

Legislative Assembly.

Thursday, 11th August, 1949.

CONTENTS.

	Page
Questions : Railways, as to wheat and super. freights	1098
Liquid Fuel Control Board, as to suspension of officer	1098
Perth City Council, as to consent to use amplifiers	1098
Fair Rents, (a) as to right to increase	1098
(b) as to admissibility of question	1099
Trolleybusses, as to projected Mt. Hawthorn service	1099
Bills : Electoral Act Amendment (No. 3), 3r.	1099
Canning District Sanitary Site Act Amendment, 3r.	1099
Workers' Compensation Act Amendment (No. 2), Com.	1099
Traffic Act Amendment (No. 2), 2r., Com., report	1103
Wheat Pool Act Amendment (No. 3), 2r., Com.	1104
Marketing of Eggs Act Amendment, Com.	1106
Motion : State Transport Board, as to road cartage of fish, defeated	1107

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

QUESTIONS.

RAILWAYS.

As to Wheat and Super Freights.

Mr. PERKINS asked the Minister for Railways:

What are the W.A.G.P. freight rates (per ton) for bulk wheat and superphosphate for 100, 150, 200, 250, 300 and 400 miles—

(a) in 1947, before any increase in railway freight rates;

(b) in 1948, after the increase last year;

(c) in 1949, after the increase recently announced?

The MINISTER replied:

Rates per ton.

Commodity.	Mileage.	s.	d.	from		from	
				1947	1/9/48	1/8/49	
Superphosphate	100	4	1	5	1	10	2
"	150	5	2	6	5	13	3
"	200	6	2	7	5	16	5
"	250	7	3	8	8	18	6
"	300	8	3	9	9	20	7
"	400	10	4	11	11	24	9

Bulk Wheat	100	11	8	14	5	18	10
"	150	13	3	16	5	23	0
"	200	14	10	17	8	26	2
"	250	16	8	19	10	29	3
"	300	19	9	23	3	32	5
"	400	24	9	28	4	37	7

LIQUID FUEL BOARD.

As to Suspension of Officer.

Mr. KELLY asked the Minister for Transport:

Will he lay on the Table of the House all files dealing with the reasons for the suspension from duty of Mr. Driver, formerly secretary of the Liquid Fuel Board?

The MINISTER replied:

No.

PERTH CITY COUNCIL.

As to Consent to Use Amplifiers.

Mr. GRAHAM (without notice) asked the Acting Premier:

(1) Is he aware that, owing to a recent decision of the Perth City Council forbidding the use of amplifiers without the consent of the council, which does not ordinarily meet again until next Monday week, there is every likelihood of the Minister for Immigration (Hon. A. A. Calwell) being obliged to speak on the Perth Esplanade on Sunday next without the assistance of amplifiers?

(2) Will he make representations to the council with a view to having such facilities made available to the Minister?

(3) In the event of the council not being agreeable to grant permission, will he investigate the possibility of taking action in his capacity of Minister for Local Government?

The ACTING PREMIER replied:

(1) The hon. member brought the matter to my notice approximately an hour ago.

(2) The matter is being discussed with the Perth City Council by officers of the Premier's Department.

(3) Action will depend upon what the powers of the Perth City Council are and on its by-laws.

FAIR RENTS.

(a) As to Right to Increase.

Mr. McCULLOCH (without notice) asked the Acting Premier:

Does the relevant Act provide that where a landlord has reduced his tenant's rent sub-

sequent to the 31st August, 1939, such rent may be increased to the standard rent existing at the 31st August, 1939, without first applying to a fair rents authority to do so? This question is based on the assumption that no additions or alterations have been made to the property concerned.

The ACTING PREMIER replied:

I will ask the Crown Law Department, if the hon. member will give me notice of the question, whether an answer will be given.

(b) *As to Admissibility of Question.*

Hon. F. J. S. WISE (without notice) asked the Speaker:

I wish your advice in connection with the question asked by the member for Hannans, who has been requested by the Acting Premier to place it on the notice paper, such question having already been disallowed by the Clerk Assistant, I understand under your instructions. Will you advise the member for Hannans how he can now ask the question?

Mr. SPEAKER replied:

To be quite frank, I did not hear the question as read out. I could only pick out a word here and there and was not sure whether it was the same question as that referred to me by the Clerk Assistant.

Hon. F. J. S. Wise: It was the same question.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member will find the question is not allowed when it is put in to be printed.

TROLLEYBUSES.

As to Projected Mt. Hawthorn Service.

Mr. NIMMO (without notice) asked the Minister for Transport:

(1) Can he inform the House when the trolleybus service to Mt. Hawthorn will commence?

(2) Can he state whether the terminus of this service will be at the corner of Oxford-street and North Beach-road?

(3) Has the State Transport Board got a plan out for the balance of the route in Mt. Hawthorn?

The MINISTER replied:

(1) Subject to completion of vehicles and materials coming to hand, approximately mid-year 1950.

(2) Yes. Provision will be made to loop the busses round the reserve at this point.

(3) The route beyond Oxford-street along North Beach-road is well served by busses. The Government omnibus service to Osborne Park along this route will be augmented as found necessary.

BILLS (2)—THIRD READING.

1, Electoral Act Amendment (No. 3).

2, Canning District Sanitary Site Act Amendment.

Transmitted to the Council.

BILL—WORKERS' COMPENSATION ACT AMENDMENT (No. 2).

In Committee.

Resumed from the 2nd August. Mr. Perkins in the Chair; the Minister for Education in charge of the Bill.

Clause 3—Amendment of Section 4:

The CHAIRMAN: Progress was reported on this clause, to which the member for South Fremantle had moved an amendment to add the following proviso:—

Where a total permanent or partially permanent disability has to be redeemed by a lump sum settlement under the First Schedule to this Act, such amount shall be arrived at by subtracting the amount of weekly payments from £1,250 and then have an actuarial calculation made of the balance remaining to find the amount to be paid by way of redemption. Such calculation to take into account the percentage amount of disability which shall equal the percentage of weekly payments. Then find the present value of the amount remaining due in such percentage of weekly payments at two and one-half per centum.

Mr. FOX: I ask permission to withdraw the amendment.

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

Clause put and passed.

Clause 4—agreed to.

Clause 5—Amendment of Section 8 (14):

Mr. MARSHALL: The Minister has an amendment on the notice paper, but I do not want him to move it until he thoroughly understands where we are, because I have an amendment which precedes his. I propose to ask for the deletion of the clause. The Minister's amendment would, at first sight, appear to be all that is necessary, but it will be little better than the subsection itself. I admit that the subsection

is badly worded. Subsection (11) of Section 8 provides that a worker coming to Western Australia shall not be entitled to benefit under the section until he has lodged with the registrar a certificate from a medical referee certifying him to be free from pulmonary tuberculosis, pneumoconiosis and miner's phthisis.

That is a remarkable piece of phraseology. If a newcomer goes in to the mining industry and gets what is known as his initial certificate, he may be employed for five or 10 years, or even longer. Then as a result of an examination by the Kalgoorlie unit he might be found to be suffering from one of these complaints. He should then be entitled to compensation, but as a newcomer to the State he would have had to be certified free from these diseases before going into the industry. When he makes application for compensation, because he is suffering from one of the diseases mentioned in the Third Schedule, how is he to claim compensation? He cannot do so until he presents to the registrar a certificate from a referee.

The Minister for Education: That is why I want to move the amendment. It is to provide for someone more suitable than a referee.

Mr. MARSHALL: I know, but the word "until" is particularly bad. The subsection states "until he has lodged with the registrar." He might have been in the industry for 15 years without knowing of that, but until he lodges that certificate he is not entitled to compensation. If a newcomer works in the industry, in ignorance of that provision, until he gets an industrial disease, how, when he claims compensation, can he lodge a certificate with the registrar to say that he is free from the disease? It cannot be done. The wording should be changed. The section should provide that he is not entitled to benefit "unless" he has lodged a certificate with the registrar.

The Minister for Education: Would it suit you if the certificate were made to refer back to the time he came to the State?

Mr. MARSHALL: Irrespective of that, I point out where the Minister's proposed amendment will not be effective. He desires to add after the word "phthisis" in the last line of the subsection the following words—

or a certificate certifying him as free from all such diseases from a medical officer attached to the Commonwealth Health Laboratory.

That means that a newcomer to this State must lodge with the registrar a certificate to say that he is free from any of these diseases. It must be issued by a medical referee appointed under this subsection or be a certificate from the Kalgoorlie laboratory. However, a large number of men will not be near the Kalgoorlie laboratory because most parts of the outer Goldfields receive only periodical visits from the personnel of the laboratory.

The Minister for Education: The intention of your amendment is to strike out Subsection (11).

Mr. MARSHALL: It is.

The Minister for Education: I will accept it.

Mr. MARSHALL: Every newcomer to the mines must now be examined at the Kalgoorlie laboratory. If he gets into the industry he must be clean and free from these diseases. While that subsection might have been required when the Act first became law, it is of no further value now. If the Minister studies the definition of "mining" under the Third Schedule he will note that it covers quarrying, stone-crushing and cutting. So far as I know the employees of those industries are not annually examined as they are in the goldmining or metalliferous mines in this State. Therefore some provision should be made for them to be examined before they enter those particular occupations. We should safeguard the quarrying industries otherwise they may be carrying the load of miners coming from elsewhere who are not free from disease. I move an amendment—

That in line 1 the words "subsection (14)" be struck out.

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION: I have already told the hon. member that I propose to offer no objection to the amendment. I understand it was originally inserted because the benefits to be derived by workers under the compensation laws in Western Australia were greater than they were in some other States. It was thought that it might be an inducement to come to this State for better opportunities in the event of compensation being required. However, I believe that it applied on only one occasion in respect of a worker

who substituted somebody else for himself in the course of the examination. I see the difficulty to which the hon. member refers and I think there is some substance in his argument. I have discussed the matter with the manager of the State Insurance Office, and when I placed the amendment on the notice paper I was between two minds whether I should adopt the procedure followed by the hon. member or the one I proposed. On weighing up the whole matter, I accept his amendment.

Amendment put and passed.

Mr. MARSHALL: I move an amendment—

That in line 2 after the word “amended” the following words be added:—“as follows:—

(a) By deleting Subsection (11).

(b) By amending Subsection (14) as follows:—”

Amendment put and passed.

The CHAIRMAN: The hon. member's other amendments on the notice paper are consequential.

Clause, as amended, agreed to.

Clauses 6 to 9—agreed to.

Clause 10—Amendment of Section 30:

Mr. HEGNEY: I move an amendment—

That all the words after the word “the” in line 7 be struck out with a view to inserting the following words:—

“three members of the Board, the Manager of the State Government Insurance Office, and one person who shall be nominated by all other insurers approved by the Minister under the provisions of Section thirteen of this Act, and who shall be appointed by the Governor and entitled while acting on the Committee to such remuneration and allowances as shall be prescribed. The Chairman of the Board shall be the Chairman of the Committee.”

I indicated, during the second reading, the reasons which prompted the amendment. In the present Act provision is made for four members of the premium rates committee and the Minister's amendment provides for a total of seven, including three members of the Compensation Board. It also includes the manager of the State Insurance Office and two representatives provided by the insurance companies. I believe that a committee of five would be appropriate and I also believe that the members of the board

should be members of it; the State Insurance Office should have one representative and the other insurance companies one as well.

The employers' representative on the committee is vitally interested because the employers provide the major portion of the premiums and the best interests would be served if the private insurance companies had one representative as well as the State Insurance Office, which I believe is regarded as a non-tariff concern. Such a committee would provide adequate representation. I certainly think the chairman of the Workers' Compensation Board should be appointed as chairman of the premium rates committee.

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION: I hope the member for Pilbara will not press his amendment for the reasons I outlined when speaking on the second reading. The clause in the Bill represents a very substantial change from the position created by the Act passed last year when the premiums committee was constituted for the first time. It consists of the Auditor General as chairman, the manager of the State Government Insurance Office, a person nominated by all the other insurers and approved by the Minister under the provisions of Section 13, and a person nominated by the non-tariff companies who is appointed by the Governor. Thus the committee consisted of three insurance representatives and the Auditor General, although it must be admitted that of the insurance representatives one is the manager of the State Insurance Office.

In the circumstances, the premium rates committee should be fairly stated, on a further consideration of the facts, to be over-representative of the insurance people and therefore the proposal in the Bill seeks to rectify what might be claimed to be an ill-balanced committee by creating a balanced body on which the three present members of the Workers' Compensation Board, who are entirely disinterested in the collection of insurance premiums and have as their duty the successful operation of the Act, will counterbalance the three representatives of the insurance people, one of whom, as I have already mentioned, will be the manager of the State Insurance Office. At the same time, as chairman there will be the Auditor General who is

entirely unbiassed and quite independent. Thus there will be four members of the board entirely disinterested in the collection of premiums.

I ask the Committee not to accept the amendment moved by the member for Pilbara because it must be borne in mind that the Act has been in operation only for the last five months, and it would be hardly reasonable to say to the representatives of the insurance companies on the board that their services would be set aside before they had barely time to establish themselves on the committee. On the proposed basis, it seems reasonable, as indicated by the member for Pilbara, to suggest that the solitary representative of the insurance people will be one from the tariff companies that are in the majority and not from the non-tariff companies whose attitude with regard to premiums has been very reasonable.

I desire to achieve a well-balanced committee, and I submit the proposal in the Bill will have that effect. It will place in a reasonably commanding position the members of the Workers' Compensation Board, who will fix the basis on which premiums are to be calculated. I have already told the member for Pilbara that I propose to accept his second amendment, which seeks the deletion of paragraph (b). That will mean that the Workers' Compensation Board will revert to the position where it, and not the premiums committee however constituted, will fix the basis on which premiums are to be assessed. I discussed the matter with members of the board who at one time held slightly different views from those indicated in the measure. I suggested to them the point of view I have placed before the Committee, and they were good enough to hold a meeting to consider the matter. They conveyed to me, through the chairman, this minute—

At a formal meeting of the Workers' Compensation Board held on the 19th July, 1949, and after a full discussion on alternative proposals for the amendment of Section 30 of the Act with regard to the constitution of the Premium Rates Committee, the following motion was unanimously carried:—

That Section 30 of the Act should be amended to provide for a Premium Rates Committee, consisting of the Auditor General as chairman, the three members of the board, the manager of the State Government Insurance Office, one representative of the

tariff insurance companies and one representative of the non-tariff insurance companies.

Members will see that I have inserted in the Bill the exact phraseology used by the Workers' Compensation Board in that minute. I am convinced that the Committee will agree that there are very strong reasons for the adherence to the proposal in the Bill. I ask members not to accept the amendment, and the member for Pilbara not to press it.

Amendment put and negatived.

Mr. HEGNEY: I have another amendment to move with the object of deleting paragraph (b).

The Minister for Education: If you move the amendment, I will agree to it.

Mr. HEGNEY: I move an amendment—That paragraph (b) be struck out.

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

Clause 11—agreed to.

Clause 12—Amendment of First Schedule:

Mr. HEGNEY: I appeal to the Minister not to persist with the clause. I admit that the intention of Parliament was that £6 a week should be the maximum amount payable per week to any injured worker, and that would include money paid in respect of a dependent wife. In view of the changed value of money, I ask the Minister not to press the clause. At the time the Bill was drafted, the basic wage was £5 12s. 9d. or £5 15s. 9d., whereas today it is £6 13s. 2d. for the metropolitan area and over £7 a week on the Goldfields. I do not know that any injustice would be done if the schedule were to stand in its present form. The Minister might say that we should not seek to amend the Act by such a method even where some provision had crept into the measure by mistake. On the other hand, we should regard the position in the light of present circumstances, and I appeal to the Minister not to press Clause 12.

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION: I hope that the hon. member will not press his point. As he said, it was well known to be the intention of Parliament at the time that the amount should be £6 and not any greater sum. The law, as a result of the 1948 amendment, has increased the proportions of the

weekly average wages from 50 to 66 2/3rd per cent., which is a considerable accretion. It provided an additional allowance for each dependent child, but it was not intended that the extra £1 a week for a dependent wife should be paid over and above the £6.

Though the basic wage has increased, nevertheless if the hon. member's desire were carried out it would be possible for a worker to receive more than the equivalent of full wages. Everyone, not excluding myself, is inclined to be generous in these cases, but one must bear in mind that the Act compares favourably or more than favourably with the legislation elsewhere in Australia, and this fact must be given consideration by Parliament so as not to make unduly difficult the payment of compensation by employers, admittedly through insurance policies.

The intention was quite clearly expressed and understood at the time, apart from the provision in the schedule, which is open to some doubt. Under the Act, the extra amount might be payable, but it is desirable before disputes arise that the position intended by Parliament should be made perfectly clear. This amendment to the Act will not deprive anyone of anything, but will ensure that disputes will not arise.

Clause put and passed.

Title—agreed to.

Bill reported with amendments.

BILL—TRAFFIC ACT AMENDMENT (No. 2).

Second Reading.

Debate resumed from the 4th August.

MR. GRAHAM (East Perth) [5.20]: This Bill is one to which I feel sure no objection will be raised. It merely seeks to make the provisions of the Traffic Act conform to certain time periods set down in the Motor Vehicle (Third Party Insurance) Act. Consequently the first amendment is designed to require the return of license plates in a period of 15 days instead of 14 days as at present, because third-party insurance policies continue in operation for 15 days beyond the normal date of expiry.

The second amendment deals with "staggered" periods of licensing. Under the Traffic Act, license plates must be returned

within 21 days. I do not know why the differentiation was made in the first place, but as traffic licenses and third-party insurance policies are now issued simultaneously, it is necessary for practical working that the periods should be identical. It cannot be suggested for a moment that a period of 15 days is too short in which to require a person to return license plates in the event of his not continuing to use the vehicle.

The Act provides that an unlicensed vehicle may be driven direct from the owner's premises to a licensing authority for the purpose of being licensed. The Bill proposes that when a vehicle has been damaged or is not in working order and is being driven or towed, a permit may be issued authorising the vehicle to be taken to a workshop for repairs. That is a reasonable proposition. I take it that the permit, which will be issued for 2s. 6d., will be specific in setting out the particular journey as well as the date upon which it may be undertaken. Otherwise, a vehicle might be moved about on a number of days and follow devious routes under the mere cover of a permit issued to meet an emergency, though perhaps that is hardly likely to happen.

There is another matter I wish to mention and not for the first time. Members will experience difficulty in following the proposals in the Bill. Fortunately, no important principles are involved. However, it is practically impossible to obtain copies of the Act as previously amended: I understand that the Government Printer has no copies, but one of the Clerks was able to obtain two copies from the Public Works Department. Once again, therefore, we have an indication of the great need that every effort be exerted to bring the Government Printing Office up-to-date. Reference to the statutes that are available to members will convey nothing, because different numerals have been employed to denote the various sections in the amended Act. I support 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.

