

interests of many people to be able to go along and borrow £5 or £10 when in dire trouble. I also realise that 20 per cent. charged on an amount of, say, £2 or £3 or £4 over a short period is not attractive for the money lender. If a special rate of interest were not provided for such cases, the effect would be to make it impossible for poor people to borrow those small amounts as occasion required them to do so. Members will observe that the Bill has a schedule attached to it, and that the schedule deals with interest on amounts under £10. It provides that if the money is repayable in one month or less, 60 per cent. interest may be charged; if repayable in more than one month but less than two months, 54 per cent. may be charged; and the rate gradually becomes lower as the period lengthens. I have here a schedule which explains the results. It means that if £5 is borrowed for one month, the money lender will be able to charge 5s. interest, which is at the rate of 60 per cent. For two months the rate of interest will be 9s.; for three months, 11s.; for four months, 12s.; for five months, 13s. 4d., and for six months, 14s. For a loan of £10 those interest payments would be doubled.

Hon. V. Hamersley: Those interest figures represent the amount for the full period of the loan?

Hon. E. M. HEENAN: Yes. The advantage of such a schedule is that fixed rates will be charged. All money lenders will be restricted to those rates. Anyone borrowing money cannot be imposed on as in many cases borrowers have been in the past. There is only one other clause of the Bill which I should mention, Clause 2, which provides that Section 3 of the Act is to be amended by substituting the word "ten" for the words "twelve and a-half." The amendment means that any person or body lending money and charging interest in excess of 10 per cent. will come within the scope of the existing Act. That Act is now restricted to persons charging interest in excess of 12½ per cent. The Bill provides that money lenders charging in excess of 10 per cent. must register. It means that many more persons will have to register than at the present time.

Hon. J. Cornell: Why these alterations after 28 years? Money is dearer now.

Hon. E. M. HEENAN: The Money Lenders Act is a good measure. Members who look through the Act as it stands will realise that it contains many safeguards for the public. Widening its scope, will, in my opinion, be to the advantage of all concerned. Those are the main provisions of the measure, and I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

On motion by Hon. H. S. W. Parker, debate adjourned.

House adjourned at 6.12 p.m.

Legislative Assembly,

Thursday, 31st October, 1940.

	PAGE
Auditor General's Report	1616
Question: Petrol rationing, as to protecting traders' interests	1616
Bills: Civil Defence (Emergency Powers), 3R.	1617
Fisheries Act Amendment, 8R.	1617
Harbours and Jetties Act Amendment, 2R.	1634
Com. report	1652
Road Closure, returned	1652
Annual Estimates: Votes discussed—	
Labour	1634

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

AUDITOR GENERAL'S REPORT.

Mr. SPEAKER: I have received from the Auditor General a copy of his report on the Treasurer's Statement of the Public Accounts for the financial year ended the 30th June, 1940. It will be laid on the Table of the House.

QUESTION—PETROL RATIONING.

As to Protecting Traders' Interests.

Mr. LAMBERT asked the Premier: In view of the adverse effect of petrol rationing on the businesses of service stations and motor repair depots, is it the intention of the Government to introduce legislation so that they and other businesses affected,

may be protected regarding the rent of their premises, mortgages, and other financial commitments?

The PREMIER replied: Petrol rationing is imposed by the Commonwealth Government, and the State Government has no jurisdiction.

BILL—CIVIL DEFENCE (EMERGENCY POWERS).

Read a third time and transmitted to the Council.

BILL—FISHERIES ACT AMENDMENT.

Third Reading.

THE MINISTER FOR THE NORTH-WEST (Hon. A. A. M. Coverley—Kimberley) [4.34]: I move—

That the Bill be now read a third time.

MR. F. C. L. SMITH (Brown Hill-Ivanhoe) [4.35]: I intend to oppose the third reading of the Bill. I endeavoured to speak on the second reading, but unfortunately, I did not catch Mr. Speaker's eye. It is curious to note in this Chamber how some Bills are passed very quickly, while others seem to hang around like a valley mist. Apparently the Bill before the House is one that has passed its various stages rather quickly. It was introduced when I was absent from the House last week.

Mr. Doney: That should not have been done.

Mr. F. C. L. SMITH: In consequence, I did not have an opportunity to look through it. Since then I have availed myself of the opportunity. While it may be said that there are no fish in the Brown Hill-Ivanhoe electorate, I am just as much interested in the question of fish and fishermen as is any other member of the House. I do not propose to allow the third reading of the Bill to be passed without voicing my protest against its punitive provisions. I regard the penalties proposed therein as absolutely vicious in connection with the misdemeanours to which they have relation. I regard the proposed increases in the penalties as absolutely unwarranted. Not only do I consider them to be unwarranted, but I regard the attempt to increase

them as an affront to the judiciary of the State, to the magistrates and the justices of the peace who hear cases brought before them under the provisions of the Fisheries Act. If the maximum penalties had been consistently inflicted in those cases, there might be some justification for the House taking action regarding the penalties prescribed by the parent Act. But no! The maximum penalties have not been inflicted by the magistrates and justices of the peace in these cases. In dealing with those prosecutions they adjudged the facts and decided that they did not warrant, in all the circumstances, the maximum penalties they could have imposed in accordance with the provisions of the parent Act.

I read very carefully what the Minister had to say when moving the second reading of the Bill, and I say, without fear of successful contradiction, that he advanced no argument whatever to justify the penalties set out in the measure. He did say that its passage would result in a considerable improvement in the administration of the Fisheries Department. That is to say, we have to agree to increased penalties of an aggressively vicious character in order to effect an improvement in the administration of the department! The House should have something more than that to justify the outrageous minimum penalties proposed in the Bill. I agree that the departmental administration might be improved by the department submitting an annual report to Parliament in connection with its activities. From inquiries I have made I find there have been no such reports. I have looked through "Hansard" back to the year 1932 and I found that even on the Estimates the subject of the Fisheries Department has seldom been dealt with. Therefore it is quite possible that the administration of this particular department could easily be improved. We could have annual reports on its activities, the prosecutions undertaken, and particulars of the penalties imposed together with details of the misdemeanours in respect of which those penalties were inflicted. Parliament has never received such a report. The Minister said that the amendments embodied in the Bill would bring our legislation into conformity with that of the Eastern States and the Commonwealth, but he said nothing, supplied no information, and advanced no instances to prove that that

would be the effect of the proposed amendment. He quoted no evidence in that respect whatever. Surely this House was entitled to some comparison between the different enactments to indicate that that would be the effect of the Bill. If this Bill is going to bring our legislation into conformity with that of the other States and the Commonwealth, why is it that the Commonwealth Year Book for 1939 referring to fisheries states on page 697—

In some cases the minimum size of fish to be taken is fixed, and in other cases the taking of some kinds is prohibited during periods according to necessity.

That does not seem to indicate that there are vicious penalties in other legislation, nor do the returns appearing in the Commonwealth Year Book show that any penalties are imposed in some of the States. For instance, no revenue seems to be derived in South Australia or Tasmania from fines or forfeitures. So I am not satisfied with the mere statement that these amendments will bring our legislation into conformity with the legislation of the other States and of the Commonwealth.

The Minister said the fact that material changes have taken place in the fishing industry itself is the real argument in favour of amending the present Act. What are those material changes? Did the Minister tell us? I want to know what they are. I looked up the Commonwealth Year Book on the matter and that Year Book gives no indication of any material changes in connection with the fishing industry in the Commonwealth. The Year Book for 1939 states—

Despite the abundance of edible fish, the progress of the fishing industry in Australia has been slow, the difficulties of transport and marketing supplies presenting the chief obstacles.

Precisely the same statement is made in the Commonwealth Year Book for 1932. So what are the material changes in the fishing industry of which the Minister spoke?

As the Minister pointed out, the Bill has four main features: the first, increased penalties; the second, wider powers for the inspectors; the third, the establishment of acclimatisation societies; and the fourth, increased powers concerning the collection of data. I am not concerned with Items 3 and 4 but I am particularly concerned about Items 1 and 2 which deal with increased penalties and wider powers for

inspectors. Inspectors under the Fisheries Act, or any other Act, whose duty it is to watch others with a view to catching them committing offences, very often develop an enthusiasm for their work that requires to be curbed rather than encouraged if the interests of justice and humanity are to be served. Not long since we had an instance of that in this State in connection with a Government instrumentality. On that occasion there was nearly a stoppage of work through an inspector behaving in a manner that would not be approved by the general run of mankind. We need to be very careful about the enthusiasm of inspectors in whatever walk of life they are to be found. I know they have a job to do and I appreciate the difficulties of that job. At the same time, I do not intend to encourage over-enthusiasm in inspectors, particularly in regard to the manner in which they perform their duties.

The Minister said, "The reason for the increased powers will readily be appreciated." I cannot appreciate it. I do not know whether other hon. members of this Chamber have been readily appreciative. One does not readily appreciate things through mere assertion. Some argument has to be advanced in order to make people appreciate the necessity for a certain course of action. The Minister submitted no argument, so I have not readily appreciated the necessity for these amendments. The Minister said the department has been in trouble because of complaints from local governing authorities and fish and game societies which have urged more departmental activity. What is the remedy he proposes? He proposes to stir up departmental activity through heavier penalties on a number of poor fishermen who, I suppose, in the prosecution of their job do not earn an amount equal to that received by the ordinary sustenance worker. That is the kind of action the Bill proposes for stirring the department into activity. When I was a young man in Victoria some years ago, the Victorian Anglers' Society used to have its meetings at the Bull and Mouth Hotel in Bourke-street, Melbourne. There was a brass plate outside the door of the hotel to indicate that the society met there. That plate was divided by a black line under which ap-

peared the words, "Victorian Fish Protection Society." I recollect that the Sydney "Bulletin" once had a cartoon in which was depicted a fish looking at this brass plate and saying, "Preserve me from my friends!" But there is an indication in that brass plate that the influence of the Victorian Anglers' Society is greater in connection with the protection of fish for the purpose of providing sport than it is in connection with the protection of those engaged in fishing for a living. I feel that that is the position in this State also. Too many people are interested in the possibility of fishing as a sport, but numbers of men in this State have to catch fish for a living and they are the people in whom I am most interested. I am interested in people who have to earn a living by means of a very hard and difficult avocation. I am interested in fishermen who go out from Fremantle and endure all the hardships of that calling. I am not a bit interested, or at least not very greatly interested—certainly not as much interested—in those who indulge in fishing as a sport.

The Minister declared that the inspectors say it is usually the same fishermen who are caught each time, and their faces are familiar in the court. Apparently a few fishermen are so often caught that their faces become familiar, although we are told that the average fine inflicted is only 10s. That is a different story from what was told by the member for Katanning when he said that five fishermen who were prosecuted in the Katanning court were fined £40.

Mr. Watts: Between them.

Mr. F. C. L. SMITH: That is different from a fine of 10s. for each man, and it is different from my experience when I was at the Crown Law Department in respect to fines. If fishermen are usually fined only 10s., why were representations frequently made to me on behalf of poor fishermen, and why did they ask for time in which to pay their fines?

Mr. Cross: I have never heard of a fine as low as that.

Mr. F. C. L. SMITH: Why also did they ask for the return of their nets so that they might continue to eke out their miserable existence? Members of this House took part in those representations. The fines were frequently in the vicinity of £5, and in some

cases may have been more. I do not care if those in the fishing business are all foreigners.

Mr. Cross: They are not.

Mr. F. C. L. SMITH: I think that statement has been made. I am going to stick up for the rights of foreigners who fish in the waters of this country, just as I would stick up for any other section of the community. And it may not be right to suggest that all those who are engaged in the fishing business are foreigners. There are dozens of callings in this State that are not attractive to Britishers. Not many Britishers were anxious to take on wood-chopping for a living along the Kurrawang woodline, and not many are anxious to take on fishing for a living. If the fine in the majority of cases was only 10s., I am prepared to leave that to the magistrate to decide, and to say within the limits of the Act that the penalty he imposes shall fit the crime with which the person is charged. We are told it is within the power of the magistrate to order the return of the net or fishing gear. It is now proposed to deprive him of that discretion. Why should that be so? The circumstances may not warrant the forfeiture of the net, or a fine greater than 10s. If they do warrant a fine, ample scope is provided under the present Act for the imposition of a fine greater than 10s. I look upon this Bill as an absolute affront to the justices and magistrates of the State who have tried this type of case. The department is not satisfied with the penalties the magistrate imposes, although in many cases the penalties are below the maximum that might be imposed. Surely members appreciate the significance of decisions of that kind. Even without this amending legislation the fines could be increased. It is suggested that through this Bill magistrates should be told that their judgment has been misplaced, and that their leniency has been unwarranted in cases of this kind. It is also suggested that they should be directed as to the penalties imposed. The long and short of it is that the Chief Inspector and the department want to be the judges in their own case. That is the effect of putting up a measure of this kind that proposes minimum penalties. They are not satisfied with the judgments that have been given in the past. They want to be in a position to put up their own case, and, because magis-

trates in their opinion have been lenient, they propose that this House should fix the minimum penalties.

The Premier: That is the proper thing to do.

Mr. F. C. L. SMITH: The idea is that penalties may be imposed in keeping with their ideas of the enormity of the offence, but not in keeping with the evidence submitted in connection with it. Sections 8 and 9 of the Act deal with the prohibition by proclamation against the taking of specified fish and the means of taking them. I am putting the matter shortly. They provide for a fine not exceeding £20 for breaches of the law. It is now proposed by this Bill that the fine shall be not less than £5 and not exceeding £20 for the first offence, and not less than £10 and not exceeding £50 for the second or subsequent offence. Where it was formerly unlawful to use seine nets without a fisherman's license it is now going to be unlawful to use any net without a license. Seine net is a large net which has to be buoyed and is spread out in a huge semi-circle. That is the kind of net the use of which is prohibited under the parent Act without a fisherman's license, but under this Bill any kind of net will be prohibited. Almost any evening one can go along the Swan River in the summer-time, during the shrimp season, and see boys with a hurricane lamp wading near the shore catching shrimps with nets. In future they will have to take out a fisherman's license in order to catch shrimps with those nets. Some sustenance worker in Victoria Park possibly uses a net near the Causeway to add to the provender as food for the empty stomachs of his wife, himself and his children. He will not be able to do that in future unless he possesses a fisherman's license. Under the parent Act before a person exposes fish for sale he can be called upon to supply a weekly statement. I do not know the effect of that provision in the Act, but apparently he is to provide a weekly statement giving details of the fish he exposes for sale, probably setting out who purchased it and what fisherman supplied him with it. It is now proposed that any person who attempts to catch fish for sale, or catches it for sale, or is employed to catch it for sale, can be called upon to supply a weekly statement. Half the fishermen in the State who catch fish for sale, or are em-

ployed by others to do so, could not make out a weekly statement if they were offered £100. I venture to say that hundreds of them cannot either read or write. Are we going to call upon those people who attempt to catch fish for sale, or are employing someone else to do so, to make out a weekly statement? The proposition is ridiculous. Another provision deals with the using of a net of a kind that is prohibited. I need not go into all the details of that net. However, the penalty was a fine not exceeding £5 for the first offence, and for a subsequent offence the penalty could be as high as £20. The Bill proposes to alter that. The fines are not high enough for the Fisheries Department. Now the penalty is to be not less than £5 and not more than £20 for a first offence and not less than £10 or more than £50 for the second offence. For possession of underweight or undersized fish the penalty was not exceeding £2 for a first offence and £5 for a subsequent offence, together with seizure of all the fish if more than one twentieth were undersized. Now the penalty is to be not less than £2 or more than £5 for the first offence, and not less than £5 or more than £20 for a second or subsequent offence. The penalties strike me as outrageous for offences of that kind. The present Act is quite adequate, and the fine should be left to the discretion of the magistrates who hear the facts of the case as presented by the prosecution and what is urged by the defence.

