could become exempt from necessity for the registration. That would encourage unscrupulous manufacturers to defraud stockbreeders and poultry farmers.

The Honorary Minister for Agriculture: It sounds very bad.

Hon. E. H. GRAY: It does not look very well, and it would enable unscrupulous manufacturers to reap a small fortune. When the Bill is in the Committee stage, I will move to have that provision eliminated.

HON. E. M. DAVIES (West) [7.55]: I support the second reading of the Bill, but take this opportunity of pointing out that no reply has been given by the Honorary Minister to the questions raised in this connection during the debate on the Address-in-reply.

Hon. A. Thomson: That is owing to the illness of Mr. Parker, and is unavoidable.

Hon. E. M. DAVIES: There has been no reply to any such questions raised by members during that debate.

The Honorary Minister for Agriculture: Did you speak before or after me in that debate?

Hon. G. Fraser: Before.

The Honorary Minister for Agriculture: I answered a good many questions.

Hon. E. M. DAVIES: Although the Bill provides that the packages shall be marked with particulars as to the ingredients they contain—excepting packages of 28 lbs. or less, with which I do not agree—I feel that the question of prepared poultry foods should receive greater consideration by the Minister than it has in the past. On many occasions it has been

pointed out that poultry and dairy farmers are obliged to use these prepared mixtures because it is not possible to obtain sufficient offal for the preparation of their own mixed foods. In spite of that, they are able to purchase as much as they wish of the prepared foods, provided they are willing to pay £13 per ton for it as against £8 13s. 11d. for bran or pollard, if they could obtain it. It is unfair that they should be put to the extra expense of buying prepared foods that in some cases do not contain as much crushed wheat or other ingredients as they are supposed to. The producers are compelled to pay £13 per ton instead of £8 13s. 11d. for ingredients that they could mix far better than the mills do.

Hon. L. A. Logan: They would have to buy them.

Hon. E. M. DAVIES: They could buy the offal, if it were available, much cheaper than the prepared foods. This is not the statement of producers only, but also of a produce merchant who said that if he placed an order with the mill for five tons of prepared poultry food, he would have no trouble in getting it, but that if he ordered five tons of offal he would be laughed at. The producers are not receiving a fair deal from the mills.

The Honorary Minister for Agriculture: How many mills are manufacturing these prepared poultry foods?

Hon. E. M. DAVIES: I do not know, but there are many producers in the Fremantle district who cannot obtain sufficient offal for poultry or dairy purposes, though they can obtain as much prepared stockfood as they can pay for. While the mills can obtain £13 per ton for the prepared food, they will do so in preference to selling the offal at £8 13s. 11d. per ton.

Hon. G. Bennetts: It shows that the mills are getting an extra "cop" out of it.

Hon. E. M. DAVIES: I support the second reading of the Bill. I know the measure cannot make much difference to that aspect of the question but I intend, in the Committee stage, to have something to say about Clause 5.

HON. A. THOMSON (South-East) [8.0]: There is no doubt that those members who have spoken to the Bill have voiced complaints regarding real disabilities from

which a great number of producers are suffering. Unfortunately the producers in their districts are not the only ones concerned because the complaints apply equally in the country areas. I do not know how many registered stock foods are being produced, but possibly the Minister could enlighten us on that point. I would like to inform Mr. Gray that in the parent Act, which has been in existence since 1934, there is a provision setting out that it will not apply to any package the net weight of which does not exceed 28 lb. I am inclined to agree with him that if such food that is supplied in large quantities to poultry men or dairymen has to be branded and marked, then I can see no reason why lots sold in small quantities should be exempted.

We safeguard the food supplies for human beings, and I fail to see why we should not equally safeguard the stockfoods sold to those who make a living from poultry keeping or any other avenue of production. When the Minister replies to the debate, he may be able to give us some further information in that respect. I have no doubt that it applies to the mills in the metropolitan area as well, but I can assure the House that were it not for the export of flour under contract to the Imperial Government, the country mills would not be able to supply as much bran and pollard as they do now. To my personal knowledge, the country mills are in a desperate position regarding the supplying of the requirements of their regular customers, with whom they have been trading for years.

HON. G. FRASER (West) [8.4]: I trust the Minister will not reply to the debate tonight so that he may make inquiries regarding the matters mentioned by my colleagues. It is a very sore point in our area.

Hon. A. Thomson: There are complaints in the Press daily about it.