BILL—WHEAT POOL ACT AMENDMENT (No. 3).

Second Reading.

Debate resumed from the 4th August.

HON. J. T. TONKIN (North-East Fremantle) [5.27]: This Bill deals with an agricultural subject and, in view of the opinion expressed by the Honorary Minister for Agriculture that I should confine my attention to education, it is with considerable temerity that I approach a discussion of the measure. However, I shall attempt to do my best within my very limited knowledge of this department.

The Minister for Lands: Do not be intimidated.

Hon. J. T. TONKIN: The Bill aims at providing an official standard for oats. The Minister for Lands, in moving the second reading, said that a standard had been set by the Department of Commerce. I assume that he meant the Commonwealth Department of Commerce and Agriculture. I do not know where the Minister obtained that information, but no such standard has been set by that department. The Australian Barley Board conducted a voluntary oat pool during the years 1945-46, 1946-47 and 1947-48, and the board required that oats being delivered to the pool should comply with a certain standard. I presume that that was the standard to which oats for export had to conform, but by no means was it a standard set by the Commonwealth Department of Commerce and Agriculture.

The Minister for Lands: I thought the Department of Commerce had an export standard for everything.

Hon. J. T. TONKIN: To ensure that my impression was right, because of the Minister's statement that there was such a standard—

The Minister for Lands: I did say that.

Hon. J. T. TONKIN: —I communicated with the Department of Commerce and Agriculture to ascertain what the standard was, and was informed that that department had no such standard. So the standard was one, I presume, that was recognised by the Department of Agriculture because it was the standard required by the Australian Barley Board when oats were being delivered for export. Perhaps that is not quite the right way to put it. I should say that when oats

were being delivered to the pool, they had to comply with a certain standard, and that standard was also one recognised as being suitable for oats for export. It is very necessary that there should be an official standard and that standard cannot very well be an f.a.q. one.

If you, Mr. Speaker, would permit me to refer to the debate in another place on this matter I could give you some entertainment. But Standing Orders will not allow me to do that, although I daresay I could stretch the Interpretation Act to make it possible. However, I will not attempt that; but I suggest to members that they might read what the Minister for Agriculture said about this matter in another place when he introduced the Bill, and they will be surprised at his reference to an f.a.q. standard.

It is not practicable to set an f.a.q. standard with regard to oats—firstly because such a standard is supposed to be the average of the current season's crop, and if it was necessary to wait to get the average of a current season's crop, the standard when set would be too late to be of much use during the season. Further, there is not the quantity of oats being grown for export to make it practicable to set up such a standard. There are other reasons too, similar to that advanced against an f.a.q. standard for wheat. A couple of Royal Commissions have pronounced very definitely against the use of such a standard.

But there has been in use in Western Australia for many years an f.a.q. standard recognised by merchants—not a true f.a.q. standard, but one which they recognised as being representative of a fair average of the crop of a normal season. The Minister desires that we should provide a definite standard where there is some little confusion existing at present, because there is the f.a.q. standard of the merchants and there is the W.A. standard feed oats recognised by the Department of Agriculture. It is desirable that we should have one standard only and that we should clarify the position, and the Bill will do that.

When it is necessary to export oats, a permit has to be obtained; and State officers can issue a permit for up to a quantity of 25 tons. That is the only control the Commonwealth imposes as to quantity, and a permit is necessary. If it is required to export a greater quantity than 25 tons, the

matter has to be referred to the head office; and I have no reason to believe that the necessary permit would not be given if it were asked for. The regulations provide that in all cases where the parcel of oats exceeds 25 tons, a permit cannot be issued by State officers, but the matter must be referred to the head office of the Department of Commerce and Agriculture.

The standard which this Bill proposes to establish will not be an f.a.q. standard, but I believe it is designed to represent what would be a fair average of the crop of a normal season. The object of the Bill is to ensure that any person who has contracted or who will contract to supply oats will supply them of a standard not less than that being set up under the Bill, and equal to the W.A. standard feed oats. The Bill says that the standard shall be as follows:—

(a) the oats shall be bright and sound and free from musty, smutty or other objectionable smells;

(b) the oats shall have a natural bushel weight of not less than thirty-eight pounds;

(c) not less than fourteen per centum of the whole shall be prime oats, that is oats held on a two millimetre sieve;

(d) not less than seventy-six per centum of the whole shall be grade oats, that is oats held on a 1.5 millimetre sieve;

(e) not more than a total of ten per centum of the whole shall comprise tailing or screening oats (that is oats passing through a 1.5 millimetre sieve) and foreign matter: Provided that not more than four per centum of such ten per centum shall be foreign matter (foreign matter includes other cereals, oat husks and the like, weed seeds or uncultivated oats);

(f) not more than one-twentieth per centum of the whole, by weight, or five seeds per hundred grammes of the whole shall be speargrass.

I submit that unless these provisions are to be capable of foolish application, some amendment will have to be made, because they say that there shall be not less than 76 per centum of grade oats. A little thought will show that that limits the amount of prime oats that can be supplied; because if a man had a better sample than this, if he had a good crop and his sample of oats contained 50 per cent. of prime oats, it would be impossible to have that sample comply with this requirement that there shall be 76 per cent. of grade oats. Surely that is not intended.

As this is worded, the absolute limit of prime oats which can be in any sample is 24 per cent. That is assuming there are no tailings at all, that there is no rubbish whatever, and that there are only grade oats and prime oats. The Bill requires that there shall be 76 per cent. of grade oats and there can only be 24 per cent. of prime oats. A man might have a sample of 30 per cent. or 40 per cent. of prime oats. Why prevent him from legally tendering that as 'equivalent to the oats standard? This requires some alteration and I have an amendment on the notice paper to meet the position. The Bill is deficient because it does not allow for the substitution of prime oats in place of the lesser quality of grade oats. I submit that that should be possible. I have provided in the amendment that while there shall not be less than 14 per cent. of prime oats, the quantity of prime oats can be increased if the quantity of grade oats is reduced. So I propose to provide for a total of 90 per cent. to be prime and grade oats taken together. There is a proviso that there cannot be less than 14 per cent. of prime oats and that will mean that any increase in prime oats will be permissible so long as the grade oats are correspondingly reduced.

There is a further amendment which I consider necessary. The Bill refers to 76 per centum of grade oats. The words "grade oats" are not used in the trade generally and can be confused with "graded oats." Graded oats are known in the trade. They are oats which have been specially selected, from which the seeds and rubbish have been removed. Again, when reference is made to grade oats, we refer to steps or degrees of quality, such grade being denoted by a numeral. So it is undesirable to have a term which could lead to confusion; and I suggest to the Minister that instead of providing for 76 per cent. of grade oats, a term unusual in the trade, he should use the word "seconds" which is readily recognisable. In that way we would have 14 per cent. of prime oats and then 90 per cent. of prime and seconds taken together, and that would be a sample which would be equal to what the Minister requires and would not exclude a person from legally offering a crop better than f.a.q. in fulfilment of a contract.

As the Minister desires to set up an official standard in place of two standards, which have been known in the trade so far, but neither of which has actually been official, I think the Bill should be supported. But I believe the amendments I have indicated would be a definite improvement to the Bill, and at the appropriate time I propose to move them.

MR. ACKLAND (Irwin-Moore) [5.43]: I find myself in perfect agreement with the member for North-East Fremantle.

Opposition members: Oh!

Hon. A. R. G. Hawke: Good heavens!

Mr. ACKLAND: I will ask the Minister, when the appropriate stage is reached, to accept the amendment suggested by the member for North-East Fremantle.

Hon. F. J. S. Wise: Have you called a truce?

Mr. ACKLAND: We will have to increase our oatgrowing in this State and will have eventually, I believe, to look for considerable markets overseas. I feel that the standard set out in the Bill is too low and allows for too great a proportion of inferior quality grain. Last year, Western Australia exported 7,500 tons of oats overseas, one shipload of which had a bushelage weight of 41 lb. to the bushel. I think 41 lb. would be too high as a standard and I notice that the Bill provides for 38 lb. which I think is quite reasonable. I believe that allowing so much inferior oats and foreign matter to be included would be detrimental to any market that might be established overseas. There is a great shortage of supplementary feeds for stock such as poultry, pigs and cattle, and there is never likely to be sufficient bran and pollard to satisfy those industries. Oats are a fine substitute feedstuff and to set a standard now higher than has been provided for in the Act would be a desirable step.

Hon. F. J. S. Wise: To what use are the oats generally put in the countries of destination?

Mr. ACKLAND: The shipment I referred to went to Switzerland, some for use as rolled oats and some for feedstuffs. I believe a second shipment was for feed purposes only.

Hon. F. J. S. Wise: I understand that quite a lot is sent abroad for racehorses.

Mr. ACKLAND: I believe some of the oats sent to Switzerland were used for stock feed purposes. I support the Bill and, when it is in the Committee stage, will ask the Minister to accept the amendment.

THE MINISTER FOR LANDS (Hon. L. Thorn—Toodyay—in reply) [5.45]: I have been mentioned that a standard was set by the Department of Commerce, and that was the information supplied to me. I handled the commerce export regulations for years and it was the practice in those regulations clearly to describe and define the grades of exportable products. It is evident that in the past there has not been any great export of oats, if they are not described in the regulations. I will accept the suggested amendment, because the provision in the Bill clearly lays down the 76 per cent of what we would call second-grade oats. It would be a retrograde step to fix a sample grade limiting the proportion of first-quality oats.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Mr. Perkins in the Chair; the Minister for Lands in charge of the Bill.

Clauses 1 and 2—agreed to.

Clause 3—Amendment of Section 15A:

Hon. J. T. TONKIN: I move an amendment—

That paragraph (d) of proposed new Subsection (3) be struck out and a new paragraph inserted as follows:—“(d) not less than total of ninety per centum shall be prime and seconds oats, the latter being those held on 1.5 millimetre sieve.”

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

Title—agreed to.

Bill reported with an amendment.

BILL—MARKETING OF EGGS ACT AMENDMENT.

In Committee.

Resumed from the 9th August. **Mr. Perkins** in the Chair; the Minister for Lands in charge of the Bill.

Clause 1—Short Title (partly considered):

Clause put and passed.

Clauses 2 and 3—agreed to

Clause 4—Amendment of Section 32:

Mr. YATES: I move an amendment—

That after the word "permit" at the end of proposed new Subsection (5) (b) the following proviso be added:—"Provided that eggs used or sold for the purpose of hatching shall be exempt from all charges under this Act."

When speaking to the second reading I pointed out the difficulties suffered by a producer when supplying eggs for breeding purposes. I felt that further words should be added to this new subsection in order to help producers who supply eggs for that purpose.

The MINISTER FOR LANDS: After listening to the debate on the second reading I made inquiries as to the sum that could be collected by way of levies on eggs used for incubation. I was advised that the sum involved would not be very considerable and when we take into account that the subsection would require a great deal of policing—and in my opinion the provision could still be evaded—I consider the amendment should be accepted.

Hon. J. T. TONKIN: I am glad the Minister intends to accept the amendment which is a most reasonable one. People engaged in producing eggs for hatching are not so engaged for the 12 months because the breeding season does not extend over the full period. During the period when eggs are not being produced for breeding purposes, they are being sold in the ordinary way through the board. All eggs produced during the breeding season are not necessarily used for hatching because a percentage of them do not come up to the standard required of eggs for incubation. Those eggs are sold through the board, but as they are infertile they are sold at a lower price than fertile eggs. That of itself is a penalty upon the producer of such eggs. That producer will not receive such an advantage over other producers as it would appear and the sum involved cannot possibly be very much, whereas some expense in calculation would be incurred if the amendment were not agreed to.

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

Clause 5, Title—agreed to.

Bill reported with an amendment.

MOTION—STATE TRANSPORT BOARD.

As to Road Cartage of Fish.

Debate resumed from the 27th July on the following motion by Mr. Grayden:—

That in the opinion of this House the action of the Department of Industrial Development in recommending to the Transport Board to refuse to grant a transport license to the Ocean Canning Co., Belmont, for the purpose of transporting fish from the South Coast of Western Australia is not in the best interests of industry. This House further recommends that the aforesaid license should be granted to the Ocean Canning Co.

THE MINISTER FOR INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT (Hon. A. F. Watts—Katanning) [5.58]:

This motion, moved by the member for Middle Swan, is one which in my opinion has more importance than might appear at first sight. I say quite frankly at this stage that if this House sees fit to carry the motion, then the Department of Industrial Development will alter its recommendation to the Transport Board in relation to the application. However, it will do so only because of the expressed opinion of the majority of this House, and with the deepest regret. *

In the opinion of myself, and the officers of the Department of Industrial Development, it would be a most retrograde blow struck at those who believe in decentralisation of industry in Western Australia, and who have, under this Government and its predecessor, without any question in both instances, been striving to the best of their ability to ensure that there should be a better balanced industrial economy in Western Australia than there was a decade or two ago.

It is perfectly true, as the hon. member stated, that Mr. Gardiner has done an excellent job with this factory at Belmont and with the one he has at Fremantle. It is true also that he did not commence that factory, or either of them, with the intention of canning salmon. He has canned many things. I think the first of them was sheep's tongues which made a very acceptable product. I believe it was used by the Armed Forces during the latter part of the war as well as by the civilian population. Later, he commenced the manufacture of turtle soup from turtles obtained from northern areas in limited quantities, and this found a ready market not only here but also in

the Eastern States. Subsequently he commenced inquiries into the possibility of obtaining agar agar from seaweed.

As is known, agar agar is used in the canning of foodstuffs, providing that jelly-like substance which surrounds canned meats. About the same time he commenced canning herrings in tomato sauce. Those herrings were captured in waters in the vicinity of the metropolitan area. That product also was acceptable. Later, he commenced the canning of a substance known as "Frelish," made from a mixture of salmon, potato and other ingredients which I believe was a reasonably good product, too. Having had no personal experience of it, I am unable to judge exactly its quality.

Hon. A. H. Panton: It is something like Irish stew.

Mr. Yates: Only much better.

The MINISTER FOR INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT: However, I believe it was quite a suitable product for civilian consumption and found a considerable market. Lastly, he conceived the idea of canning salmon cutlets and proceeded to acquire them mainly from the southern coast. At that time there was little or no industry in the way of fish canning factories on the southern coast. Today there are factories at Esperance, in the district of the member for Kanowna; at Hopetoun, which I think is in the district of the member for Wagin, and at Albany which, of course, is in the district of that name. Those factories have been started and carried on by a most energetic person named Hunt.

There is no question whatever in my mind that had it not been for the activities of Mr. Hunt those three factories would not have been built up. The one at Albany alone has provided considerable quantities of canned fish for export to such an extent that ships have put into that port, which hitherto was substantially neglected by ships, in order to pick up cargo which he has made available. His exports run into many thousands of tins of salmon and other local products, too, from the waters of those areas where Hunt's canning company has been so successful. So at Hopetoun today there are at least 30 people, in an otherwise most desolate spot, who have been able to earn a living and maintain themselves reasonably well by employment at this factory.

Later on I hope to give members the earnings of those people and the effect and condemnation of the available supplies of fish of those areas is likely to have on the factories. How can we achieve with any degree of satisfaction a policy of decentralisation if we are to support the proposal of transporting by road supplies to a metropolitan factory from the area where there is a local factory, a distance bordering 400 miles? To do those things, believing as we do in the principle of decentralisation, would pass my comprehension.

Mr. Grayden: Why was he not stopped two years ago?

The MINISTER FOR INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT: Were it impossible for the Belmont factory to continue operation without salmon from Albany, Hopetoun or some other part of the southern coast there might be some justification for the complaints that have been made by the mover of the motion. He endeavoured to lead the House to believe two or three things. The first was that it would be to the interest of the fishermen on the south coast if the motion were carried. Well, is my intention later on to read communications I have received from individual fishermen—communications entirely uncited so far as I am concerned—

Mr. Grayden: Hunt's friends.

The MINISTER FOR INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT: Whether they are his friends, I do not know, but I cannot say that the hon. member is warranted in making such an assertion until he knows what they are. These communications, as I have said, have been unsolicited, but are the result of the publicity given by the Premier to the observations of the hon. member. The letters will show members that the fear expressed by the mover of the motion that to deprive them of Mr. Gardiner as a customer would react detrimentally on their interests is not correct.

I have gone to the trouble to establish. I hope to the satisfaction of the House what fish are available in metropolitan waters where one could go after them and catch them. Therein, I consider, lies the crux of the argument. The man in the south coast factory at Albany has supplied himself with a small aeroplane for spotting and with a boat and gear to catch the fish as well as with men to work the boat. E

has not contented himself, either with waiting for the fish to come within his vision, or for the fishermen, probably more profitably employed in supplying some other avenue, to make fish available to him. He has been prepared to purchase at proper prices the product of those fishermen who go out of their own volition and who offer the fish to him.

I hope to satisfy the House by quoting the views of a good many of them before I conclude my remarks. On the contrary, there has been no effort on the part of the metropolitan factory in question to take any such action—

Mr. Grayden: For a very good reason.

The MINISTER FOR INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT: —or make any attempt to go out and locate the fish and bring them in. I understand that it has not suited the fishermen, who may have quantities of fish, to supply them, as the price which the proprietor was prepared to pay did not coincide with their ideas of values, and so the hon. member now comes to the House and says, "If you do not give us salmon from the south coast by road, the factory must close down."

Mr. Grayden: That is a fact, according to Mr. Fernie, and he should know.

The MINISTER FOR INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT: I shall deal with the hon. member's remarks about the Director of Industrial Development a little later on. Meanwhile, I should like him to do me the honour of listening to me without interruption, as I did to him, and then he will have an excellent opportunity of making his reply at the close of the debate.

Hon. A. H. Panton: He is very young. Give him a chance!

The MINISTER FOR INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT: I am endeavouring to be perfectly fair in the matter. I have provided an opportunity for the motion to be discussed today—because I regard it as being of some importance and no doubt it is of great importance to Mr. Gardiner—instead of leaving the motion in its normal place until it could emerge to the top of the notice paper. We have to bear in mind that what is desired is a continuance of special licenses to permit of the carrying of fish by road. It is on record that fish have been carried by rail from Albany to this

factory and they could still be so carried if the proprietor of the Belmont factory could buy the fish.

Sitting suspended from 6.15 to 7.30 p.m.

The MINISTER FOR INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT: I have here an extract from a letter written to the secretary of the Transport Board on the 29th September, 1948, from the governing director of the Ocean Canning Pty. Ltd., in which he says, *inter alia*—

I am quite prepared to again use the railways providing they can supply insulated trucks for my purpose, otherwise I request your permission to use road transport.