Another provision deals with assaulting an inspector. There the penalty was a fine not exceeding £10 or six months' imprisonment. But that is not sufficient for the Fisheries Department. Now the penalty is to be a fine of not less than £10 and not exceeding £50, or six months' imprisonment. An assault can be of varying degrees. A simple push might be regarded as an assault. A person could be charged with assault for a simple push, and the minimum penalty proposed is £10. I remember a case in the district of the member for Murray-Wellington (Mr. McLarty) where the facts were that an inspector waiting on a bridge got pushed out of the road while a man was putting his foot out of a truck. That would be an assault, and if the man were charged the minimum penalty would be £10. That I regard as outrageous. In connection with

fish in possession and suspected of having been caught in contravention of the Act, if the poor fisherman—and not many professional fishermen are wealthy—cannot satisfy the magistrate that he got the fish lawfully, he will be in trouble. Some poor ignorant fisherman who might have got the fish quite lawfully, but is called upon to appear in a court of law with all its panoply, may be quite unable to satisfy the magistrate that he did obtain the fish lawfully. This is a new provision; it does not appear in the parent Act. The penalty is not less than £5; and, moreover, the onus is thrown on the person charged to prove that he got the fish lawfully. Every member of the House knows the type of man that follows fishing in this State. Such men would not be very competent to make explanations with regard to fish in their possession. Another clause deals with persons who are found on any waters in a boat containing any net or other implement whatsoever, the use of which in such waters is prohibited by any proclamation made under Section 8 or 9 of the Bill, shall be guilty of an offence, and shall be liable to a penalty of not more than £5 for a first offence and to a penalty of not less than £5 and not exceeding £20 for a second or subsequent offence. Here the department makes a wonderful concession by proposing to provide that after the person accused has been arraigned before a magistrate and charged with the offence, it shall be accepted as a defence if he can show that a license in or to the effect of the prescribed form to take the net or other implement through the waters mentioned in the charge to other waters had been issued by an inspector, and that at the time of the commission of the alleged offence such net or implement was on such waters solely for the purpose of being so taken. Only after the fisherman has been charged will the certificate of the inspector be of any value to him. I never heard of anything more ridiculous than the suggestion that after an inspector issues a license permitting the fisherman to do this thing, he can still be prosecuted for doing it.

Another clause refers to seizure of engines, lines, nets and other articles used by or in the possession of any person, and all fish taken, sold, offered, consigned or exposed for sale by or in the possession

of any person contrary to the provisions of the Bill. In such case all those engines and so forth, together with the fish, shall be forfeited. I do not propose to deal with that aspect, but I ask what hon. members think of this type of legislation. I shall oppose any punitive measure such as this. The whole sentiment of our legislation is against measures of this kind. I am opposed to the passing of aggressive legislation for the purpose of trying to secure conformity with an Act dealing with offences of, in my opinion, a trivial nature.

I spoke earlier of the fact that very little has at any time been brought before the House relatively to the activities of the Fisheries Department and the subject of fishing in Western Australian waters. Certainly on one or two occasions members of this House have addressed themselves to the subject of fishing in Western Australia. I say without fear of contradiction that many of the statements made on such occasions were gross exaggerations. The member for Nedlands (Hon. N. Keenan) once said that our fishing grounds were depleted and useless because of a certain class of fishermen systematically destroying fish over a long period. I say that is a gross exaggeration.

Mr. Stubbs: It is perfectly true.

Mr. F. C. L. SMITH: The member for Nedlands also stated that there was scarcely a chance of getting a schnapper or a dhu-fish between Rockingham and Fremantle. This after what the member for Irwin-Moore (Mr. Berry) told the House about all the schnapper coming into Safety Bay. The member for Nedlands further said that fishing grounds in the south had been worked out in consequence of the destruction of immature fish. Are there any other reasons for fishing grounds becoming worked out besides destruction of immature fish? The hon. member informed the House that a little while ago a society was formed to deal with the matter from the private fisherman's point of view. I can quite understand the use of exaggeration in those circumstances. The member for Toodyay (Mr. Thorn) said that millions of fish were destroyed every year by the fishermen. On the other hand, an ex-member for Albany (Mr. Wansbrough), who I presume knows something about fishing, has said that he does

not agree with the total abolition of netting. He went on to say that some people thought that if we closed certain estuaries, it would assist fish breeding. The hon. member added that this was wrong because not half of our fishing grounds were breeding grounds. The member for South Fremantle (Mr. Fox) said that statements which had been made were exaggerated. The member for Katanning (Mr. Watts) referred to the large numbers of fish that were taken from Bremer Bay and an estuary there which had been closed against fishing for a number of years, with the result that the people of the district, who had been accustomed to use those waters for a holiday, now found themselves prevented from doing so because there were no fish to be caught. The hon. member showed that he was more concerned for those who indulge in fishing as a sport than for those who get their living by it. He also said that the law should be amended to make prosecution easier. There might be something in that suggestion. Certainly it is a better suggestion than that of increasing penalties under the parent Act. The member for Nedlands (Hon. N. Keenan) on another occasion said that our deep-sea fishing was becoming depleted. Would that be due to the catching of immature fish? The hon. member said that all along our coasts fish were destroyed when spawning. I do not know how long it takes a fish to spawn; but I should think that once a fish has spawned, it ought to be old enough to catch. That is how the matter appears to me, anyhow. The late Mr. Brockman, when member for Sussex, said that the bar of the Blackwood River was silted up and that therefore the fish were not able to enter the river, which was a spawning ground at certain periods of the year. That fact might alter all the habits of the fish in that particular district. They cannot get up the estuary where they had been used to spawn, and so they had to go somewhere else to spawn. The probability, though, is that Nature will look after things and that the fish will go somewhere else to spawn. I doubt whether we know as much about fish as we think we know. Certainly there has been much investigation of the subject. It is known that salmon go from the sea to fresh water to spawn, and that eels go from fresh water out into the ocean to spawn. Is anything known about the destruction that takes place in the sea because of the strug-

gle for existence there? In sea water there is nothing to sustain life. All the organic matter in the sea that is capable of sustaining life comes from the land. If there were anything in sea water that would enable fish to live, the ocean would become a solid block of fish. A pair of salmon, properly protected against their natural enemies, would in a period of about 10 or 15 years fill an ocean with fish. Therefore, it is the natural enemies of fish that cause a depletion of their number in the oceans. The member for Irwin-Moore (Mr. Berry) suggested that something ought to be done to protect the fish while they are spawning. I agree that something should be done; it might be a good thing for the fish, as well as for our fishermen, if arrangements could be made for both fish and fishermen to have a fortnight's holiday each year. That would certainly do our fishermen much good; I venture to say they cannot afford many holidays out of their meagre earnings. To say that depleted fish supplies in Western Australian waters are caused to any great extent by breaches of the Fisheries Act is, in my opinion, a ridiculous and grossly exaggerated statement. There are many factors operating in the depletion of fish, if they are depleted.

Mr. Thorn: They are in cool chambers.

Mr. F. C. L. SMITH: I am not saying there should be no control. As I said, to protect fish while they are spawning may be desirable; but whether the eggs are fertilised internally or externally, the young fish must look after themselves; they are not nurtured by their parents in the way that human beings are. When fish are spawned and return to the fishing grounds, I fail to understand why they should not be eligible for capture. I have come to the conclusion that legislation tends to make the occupation of fishing as hard as possible. The member for Irwin-Moore also spoke about set lines. He told us how fish caught on the hooks on set lines frightened other fish away. I venture to say the frightened fish did not go very far away.

Mr. Berry: They have been cleaned out.

Mr. F. C. L. SMITH: Out of Safety Bay, possibly, just around the reef through the passage of which the hon. member spoke. I do not know whether it is possible for the "Kybra" to enter Safety Bay, but if it is, one could hire the vessel and hang fishing lines all around it. The Act does not

prevent one from trying to catch schnapper.

Mr. Berry: I am glad you said "trying."

Mr. F. C. L. SMITH: Where were the fish caught on the set lines about which the hon. member spoke? I recall that some years ago a company was formed in this State to trawl on our west coast. A friend of mine in Kalgoorlie—a Greek—who knew every inch of the coast, told me not to invest my money in the company; at the time people were trying to sell shares. The Greek said, "I know every inch of the coast, and the sea bottom is unsuitable for trawling. There are too many reefs along the coast." But suppose trawling had been successful, suppose the sea bottom was suitable, what about the depletion of the fish? As the member for South Fremantle (Mr. Fox) said, "Can you expect any other position, in view of the fact that the population of the State has grown in the last 30 or 40 years and that each year the supply of fish has been greater than that of the previous year?" One would imagine there must be some change in the supply. But it is wonderful how Nature preserves the balance of things. Let us consider the figures in connection with the supply of fish in this State. In 1930, there were 313 boats valued at £55,453; 692 men were working in the industry; the fish caught weighed 42,400 cwt. and were valued at £125,250; and 12,294 dozen crayfish, valued at £4,917, were caught. In 1938, there were 316 boats valued at £53,128; 662 men were working in the industry; the fish caught weighed 46,649 cwt.—4,000 cwt. more than in 1930; 46,180 dozen crayfish were caught—about 34,000 dozen more than in 1930; the value of the fish was £146,945 and of the crayfish, £20,031. Do those figures indicate that the fish supply is depleted? The figures have increased each year, although there may have been a slight decline during the years of the financial depression.

I shall give some figures in connection with revenue from fisheries. In 1934-35, New South Wales had a total revenue of £12,490 from licenses, leases, fines, etc. Of that sum, £342 was derived from fines and forfeitures. I desire members to bear those figures in mind. Western Australia's total revenue that year from the same or similar sources was £1,371, of which the

sum of £181 represented fines and forfeitures. In 1936-37 the comparative figures were—

	Revenue.	Fines and Forfeitures.
	£	£
New South Wales ..	12,186	545
Western Australia ..	2,751	424

Do those figures indicate that magistrates have not inflicted severe penalties? Of a total revenue of £2,751, the sum of £424 is represented by fines and forfeitures. We appear to be getting the greater proportion of our revenue from fisheries in fines and forfeitures imposed under the parent Act. That proportion of our revenue appears to be greater than the proportion collected by the other States of the Commonwealth. I hope the third reading of the Bill will not be agreed to.

Mr. Stubbs: It will be carried all right.

Mr. F. C. L. SMITH: I do not care whether it is or not, I have raised my protest against it. I am entirely opposed to the punitive provisions of the measure. If we pass legislation of this kind dealing with fisheries, before long we shall be introducing similar legislation to deal with other industries. The existing Act provides sufficient penalties. This House has no right to impose minimum penalties when, by so doing, it interferes with decisions of magistrates and justices of the peace. I oppose the measure. I regard it as a piece of aggressive legislation that is entirely unwarranted.

MR. STUBBS (Wagin) [5.25]: I trust that the oration just delivered by the previous speaker will not be taken seriously by this Chamber. The hon. member represents a constituency—

Mr. F. C. L. Smith: I represent the State.

Mr. STUBBS:—whose residents believe in eight hours' work, eight hours' recreation and eight hours' sleep.

The Minister for Labour: They do not get it.

Mr. STUBBS: I have been a resident of the State for nearly 50 years. For 45 years I have lived on the shores of the ocean and the estuaries and on the banks of our rivers. With all respect to the previous speaker, I claim that I am conversant with the fishing industry from all angles—far more conversant than the hon. member wished the House to believe he is. Many years ago the fishing industry in this State was controlled by

British-born or Australian citizens. I would ask the hon. member how many of those citizens are engaged in the industry to-day and why it is that so many had to leave it. I am surprised the hon. member should stand in this Chamber and assert that he is here to protect the rights of foreigners engaged in any kind of trade. What would the hon. member say if a foreigner went to his electorate and offered himself for work at less than the Arbitration Court award rates and expressed his willingness to work 15 hours a day?

Mr. Doney: That is the point he forgot.

Mr. STUBBS: The foreigner would be lucky if he got away from the hon. member's electorate with his clothes on.

Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. STUBBS: It is all very fine for the hon. member to take up the time of the House for an hour in saying that the penalties provided by the Bill are too severe. The Bill is designed to protect the food of both the poor and the rich. I have in my pocket a card evidencing my appointment as an honorary inspector of fisheries, an appointment which I have held for 40 years, and I can give the hon. member—and other members of this Chamber—information with regard to illegal fishing in our rivers and estuaries. Some of the men engaged in illegal fishing have gone so far as to fire shots warning fisheries inspectors not to come too close. Inspectors have been threatened when in the course of their duties they attempted to take the names of the persons committing these illegal acts. I have seen as many as a dozen illegal nets stretched across the Murray River in one night and all the nets were full of fish; and members must bear in mind that the inspector whose duty it was to patrol the river had 100 miles of water to supervise. The great difficulty in the past has been the insufficient number of inspectors to police the Act. If the object of the amending Bill in increasing the penalties for offences is not to give our rivers and estuaries a chance of getting back to the condition of 30 or 40 years ago, I do not know what it is. At that time our waters were teeming with millions of fish. For every fish caught now, a hundred were caught years ago. The difficulty I see ahead is that unless the Bill is passed, poor people before long will be deprived of fish for their breakfast. To-day I inquired the price of a nice-looking piece of

dhu fish in a shop and was quoted 3s. a pound. Why, 15 or 20 years ago one could have bought 15 lbs. for 3s. Why is fish so dear to-day? I ascribe the high price of fish to the foreign control of the industry, for 90 per cent. of those engaged in it are foreigners; they go out in their boats and live on their boats day and night. I wonder whether the member for Brown Hill-Ivanhoe would like to see some of his constituents working 15 out of the 24 hours and competing with Australians. I hope members will agree to the third reading. A measure of this kind is long overdue.

MR. FOX (South Fremantle) [5.32]: I fail to see any connection between the case of a fisherman and that of a man working under an Arbitration Court award in Kalgoorlie. Undoubtedly the member for Brown Hill-Ivanhoe believes it is not right that fishermen should have to work such long hours for such little pay. The penal clause of the Bill is going to make it harder for fishermen to continue in the industry. I am willing to support any measure introduced by the Government to penalise law-breakers for offences that mean much to the community. From time to time milk-vendors are prosecuted for supplying milk of less than the requisite standard, and in many instances babies are fed on such milk, to the detriment of their health.

Mr. SPEAKER: I hope the hon. member intends to connect his remarks with the Bill.

Mr. FOX: Yes; I wish to show the difference between the penalties imposed under this measure and those prescribed for offences in respect of more important commodities used by the whole of the people. We read of prosecutions for supplying light-weight bread. I could quite understand the Government's introducing a measure to inflict heavier penalties on bakers for that offence.

Mr. Thorn: And starting-price book-makers?

Mr. FOX: There is no necessity for a man to indulge in betting, but he must buy bread. If he bets, it is his own business: the bookmaker does not ask him to bet. If heavy fines are inflicted for penalties under our fisheries laws, one of the effects will be to drive the fishermen out of the in-

dustry. I am convinced that there is a risk of that happening. Members would not then get fish at such a cheap price.