Hon. G. FRASER: That is so. On many occasions we have been approached by producers in the West Province regarding this matter and they complain that while they can purchase as much of the prepared foods as they require, they cannot get sufficient bran and pollard in order to do their own mixing. They cannot understand why the mills can provide the prepared foodstuffs but cannot make available the necessary supplies of bran and pollard. The Minister should investigate

the position. One or two of the producers suggested that it would be better to revert to departmental control. I understand that at one time the Agricultural Department exercised some control over bran and pollard supplies.

The Honorary Minister for Agriculture: No. Do you want more control?

Hon. Sir Charles Latham: They do not mind.

Hon. G. FRASER: We do not mind controls, if they are in the interests of the people.

Hon. Sir Charles Latham: This would be in the interests of the poultry.

Hon. G. FRASER: I understood that the department entered into the matter somehow.

The Honorary Minister for Agriculture: That was under the National Security Regulations during the war.

Hon. G. FRASER: At any rate, the people were satisfied in those days.

The Honorary Minister for Agriculture: No, they were never satisfied, and I will tell you why.

Hon. G. FRASER: This proposal came from people who suggested that the department should take over control again.

Hon. A. Thomson: That would not help.

Hon. G. FRASER: I am telling the House what information was conveyed to us by people in the trade. They had experience under departmental control, hence their suggestion that the position would be better if that control were again exercised. I suggest that in order to provide the House with the fullest information possible, the Minister should make further inquiries and give us the reason why producers cannot secure the bran and pollard supplies they require.

Hon. A. Thomson: It is all a matter of shortage of supply.

Hon. G. FRASER: If that is so, why can the mills supply the mixture?

Hon. A. Thomson: I do not know what is in the mixture.

Hon. G. FRASER: There is no limit to the quantity of prepared foodstuffs that the mills can supply.

Hon. A. Thomson: There must be a limit.

Hon. G. FRASER: They say there is not.

Hon. A. Thomson: There is certainly a limit to the bran and pollard that can be supplied.

Hon. G. FRASER: If that is so, and yet there is no limit to the quantity of prepared foodstuffs that are available, some further light should be thrown on the matter. Earlier in the session questions were asked on this very subject, and when I sent copies of the questions and answers to the people concerned, they were very dissatisfied.

The Honorary Minister for Agriculture: I am not a magician.

Hon. G. FRASER: Quite so, but the people were certainly not satisfied. I hope the Minister will furnish the House with further information when he replies to the debate.

HON. W. J. MANN (South-West) [8.8]: I have had some experience in buying prepared poultry food and on the whole I have been fairly well satisfied. I know that many commercial poultry men like to mix their mash according to their own formula. I have often heard arguments between them, one man claiming that he gets extra production in eggs from his mix compared with the next man whose formula is only slightly different. The majority of the commercial poultry raisers like to mix their own mash. I have certainly heard complaints similar to those that have been voiced this evening. It has been stated that a man can get as much bran and pollard as he requires within reason if he goes on the black market. I heard that statement made less than three months ago. Another man said he could get all he wanted on the black market by paying 12s. a ton or so more than the fixed price. Another complaint is that if a person went to a mill to order supplies, he would be told that if he went to such and such a produce merchant, he could get all he wanted. If he does so, he has to pay the maximum price and that hardly seems to measure up to what we want with regard to increased production, with payable costs. I do not know what prompted the enactment of Section 5 of the principal Act. I know that there are some people who go in for poultry in their backyards, who do not desire to buy a 120 lb. bag of prepared poultry mash. All they require is 20 or 30 lbs. It may be that the section

was enacted to cover retailers who might open a bag and sell small parcels of 12 or 20 lbs.

The Honorary Minister for Agriculture: You have hit it at last. That is the answer.

Hon. W. J. MANN: If that is so, I cannot see anything very wrong about it. When I have received some from a bag of poultry mash, I have always noticed that it was labelled showing the ingredients and other requirements set out in the Act. If what I suggest is the solution, I do not think we could expect retailers to put labels on small bags containing 12 lbs.

The Honorary Minister for Agriculture: Or on bags containing 5 lbs. or 2 lbs.

Hon. W. J. MANN: That is so. We know that the retailer merely opens up a bag and takes from it small quantities as they are required.