I am also informed that no application was made for those particular trucks by this particular proprietor. I wish to make this quite plain at this stage in case any member is not acquainted with the position: There is nothing to prevent any person from using the services of a common carrier offered by the railways. The only question at issue is whether the Transport Board should be recommended to grant a license for road transport for this purpose. I also have—and I think I should read portion of it to the House—a communication from Hunt's Canning Factory, dated the 20th January, 1949, to the Minister for Transport, in which it is stated—

We would like to confirm today's discussion regarding the transport of fish from Albany to Perth.

The licenses as they now stand mean that fish is to be carted from any beach around Albany (the source of the Albany Cannery's supply) for the Albany season, that is, from the 20th February to the 31st March, 1949, but Hunt's Canning Coy., Albany, are not allowed to supplement their supply by carting from other beaches, such as Hamelin, which is reserved for the Ocean Canning Company Limited. Your decision to amend the licenses for carting out of Albany to only cover fish which has first been offered to our Albany factory and which we have refused to accept, assures us of fish from our own zone, while we feel sure that the Ocean Canning Company's requirements will be supplied from operations around Hamelin, in their zone.

That brings me to the point that one of the suggestions made to the Director of Industrial Development, when the question arose of making a recommendation in this matter, was that Hunts should be allowed to take fish from Hamelin on the west coast, south of Busselton, and that he told Mr. Hunt he would not recommend such

a license because Mr. Gardiner, of the Ocean Canning Company, had decided to open a factory at Busselton and fish in the Hamelin area must be reserved for him. So it becomes a rather extraordinary proposition that a reservation made in respect of a factory in Busselton in pursuance of precisely the same policy should be acceptable, and that then an attempt should be made to undermine that policy in another area for the benefit of the same person. In another communication, dated the 31st August, 1948, from Hunt's Canning Factory, it is stated *inter alia*—

The factory is designed to treat . . .

This is the Albany cannery, I should mention.

. . . between twenty and twenty five tons of fish in a day, and to keep this plant working on an economic basis and give complete and permanent employment to the staff continual supplies are essential.

To substantiate the capabilities of this factory, the quantity of fish actually treated and canned (not stored) in March of this year was 350 tons, an average of almost 90 tons per week. This quantity was, however, not sufficient to enable both the automatic and semi-automatic closing machines to be used and the latter remained idle for the whole season through lack of supplies.

At this time of the year considerable difficulty is experienced in keeping the factory turning over and in finding employment for a nucleus only of the staff. Attempts are being made continually to obtain additional supplies, so that the staff can be kept in permanent employment, as it is not the desire of the factory to stand down employees.

A Tiger Moth plane has been purchased for spotting fish, but even with this added assistance and the supplies carted from Hopetoun, the intake of fish at the factory for July and August has not averaged 20 tons per week, a quantity which could be handled in one day in any week.

Since the Hopetoun season started in May, 1948, the following quantities of fish have been carted out of Hopetoun and divided between our factory at Albany and the Ocean Canning Company Limited, Perth.

That was an arrangement temporarily made between the parties for a division of fish supplies so long as this road license was granted. The letter continues—

				tons.
May	12
June	20
July	95
August	110

It can be seen from these figures that, were the whole of the fish available at Hopetoun to be canned at Albany, four times as many fish could be caught before the factory would be fully employed.

I want to make that point very clear. Those factories are capable of handling four times the quantity of the fish they can catch, according to this communication from the accountant of the company. The letter continues—

It is impossible, therefore, for the Albany factory to be over-supplied with fish from Hopetoun, even if the whole of the supplies from that source were available.

Mr. Fox: Is that during the season?

The MINISTER FOR INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT: This communication deals with the matter since the Hopetoun season in May.

Mr. Kelly: 1948?

The MINISTER FOR INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT: Yes. The same circumstances I believe apply almost every year. It must surely be apparent that any action which will result in a diminution of the available supplies from this particular place on the south coast must react to the detriment not only of the proprietors but also of those employed in the factory on the south coast, and in effect probably nullify their existence unless it is practicable to carry them on with other supplies. The member for Middle Swan referred to certain alleged statements by the Director of Industrial Development, and I have here a report from the director made after he had been permitted to peruse the speech of the hon. member, which is attached to his report. He says—

According to the attached "Hansard" report of the debate, Mr. Grayden has attributed statements to me, some of which are partly true only and others nothing more or less than a figment of his, or Mr. Gardiner's imagination.

Mr. Grayden: That is a deliberate lie! We have the director in the gallery and I will be able to tell the House something about it shortly. There may be one or two other things coming up, too, in connection with that.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! The Minister may proceed.

Hon. J. B. Sleeman: Cannot you control those fellows over there?

Mr. SPEAKER: Order!

The MINISTER FOR INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT: I would like to submit to the House for the consideration of every member that I am merely reading a report of the Director of Industrial Development made after he had had an opportunity to peruse the statement of the member for Middle Swan. I would like to point out also at this stage that the hon. member does not know what statements are objected to. The director goes on to say—

At no time had I in any way indicated to Mr. Gardiner that the zoning plan would be abandoned; in fact, I stressed to him that as far as I was concerned, I would continue to recommend the zoning plan as, in my opinion, it was in the best interests of the industry and conformed with the Government's decentralisation policy.

I advised Mr. Gardiner to develop his Busselton factory as quickly as possible and also the excellent zone—Nornalup to Lancelin Island—that had been allotted to his factories.

So the area in question which had been allotted to his factories was from Nornalup to Lancelin Island. The report continues—

The department gave Mr. Gardiner every possible assistance in the development of the Busselton factory and I refused to sponsor an application by Mr. Hunt for a transport license for him to continue carting salmon from the Busselton zone for his factory at Albany.

I certainly used the words "If the Belmont factory is solely dependent on fish transported by road from the south coast, the sooner it is shut down the better." But this statement was preceded by the remark that the zone allocated to Mr. Gardiner's two factories extended from Nornalup to Lancelin Island, in which salmon and other fish were plentiful. I never, at any time, admitted or stated that there were no salmon in the Mandurah-Lancelin Island zone. In fact, I informed Mr. Grayden that I had personally netted salmon in fairly large quantities as far north as Safety Bay. I informed Mr. Grayden that natural fish varieties for Mr. Gardiner's Belmont factory were sea herring, sprats, garfish and Perth herring.

I think that the House is the most capable judge of the truth or otherwise of the statements made in that report to me by the Director of Industrial Development. I do not think there is the slightest necessity for me to elaborate upon it or to give to the House any opinion I may possess as to the veracity of that gentleman. He is well-known in this Chamber and I leave members to decide, as a jury has to decide, as to his credibility.

Hon. F. J. S. Wise: I would like to hear him at the bar of the House, stating a case.

The MINISTER FOR INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT: It has been pointed out that the acceptance of this motion would be of the greatest possible value to persons engaged in fishing on the south coast. I have here a letter addressed to the Minister for Industrial Development, Parliament House, Perth, dated the 4th August, 1949. It comes from Hopetoun and is signed by one C. E. Chipperfield, manager of Hopetoun Fisheries, a fishing syndicate working at 12-Mile Beach. He says—

We have read with interest the discussion in the House re road transport, etc. of fish from the South coast beaches.

As manager of the Hopetoun Fisheries I would like to voice my views on the matter.

We feel that the fish should be treated at the local cannery for the following reasons:—

1. The fish are canned within a few hours of being caught with vacuum closing machines making the best product in the West.

2. It is in the interest of the fishing industry and the fishermen that the best product should be put on the market. This is only made possible by the fish being received at the cannery within the shortest possible time after being caught.

3. The district generally would suffer should fish be processed at other centres, and everyone would be thrown out of work as this is the only livelihood in the district.

We are quite satisfied to supply fish to local cannery at present prices and look forward to the development of this industry under the present Government's decentralisation policy.

I prefaced my remarks earlier by saying that I understood the views of my predecessor on this subject did not conflict with that view. Therefore I do not make a reference myself in this instance to this Government's decentralisation policy. I have here a number of other communications which, in view of what has been said, I think I am obliged to read if the House will bear with me for a few minutes longer. I have a letter written to me from Denmark on the 30th July, 1949, by people calling themselves Pinniger and Smith. It is as follows:—

We have read with interest the discussion in the House re road transport, etc., of fish from the South coast beaches.

As fishermen of many years standing, being the biggest in this district, we would like to let you have our opinion on the above matter.

Until Hunts Cannery and Seafoods Ltd. built their factories in Albany the fishing industry was in a very bad way, as we were at the mercy of the central buyers and had to take what they gave for our fish and be thankful for what we got or get out of the game.

With the advent of the two above factories starting up our worries soon ended as we were given set prices for our catch which were fair to all, and the industry was placed on a footing never before experienced. Not only this but our worries over ice and transport were also at an end.

These factories have done a great lot to making the fishing industry what it is today, for while we were at the mercy of the central buyers the game was in a very bad way.

The fishermen of this district are well satisfied with our present local markets and only trust that supplies will always be plentiful to keep them in operation.

Another note reached me, dated July, 1949, and signed by N. K. Swarbrick, F. H. Swarbrick, J. Swarbrick, W. H. Swarbrick, R. Sampson, D. Keyser, C. H. Martin, and F. W. Gomm, as follows:—

This is to certify that we the undersigned fishermen of Albany, have suffered no loss in our dealings with the local canneries.

I have another letter from a man named Cook and a man named Shruelf. On the 30th July last they wrote in the following terms:—

The Hon. Industrial Development,
Parliament House,
Perth.

Dear Sir,

We noticed in Thursday's "West Australian," dated 28th July, an article re the transport of fish from the South coast. We understand it was said the fishermen here are dissatisfied and want licences to transport their fish to Perth.

This is not so for until the local canning factory started processing fish, we had no outlet for the salmon—one fisherman was able and had the contract to keep the metropolitan factory supplied.

The local factory has done everything to develop the industry with the assistance of the Government, ensuring us of a satisfactory market for our fish and we are anxious that they receive sufficient supplies to enable them to economically operate and further develop the industry in this area.

I have another letter signed by E. Pitt and Gomm, Cheyne Beach fishermen—

The Minister for Industrial Development,
Parliament House,
Perth.

Dear Sir,

Being interested we would like to give our views on the South Coast carting of fish mentioned in "The West Australian" paper this week.

We think the Government showed wisdom in carrying out a decentralisation policy in establishing canneries on the South coast, giving the fishermen a market for their fish which we could not sell previously.

Because of the progressive policy adopted by the local cannery they have been able to treat all our fish. We look forward with pleasure to a good livelihood, assuring the firm our full support, for we feel it is in the best interests of the industry.

Mr. Grayden: Some of these facts are weak!

Hon. A. A. M. Coverley: Who said they were facts?

The MINISTER FOR INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT: If the hon. member is very interested I might manage to strengthen them with this letter from one, Mouchmore of South-street, Albany—

To Hon. Minister
for Industrial Development,
Parliament House,
Perth.

Dear Sir,

We, the undersigned, Mouchmore Bros. Mayfield, one of the oldest fishermen in Albany, understand it was reputed in the House by Mr. Grayden, M.L.A., that the Albany fishermen are dissatisfied with supply ing Hunt's Canning Co. with fish.

This is not so, and we would prefer to supply the local cannery for many reasons

That fairly disposes of the argument by the hon. member that all the fishermen in this area, or words to that effect, were thoroughly dissatisfied with the results they could obtain from the southern coast factories because apparently of the advantageous position they would be in if they sent their catch up here. I think these communication bear evidence entirely to the contrary.

Hon. A. A. M. Coverley: You do no object to a producer having some competition for his market?

The MINISTER FOR INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT: Not at all. I believe the producer is the best judge of what is a profitable price for himself. If he writes that the terms and treatment he is getting are more satisfactory than when he sent his fish to Perth, as these people have done then most obviously the system under which he is at present working is more satisfactory than the other. I do not think anyone can deny that.

Hon. A. A. M. Coverley: Surely that is his own business. He will not send them to Perth if he can get a better price when he is selling them at the moment.

The MINISTER FOR INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT: The hon. member is adopting the argument I have presented to him.

Hon. A. A. M. Coverley: Not necessarily.

The MINISTER FOR INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT: I can see no other course that he is following. The Director of Industrial Development informs me, and some perusal of the papers associated with the matter confirms his statement, that it was a long time before Mr. Gardiner could be persuaded to believe that the establishment of a factory outside the metropolitan area was desirable. He says—

Although the Department of Industrial Development initiated salmon canning in West Australia vide letter folio 47, file 175/38 and arranged for Mr. Gardiner to carry out the initial experiments, at no time has it advocated the canning of salmon on a permanent basis in the metropolitan area.

When Mr. Gardiner refused to extend his operations outside of the metropolitan area, even when promised financial assistance to do so, the department endeavoured to interest others in establishing canneries on the South coast.

Mr. Hunt responded to the department's request and has established canneries at Esperance, Hopetoun and Albany. He also acquired the Geraldton crayfish cannery which he proposes to convert to a fish cannery in the near future.

Mr. Gardiner was advised of the department's intention to recommend a zoning system governing the issue of transport licenses for the transport of canning fish. It was only recently that he established his Busselton factory and the operation of the zoning system was withheld until his Busselton factory was in operation.

The effective coastline allocated to the Albany, Hopetoun and Esperance factories, all in the one ownership, is from Nornalup to Israelite Bay, a distance of approximately 400 miles. The coastline allocated to Busselton and Perth factories, is from Nornalup to Lancelin Island approximately 430 miles. Natural fish supplies for the Perth factory are Perth herring, sea herring, sprats, garfish, sardines and some salmon. For the Busselton factory salmon, sea herring, garfish and sardines. For the Albany factory, sardines, salmon, sea herring, garfish and tuna. For Hopetoun salmon only. For Esperance salmon, herring and garfish.

The advantages to the State from the zoning system are:

(a) It has encouraged the establishment of decentralised canneries.

(b) The products are improved because the fish are canned fresh and do not have to be carted long distances.

(c) Railways revenue benefits as cans and canned fish produced by decentralised canneries are transported from and to Perth by rail, whereas road transport is requested for the transport of fish to the Perth cannery.

(d) A saving in the consumption of liquid fuel is effected.

There are no disadvantages to the State from zoning. However, some fishermen consider that they would be better off if competition was encouraged. There is probably some reason in their argument. However since canneries were developed on the South coast fishermen have enjoyed a prosperity never before experienced.

That, I think, can be evidenced from the letters I read a few moments ago—

The difficulty could be overcome by the fixing of a price for canning varieties of fish at the various canneries. Such fixed price should ensure a fair return to fishermen, and, at the same time, allow the canneries to operate at a reasonable profit. The fixed price for headed and gutted fresh salmon is now fixed at 6d. per lb. delivered Perth and an arbitrary price of 5s. per lb. for canning salmon at Perth has been adopted. Assuming a basic price of, say £40, delivered Perth, possible equitable prices would be £25 per ton Hopetoun (cartage cost £15), £30 per ton Albany (cartage cost £10) £34 per ton Busselton (cartage cost £6), £20 per ton Esperance (cartage cost £20).

Before zoning was introduced, Mr. Hunt obtained a considerable quantity of fish from the Busselton zone for his Albany cannery. He is now denied road transport from this source.

Mr. Hunt has developed the South Coast fishery and canneries entirely on his own financial resources. The Albany cannery is particularly well equipped for a very large output. The Hopetoun cannery has recently been equipped with two modern vacuum closing machines and the Esperance cannery is capable of handling a reasonable output.

I read, a few moments ago, a portion of a letter with reference to those machines, which are difficult to keep fully occupied even with all the supplies of salmon that are available. The report continues—

Mr. Hunt has made many miles of tracks to beaches on the South coast. He operates two aircraft for fish spotting, special vessels and equipment for taking new types of canning fish, such as sardines, numerous motor vehicles and a tank for transporting fish over sandhills. If a transport license is granted for one third of the Hopetoun catch to be transported to Perth, the Hopetoun cannery will probably close. The decision to be made is between continuing a policy which has already achieved something worthwhile for decentralisation or abandoning zoning in favour of centralisation. The facts are, the Perth cannery will not suffer any great hardship by

being denied road transport for fish from Hopetoun and will be forced to develop its own zone for supplies, whereas the abandoning of zoning will probably result in the closure of the Hopetoun factory.

I have already stated that in that area only salmon can be taken. At the Albany cannery there were an average number of 100 fishermen employed and from the 1st July, 1948, to the 30th June, 1949, the factory paid £30,000 in wages. At Hopetoun the average number of fishermen employed was 20 and the factory wages paid between the same dates were £8,500, and the total sum paid to the fishermen for their fish was £11,321. I think it will be fairly apparent that there is no grave need at this stage, as has been suggested, for the Department of Industrial Development to change its recommendation to the Transport Board. In recent years, as is well known, the C.S.I.R. has been doing a great deal of research into the incidence of various kinds of fish in the waters surrounding the south and western coasts of Western Australia. From the conclusions of that organisation, as the result of the research, it is clearly established that if the proper facilities are made available it will be possible, even in the waters surrounding Rottnest Island, to take scores of tons of herring which are suitable for canning and which, indeed, as I mentioned earlier, were at one time one of the principal products of the Ocean Canning Company.

I have already said that the factory at Belmont was not established for the purpose of canning fish and I have pointed out that the factories on the south coast have, largely, built up the opportunities they are affording local people by taking steps for the employment of men and the provision of gear to tackle the fish where they are found. We do not have to consider the persons in question in this issue. I know both of them equally well, or equally little. We have in this House the interests of the State to consider. Has it not been proclaimed from almost every housetop in Australia, by people of all shades of political thought, that one of the greatest troubles of Australia in the last half century has been the enormous development of its capital cities? Commonwealth and State Governments, with no conflict of opinion whatever may have been their political beliefs, have in recent years arrived at the conclusion that something must be done to restrict the growth of the octopus of centralisation.

Hon. F. J. S. Wise: That is not a canning variety of fish.

THE MINISTER FOR INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT: In a State such as this it is more detrimental to the interests of the country, in all probability, than it is in many other of the States of the Commonwealth. Statistics show that during comparatively recent years the population of our metropolitan area has increased at a greater rate than has the population of the whole State. Obviously during that time, far from there being a movement outwards from the metropolitan area, there has been a movement of people into it. If we willingly subscribe to a policy that even in small degree reverses the process of trying to induce people to leave the capital city, we will be doing no good for the State. I ask the House, in arriving at a conclusion on this motion, to be watchful of the situation that is likely to be created if it becomes known to those who are trying hard to establish industries in various parts of the State, in a small way, that this Parliament favours a return to centralisation. What would be the result of that? Undoubtedly it would be extremely detrimental to the State and would put the clock back to a large extent, so that the well-meant efforts of recent years would become fruitless.