Mr. Thorn: Cheap!

Mr. FOX: Fish is an important food, and the price is fairly dear. The magistrate should be permitted to exercise his discretion and impose a fine commensurate with the offence. Britishers will not undertake fishing because the industry does not appeal to them. The same applies to wood-chopping; that industry does not appeal to Britishers. Recently I had a visit from a Fremantle contractor who thought of putting in a tender for supplying wood to the military camps, but he told me it was impossible to get Australians or other Britishers to undertake wood-cutting; he would have to depend upon Italians, and there seemed to be little chance of carrying out a contract under those conditions.

Mr. Thorn: Is that a reflection on Australian workmen?

Mr. FOX: The hon. member must know how difficult it is to get men for work of that kind. One has only to visit the wood-lines, as the member for Brown Hill-Ivanhoe mentioned, to appreciate that practically the whole of that industry is operated by Slavs and Italians.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member had better get back to the Bill.

Mr. FOX: If we provide severe penalties, we shall drive the fishermen out of the industry, and the result will be that the Government will have those men on its hands and will be expected to provide relief work for them.

Mr. Stubbs: Would you permit a fisherman at sea now to join the Lumpers' Union at Fremantle?

Mr. FOX: There are some naturalised Italians in the Lumpers' Union; in fact, there are naturalised Italians in nearly every union in the State.

Mr. Doney: That is not an answer to the question.

Mr. FOX: It is an answer.

Mr. Thorn interjected.

Mr. FOX: That is a reflection on the Labour organisations in this State.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! I ask the hon. member to get back to the Bill.

Mr. FOX: The member for Toodyay would not have a chance of proving his statement. He does not know of a case of that kind.

Mr. Thorn: Where a premium of £25 was charged?

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! I ask the member for Toodyay to keep order. The member for South Fremantle has the floor.

Mr. FOX: One would expect something of the kind from the hon. member. I was saying that if the fishermen are put out of the industry, they will fall back on the Government for relief work. Within two or three days of some unnaturalised fishermen having been interned, they were applying to the Child Welfare Department for relief. That shows the position of the fishermen engaged in the industry at present. I am sure that would be the effect of passing this Bill. There are many explanations of the depletion of our fish supplies. Fishermen have told me that the sea bottom does not afford very good breeding ground. They also say that it matters not how many fish are caught, an equivalent number will be found there in succeeding years. When we consider the millions of tons of fish that have been taken from the North Sea during the last 60 or 70 years, we must marvel that those waters have not been denuded of fish.

Mr. Berry: The explanation is that the authorities control the fishing there.

Mr. FOX: When a larger quantity of fish is taken from the sea, Nature probably adjusts the balance by permitting a greater number of the small fry to survive. A few years ago a large quantity of fish was killed in the Fremantle Harbour and outside. A fire started in the hold of one of the North-West boats; water was pumped into her to extinguish the flames, and the water came into contact with cyanide and later was pumped into the harbour. After that, thousands of fish were killed and could be seen right along the banks of the Swan River. I wish to direct attention to a case that came before the Fremantle court recently. A fisherman was fined for having in his possession 60 fish which were undersized to the extent of a quarter of an inch. That was the number of undersized fish in a catch of 50 dozen. What do we expect the fishermen to do? Carry a rule and measure them? Under the provisions of this Bill, I suppose that fisherman would be fined

not less than £5 and not more than £20. If his nets were confiscated, he would be driven out of the business. I and other members have been to the Minister for Justice on numerous occasions to request the return of confiscated nets because the fishermen deprived of them had no possible chance of paying the fine or getting a living. I commend the member for Brown Hill-Ivanhoe for his excellent speech. I shall vote against the third reading.

MR. BERRY (Irwin-Moore) [5.43]: I regret that I feel impelled to speak once more on this measure. The other night when I spoke, I quoted Safety Bay as a parallel of what was happening elsewhere; in fact, I assured the House that the same thing was going on all over the State. My object in explaining what was happening was to bring members to realise that if we protect the fish now, not only for future generations but for the present-day fishermen, we shall be doing the fishermen a service. Undoubtedly the fishing industry on our coast has gone sideways and backwards, and if we can save the fish, we shall save the industry. The wise course to adopt is to protect the fishermen against themselves, and the only way to do that is to prescribe penalties that will make them realise that it is not worth while to take fish by illegitimate means. The strongest point I made the other night was against the use of set lines. There is no doubt about the wickedness of that method. The member for Brown Hill-Ivanhoe, the fishing port of Kalgoorlie, said that if we took the "Kybra" to Safety Bay, we would be doing the same thing. That is not so; one could not get a single schnapper in Safety Bay, no matter how many lines were put out, unless one knew exactly where to fish. Some of the fishermen know the precise spots for putting out set lines. The fisherman who breaks the law, and flaunts the fact in our faces, as is being done, not only gets all the fish but prevents the honest man from gaining a living, and I suggest that before the outbreak of this war, all the illegal profit made by such a man was transmitted to Italy or Albania and lost to Australia. I am quite sure of that.

Mr. Fox: Many have their wives and families here.

Mr. BERRY: I know that a good deal of money did go out of the country; I helped them to send it away. The position

at Safety Bay in regard to illegal fishing is such as I described to the House yesterday, and only this morning I had endorsement of what I informed the House. There are certain English fishermen who reside there who would not dare to adopt illegal means of catching fish, and those men have told the Minister that it is their intention to clean up this nonsense if Parliament cannot stop it. They are pretty husky chaps and they will do it, too. The only way to stop what is going on is for the department to carry out the threat of penalising those who are engaged in illegal practices. The member for Wagin spoke about having had to pay 3s. a lb. for fish and he maintained, as I have done, that the waters have been depleted.

Mr. F. C. L. Smith interjected.

Mr. BERRY: The hon. member does not know anything about it. Schnapper come in at the beginning of October and are gone a week before Christmas. If it is not intended to stop the existing practices then let us cut out the penalties and the Fisheries Department and allow the fishermen to do what they like. Then in a matter of a few weeks there will be no fish at all and no fishermen. To-day we have to pay 1s. a lb. for schnapper when 40 years ago it was bought by the ton and £10 was paid per ton. That industry has gone. In the electorate I represent I do not say that exactly the same thing is being done, but we have heard the complaints of the members for Wagin, Katanning and Toodyay. I have no personal interest in the fishing industry, but my duty is to look after the people and particularly the generations to come. If we take from the Fisheries Department the power that it should have, then we shall be committing a breach of trust to future generations. The desire of those who are continually breaking the law is to get rich as quickly as they possibly can, and those who are honest are handicapped by that fact. The member for South Fremantle said that if we destroyed the fish that came in to spawn, Nature in her generosity would look after the spawn. Perhaps he thinks that Nature in her bounty will rain fish to replace depleted stocks.

Mr. J. Hegney: It has rained fish before.

Mr. BERRY: The fish caught during the spawning period are full of spawn and if that spawn is thrown on the beach or on the floor of the boat it is difficult for it to

get back to the sea. It is "hoovey" to say otherwise. Apparently the hon. member does not know that. I will be very happy to show him what happens. I hope the Bill will go through because in my opinion it will enable the Fisheries Department to do a great service to Western Australia and posterity. No matter what the member for Brown Hill-Ivanhoe or any other member has to say, the question has nothing whatever to do with party politics and neither will it disturb labour in any way.

MR. CROSS (Canning) [5.50]: So much has been said about the fishing industry that one could construct quite a number of fish stories out of the debate. No matter what legislation may be introduced it will never make the waters around the coast of Australia anything like as prolific as are the waters around Great Britain. The member for Irwin-Moore (Mr. Berry) mentioned that restrictions were imposed in the fishing industry of Great Britain. There are no restrictions at all. I was born in a fishing country, and I suppose I am the only person in this House who has ever been out on a Grimsby fishing smack. As a lad I went out hundreds of times in The Wash and the Spalding River, where there were literally tons of fish. The boats went out with the tide and into The Wash and then with the receding tide collected mussels, cockles and fish. Around the Dogger Bank hundreds of tons of fish have been caught daily over the last 50 or 100 years. I have been at Grimsby Docks when packets have come in and landed 1250 tons of fish in a day. Those waters have never been depleted. A fisherman who had worked around the Dogger Bank lived for a little while at Canning Bridge where he followed his vocation. In 1934 when officers of the Employment Department were removing the fishermen from that vicinity and finding them employment elsewhere, that man said to me that the problem of the Swan River was that there was no food left for the fish on the bed of the river, and that around the coast many fish were being taken by sharks. That was the reason for the scarcity of fish.

Mr. Stubbs: And there was a combine at work.

Mr. CROSS: I do not think so. It is just a matter of the lack of food for the fish.

I am opposed to the excessive fines it is proposed to impose on fishermen for what I call minor breaches of the Act. I have had occasion to interview the Minister before to-day on behalf of some of my constituents around Canning Bridge and South Como, men who were engaged in the industry. One man was fined £5 and the department confiscated his net and in that way took his living from him. It was his first offence.

The Premier: You mean it was the first time he was caught.

Mr. CROSS: No, his first offence. It is easy enough when netting to catch a few undersized fish, but if they are thrown back into the water immediately they do not die. One man was caught with undersized fish though they were only about a quarter of an inch under the regulation size. Yet he had to pay the penalty. However, to-day there are not many fishermen about South Como and Canning Bridge and not much fishing is carried out. The Canning River fishermen to whom I referred belittle the idea of limiting the number of men engaged in the industry around the coast. The removal of some of the fishermen would not have any effect on the number of fish. This man knew what he was talking about because he was born in the industry and lived on it all his life. The only way to increase the number of fish, he said, was by providing food. Fish are like human beings, they cannot live without food. It might be all right to prohibit fishing in certain localities, and by doing that affording the opportunity for the fish to multiply. I do not believe in imposing savage penalties on the fishermen, all of whom are poor men. Not only are they poor but they are, like dairymen, the hardest worked people in the world, and receive the worst pay. Trout fishing is different. I know trout live on entirely different food. That part of the Bill which deals with trout fishing will assist to establish that as an industry and it will become an asset to the State. At the same time we must use common-sense with imposing penalties for minor breaches. For a first offence what might be termed reasonable punishment should be meted out, then for a second offence the penalty should be increased, but it should not be what I would describe as savage. The fishermen are not able to pay heavy fines, and it means that several months

must be given to them in which to complete the payment. So in that respect we should treat the fishermen with consideration, and unless that is done I shall oppose the third reading.

HON. N. KEENAN (Nedlands) [6.0]: I had not intended taking part in the debate, but, as my name has been dragged in by the protagonists, I ask the House to be good enough to allow me to speak very briefly. The member for Brown Hill-Ivanhoe (Mr. F. C. L. Smith) based his opposition to the third reading of the Bill on three separate grounds. The first point he took was that the increased penalties provided for in the Bill are far too high. Secondly, he objected to the magistrates not having discretion regarding the penalties, or rather that they were given limited discretion because they could not inflict a lower penalty than that fixed in the Bill in certain circumstances. Thirdly, he dealt generally with the fishing industry, what really produced the shortage of supplies and what was the cause of the shrinkage. As regards the first two grounds—the increased penalties and the limitation upon the discretion of magistrates who deal with cases involving breaches of the provisions of the Fisheries Act—a lot could be said in favour of the arguments he advanced. Nevertheless, his contentions were not sufficiently convincing to convert me from my opinion that the Bill is necessary in order to preserve the industry and to make it not worth while to fish illegally. There have been instances where the imposition of the penalty has been very severe, and where the right of the Crown to reduce the penalty has been sought. I have no doubt that in every such case deserving of that consideration, the right has been exercised by the Crown.

It seems beyond any question of doubt that the fishing industry has been declining steadily almost without any break or suggestion of revival for many years past. Those of us who have resided in the State for many years are well aware of the fact. Where fish was plentiful only 20 or 25 years ago, there is the utmost scarcity to-day. It is useless for any member to come to this House and tell us there is not sufficient food on the floor of the sea to maintain a plenitude of fish. If that were so, there would never have been the plentiful supplies that existed in the past. The food

on the floor of the sea was quite sufficient 20 or 25 years ago to maintain fish in vast numbers. Now it is alleged that feed does not exist. That was the suggestion advanced by the member for Brown Hill-Ivanhoe.

Mr. F. C. L. Smith: I did not say anything of the kind.

Hon. N. KEENAN: One hon. member made that allegation.

Mr. Fox: That has been suggested by those who fish in the harbour.

Hon. N. KEENAN: Fremantle harbour is nothing; it is only a hole in the floor of the sea.

Mr. Fox: That is where so many private fishermen operate.

Hon. N. KEENAN: And that is all.

Mr. Fox: And that is where all the complaints are coming from.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order: I must ask the member for South Fremantle to refrain from interjecting.

Hon. N. KEENAN: The views of private individuals will have no influence upon me on this matter except with reference to trout. In the latter case I am prepared to place a great deal of weight on the opinions of private fishermen because they are interested in fishing only and not in augmenting the supplies of the people. Trout fishing has nothing to do with food supplies, but serves as an attraction to tourists and offers opportunities for legitimate sport to citizens of the State. However, that is not the phase with which we are concerned at present. Naturally the portion of the Bill that deals with the acclimatisation of trout is important, but has really little bearing on the subject matter of the debate. Before I pass away from that phase, however, I would like to remind those who are not perhaps acquainted with the facts, that the introduction of fresh water fish into Western Australia was carried out by private individuals, not by the Government. It is true that the State has, very properly, now lent its support to the movement, but years ago some of us became associated with the object of purchasing, through the proper channels, supplies of the ova of trout for the purpose of stocking our streams. The ova was brought here and placed in hatcheries. When the fry had developed, they were distributed among the rivers that we regarded as suitable. To some extent the move was success-

ful, but our means were very limited, and we depended entirely upon those limited means as to the extent of our efforts. Then, very properly, we recognised that public support was necessary and we induced the Government to supplement our resources. Now the effort is being carried out on a greater and more successful scale. Whether it will ever be a great success remains entirely for the future to disclose. Personally I do not think that trout will ever be successfully established anywhere except in moving waters. At the present time we have trout in rivers that subside in summer time into mere pools with no flow from pool to pool. I doubt very much if trout can be successfully introduced in such streams. Of course, there are a number of smaller streams that contain moving water all the year round and I hope and trust the trout will be successfully established in them. That deals with the only portion of the Bill with which private fishermen are concerned, and it has nothing to do with the supply of fish for the people's requirements.

I said earlier that, although I supported the Bill, I realised there was considerable weight in the objections taken to the restricted discretion permitted to magistrates. I felt that that was so when the Leader of the Opposition raised the point during the second reading debate, at which stage he did not receive much support from members who have now decided to object to the third reading of the Bill. On the whole, I felt I was bound to support the Minister and his Bill because unless we can make it not worth while for professional fishermen to break the law, then it is certain that the fishing industry is doomed. I know a good deal about fishing in outside waters and I do not know of any fishing boat which to-day goes in for deep-sea operations and which does not sail north of Geraldton to get supplies, or does not go south below Cape Leeuwin to Sandy Beach. The member for Brown Hill-Ivanhoe knows nothing about that. He does not enter into the possibilities of the position. As a matter of fact, if you, Mr. Speaker, know anything about the industry, you must know that deep sea fishing boats all go north of Geraldton—

Mr. Patrick: To Shark Bay.

Hon. N. KEENAN: —before they attempt to fish, or go south to Sandy Beach before starting work.