THE HONORARY MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE (Hon. G. B. Wood—East—in reply) [8.13]: Mr. Mann has hit the nail on the head and has given the solution. Sometime somewhere a mash is registered. When it goes from the factory in big bags containing 120 lb., it is registered. The article turned out by the factory is closely inspected by officers of the Agricultural Department. In those circumstances, it would not be necessary for the storekeeper who took a small quantity from the bag and sold it to a customer to do what is suggested.

Hon. Sir Charles Latham: They sell the mash by the bushel.

The **HONORARY MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE**: All that mash would bear the closest inspection. When I moved the second reading of the Bill, I suggested to members that they should consult interested constituents and ask them what they thought about the legislation. I do not know if they did that, but evidently Mr. Gray did not consult any of them. I can assure the House that everyone concerned desires this legislation. The Act makes every provision to safeguard the interests of the producers. It would not be desirable merely because a little salt or some other commodity was added to the mash, that the old registration should be cancelled and a new one obtained. The department could approve of the new mixture.

Hon. E. H. Gray: We have no objection to that.

The HONORARY MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE: I shall deal with the other matters which were raised. I regret that I did not reply to all of Mr. Davies' questions. I thought I made a note of all the points which were raised during the debate on the Address-in-reply; but I have had so much worry over the past 18 months and have made so many replies to other people with regard to bran and pollard, that perhaps I thought I had replied to all the points raised during that debate.

Millers cannot produce bran and pollard out of a hat. I will explain why they are in such short supply. During the war, bran and pollard were under the control of the Agricultural Department. At that time some people were satisfied, because during that period we had not many poultry farmers. They had gone to the war, for one thing. Immediately hostilities ceased, however, not only did many more people engage in poultry raising, but those already in the industry increased their production and consequently the need for these supplies increased.

There is still another reason for the shortage. The difference between the comparable prices of various feeds is enormous. Chaff today is £17 per ton, wheat nearly £18 a ton and oats about £19 a ton. As Mr. Davies said, bran and pollard cost £8 a ton. Therefore, the man who owns a horse or a cow feeds it on bran and pollard. That is a pity, but one cannot blame them for doing so. They put as much bran and pollard into the feed as they possibly can. I suggested to the poultry farmers that the solution of the problem was to raise the price of bran and pollard to £20 a ton, but they threw up their hands in horror at the suggestion. It might have been the solution. In America, the price of bran and pollard is £22 a ton. This is by the way. What makes it difficult for the flourmillers in Australia to compete with the flourmillers in America in selling flour, particularly in the islands, is because the Americans get £22 10s. a ton and, I believe in some cases, £25, for bran and pollard.

Hon. A. Thomson: Yes. They sell their flour below cost.

The HONORARY MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE: They can easily do so and

still make a profit. Therefore, in my opinion, the producers in Western Australia are very lucky indeed to get their bran and pollard at £8 10s. a ton, although it causes a shortage. It is difficult to know what to do; the bran and pollard supplies are simply not available. If this and another place give us power to control bran and pollard, we still would not be able to get any more out of the hat.

Hon. A. Thomson: Not a bit more.

Hon. G. Fraser: Would you give it to the right quarters?

Hon. E. H. Gray: Why make up such large quantities for feed?

The HONORARY MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE: Mr. Watson referred to that point when speaking to the Address-in-reply. It increases the supply. I have discussed the matter with those concerned. The millers declare that the bran and pollard belong to them and they can do what they like with their stocks. Naturally, they can, until we take the control out of their hands.

Hon. A. Thomson: You set a standard for the bran and pollard.

The HONORARY MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE: Yes. I know the position of the poultry farmers and can see their point of view. They do not want these mashies, but if anyone can suggest how we can alter the position, I shall be only too happy to have the information. It would be the solution of the problem. The millers say they are doing their best, but that the bran and pollard are their property. There is nothing to stop them from continuing their present practice. I do not know whether any other points were brought up to which I have not replied, but I shall not proceed to the Committee stage this evening. I would ask the House, however, to pass the second reading tonight and if there is anything I have not replied to, I shall be happy to give the information later.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

BILL—FISHERIES ACT AMENDMENT (CONTINUANCE).

Second Reading.

Debate resumed from the previous day.