We should know perfectly well that the process of building large cities on the coastline of the Commonwealth is hard to halt and the process of moving people outwards from those cities is difficult of accomplishment. Should we do anything tending to make it more difficult still, we would be making a great mistake. As I have already stated, my reason for bringing this motion before the House this evening, out of its place upon the notice paper, was because I regarded it as one of great importance. As the Minister for the moment charged with the administration of the Department of Industrial Development, I will feel impelled, if this motion is carried, to inform the director that he must withdraw his objection and recommend to the Transport Board the issue of a transport license. I would do that with considerable regret for the reasons I have tried to make clear during the last half hour. In my view it would be a most retrograde step and detrimental to the interests of Western Australia but, if this House feels that it should be done, then it will be my duty to see that it is done.

MR. GRAHAM (East Perth) [8.11]: Judging by past performances, it will probably be regarded as more than passing strange that the member for Middle Swan and I should find ourselves bedfellows so far as this matter is concerned.

Hon. F. J. S. Wise: That is the second miracle tonight. The other concerned the member for North-East Fremantle and the member for Irwin-Moore.

Mr. GRAHAM: I wish to compliment the member for Middle Swan upon the excellent case he presented in support of the viewpoint contained in the resolution we are considering. In my opinion it is a pity that he does not show a little more restraint, and be a little more temperate in his remarks when he is addressing the Chamber on other occasions. As a rule we hear from the Minister for Industrial Development a very strong and logical case for the point of view that he seeks to express. This evening, however, I feel that I am not able to pay him that tribute which he usually earns. It is all very well to work oneself up into a frenzy about this principle of decentralisation of industry. That is an admirable sentiment, but surely it is necessary to be a little practical in one's approach to this matter.

The Minister, when seeking to establish that point, chose a most unfortunate example because, as was well demonstrated by the member for Middle Swan, the company which the Minister is prepared to see closed down is the pioneer of this industry in Western Australia. Surely that is something of which account should be taken. However, there is no denying the enterprise of Mr. Hunt and it is not sought by me to detract from him in any way because of his efforts, which have been exceedingly successful, to establish an industry chiefly at Albany, but also at other centres. The industry at those particular centres has sufficient protection at present without the Minister and his department seeking to close a company that is established in Perth. It is protected because transporting fish from the southern coast to the factories at Hopton. Esperance and Albany cannot be compared with having to bring those quantities of fish several hundred miles further to Perth. Because of the distance involved, and accordingly the added cost, there is

adequate protection for the canning industry at any of those centres on the southern coast of this State.

I am wondering upon what the Minister's argument is based. At one point it would appear that he is in favour of the fish which are caught on the southern coast being used exclusively for the purpose of supporting secondary industries in those areas. But, on the other hand, as he knows and has admitted, there is nothing to stop, if it were practicable, a person bringing hundreds or thousands of tons of fish to Perth by rail for the purpose of canning. Therefore, it is largely a matter of the Minister and his department considering that it is all right for fish to be brought to Perth by railway trucks but that they should not be conveyed by motor vehicles. Apparently there is no great concern that the fish should be treated where they are caught.

Railway transport is anything but satisfactory, for a variety of reasons. Only a few weeks ago I participated in the hauling and treating of many tons of fish. As soon as they are landed on the beaches, the fish are immediately cut, headed, gutted and thrown into trucks which transport them without delay, day and night, to the canneries. If those fish had to be transported by rail, it would be a totally different proposition. If they are so transported they have to be packed in boxes or crates, then placed on trucks and taken to the railway stations and transported by train. At their destination they are unloaded, put into trucks and then taken to the cannery. Because of their being packed in crates, fish, particularly salmon which does not keep very well, deteriorate when transported by rail. If those fish were packed tight under ice on motor vehicles they would, within several hours of being hauled on to the beaches, be delivered direct into ice at the other end of the journey. Therefore it is an unfair proposition to ask that one concern, the pioneer of the fish canning industry, should suffer these hardships in comparison to its competitor.

I am unable to understand the situation because even during the present year scores of tons of fish have been transported, by Mr. Hunt, hundreds of miles to Mr. Hunt's various factories. Apparently there is no objection to motor transport being used in favour of one individual. In view of what

has been stated, and because of some facts which I intend to submit shortly, I think members will appreciate the interjection I made when the member for Middle Swan was speaking. It was to the effect that there is an official bias in favour of Mr. Hunt and his concern and that can be sustained from facts which I will submit. I do not know either Mr. Gardiner or Mr. Hunt, or the principals of either of those firms. Mr. Gardiner is asking nothing whatever of the State. He is not seeking a subsidy or financial assistance in any way for the transport of a commodity that he requires for his factory. It is a matter which surely causes all of us to wonder when we remember that over the air, through the Press and from the public platform, the Parties which occupy the other side of this Chamber at present have been speaking so freely of the virtues of private enterprise, have been crying for the cessation of control and restrictions, now desire a pioneer industry to be exterminated because of certain controls and restrictions it seeks to impose. Is there any logic shown by this Government in this matter?

Hon. A. R. G. Hawke: In any matter.

Mr. GRAHAM: There does seem to be a tendency to describe as a virtue the fact that Mr. Hunt and his concern are operating in a big way. Surely it is not seriously suggested, merely because it is a big business, that that is an argument in favour of supporting it. There have been so many contradictions on this matter submitted by the Minister that I repeat what I said earlier in my remarks that I am somewhat confused, and obviously the Minister was, too, because there was a mass of contradiction and illogical points running throughout his address. Mr. Hunt is undoubtedly a most enterprising gentleman which is evidenced by the fact that he has two aeroplanes used for spotting, he has opened several canneries, he has about 15 parties of fishermen who are hauling the salmon for him, and he has constructed and repaired a number of roads to assist in the transport of that salmon. At the same time, however, Mr. Hunt is a most ambitious and selfish gentleman and is inclined to be ruthless, and I will submit facts to support that statement.

Hon. A. H. Panton: Most ambitious men are.

Mr. GRAHAM: His object, which is no secret, is to secure the monopoly of the fish canning industry, or at least the salmon canning industry in Western Australia. The unfortunate part of it is that he is being aided and abetted by the Department of Industrial Development and the Government. This matter of advocating that products shall be treated in the zone from where they emanate can, I think, be overdone. Knowing a little about the canning of salmon I say it would be utterly impossible for any canning factory of any size to operate in the metropolitan area if it had to depend upon salmon obtained from the western coast, and I hope to submit a few facts to substantiate that bald statement. The decision of the Transport Board, based upon the recommendation of the Department of Industrial Development, is entirely wrong in principle and in this particular instance is likely to have tragic results, not only for the fishermen, notwithstanding the letters quoted by the Minister, but also for the public.

To quote an example! Fishermen from Bremer Bay or Doubtful Island Bay, which are the areas in which I spent a short period, during the present season have been receiving £30 a ton for their salmon delivered at the Albany cannery. The fee usually paid for the transportation of salmon is roughly about 1s. per ton per mile. As Bremer and Doubtful Island Bays are approximately 170 miles from Albany it costs about £8 10s. per ton to transport fish to that centre. In other words, the fishermen are receiving about £22 net. To bring fish to Perth from the same locality, a distance of approximately 340 miles, the fishermen are paid £47 a ton, that is, £17 for the cost of transport and £30 for the return to the fishermen. Accordingly, it will be seen that the fishermen, those who are supplying and have been supplying fish to the metropolitan factory, will suffer a considerable financial loss when this Belmont factory goes out of existence—which appears to be the avowed policy of the Government—and I trust that members will do something to prevent it.

It will be appreciated therefore that Mr. Hunt is receiving his fish at a far lower price than is the management of the Perth factory. Whilst I have not checked this point I believe that Mr. Hunt's salmon is obtainable in the metropolitan area for 2d. a tin more than that of the other products.

As 250,000 tins of salmon can be produced at the Albany works in a week alone, members can have some conception of the enormous profits that must be accruing to this individual and who, if the Government has its way, will make a fortune in an extremely short period. Over the past several years certain things have been going on tending to bring about a monopoly for this individual and his enterprise. He has already made attempts to conspire, if I might use that term, with his opposition for the purpose of reducing the price of fish not to the consumer of course, but to his factory. That statement was made at a public meeting of fishermen in Albany. It was hotly denied by a representative of Hunt's concern until the manager—I think Smith is his name—of the Gardiner cannery was able to give the lie direct before the whole meeting of interested fishermen who attended that gathering. I had a discussion with one of them within the precincts of this building only a few days ago. As a matter of fact, it was that person's father who made the statement at the meeting that was contradicted by Hunt's representative but was sustained by the representative of the other concern.

Surely it will be appreciated by all members that to provide a monopoly is exceedingly dangerous. The early history has already shown that this man, who has stated that his ambition is to secure a monopoly, has within comparatively recent times sought, by co-operating with his opposition, to secure a reduction in the price of fish to his factory. If with the consent of the Government he secures the absolute monopoly he seeks, all the fishermen will be at his mercy so far as the catching of salmon is concerned. The Hopetoun cannery is incapable of handling all the fish caught in Hopetoun waters. There are several reasons for that. Within close proximity to Hopetoun there is, apparently designed by Nature, a reef that extends a short distance from the shore. Salmon have possibly been coming there for thousands of years, converging in the small bay. When the tide goes out, the fish are trapped behind the reef. That is what has been going on there, and it has been described to me as absolute murder because the fish are completely at the mercy of the fishermen.

There are probably scores of tons of fish available for fishermen without any effort whatever, and so it is that great quantities are usually obtainable from that source. The short season for salmon along the bulk of the coastline is restricted to about two months when the salmon are running. That is usually during the months of March and April. However, at Hopetoun the season extends, generally speaking, with considerable density from May to December and it is the only place along the southern coast that enjoys that long period. Thus it will be seen immediately that Mr. Hunt, who has a factory at Hopetoun, another at Esperance and a third at Albany, is in a very fortunate position, particularly if the rival concern is not to be permitted to bring fish by road from southern sources.

It will certainly be hard to secure any salmon and what will be available will be in negligible quantities. Even so, the period when the rival concern will be able to secure those supplies will be confined to the short season of two months, at which stage precious little salmon will be caught on the lower western coast of Western Australia. That is so because, after proceeding in schools along the southern coast near the eastern border and then going westwards, hundreds of tons of fish are being caught while the schools are going along the coast and before they round the south-western corner of the State. By the time they round that corner and proceed along the western coast, very few are left, speaking in comparative terms. Therefore, the conditions and restrictions imposed by the Department of Industrial Development are exceedingly unfair in every respect. They are not only hampering one who pioneered the industry but are giving him no chance to survive.

Surely there is no need to fear that the factories on the southern coast will be extinguished because, as pointed out by the Minister himself, the operations of the Gardiner factory here and the quantity of fish it handles are infinitesimal compared with the operations of, and the quantities treated by, the factories on the southern coast. Therefore, there is no threat or danger to the policy of decentralisation. To emphasise what I stated earlier, surely the fact that it is 150 or more miles further to Perth with the attendant increased

cost of hauling supplies to the metropolitan area, should be all the protection required to sustain the decentralised industries along the southern coast. During the off season in the Albany locality, practically all the fish caught in the Hopetoun area, with its extended period of operations, were transported by road to Albany, a distance of 230 miles, and the only fish treated at Hopetoun where they were caught were the supplies that the Albany factory was incapable of absorbing.

That practice has been going on with the full knowledge of the Fisheries Department, the Department of Industrial Development, the Transport Board and, I dare say, of the Minister himself. Notwithstanding that fact, nothing whatever has been done respecting the matter. The question may be asked: Why? I can supply the answer myself and say that it is because Mr. Hunt had to get the fish for his factory, and not Mr. Gardiner. I stated that Mr. Hunt is an ambitious and ruthless businessman. I say that in respect of him not necessarily in a critical sense. He has his objective and is determined to attain it. About two years ago, he approached a party of fishermen who were operating at Doubtful Island Bay, and threatened to stop them from fishing by the very simple device of exerting pressure on the person through whose property it was necessary for them to travel in transporting their fish and returning afterwards with the empty trucks. To use his own words, Hunt said he was "sweet with the owner of the property." He threatened he would take that action unless the fishermen were prepared to sell their catch to him at £22 a ton. At that time they were receiving £30 per ton net from the Perth factory.

I know that quite a number of fishermen on the southern coast are not greatly perturbed about the matter because they realise that the factory with a comparatively small intake is incapable of absorbing their catch. Therefore they are unfortunately dependent entirely upon the concern of one individual. A number of them have expressed themselves in terms somewhat akin to this, namely, that judging by the trend of events and what they have heard from official sources—and time is proving how right they were unless we take some action on this motion—it would be only a matter of time before Mr. Hunt had a complete monopoly

and they were not going to say or do anything to offend him because, when the day arrived, as well it might in say two months' time, they would be left out in the cold and absolutely at the mercy of this individual. Because of that, they are not likely to be vocal in their objections to what is happening.

Fish have been transported from Hopetoun to Perth during the last four years or so. As a matter of fact, one-third of the catch in the Hopetoun area was, by arrangement, sent to Perth. It reached Perth by road, not rail transport, but apparently there was nothing to become excited about at that stage. Since then, however, Mr. Hunt has come on the scene very prominently. Last year the Gardiner factory had only two parties operating for it as against approximately 15 salmon fishing parties operating for Mr. Hunt.

When Mr. Hunt was having the salmon carted from Hopetoun last year, namely, during the off season—I repeat that all the fish caught at Hopetoun was being transported 230 miles to Albany except that which was beyond the capacity of the Albany factory—it was being done by contractors. He bought the fish on the beach at, I think, 1s. 2d. per fish, which worked out at approximately £22 per ton. This year, perhaps fearing that the Transport Board might have something to say or for some other reason, the fishermen are bearing the responsibility of transporting the fish over the 230 miles to the factory and only at that point is Mr. Hunt assuming any responsibility.

To give members an idea of how things have been operating and the disadvantages of geography and economics, I am informed that over a period, Mr. Hunt, as I said earlier, was buying his fish under contract at 1s. 2d. per fish on the beach. He himself took the best of the fish. I may explain that the best fish are those that are first loaded on to the waiting trucks. If the fish are kept any considerable time on the beach, they tend to depreciate. Fish is a highly perishable product and salmon especially so. The fish that had been a longer time on the beach were allowed to go to Mr. Gardiner's factory. We ought to pay tribute to this enterprising Mr. Hunt who knows all the answers even before the questions have been asked.

I want members, while sympathising with the policy of decentralisation, to have some regard for the patently unfair treatment that would be accorded the pioneer of the fish canning industry in this State, for the position in which the fishermen, who are deserving of great consideration, will be placed if left entirely at the mercy of one man, and for the viewpoint of the public who consume this commodity. I have already mentioned the disparity in prices. I know not whether the price of canned fish is controlled under our legislation or under some regulation. Even if it is, there might still be some doubt as to whether the price is, in fact, controlled. However, I daresay that, in course of time, price controls will be completely lifted, and if there is then one firm only and not even a second very small firm operating to treat this commodity, it stands to reason that the consumer will be exploited.

I have shown that fish over the years have been transported hundreds of miles and that fish will still continue to be transported by road several hundred miles. I ask members to bear in mind the Minister's admission that there is no objection to fish in quantities, either large or small, being transported to the metropolitan area, provided they are conveyed by a particular form of transport. Well, what sort of dictators are we? Here are two private companies, and yet a Government department and the Government are choosing which company shall be marked out for extinction and which company shall be allowed a complete and entire monopoly. Surely it has been already clearly demonstrated by the experience of several years past and the evergrowing influence of Mr. Hunt because of his initiative and drive, that the factories will still continue in operation along the southern coast of the State. We will have decentralisation. Therefore, the Minister has raised a false issue. Decentralisation of industry will not be interfered with in any way.

Those canneries have been established, they have flourished and are flourishing, while the Gardiner factory has been in existence. My knowledge of the industry is certainly not complete, but the factory at Belmont has remained more or less stationary as far as its output is concerned. On the other hand, the factories along the southern coast have expanded rapidly. That state of

affairs has been brought about notwithstanding that fish have been transported to Perth by road. If the Government decided in the interests of decentralisation of industry that no additional factories should be established in the metropolitan area, there would be something valid in its submissions; but for the Government to take action to strangle an industry already established—and I repeat, the pioneer of the industry—is unfair in the extreme.

When the various points are analysed, I do not think members should be in any grave doubt as to how they should cast their vote on this motion. We members of this Parliament do not represent Western Australia, except indirectly; we represent our individual constituencies. I may be right or wrong, but I can envisage the parochial outlook of a member for a coastal constituency; he must perforce rise in his place and put on a show to tickle the ears of the people he represents! But this motion is not a parish pump matter; it involves a principle of the highest order. No one is seeking to interfere with or in any way reduce the quantity of fish to be made available to these companies, which at the moment are decentralised. Therefore, what have we to fear from a little free competition? In view of the expressed policy of the Liberal and Country League and the Country and Democratic League and their belief in free enterprise, it is all the more strange that they should be parties to the proposals of certain Government departments. That is completely beyond me. It runs entirely contrary to everything that we have heard during the past several years from public platforms and broadcasting stations.

If I thought the carrying of this motion would mean the extinction of the factories on the southern coast or a reduction in their capacity to can fish, I should have to give much consideration to the issues involved. There are salmon running every year for an exceedingly limited season of two months except at Hopetoun where the season is longer. Thousands of tons of fish come right in to the sandy shore. New and improved methods of spotting and catching fish are being devised. More and more persons are combining to make fishing parties in order to catch salmon on the southern coast, where they are in great abundance. This is a thriving, growing industry which is rapidly ex-

panding. By comparison, we have a small metropolitan unit situated at Belmont and the Minister would have us believe that if it is allowed to continue it will sound the deathknell of the industry along the southern coast. Of course, the suggestion is absurd.

I do not know the parties concerned. I have not met the principals of either of the companies nor anybody employed by them. I have no financial or other interest in either of the companies. The factory at Belmont is not in my electorate and so far as I am aware not one of its employees resides in my electorate. I recently toured the southern coast; incidentally, I drove a truck with four or five tons of salmon behind me from Bremer Bay to Albany. I made inquiries about the industry and inspected portion of the Albany factory. I interrogated fishermen, some of whom were operating in a large way, and I learned sufficient from them to indicate to me that they were fearful of the consequences of something of which they then saw the portent. That was in March last.

I maintain it has been established that no damage is likely to be sustained by the canneries at Albany, Esperance and Hope-toun if fish are allowed to be transported by road to Perth. There is a limit to what fishermen can stand. On many occasions, because the season is so short, they work the round of the clock and perhaps lose two or three nights' sleep. No harm is likely to be done to the canneries along the southern coast if fish are allowed to be transported by road; but if the Government's proposal is endorsed by this House there will be fearful results to the people of the State following on the establishment of a monopoly in this industry. I implore members to support the motion so ably submitted by the member for Middle Swan.