Mr. Stubbs: And more than that, these people club together to pay fines.

Hon. N. KEENAN: Not more than 25 years ago fishing boats did not have to go more than five or six miles north or south of Rottnest to secure supplies. These were readily obtainable in the waters between Rottnest and Bunbury or Jurien Bay. Why is it that the fishing grounds have been so depleted? There are many reasons. One, of course, is, as I explained in this Chamber on a previous occasion, that the spawning of fish has been terminated by the fishermen capturing the fish when they come in to spawn. Many types of fish are migratory and come to the coast only at certain seasons of the year for the purpose of spawning. If those fish are caught before the spawning season is completed, we most certainly will find in future years that the supply of fish will greatly diminish. Then there is the question of illegal fishing of the kind described by the member for Irwin-Moore (Mr. Berry). Further, there has been the use of dynamite. Frequently when at sea I have heard a rumble and looked round to see where the thunder was coming from. It was not thunder; it was the sound of the explosion of a plug of dynamite.

Mr. Cross: That has been going on in the Canning River.

Hon. N. KEENAN: The reason the dynamite is used is that when one fish is caught, the others are likely to escape before other lines can be lowered. The result is that one fish is caught and the rest are lost. For instance, schnapper move in a school. If many lines are down, a great many fish may be caught, but that does not usually happen. Therefore, a plug of dynamite is sent down and not only do the fishermen secure the whole of the school of schnapper, but kill three or four times as many under-sized fish as those they catch of the prescribed weight. These are the happenings that have resulted in the decline of the fishing industry. I hope the Bill will be passed. The Minister has not been coerced into introducing the legislation by the officials of his department. The suggestion has been made that he was coerced by them and that the officials had told him that they required him to introduce the Bill. I have no doubt the Minister gave the matter proper consideration and came to the conclusion that the measure was necessary. I support the third reading.

MR. McLARTY (Murray-Wellington) [6.12]: During the second reading debate I protested against the provision for increased fines and endeavoured to effect alterations when the Bill was considered in Committee. I agree with the member for Brown Hill-Ivanhoe (Mr. F. C. L. Smith) that the proposed penalties are altogether too severe. True, the maximum fines have rarely been imposed. If the department wished to prevent illegal fishing, why did it not take steps to secure the imposition of heavier fines? Licensed fishermen have been blamed for the depletion of Western Australian waters. I do not consider that charge to be just. The member for Wagin (Mr. Stubbs) has fished in the waters of the Murray for many years and he told the House what has happened there. I know that his statement was based on actual facts. Formerly fish could be caught there in abundance. There are reasons why there is not that abundance of fish in those waters to-day. I have already told members that, in the early days, fish were used as manure and legislation had to be introduced to prevent that practice. Then again the bars at the mouths of rivers have closed up and that has contributed to the scarcity of fish. Another contention advanced has been that enormous quantities of fresh water draining into the estuaries has had an effect on fish life. That is probably true. I know that the reason magistrates and justices of the peace do not impose heavy fines on fishermen is that they know of their own knowledge that the men, as a class, are struggling and are very hard up. There are between 60 and 80 fishermen in my electorate who are trying to make a living. That is what is responsible for the despatch of small fish to the metropolitan market. I have received many requests from those men to secure relief work for them so that they can leave the fishing industry.

Sitting suspended from 6.15 to 7.30 p.m.

Mr. McLARTY: I have not much to add. In my opinion the proposed penalties are much too severe and I suggest to the Minister that he agree to their alteration by another place. I am sorry now that when we were in the Committee stage the House was not divided on the question of some of the penalties, because many members agree that these are too high. An impression has been conveyed to members

that the persons engaged in our fishing industry are foreigners. That, however, is not so in the district I represent, where almost 100 per cent. are Britishers. I would be sorry to see the Bill defeated; because, if passed, it will give great encouragement to those interested in stocking the streams of our South-West with trout. I am reluctant to vote against the third reading, but I am more concerned about the men gaining their livelihood in the industry than I am about those who merely regard fishing from the sporting and the tourist aspect.

MR. ABBOTT (North Perth) [7.32]: Some of the previous speakers appear not to have conceived the real purpose of the Bill. The member for Brown Hill-Ivanhoe (Mr. F. C. L. Smith) conveyed the impression that the Government and its advisers were trying to deprive fishermen of their livelihood. Such an impression totally fails to express the intentions of the Government. What it is trying to do is to preserve for our fishermen and those who must follow them their livelihood. I am convinced the Bill is introduced on the recommendation of an expert technical adviser. The position of the fishing industry must indeed be serious when the Government has thought it wise to provide penalties such as those set out in the Bill. But apparently these are necessary in order that the industry might have a chance to survive. Admittedly the industry is difficult to police, and it is for this reason that high penalties are provided by the measure. What good purpose will be served if some poor fishermen are permitted to make a haphazard living to-day and the industry perishes? Most members are aware that fishermen realise something must be done to protect the spawning grounds of the fish that frequent our coasts. If it were suggested that the number of licenses should be limited so that those engaged in the industry might earn a more reasonable living, the measure would have my support. I agree with the statement of the member for Brown Hill-Ivanhoe that few fishermen are earning more than a bare subsistence. If the Bill were designed to assist those men, it would have my support. But is it worth while to legislate for the few while poachers are ruining the industry? We must consider those now honestly engaged in the industry and those who will succeed them.

The Legislature has made provision for heavy penalties in cases where it is difficult to obtain a conviction. For example, the penalties provided by the Transport Act are extremely severe. To prove that a person is in possession of stolen gold is difficult, and consequently the onus has been cast upon the person in possession of the gold to prove that it is rightly in his possession. For similar reasons, the Government has provided for heavy penalties in this measure. Is it not extraordinarily foolish to sacrifice the future for a rather miserable present? The member for Brown Hill-Ivanhoe mentioned that the provisions of the Bill would press heavily upon some unfortunate sustenance worker who might scrape the river bed here and there for fish, or upon some person netting prawns. I assert, however, that we would achieve greater success if we prohibited amateur netting. It is very nice for a person to take a net, cast it across a small stream and catch a load of fish; but these men are not fishing for their livelihood. Everything possible should be done to preserve spawning grounds, so that the industry may be conducted in a proper fashion. In my opinion, the penalties provided are not too severe and consequently I support the Bill.

MR. WITHERS (Bunbury) [7.40]: I hope the third reading will be agreed to. Considerable objection has been raised to what is, after all, only one portion of a very important Bill. As the member for Murray-Wellington (Mr. McLarty) said, we desire to see other portions of the Bill made law such as the provisions relating to the acclimatisation and protection of trout, particularly in the South-West. It is hard to understand the reasoning of some hon. members. As was pointed out by the member for North Perth (Mr. Abbott) penalties are imposed on people for breaches of other laws. We know that the penalties will not altogether prevent them from breaking the law, but they know that if they do commit offences they will be heavily penalised, and that to some extent acts as a deterrent.

Mr. Hughes: In many cases the fixed minimum works very harshly.

Mr. WITHERS: I supported the second reading of the measure, but I am not wedded to the penalties provided in the Bill. The clauses relating to those penalties can

easily be amended in another place. The member for Canning (Mr. Cross) sympathised with the breakers of this law and suggested that a small penalty only should be imposed. That would encourage a continuance of law-breaking.

Mr. Thorn: He does not know what he is talking about.

Mr. WITHERS: Only last week the member for Canning introduced a Bill designed to penalise the Jews for doing something wrong. He ought to be consistent. If the penalisation of one section of the community is right, it is right to penalise another section. There should be penalties for all wrong-doers.

Mr. Patrik: He did not propose to take away their livelihood.

Mr. Withers: This measure will not deprive the fishermen of their livelihood.

Mr. Fox: Of course it will.

Mr. WITHERS: We say to the fishermen of this country, "We will grant you a license to fish in certain waters under certain conditions, and if you do not observe those conditions you will be penalised." If we listened to the member for South Fremantle (Mr. Fox) and the member for Brown Hill-Ivanhoe (Mr. F. C. L. Smith), we would say to the fishermen, "You can fish ad lib; there is no penalty; you may have any size mesh you like; you may fish any day you like and in any waters and how you like." People have been known to blow up fish with explosives. Some of them have paid the penalty for so doing. A former member of this House paid the penalty for this offence, inasmuch as he suffered personal injury. Are we to make the penalty for breaches of this law so light that people will continue to infringe it?

Mr. Cross: Make the penalties fair.

Mr. WITHERS: A fair penalty is one that will be a deterrent to law-breakers. I hope the third reading will be agreed to. If members of another place consider the penalties too high, they can amend the Bill.

THE MINISTER FOR THE NORTH-WEST (Hon. A. A. M. Coverley—Kimberley—in reply) [7.45]: I listened attentively to the member for Brown Hill-Ivanhoe (Mr. F. C. L. Smith), whose remarks appear to have resulted in a considerable waste of time. First of all he complained of the brevity of the speech made by the

Minister introducing the Bill. He said I did not explain many matters. When I introduced the Bill I said it was essentially a Committee measure.

Mr. Hughes: You are not burling that back at him, are you?

The MINISTER FOR THE NORTH-WEST: I mentioned that I would be pleased to supply hon. members with any information they desired during the Committee stages. If brevity is a sin, then I have committed a sin in being brief in my introductory remarks. I shall probably commit another sin by being brief in my reply to the hon. member. He complained about the hurried passage of the Bill, saying that some Bills appeared to be hurried through all stages in this Chamber. I am not responsible for that. I had nothing to do with the hurried passage of the Bill. The House appeared to desire it to be put through Committee and that was done. The member for Murray-Wellington (Mr. McLarty) said he had protested against the heavy penalties provided in the Bill. In his second reading speech he did disagree with certain portions of the measure but he sadly neglected his duty as a member of this House by allowing the Bill to pass through the Committee stage without entering any protest or suggesting any amendment to any clause. Now, on the third reading, he repeats his previous complaint and suggests that members of another place should be asked to amend what he terms the pernicious clauses of the Bill. I am afraid I have no say as to what happens in another place.

The most serious complaint made by the hon. member for Brown Hill-Ivanhoe was that this measure was an affront—he used very extravagant language—to magistrates and justices of the peace. I fail to agree with him. I do not think his argument was sound.

Mr. Thorn: He himself introduced any amount of similar legislation.

The MINISTER FOR THE NORTH-WEST: Magistrates and justices of the peace are merely servants of the people. They are there to administer the laws passed by this Parliament. I suggest that they endeavour to administer those laws as they consider Parliament desires them to be administered. I can imagine a magistrate saying, "Parliament has decided on a minimum of 10s. for a breach of the Fisheries

Act," and I can imagine that that knowledge would influence him into thinking that a breach of that Act was a minor affair. Consequently, he would be inclined to deal leniently with persons brought before him for offences under the Act. That is the advice given me by the Chief Inspector of Fisheries who pointed out that, after 35 years' experience of this law, magistrates are still viewing breaches with leniency. That was my reason for suggesting an increase in the penalties. The hon. member referred to them as vicious penalties. I am convinced that to spoil the fishing waters of Western Australia in the way they are being spoiled is vicious, and I have no intention of agreeing to a reduction of the penalties. In my opinion the penalties set out are quite necessary; we should have amended the law years ago. As I pointed out on the second reading, the Act was passed 35 years ago, and after the experience of all those years, the department has endeavoured to bring our law more into line with those of the other States and the Commonwealth. The hon. member inferred that the need of these amendments was only supposition on the part of a scientific or departmental official. Suppose I admitted that the Bill had been brought down on the suggestion of the Chief Inspector of Fisheries, I ask members, whose duty is it to assess the value of the fishing industry of Western Australia and suggest steps for its protection?

Mr. Mann: He has the better knowledge.

The MINISTER FOR THE NORTH-WEST: Yes; he has a better right from experience and knowledge to make recommendations for the protection and saving of the industry. I agree with the Chief Inspector, and I am pleased that a majority of members have indicated their agreement by permitting the Bill to reach this stage without a division. There should be no need to point out again the detrimental effects that the actions of some fishermen are having on the industry. The hon. member was not present or he would have raised his objections on the second reading. I wish he had been present to do so, because, while I was on the subject, I might have devoted a little more time to giving the information he desired. I ask members, would it be right to reduce the penalties simply to appease people who are

breaking the law? Each fisherman is well aware of the conditions under which his license is granted and is equally well aware of the penalties for breaking the law. As was pointed out on the second reading, the fact of the penalties being so small is an incentive to many fishermen to take the risk of indulging in illicit fishing. Such a fisherman could take undersized fish and be practically sure that the returns would more than cover the very small amount of fine that would be imposed if he were caught, and at the same time he would be practically certain that his net would be returned. The hon. member spoke of the extreme penalties proposed to be inflicted. Had I had an opportunity to peruse the records of the various convictions, I could have quoted a great majority of lenient fines and of nets returned as against the number of heavy penalties.

I have no intention of occupying time by explaining what has happened to the fishing industry, but I should like members to visualise what will happen when this measure becomes law. The timber industry of Western Australia was practically ruined—millions of pounds worth of timber had been ruined—until the Forests Act was brought into operation. That Act has saved this State many millions of pounds worth of jarrah and other timber, and that legislation provides heavy penalties for breaches of various kinds. If this measure is passed by another place, it will do as much towards saving and reviving the fishing industry as the Forests Act has done for the timber industry.

The onus-of-proof clause was objected to by the member for Brown Hill-Ivanhoe. I know of no Act of Parliament in which the clause more deserves a place than in our fisheries legislation. Everyone knows of the hostility exhibited to fisheries inspectors and of the combinations employed to defeat their efforts to protect the industry. The member for Canning ought to know that, in the matter of illicit fishing, there is no place worse than the section of the river in his district. The fisheries inspectors know how difficult it is to detect a fisherman in breaches of the Act because of the organisation used against them. Some of these fishermen have what are known as "cockatoos." This means that mates of the fishermen are posted along the

bank, and immediately a fisheries inspector is sighted in his boat, a screech is sent up and passed on until it reaches the men engaged in illicit fishing. The net is at once hauled in, and when the inspector reaches the spot, he finds the fishermen merely enjoying the sea breeze and having a smoke.

The hon. member also complained that we were requiring a private person who used a seine net to take out a license. The department desires this power because the interpretation of "seine net" is any net that can be pulled or dragged. A seine net might have a mesh of $2\frac{1}{2}$ inches, whereas the legal size is $2\frac{1}{4}$ inches. For this and other reasons of the kind, we desire power to control persons who use seine nets. The member for South Fremantle complained of the penal provisions, which might have the effect of depriving a fisherman of the opportunity to make a living and necessitate his seeking Government relief. That statement was somewhat inconsidered because I do not think the hon. member would desire to give protection to anyone who deliberately broke the law. There is no doubt that some of these fishermen do break the law deliberately. If the hon. member desires to protect the industry as well as the fishermen, he should regard this Bill as a godsend to the fishermen. The fewer the opportunities available for illegal fishing, the better off will the fishermen be in the future. The member for North Perth suggested the need for amending the heavy penalties and thought this might be done in another place, but the justification for the provision has already been stressed. It is difficult to catch offenders because of the "cockatoo" screechers, etc., employed to outwit the inspectors. The member for Murray-Wellington also complained of the heavy penalties, but if, after a few years' experience of the measure, he can convince the House that hardships are being imposed upon professional fishermen, no doubt steps will be taken to reduce the penalties. From my knowledge of the industry and the information I have received, I feel warranted in asking members to pass the Bill as it stands, and not to request that greater leniency be granted to offenders until proof is afforded that hardships are being imposed upon them.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a third time, and transmitted to the Council.

