

fore the adjournment could have voted. It is making judge and jury both of the presiding officer. I move an amendment—

That beginning in line 4, the words "and who in the opinion of the presiding officer in ordinary circumstances would have voted at that polling place but for the adjournment" be struck out.

Amendment put and passed.

On motion by the Chief Secretary, postponed Clauses 124 and 126 were further postponed.

Postponed Clause 127—The officers count the votes in the respective boxes which they open:

On motions by the Chief Secretary, paragraph (c) of Sub-clause 8 amended by inserting after "distribution" in line 1 the words "shall again ascertain" and by striking out of lines 2 and 3 "shall again be ascertained"; and paragraph (d) amended by inserting after "votes" in line 2 the words "shall repeat"; by substituting "distribute" for "distributing" in lines 3 and 4; by striking out of line 6 the words "shall be repeated"; by inserting after "and" in line 6 the word "recount"; by striking out of line 7 the word "recounted"; by striking out of line 9 the words "such candidate," and by striking out of line 10 the words "be declared" and substituting the words "declare such candidate."

On motion by the Chief Secretary, further consideration of the clause, as amended, postponed.

Postponed Clause 130—Informal ballot paper:

On motion by the Chief Secretary, further consideration of the clause postponed.

Hon. J. CORNELL: We have practically completed the Bill now, the only exception being the postponed clauses, which, but for one small amendment, will require only numerical alteration. We have now been right through the Bill. It is almost impossible to bring the numbers into proper sequence until the Bill has been recommitted. When that has been done, we can bring the clauses into their proper sequence. I will confer with the President on the subject to-morrow.

Progress reported.

House adjourned at 12.4 a.m. (Thursday).

Legislative Council,

Thursday, 5th December, 1935.

	Question: Land taxation, leasehold residential areas	PAGE
Motions: Standing Orders suspension	...	2215
Additional sitting day	...	2216
Wheatgrowers, Federal assistance, to inquire by select committee	...	2216
Bills: Adelphi Hotel, 3A., passed	...	2216
Reserves, reoom.	...	2216
Industrial Arbitration Act Amendment, (No. 2) remaining stages	...	2217
Public Service Act Amendment, 3A., passed	...	2217
Public Service Appeal Board Act Amendment, 3A., passed	...	2217
Railways Classification Board Act Amendment, 1A.	...	2217
Constitution Acts Amendment Act, 1899, Amendment (No. 2), report, 3A.	...	2217
Loan, 2A.	...	2218
Metropolitan Whole Milk Act Amendment, 2A., etc.	...	2226
Electoral, Com.	...	2242
Adjournment, special	...	2246

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

QUESTION—LAND TAXATION.

Leasehold Residential Areas.

Hon. H. J. CORNELL asked the Chief Secretary: 1, In what year did the Land and Income Tax Act first apply to leasehold residential areas leased by the Crown to tenants for a fee of 10s. per annum in the Kalgoolie and Boulder districts? 2, Has the holder of such an area been required to furnish a land tax return each year since the Land and Income Tax Act first applied to the holder thereof? 3, If not, why not? 4, Is the Minister aware that some holders of these areas who have been in possession less than nine years have been assessed at 2s. 6d. per annum for four or five years only, and have been asked to submit a land tax return for the full period they have held their areas, whilst other holders who have held these areas for a much longer period have been assessed for lesser periods, and in some cases have not been assessed at all? 5, Does the Minister approve of invalid and old-age pensioners, holding the areas in question, being taxed therefor? 6, If not, will the Government take steps to cause the Taxation Department to refrain from asking these pensioners to furnish land tax returns, and to cease to impose an extra charge of 2s. 6d. per annum on their residential leasehold areas?

The CHIEF SECRETARY replied: 1, The year 1907. 2, Yes, vide Section 33 (4)

and these are called for because the definition of "owner" in Section 2 (b) is as follows:—"Owner" as applied to any estate or interest in land includes every person who is, jointly or severally, whether at law or in equity—(b) entitled to land for any leasehold estate or interest granted under the Land Act, 1898, or any amendment thereof, or under any Land Regulations thereby repealed, with or without the right to acquire the freehold. 3, See answer to Question 2 above. 4, Default land tax assessments have been raised for all owners who hold leases as above under the Land Act calculated under Section 2, definition unimproved value (c) despite their neglect to lodge returns. 5, Invalid and old-age pensioners are exempt from assessment for land tax under Section 10 (1) (f), but not from lodging returns. Where defaulters have advised that they receive pensions under the Old Age Pension Act, 1908, the assessments raised have been cancelled. 6, See reply to Question 5.

MOTION—STANDING ORDERS SUSPENSION.

THE CHIEF SECRETARY (Hon. J. M. Drew—Central) [4.35]: I move—

That, during the month of December, so much of the Standing Orders be suspended as is necessary to enable Bills to be passed through all stages in one sitting, and all messages from the Legislative Assembly to be taken into consideration forthwith.

Such a motion has been moved at an earlier stage in previous sessions. In my opinion, this session it was not necessary to move it before; but now it is necessary. I assure hon. members that in accordance with my practice in the past I shall exercise care and caution before passing a Bill through its final stages.

Question put and passed.

MOTION—ADDITIONAL SITTING DAY.

THE CHIEF SECRETARY (Hon. J. M. Drew—Central) [4.36]: I move—

That, unless otherwise ordered, the House meet for the despatch of business on Fridays at 4.30 p.m., in addition to the ordinary sitting days.

In view of the progress we made last night, and in anticipation of similar progress being made this afternoon and this evening, I do

not think it will be necessary for us to sit to-morrow.

Question put and passed.

BILL—ADELPHI HOTEL.

Read a third time, and *passed*.

BILL—RESERVES.

Recommendation.

On motion by Hon. W. J. Mann, Bill recommended for the consideration of a new clause.

In Committee.

Hon. J. Cornell in the Chair; the Chief Secretary in charge of the Bill.

New clause:

Hon. W. J. MANN: I move—

That the following be added to stand as Clause 9:—"All that piece of land, being reserve 12905 (Busselton lot 311) granted to the Busselton Municipal Council in trust for municipal endowment may be surrendered by the said Busselton Municipal Council to His Majesty to the intent that the same may be granted to the Western Australian Fire Brigades Board for the purpose of a site for a fire station.

The necessity for the new clause has arisen out of circumstances connected with the building of a new fire station at Busselton. Arrangements were made some time ago between the Western Australian Fire Brigades Board and the Busselton Municipal Council for the erection of the station. Part of the arrangement is that the municipality shall provide the land on which to erect the building. It is proposed to utilise for the purpose portion of an endowment made to the council many years ago. Plans have been prepared for the building, tenders called, and a tender accepted. Now it has been discovered by the Crown Law authorities that the council really have no authority to hand over the land to the Fire Brigades Board. After investigation it was suggested that the council surrender the land to the Crown, and that the Crown make it available to the Fire Brigades Board for the erection of the station. I have the assurance of the Minister that he is fully in favour of the new clause. The Busselton Municipal Council are also fully in favour of it. Without the new clause, the building cannot be erected on the site proposed.

New clause put and passed.

Bill reported with a further amendment.

BILL—INDUSTRIAL ARBITRATION ACT AMENDMENT (No. 2).

Remaining Stages.

Reports of Committee adopted.

Bill read a third time and returned to the Assembly with amendments.

BILLS (2)—THIRD READING.

- 1, Public Service Act Amendment.
- 2, Public Service Appeal Board Act Amendment.

Passed.

BILL—RAILWAYS CLASSIFICATION BOARD ACT AMENDMENT.

Received from the Assembly and read a first time.

BILL—CONSTITUTION ACTS AMEND- MENT ACT, 1899, AMENDMENT (No. 2).

Report Stage.

THE CHIEF SECRETARY (Hon. J. M. Drew—Central) [4.49]: I move—

That the reports of the Committee be adopted.

HON. J. CORNELL (South) [4.50]: I understood last evening that the Chief Secretary intended to give some explanation regarding the effect of the amendment secured by Mr. Seddon. Is he in a position to do so?

THE CHIEF SECRETARY (Hon. J. M. Drew—Central—in reply) [4.51]: Yes, I desire to read the following report from the Solicitor General, Mr. J. L. Walker:—

1. Messrs. Nicholson and Seddon, Ms.L.C., discussed with me this morning the effect of paragraph (e) of Subsection 1 of the proposed new Section 32 in Clause 3 of this Bill.

2. As finally amended in Committee of the Legislative Council to date that clause (e) now reads as follows:—

(e) Is or has been attainted of treason or has been convicted for any offence under the law of any part of His Majesty's dominions punishable by imprisonment for one year or longer.