HON. W. J. MANN (South-West) [8.20]: I secured the adjournment of the debate with the object of consulting with some fishermen of my acquaintance in order to ascertain their views on this measure; but unfortunately I did not contact the men I had in mind. I did, however, consult with other interested fishermen, who assured me that they had no objection whatever to the Bill. They considered that the position, so far as nets are concerned, was now, to use their own term, pretty right. They also told me that the majority of the fishermen of their acquaintance did not mind which way it went. Consequently, I have no criticism of the measure to offer and shall support the second reading.

THE HONORARY MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE (Hon. G. B. Wood—East—in reply) [8.21]: I shall not take up much time in replying, but I desire to answer a few contentions put forward yesterday. I think there is some misunderstanding about the Bill. Much was said, particularly by Sir Charles Latham, as to the price of fish. This measure has nothing to do with the price of fish.

Hon. Sir Charles Latham: It would have.

The HONORARY MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE: Nor has it anything to do with the control of fish.

Hon. Sir Charles Latham: It deals with the supply of nets.

The HONORARY MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE: That is so.

Hon. Sir Charles Latham: Do you not think that that will limit the quantity of fish being caught?

The HONORARY MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE: No. I shall prove to the House that the effect will be to increase the supply of fish, because if we did not control the supply of nets and Sir Charles Latham or any other member of the House went on a pleasure jaunt—

Hon. G. Fraser: Once a month.

The HONORARY MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE:—once a year, he could buy a net and so deprive the professional fishermen of their means of livelihood. That is the way in which the supply of fish might be decreased. I do not wish to dwell on

that point, as it is obvious. Sir Charles Latham also spoke about the making of fishing nets out of Russian hemp. I made it my business to get some information for the House on that point. It is as follows:—

With the possible exception of a few hemp nets which have been recently imported into this State for use in the salmon fishery, all netting used by local fishermen is made from cotton. The general world shortage of cotton has restricted the quantity of netting being manufactured and, in common with other cotton goods, the supply has not been sufficient to meet the demand. The post-war allocation of cotton has to some extent relieved the acute shortage of netting which was experienced during the war years, but this has been offset to some extent by the present limited supply of raw cotton from dollar countries. At present all netting is imported from England, whereas prior to the war portion of the Australian requirements were supplied by America and Japan. In view of the world cotton position and the future doubtful supplies of netting, the Fishermen's Advisory Committee recommended that the existing legislation controlling the sale of fishing netting and cotton be extended for a further twelve months.

The control of the sale of netting ensures that bona fide fishermen and genuine men, particularly ex-Service men, desirous of entering the industry, have the opportunity of securing the gear necessary for their fishing operations. Fishermen are working along various parts of the coast extending from Esperance in the south to Carnarvon in the north, and it is considered that the men operating outside the metropolitan area should have the opportunity of purchasing essential requirements as stocks of netting come to hand.

Otherwise, the fishermen who are sitting on the doorstep of the people who sell the material would get all the goods. To continue—

Should the control lapse, many persons would have the opportunity of purchasing netting and cotton to the exclusion of professional fishermen operating in the outlying areas, and it is considered this would have a detrimental effect on the industry generally.

The control of the sale of netting and cotton has no bearing on the price of fish. Like other commodities the price of fishing gear has increased since prewar by approximately 150 per cent. The Commonwealth Government fixed a maximum price for fish and, with the exception of the herring season, this price has generally been maintained by supply and demand. It was only recently, during the Shark Bay schnapper season, that production exceeded the demand and local buyers refused to pay the maximum price for fish. With adequate supplies of gear for the genuine fishermen and extensive expansion in the fisheries of this State, the resultant increased produc-

tion should have a distinct bearing on the future prices of fish.

I do not want to say more than that. I think I have proved to the House that it is desirable that this measure should be continued for a further 12 months. The Fisheries Advisory Committee, whose members comprise the Chief Inspector of Fisheries and three professional fishermen, have advised the Minister that this course is desirable.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Hon. J. A. Dimmitt in the Chair; the Honorary Minister for Agriculture in charge of the Bill.

Clauses 1 and 2—agreed to.

Clause 3—Amendment of Section 36A:

Hon. A. L. LOTON: I desire to protest against the continuance of this measure. This is another instance, among many others, in which the Minister has pointed out that it is necessary to continue controls. I am sick of controls, as I am sure other members are. The measure was a wartime one, yet here we are, in 1948, seeking to continue the legislation for a further twelve months.