HON. E. NULSEN (Kanowna) [9.0]: I shall never forget the name of Mr. Hunt. It has been used so often tonight that I feel there is really a vendetta in operation. The name is indelibly engraved on my mind, because it has been repeated so often. This motion is a non-Party one; it is a matter of policy. Decentralisation is the policy of the Party on this side of the House, and, as the Acting Premier has said, it is the policy of that side of the House. If that

is so, there should be no argument in regard to the question brought before us by the member for Middle Swan.

The member for East Perth said that the Ocean Canning Company pioneered this industry. The company was probably the pioneer of the canning of sheeps' tongues and other things, but it was not altogether the pioneer of salmon canning. I am quite sure that not one member of this House would like to see the Belmont cannery closed down, and it will not close. It has been in existence for many years and the company has had the same opportunity as Mr. Hunt to establish itself on the southern coast of Western Australia. I think the Director of Industrial Development very earnestly asked Mr. Gardiner to establish a factory at Albany, and then at other ports if he so desired. He still has that opportunity. There is nothing to stop him from building factories at Albany, Hope-toun, or Esperance.

It is said that the Ocean Canning Company's factory is very important, and I agree. But it is no more important than the Albany cannery. As a matter of fact the Albany cannery, from the point of view of Albany and of the State, is more important because it employs 150 persons, whereas the Ocean Canning Company employs only 30. I am quite satisfied that the director gave full consideration to his recommendation to the Transport Board. He knows that the policy, not only of the Government but also of the Opposition, is decentralisation, and there is no reason why the road should be in competition with the railway when factories are established at the various centres.

It has been said that the company has a contract for 25,000 cases of tinned fish for the Eastern States, worth £75,000. If that be so, I do not think there is any reason why it should not be able to transport the fish by rail and can them as has been done in the past. The member for Middle Swan put up a very good case and was very earnest in his endeavours. But he is not imbued with the idea of decentralisation. He is something like our young friend from East Perth. I feel that they must be reincarnations of those who lived 40 or 50 years ago when this State was developed on the basis of centralisation and not decentralisation. I can remember

when we wanted a railway built from Esperance to Kalgoorlie. The member for Nedlands will recall the petition that was sent to this part of the State for consideration to be given to that matter. When did we get the railway? It was opened in 1927. Why? It was because the policy in those days was centralisation. I can remember the very early days—and so will the member for Nedlands—when people at Kalgoorlie said, "We will have federation or separation." The people in this part of the State gave very little consideration to those in the country.

The processing of fish is an expert job. I am told that the sooner the fish can be canned, the better the product; and there is no hope of getting a 100 per cent. product if it is not canned immediately it is taken out of the water. That is one of the reasons why the cannery should be on the spot where the fish are caught, so that they can be cleaned and processed at once. In that way a very high quality fish will be provided, which is required by all of us in this State. The south coast cannery processes fish daily. It is not kept. The claim has been made that the fish processed there are not only the best canned fish in Western Australia but that they are considered by experts to be the best canned fish in the whole of Australia. Why is that? It is because they are canned while fresh. The fish are caught and put into the tins as soon as possible.

Mr. Fox: How much do they sell in Western Australia?

Hon. E. NULSEN: I do not know the prices they are getting. I would say that could be controlled by the Prices Commissioner.

Mr. Fox: Not the quantity!

Hon. E. NULSEN: I do not know whether it is or not.

Hon. A. H. Panton: He wants to know how much they would sell.

Hon. E. NULSEN: I do not know. But they can sell all the fish they are able to can. The Albany factory is canning 54,000 tins a day and Mr. Hunt is putting an addition there, as a result of which he will be able to can about 100,000 tins.

Mr. Fox: They can sell them in the Eastern States for what they like.

Hon. E. NULSEN: If the hon. member were in the same position, I suppose he would get all he could.

Mr. Fox: That is not the question.

Hon. E. NULSEN: It is a matter of business and has nothing whatever to do with this question.

Mr. Fox: That is not the question at all.

Hon. E. H. H. Hall: Do not take any notice of him.

Hon. E. NULSEN: Before the Albany cannery was established, the fish, so I am told, were all carted by rail to Perth. If that is so, why is it that now the cannery is there they want to cart the fish by road? The policy of both the Government and the Opposition is to give all possible traffic to the railways. The Albany factory paid to the railways £3,000 for railage last year.

Mr. McCulloch: Where is the Israelite Bay cannery?

Mr. Cornell: That is where they get the jewfish.

Hon. E. NULSEN: I did not hear the interjection. I have received several letters, and the writers of them would be sorry if anything happened to the canneries on the south coast as it is only since their establishment that they have had an assured market for their fish. As far as Hopetoun is concerned, not many years ago a few men discovered that a lot of salmon could be caught there. One of these men, a fellow named Young, started to bring fish to Perth, but found he did not have a market. He thought the only way to get a market was to establish a small factory at Hopetoun. He did that, but unfortunately he did not have the finance to make it successful. Later, Mr. Hunt took it over. He made additions to it and put it on a proper business basis. Since then the town of Hopetoun has increased in population from 10 to over 100, and now it has a school.

What would happen to the district if the cannery closed? It would again be deserted and there would be no school for the few children remaining. A lot has been said about pioneering. I do not think there is any pioneering in establishing a factory at Perth. Why migrate all the people here? In this State we have a population of 503,000 people of whom 273,000 are in the metropolitan area. Now we have members standing up here and telling us that we should

allow the fish to be taken away from these factories. They do not care so long as the metropolitan factory survives.

Mr. Graham: There is plenty for both.

Hon. E. NULSEN: There is not plenty for both. If the fish are to be taken from Hopton, then they should go the shortest distance and that is to Esperance, which is less than one-third of the distance from Hopton to Perth.

Mr. Graham: They are going to Albany now.

Hon. E. NULSEN: Some might be, but now a factory has been established at Esperance. It has been a great boon to the people of that town. Some nine or ten operatives are employed at the factory. It would be a terrific blow to the Esperance people if it had to close. In regard to Hopton, Mr. Hunt uses the railway between Newdegate and Perth. He employs the local carrier to cart his fish from Hopton to the rail-head. In addition, he patronises the local traders. If all our factories were in Perth we would have a similar position to that which obtains in respect of the ore that we are sending out of Western Australia, and from which we get nothing except a small royalty. If we are not to have decentralisation then we are not going to progress in the development of our huge State. Since Mr. Hunt has established himself, the fishermen, generally speaking—I suppose I could say 95 per cent. of them—are satisfied because they have an assured market. That is quite different from what we were told by the member for Middle Swan. He may have been led astray, because I do not think he would do that purposely.

Then, too, I am told that fish, as soon as they are taken from the water, start to deteriorate. The Ocean Canning people bring their fish to Perth, I understand and then put them into freezers for, probably, three months before being processed because they are used not only for canning as fish, but also as part of a pack which carries about 70 or 80 per cent. of potatoes. I am not saying anything about that other than that if we want good fish, and we desire to create a market for them, then let us have the canneries on the coast. By doing that we shall carry out the policy of decentralisation and so help to develop the State. We will get on to the same basis as

Queensland where a little over one-third the population is to be found in Brisbane. In Tasmania, which has been developed along the lines of decentralisation, less than one-third of the population is in Hobart. Yet here it is still being advocated that we should have centralisation.

I want to ask another question: Who is the pioneer, the man who goes to the country and opens it up, or the man who stays in the city? Who is the man who does most for the development of the country? Is it the person who goes out and opens it up, or I feel that there are many unnecessary people in the city who, if they are not parasites, hold parasitical positions. I am not leaving out politicians. All canneries are seasonable. Salmon can be caught only at certain times of the year. So the canneries on the coast have to make the best they can of the position.

Mr. Hunt is an enterprising man, and will put in the machinery that is necessary to cope with the catches that he makes. I have two De Havilland planes which he uses for spotting; and he is not selfish with them either, because at times he apprises other fishermen of shoals that he locates with them. The member for East Perth said the Government was creating a monopoly, but I know perfectly well it is doing nothing of the kind and that it is merely implementing the policy of decentralisation.

Mr. Rodoreda: It could be doing both.

Hon. E. NULSEN: I do not think it could do both in this case. The member for East Perth has on several occasions said that the refusal of a transport licence will mean the extermination of the Ocean Canning Co. That is an exaggeration, because there is nothing to prevent the company obtaining its fish by rail. If Mr. Hunt wishes to transport his canned fish, he has to send them by rail and thereby contribute to the revenue of the State.

Mr. Graham: Why not make Hunt transport his fish by wheelbarrow?

Hon. E. NULSEN: If the member for East Perth had his way, I think he would do that. Why not put them both on an even footing? Put Mr. Gardiner's factory on the south coast alongside Mr. Hunt's.

Mr. Graham: Why not let them cart their fish in whatever way they wish?

Hon. E. NULSEN: Let us foster our railways. That is the policy that Mr. Hunt has followed. The member for East Perth has harped on free competition, but there is nothing to prevent free competition in this case. Mr. Gardiner can compete with Mr. Hunt in any way he likes and there is nothing to prevent it.

Mr. Graham: Only the Transport Board.

Hon. E. NULSEN: It is not preventing him competing, but is merely saying he must cart his product in the same way as Mr. Hunt does. There is nothing to prevent Mr. Gardiner establishing himself on the south coast and competing with Mr. Hunt on a fair basis.

Mr. Graham: Not one of Hunt's fish is carried by rail.

Hon. E. NULSEN: All his tinned fish are transported by rail. If Mr. Hunt does send fish from Hopetoun to Albany by road, I would ask the hon. member would he expect them to be sent right around, instead of straight across?

Mr. Graham: You are asking that of Gardiner.

Hon. E. NULSEN: The train runs straight from Albany to Perth.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! The hon. member must address the Chair.

Hon. E. NULSEN: I have figures showing the value of fish produced from the factories during 1949. The Minister did not give the figures for the Esperance factory, but they are as follows: For the year ended the 30th June, 1949, the wages paid were £5,780, and the staff, when the factory closed, comprised 34 hands and nine fishermen. That is a great help to the area concerned. I plead with members to support decentralisation and justify the decision of our able Director of Industrial Development with regard to the fish canneries of the State. I am satisfied that our fisheries have been established on a fair basis and that there has been no bias. Anything the Director of Industrial Development has done has been done impartially and to the advantage of the whole of the State.

MR. BOVELL (Sussex) [9.25]: In submitting this motion to the House, the member for Middle Swan has done a service to the community. We have in the past been indebted to great citizens of our State for

developing various industries in the sphere of primary production. Sir James Mitchell took a great part in establishing the wheat industry in Western Australia, and he and the late Phillip Collier did much for our dairying industry in its early stages. The products of those industries have qualities that make them marketable throughout the world. We have built up an exportable surplus of wheat and are building up an exportable surplus of butter, but only in recent years has this State realised the full resources of the seas surrounding its coast. I am sure the present Minister for Industrial Development has an opportunity of going down in the history of the State as one who helped to establish a great Western Australian industry. It has been my privilege to visit the north-east coast of Scotland during the fishing season and see what the fishing industry means to the people in that part of the world.

One morning I saw the fishing fleet come in and there were no less than 600 women and girls on the fish wharves of Wick, ready to handle the fish as they were unloaded from the luggers. That sight brought to my mind the great potentialities of the fishing industry in our country such as our own. Not only the State Government but also the Commonwealth Government—as evidenced by its action in establishing a whaling station on our coast—has realised the importance of the wealth to be found in the seas off our shores. The Ocean Canning Co., until recently, has been granted a permit to bring salmon from the south coast to the metropolitan area. Being a business organisation, it has built up its programme on that basis, but its source of supply has now been to a great extent cut off. Any organisation would find it difficult to cope with a situation such as that. In my opinion, the question of decentralisation does not come into this picture at all.

The Ocean Canning Co. is endeavouring to decentralise. It has, as the Minister has already stated, established a factory at Busselton and I have no doubt that if building materials were available it would also establish factories in the areas on the south coast. Salmon have their home on the south coast and, as the member for East Perth has stated, every May to December it is possible to obtain fairly liberal supplies of that fish. However, the salmon migrate to the South-West coast only during a very

short portion of the year. I have been down at Hamelin Bay and round to Eagle Bay when the salmon are in but supplies can only be caught during a few weeks of the year. The schools are migrating and they turn round and travel up the west coast. I do not know how far they go but from my information the actual end of their migration, and where they return to their natural home, is in Geographe Bay, south of Busselton. I do not know Mr. Hunt, but if he is permitted to have a monopoly—

Hon. F. J. S. Wise: What is all this insistence that nobody knows anybody else? What is that all about?

Mr. BOVELL: I do not know him.

Hon. A. H. Panton: He will be well known by reputation after tonight.

Mr. BOVELL: If, through the lack of materials to build factories, Mr. Hunt is permitted to establish a monopoly, then that is a wrong principle. In view of the housing shortage I agree that materials should not be diverted to the building of factories but I do say that once they are erected and come into operation, it will assist the position as far as the fishermen are concerned. They will have more than one organisation established at the same centres, and the competition will give the fishermen some assurance that they will get a just price for their product.

If this motion is not carried, there will be a very grave danger of creating a monopoly which will rebound to the detriment of fishermen and consumers for years to come. We must realise that the fishing industry is in its infancy and any move at this stage to curtail its operations may be detrimental to it. I suggest that the Minister for Industrial Development will make a name for himself in the history of this State—

Hon. A. R. G. Hawke: You will get on.

Mr. BOVELL: —if he permits this motion to be carried. Not only will he contribute to the bodily needs but I also understand that fish are a brain food and he may thus contribute to the gray matter of this community.

MR. MANN (Beverley) [9.35]: I do not intend to speak for very long on this subject, but the Minister for Industrial Development, when he replied to the motion moved by the member for Middle Swan,

revealed something more important than the question of the Ocean Canning Company or Mr. Hunt's canning factory. He told this House that the Transport Board had decided—not on the question of supporting and protecting railway transport—who shall have the right to live and who shall not. It is because of his remarks that I intend to take part in this discussion.

In 1933, the then Labour Government brought down a Bill which was wholly and solely for the purpose of protecting the railways from other forms of transport. The motion moved by the member for Murchison, and debated last night, was a little premature. That debate should have been carried on tonight after the disclosures made by the Minister. The Minister has practically admitted that Mr. Fernie, who is in charge of the Department of Industrial Development, had told the Transport Board not to grant a license to the Ocean Canning Company. That is going beyond all means of—

Mr. Marshall: He could not direct the board. He could only recommend.

Mr. MANN: Apparently he has directed the board.

Mr. Marshall: The board is the Minister for Transport now.

Mr. MANN: On the 22nd September, 1948, the Western Australian Transport Board wrote to Mr. Gardiner as follows:—

Applications for Transport Board licenses have been submitted recently by a number of operators mainly in respect of the transport of fish from the South coast to Belmont. In considering these applications the Board has had the benefit of the advice of the Director of Industrial Development and also of the Chief Inspector of Fisheries.

I am concerned very much with this case. I am chiefly concerned with the fact that the Transport Board has gone beyond its powers. Apparently it can tell any person it likes what he shall do or shall not do. The Transport Board was set up by an Act of Parliament, in 1933 or 1934, to protect the railways. Who is this board to decide what a man will or will not do? That is the main feature in the motion.

The question has been raised about decentralisation, but as a country member and a farmer and producer, I say that the Minister's argument will not support a policy of decentralisation, but rather

will it grant a monopoly to one particular firm. Members on this side of the House have always preached against the setting up of monopolies. We have never approved of such a policy and I cannot remember any member of either the Liberal and Country League or the Country and Democratic League ever supporting it.

Hon. A. H. Panton: It is not the only thing you have preached about either.

Mr. MANN: Members on this side of the House have always been against socialisation, but from the Minister's utterances tonight it appears that a monopoly is to be granted to this one firm. Apparently he is supported by his Ministerial colleagues and the matter must have been submitted to Cabinet. I wonder just how far Cabinet has discussed the matter.

Mr. Fox: Do they not tell you anything?

Mr. MANN: Power is granted to one civil servant to do anything he likes. Members on this side of the House have charged the Prime Minister with being a dictator. It has been our idea that he has dictated what the people shall do whether they like it or not. However, tonight the Minister has revealed that he is very much of the same colour as the Prime Minister in this respect. If this motion is carried it will prove that this Government is carrying on the same ideas. I would like to see this matter referred to a Select Committee or even a Royal Commission—

Hon. A. H. Panton: What again!

Mr. MANN: If that were done I think the facts would be revealed in evidence. There is more in this than meets the eye. I honestly feel that this is a pious motion because if it is carried the Government or the Transport Board still decides whether it will grant the permit or not.

Hon. A. H. Panton: The Minister gave his word about that.

Mr. MANN: The matter should go further. An inquiry should be set up where evidence can be taken on oath, because there is more behind this discussion than meets the eye and there is much more to be disclosed. It appears that those now on the Treasury bench are of the same kidney, and follow the same policies as their predecessors. It apparently does not matter how a man administers his department because the Government will stick by him. It always protects any direction issued

by a Government official. The trouble today is that there are too many ideals of members on the other side of the House which have been upheld by the Minister.

Hon. A. H. Panton: You are a funny old man!

Mr. MANN: Not quite so funny as the hon. member thinks.

Hon. A. R. G. Hawke: You must be sore from sitting on the fence.

Hon. F. J. S. Wise: Whose side are you on?

Mr. MANN: If the day is to come to this State when any individual must do as he is told, that will be the first road to socialism. The Minister has said that fish can be carted by rail, but he knows that that is impossible because on a distance of three or four hundred miles the fish would be rotten by the time it reached their destination. To camouflage that, this man is denied the right by the Transport Board to convey the fish by road. That is not British justice. I am glad to see the support that has been given to this motion by members of the Opposition. The strange feature in this debate is that the members on the Government side of the House, whom one would expect would support the motion of the member for Middle Swan, are adopting exactly the opposite attitude. A division on this question will be interesting and I will guarantee that it will be decided in the main between the front benches on either side of the House.

Hon. A. H. Panton: How much would you like to bet on that?

Mr. MANN: A man has the right to live, and when it is impossible to transport his goods by rail he should not be denied a permit to transport them by road. If that is to be the position the Transport Board should be abolished because there is absolutely no justice in the case with which we are dealing tonight.

MR. FOX (South Fremantle) [9.42]: From what I have heard last evening and this evening I think this Parliament is developing into a mutual admiration society. First we had the member for Irwin-Moore congratulating the member for North-East Fremantle and tonight we had the member for East Perth congratulating the member for Middle Swan. I do not know that I will join the mutual admiration society, although

I will support the motion by the member for Middle Swan. I believe he is right on this occasion. It is also a peculiar thing that I am in the same corner as the member for Beverley.

Hon. A. H. Panton: That is worse than ever!