3. In this form the said Clause (e) is now for all practical purposes virtually of the same effect as paragraph (6) of Section 31 of the Constitution Acts Amendment Act, 1899, which reads as follows:—

(6) Has been in any part of Her Majesty's dominions attainted or convicted of treason or felony.

4. Under earlier law "felony" was the generic term used in connection with certain serious kinds of criminal wrongdoing. Under the Criminal Code of this State and in the criminal laws of some of the other parts of the British dominions, the term "felony" has ceased to be used.

In the State Criminal Code criminal wrongdoing is classified into crimes, misdemeanours and offences. Crimes are the most serious forms of criminal wrongdoing; misdemeanours are forms of wrongdoing less serious than crimes, but still punishable by imprisonment as the primary penalty; whilst offences, as distinguished from crimes and misdemeanours, are the least serious forms of wrongdoing generally punishable by a fine as the primary penalty.

5. You will realise, therefore, that, having regard to our criminal law and possibly the criminal law of other parts of the Dominions the words "or felony" as they appear in paragraph (6) of Section 31 of the Constitution Acts Amendment Act, 1899, are now incorrect, inconclusive, and ambiguous.

Consequently in Clause (e) of Subsection (1) of the proposed new Section 32 in Clause 3 of the Bill the words "or felony" have not been used, but in lieu thereof the words used are "any offence under the law of any part of His Majesty's dominions punishable by imprisonment for one year or longer."

These latter words therefore include crimes and misdemeanours punishable by imprisonment for one year or longer, and are used as the only reasonable alternative to the words "or felony" aforesaid in view of the fact that in our State law there is now no such thing as a "felony."

6. You will understand, therefore, that in my opinion Clause (e) of Subsection (1) of the proposed new Section 32 in the Bill approaches as nearly as practicable in effect to paragraph (6) of Section 31 of the Constitution Acts Amendment Act, 1899.

Question put and passed; report of Committee adopted.

Third Reading.

THE CHIEF SECRETARY (Hon. J. M. Drew—Central) [4.53]: I move—

That the Bill be now read a third time.

HON. J. CORNELL (South) [4.54]: I desire that the House divide on the third reading of this measure. The Bill as it stands, I consider, will in future make confusion worse confounded. Those members who so desire will now have an opportunity to show their disapproval when the motion for the third reading is put.

THE PRESIDENT: In view of the fact that opposition has been expressed to the Bill, and that it is necessary for the Bill to be passed by an absolute majority, I will take a division.

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

Ayes	22
Noes	6

Majority for	16
--------------	----	----	----

AYES.

Hon. E. H. Angelo
Hon. C. F. Baxter
Hon. L. B. Bolton
Hon. A. M. Clydesdale
Hon. L. Craig
Hon. J. M. Drew
Hon. C. G. Elliott
Hon. J. T. Franklin
Hon. G. Fraser
Hon. E. H. Gray
Hon. W. H. Kitson

Hon. J. M. Macfarlane
Hon. W. J. Mann
Hon. R. G. Moore
Hon. J. Nicholson
Hon. H. S. W. Parker
Hon. H. V. Piessie
Hon. A. Thomson
Hon. C. B. Williams
Hon. C. H. Wittenoom
Hon. H. J. Yelland
Hon. T. Moore

(Teller.)

AYES.

Hon. J. Cornell
Hon. V. Hamersley
Hon. J. J. Holmes

Hon. G. W. Miles
Hon. H. Seddon
Hon. H. Tuckey

(Teller.)

The PRESIDENT: I declare the third reading carried by more than an absolute majority.

Bill read a third time and transmitted to the Assembly.

**MOTION—WHEAT GROWERS,
FEDERAL ASSISTANCE.**

To Inquire by Select Committee.

Debate resumed from the previous day on the following motion by Hon. J. J. Holmes (North):—

That a select committee consisting of five members of the Legislative Council be appointed to inquire regarding the allocation and distribution, by the State Government, of approximately two million pounds provided by the Federal Government to assist the wheatgrowers of this State during the years 1932-33, 1933-34, 1934-35; the committee to have power to call for persons, papers, and records, and report on Thursday, 12th December, and three to form a quorum.

THE CHIEF SECRETARY (Hon. J. M. Drew—Central) [4.58]: I have gone carefully through my notes of Mr. Holmes's speech. The hon. member has made no charges, but simply desires an investigation. Hence there is nothing for me to reply to, and the Government have no objection to the passing of the motion.

Question put and passed.

Select Committee Appointed.

HON. J. J. HOLMES (North) [4.59]: I move—

That the select committee consist of a member from each of the four principal wheat-

growing provinces, namely, the Hons. C. B. Williams (South), E. H. H. Hall (Central), A. Thomson (South-East), and C. F. Baxter (East) and the mover.

In the motion to which we have already agreed the quorum was set at three. Also, we are to report on Thursday next. The Standing Orders provide that we may report earlier if it be convenient.

The PRESIDENT: If any member of the House so desires, these proposed members can be selected by ballot.

Hon. J. Cornell: I am almost sure that five was the number in the general motion.

The PRESIDENT: Yes, with three to form a quorum.

Question put and passed.

BILL—LOAN.

Second Reading.

Debate resumed from the previous day.

HON. J. CORNELL (South) [5.2]: I wish to point out that, of an authorisation of £2,627,000, there appears to be for the goldfields only an allocation of £397,000, of which amount £350,000 is for the Goldfields Water Supply. We all know that the Goldfields Water Supply supplies water from the southern end of the goldfields to Carrabbin, and that from Mundaring to Carrabbin the farmers are as well served by the Goldfields Water Supply as are the people of Kalgoorlie or Boulder. The only two items I can find are Water Supply, Eastern Goldfields, £7,000, and Development of Mining and Boring for Minerals £20,000. Then there is a further sum of £20,000 for State batteries. So it would be fair to write down the allocation for the Goldfields Water Supply by one-half, and it would be found that out of £2,627,000 the goldfields are to get less than a quarter of a million. I do not mention that in any carping spirit, but if members will make a retrospect of Loan funds that have been spent in recent years on the goldfields, as compared with other parts of the State, they will find that it is like comparing a couple of buttons to a suit of clothes. There is no doubt about the wonderful asset the goldfields have been to the State, particularly in the depression years. I venture to say the goldfields are being treated niggardly. Even mining companies who are subscribing over 1½ million pounds of capital have been asked to put up their money in advance and after-

wards take it out in water when the scheme is completed. This is a totally new idea. When there is development work going on in the agricultural districts or in the metropolitan area, the people concerned are not asked to find the funds for the carrying out of the necessary work and then take out their money in water or in some other service.

Hon. A. Thomson: It is, do the work and charge them afterwards.

Hon. J. CORNELL: That, to-day, is what is applying to essential services, and there is no more essential service to goldmining than is a good water supply. Mr. de Bernales the other day put the whole thing in a very small compass when he said the future of gold mining depends on the treatment of our lower-grade ores, and that the treatment of our lower-grade ores, the modern process of treatment, can only be carried out satisfactorily with the aid of an adequate water supply. Mining companies subscribing all the money where there is no adequate water supply are being asked to provide the money in advance and take it out in water supply later on, whereas in regard to other essential services in the metropolitan area one is not asked to do that at all. This is an innovation by the Government. In the old days it was at the cost of the general taxpayers of the State that water supplies were put in hand. Coming to State batteries, there is no question, no doubt whatever, that the present-day treatment charges and deductions for sands are working out detrimentally to the genuine prospector; that is, if he uses a State battery. I understand that while gold is £8 per ounce, practically the same deduction is made for sands and slimes as was made when gold was only £4 4s. per ounce. The prospector cannot shoulder these charges and I venture to say that he is due, indeed overdue, for some consideration. The Minister for Mines has pointed out what a wonderful institution the State batteries are, and has assured us that they are paying. Is not that a wonderful tribute to the goldfields? I ask, are the State Sawmills paying? Are the State Implement Works paying? Are the Wyndham Meat Works paying? Are the State steamers paying? None of them is paying, but the State batteries are paying and returning a profit to the Mines Department.

Hon. J. J. Holmes: If a prospector could pay those charges when gold was £4 4s. per

ounce, why can he not pay them when gold is £8 per ounce?