BILL—HARBOURS AND JETTIES ACT AMENDMENT.

Second Reading.

Order for the Day read for the resumption from the 29th October of the debate on 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.

ANNUAL ESTIMATES, 1940-41.

In Committee of Supply.

Resumed from the 17th October; Mr. Withers in the Chair.

Vote—Labour, £1,525:

THE MINISTER FOR LABOUR (Hon. A. R. G. Hawke—Northam) [84]: The Department of Industrial Development has been very active during the last 12 months in an endeavour to forward the Government's policy of expanding existing secondary industries, and of establishing new secondary industries wherever that has been found possible. It is generally admitted that the task of expanding the secondary industries of Western Australia is not an easy one. Most members are aware of the many difficulties that have to be faced by those who establish and endeavour to carry on local secondary industries. There are others in the community who develop a great deal of optimism for secondary industries, which optimism soon evaporates when large and satisfactory results are not quickly achieved. Those who expect that our secondary industries will be quickly and substantially expanded are, I think, doomed to disappointment. We have to take into consideration the fact that for many years Governments, financial institutions, private firms and individuals in the State concentrated very largely, if not entirely, upon the development of our primary industries and the gold mining industry.

Mr. Doney: Gold mining is a primary industry.

The MINISTER FOR LABOUR: I would not care what it was called if I had more

of the product of that industry than I have been able to secure up to date. Because of those circumstances, very little effort was exerted for the purpose of establishing or expanding our secondary industries. Not many years ago the opinion existed almost universally amongst our people that the development of local secondary industries was something about which we should not concern ourselves. Nine out of ten people of this State railed very savagely against the policy of Australian protection for secondary industries. That opposition to the Federal policy of protection for secondary industries has to a large extent disappeared in recent years. People now recognise that that policy has been tremendously valuable to Australia, especially in the crisis through which we are now passing.

Mr. Lambert: It has killed Western Australia.

Mr. Sampson: It is a protection to the Eastern States.

The MINISTER FOR LABOUR: Had that policy of protection for secondary industries in Australia not been operating, our war effort to-day would not have been worth talking about. There would have been no war effort, because we would not have had in operation the industries that are so essential in the carrying on of war efforts of any importance. It is true the policy of protection for secondary industries in Australia has acted with benefit to certain States, and to the detriment of others. That is not the fault of the policy but the fault of those who are responsible for its operation.

I say definitely that any Federal Government which desired to spread the benefits of protection more evenly could do it. The time will come, I hope, and in the not-distant future, when the power controlled by Federal Ministers will be used for the purpose of ensuring that those benefits are spread more evenly over all the States and that the disabilities of protection also are spread more evenly over the States than is the case to-day. In any event, the policy of protection for secondary industries is an established policy in Australia. It always will be, and we in Western Australia owe a duty to take whatever advantage we can of the policy so as to have it used to the greatest possible extent for our benefit. It is certainly not sufficient for us merely to indulge in strong condemnation of the policy while doing nothing to take advantage

of it as largely as possible. When this Government some 18 months ago decided to concentrate upon accelerating the rate of expansion in our secondary industries, it was resolved that a special council for the development of secondary industries here should be established. That council was established. Its personnel at the present moment is as follows:—Hon. L. Craig, M.L.C.; Mrs. E. B. Sinclair; Messrs. H. L. Brisbane, R. O. Law, N. Temperley, B. Meecham, A. W. Jacoby, Langlois Lefroy, P. J. Mooney, P. J. Trainer, J. W. Vivian, J. L. Paton, H. V. Marr, and O. Vincent, with myself as chairman.

Mr. Doney: In what year was the council formed?

The MINISTER FOR LABOUR: In the year 1939.

Mr. Doney: I am thinking of the council formed by Mr. Kenneally.

The MINISTER FOR LABOUR: That is going back to about 1934. The former council went out of existence. This council for the development of industries, it will be realised from the list of names I have read, is made up of persons who have special knowledge of one or more of the phases of our secondary and primary industries. The council meets every month and discusses problems associated with our industries. It also discusses various phases of development covering those industries. Further, it receives and discusses suggestions coming forward from time to time and from various sources as to steps that might be taken for the purpose of making still more important the secondary industries of Western Australia. The members of the council themselves, I think, feel that the work they have been able to do during the last 18 months has been effective work. I propose, before concluding my speech on the Estimates of this department, to indicate briefly some of the progress that has been achieved in certain industries during the period the council has been functioning and during the period the Government has been concentrating upon the endeavour to bring about greater expansion and greater activity in the secondary industries. It will be remembered that some 12 months ago the Government appointed an Industries and Works Promotion Engineer. We did not have to go outside the State to obtain the services of a suitable and capable man for the job. In fact, we did not even have to go out-

side the Government service. We were able to obtain the services of Mr. Fernie, who had for years previously been associated in an engineering capacity with the Goldfields Water Supply Department.

Mr. Doney: You have as good a man as there was to get.

Mr. Lambert: But surely it will not be suggested that he is efficient if he has only been associated with the Goldfields Water Supply. We do not want to manufacture water.

The MINISTER FOR LABOUR: We do not want to manufacture water, and neither do we want to manufacture wind.

Mr. Lambert: Not for you, at all events.

The MINISTER FOR LABOUR: Mr. Fernie concentrates upon the task of making himself familiar with factories and workshops in Western Australia. He has been gladly received in every factory and workshop that he has visited. I may mention that I, together with Mr. Fernie and other officers, desired to visit and inspect a factory in which the member for Yilgarn-Coolgardie (Mr. Lambert) is interested. When we went along, however, the door was locked.

Mr. Warner: After all his talk about it!

The MINISTER FOR LABOUR: Mr. Fernie is always available to manufacturers for the purpose of discussing with them any particular problem they have on their hands. He is always available to give any advice within his power to offer. The department itself, through its officers, is always available to endeavour to obtain any advice or information that manufacturers may require, or that may be needed by individuals thinking of establishing a new industry to enable them to make up their minds finally whether a proposed new industry is worthy of establishment here. I do not say that our Industries and Works Promotion Engineer knows everything there is to be known about secondary industries. I do not know of any engineer in the world, or of any individual in the world, he member of Parliament or otherwise, who knows all there is to be known about secondary industries and the activities that are associated with them. All the department aims to do is to give the best advice it can obtain, and to assist in the fullest possible measure those Western Australian manu-

facturers who feel that they need advice or who even need financial assistance to enable them to carry on.

Mr. Sampson: And is that assistance on occasion forthcoming?

The MINISTER FOR LABOUR: I thought that remark would cause the member for Swan to be interested even to the extent of making an interjection to ascertain whether the financial assistance is given to every applicant. I can put the mind of the hon. member at rest on that point immediately by telling him that the financial assistance applied for is not granted in every case.

Mr. Sampson: I hope it is granted in some cases.

The MINISTER FOR LABOUR: The granting or otherwise of financial assistance applied for depends entirely upon the merits of the proposal put forward by the applicant. Associated with the department and the Council of Industrial Development is a special technical committee, the members of which are Mr. S. L. Kessell, the Conservator of Forests, Mr. F. E. Shaw, the Government Mechanical Engineer, Mr. H. Bowley, the Government Analyst and Mineralogist; Mr. H. J. Goodes, the Government Economist; and Mr. F. Gregson, Utilisation Officer of the Forests Department. This committee considers any special problems that are submitted to it. It is a committee to which we submit technical questions for consideration and advice. The committee is comprised of particularly well-trained and competent men. When we have sought their advice, as we have from time to time in connection with special problems, they have proved very helpful on each occasion. The development of the gas producer industry has been accelerated to a considerable extent during the last two years, and particularly during the past 12 months. It was quite unusual two years ago, or even 12 months back, to see a gas producer plant attached to motor vehicles. In the country districts one would occasionally see a motor truck or tractor fitted with such a plant. To-day, no matter where we may go, whether in the city or in the country, we can see motor trucks, tractors, and even motor cars, fitted with gas producers.

Mr. Patrick: And motor buses, too.

Mr. Sampson: You feel that the department has done something in that direction?

The MINISTER FOR LABOUR: I am positively sure that it has.

Mr. Doney: You might even give some credit to the war for having created a demand for the plants.

The MINISTER FOR LABOUR: I am prepared to give some credit even to the member for Williams-Narrogin (Mr. Doney) for having done something to assist in the establishment of the industry. Whatever credit is given him he will deserve.

The Minister for Works: Compliment received with due modesty!

Mr. Doney: I am just trying to decide what the Minister really means by that remark.

Mr. Patrick: The fear of petrol rationing has had an influence as well.

The MINISTER FOR LABOUR: I do not suggest that everything that should be done in connection with gas producer plants has been done, nor do I suggest that everything necessary in connection with the manufacture of charcoal for use in those plants has been dealt with. Much still remains to be done before it can be claimed that the gas producer plants are perfect and charcoal supplies as satisfactory as they should be. To those who may be inclined to submit instances of gas producers having failed, or of charcoal not being of the quality necessary, I would say that the industry is practically new. There has been a great deal of experimentation carried on both with the manufacture of the plants and the production of charcoal. Quite a number of the plants have been made in what might be designated as backyard factories.

Mr. Patrick: There are plenty of home-made plants in use.

The MINISTER FOR LABOUR: A good deal of improperly treated charcoal has been placed on the market from time to time. What the Department of Industrial Development is aiming at is the establishment of a reasonable minimum standard to which gas producer plants, and charcoal as well, will have to comply before they can be passed as suitable for sale to the public.

Hon. N. Keenan: Has that standard been fixed yet?

The MINISTER FOR LABOUR: I am leading up to that particular point and will deal with it in a moment. A producer gas committee was set up some time ago at

the instance of the Commonwealth Government, whose desire was to encourage the use of producer gas plants to the fullest extent possible. Such a committee has been set up in every State of the Commonwealth with a central co-ordination committee in Melbourne. The Western Australian committee consists of Professor Blakey of the University of Western Australia, Mr. F. E. Shaw, the Government Mechanical Engineer, Mr. Gregson of the Forests Department, and Mr. Fernie, the Industries and Works Promotion Engineer. That committee has given consideration to the following matters: The establishment of standard specifications for charcoal, the laying down of standard specifications for gas producer plants, and advising on suitable methods for the production of charcoal. Some time ago the committee recommended the Government to equip a number of its vehicles with gas producer plants and a number of those vehicles have since been so equipped. A complete producer gas testing plant is now being erected at the University under the supervision of the committee. When that plant has been finally erected, the necessary tests will be carried out and it is hoped that a reasonable minimum standard will then be established, and some means of preventing gas producer plants not reaching that standard from being developed. Advice regarding the equipping and financing of producer gas plants has been given to many individuals throughout the State and to many local governing authorities. Matters affecting the licensing of producer gas vehicles, the position of such equipment on vehicles, and access of such vehicles to the wharves at Fremantle have been taken up with the various authorities concerned. Firms manufacturing these plants have been advised on many questions regarding the marketing of their products, and representations on their behalf have been made in many instances for the purpose of having necessary raw material made available to them.

The question of obtaining raw materials for many of our secondary industries in Western Australia is most important. That phase has created considerable difficulty during the last 12 months. Many of the raw materials required have to be obtained from Victoria or New South Wales, and several of our manufacturers have experienced considerable difficulty in obtaining necessary supplies. Some of the manufacturers have

not been able to obtain all the supplies of raw materials they require, and on occasions some have not been able to obtain any such supplies at all. They have been told by the officials of the Commonwealth Supply and Development Department in Melbourne that, unfortunately, consignments could not be made available as the materials were required for defence industries or for essential peace-time activities. When I was in Melbourne a few weeks ago I made particular inquiries in connection with this aspect. As a result, I am convinced that Western Australia and the manufacturers in this State are not getting anything like a square deal regarding the obtaining of raw materials required to carry on activities in our factories and workshops.

Mr. Sampson: That is true.

THE MINISTER FOR LABOUR: Supplies of raw materials could be made available to our manufacturers. To prove that statement I need only point to articles manufactured in the Eastern States and sent here which our manufacturers would make could they secure the necessary raw materials. The manufacturers of the Eastern States can obtain the raw materials to manufacture goods which are sent to Western Australia; but our manufacturers are refused necessary supplies because the officials of the Commonwealth Supply and Development Department say that such supplies cannot be made available.

Mr. Sampson: That is another phase of the "all-in" policy.

THE MINISTER FOR LABOUR: It is a phase of the "all-in" policy of the big industrial interests of the Eastern States.

Members: Hear, hear!

THE MINISTER FOR LABOUR: Those interests, in my opinion, are exercising far too much influence upon certain Commonwealth departments.

Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Sampson: Strangling Western Australia!

THE MINISTER FOR LABOUR: Consequently it is necessary for us at all times to bring all the pressure we can to bear in order that our secondary industries may not be penalised to the extent to which they have been penalised in the past and are being penalised at the present time. This penalisation of our secondary industries is not so much caused by the policy of protection as it is by the unsympathetic attitude adopted

by Commonwealth departments towards our State. The sooner the influence of the big interests of Victoria and New South Wales over Commonwealth departments is wiped out, the better it will be not only for our industry, but for the Commonwealth as a whole.

Mr. Patrick: Sydney complains that Melbourne is getting all the business.

The MINISTER FOR LABOUR: I believe Sydney has justification for making that complaint. The State Government and the Department of Industrial Development have made continual representations to the Commonwealth authorities with regard to this matter and other matters of a similar nature. In many instances these representations have been forwarded through Senator Collett; and I say to-night—as I have said on several occasions previously—that he has done everything possible to obtain for Western Australia what both we and he consider to be a fair deal so far as the development and maintenance of our secondary industries are concerned. We realise that one Minister in a Government cannot do all he might desire to do; we know that one Minister from Western Australia in a Federal Government of 16 or 18 Ministers cannot achieve all that he and we desire. In fairness, I may add that we have from time to time also enlisted the assistance of every other Federal member and every Federal Senator from Western Australia in these matters. To the credit of them all, it can be said that, irrespective of the party to which they belong, they have co-operated in making the strongest possible representations to the Federal authorities to secure better treatment for our industries.

The development of producer gas plants in Western Australia was one of the first subjects investigated by our Council for the Development of Industries. It is estimated that there are now 2,600 motor vehicles in this State equipped with these plants and that at least 300 additional motor vehicles are now being fitted every month. It is also estimated that at least 400 men are engaged in the manufacture of these plants. Many of these plants are being exported to the other States, where they can be sold in competition with similar plants manufactured in the Eastern States. If the present rate of development continues, this industry will be employing about 1,000 men this time next year. A special charcoal-burning kiln

has been designed by the department; its object is to eliminate excessive handling and to produce clean charcoal at reasonable cost. The kiln consists of a steel retort with external firing and two coolers. Wood is loaded on to steel trucks which pass through the kiln and the coolers discharging with a hopper constructed over a crusher. From the crusher the charcoal is elevated to a grader and bagged or discharged into railway trucks. Two companies are interested in the kiln. One has acquired a timber concession and intends to proceed immediately with the construction of a plant estimated to produce $4\frac{1}{2}$ tons of charcoal per day.

The practice of paying visits to factories and workshops has been continued. The purpose of such visits is of course to obtain first-hand information of the activities being carried on by the manufacturers. In addition, these visits establish a bond of goodwill between the department and the proprietors of the factories and workshops. A better understanding exists between the department and the manufacturers than has ever existed previously in this State. The department understands the manufacturer's difficulties and point of view better than it did two years ago; while the manufacturer now understands better than he did before the policy and aims of the department.