Mr. FOX: Yes, but there is always the possibility that he may be right sometimes. I am rather surprised at the way he has taken on his Government tonight. I wonder what will happen at the next Party meeting? However, I wish him well. I have every admiration for Mr. Hunt and the wonderful job his factory is doing in the South-West. One would think, in listening to the member for Kanowna, that Mr. Hunt canned the fish immediately they are drawn from the water, but that is not so. He has had to cut roads through the bush for a distance of 70 or 80 miles with a bulldozer and after he has caught the fish, cleaned them on the beach and headed them, they are transported along that rough bush road. That distance of 70 or 80 miles would be equal to a distance of 100 to 120 miles of bituminised road. The member for Kanowna said that there were 100 persons employed in the Albany cannery.

Hon. E. Nulsen: 150.

Mr. FOX: It does not matter. The numbers are neither here nor there. The company pioneered the industry in this State and I think the Government is acting very shabbily in not permitting it to cart its fish from Hopetoun. The amount of fish required will not deplete the available supplies for the canneries in the South-West.

Hon. E. Nulsen: It will not matter if they close down, will it?

Mr. FOX: That is not the position. A few days ago I read in the paper where the pilot of a Skymaster flying over the Great Australian Bight saw millions of salmon in the ocean beneath him and I am quite sure that would be correct. We are aware of the enormous quantities of fish that are sent to the canneries in the South-West. I do not think there is any possibility of depleting the salmon supply no matter how many are caught. Dr. Serventy has said that the amount of fish caught has no relation to the quantity reproduced later. I do not know whether there are any more factories to be established at Albany because I do not think that would be possible at present.

I understood that when the legislation dealing with fish was brought down the whole coastline was parcelled out to different people. I am speaking from memory now and I may be corrected as to that statement. Why should not the Ocean Canning Company be permitted to transport fish from the south coast? We have heard from the members on the other side of the House and from their supporters over the air of the fear of the individual being directed to where he shall work. What is this Government doing? It is directing the Ocean Canning Company to use that fish available to them only between Fremantle and Lancelin Island. Of course, the Government says that the company can transport its fish from the South-west by rail, but it also knows that that cannot be done, and it boils down to the company getting its fish between here and Lancelin Island or going without. As the member for Beverley has said, there is no possibility of carting fish on the railways over that distance unless there are specially fitted vans to transport it.

Hon. A. H. Panton: What about training the fish to come round?

Mr. FOX: There has been a great deal of talk about decentralisation, but let us see how the Government has acted as to that matter. Not so long ago I put up a lengthy argument to the then Minister for Industrial Development, the member for Northam, in an endeavour to obtain permission for the Albany Woollen Mills to establish a mill at Fremantle for the manufacture of blankets. All they desired was a guarantee for a bank overdraft. Although I was persistent in my argument, the then Minister steadfastly refused to permit the establishment of the mill at Fremantle. What has this Government done? Not that I am objecting to its policy in this regard because since it has assumed office it has established another mill at Fremantle to the detriment of Albany. That mill will be making blankets later on, I believe, and it would have been making them long ago if the present Government had been in office at that time. Is that implementing its policy of decentralisation? The Government of the day would not approve of another industry being established in Fremantle. What will the member for Albany say about that?

Mr. SPEAKER: Let us get back to fish!

Mr. FOX: I am speaking about decentralisation. The Minister spoke about it and I think I am justified in dealing with the point as well.

Mr. SPEAKER: Yes, but the hon. member must not go too far.

Mr. FOX: You did not interrupt the member for Beverley, Mr. Speaker, nor yet the member for Sussex, and they spoke about decentralisation. I claim I should be entitled to do so, too.

Hon. F. J. S. Wise: Only so far as Mr. Speaker will allow you to do so.

Hon. A. H. Panton: And the member for Sussex is a privileged person!

Mr. FOX: Another point is that if the Ocean Canning Co. can compete with Hunt's factories after transporting fish from the South-West coast and selling it at a profit in Perth, there must be something radically wrong with the price received by the fishermen. They obviously are not being paid enough. I regard it as a shame and a disgrace that an endeavour should be made to close up an enterprise and put a man out of business, the effect of which would be to prevent fishermen along the South-West coast from getting decent prices for their catches. It is all very well to say that Hunt's operations made the fishing industry prosperous. It is quite easy to make an industry prosperous if one has the initiative and the capital necessary. To catch salmon is not difficult, because they are present in local waters in their teeming millions.

I am not speaking derogatorily of the work Mr. Hunt is doing, for I know his is a wonderful job. But after all, it is not so very wonderful when a man has the initiative, the money and the plant enabling him to carry to successful fruition what he attempts. The member for Kanowna spoke about the quantity of fish consumed in Western Australia. I realise that the quantity is small and that most of the supplies are exported to the Eastern States. That is all to the good because it assists in the establishment of the industry and brings to Western Australia a great deal of money.

Mr. Needham: And he can get the price for the fish.

Mr. FOX: I cannot see that the Government could do anything to prevent Mr. Hunt from selling his fish in the Eastern States and getting any price he likes to ask.

Hon. A. H. Panton: Section 92 helps him.

Mr. FOX: Of course it does. The hon. member is referring, of course, to the Constitution Act. The fact is that Mr. Hunt can send his fish supplies to the Eastern States and put whatever price he likes on the consignment, despite the State Price Fixing Commissioner—unless Mr. Hunt is agreeable to listening to reason, and I do not see why he should do so. The Minister claimed that the business had been established without any help from the Government. All I know is that some fishermen in the South-West think that the Government has done a great deal for Mr. Hunt. I asked a question in this House as to what help the Government had extended to that individual in connection with the establishment of his factories. I put that query to the Minister because the Government had been parsimonious regarding assistance to the fishermen's cooperative organisation at Fremantle, when it came to a question of a bank overdraft. I wanted to find out what the Government would do for a similar industry in another part of the State.

Hon. F. J. S. Wise: The trouble is you live in the wrong electorate!

Mr. FOX: I do not know about that. I know that the fishermen down my way have had very little Government help, but they are endeavouring to establish quite a large industry in the snap-freezing of fish and possibly they will deal with vegetables as well. I had not intended speaking on the subject this evening.

Hon. A. R. G. Hawke: You were goaded into it by the member for Beverley!

Mr. FOX: There is one other point I shall mention. Last night we had a discourse by the member for North-East Fremantle relative to the validity of the constitution of the State Transport Board. He submitted an excellent case in support of his contentions, and the Acting Premier put up a very sorry reply.

Hon. A. A. M. Coverley: It was very poor!

Mr. FOX: I do not say that in any derogatory manner.

The Minister for Works: In what manner do you say it?

Mr. FOX: Perhaps the Acting Premier was not so prepared for his reply as the member for North-East Fremantle was with

respect to his case. Then we have another eminent gentleman, the member for Nedlands, for whose opinion, in his capacity as a King's Counsel, we have very great respect. If he cared to give a considered legal opinion on the case put up by the member for North-East Fremantle, I am sure members would listen to it with interest, and would be prepared to accept it. In all the circumstances, I would say to the Ocean Canning Company that, on the case put up by the member for North-East Fremantle, the Transport Board does not exist on a legal basis and that if the firm went ahead and transported fish from the southern coast, the board could then take the initiative, which would enable us to ascertain whether the board itself is properly constituted. If the Government received an adverse finding from the court, it would not be the first time that Government action has been over-ridden. In the Federal sphere we know what happened in connection with the bank case and also in connection with the dried-fruit industry. The Commonwealth laws concerned were declared invalid. Let us go ahead here and make history. Let the Ocean Canning Company go ahead, cart its fish and then let the Transport Board find out whether the member for North-East Fremantle is right or the Minister is correct with respect to the constitution of the board itself.

The Minister for Lands: If the firm were heavily fined, would you help them out?

Hon. J. T. Tonkin: There is no chance of the concern being fined.

The Minister for Lands: Is there not?

Hon. J. T. Tonkin: No chance whatever.

The Minister for Lands: It will be a matter of concern to the firm.

Mr. FOX: At any rate, I would sooner take the opinion of the member for North-East Fremantle on a legal point than that of the Minister.

The Minister for Lands: But you are biased!

Mr. FOX: If the Minister were to talk about fruitgrowing, I would probably accept his views rather than those of the member for North-East Fremantle on such a matter. However, in this instance I support the member for Middle Swan and trust that the majority of members will be in favour of the motion.

MR. HILL (Albany) [9.58]: First of all, I must admit that I know Mr. Hunt. I first met him when the present Leader of the Opposition was electioneering at Albany. Since then I have been in constant contact with Mr. Hunt and his leading managers. In fact, I have had Mr. Hunt in my own home and I class him as a friend. At the outset, I wish to extend to the member for East Perth my very sincere thanks for the compliment he paid Mr. Hunt.

Mr. Rodoreda: Hear, hear!

Mr. HILL: He said that Mr. Hunt had the support of 15 groups of fishermen while Mr. Gardiner had the support of only two groups. Could a greater compliment be paid to Mr. Hunt than that embodied in such a statement? I also thank the member for East Perth for the very fine arguments he advanced in support of the action taken by the Department of Industrial Development in fixing the zoning system for salmon. The member for East Perth explained how he had been at Doubtful Island Bay and had seen the salmon brought ashore. He emphasised that salmon was a perishable commodity and deteriorated quickly. Does not that very fact justify the Department of Industrial Development in insisting that salmon shall be treated at the nearest factory?

We have heard a lot about decentralisation. The Minister described the policy of centralisation as an octopus; I prefer to describe it as cancerous. It certainly resembles the growth of cancer in the human body. Between the last two censuses the population of Western Australia increased by 60,000—the metropolitan area by 61,000, while the areas outside that section decreased in population by 1,000. This State cannot continue to prosper while there is such a disproportionate growth of population in the metropolitan area. The Department of Industrial Development is sincere—and I also give the member for Northam credit for sincerity in this—that an industry endeavouring to establish itself outside the metropolitan area has to meet many difficulties, that is, comparing Albany with Perth or Fremantle. Take electricity for light and power: At Albany the charge is 5d. per unit for power and 8d. per unit for light.

Hon. A. H. Panton: Do you catch fish with electricity?

Mr. HILL: No, but it is necessary when treating fish. In Perth the charge is 1¼d. per unit for power and 3d. per unit for light. Water in Albany costs 3s. 6d. per thousand gallons compared with 1s. in the metropolitan area. In addition, the labour problem is much simpler in the metropolitan area, particularly when a lot of female labour is required. Further, industries at Albany such as the woollen mills and Hunt's canning factory have to pay railway freight on goods sent to Perth. Hunt's factory uses some millions of tins and they have to be bought in Perth and transported to Albany.

Reference has been made to transport. Some years ago, the leading administrators in South Africa held a conference and decided that the railway policy the world over charging high rates for high-grade goods and low rates for low-grade goods was sound and in the best interests of the primary industries, but that policy could not continue if motor transport were permitted to engage in unrestricted competition. For that reason, the State Transport Co-ordination Act was passed.

Much has been said about a monopoly. Supporters of the motion have been so busy talking about Hunt's monopoly on the south coast that they have quite overlooked the fact that he can draw his supplies of fish only from the area east of Nornalup, and that Gardiner has a similar monopoly west of Nornalup. If Mr. Gardiner is to be permitted to cart fish by road from the south coast in competition with the railways, why not let Mr. Hunt cart his tins by motor from the metropolis to Albany? It would not be fair to permit one and not the other. There is nothing to prevent Mr. Gardiner from establishing canning works on the south coast. There is plenty of room. If Mr. Hunt is making such a wonderful thing out of his canneries, why have not other firms entered the industry?

The fishing industry is a very valuable one and I say without hesitation that not only Western Australia, but also the world will have to look to fish to provide more of its food. At Albany three years ago the fishermen whose names were read out by the Minister were right up against things. I do not think that one of them was a permanent

fisherman; most of them depended for much of their income on lumping. Since the establishment of the Hunt cannery, those men are in clover. They are making more money than they had ever had before and are doing really well.

If, as some opponents contend, Mr. Hunt is making a lot of money, my reply is "Good luck to him!" He has built up an industry and has sent his manager to tour Europe and America at a cost of £3,000 with the object of gleaning information that will enable him to conduct a sardine fishery at Albany. He has a boat, and paid £5,500 for one net with which to catch sardines. So far, he has been handling sardines in only a small way.

In the metropolitan area, Mr. Gardiner might be the pioneer of fish canning, but Mr. Hunt has been the pioneer on the south coast. He is a man of great initiative, and I feel that the Government and Parliament should give him all possible support. At the same time, I stress the fact that he is not a monopolist. There is nothing at all to prevent any other firm or individual from starting a cannery on the south coast. Let us not make fish of one and fowl of another. As I have pointed out, Mr. Gardiner has a monopoly from Nornalup westward. He is not content with that, but wants to poach on the south coast as well. If he is really anxious to do that, let him come down to the south coast and invest money there as Mr. Hunt has done.

MR. HOAR (Nelson) [10.5]: Unlike the member for East Perth, I still find myself opposed, consistently and effectively, I hope, to the member for Middle Swan. This is not that I know anything about fish because I do not even know what is done with the gutted fish after the head has been knocked off, but having listened to the various speakers, I believe that we would be making a very serious mistake indeed if we passed the motion. I think the member for Middle Swan introduced the subject in all sincerity because he considered that an injustice was being done and that the Ocean Canning Company was not receiving a fair deal under the existing system.

If the company were the pioneer it is said to have been, I cannot understand why it did not establish itself immediately on the south coast and thus save costs and procure a better quality of fish for canning. I can

only imagine that it started at Belmont in an industry entirely divorced from fish and that fish only came into the business as a sort of afterthought following on other production. While still admitting that I know nothing much about fish, I should imagine the best way to treat them would be in a cannery located as close as possible to the seaboard. That being so, it seems that Mr. Gardiner's company, which now finds itself at some disadvantage, would have been much better advised had it displayed the initiative shown by Mr. Hunt and established factories on the south coast.

I approach this problem from the point of view only of what is best for our population. I have always been a keen advocate of decentralisation. I have known of instances, not only under the present Government, but also under the preceding one, that led me to the conclusion that the whole policy and economy of this State are today directed to centralisation, while we at the same time give lip service to decentralisation.

From the Pemberton district, timber in the log is being sent to Carlisle. I asked the owner of the factory why he had not established his business in Pemberton where the logs were grown and selected, and he replied that the policy and freight system of the railways were such that it was cheaper for him as a business man to purchase his logs in the round at Pemberton and transport them to Carlisle than pay freight on the finished product. That is only one example; instances could be multiplied many times. My opinion is that the existing system drives people to live in the metropolitan area. Over half of the State's population live there today.

This State cannot continue along those lines for very many years if it wants to take its rightful place in the economy of Australia and also play a useful part in the world, particularly in regard to immigrants and displaced persons from overseas. Whilst this debate has centred round a relatively small matter from the point of view of numbers—it would not matter very much to us as a State if the men employed at Belmont went to Albany or some other part of the south coast to work—it is the principle that counts. Although the member for East Perth said that the continuance of the Belmont factory would not sound the deathknell of

the factories in the southern part of the State, nevertheless I believe that if the Department of Industrial Development budged in any way from its present policy and permitted the transport by road of fish to the metropolitan area, that would in the course of time be the thin end of the wedge that would break down the whole zoning system so far as our fisheries are concerned. It would also break down our decentralisation policy. It is from that angle that I approach the subject.

I do not believe that the Belmont factory should go out of existence as a result of the present Government's policy in refusing to grant a transport license, because members who have had a better opportunity than I of studying the inside running of these factories say that Hopetoun produces far more fish than can be coped with. I therefore suggest to the Belmont factory which, according to the member for East Perth, is now prepared to pay £8 per ton more at Belmont for fish than the other companies pay the fishermen on the south coast, that it could very well use that money over a period to install a factory in the Hopetoun district and so place itself in a situation to compete with Mr. Hunt's company. I think this suggestion should be seriously considered by the Belmont company. I refuse to have myself placed in a position where certain interests are trying to make me vote in one way and other interests in another way,

I am not at all parochial in my outlook. I have no personal knowledge of any of the people connected with these companies, nor have I any interest in them whatever. I am concerned, however, about the effect that the granting of this license would have on the State's policy of decentralisation which, I understand—and I believe correctly—to be accepted by all Parties. It is to disperse our population and encourage people now living in the metropolitan area and the many other thousands we hope to attract to the State to go into the country and do that pioneering work so much of which has still to be done.

This Parliament has during the last few years passed legislation providing for huge sums of money to be spent on such undertakings as the South-West power scheme and water conservation. These must be paid for eventually by somebody. They will not be paid for by the people in the

metropolitan area with its density of population. They will only be paid for by the people who are encouraged to go into the country and work. I certainly would not think much of the Government if it did not stand fast to its policy, which was the policy of the previous Government, of encouraging industry to go outside the metropolitan area and fend for itself and add its small quota to the population of the south coast. This, in turn, would affect the trading of other businesses in that district, and as these expanded and snowballed, as they would, other people would be attracted there. There is no doubt where I stand in this case. I am wholeheartedly behind the Government and the Department of Industrial Development, which has laid down its policy of decentralisation. I support the motion.

HON. A. R. G. HAWKE (Northam) [10.14]: When the member for Beverley suggested that this question might very well go to a Select Committee for inquiry and report, he was met with an outsize instalment of levity. Judging by the course the debate has taken I think it might have been much more satisfactory to members if the suggestion of the member for Beverley had been adopted in the first instance by the member for Middle Swan. We have had much talk for and against the motion. There has been considerable conflict in the statements put forward by one side and the other, with the result that no member can be absolutely sure about a number of essential features of this matter. We each are forced into the position now of forming our own conclusion, based upon our choice of what we accept from those who have supported the motion or, on the other hand, of those who have opposed it. We have heard a great deal about Mr. Gardiner and Mr. Hunt and a little about the Director of Industrial Development. Those three gentlemen are present tonight and have been present during the whole of the debate since the tea suspension. How much better would it be if we, as members of this Assembly, could have a table big enough to accommodate Mr. Hunt, Mr. Gardiner, Mr. Fernie and ourselves. We could then have an all-in discussion at which we would at least be able to establish the facts more clearly in our minds.

The Minister for Lands: Followed by a fish supper!

Hon. A. R. G. HAWKE: Unfortunately, that sort of thing is not done in Parliament; our Standing Orders and Rules do not provide for it, and consequently we are denied an opportunity which otherwise would easily have been available to us. We are not in a position to question and cross-question Mr. Gardiner or Mr. Hunt, and so are not able to bring them face to face in order to decide which of the conflicting statements made today are more likely to be correct. We have therefore to use our own judgment as best we can and decide which way to vote on the motion. I know Mr. Gardiner very well. I met him on the first day he came to Western Australia. It was his intention to stay only one day. He arrived that morning by ship from overseas and, if I remember rightly, was on his way to Sydney and intended to resume his journey that night. However, he took advantage of the opportunity while he was in Perth to make inquiries as to whether there was any possibility of obtaining a manufacturing industry in this State which he might purchase and operate. He approached the Department of Industrial Development and was given some suggestions, as a result of which he made contacts during the day and decided that very day to purchase a small industry which was then operating in the Belmont area and was, if I remember rightly, engaged in the canning of sheep's tongues.