Hon. J. CORNELL: Because ore that he could not possibly go after when gold was £4 4s. per ounce he now goes after with gold at £8 per ounce; and he is subject to the same deduction for the dockage of the sands as when gold was £4 4s. per ounce. I understand that employees at State batteries are not treated the same as are employees at private batteries. The State battery employees do not come under the industry allowance in the Court of Arbitration. And we have the spectacle in Kalgoorlie and in Coolgardie of men employed on State batteries not receiving the industry allowance of 14s. per week, although men employed in adjoining private batteries are in receipt of that allowance. That is the difference between men engaged in State batteries and men engaged in private batteries. If this is an example of the liberal interpretation of the application of awards to workers, I think it reaches the limit. I wish to make a few remarks respecting the development of agriculture. I see here an item showing that £50,000 is to be advanced for new working capital for the Agricultural Bank. Speaking for one part of the State, the Esperance district, I wish to say that the longer procrastination goes on, the less possibility there is of there ever being a rehabilitation scheme there, because men are absolutely disgusted with their treatment and with the capitalisation they are asked to carry. I venture to say there will not be 50 of the settlers left there next March. That is to be regretted. I know that probably the Agricultural Bank has to find a policy, but I have yet to learn that by the importation of people who know very little about agriculture in the district the Bank is going to be in a better position to form a policy than are those men who have been down in the district for many years past. My own opinion as to that state of affairs is that with an independent chairman there are two or three men in that district who have succeeded in that district. Mr. Johns has been there for 40 years, and Mr. Berry almost as long, while Mr. Macher has been there for a large number of years. If a way is going to be found for a proper basis of rehabilitation, those common-sense practical men are the men to make the suggestions. If they cannot find a way out, I venture to say that the man who goes on valuations is

a man who has farmed very casually in life and never had anything to do with that class of land. He is not going to find a way out. Even at this late hour, although the Commissioners are a law unto themselves, I do make that suggestion. Mr. Rogers has gone, and a new man is going down there. If a proper visualisation of the future be entertained, with an ordinary settler expecting to stop there, what he can do and what the country can do could be better determined by men who have lived there 35 or 40 years, men who have grown crops and bred stock there, the men who agree as to what it is best to do with that part of the State in regard to rehabilitation. The position is serious. No less a sum than two millions of public money has been sunk there in railways, jetties and other things. I venture to say that the tourist traffic from the Eastern Goldfields is not going to maintain those facilities, will not even pay axle-grease on the working of that railway. It may pay as far as Norseman so long as the goldmining industry flourishes, but let that industry collapse and the railway will not pay axle-grease. Even now half the people who use Esperance as a seaside resort travel there by motor car. I hope that even at this late hour something will be done to secure the application of common sense to a scheme of rehabilitation for the Esperance district. Personally I do not think that the settlers in that area can shoulder the capitalisation that it is alleged they will be asked to undertake. I suggest that the men I have indicated are in an infinitely better position to determine what the settlers can pay than are those who are attempting that task to-day. If men could be placed on the farming propositions and they could make a success of the work with very little financial assistance, would that not be beneficial to the State? Would it not be of assistance if, by their work in that district, they could raise some semblance of hope for successful operations on those holdings in future? I notice in the Schedule an item relating to £15,000 as working capital for the Workers' Homes Board. Why is that item necessary? Where is it proposed to spend the money? During the recent controversy regarding the extension of the operations of the Workers' Homes Board to the goldfields, the Premier, in a letter to the Kalgoorlie Municipal Council, in reply to a request from that body that he should endeavour to assist in securing

workers' homes for men on the goldfields, said—

The Workers' Homes Board has adequate funds at its disposal and full power to build in any portion of the State that it deems advisable.

The full text of the Premier's letter appeared in the "West Australian" of the 29th November. If the Workers' Homes Board have adequate funds, why is Parliament asked to provide £15,000 additional working capital? Apparently the goldfields are not even to be treated as a poor relation. According to Mr. Seddon, the goldfields do not even constitute a memory, from the standpoint of the Workers' Homes Board.

Hon. G. W. Miles: The goldfields are getting into the same position the North-West was in for a number of years.

Hon. J. CORNELL: The goldfields represent one of the principal assets of the State to-day and, in fact, the goldfields are practically carrying the State. If we view the agricultural industry in retrospect, we have to recognise, unfortunately, that every bushel of wheat that has been grown during the last few years has represented a loss of from 1s. to 1s. 6d. to the farmers. The citizens of Australia and Western Australia have been asked to make good part of that loss by providing a bounty payable to the growers. On the other hand, the position regarding the goldmining industry is that not only is the industry paying its way but, within the last three or four years, has found work for an additional 6,000 men or more, and all that has been done because of the investment of outside capital. However, I would like the Chief Secretary to explain why this additional £15,000 is necessary for the Workers' Homes Board, and where the money is to be expended. I was rather interested in Mr. Seddon's remarks last night, particularly when he referred to one of my life-long friends, who introduced the first Workers' Homes Act. The late Mr. John Scaddan was not consistent in too many things, but if there was one matter in respect of which he was consistent, it was in connection with the workers' homes movement. At the request of others, I approached him several times with a proposal that he should make provision for turning leasehold properties into freehold. Mr. Scaddan adhered to the attitude he adopted when in 1911 he introduced the first Bill that provided workers with homes. More power to him for having done so! He had good and valid

reasons for his attitude. In the first place, he said that the only way in which we could assist the poor man to secure his home was to provide him with a house and the land on which it was built at a nominal rent per annum. He also pointed out that once such a man secured his home, it became a negotiable asset and if he had the freehold, the moment he was in difficulties he was likely to borrow on the premises and ultimately lose his home. His sole object in introducing legislation of this description was to provide homes for people who could not make that provision for themselves, and he provided that so long as they fulfilled their obligations reasonably, their homes could not be sold over their heads. In recent years a new phase has been introduced into the administration of the Workers' Homes Board. The consideration extended in the early days to applicants is not that which is extended to-day. The one who receives most consideration to-day is the man whose salary is such as to demonstrate his ability to continue repayments. I suggest that within the last four or five years infinitely more people whose salaries averaged from £300 to £400 a year have secured workers' homes than have those in receipt of less than the salary range I have mentioned. The Workers' Homes Board was established in the interests of men in receipt of small wages. In a way we cannot blame the board for their attitude because obviously the man in receipt of £400 a year must be a better client than the man who enjoys intermittent work only, or is on sustenance work.

The Honorary Minister: Are you inferring that those in receipt of £400 have secured homes at the expense of others less fortunate whose applications have been refused?

Hon. J. CORNELL: I say that if a census were taken, it would be found that during the last five years more applicants in receipt of £300 or more have secured homes than have those in receipt of less than £300 a year.

The Honorary Minister: I do not think you are right, but even if your statement is correct, that does not say that those in receipt of lower salaries have had their applications refused.

Hon. J. CORNELL: I say that their applications have been deferred.

The Honorary Minister: The hon. member should say one thing or the other.

Hon. J. CORNELL: Quite a number of their applications have been deferred. I happen to know of one instance in which the man in receipt of the larger salary secured the board's consideration. Naturally, the Workers' Homes Board represent a business undertaking, and human nature is the same throughout. I contend that the man on the basic wage to-day does not receive the consideration extended to men in his position from 1912 to 1914. Reverting to the subject of the goldfields workers, I have listened with interest from time to time to remarks that show how the worker there is being shot at. Every available shilling it is possible to obtain from workers on the goldfields is extracted from them. For instance, I listened with interest to the answers submitted by the Chief Secretary this afternoon to my questions regarding the imposition of land tax. The answers were purely departmental, and the facts of the case are that for 20-odd years there have been many men on the goldfields who have been the registered holders of residential areas at a fee of 10s. a year who have never been asked to lodge land tax returns until recently.

Hon. G. W. Miles: You are not insinuating, are you, that the Government instructed the department to tax those people as you have indicated?

Hon. J. CORNELL: I am not insinuating, but I say definitely that every shilling that can be extracted from people on the goldfields is being obtained from them.

The Honorary Minister: In other words, they are receiving preferential treatment.

Hon. J. CORNELL: Undoubtedly they are. I have in my possession now a letter from a man who has been in possession of one of these residential areas for nine years and has been assessed for a period of four years. He has been asked to put in land tax returns. He has been assessed for those four years, without any land tax return being lodged, at the minimum rate of 2s. 6d. a year. Now he has to put in his returns, and he must indicate how long he has held the land. The effect of that is that he will be sluggish for another five half-crowns. His is not the only instance. That sort of thing is occurring right throughout the goldfields areas. At any rate, I know that is what is happening at Kalgoorlie and Boulder, and I understand it is happening elsewhere. While the Act may say that old age pensioners are exempt from taxation, I know

one old age pensioner who has been assessed, and she has been required to pay five half-crowns.