Hon. Sir CHARLES LATHAM: The point to which I hope the Honorary Minister will give consideration is the dropping of this legislation before the expiration of twelve months, if that is at all possible. I am aware that members smiled while Mr. Loton spoke, but it is only a short time ago since the public clearly denounced controls. They voted against the continuance of Commonwealth controls. The Minister said that I was wrong because I told him fishing nets were made of Russian hemp. For some time cotton was not available and consequently nets became scarce. There was justification for restricting their sale to people using them for commercial fishing. Cotton has not been available for quite a time, and that is why the restriction was originally brought in.

Hon. H. Tuckey: What about hemp?

Hon. Sir CHARLES LATHAM: That has not been very plentiful, although there has been more of it than there has been

of cotton. I went around the country, when the referendum campaign was in progress, saying I objected to controls, and I now feel a hypocrite when I support controls here. All the important measures we have dealt with have been control Bills.

Hon. G. Fraser: I bet you will be supporting one tomorrow night.

Hon. Sir CHARLES LATHAM: What is that?

Hon. G. Bennetts: Tractors.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! Members must not refer to legislation that is to come before the Chamber at some future time.

Hon. Sir CHARLES LATHAM: If during the year the Government is able to drop these restrictions I hope it will do so.

Hon. H. TUCKEY: I know a number of licensed fishermen and they have not approached me regarding the legislation. I do not like opposing the Bill, but it probably would not make much difference whether it was discontinued or continued for another year. The time has arrived when we should do without these controls.

Hon. A. THOMSON: I support the members who have spoken, but it might be necessary for us to continue this control for another 12 months. Apparently it is due to a shortage of cotton.

The HONORARY MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE: The Government is no more desirous of continuing these controls than is anyone else. The Crown Law officers have enough to do drafting Bills, without dealing with unnecessary ones. Measures are brought before Parliament after due advice and consideration by the people concerned. This one was asked for by the advisory committee which comprises three professional fishermen and the Chief Inspector of Fisheries.

Hon. Sir Charles Latham: Many fishermen do not want it.

The HONORARY MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE: I have not heard of them. Mr. Tuckey said he had received no requests for this legislation. I was wondering whether the fishermen knew that this control might be taken from them. If there is plenty of cotton, we will not necessarily continue the control for 12 months. Sir Charles Latham talked of other Bills. This is only about the second or third.

Hon. Sir Charles Latham: We have had three.

The HONORARY MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE: The only person who will object to this is the man who wants a net for his own pleasure. He should not have one in the circumstances, because it would not be fair to the man making his living this way.

Hon. A. L. LOTON: I begin to feel that the Honorary Minister resents my action in rising to speak.

The Honorary Minister for Agriculture: No.

Hon. A. L. LOTON: He suggests that because the Government brings these Bills down we should accept them and when asked by our people about them say, "The Minister introduced them and we have to take them."

The Honorary Minister for Agriculture: You are imagining things I never thought of.

Hon. A. L. LOTON: The Honorary Minister opposed, during the referendum campaign, the continuance of controls.

The Honorary Minister for Agriculture: I am now; most of us are.

Hon. A. L. LOTON: Yet the Bills introduced here have been for one control after another.

The Honorary Minister for Agriculture: Acting on the advice of the people who know all about the position.

Hon. A. L. LOTON: The legal fraternity.

The Honorary Minister for Agriculture: I never mentioned the legal fraternity in this case.

The CHAIRMAN: I point out that this is not the place to oppose the Bill. The only thing Mr. Loton can do is to oppose Clause 3.

Hon. A. L. LOTON: I oppose the altering of the words "forty-eight" to "forty-nine."

The CHAIRMAN: Is the hon. member moving an amendment?

Hon. A. L. LOTON: No. I am speaking against the alteration of those words.

The CHAIRMAN: The hon. member can vote against the clause.

Clause put and passed.

Title—agreed to.

Bill reported without amendment and the report adopted.

BILL—FACTORIES AND SHOPS ACT AMENDMENT.

Second Reading.

Debate resumed from the previous day.

HON. L. CRAIG (South-West) [8.40]: I shall not oppose the Bill. I have looked into it, and all it proposes to do is to confer on natural born Asiatics the same rights as other citizens. It will allow them to own a factory, to work in a factory and to work the same hours as ordinary citizens of this country. It has no relation whatever to the immigrant who may possibly be allowed in. I support the Bill.

On motion by Hon. E. M. Davies, debate adjourned.

BILL—LICENSING ACT AMENDMENT.