The question of publicity is of great importance to the expansion of our secondary industries. Such publicity is really an attempt to educate the people of the State to do what we consider they ought to do, that is, support at every possible opportunity the products of our workshops and factories. The advice is exceedingly simple. I sometimes think it is too simple. Many men and women cannot really believe that the welfare of our people can be greatly promoted by their demanding and purchasing goods made by workers engaged in our own secondary industries. Nevertheless it is true that the welfare of the people of our State could be substantially increased and improved if more of our people would do that very simple thing. But they do not do it. Only a minority of the people of this State do that sort of thing regularly. Some of our people do it spasmodically. They develop a sudden spasm when they are sufficiently appealed to. For a day, a week or even a month they become disciples of the policy of buying locally-made goods when-

ever and wherever possible. Then they forget about it. I would not like to ask each hon. member here this evening to stand up in turn and confess what brand of cigarettes he or she smokes, or what brand of jam he or she has upon the breakfast table.

Mr. Mann: It should be all home-made!

The MINISTER FOR LABOUR: Or what brand of cloth is in the suit or dress he or she is wearing, or where the boots or shoes he or she is wearing were made, and so on. I am afraid if we were called upon to do that and did it with absolute honesty, not one of us would show up too well.

Mr. Doney: Not even the Minister!

The MINISTER FOR LABOUR: Not even the Minister. I put it to hon. members very strongly that the duty of encouraging the secondary industries of this State is not the duty of the Government alone or of the Minister alone. In this matter every member of this House has an equal duty with every member of the Government.

Mr. Patrick: You can sell a man anything, but just try to sell a woman anything!

The MINISTER FOR LABOUR: I do not know whether "Hansard" has reported that interjection, but it is one capable of many dangerous interpretations. Despite the strong temptation there is to deal with those interpretations, I resist it. I suggest to hon. members that the duty in this matter is intensely individual. It is no use at all for me or any Minister of the Government or any member of Parliament to stand up on a public platform and appeal to the general public to do the right thing when we do the wrong thing ourselves. It is no use for me to write articles in the "West Australian" for a special industrial supplement which is issued from time to time; it is no use anyone else writing special articles for that supplement urging the people of this State to be loyal to the goods made in Western Australia, unless everyone who so writes does the right thing also. I appeal to every hon. member, including even the member for Swan, to give very careful and continuous attention to this matter.

Mr. Warner: Why pick on him?

Mr. Sampson: I have been at the penitent form for a long time.

The MINISTER FOR LABOUR: For us to remember our duty in the matter is difficult. To forget about it is easy. To go into a shop and ask for a packet of this or a pound of that or a tin of something

else and take it when it is handed over, is easy. It is also very easy to demand a locally-made article, and yet to be told that the article is not in stock and to have some imported brand pushed on to one.

Mr. Sampson: What do you do then?

The Minister for Mines: He goes to the next shop.

Mr. Sampson: Do you refuse it and go out with a halo round your head?

The MINISTER FOR LABOUR: All I can do is to tell the member for Swan what to do; I cannot make him do it.

Mr. Sampson: Have you any control over your own actions?

The MINISTER FOR LABOUR: I must admit that when the member for Swan interjects as persistently as he does, I very nearly reach the stage of losing control over my own words and actions. But I refuse to become annoyed with him.

Mr. Sampson: That is a nice change.

The MINISTER FOR LABOUR: I will treat him as reasonably and generously as I can.

Mr. Fox: Do not forget he is Sampson!

The MINISTER FOR LABOUR: Someone the other evening suggested I was Hercules.

Mr. Sampson: Adonis or Apollo!

The MINISTER FOR LABOUR: I suggest that if we want the men and women of Western Australia to be continually loyal to the products of our factories and workshops, it is up to every member of this House to set the example. If we do not do so—

Mrs. Cardell-Oliver: Do not look at me! I do.

The MINISTER FOR LABOUR: I am not looking at the hon. member because I think she does not do so, but because I enjoy looking at her.

The CHAIRMAN: Order!

The MINISTER FOR LABOUR: I hope she will not deny me the pleasure of doing that. I quite believe that the hon. member not only does the right thing regarding the purchase of local products at every opportunity but that she also endeavours to influence and persuade as many of her friends as possible to do the same. That is the duty of every one of us. If every one of us were to do that, I am sure the rate of progress of our secondary industries would be much greater than it has been in the past. If we make appeals to the general

public to do something we are not doing ourselves, we cannot expect worth-while results and we do not deserve to get them.

I have already made reference to the special industrial supplements issued by the "West Australian" Newspaper Co. during the last two years. Those supplements contained much of educational matter concerning our secondary industries. I am sure their publication was responsible for achieving worth-while results because those who read them must have been considerably impressed by the magnitude of our secondary industries and the possibility of their expansion in the future. In addition to using the "West Australian" newspaper and other publications, we took advantage of every other medium of publicity to bring before the people of the State as frequently as possible the desirability and necessity for the greatest possible patronage being given to products made in the factories of Western Australia. Another method employed to bring directly before the notice of the public the range of products manufactured in this State is that of staging exhibits both in the metropolitan area and in the country. In recent months exhibitions have been held at Northam, Geraldton, Kalgoorlie, Boulder, and Merredin. Since July last several exhibitions have been staged in the South-West, including the towns of Collie, Manjimup, Bridgetown, Bunbury, Busselton and Harvey, and a further series of exhibitions is now being held in the Great Southern districts.

Mr. Mann: Have not they been held?

The MINISTER FOR LABOUR: Some have been and some have yet to be held. The towns are Northam, York, Beverley, Narrogin, Albany, Katanning and Wagin. Manufacturers who have exhibited at these shows of local products have notified the department that the sales of their products have increased in the centres concerned following the staging of exhibits. I am pleased to say that the local governing authorities in the centres in which exhibitions have been held have co-operated to the fullest extent with the department. Not only have they been helpful in making halls available and providing electric light free of charge, but the chairmen, secretaries and members of the boards have gone out of their way to ensure that the greatest

possible advance publicity was given to the exhibitions. I come now to particular applications for financial assistance. Thirty-five applications for financial assistance have been dealt with. All of them have received careful consideration and, as far as was safe, sympathetic consideration.

Mr. Doney: In how many cases?

The MINISTER FOR LABOUR: The number of applications approved to date is 13. The industries that have been financially assisted cover the production of paving and wall tiles, fire extinguishers, water-proof and ordinary clothing, electrical machinery, fish meal, the canning and bottling of various foodstuffs, and the erection of a pilot plant for the treatment of alunite for potash and the treatment of certain minerals, and for the manufacture of scientific instruments.

I propose now to give some details of particular industries or sections of industry that have been financially assisted. There was a factory in Western Australia that manufactured water-proof clothing. The factory was supplying not only local requirements, but also the requirements of certain Government departments in the other States. Difficulties developed in the management of the factory, and there was a clash of opinion and interests between the manager and the directors. Because of the exceptionally skilful operations involved in the making of water-proof clothing and because the manager had considerable skill and the directors had none, the manager was able to bring about a condition of affairs that caused the factory to be closed down. The machinery was on the point of being dismantled and sold for what it would bring when the department came into possession of information regarding the position. We set to work to interest other people in this factory. Finally we were able to make contact with two enterprising young fellows who were already operating in another branch of the clothing industry. They examined the factory and the machinery; we gave them all the information we had about the requirements of our Government departments and the orders that had previously been filled for Government departments in the Eastern States. They were convinced that the factory could be re-opened and operated successfully, and they took possession. They

re-employed the persons necessary to operate the machinery and carry on the factory, which has now been working for a period of approximately nine months. I am pleased to be able to report that the factory is working at full pressure and that the two men who took it over are entirely satisfied with the results achieved. I might add that under the new management the factory is again supplying water-proof clothing to some Government departments in the other States, as well as to all the Government departments in this State.

Mr. Sampson: And you think their balance sheet is all right?

The MINISTER FOR LABOUR: I do not know whether their balance sheet is all right, but the principals of the firm are all right, and that is the most important point. Another firm has since undertaken the manufacture of water-proof clothing here so that we now have two factories engaged in this class of industry. It therefore seems reasonable to suppose that the whole of the State's requirements in water-proof clothing will be supplied within the State, and we might also hope that the export trade with the other States will increase as time goes on. Following the granting of financial assistance to another clothing factory, its operations have been expanded to such an extent that the number of persons employed has increased from 13 to 77. This factory is now handling substantial contracts for the Commonwealth Defence Department. The manufacturer of fire extinguishers in this State, who was assisted by the Government, is producing an extinguisher that complies fully with the requirements of the Fire Brigades Board and the Insurance Underwriters. Orders for fire extinguishers are now being executed by the factory, which orders, but for its establishment, would have been carried out by Eastern States firms. This is the first time in the history of Western Australia that chemical fire extinguishers have been manufactured locally. Most members who are observant, and perhaps those who are only normally observant, will have noticed that the corridors of Parliament House have been brightened considerably in recent weeks by the installation of new fire extinguishers. If they closely examine those articles, they will notice that they are made in Western Australia, and carry in bold letters the name of the local manufacturers.

Mr. Sampson: I hope there is no conspiracy to burn down Parliament House.

The MINISTER FOR LABOUR: Financial assistance has been given to a factory that was inaugurated primarily for the canning of sheeps' tongues. The company has progressed to such an extent that it is sending its products to several of the Eastern States, whilst also supplying the large market that exists for them locally.

The Premier: And they are of very good quality, too.

The MINISTER FOR LABOUR: The factory has now been expanded to double its previous capacity, and has embarked upon the canning of other products, including turtle soup. This last product has met such a steady and consistent demand from all the States of the Commonwealth that proposals are now under consideration by the company for the canning of crayfish in this State. The main reason why the canning of crayfish has not been carried out already is that a number of fishing boats were put out of commission more or less recently, because of action that had to be taken by the Commonwealth authorities in connection with those in control of the boats in question.

Mr. Patrick: Crayfish were being canned in Geraldton a few years ago.

The MINISTER FOR LABOUR: Crayfish of excellent quality were canned at Geraldton some years ago.

Mr. Sampson: The "red tail."

The MINISTER FOR LABOUR: I do not desire to go into the history of that enterprise; unfortunately it failed. We hope by assisting this particular company to have the industry re-established in the factory at Geraldton.

Mr. Berry: How much of the local products are going to the Far East?

The MINISTER FOR LABOUR: Off-hand, I cannot answer that question.

Mr. Berry: Some are going there.

The MINISTER FOR LABOUR: I will make a note of the question and, when replying to the general debate, will undertake to give as much information on the point as possible. Laboratory tests have been carried out in connection with our alunite deposits at Campion. These indicate that not only is the deposit suitable for the production of potash, but that alumina is one of the by-products of that alunite. Alumina is the basis for the manufacture

of aluminium. There is no need to tell members how valuable aluminium has become as the result of the outbreak of war and the greatly increased production of aeroplanes. Sufficient is it to say that it is very difficult and expensive to obtain aluminium to-day. We hope that the tests upon the alunite deposits at Campion will be so successful as to enable us not only to manufacture great quantities of potash from the deposits, but to manufacture also alumina and other by-products of considerable value. A local syndicate is developing the deposit but to safeguard the interests of all concerned the Government recently had a pilot plant manufactured locally. That plant will be installed at the University, and will be used for the carrying out of the necessary tests on a commercial scale. We feel that every possible safeguard should be employed before the public is encouraged to invest money in this enterprise. That is also the view of the members of the syndicate. If the tests are successful, as we have good reason to believe they will be, we shall see the establishment in Western Australia of one of its biggest industries. It will be an industry of considerable importance, and will certainly be worth all the trouble, worry and expense that have so far been met by those who have taken a keen interest in the project.

It has been proved by inquiry that there is a big market for fish meal, not only locally but in the other States. The consumption of that commodity within Australia is estimated to be 8,000 tons per annum, of which Western Australia consumes 3,000 tons. A company is now operating in this State and has received financial assistance from the Government. It is producing fish meal and making it available to poultry farmers as a poultry food, and the commodity is also used, I understand, as a fertiliser by primary producers in certain of their activities. Apart from the financial assistance afforded by the Government to this industry, help has been given in many other forms to those who are conducting it, with the result that the industry has been developed upon a very favourable basis. The department has given considerable advice and assistance to firms in this State for the purpose of enabling them to instal additional plant, and also to purchase raw materials so that they may carry out contracts for the Defence Department.

A conference of local manufacturers was convened on the occasion of the visit of the Commonwealth Controller of Canteen Supplies, together with one of the staff officers for canteen services. The position relating to supplies for military canteens was fully explained to the manufacturers, and all the requirements covering quantities, the size of packages, and the like, were placed before those manufacturers. As a result of the representations made by the department to the Commonwealth authorities, advice concerning all tenders called by the Commonwealth department in question is now received immediately tenders are announced. Some months ago complaints were received that manufacturers in this State knew nothing about the tenders until they had closed, because of the very poor publicity given to such things in Western Australia. The fact that advice is now received and made available immediately following the announcement of tenders enables a check to be maintained in this State, and very often interested firms here are acquainted by the department with the nature of the tenders and as a result are assisted to prepare prices and submit tenders so that these may be considered by the Commonwealth departments in question.

A good deal of consideration has been given to the manufacture of motor bodies for supply to the Defence Department. We feel that Western Australia has not received any sort of a deal at all in this matter, and that the big manufacturing concerns in South Australia, Victoria and New South Wales have received far too much consideration in the question of supplying motor bodies to the Defence Department, while Western Australian manufacturers have received very little consideration, if any at all. Here again I am afraid that the interests of big business in Eastern Australia somehow or other operate an influence detrimental to the smaller manufacturers in this State. A very important point is that if the bodies were made locally, our timbers would be utilised in the making of them. We cannot possibly have any objection to the Defence Department buying the motor bodies it requires for use in Eastern Australia from Eastern Australian manufacturers, but we entertain a decidedly strong objection to that department buying from manufacturers in Eastern Australia motor bodies which are required for

use by the Defence Department in this State.

Mr. Mann: Have you made any appeal to the Commonwealth Government?

The MINISTER FOR LABOUR: Yes; numerous appeals.

The Premier: One was made only this week.

The MINISTER FOR LABOUR: We appeal to the Commonwealth Government at least once a week, and during some periods once a day. The Commonwealth Government always assures us that the interests of Western Australia are being looked after, and that not only fair consideration, but generous and sympathetic consideration, is always being extended to us in these matters. However, that generous consideration very rarely seems to take practical form. Many other matters have been taken up in connection with the supply of clothing, food and other commodities to the Defence Department. The commandants of all military camps here have been written to with a view to having Western Australian-made goods used in the camps, and assurances have been received from the commandants that they are willing to do all in their power to encourage the greater use of locally-made articles. Constant representations are being made on behalf of Western Australian manufacturers with a view to their receiving consideration for tenders, and also receiving necessary supplies of raw materials, as mentioned earlier, to enable them to tender for Commonwealth requirements.

Contracts were called for wooden tool chests, softwood being specified. Representations made by the Department of Industrial Development resulted in that restriction being removed. Had it not been removed, the contracts would undoubtedly have gone to firms in Eastern Australia. From September, 1939 to August of this year orders to the value of £471,000 were placed in this State on account of defence expenditure, the principal items being—clothing £66,000, boots £28,000, engineering and general orders £128,000. The total amount of £471,000 for one year seems a large amount, but if we compare the total value of orders received by us with the total value of orders received by New South Wales, South Australia and Queensland, we will find that our amount of £471,000 represents but a paltry proportion.