Hon. G. Fraser: The department can tax pensioners on vacant land but not in respect of premises they occupy.

Hon. J. CORNELL: This particular old age pensioner is living in a little shack, and she is 75 years of age.

Hon. G. Fraser: It is quite easy to get over that.

Hon. J. CORNELL: I want to know why the Taxation Department have suddenly decided to deal with these people who do not escape taxation, but pay the lot. They pay the hospital tax, the income tax, the financial emergency tax, and now they are required to pay the land tax.

Hon. E. H. Gray: Do you want the people on the goldfields to be exempt from the payment of land tax?

Hon. J. CORNELL: The hon. member would squal like a lame duck if some of his constituents were treated in this way.

Hon. G. Fraser: You need not worry about that. Our people have been paying for years.

Hon. J. CORNELL: In respect of residential leaseholds in the Fremantle area? Are they taxed?

Hon. E. H. Gray: Of course they are.

Hon. J. CORNELL: There are none there.

Hon. E. H. Gray: Yes, there are.

Hon. J. CORNELL: Residential leases at 10s. a year! The hon. member does not know what he is talking about. The man on the basic wage of £3 12s. a week in Fremantle is not taxed. On the goldfields the man on the wages he is receiving is assessed on the same process of reasoning as is the basic wage man in Fremantle. I am protesting against this sudden onslaught, this new form of slugging. If the Government are short of revenue, why do they not go the whole hog? Why do they now say to those people who are paying 10s. a year, and have been doing so for over 30 years, but have never yet put in a land tax return, that they must put in a return? They were never brought to book for not putting in a return, and indeed their land has no taxable value, but the Taxation Department are using every subterfuge they can to garrot the Eastern Goldfields worker. He has now to put in a return, and if he does so he has to pay a minimum tax of 2s. 6d.

The Honorary Minister: That is in accordance with the law.

Hon. J. CORNELL: But is it in accordance with justice? The previous Labour Government of which the Honorary Minister was a member had an opportunity to do this, but refrained from doing it. It has only been done recently in the case of residential leaseholders. The holder of a worker's home on leasehold who has a block valued at £100 pays £3 a year rent to the board in perpetuity. Why is he not slugged for the 2s. 6d.?

Hon. E. H. Gray: Are you sure he is not?

Hon. J. CORNELL: I am sure.

Hon. E. H. Gray: I think he is.

Hon. J. CORNELL: Why is he not slugged? There is no difference between that and the Crown saying to a miner, "We will give you an area of land in the district for 99 years at 10s. a year, paid in two instalments."

Hon. E. H. Gray: I think he does pay.

Hon. J. CORNELL: The hon. member ought to be sure about it. I have owned a leaseholder worker's home since 1914. I have never put in a land tax return for it, nor have I been asked to do so, nor have I been assessed for it nor asked to pay.

Hon. E. H. Angelo: You will get a big slug from the department now.

Hon. J. CORNELL: If old age pensioners of the Eastern Goldfields have got to pay, so ought I. I should be quite willing to partner them in the slugging.

Hon. E. H. Gray: I think you do pay, or else the board pay for you.

Hon. J. CORNELL: The hon. member often preached the non-alienation of Crown lands, but took advantage of the freehold. I have yet to learn that the board do anything they expect their clients to pay for.

Hon. E. H. Gray: They pay the rates if necessary.

Hon. J. CORNELL: I know all that they do. I also know many members of the Labour Party who talk a lot about workers' homes, but have not got one themselves.

Hon. G. Fraser: Give us the chance to get one.

Hon. J. CORNELL: My friends say, "Don't do as I do, but do as I say." Were it not for the goldfields the people of Fremantle would be taking in each other's washing. If it is necessary for these residential leaseholders to pay 2s. 6d. a year, why not go about it in a business-like manner? Why

should a lot of old people be troubled about filling in forms? I hope the Minister in his reply will clean up Mr. Holmes's reference to one of the Agricultural Bank commissioners. I have been repeatedly asked who this mysterious cavalier is, who is referred to on page 54 of the 17th report of the Commonwealth Commissioner of Taxation. I have an idea who he is.

Hon. G. W. MILES: I think you are doing him an injustice. The least said about it the better.

Hon. J. CORNELL: I have an idea who he is.

Hon. A. M. Clydesdale: Why vent your spleen here?

Hon. J. CORNELL: I am not doing so, although the hon. member is good at that when it suits him. Members will be astonished if they look at this return to see how few men have been asked to toe the carpet in Western Australia. Out of the thousands of taxpayers in this State, only about 20 have been obliged to do this.

Hon. E. H. Gray: People must be particularly honest in this State.

Hon. J. CORNELL: I happen to know that clients of the Agricultural Bank have been prosecuted, and some have been threatened with gaol since the new commissioners took over, either for stealing a calf or a bag of wheat or because the wife has got away with a dozen eggs.

The Honorary Minister: Surely that is an exaggeration.

Hon. J. CORNELL: They are watching a man's wife while she gets away with the eggs or a sucking pig.

The Honorary Minister: But you said people were being threatened with gaol.

Hon. J. CORNELL: Men have been gaoled by the trustees of the bank for beating the bank, or endeavouring to do so. I want the clients of the bank to know that the men who are policing them to-day have had to toe the carpet for trying to get away with other people's money, that they have been weighed in the balance and found wanting. If I had tried to get away with other people's money I would not squeak. Mr. Clydesdale asked why I am venting my spleen here. If I were doing so, this would be the proper place for it. When men are appointed to public positions to police thousands of other people, and stand guard over the State's money, if their reputation is at stake or at all murky, the people of

the country should know about it. I have never done anything I am anxious to hide, and I am not going to stand for the smothering up of anything. I support the second reading of the Bill.

HON. G. W. MILES (North) [5.40]: I deprecate the attempt of some members to undermine the management of the Agricultural Bank. This is doing no good to anyone. It is only fair that the public men of the State should give the newly appointed commissioners a fair chance. I have made inquiries about this report, and have been informed confidentially that there is nothing in the transaction concerning the men who were appointed that would at all interfere with their appointments. If the Government wished I think they could say they knew all about page 54 of the Commonwealth report, before they appointed the commissioners.

Hon. J. Cornell: The individual in question has been fined.

Hon. G. W. MILES: I do not know whether that is so or not. It is beneath the dignity of members of this Chamber to criticise public officers in the way they have done.

Hon. J. Cornell: The Government should appoint men who are not open to criticism.

Hon. G. W. MILES: This man is not open to criticism. I have discussed the matter confidentially with people who know the circumstances. They say there is nothing in the transaction to prevent these men from holding their positions as commissioners.

Hon. A. M. Clydesdale: Hundreds of taxpayers have been fined by the same authority.

Hon. G. W. MILES: I wish to make some reference to the conditions in the North.

Hon. C. B. Williams: The Wyndham Meatworks particularly?

Hon. G. W. MILES: The works are doing splendid service to the people of the country and for the Northern Territory. I would urge upon the Government to approach the Commonwealth to see if they cannot get assistance whereby they may pay the interest which the works are losing.

Hon. C. B. Williams: That is very good of you.

Hon. G. W. MILES: The Commonwealth have announced that they wish to assist the people of the Northern Territory. The State Government could put up a good case. Already a certain amount has been done by

way of roads and crossings. A little while ago, the Minister for the Interior, Mr. Paterson, said that one of the great hindrances to the development of the Northern Territory was the high cost of transporting essential requirements, owing to the great distances which had to be covered. That applied to the Kimberleys and other portions of the North-West, as well as the Northern Territory. To reduce transport costs, the Government had approved of a substantial reduction in the freight rate on the Northern-Territory railway and of the wharfage dues at Darwin. A report of Mr. Paterson's statement contained also the following:—

The Government would subsidise boring for water on any lessee's property on a pound for pound basis of the actual cost of sinking and casing a bore, and when the Government water boring plants were available they could be hired for this purpose without charge. The Government would also bear half the total cost of the sea, rail and road freight of an engine, or mill tower, trough, etc. Mr. Paterson also said that the Government would encourage lessees to fence portions of their areas by bearing half the total cost of sea, rail, and road freight of all fencing materials other than posts obtained on or near a property purchased by any lessee. More generous provision would also be made for the construction of roads, more especially for creek crossings, and for the maintenance of roads and stock routes. Mr. Paterson promised to review the rentals of all pastoral leases in North Australia. He said it was hoped that the assistance to be given in boring for water and in connection with the carriage of fencing materials would encourage some cattle breeders on suitable areas to re-establish stud farms in the Territory so that the heavy expense of transporting bulls from other parts of Australia would be largely done away with. Dealing with gold mining in the Territory, Mr. Paterson said that the sum of £45,000 provided by Parliament late last year for the stimulation of employment in this industry was being used for that purpose and its provision was proving well justified.