Second Reading.

Debate resumed from the previous day.

HON. E. M. DAVIES (West) [8.41]: I do not feel very happy about this proposed amendment. In the first place, the Honorary Minister told us, when introducing the Bill, that representations had been made by the Government of India regarding certain of its nationals, resident in Australia. Most of us are somewhat sympathetic to that request, but when we come to examine the Bill we find that Section 130a which we are asked to amend, is as follows:—

Every licensee by whom any person of Asiatic race was employed in or about his licensed premises on the 15th day of August, 1922, shall cause the name of such person to be registered in a register to be kept at the Licensing Court for the district in which the licensed premises are situated; and no licensee shall, elsewhere than in the North Province of the State, employ any person of Asiatic race in or about his licensed premises whose name is not so registered: Provided that this section shall not apply to persons of the Jewish race.

We are asked to amend that section by adding the words—

and that this section shall not apply—

- (1) any person of the Asiatic race who is a natural-born British subject and whose principal domicile is in the State on the day of the commencement of the Licensing Act Amendment Act, 1948, nor

- (2) to any descendant of any person referred to in the next preceding paragraph if the domicile of the descendant is in the State.

We have been told that this arises from a request made by the Government of India, but I feel that the Act itself deals with Asiatics. Whilst the question of domicile comes into it, as far as the State is concerned, it is possible that numerous persons of Asiatic origin, at present in the northern part of Australia, may infiltrate into this State so that in future we shall find them domiciled here, notwithstanding that the Act provides that their domicile shall be in this State.

Hon. A. Thomson: They would be natural-born.

Hon. E. M. DAVIES: I do not know. Possibly some of them have been natural-born in the northern part of Australia. I cannot subscribe to the Bill at the present juncture. After hearing it explained, I may change my opinion. It occurs to me that some years ago a friend of mine had a small business in Bunbury—his daughters looked after it—and a Japanese frequented it. When he was told by the proprietor that he did not want him there, or his custom, he said, "I am not a Japanese, but an Australian." Apparently he was born in Australia. At the same time I am not prepared, if it can be avoided, to allow this class of people to be employed in and around these businesses in Western Australia. We have many of our own people who desire that class of work. I am not happy about the Bill, but I have not yet made up my mind how I shall vote. Unless it can be explained to me that the position is other than what I read in the Bill, I shall express my disapproval by my vote when it is taken.

On motion by Hon. L. A. Logan, debate adjourned.

House adjourned at 8.47 p.m.

Legislative Assembly.

Wednesday, 15th September, 1948.

CONTENTS.

	Page
Address-in-reply, presentation	1079
Questions : Education, as to resignation of teachers	1080
Servicemen's land settlement, as to allotment of "The Carrolls" property ...	1080
Galvanised piping, as to shortage and control of supplies	1080
Pollomyelitis, as to investigation of Osborne Park outbreak	1080
Housing, as to rental and war service homes	1081
Railways, as to conditions at Midland Junction Workshops	1081
Fisheries Act, as to prosecution for offences	1081
Goldmining, as to assistance for Phoenix and Tindals mines	1082
Canning Bridge, as to condition of bitumen surfacing	1082
Roads, as to Great Eastern-highway, Coolgardie-Southern Cross section ...	1082
South Fremantle Power House, as to capacity and cycle equipment ...	1082
Tractors, as to imports from U.S.A. ...	1083
Papers : Water Supplies, as to Port Hedland scheme	1083
Police Sergeant R. Kendall, as to transfer and appeals	1090
Collie Coal, as to Black Diamond leases	1106
Motion : Electricity Act, to disallow supply authorities' fees regulation	1087
Bills : Building Operations and Building Materials Control Act Amendment (Continuance), 3r.	1083
Bush Fires Act Amendment, 2r.	1084
Prices Control, Council's message	1106
Land Sales Control, message, remaining stages	1107

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

ADDRESS-IN-REPLY.

Presentation.

Mr. SPEAKER: I desire to announce that, accompanied by the member for Wagin and the member for Canning, I attended upon His Excellency the Governor and presented the Address-in-reply to His Excellency's opening Speech. His Excellency was pleased to reply in the following terms:—

Mr. Speaker and Members of the Legislative Assembly: I thank you for your expressions of loyalty to His Most Gracious Majesty the King and for your Address-in-reply to the Speech with which I opened Parliament.