A local engineering firm has just secured a contract to supply the Defence Department with mincing machines. Possibly the Defence Department has in mind the mincing of the enemy. An order has been given locally for the manufacture of 450 of these machines. The fact that they are being manufactured in Western Australia reflects great credit on the local manufacturers concerned. They are two young men with tons of initiative, heaps of courage, and a great deal of skill. The task of manufacturing a mincer is not an easy one. It calls for considerable skill and very special machinery. These two young fellows have established the industry and built it up successfully. The same firm is engaged in the production of lathe tool holders, and the manufacture of lathe tool holders is a highly difficult process, requiring great skill. Young men of this description deserve every encouragement and every assistance which the Government can give to them, and which anyone else in our community can give to them. The firm desires to extend its range of manufactures in regard to the production of lathe tool holders, and representations made on its behalf have resulted in its enterprise receiving protection through a restriction of import licenses for certain articles from overseas, which articles are similar to those the firm is now making in the local factory.

Further defence contracts have been placed during recent weeks with private and Government workshops in Western Australia. We are hopeful that before long most of the workshops capable of carrying out defence contracts will be working at full capacity, but there is a good distance to be travelled before that desirable objective is attained. Some time ago the department arranged a conference between representatives of jam, preserved fruit, and fruit-juice producers. Information was recently given to the department by the manufacturers showing that the turnover of our jam and fruit-juice manufactures has increased considerably this year, necessitating the employment of many additional hands. One factory, and quite a big one, has doubled its capacity. A company is being formed for the production of fruit juices, and permission has been obtained from the Commonwealth Treasurer for its

flotation. An application on behalf of the company to our department for financial assistance to enable certain plant to be obtained is now receiving consideration. Considerable progress has been made in the manufacture of pickles and sauces locally. In the case of one firm it has been found necessary to secure much larger premises in order to enable it to cope with the expanded business it has received. In the change-over the firm took advantage of the opportunity to instal a completely up-to-date plant in the new premises. A company has been established in the district of the Premier, at Geraldton, for pulping of the surplus tomato crop in that district. As an immediate result of these activities, it is estimated, 700 tons of oversized and undersized tomatoes, which in previous years could not be marketed, will now be processed for the production of tomato pulp.

The production of condensed milk by local firms shows a consistent increase, and the question of extension has been studied by the manager of one of the larger firms for the purpose of ascertaining whether a further expansion in this particular industry cannot be achieved in the near future. The manager in question indicated that as opportunities presented themselves, the company would not hesitate to extend its activities in the industry.

Mr. Patrick: Are we manufacturing powdered milk?

The MINISTER FOR LABOUR: No. It may interest hon. members to know that the manufacture of condensed milk is now concentrated in two States of Australia—New South Wales and Western Australia. The biggest company associated with the manufacture of that article has factories in those two States, and proposes to take every opportunity to extend its activities in Western Australia.

Mr. Lambert: That company came here only to kill the local industry.

The MINISTER FOR LABOUR: That is definitely a wrong point of view to take.

Mr. Lambert: It is absolutely true.

The MINISTER FOR LABOUR: The other condensed milk manufacturers are still operating.

Mr. Lambert: You ask Mr. Macfarlane, M.L.C.

The MINISTER FOR LABOUR: I prefer to accept the advice of other people rather than that of Mr. Macfarlane, which is being conveyed to me secondhand. A matter that has received repeated consideration at the hands of the department is that of promoting the interests of the fishing industry. Dr. Thomson, of the Council for Scientific and Industrial Research, visited Perth some little time ago for the purpose of conducting a preliminary investigation covering the possible developments of the industry. Following his visit, representations were made to the Commonwealth Government urging that a fisheries research vessel should be made available to carry out extended investigations in the waters off the coast of our State. It was represented that the investment of capital in our fishing industry would be much facilitated if the necessary scientific data relating to the movement of fish in our waters and the quantity of fish available, was made known. The Commonwealth Government has now agreed to make available the necessary vessel, which, when constructed and in commission, will operate exclusively in Western Australian waters.

Mr. Berry: When will that be?

The MINISTER FOR LABOUR: I am hopeful that it will not be very long before the vessel is constructed and operating in the waters off our coast. The Commonwealth Government has made a decision in the matter. A conference is to be held in Melbourne next week at which the subject will be further discussed. We will have at least two representatives at the conference and we are hopeful that when they return they will be able to give us some idea of when the vessel will be in commission. The market for frozen whiting and garfish is being developed at Albany. It is estimated that five tons of the fish can be obtained weekly, and that will mean an annual return of nearly £30,000. Lack of shipping has been the drawback to date. The possibilities of canning salmon and tunny are receiving consideration.

Until recently coking coal was considered necessary for the economic production of pig iron. By means of the new English Duffield process, it is considered that no longer is coking coal necessary for the production of pig iron. We are having a check made in connection with the new process through our Agent-General in London.

There seems to be no doubt from the information made available to us that the Duffield process is revolutionary with regard to the production of pig iron inasmuch as it brings about many changes in the production of that iron and drastically reduces the cost of its manufacture. Western Australia possesses excellent raw materials in close proximity to each other for the production of iron and steel under this particular process. It is probable that it will be found cheaper under the new process to produce pig iron in Western Australia than in any other State of the Commonwealth. No doubt those interested in Australia now engaged in the production of pig iron will probably do everything possible to prevent the application of the new process to production and its development in Western Australia.

Member: Naturally.

The MINISTER FOR LABOUR: If those interests adopt that attitude, or attempt to do so, the duty will devolve upon the Government and the Parliament of Western Australia, backed by the people generally, to take whatever steps are considered necessary to see that the big interests concerned in the Eastern States are not allowed to prevent the establishment of this important and vital industry in Western Australia. This State imports annually about 44,000 tons of sulphur, valued at £180,000. Inquiries have been made and are still continuing with a view to ascertaining whether it is possible to recover sulphur from the flue gases on the gold mines and also by extraction from sulphides. As I say, this matter is still receiving close attention. There is a great demand for the mineral known as vermiculite, which is used for a variety of purposes, the most important of which is that associated with heat and sound insulation. There are in Western Australia three large known deposits of this mineral. A statement has been made by a company in Sydney that the British Empire market for vermiculite is 5,000 tons per week, valued at between £10 and £12 per ton. Tests regarding this mineral, which we propose to carry out, are being arranged by Mr. Fernie, our Industries and Works Promotion Engineer, with a view to seeing whether the mineral can be marketed in Western Australia.

Mr. Patrick: Where are the deposits?

The MINISTER FOR LABOUR: There are some in the electorate of the member for Yilgarn-Coolgardie.

Mr. Mann: What is it used for?

The MINISTER FOR LABOUR: Mainly in connection with heat and sound insulation. It has proved very effective for that purpose. At the moment there are very few known deposits of the mineral in the world; therefore it is most important that we carry out intensive investigations regarding the deposits in this State. Inquiries are being made regarding a number of deposits of phosphatic rock with a view to ascertaining if they can be economically exploited for the production of fertilisers. A small quantity of asbestos from the Hamersley Ranges has realised £120 a ton in London. As Western Australia possesses extensive deposits of different types of asbestos, there would appear to be excellent avenues for the investment of capital in the development of these deposits, particularly when it is known that in 1938-39 Australia imported asbestos supplies valued at £223,000. It is considered that if our deposits were to be fully developed, the work would provide employment locally for probably 500 men. Deposits of commercial quality mica of a high grade occur from the lower South-West up to the Kimberleys; but there has been no systematic development of these deposits.

The Australian Glass Company has extended its premises at East Perth and installed plant necessary for the treatment of felspar, which previously was mined in this State, sent in its raw condition to New South Wales and treated there. Additional employment has thus been provided locally at that factory. The same company is erecting additional premises to enable it to manufacture corrugated cardboard, which is used for a variety of purposes in this State.

There are known deposits of many other minerals in Western Australia and consideration is being given to the possibility of exploiting one or more of them in order that the variety of minerals produced in this State might be increased and additional opportunities provided to increase our wealth.

At the request of the British Minister for Supply, the Commonwealth Government has undertaken to sow 21,000 acres of flax in Australia and to process the straw for the purpose of producing flax fibre. After consultation with the local De-

partment of Agriculture approximately 1,100 acres of flax were sown some months ago between Waroona and Dardanup. Plant and machinery are to be installed in a mill at Yarloop for the purpose of processing the straw. Mr. Fernie has been made available for consultation with the mill management to deal with any engineering and mechanical problems that may arise from time to time. As much as possible of the plant required for the process will be manufactured in our own workshops. The possibility of using Guildford grass as a substitute for jute in the manufacture of certain articles has received consideration. Samples have been forwarded to two firms in Victoria, at their request, with a view to testing the grass in order to ascertain its commercial possibilities. As the result of a suggestion received from the W.A. Fibre Plaster Manufacturers' Association, the question of sowing an experimental plot with hemp has been taken up with the Agricultural Department. Endeavours are now being made to obtain suitable seed. A well-established company has signified its intention of spending approximately £30,000 on extensions of its tannin-extraction plant, and also of proceeding with the destructive distillation of wood to produce briquetted charcoal, acetone and methyl-alcohol.

Lengthy consideration was given to the possibility of establishing an industry in this State for the purpose of manufacturing transparent paper, with subsequent extension to the production of rayon. The services of an expert from Switzerland were obtained, and he visited Perth towards the end of last year. Some business men in Perth became interested in the proposition, and necessary steps were taken for the formation of a company to deal with the proposed industry. The main project, that is, the production of cellophane and rayon, would involve a capital requirement of £700,000. It is thought, however, that the present time is not propitious to take on so tremendous a project. In addition, the share market could not reasonably be called upon to support a flotation above £160,000, which would be sufficient to enable the manufacture of cellophane to be undertaken, thus leaving action to be taken at some future date for the production of rayon. An application has been made to the Commonwealth Treasurer for permission to proceed with the formation of the com-

pany and such application is now receiving attention. The value of transparent paper imported into Australia during the year 1938-39 was £59,000.

There is a good demand for eucalyptus oil and a local firm is prepared to advise suitable men as to the methods they should follow in this industry. This firm is also prepared to provide stills and to refine the distillate for the market. The department is able to assist by procuring supplies of steel pipes for conversion into retorts. Experiments conducted by the Agricultural Department prove that the castor oil plant thrives without irrigation on our coastal sandplains. A yield of approximately 1,000 lbs. of beans produces 50 gallons of castor oil. Australia's requirements are approximately 1,200 tons per annum, valued at about £70,000.

Representations were made to the Agricultural Department to obtain seeds of a high pyrethum content, and advice has now been received that the seed has arrived. A small experimental plot is to be developed in the Manjimup district. Pyrethum is an essential ingredient in the manufacture of fly-spray oil and the like. Difficulties in obtaining supplies of dried-fruit cases from overseas resulted in attention being given to the possibility of using karri for the purpose. A trial shipment of cases made of karri was sent to England and the Agent-General informed us that they proved entirely satisfactory. Requirements for next year's pack of fruit will probably be over 20,000 cases which, we hope will be made from local timber. Should the member for Toodyay (Mr. Thorn) care to take part in this discussion, he will be able to inform the House of the many difficulties that had to be overcome before karri was even given a trial. He will be able to tell members how interests in the other States had to be fought before it was possible for us to obtain permission to use karri for cases to export our fruit to the markets of the world. The hon. member played a not unimportant part in bringing the negotiations to a satisfactory conclusion.

Members: Hear, hear!

The MINISTER FOR LABOUR: A local company approached the department and complained of the difficulties it was experiencing in obtaining supplies of imported tobacco leaf required by it to main-

tain its own manufactures at their existing level. The trouble arose because of the inability of the firm to obtain the necessary license to permit of the importation of the tobacco leaf in question, as it had to be obtained from non-sterling countries. The matter was taken up with the Commonwealth Government and that action resulted in supplies being realised. At the time of which I am speaking they had arrived in Australia and were on the Fremantle wharves, but because the manufacturer had not obtained the license prior to their coming here, the Commonwealth department concerned had refused to release the tobacco leaf to the local company. Hon. members will know that local tobacco leaf is blended with imported leaf and from that blending tobacco manufactures of different kinds are made. Had the imported leaf lying on the wharves at Fremantle not been made available to the local company, it could not have carried on its activities except in a very restricted way. A trial lot of tobacco leaf grown in Western Australia was sent to a London manufacturer through our Agent General in London. The lot proved so satisfactory as to cause arrangements to be made for the despatch of much greater consignments of locally-grown tobacco leaf to manufacturers in London.

It was ascertained by officers of the Department of Industrial Development that concrete mixers and hoists required by a Government department were about to be obtained from the Eastern States. Inquiries were immediately set afoot to ascertain whether local firms could manufacture those particular articles. After consultation between Mr. Fernie, our engineer, and certain local firms, it was found that one of the firms was willing to attempt the manufacture of those commodities. An order was placed with the firm and the article it manufactured was so satisfactory to the department concerned that additional orders were placed. The concrete mixers and hoists have given complete satisfaction. They were manufactured locally at a lower price than that at which they could have been imported from the Eastern States.

[*Mr. J. Hegney took the Chair.*]

A local company has installed equipment for the manufacture of water meters for Government requirements. It is also sup-

plying the Bunbury Water Board. Because of the orders it has received from the Government, the company has installed plant to manufacture everything in connection with water meters except the working chamber and special undergear. The parts manufactured in this State represent 40 per cent. of the total value of each meter, and their manufacture provides the greatest amount of employment. A local company engaged in the production of conduit for electric light wires experienced unfair competition with manufacturers in the Eastern States. Action was taken by the department to protect the interests of the local company, which has made considerable progress since that time, and is now manufacturing many articles which it previously made no attempt to make. I am also pleased to report that this particular firm is developing a market in Eastern Australia for many of its products.

A local company engaged in the manufacture of weighing machines and weighbridges approached the department for assistance in the fixing of a standard of hardness for knife edges. The matter was taken up and a satisfactory standard was established. At the request of the local authorities at York, Toodyay and Albany, advice was given covering the installation of producer gas plants as generating units for electric light stations. The claims of local manufacturers of metal lockers were represented to the Railway Department recently and I am pleased to tell hon. members that a local firm was successful in securing a contract a few days ago against Eastern States competition. This is the first time that metal lockers of this type have been manufactured in Western Australia.

Last year and again this year evidence was given before the Commonwealth Grants Commission on behalf of the department. Every possible subject associated with secondary industries was covered by the evidence given on each occasion. The members of the Grants Commission appeared to appreciate the opportunity to hear the case for the industrial expansion of Western Australia. They appeared to be sympathetic and undertook to do all in their power to ensure that Western Australia received the most reasonable deal possible from the Commonwealth authorities and other authorities that have some influence and power in this matter. The

Department of Industrial Development is represented by its secretary, Mr. Macartney, on the Board of Area Management for Munitions, and the Industries and Works Promotion Engineer conducts special engineering investigations for the board.