I read the article which I quoted because I would like this Government to approach the Commonwealth Government with a view to obtaining some further assistance for the people in the Kimberleys. I congratulate the Commonwealth and State Governments upon the geological and geophysical surveys that have been carried out in the North. The Government would be putting forward a just claim if they were to ask that the Commonwealth Government subsidise the Wyndham Meat Works, because the Northern Territory leaseholders also get the benefit of those works. Another matter to which I desire to refer is the shipping ser-

vice along the coast. The North-West has never been so badly off for a shipping service as it is now.

Hon. G. Fraser: What about the State Shipping Service?

Hon. G. W. MILES: It is the policy of the Government to run State ships. My policy is not to run State ships, but to subsidise a private line, whose freights and fares should be fixed.

Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. G. W. MILES: The position to-day is that the Government have not sufficient ships to cater for the trade along the coast. I understand the reason why an embargo is placed on private shipping along the coast is because the Government have been requested by the West Province members not to allow other ships to trade along the coast. We have only two ships a month calling at the North-West ports north of Carnarvon. Those vessels cannot cater for the business of the North-West. They are shutting out cargo. For instance, the "Koolinda" arrived at Fremantle two days ago and is leaving to-morrow afternoon. She has been in port only two days and is leaving with a full cargo.

Hon. G. Fraser: She is a Christmas ship.

Hon. G. W. MILES: Whether she is a Christmas ship or not, there is a restriction on other boats trading along the coast. Such a condition of affairs would not be tolerated in any other part of the State. It is argued that the ports along the coast are tidal ports, and that if additional ships were put on the run, they would be following each other too closely. There is, however, a period of five days from the beginning of the tide to the end of the tide. If people in the metropolitan area or on the goldfields were restricted to a train every five days, there would be a revolution. We are really worse off than that, and I am speaking for the workers of the North as well as for the other residents.

Hon. C. B. Williams: I am pleased that the hon. member recognises the stalwart workers on the goldfields.

Hon. G. W. MILES: The people in the North have to be supplied with perishable goods and five days makes a great difference in the condition of cabbages, pumpkins, potatoes, onions and butter. Those who live in the North know how these products deteriorate.

Hon. J. Nicholson: It is a very serious matter.

Hon. G. W. MILES: It is a most serious matter, and unless the Government can put another boat on the run, I appeal to them to get out of the business altogether and subsidise a private shipping service, whose freights and fares could be fixed. I am opposed to the State Shipping Service. It is all very well for young members of the House to laugh, but before they were born we had a better service to the North-West with private enterprise than we have to-day with the State Shipping Service.

Member: There was a lot of growling in those days.

Hon. G. W. MILES. No. There was not. If the Scaddan Government had not pushed their way in and collared the subsidy from the Commonwealth in 1914, we would have a better service to-day than ever the State has given us. What do we find in the report laid on the Table of the House? Continual losses are being made by the State Shipping Service and the taxpayer has to foot the bill. As I say, if the Government subsidised a line, its fares and freights could be controlled and there would be no monopoly. It was done in the past, and if the State Shipping Service had paid the fines which were due to the Commonwealth Government for non-fulfilment of the mail contracts, the Government would have paid away more than they received by way of subsidy. The State Shipping Service has been educated in the requirements of the North and the service is quite as good as one could wish for, but there are not sufficient ships to cater for the trade. I ask the Chief Secretary to use his influence to get these permits restored so that the overseas vessels can trade along the coast.

Hon. G. Fraser: What about the North-West and the West Provinces combining forces?

Hon. G. W. MILES: I would not be associated in any combination with the West Province.

Hon. G. Fraser: You would have the wharf lumpers out on strike on the North-West coast.

Hon. G. W. MILES: I would emphasise this point, as I have done for a number of years. Unless something is done to develop and people the North of Australia we will be pushed out of it by other nations. There is real wealth in the North and room for

thousands of people if the conditions are made right for private enterprise to step in, without being harassed as it has been in the past by Labour Governments. The Labour Governments have introduced regulations which resulted in driving these private companies away from the North. They wanted inspectors to board foreign ships to see if they were run decently; they also wanted to charge so much a head for every whale which came from the Antarctic. They frightened the whaling company off the coast and put a large number of men out of employment. We want no more socialistic legislation that interferes with private enterprise.

Hon. J. Nicholson: The whales had to be labelled, had they not?

Hon. G. W. MILES: There is another matter which the Government should urge upon the Commonwealth Government, and that is to provide a suitable airport at Wyndham. Wyndham should have been, and could have been, a national airport if the Government had taken the trouble to expend a few thousand pounds in making a convenient and suitable landing place. I am not blaming the present Government in this respect, but I would urge them to see that Wyndham is made an airport.

Hon. C. B. Williams: What is your opinion with respect to miners wanting a district allowance in the North-West?

Hon. G. W. MILES: The mine-owners in the North pay the men over £1 a week tropical allowance. They are paying a sum in excess of what has been fixed by the Arbitration Court. They are, however, opposed to paying an allowance of 38s. a week which some agitators, who represent the miners, have asked the court to award as a tropical allowance. If such a high allowance is fixed, the North will never be peopled. You will kill the industry. There is every prospect now of Yampi Sound being developed; yet at the present time there is an application by some—I do not want to use the word agitators, or Labour agents, or Trades Hall secretaries—to the Industrial Arbitration Court for a tropical allowance of 30s. per week. It is but right that the men should be paid the difference in the cost of living as an allowance, but they should not ask the Arbitration Court to fix an allowance at an amount more than sufficient for them to live. I hope when the other side puts its case before the Arbitration Court—and luckily the court cannot

deal with the application without hearing the employers—a just tropical allowance will be awarded. I have pleasure in supporting the Bill.

HON. W. J. MANN (South-West) [5.55]: Before the Bill is passed, I would like to make a few comments and ask a few questions. I join with most of the other members who have spoken on the Bill in their regret that we have each year to pass these Loan Bills. I also add my conviction to those already expressed by members that the time is not very far distant when this borrowing will have to be materially diminished. I do not mean to infer that we can do without borrowing altogether, but I believe that we cannot go on borrowing at the rate we have been doing for many years past. There are some items in the Schedule that I want information about. There is an amount of £100,000 for the electric power station at East Perth. We all know that the policy of the Government, and apparently of the Government which preceded it, is to centralise the production of power in the metropolis. I contend that that is quite wrong. It is against the custom in many other parts of the world. In most countries electric current is now generated as near as possible to the source of power. I contend that it is uneconomic to haul coal 100 miles or more in order to generate electric current. I suggest that the Bill which was passed about eight years ago in this House, and which enabled a big power station to be established at Collie, should have been given effect to, and that the station at East Perth should not have been permitted to grow to the extent to which it has.

Member: It is a great pity.

Hon. W. J. MANN: It has been permitted, but that does not alter the fact that the procedure is wrong. The time will come, although it may not be in our time, when all current will be generated at the point where fuel or coal is obtained. Once more I wish to record my opposition to the system of centralising everything around the city. There is an amount of £50,000 allotted to railway rolling stock. Those who use the trains every week will agree that there is any amount of room for that expenditure. I trust that in making the allocations the railway authorities will take care

to provide a newer form of transport, in the form of single-unit coaches, enabling journeys from the country to be made much more expeditiously than is the case to-day. We see comparatively empty trains entering the city at all hours of the day, and we see the roads almost covered with motor cars competing with the railway system. We cannot blame the people who accomplish by car in four hours a journey which takes the train nine or ten. The only means by which the Railway Department can get back some of their traffic is by instituting, especially on all spur lines, the running of single-unit coaches that will do the journey much more quickly and much more cheaply than the present system. A single-unit coach can be run by one man, whereas it takes four or five men to run a train. I have frequently seen more staff than passengers on a train. It is an experience frequently to be met with on country spur lines. An amount of £75,000 is provided for Bunbury harbour works. I hope that undertaking will be pushed on. Quite recently we heard of a movement to erect freezing works at Albany. Freezing works will come at Bunbury, but in order that the trade may grow to any dimensions the Bunbury harbour facilities will have to be improved. I trust that this work also will be pushed on. There is an amount of £20,000 for water supplies for towns generally. I hope the Government will give sympathetic consideration to many of the small towns in this respect, not so much small towns in the Province I have the honour to represent—because that portion of Western Australia is fairly well off for water—but towns elsewhere which are in a deplorable state for want of water. The least the Government can do is to make a generous contribution to people in that plight, so that they too may enjoy the facilities available to goldfields people and people along the pipe line track who are utilising the Mundaring water. In connection with the amount of £150,000 provided for roads and bridge throughout the State, including feeders to railways, I wish to pay a tribute to the men associated with that work. The Commissioner for Main Roads and his officers are doing excellent work in regrading and reconstructing country roads. Portions of Western Australia are fairly hilly, and in those districts some roads have in the past been positively

dangerous. The Commissioner for Main Roads has displayed a wise judgment in making deviations. If hon. members wish to see an example of excellent work, they need only travel from Donnybrook to Bridgetown and observe the wonderful improvements effected in a road that previously was absolutely hazardous in many places.