Mr. Gardiner carried on that industry for a considerable time and subsequently developed the canning of other products, including fish. I think he would be the first to admit that he received a great deal of useful advice and practical help, financial and otherwise, from the officers of the Department of Industrial Development, during many of the years he was operating the factory at Belmont. I know from my own knowledge that officers of the department were very anxious to see fish canning developed as an industry in this State. I know that the Director took practical steps to investigate on the export side the possibility of the canning of salmon in Western Australia and in the course of his investigations obtained valuable information from a factory which was being operated, if I remember rightly, on the north coast of New South Wales—or it might have been the south coast.

The Belmont factory did take on the canning of salmon during the war. I understand that a suitable pack was developed. Later again, as mentioned by the member for Kanowna, a Mr. Young established a small industry at Hopetoun for the canning of salmon. Subsequently Mr. Young's interests were taken over by Mr. Hunt who, in a reasonably short period, not only further developed the factory at Hopetoun but established a fairly large factory at Albany and, later again, one at Esperance. I think everyone would agree that it is an advantage to establish fish canning factories as near as possible to the source of supply. There are many reasons why that would be the wise course to follow. Mr. Hunt did that, with the result that his operations in the canning of salmon in the districts to which I have referred have proved to be very successful.

It might very well be that Mr. Gardiner, if he had not already been tied to his established factory at Belmont, would in his initiation of the fish canning industry, especially in connection with salmon, have established a factory for that purpose at Albany or Hopetoun. It was probably because Mr. Gardiner already owned a canning factory at Belmont that he added to his activities at that place the canning of salmon. I think it is beyond argument that salmon which are obtained from the ocean waters in the Albany, Esperance and Hopetoun areas should be canned if at all practicable in those areas. I think that is the sensible thing to do from every point of view that could be mentioned.

I feel sure, too, that if every member of this House could be assured that the Belmont factory would continue operating under the zoning system put into operation by the department and could go on canning products other than salmon, there would not be one supporter for this motion. The only reason why any member might support the motion would be because of the fear in his mind that the continuation of the regulation promulgated by the Transport Board, would, in its operation, have the effect of bringing about the closure of the factory located at Belmont. I am not convinced at all, and certainly not completely convinced, that the defeat of this motion and the continuance in operation of the regulation in question are sure to bring about the closure of the factory at Belmont.

We know of our own knowledge that there is more than salmon as a foodstuff which is capable of being canned for sale to the public of this State and the people of other States. We know that we live in a more or less canning age. We know that in these days women have so many interests and such a great variety of interests that they are not able to spend as much time in the home as in days gone by, and as a result they rely very much more upon canned foods for the purpose of providing physical sustenance to their husbands, themselves and their children than they have ever done in any previous age. Consequently I think it is logical to believe that the Belmont factory would be able to continue in operation on a reasonable basis even though it would not be able to obtain all the salmon it required, or might not be able to obtain even any salmon at all.

I am impressed quite considerably by the contentions which have been put forward in connection with the policy of decentralisation. I know that we all give lip-service to the policy and ideal of decentralisation. I know, in addition, how difficult it is to do very much of an effective character in a practical way to implement fully a policy of decentralisation. Therefore I would be very anxious to assist and to safeguard a movement calculated to further in a practical manner the decentralisation of industry and population in Western Australia.

It is rather sad that in a State like Western Australia, where we have been struggling for years to develop secondary industries, we should at this stage find a conflict raging between two companies, each of which has already done a good deal to assist the State and further its secondary industries. It is most unfortunate and greatly to be regretted. I hope that after the motion is defeated the Minister for Industrial Development will make some effort to call Mr. Hunt and Mr. Gardiner together for the purpose of developing a basis upon which both of them might come to some reasonable and satisfactory arrangement in regard to our fish canning industry.

The Minister for Industrial Development: I did arrange a conference some months ago.

Hon. A. R. G. HAWKE: Did the conference take place?

The Minister for Industrial Development: I understand it did.

Hon. A. R. G. HAWKE: I am suggesting something much more than the Minister is talking about. I am suggesting that the Minister himself convene a conference.

The Minister for Industrial Development: The director handled this one.

Hon. A. R. G. HAWKE: I also suggest that he be present at it. He tells me that he arranged a conference some months ago, but did it take place? I say that after the motion is defeated the Minister should call these two company proprietors together. He should also have with him, I quite agree, the Director of Industrial Development. I would say that in the interests of peace and the probability of getting good results, the member for Middle Swan be excluded. I know that both Mr. Gardiner and Mr. Hunt are strong minded men, and each is capable of generating a good flow of Australian language when the occasion demands it. But I also know that the Minister is strong enough, if necessary, to butt their heads together for the purpose of ensuring that commonsense comes to the top. He might find that despite all the ill-will and antagonism that have developed between them in recent months there is still some practical method by which their efforts could be co-ordinated on a reasonable basis of cooperation. I oppose the motion and I think in view of the essential features of the whole matter the House would be well advised to reject it.

HON. E. H. H. HALL (Geraldton) [10.33]: We have listened for three hours to what has proved a very interesting discussion.

Mr. Reynolds: You are going to keep us for another three hours.

Hon. E. H. H. HALL: It has been quite refreshing, because it is not often that we are treated to a debate such as has taken place tonight where members on both sides of the House have been in violent disagreement. There is an old saying that adversity makes strange bedfellows. The same applies to politics. I am in entire agreement with my young friend from East Perth when he says that this is not a parish-pump subject; it is of State-wide importance. After listening for three hours to the debate, it is not my intention to detain the House much longer. But I do want to say, as the Deputy Leader of the Opposition has said, and it

cannot be too often repeated, that it is not enough to give lip service to the cry that we have heard for so many years—decentralisation.

I speak feelingly on the motion because I have had some practical experience in the canning of fish. Anybody that knows anything at all about the subject must admit that there is only one place to can fish and that is the nearest point to where they are caught. Most of our canned fish are exported, and it should be somebody's duty, if it is not that of the Director of Industrial Development, to insist that the article being exported is the best possible one. If expert advice is obtained, and it should be, the best article will be canned at the nearest point to where the fish are caught. That is not a matter of opinion, but of established fact. The continual drift to the city, which public men throughout the Commonwealth have been deploring for years, is the essence of the motion.

Unlike many of the speakers tonight, I have had the pleasure of meeting both Mr. Hunt and Mr. Gardiner. To me this is not a question of whether I am going to hurt Mr. Gardiner or do something in favour of Mr. Hunt; it is a State-wide question. We have the member for East Perth imploring members to support the motion and, on the other hand, the member for Kanowna appealing to members to oppose it. If those members—it does not matter what Party they represent—have the interests of the State at heart and want to provide some means of employing our young people in the various towns throughout the country, they will oppose the motion. If they do that we shall be helping to provide the employment which is so necessary to keep these young people in their various towns and districts rather than have them coming here to swell the population of and overcrowd this fair city of Perth.

HON. A. A. M. COVERLEY (Kimberley) [10.37]: I do not propose to take up much time in explaining that I intend to support the motion moved by the member for Middle Swan.

Hon. A. R. G. Hawke: You are in bad company.

Hon. A. A. M. COVERLEY: My friend from Geraldton made the quotation about adversity. I am not concerned as to who

owns what, or where it is situated, but with the principle involved and in the two industries that are already established. The Minister, in opposing the motion, took some considerable time in quoting statistics, but finally made his main point that of principle; of decentralisation; that all Parties and all members should agree to the principle of decentralisation. Many atrocities have been committed over the word "principle." More than one principle, to which the Minister did not pay much attention, is involved in the motion. I think he was right when he said that both sides of the House agreed to the general principle of decentralisation, but the Minister and his Government overlooked the principle of decentralisation not long ago when introducing a Bill for the redistribution of seats. On that occasion he did not worry very much about the country representatives, the country districts or the country people. He took three seats from the country districts and added them to the metropolitan area. He gave the greater representation to the metropolitan area.

So much for a principle that the Government supports when it is convenient to do so. Other principles involved in this debate are worthy of some consideration. The first of them is that the Ocean Canning Company of Belmont was the first to establish the canning industry in this State. At that time the company had no more idea of the development that was to take place in the salmon industry than had the then Director of Industrial Development. That gentleman, to his credit, encouraged the firm to start the canning industry. Now, however, other circumstances prevail. Today the salmon fishing industry is bringing forth overtures from other operators in the canning field. They, doing the sensible thing, established their industry on the south coast, but it is most unfair to suggest that the gentleman who established his industry at Belmont should now shift it to the southern part of the State.

The member for Kanowna was fearful of two things, the first of them being what might happen to the residents of part of his electorate if the Esperance canning factory closed down. I cannot agree with that argument, as there is no likelihood of that factory closing down. Two or three hundred tons of fish per annum being sent to another

factory would not have that effect and I believe there is room for both factories to continue operations. If I had any personal leaning towards either of the two factories it would be towards that of the gentleman who started the industry at Belmont. There are men who have been dependent on employment at that factory for a number of years and who are still employed there, and if that factory were closed they would lose their jobs.

I am surprised at the Director of Industrial Development having so much influence with the Government that he can prevent the Transport Board issuing a permit for fish to be transported overland, but I do not think that would close the Belmont factory, though it would hinder its output. Salmon canning is a seasonal industry and provides only part of the employment at the Belmont factory, and that applies also to the Albany and Esperance factories. There are many other classes of fish to be dealt with, and I therefore feel there is ample room for all the factories.

Another aspect is involved from the point of view of the fishermen. I am surprised that members on the Government bench have overlooked the fact that if salmon canning is restricted to the one factory those who catch the fish will be deprived of their competitive market, and I think they are entitled to some consideration. Then there arises the question of who should be the authority to advise the Government on the fishing industry in this State. Why was the Chief Inspector of Fisheries superseded in this regard? At one time it was his duty to make recommendations and I want to know why that role has been transferred. I believe there are two Government officials in some way mixed up with this matter of advising. First of all there is the Chief Inspector of Fisheries, who has a life-long experience of the industry, and should be more competent than would anyone else to advise the Government on the extent to which the industry can be worked and how long our coastal waters will stand up to extensive exploitation.

On the other hand we have a competent Director of Industrial Development. It is to his credit that Western Australia owes him a tribute for the work he has done in the interests of the State, but I will not

admit that he has any greater knowledge of this industry than has the Chief Inspector of Fisheries, or that he should supersede that officer in the matter of advising the Government on questions of this kind. I pay tribute to his ability and to what he has done for the State, but I say also that he has a neck like a giraffe, and is always sticking it out. Some good might come from the conference suggested by the Deputy Leader of the Opposition, but only on the condition that some other names were added to those that he suggested should attend. I think it is imperative that the mover of the motion should attend that conference, and that the Chief Inspector of Fisheries should take part in it. I see no reason why there should not also be present the Town Planning Commissioner.

The debate on the motion has boiled down to a matter of principle and I think we should give consideration to the interests of the pioneer who has already expended his money and built up his industry to its present position with the encouragement of the Government and the Department of Industrial Development. It is unfair now to ask him to shift to some other part of the State, as there is sound argument to support the view that both sections of the industry can be carried on. I support the motion.

MR. RODOREDA (Roebourne) [10.50]: Because I do not want to cast a silent vote on this matter, I intend to have a few words to say about it. The point that has intrigued me most about the debate has been what I might term the very skilful red herring dragged across the trail by the Acting Premier.

Hon. A. A. M. Coverley: Hear, hear!

Mr. RODOREDA: That red herring appears under the name of decentralisation and nearly every speaker has followed the trail. As far as I can see and judge, this motion has nothing whatever to do with decentralisation.

Hon. A. A. M. Coverley: Of course it has not.

Mr. RODOREDA: Not in the slightest degree. Can any member tell me that the granting of a permit to Ocean Canning Coy., for the transport of fish by road, would have any effect whatever upon the decentralisation policy of this State? If any member thinks

that, then he is deluding himself and endeavouring to delude this House as well. If it were a motion to give everyone a permit if he desired to start a factory in Perth, then it would affect the decentralisation policy of this State, but it is nothing of the sort. There are more principles involved in this motion than the question of decentralisation.

For as long as I have been a member in this House, when legislation has been introduced to make a close preserve of some trade, the principle has been to protect the interests of those who are already in the trade. The same principle is at stake in this motion. When we dealt with a Bill to register builders and force any entrants to undergo severe examinations, the builders who were already in the trade were protected. Similarly, if we introduced Bills to register hairdressers, butchers, bakers or anybody else, those in the business were always protected. Now, by this arbitrary action of the State Transport Board, we are making it tremendously difficult for a business already established to carry on. The Ocean Canning Coy. was quite entitled to believe that it would be permitted to continue to operate because of arrangements that had previously existed and it would have made its plans accordingly.

It is extraordinary to me to see members on the Labour side of the House, belonging to the Labour Party in this House, rising in their seats and imploring this House to vote for a motion which creates a monopoly. It is not a Government monopoly either; it is a private monopoly because, if the motion is defeated it will make it tremendously difficult for the company already established to carry on.

Nobody seems to be considering the interests of the fishermen. What is likely to happen to the fishermen engaged in this industry when there is only one buyer for their products? Members know very well what will happen, and what has always happened. Surely we should consider their interests and those of the consumers of the product. We know that once competition fades from the industry the price to the consumers will go up. The member for East Perth has already told us that there is a difference in the selling price of the product. I do not know the relative values or merits of the products from

either of the canneries because my wife's interests are in her home. She does not have to use a tin-opener very often.

However, we are at least entitled to do what we can to protect the consumers and safeguard the fishermen as well. I would be opposed to the starting up of any new factory in the metropolitan area and the granting of a license, such as has been refused to the Ocean Canning Coy. Personally I consider that the right place for a company which intends to start in the fishing industry is where the fish are being caught. We are not going to allow ourselves to be put in a position which will make it tremendously difficult for a company already established to carry on in that business. That is the principle I see in the motion.

There is another phase of this debate that is rather intriguing to me and that is to see a whole night's debate, which normally would be all Government business, frittered away by the Acting Premier in the Premier's absence. He has put this private member's motion right up on top of all Government business. It does seem extraordinary. I have no further comment to make but I hope that as each member is being permitted to use his discretion, and as the strong discipline of the L.C.L. and the C.D.L. or the X.Y.Z., or whatever the Parties are called, has been loosened to-night, or apparently so,—which has not been the case in other matters which have been brought before the House—each member will use his own discretion and vote according to his conscience. I support the motion.

MR. GRAYDEN (Middle Swan—in reply) [10.57]: I intend to be fairly brief because the hour is getting late and most of the points relevant to the discussion have been raised this evening. I have not been a member of this House for very long but I am just beginning to realise tonight where some of the sincerity lies. When I think of listening to some members on this side of the House—

Labour members: Hear, hear!

Mr. GRAYDEN: —repeating Party propaganda at every opportunity and then coming along in this instance—

Hon. A. A. M. Coverley: That's it.

Mr. GRAYDEN: —and brushing their principles aside—

Mr. May: Stick it into them.

Mr. GRAYDEN: —simply to satisfy their parochial feelings and one or two electors who have contacted them at the behest of Hunt's Canning Factory, I am amazed. Members in Perth, not only in Albany, have been inundated with phone calls from Hunt's Cannery and we have had letters from fishermen—again at the instigation of the same firm. The Acting Premier, when this matter was first raised, said that he would have it reintroduced at the earliest opportunity. That was almost a month ago.

Hon. A. A. M. Coverley: Shame!

Mr. GRAYDEN: Now I realise the object of the delay. It was simply—

Hon. A. A. M. Coverley: Organisation.

Mr. GRAYDEN: —to organise among some fishermen, among those completely dependent on one factory, in order to let them write to the Minister.

Hon. A. A. M. Coverley: You have got it right.

Mr. GRAYDEN: But the Minister did not say this. He did not read out the letter I handed him last month and which came from a general meeting of fishermen on the south coast. That letter was strongly in favour of both these factories being in the field.

Mr. May: Have you a copy of it there? Read it out.

Mr. GRAYDEN: Unfortunately I have not.

Mr. Reynolds: Cannot you manufacture one?

Mr. GRAYDEN: I have listened with interest to the speeches against this motion. The members making them have not been concerned for Mr. Gardiner who pioneered the canning of fish in this State. Their concern has not been for him, who commenced this industry at the behest of a Government department in order that our Defence Forces might be supplied.

Hon. A. A. M. Coverley: When things were not so rosy as they are today.

Mr. GRAYDEN: It is not the concern of those members that this factory will close. There is not the slightest doubt that it will close, although some speakers have endeavoured to create the impression that it would

not. It is not so much concern on my part for Mr. Gardiner that the money he has invested in this factory at Belmont will be lost.

Hon. A. A. M. Coverley: It ought to be; it should be the concern of all of us.

Mr. GRAYDEN: It is my concern to some extent. However, my concern is directed to the greatest extent to the 30 employees—many of whom reside in the Riverdale district—who are dependent upon this factory for their livelihood. Members should know that at present jobs in the metropolitan area are not as easy to get as they were a few months ago. The member for Victoria Park can possibly tell members something about the employment problem in the Victoria Park, Belmont and Riverdale districts during the last depression because unemployed used to approach him for free medicine, which they got. My concern also is for the fishermen on the south coast because they know what the result of a monopoly will be. They might not feel the effects of it immediately but they will in the long run.

We have an expression of opinion from them in the letter I handed to the Minister. It was to the effect that they desire two competitors in the field. That was not a letter from the individuals of the fishing industry; a handful, perhaps, in Albany. I was in Albany a few weeks ago and I know there was a meeting because they were dissatisfied with the price given by Mr. Hunt. I listened to some of the letters read by the Minister, and they were from Albany. They did not express the true feeling of the fishermen. My concern is for the people who will be thrown out of employment and that the head of a Government department—I notice he has now left the gallery—is proposing a course of action that we could expect in totalitarian Russia but not in this country. He not only proposes it but he has the backing of this Liberal-Country Party Government.

Hon. J. B. Sleeman: It is L.C.L. now, is it not?

Mr. GRAYDEN: That departmental head has the support of the Government for one reason only and that is that it relied on that departmental head when he first submitted the matter to it, and sanctioned the action

he proposed. Now that the full and true facts have been brought to its notice, the Government does not want to admit, and is not going to admit, that it was in the wrong.

Mr. Rodoreda: Are you referring to the Liberal Party?