I emphasise again, as I did earlier, that the duty of assisting to promote the industries of Western Australia is the duty of every one of us. We are making progress against great difficulties but unless each one of us in this Parliament is prepared to do his and her share in this matter, the greatest possible efforts of the Government and the department concerned are not likely to achieve very much. We depend upon the full co-operation and support of all members of Parliament just as we depend on the support of the general public to assist us in bringing to greater fruition the efforts we are continually making to overcome the many difficulties facing our secondary industries, and to ensure their maintenance and more rapid expansion.

I propose now to deal briefly with the Factories Department and other departments under my control. Year by year the number of factories and shops registered and the number of persons employed therein has increased. Last year, leaving out of account the factories registered under the Timber Industry Regulations Act, the number of registered factories was 2,775 and the number of persons employed therein was 26,004. There were 9,052 shops and warehouses registered, providing employment for 35,536 persons. Those are the highest figures ever recorded in Western Australia.

The State Government Insurance Office is now housed in much more suitable premises in St. George's Terrace. During the year the staff was re-organised. Mr. Bennett, who had acted as part-time manager ever since the establishment of the office, was made full-time manager a few months ago. He is now located at the office and gives the whole of his time and attention to the control and management of the business. As a result of the move to new premises, together with the change of management, the business is being carried on satisfactorily and is increasing.

The Department of Labour has continued to carry on its excellent work in connection with the industrial relationships existing

between unions of Government employees and Government departments. It has established a very large measure of goodwill between the departments and the unions covering the men employed in various Government departments. This has enabled agreements to be made by negotiation, thus saving the time of the Arbitration Court and its officers and also saving much expensiveness to the Government and the industrial organisations.

The Child Welfare Department had approximately 5,000 children under its care on the 1st July last. That number was 85 more than the number under the care of the department in the previous year. Of those children, 628 were maintained in institutions. In addition, 332 wards were boarded out to private families. The number of women with dependent children being assisted by the department on the 1st July last was 1,076. Outdoor relief, in addition to the outdoor relief already referred to, has been granted in 153 special cases under the headings of widows, deserted wives, incapacitated husbands, sick single persons, husbands in mental hospitals and husbands in prison. Licenses were granted or were current at the 30th June of this year for street-trading by children to the number of 355. That is the essential information covering the Department of Child Welfare. If any member desires details of the administration or of the many useful activities of the department, I shall be pleased to supply them after members have taken part in the discussion.

Mr. Sampson: What about adoptions?

The MINISTER FOR LABOUR: There is one point I should like to mention. The number of children coming from overseas for the Fairbridge Farm School is now practically nil because of the difficulties and dangers that would be encountered in bringing them to Western Australia. Every member will regret the fact that no children can be brought to the Fairbridge Farm School for the time being, but all will hope that the conditions which make this impossible will pass away before long to the end that this very praiseworthy scheme might be re-established and carried on.

HON. N. KEENAN (Nedlands) [9.55]: First of all I must take the opportunity to compliment the Minister upon the very exhaustive and very lucid speech he has

made on the subject of our secondary industries. Other matters he has dealt with will no doubt receive attention at the hands of various members, but I do not propose in my remarks to refer to more than the very important question of our secondary industries. I should like at the outset to congratulate the Minister upon recovering his health. His has been a marvellous recovery, because he underwent a serious operation, such as I once had the misfortune to undergo, and I know that the physical strength he has displayed to-night indicates a marvellous recovery. We congratulate him upon it, and hope it will be permanent and without any return whatever of the trouble that forced him to have resort to hospital.

The Minister, in his opening remarks, confessed himself a convinced protectionist. He is very satisfied that protection has produced the most beneficial results in Australia in stimulating the establishment of secondary industries. But I would remind him that freetrade conditions have also led to most marvellous developments in the field of secondary industries. Let me instance England. In the early Victorian and mid-Victorian age England, of course, was the brightest example of free trade that ever existed. No tax was imposed upon anything except luxuries and, of course, a few articles of production such as beer and spirits which were subject to excise duties. Otherwise England was completely a freetrade country, and no country has ever made such colossal strides in secondary industries as were made by England during that age.

The Minister for Labour: Did England have any competition to meet?

Hon. N. KEENAN: Just the competition of the world.

The Minister for Labour: But England was in the field first.

Hon. N. KEENAN: The United States of America, France and other countries were also in the field, and indeed France was a very much more advanced industrial country in 1840 than England was. I merely mention this to show it is not at all to be accepted as conclusive that because industries have been established in Australia, their establishment was due to protection. When, before Federation, New South Wales was a sovereign State in every sense of the word, its policy was practically freetrade, or very close to it. On the other hand, Victoria, its neighbour, equally a sovereign State, was

entirely governed by protectionist principles. Which of the two had the greater success in the establishment of secondary industries? There is no question about it. New South Wales was rapidly developing its industries in a manner that Victoria could only look at and shut out by its wall of protection.

The Premier: But New South Wales had cheap fuel—coal—which made a tremendous difference.

Hon. N. KEENAN: It had certain advantages from which it derived the greatest possible benefit. One State which, when the Commonwealth was founded and when consequently protection became the policy of Australia, that suffered more than any other, that suffered in fact almost entirely on its own, was Western Australia. We received no benefits whatever from protection, whereas we had all the disadvantages. At that time, in 1900 and 1901, and up to the time of the first Commonwealth tariff in 1903, our position was entirely that of a primary producing State. We had no opportunity then, at the time when we had a Colonial Government with full power to impose protective duties, to establish secondary industries. There were two reasons for that. In the first place, our population was small in number and our market was therefore small. Secondly, our capital resources were even smaller. When protection was forced upon us, as an integral part of the Commonwealth as we were then, it meant merely a burden, and a burden the actual effect of which it would be impossible to estimate. Had it not existed, no one can say to how much larger extent our primary industries might have been developed with the lower costs which would have been involved in their development. I remember when I was on the goldfields and was interested very much in mining, we ran a candidate, a working man candidate, for the Senate simply on the free trade ticket. To our astonishment, the Victorians, those who had come over from Victoria to work in Kalgoorlie, and were drawing Western Australian money, voted the way their fathers and mothers had brought them up to vote, namely, as protectionists.

The Premier: And they sent the wages they earned back to Victoria.

Hon. N. KEENAN: Yes.

The Premier: Not less than £100,000 a month used to go back to Victoria.

Hon. N. KEENAN: At that time the coastal districts were under the spell of Sir John Forrest (as he then was), who was a protectionist, while the goldfields people were under the spell of their fathers and mothers in Victoria, so that we found there was no world left for the operation of common sense.

Mr. Patrick: The first goldfields Parliamentary representative. Sir John Kirwan, was a freetrader.

Hon. N. KEENAN: In the 1900 elections we did elect freetraders. As a result of the Senate election in that year, all its members were freetraders, including Sir George Pearce, who unfortunately afterwards changed his opinion.

Mr. Needham: He would change his opinion at any time.

Mr. Patrick: He was not the only one to do so.

Hon. N. KEENAN: No. It became apparent that we were butting our heads against an immovable wall in an attempt to fight protection in Australia, and so the Freetrade League, which I may say unfortunately cost me more than I ever had to spend in its activities, had to be disbanded, and we had to submit to protection and all its burdens. It was that which formed the basis of the movement for separation. So long as we had imposed upon the State a policy, that people in the Eastern States had the right to determine was a favourable policy for them, but was grossly unfavourable to us, we were in a hopeless position. Although two-thirds of the State voted in favour of secession, that was defeated, I am sorry to say, partly by chicanery, by the then Government in power in Great Britain, and by Mr. J. H. Thomas, Dominions Secretary, in particular. Some time ago I read the report of a very interesting contribution made by the Minister for Labour on this very subject of secondary industries in Western Australia. If he will go back ten or 15 years in the history of an institute with which I was connected, he will find that I attempted on one occasion to show what a foolish policy it was for Australia to pursue, namely the then established policy of protection. Although that institute is a very important one, it failed to convert Australia. It would be impossible for me to follow the Minister in all the interesting details he has given us. Of some of them I have personal know-

ledge, but the great majority are absolutely new to me. It has always appeared to me that we must recognise certain limitations in our hopes for the establishment of local secondary industries. All the rest, outside those limitations, must be made mere wishful thoughts.

We cannot hope successfully to establish in Western Australia, against the competition of the Eastern States, the manufacture of heavy machinery for which there exists only a small local market. Nor is it possible to imagine that we could establish in this State, against the competition of the Eastern States, secondary industries that for their success require to be associated with mass production. Our population is too small, and mass production here would be impossible for us for that reason. Mass production is a means of reducing costs to such a point that were it possible for us to embark upon certain industries, we could not compete against those costs. Leaving out these impossibilities, and confining ourselves to what is possible, I suggest that we do not want to be too parochial in buying ourselves only what is made here. That argument can be applied both ways. It can be said by those to whom we send our exports that they also wish to observe that rule. But within reasonable limits—and those limits have, I think, been fully appreciated by the Minister—we can develop in Western Australia large varieties of the products of secondary industry. I do not know that it is entirely necessary to preach the doctrine always to the public that they should buy Western Australian products just because they are manufactured here. If we do that, we lay ourselves open to the charge that we are trying to get the public to buy an inferior article from not what can be called patriotic motives—for patriotism, after all, must be Australia-wide—but from parochial motives. That would not lead in the long run to any measure of success. But we can ask the public to buy locally-produced articles which are equal in cost and equal in worth to the imported article. We can ask our people to give the local manufacturer a fair opportunity to supply our wants, and we do ask for the local manufacturer, when he does supply our wants and refrains from asking any undue price for doing so, some slight preference; although I personally, in this hor-

rible age of nationalism in which every country is attempting to erect a wall around its boundaries and not to allow anything in that is manufactured anywhere else, feel that it is dangerous ground to tread on when one preaches a doctrine which is very close to nationalism. I do not want the Minister to think for one moment that I am not as enthusiastic as he wants me to be in supporting local industry, but I am not prepared to go the whole length of saying that every true Western Australian should buy always a Western Australian-produced article simply because it is produced in Western Australia.

There are some great difficulties, too, in the fact that there is nothing like the same capital available—one cannot expect it to be available—for the development of secondary industries in Western Australia. In one address I made in this Chamber I suggested that the Government of the day might very well make some large sum available—not a sum of a few tens of thousands, or even a hundred thousand, but a considerably larger sum, three millions or four millions—for the purpose of giving financial support to industries worthy of it. But that, of course, must remain entirely a dream of the past, having regard to the circumstances of the present day, because we know that it would be utterly beyond any possibility to raise money to that amount even if the project became entirely a practical one; and that is a possibility which is in itself doubtful. In England it was recognised, as the result of inquiry, that the age of the individual or small manufacturer had gone; that the days when one man started in a small shop and built up that small shop to a big factory were days existing only in the past; that the days when a steamship line could be established by a single firm, which used its last pot of paint on the funnel, thus originating that blue funnel which has become world-known since, are gone. Now is the day for large business, which unfortunately is sometimes looked upon as being dangerous business; but it is the only business that can succeed, because competition is so keen in the production of every article of secondary industry that only when one has large resources, and therefore can have one's factory of the highest class

and the product advertised and pushed in the market in the most perfect manner, only under those conditions is success on any large scale possible. And that is what we are facing. The Eastern States have this large business. Take for instance the Broken Hill Proprietary Company. I am quite prepared to admit, strong as I am on the question of freetrade and protection, that the factories which the Broken Hill Proprietary has established, and which it had already going at the start of the war, placed Australia in the position she stands in to-day in the matter of producing war needs. Had it not been for the steel factories of Newcastle—

Mr. Patrick: And the subsidiaries.

Hon. N. KEENAN: —and any number of subsidiaries, and even had it not been for the small shipyards existing and the larger ones now being constructed, of course Australia would not be able to make any war effort of the like dimensions.

Mr. Needham: If freetrade had had its way, we would not have those factories.

Hon. N. KEENAN: I have seen a statement that Newcastle actually produces steel to-day at a lower cost than steel could be landed from England, without any duty.

The Premier: They have said so in England.

Hon. N. KEENAN: England would have to take that steel, no matter what it cost; but it is alleged—and I have never seen the statement contradicted—that steel can now be produced in Australia at a price lower than, under peace conditions, steel could be landed for in Australia from anywhere outside, irrespective of any duty. However, I do not attribute that change to protection. I am quite convinced that the same result could have been achieved without any protection. But we are not going to attempt to debate that question now. In this State we have undoubtedly an opening for the establishment of a considerable number of secondary industries. I have listened with the greatest of pleasure and pride to the Minister's account of the progress we have already made in that direction. I can only hope that when I read in "Hansard," and digest, what the hon. gentleman has stated this evening, my impression will be still more definite and still greater, and that all of us will feel the largest measure of pride in what has been achieved. But there are

some things also in our Western Australian industrial sphere which, apart from good advertising and good marketing, are bound to be noticed. For instance, personally, in order that I might do my part, I have had cloth from the Albany Woollen Mills and got it tailored here into suits. I confess that it was not a tailoring success. For some reason or other, the shape of the suits did not remain as excellent as that of the suit with which the Minister at the present moment is adorned.

The Minister for Labour: These clothes are from Albany material.

Hon. N. KEENAN: They are better shaped than mine were.

The Minister for Labour: How many years is it since you had that experience?

Hon. N. KEENAN: About three years. The clothes were sent to the cleaner for the purpose of making them more sensible. They were not worn, but were somewhat soiled, and the colour had almost disappeared. They were sent to one of the best cleaners in Perth, but for some reason the dye was not in the cloth in a way that would resist the operation of cleaning. This defect no doubt has been remedied. I remember distinctly when the German Aniline Dye Coy. took legal proceedings in England for the purpose of protecting its patents. I was in London at the time and I was particularly interested in the legal arguments that ensued. The German company was successful in its action and was able to convince the English court that the patent for aniline dyes was German, notwithstanding the mass of evidence adduced that it was due entirely to British chemical research and that the Germans had merely used the brains of the British chemists for the purpose of manufacturing the commercial article. Subsequent to that decision, an attempt was made to use English dyes, and members probably remember with what results. There was not the permanence or the quality of the German-produced dye, but in time that deficiency was overcome in the English product. As a result of experience and most intensive research, that result was achieved and to-day the English products concerned are as effective as those of German origin.

I do not wish to detain the Committee any longer. As I remarked when I rose to speak, I intended to deal only with

our secondary industries and to take the opportunity to congratulate the Minister on his resumé of what has been accomplished by his department. I am particularly glad to extend my congratulations to him because we have sometimes indulged in what could scarcely be described as complimentary exchanges. On this occasion, I am very happy indeed to be able to offer him my most genuine congratulations. I hope that not only will he be able to tell on future occasions a still more flattering tale regarding our secondary industries, but also give a more happy account of his own health.

Progress reported.

BILL—ROAD CLOSURE.

Returned from the Council without amendment.

House adjourned at 10.25 p.m.

Legislative Council,

Tuesday, 5th November, 1940.

	PAGE
Question: City of Perth, rating appeals	1652
Motions: Agricultural Products Act, to disallow regulations	1658
Railway service, superannuation	1661
Bills: Fisheries Act Amendment, 1L	1661
Harbours and Jetties Act Amendment, returned	1661
Bills of Sale Act Amendment, reconv.	1664
Bush Fires Act Amendment, 2n., Com.	1664
City of Perth (Rating Appeals), 2n., Com.	1670

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

QUESTION—CITY OF PERTH.

Rating Appeals.

Hon. C. F. BAXTER asked the Chief Secretary: Will he lay on the Table of the House all papers dealing with the City of Perth municipal rating appeals?

The CHIEF SECRETARY replied: Yes.