Hon. E. H. Angelo: It is these wonderful roads that are causing the financial troubles of the Railway Department.

Hon. W. J. MANN: We must have roads. Motor cars are here to stay. Every man who drives a motor car pays 7½d. per gallon duty on his petrol. Therefore he is entitled to some decent roads. If that duty is to be imposed, it will be a sorry state of affairs if the old type of road is to be allowed to continue. I believe in giving honour where honour is due. From my observations I say that the roads of Western Australia are a credit to the community, and are equal to the roads in any other part of the Commonwealth. I have criticised the Government for their tardiness in doing the right thing by the Cave House and the Yallingup Caves. In that condemnation I do not include the Honorary Minister. I know certainly that Mr. Kitson has made every possible endeavour to get at least the Cave House rebuilt, though so far he has not succeeded.

Hon. G. W. Miles: Why not hand it over to the State Gardens Board?

Hon. W. J. MANN: I am coming to that board now. Somebody seems to have a policy of handing over these things to a board, concerning which we obtain but little information.

Hon. G. Fraser: The board do a lot of good work.

Hon. W. J. MANN: They do round about where the hon. member lives, and in the district he represents; but I have yet to learn that they do much work elsewhere. Their duty is to treat all portions of the State alike. I do not quibble because the Yanchep Caves have been opened up. That is a right and proper thing. I do not complain of daily bus services being run to those caves. I do take strong exception, however, to the fact that one can go through the Tourist Bureau without discovering the word "Caves" anywhere on the premises. Very little reference indeed is made to the caves so far as the Tourist Bureau is concerned. It is the Government's duty to see that attractions which provide additional traffic

for the railways—or should do so—are given full publicity. Years ago a great deal of publicity was given to our caves, and brought quite a lot of profitable traffic to them. But latterly the traffic has fallen off alarmingly. I am not blaming the Honorary Minister. In my opinion Mr. Kitson has done an excellent job for that part of the country, but the Government have not backed him up. I want Ministers to know that the people in that part of the country object to the inaction of the Government in this regard.

Hon. G. Fraser: How long is it since the Cave House was burnt down?

Hon. W. J. MANN: Four or five years ago. The previous Government were equally to blame for neglect to rebuild. They got down on the insurance money, and said they had spent £1,000 buying spoons, forks, cutlery and so forth. I have never been able to sight that thousand pounds' worth of articles put into the building, though I suppose it is there. I know what any hon. member could buy in the way of cutlery and so forth if he had £1,000 to spend in that direction.

Hon. G. Fraser: The money is held in trust.

Hon. W. J. MANN: Some of it may be. I suggest the hon. member find out whether it is actually held in a trust account.

Hon. G. Fraser: I asked that question years ago, and was told so.

Hon. W. J. MANN: Under the heading of State Hotels and Tourist Resorts I notice in the Loan Estimates an unexpended authorisation of £26,740. The estimated expenditure for the year ended the 30th June, 1936, is £10,000. To the item is attached a note to the effect that this is to be for a loan to the Rottneest Board of Control, and for other works which may be authorised. I do not know what the Rottneest Board of Control are supposed to do, but I dare say the money will be wisely spent. The First Schedule to the Bill provides £20,000 for State hotels and tourist resorts. Apparently someone is trying to establish a public house at Yanchep. I am told—I do not know whether it is true—that persons will pay a motor car fee of 1s. to get into the reserve if they want to buy a drink. If that is so, it is a new departure. I would like the Honorary Minister to tell us, if he can, what is the position as regards rebuilding

the Cave House and making the necessary renovations around the caves. Very little money indeed has been spent for a long time in that direction. I hope the Honorary Minister will be able to tell us definitely that the Government intend to devote portion of that amount of £20,000 to some highly necessary works in that connection. I had intended to make extended reference to the value of tourist traffic to a country, but I defer it for the present, restricting myself to a few figures in order that the memories of hon. members may be refreshed as to the value of tourist traffic to other countries. In Australia, and particularly in Western Australia, we have been tardy in developing our great tourist attractions. The time has come for us to set about that work. Tourist traffic means a great deal of revenue for a comparatively small outlay. In 1930 Canada derived £57,000,000 odd from tourists, France gained £80,000,000, and Italy £26,000,000, whereas the gain to Australia was about £800,000. True we are some distance from the great centres of population; but we are in a better geographical position, if only our attractions become known, insofar as there is a delightful sea journey from other countries to Australia. This in itself is a great attraction to many tourists. In the Eastern States there has been a movement to increase expenditure for the attraction of tourists, and the Commonwealth Government are subsidising the National Travel Association. I hope the Western Australian Government will endeavour to get some aid from the National Travel Association and set up a publicity campaign for tourist traffic in this State.

On motion by the Chief Secretary, debate adjourned.

Sitting suspended from 6.15 to 7.30 p.m.

BILL—METROPOLITAN WHOLE MILK ACT AMENDMENT.

Second Reading.

Debate resumed from the previous day.

HON. H. TUCKEY (South-West) [7.30]: So far there has not been one speech delivered in opposition to the Bill, and it must be a matter of considerable satisfaction both to the producers and the consumers of whole milk to know that the measure is receiving

solid support from every section of Parliament. In the short space of time that the board have operated the annual consumption of milk has increased by 535,000 gallons. This increase represents an extra £30,000 per annum paid to the producers. Another important fact is that the board prevent the sale of inferior milk at no extra cost to the consumers. I was interested in the remarks of Mr. Craig regarding the supply of milk to school children, and I hope that the board will look into the possibilities in this direction.

Hon. H. J. Yelland: That is a matter for the Government.

Hon. H. TUCKEY: I take it that would be a function of the board in order to make a success of their operations. I also consider that milk bars should be licensed at a nominal fee. This would be in the best interests of the whole of the industry as it would tend to increase the sale of whole milk. Some members expressed the opinion that dairymen in the metropolitan area should go out of the business because they could not produce milk economically. There was a time, however, when all the supplies came from the metropolitan area.

Hon. H. V. Piesse: I do not think they said definitely that those dairymen should go out of the industry.

Hon. H. TUCKEY: In the early days we required dairies; to-day we require the opposite, namely markets. The quota system has worked well, but many small quotas should be increased before any new dairymen are allowed to engage in the industry. All supplies of whole milk should be controlled by the board. There appears to be some doubt as to whether the board have the power to spend any of their funds on advertising with a view to increasing the consumption of whole milk. Money judiciously expended in that way would be very beneficial to the industry. I should like the Honorary Minister, when replying, to give some information on that point. I agree with the proposed amendment to make it obligatory on distributors to provide a reasonable bond or guarantee to cover the amount of credit for milk obtained from producers. It must be remembered that the distributors have a monopoly of the business because the number of licenses is restricted. It is not fair that the producers should be compelled to sell the milk to just a few people without a guarantee that they will be paid for their

product. I consider that they are entitled to some protection. I do not know how many producers have sustained losses, but I know that quite a few of them have done so. One producer lost £80. It seems quite wrong that men of straw should be able to run up accounts and then clear out.

Hon. H. V. Piesse: Did not the Minister in another place say that that had been corrected and that there had been no losses?

Hon. L. Craig: I do not think so.

Hon. H. TUCKEY: I would not have made the statement, had I not received it on fairly good authority, that losses have been made, and that one producer lost as much as £80. I do not consider it necessary to refer to other features of the Bill. Members seem to recognise the value of the measure, and there is no need to waste time in discussing it. Any further remarks I shall reserve till the Committee stage is reached. In concluding I should like to join with other members in expressing the view that the board have done excellent work. There is no doubt of that, and with the help of members I think we can look forward to further good results during the coming year. I support the second reading.