Mr. GRAYDEN: I am referring to the Liberal-Country Party Government. I am concerned because the Government departed from the very principles upon which it was elected, the principles upon which the Country Party and the Liberal Party are founded.

Mr. Rodoreda: They are just running true to form.

Mr. GRAYDEN: To refresh members' memories, I will again touch briefly on the position, although they should know the story by now. This fish cannery at Belmont pioneered the canning of fish in this State and from its inception brought salmon from the south coast and there were no other factories in the field at that time. Afterwards, when others noticed its success and saw how lucrative the business was, they entered the field. However, the Government cannot prevent Australians catching fish, and even the Director of Industrial Development has not that power.

Hon. E. Nulsen: He is an honest, enterprising gentleman.

Mr. GRAYDEN: So they have not stopped the men catching the fish but have used the power available to them and denied this company a transport license. It was not denied to it two years ago, but it is now when the other company has entered the field and is now on its feet. Not even the Director of Industrial Development has power to deny it a transport license. He made the recommendation to the Transport Board that it should carry out that course of action.

Mr. Rodoreda: A non-existent board.

Mr. GRAYDEN: That may be so. He made that recommendation to the Transport Board, and what is the result? This factory is to close down. What right has the Director of Industrial Development to make a recommendation such as that? Surely members will agree that such a recommendation should come from the Fisheries Department. How does that department stand on

this issue? The Fisheries Department is right behind the Ocean Canning Factory.

Hon. F. J. S. Wise: And where is the Minister?

Mr. GRAYDEN: The Fisheries Department is supporting this factory and wants it to have its transport license, but the Director of Industrial Development does not. So the license is to be denied to it.

Hon. A. A. M. Coverley: It is hard luck for you that the Minister for Fisheries is absent and will not be able to cast his vote. It looks a bit sinister to me.

Mr. GRAYDEN: Other members have touched on the principles that have been flouted by the Government in recommending this course of action. I would like to emphasise some of those principles which members on this side of the House are violating. I have here the objectives of the Liberal Party and the principles enunciated are almost identical with those of the Country Party.

Mr. May: Do not spare them.

Hon. A. R. G. Hawke: Mr. Speaker should know all about this.

Mr. GRAYDEN: The pamphlet sets out the objects of the organisation, and that, of course, refers to the Liberal Party and the Liberal and Country League. It says—

The objectives of the organisation shall be to have an Australian nation—(c) in which an intelligent, free and liberal Australian democracy shall be maintained by—

Then there are several clauses, one of which is—

(v) Looking primarily to the encouragement of individual initiative and enterprise as the dynamic force of reconstruction and progress.

Mr. Rodoreda: Whack-oh!

Mr. Graham: The trouble is that it is only on paper.

Mr. Reynolds: It sounds all right and looks nice.

Mr. GRAYDEN: I have to agree that it looks nice on paper. It appeals to a lot of Country Party and Liberal Party supporters, but apparently it does not appeal to some members sitting on the Government side of the House—"looking primarily to the encouragement of individual initiative"! We had an instance of that in this man who came along and pioneered the industry. We see what his reward is to be at the hands

of a Government that professes to stand for these principles! There is another clause in the objective which states—

(e) in which primary industries are promoted and stabilised, new and adequate markets developed . . .

Hon. J. B. Sleeman: I would not support such a Government! Why not come over here?

Mr. GRAYDEN: I want to know how we are stabilising this particular industry in accordance with our principles—by allowing it to get started, and then denying it a transport license to enable it to bring fish to the factory.

Hon. A. A. M. Coverley: What would the Honorary Minister for Supply and Shipping say about that?

Mr. GRAYDEN: I would be interested to hear. Unfortunately Cabinet Ministers have to vote as Cabinet decides. They constitute the Government. When I speak of the Government, however, I mean first of all the Director of Industrial Development! The next clause from the objective that I shall quote is—

(iv) protecting the people against exploitation.

I am afraid we are going a long way from protecting them against exploitation, because we are creating a vast monopoly. If members can see that we are protecting them from exploitation by creating that monopoly, then I regret that I cannot do so. There is another clause, which provides for—

(iii) Freedom of citizens to choose their own way of living and of life, subject to the rights of others.

Hon. A. A. M. Coverley: That should bring the Honorary Minister for Supply and Shipping to her feet.

The Minister for Lands: There is nothing in the motion about the Liberal Party's policy.

Mr. Triat: There is nothing in your attitude about it either!

Mr. GRAYDEN: Unfortunately, the whole thing is bound up with the Party's policy.

Mr. Reynolds: At any rate, you have courage.

Hon. E. H. H. Hall: Oh, let us go home!

Mr. GRAYDEN: Other members have touched on the question of the monopoly. I shall content myself by saying that if the

firm is granted the monopoly, then it will not be very long before the fishermen find that they will not be able to secure the prices they now receive.

Hon. A. A. M. Coverley: Of course, they will not.

Mr. GRAYDEN: Another angle that has been overlooked is that affecting the consumer. If we are to have this monopoly with no competition at all—there can be no possibility of any competition, by virtue of the strength of the organisation—the fishermen will find they will have to accept lower prices and the public will have to pay higher prices for the tinned commodity. The other night we listened for several hours to a debate on price-fixing. Members referred to high prices and were critical of the reasons for the increases. Now apparently they are content to take the step of granting a monopoly that will result in the cost of canned fish rising. Some members have opposed the motion. They have done it for one reason only—they represent the little electorates particularly concerned.

Hon. A. A. M. Coverley: Like Albany.

Mr. GRAYDEN: And like Kanowna.

Hon. F. J. S. Wise: What about Geraldton?

Mr. GRAYDEN: I refer to the electorates where the population is not great, the representatives of which are satisfied to throw their principles aside—and the interests of the State as well—in order to satisfy the demands of one or two of their electors. If the motion is defeated, there is one duty—I do not know upon whom it will devolve but I assume it will have to be undertaken by one of the officers of this House—that will have to be attended to. It will be for the officer concerned to go into the reading room where on the wall he will see hanging a calendar issued by the Ocean Canning Company and displaying the various types of fish found in Western Australian waters. It advertises certain of the firms' products and has been on display for a long time.

The first task of the officer will be to rip the calendar down, because if we reject the motion we shall be putting that cannery out of business. That having been done, then I suggest the Government write to "Fisheries Newsletter," which is published by the Federal Department of Commerce and Agriculture. Members receive

copies of it and they will recollect that not very long ago it contained an article entitled "Personalities in the Fishing Industry," the next headline being "Canning Chief Began as 'Sparks.'" The article deals with Mr. Vincent Gardiner and sets out that after training in cable and wireless telegraphy, he joined Marconi's marine service, being one of several North Atlantic operators transferred to service in the Pacific in 1912. He was later appointed superintendent of the Marconi School of Wireless in Sydney and later joined Amalgamated Wireless (Australasia) Ltd., of Sydney, as sales manager. The article goes on to state that Mr. Gardiner commenced meat canning in Western Australia and it continues—

Some three years later, Mr. A. J. Fraser, Chief Inspector of Fisheries for Western Australia, suggested that Perth herring (or Gizzard Shad) should be ideal for canning. At that time it had no economic value and was the bane of net fishermen on the Swan River, Peel Inlet and Leschenault Inlet.

Before long a satisfactory product was achieved, and the Army contracted with Mr. Gardiner to take the whole of his Perth herring output. Perth herring in tomato sauce thus became an established line, making possible the foundation of the Ocean Canning Company in 1941.

Then it tells how he pioneered agar-agar in Australia and continues—

Mr. Gardiner then turned his attention to the canning of West Australian salmon, and in 1944 a salmon fish cake mixture was marketed under the name of "Frelish". In 1945, after many disappointments, a process was evolved for canning local salmon in outlet form, which is marketed under the same brand ("Seahaven") as Perth herring. Today salmon are brought from many points on the southern and south-west coasts of Western Australia, the longest haul overland being from Hopetoun—370 miles from Perth. The trip is made in about 12 hours by motor truck.

So it goes on. Therefore I suggest that the Government should,—if the motion is defeated—contribute an article to the "Fisheries Newsletter" and I will leave the headlines to the imagination of members. Why has this position been brought about? Does it mean that if a transport license is granted it will be a case of one factory going out of production? It does not. There is plenty of fish for all. Even the member for Albany will admit that.

Hon. F. J. S. Wise: I doubt it:

Mr. GRAYDEN: The member for Albany does not reply, but I know his views on the point. There is plenty of fish for all and the Ocean Canning Company wants only one-third. It is not asking for two-thirds or for the lot, as one particular individual is. There being plenty of fish for all, what is the reason for the situation that has arisen? The reason is that Hunt wants to expand and there are two ways of doing this, firstly, exploit other fish in the area or go further to get more salmon, and, secondly, take over where someone else has left off provided it is possible to squeeze that one out of the industry.

I do not know Mr. Hunt. I met him once just for a moment in the corridor. I do not doubt his ability; I do not doubt that he has done a great deal for the fishing industry in this State. I have nothing personal against him. At the same time I suggest that Mr. Hunt is a cuckoo in the nest as far as the fishing industry is concerned. He started in the canning industry after the Ocean Company had become established and had shown to the world that salmon could be canned here.

Mr. Graham: And pinched Gardiner's technical expert.

Mr. GRAYDEN: Yes. Hunt, having established himself, is putting on the pressure and trying to force Gardiner out of the industry. It is not as if the industry were too small for both. Our fish resources are tremendous; the supply is ample for all, but it would be easy to push the Gardiner factory out because some interests have a very sympathetic Director of Industrial Development. When Mr. Hunt was carefully laying his plans to exploit the industry, he decided that two-thirds would be ample for him and that one-third should go to Gardiner. The next step was to open negotiations with Mr. Gardiner and subsequently a letter was written to Mr. Gardiner as follows:—

Following on the discussions we have had with yourselves, we are prepared to enter into negotiations along the lines outlined to handle your proportion of the salmon caught at the 12, 13 and 14-mile beaches at Hopetoun.

I shall skip two paragraphs that are not particularly relevant and continue with the form of contract suggested by Mr. Hunt—

Distribution of the Catch: It seems that one controlling body should be set up by the canneries to apportion the fish caught and it is

suggested that operating under the firm name of Hopetoun Freezing Works I be given the opportunity of handling and distributing your proportion of the season's catch.

The layout is obvious. Mr. Hunt enters into negotiations with one who is already operating and says he is prepared to give that one a third and will keep two-thirds, provided Gardiner allows him to handle and distribute all the fish.

This suggestion is made as, having the organisation and plant at Hopetoun, I feel that all facilities are there to enable efficient handling and distribution of the fish.

Delivery: All fish will be delivered to either Ocean Canning Co., Rivervale, or the freezing chamber at Robb's Jetty.

Fishermen: It is intended that I deal direct with the fishermen on your behalf and that this be left solely in my hands, for this way I feel that this production can be increased. I think this covers the points under which I would like to operate, and would ask that it be given your consideration.

Mr. Gardiner thought it was a good idea and would ensure stability. He reasoned that Mr. Hunt would buy direct from the fishermen and deliver the fish to his factory. So Mr. Gardiner agreed to the proposals and walked into the net. At any rate, he signed the agreement. In his letter in reply, he repeated the statement Mr. Hunt had made and added—

The spirit of this arrangement shows that the Ocean Canning Company will receive its quota of fish in the slack season wherever possible.

The spirit of this arrangement! So I come to the argument advanced by the Minister that one factory—Hunt's factory—is operating with 15 gangs of fishermen, whereas Gardiner's factory is operating with only two.

The Minister for Industrial Development: I never mentioned those figures.

Mr. GRAYDEN: If the Minister did not, some other member did. If he did not mention actual figures he did, if my memory serves me aright, say that Hunt's factory was dealing with a much larger number of fishermen than was Mr. Gardiner's. If the Minister did not say that, the member for Albany did. He mentioned 15 gangs of fishermen. Now we can see the reason Gardiner was also operating with other gangs of fishermen. Then Mr. Hunt came along and said, "Sign the agreement. Let me do it all, because I am on the spot. I

will not only purchase from the fishermen but also take the fish up to you." That agreement was duly signed and it does not expire until next year. But Mr. Hunt has not applied for a transport license this year, notwithstanding that he has signed an agreement to supply Mr. Gardiner with fish until next year.

The Minister for Industrial Development: Show me where Gardiner signed the agreement.

Mr. GRAYDEN: I can show the Minister a copy of the agreement and I can read Mr. Hunt's reply, in which he says—

This agreement shall commence from the receipt by each cannery of a confirmatory letter from the other two canneries and in such case shall remain in force until the 31st of January, 1950.

I also hold a letter Gardiner received from Phillips River Cannery, signed by D. S. Hunt and E. Young. Although the contract remains in force until next year, it is not being honoured. I wish now to touch upon decentralisation. The idea of decentralisation is not to pare down cities and tear down the industries in those cities; it is to build new cities in the country, but our Director of Industrial Development apparently believes otherwise. He believes that existing cities should be demolished and other cities built in country areas. But why does he decide, and why does the Government decide, to single out one small fish canning company, the proprietor of which cannot hit back and cannot get any compensation? Why put into effect the policy of decentralisation when the effect will be to cut across established industries? Why not make a start on the flour mills? There is a number of them in the metropolitan area. Why not tear them down and send them to the country districts where the wheat is grown?

Hon. E. H. H. Hall: Wheat is not a perishable product.

Mr. GRAYDEN: The member for Geraldton subscribes to the principles of both the Liberal and Country Parties. Their policies are identical. He got up and shed crocodile tears while propounding his policy of decentralisation. By God, there was no sincerity in his remarks. The Government and the Director of Industrial Development should pursue this decentralisation policy a little further. Let them demolish the steel mills at Bassendean. Let them take down

Hadfields' works brick by brick, as they are going to take Gardiner's factory down brick by brick. Why not take Hadfields' works to Wundowie where the steel is? That might gratify the member for Northam. I wonder whether he will vote against the motion; perhaps he has that in mind.

Let the Government take down the factories manufacturing asbestos and send them to Wittenoom Gorge, where the asbestos is. Let the Government take down the fish markets, as there is no reason why those markets should not be situated where the fish are. It is no argument to say that the consumers are in Perth, because that would apply to the Ocean Canning Co. Let us have our wool sales at Albany. The Government is in favour of decentralisation, so why does it not force the woolbuyers to go to Albany? Is it because they are too powerful, whereas the Ocean Canning Co. is not in that happy position? It is going to be stamped out and these other industries are to be permitted to remain. We could go still further with decentralisation. Under the Redistribution of Seats Act the majority of members of Parliament represent country electorates. Why not take Parliament to the country, where these members are?

Hon. J. B. Sleeman: Where would you suggest it should be put?

Mr. GRAYDEN: We have the foundation stone 10 yards from the building and the Director of Industrial Development could very easily have it removed. I do not intend to deal with the many other points raised by the Minister because I did not make a note of them. There is, however, just one other point I wish to touch on before I close. Are we going to allow civil servants to deprive a man of his means of livelihood? Are we going to allow them to dictate to a man who has established a business and tell him to pack up and get into some country district?

Hon. A. R. G. Hawke: Civil servants can only recommend.

The Minister for Industrial Development: You are drawing a long bow.

Mr. GRAYDEN: The Minister knows in his own mind that I am not.

The Minister for Industrial Development: I know nothing of the sort. Your statements during the last few minutes have been a gross exaggeration.

Mr. GRAYDEN: I listened attentively to the Minister's speech, but I have never listened to one that contained more inaccuracies than were contained in the one he delivered tonight. I do not blame the Minister, but the Director of Industrial Development who gave him the information. We have all heard the saying that the end justifies the means. That is a communist doctrine with which I violently disagree; but that is exactly what we will be doing in this case if we support the action of the Director of Industrial Development. It is a communist doctrine to which most Australians would not subscribe, and I ask members to reject it and to support the motion. If they do so, that will allow the Belmont cannery to continue getting fish as it has done for years under the terms of the contract signed with Mr. Hunt. We did not move for a Select Committee for one main reason; namely, that the canning season has started and Mr. Gardiner has been denied the opportunity to take catches from the south coast. We therefore could not risk the delay. If this motion is passed he will have the opportunity and, therefore, I ask members to support it.

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

Ayes	14
Noes	26

Majority against	12
------------------------	----

AYES.

Mr. Bovell	Mr. McCulloch
Mr. Cornell	Mr. Oliver
Mr. Coverley	Mr. Read
Mr. Fox	Mr. Rodoreda
Mr. Graham	Mr. Shearn
Mr. Grayden	Mr. Triat
Mr. Mann	Mr. Reynolds

(Teller.)

NOES.

Mr. Ackland	Mr. Nalder
Mr. Brand	Mr. Needham
Mrs. Cardell-Oliver	Mr. Nulsen
Mr. Doney	Mr. Panten
Mr. Hall	Mr. Perkins
Mr. Hawke	Mr. Seeman
Mr. Hill	Mr. Seward
Mr. Hoar	Mr. Thoru
Mr. Kelly	Mr. Tonkin
Mr. Leslie	Mr. Watts
Mr. Marshall	Mr. Wild
Mr. May	Mr. Wise
Mr. Murray	Mr. Yates

(Teller.)

Question thus negatived; the motion defeated.

House adjourned at 11.46 p.m.

Legislative Council.

Tuesday, 16th August, 1949.

CONTENTS.

	Page
Questions: Milk, as to investigation of Goldfields supply	1142
Land Sales Control Select Committee, as to blackmarketing report	1143
Railways, as to loss of tarpaulins	1143
Motions: Standing Orders, as to revision Supreme Court Act, to disallow liquidators' accounts rule	1149
Bills: Traffic Act Amendment (No. 2), 1r. Increase of Rent (War Restrictions) Act Amendment (No. 4), Com.	1150
Superannuation, Sick, Death, Insurance, Guarantee and Endowment (Local Governing Bodies' Employees) Funds Act Amendment, Com., report	1154
Gulldford Old Cemetery (Lands Revestment), 2r., Com., report	1154

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

QUESTIONS.

MILK.

As to Investigation of Goldfields Supply.

Hon. G. BENNETTS (for Hon. E. M. Heenan) asked the Honorary Minister for Agriculture:

(1) Has the Minister read an article published in the "Kalgoorlie Miner" of last Friday, the 5th instant, dealing with the present method of supplying milk to the Goldfields from the metropolitan area, which a local medical authority describes as "unsatisfactory and hopelessly outmoded?"

(2) Will he have the various matters dealt with in the article investigated by the proper authorities with a view to improving the existing state of affairs?

The HONORARY MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE replied:

(1) Yes.

(2) The various matters have been investigated and consideration is still being given to ways and means whereby improvements may be made in the milk supply to the Goldfields. Recent tests of the dairy herds at Kalgoorlie reveal 50 per cent. T.B. reactors.