HON. J. M. MACFARLANE (Metropolitan-Suburban) [7.36]: I join with previous speakers in supporting the Bill, not because I believe it is all that it should be, but because when Parliament passed the original legislation a couple of years ago, it was recognised to be experimental legislation that would need amending to develop it into a statute that would be well worth having. To perfect this law will probably need the experience of another year or two. I quite agree with the Government in having brought down the Bill to extend the operations of the board for another year. This will enable the board to observe developments during that period. The Bill contains amendments to define more clearly the terms contract, quota and surplus milk. When the original measure was under discussion I endeavoured to have some of those terms defined, and experience has proved that those definitions should have been included. I distinctly objected to the definition of surplus milk because it would have the effect of curtailing considerably the power of the board. Surplus milk represented a quantity that could be supplied to anyone who desired to huckster it and deal with it in such a way as to

defeat the objects of the Bill. Experience has proved that clearly, and now the board ask that the definition of surplus milk be entirely deleted. Anyone who has an intimate knowledge of the requirements of the industry is aware of the months of diminishing supplies and of expanding supplies, and there is no doubt that the provisions made to meet those conditions have worked satisfactorily. The quota system has not worked satisfactorily. Owing to the number of people engaged in the business it is necessary properly to organise the distribution, and a quota had to be established to discover where they stood. This has operated in favour of some and very much against others, but it has provided the board with information they desired, and I suppose that information will be used to advantage during the coming year. Much of the dissatisfaction that has occurred as a result of dealing in surplus milk may now be cleared up and that will make for the smoother running of the industry in future. I congratulate the Minister in another place and the Honorary Minister here on the temperate manner in which they presented the Bill. It was different from the way in which the Bill was put up on behalf of the previous Government, who antagonised quite an important section of the industry and caused many of the public to feel concerned as to how they would fare. Particularly do those remarks apply to the Minister who introduced that Bill. He has not been at all diplomatic in his attitude to the industry. Those are wrong tactics to adopt when endeavouring to deal with a complicated industry, such as the whole milk industry, from the point of production to the point of distribution. I was greatly interested in the remarks of Mr. Craig, whose case, I take it, reflected the experience of the board. He would lead members to believe that the board had power to fix a minimum rate to producers and a maximum retail price, and that that system was operating 100 per cent. efficiently. He also indicated that the margin of profit to the retailers was such that they were getting the better deal.

Hon. L. Craig: They were. I was complaining that there were too many on the distribution side.

Hon. J. M. MACFARLANE: That reminds me of answers given to certain questions asked in another place. The Min-

ister was asked how many producers were engaged in the business and how many people were engaged in vending. The answer was that there were 250 producers—

Hon. L. Craig: In the metropolitan area.

Hon. J. M. MACFARLANE: Yes, and 1,100 were concerned in distribution.

Hon. L. Craig: Those figures are not correct.

Hon. J. M. MACFARLANE: I feel sure an error has crept in somewhere.

Hon. L. Craig: About 500 producers.

Hon. J. M. MACFARLANE: My information is that there are about 500 producers and 500 engaged on the distribution side.

Hon. L. Craig: No, 1,100 on the distribution side.

Hon. J. M. MACFARLANE: I believe that those who supplied the information must have included shopkeepers, who cannot be considered as vendors in the ordinary sense of the word.

Hon. J. J. Holmes: And included the staffs of shops.

Hon. J. M. MACFARLANE: The shops are really only secondary sellers. They buy from the wholesale distributors.

Hon. E. H. Gray: Some of them do not sell a gallon per day.

Hon. J. M. MACFARLANE: Some of them sell very little. They can hardly be considered to be engaged in the industry because they deal in so many other lines. Now I should like to give the House some information as the result of my experience from time to time. Mr. Craig has put the case very well, but so far as the metropolitan area is concerned I fear the producer has been his own enemy; that is to say, the better class producer has had to suffer for other producers who have endeavoured to beat their own fellow men on the market. There is a certain retail price fixed for the consumers, but there are very few consumers in the metropolitan area who have to pay that price. Only the other day there came accidentally into my hands a receipt, a two weeks account for a lady living in Victoria Park. In that she was charged 2s. 11d. for 14 pints of milk, or 5d. per quart. That price is very prevalent in the metropolitan area, and in many shops one can buy two pints of milk for 5d., while in some places that same quantity can be purchased for 4d.

Hon. W. J. Mann: Do they water it down?

Hon. J. M. MACFARLANE: There are inspectors to look after that sort of thing, but the fact remains that it has been done, and there are shops where one can buy two pints of milk for 4d. The profits as estimated by the board are not based upon facts.

Hon. L. Craig: Probably the retailer produces some of that milk.

Hon. J. M. MACFARLANE: I should say the milk would be quite up to standard. At least 95 per cent. of it would be milk produced under natural conditions. But there it is. I am going to try to explain how the board has been handicapped through the Bill not being all it should be in order to give them a chance to suppress this sort of thing without any difficulty.

Hon. J. J. Holmes: It's all a case of supply and demand.

Hon. J. M. MACFARLANE: Some of these people are aiming to get more out of it from the producer, but the producer is the man who the Act said should have the price stabilised.

Hon. H. J. Yelland: It is not a matter of supply and demand.

Hon. J. J. Holmes: Of course it is.

Hon. J. M. MACFARLANE: A man went and tried to buy a round. He was to act as a partner. This man went about and found another man who wanted to sell 140 customers, including ten hotels and tearooms, and the price he was getting was 1s. 6d. per gallon. He had to make two or three deliveries per day. He had three shops selling at 1s. 5d. per gallon, and one shop selling at 1s. 3d. per gallon. The daily average was 38 gallons, costing £2 7s. 6d., for which he received £2 15s. 9d.; after paying the milk board tax he had a balance of 7s. 7½d. out of that 38 gallons per day. Next morning he inquired about another business which was for sale, but he turned that down because the bulk of it was sold at 1s. 3d. per gallon. That was after taking it to the treatment works, treating it, cooling it and holding it, and service back to the shop.

Hon. L. Craig: It could not be done.

Hon. J. M. MACFARLANE: I have here the names of the men concerned, but of course I do not wish to give them publicity.

Hon. L. Craig: But they were not paying the proper price, or they could not have done it.

Hon. J. M. MACFARLANE: No, but I am trying to show what is going on. The producers themselves are defeating the objects of the Act. One man said he had three or four firms who were offering to do it in competition with each other at 1s. 6d. I contend they could not do it, if they were complying with the terms of the Act. It is highly desirable that we should find out how and why that sort of thing happens. This man said that in one case he lost a customer to another man at 1s. per gallon. That was after taking the milk home, cooling it, and servicing it.

Hon. L. Craig: He was a producer.

Hon. J. M. MACFARLANE: But the producer cannot do it under the regulations fixed by the board. It is said that the milk board has the complete handling of the situation. I agree that the milk board have done their job conscientiously and worked very hard. Indeed I am satisfied that the chairman has somewhat impaired his health in trying to improve the conditions of the industry.

Hon. W. J. Mann: They want more power.

Hon. J. M. MACFARLANE: That is so, they want more power. The mistake that Parliament made was as to the treatment plant and the vendors. At the time the Bill was introduced it was proposed that two members representing the consumers should be on the board. At present the chairman of the board has practically two votes, so the consumers are well looked after by his judicial mind. Then there was the difficulty the board was faced with in fixing the minimum, and in not having a semi-wholesale minimum clause. That created the position that the man with his rounds in town was assailed by the producer himself. There were difficulties in the way of getting a let-up for some of their supplies. The result was that we found that when the warships were in Fremantle Harbour one of the Perth firms was buying milk, cooling it, and delivering it to the warships at Fremantle at 1s. 1d. a gallon. We were told that it was an oversight, but I should say it was a try-on, that they did use some of that surplus milk in an endeavour to get something out of it. Certainly the tale the board accepted was a very weak one. Then we are

told that the hospitals, the Old Men's Home, and other institutions have been getting milk at 1s. 1½d. per gallon. That has been going on for the last three years. It was quite within the law as far as they were concerned, but it did cut values. Had there been a semi-wholesale price fixed, this could not have happened. The next year a section of the producers sought to get even by contracting at 1s. 1½d. per gallon to the hospitals and other institutions. It was easily seen that something was breaking down somewhere in the system of the board, and this after securing to the producer the price of 1s. 1d. There has been a prosecution in this respect, but the action was too long delayed. The information was there, but, as I say, the action was too long delayed.

Hon. J. J. Holmes: What was the action; selling milk too cheaply?

Hon. J. M. MACFARLANE: No, it was for not paying the producers the full amount. However, it was done with the full knowledge of the producers. We often hear of producers having to take a price less than the minimum through fear. Fear has nothing to do with the present position. The board recognise that very well, and the Minister has told us that the board were able to reduce debts considerably, nearly to wipe them out all together. The price was fixed at 1s. 1d., and if the individual thought that he was not being treated properly he could go to the board and say that Macfarlane—I will use my own name so as not to mention anyone else—had cut him down to 9d. or 10d. If such a complaint were made, the board would deal with me very promptly.

Hon. L. Craig: Yes, and you would probably remember that man when his contract ceased.

Hon. J. M. MACFARLANE: These men are begging the question when they talk about fear and so forth, because the remedy is in their own hands. It is not right to advance that contention as a defence and to suggest that as bad debts are created, they are obliged to take less than the price fixed by the board. I feel to-day as I have felt all along, that the board would be assisted appreciably if a wholesale as well as a semi-wholesale price were fixed for the middleman, because the middleman is here for all time. That applies not only here, but in every capital city throughout the Common-

wealth. The distributor is necessary. Treatment plants are necessary because much of the milk is produced outside the boundaries of the city, and in a climate where there is a high mean temperature skilful treatment is required to assure to the consumer milk that is bacteriologically sound and in such a condition that it must be good. Without the advantage of such plants in the city, it would be almost impossible for the consumer to obtain the class of milk that is essential just now. I shall not submit an amendment along those lines, but I would like some other member to deal with that matter because I believe the board would accept such an amendment as in their own interests. Decidedly the operations would be policed better than is possible without these conditions. I do not like the idea of the board intruding upon the activities of the Health Department. It is suggested that the board will only avail themselves of the provisions I refer to with the approval of the Minister. I contend that such a system will amount to dual inspection and add to the difficulties of those associated with the industry. The work of the board should be well defined and the Health Department should deal with their part of the work through the departmental inspectors, who are all qualified men. I believe that many of the stories we hear are true. I refer to the statements made that some of the inspectors assume the status of qualified men, whereas they really are not men of that class. It is difficult to do the inspectorial work properly without antagonising those associated with the industry. In effect it is casting aspersions on inspectors who have been in the Health Department for many years. I had a chat with a health inspector recently and discussed with him the statement that milk conditions have improved very much since the board became operative. He told me definitely that, chemically and physically, the milk to-day is as good as in any other part of Australia, and has been for years, and that it had not improved with regard to quality except insofar as a general improvement was to be expected with the passing of years.

Hon. L. Craig: What do you mean by the quality of the milk? Do you refer to the butter fat content?

Hon. J. M. MACFARLANE: Yes, and to the fact that there is less bacteria in the milk. The solids are maintained at the proper standard.

Hon. L. Craig: They are not likely to improve the quality of the milk. That can be done only by changing the breed of the cows.

Hon. H. J. Yelland: I think I was responsible for raising that point. I suggested that it was possible to improve the quality of the milk by a system of herd selection.

Hon. J. M. MACFARLANE: It must be remembered that we are dealing with mixed milks, milk that is drawn from cows of various breeds. It is well known that one breed of cattle will give a high test and small quantity while other breeds will give low tests and large quantities.

Hon. H. Tuckey: You have to take the general average.

Hon. J. M. MACFARLANE: We do not buy on butter fat content, and the general aim of those in the industry is to secure a large volume of milk so long as they do not produce an article that is below the required butter fat standard. I object to the endeavour of the board to infringe upon the duties of the Health Department, whose inspectors should be above the Board in this work. The Health Department will be required for the work when the Board has gone.

Hon. L. Craig: Of course, the Minister for Health would have to approve of the inspectors.

Hon. J. M. MACFARLANE: Quite so, but I want a well-defined line drawn between the work of the board's inspectors and that of the inspectors of the Health Department. I want the demarcation to be much wider than is contemplated by the Bill. In my opinion the better way would be to hand over the control of this legislation to the Health Department. I was struck by the remarks made by Mr. Craig when he dealt with the economic side of the industry. He referred to the number of milk carts required to supply consumers in a number of streets and drew attention to the apparent oversupply of vendors for the community. When he spoke, my mind harked back to the time when I was a member of the City Council and the milk supplies at the time were not at all satisfactory. An effort was made by the municipal health authorities to improve the conditions, and after an investigation the conclusion was arrived at that an exchange, or depot, was necessary so that milk could be received at the one centre, tested for quality and then be re-sold to the distribu-

tors at the proper standard. By that means it was hoped to prevent the adulteration of milk that was so prevalent at the time.

Hon. L. Craig: That is the Sydney system now.

Hon. J. M. MACFARLANE: What I refer to was contemplated by the Perth City Council long before the Sydney system was inaugurated. The council also recognised that a zone system was necessary. We formulated a scheme that contemplated the establishment of a municipal milk board and the proposal was to purchase all the milk rounds within the city boundaries. After the city area had been divided into zones, it was proposed to re-sell the rounds in the several zones to selected vendors and by that means the board would recoup themselves for the money spent at the outset. By that method it was proposed to eliminate much of the unnecessary competition and to put the trade on a better economic footing. A good deal of opposition was evidenced on the part of householders, but it was believed that that could be overcome in time. The greatest difficulty confronting the City Council was that we could deal with the matter only from within the city boundaries and had no control whatever over the milk that was brought into the city from outside districts. In the end the scheme fell through. I am satisfied that the present Milk Board, with their powers of inspection, could carry out the work I have indicated to a satisfactory conclusion. They could utilise the treatment plants in the metropolitan area and zone by securing an authority from Parliament to raise a loan for that purpose. Then they could establish a zone system, subsequently handing back to selected vendors the rounds in the different areas. Those rounds would be then under proper control. Such a system would assure not only proper control, but would provide milk that was chemically and bacteriologically sound, containing also the required butter fat contents, as well as the solids and fats. Power would be required to undertake the improvements I have indicated, or else the compensation fund would have to be increased in some way so as to enable a fund to be built up to allow the authorities to pick out special parts of the city where the zone system could be inaugurated and carried out effectively. If that were done I am sure the economic position that was touched upon by Mr. Craig and referred to by other members, would be

rectified without upsetting the industry too much, assuring to the producers their full share of the returns and at the same time giving the vendors an opportunity to operate under proper control. I was also struck by a remark made by Mr. Gray when he referred to the supply of milk in cartons in many cities of Europe. I am satisfied that could be done here by the co-operation of the various interests or else by giving the board wider powers to establish a few distributing centres. The plant that Mr. Gray mentioned is very expensive. There is the margin of profit that is required by the patentee and, in addition, heavy duty has to be paid on the plant. By the time an expert was brought out to erect the plant, the cost would run into several thousands of pounds. On the other hand, the plant can deal with a large quantity of milk; the supplies are checked for quality; the milk is treated properly; the cartons are manufactured, sealed and delivered. The carton is a very substantial one. It is buttoned up. The cost would not be so great as, indeed it would be a great deal less than, the cost of bottles, and it would be more satisfactory. The carton can never be used again, as bottles are, and the bottles are frequently improperly washed and left unclean. There are not the same disadvantages about cartons as there are about bottles. The cartons are sterilised under great heat before they are filled, and are delivered at the door. They cannot be contaminated. Once a carton has been opened it is destroyed. The chief trouble is that the patentees require a royalty of one farthing per gallon.

Hon. L. Craig: What are the cartons made of?

Hon. J. M. MACFARLANE: Of paper pulp. The fat does not penetrate them. In the early days the fat used to penetrate through the cartons.

Hon. W. J. Mann: They are made under high pressure.

Hon. J. M. MACFARLANE: Yes. The cartons are not now saturated by the fat. The matter has been discussed in Perth. It either requires a company or some separate authority to deal with it. Once it was brought into play it would be a distinct advantage to the milk trade in the metropolitan area, as well as in the case of export. The weaknesses to me are the fixing of a wholesale minimum price, and the representatives of the vending side of the

board who should take the place of one of the consumers' representatives. I had thought of putting up some amendments. When I brought down amendments two years ago I imagined that members might think I had done so through self-interest. That, however, was never in my mind. I think if they were included in the Bill the board would have a much happier time. Their work would be more effective, and the Bill would be more in keeping with what I think are members' desires. I support the second reading, but would like to see these amendments included in the Bill.

THE HONORARY MINISTER (Hon. W. H. Kitson—West—in reply) [8.17]: In view of the very onerous duties which have been imposed upon the board, the reception this Bill has received is, I think, very pleasing, and is a tribute to the board. The remarks of Mr. Macfarlane merely emphasise some of the difficulties with which the board have to contend. They show clearly that the amendments to the Act, as contained in the Bill, are justified both from the point of view of the board and the industry. One member criticised this legislation not because of what the Act or this Bill contains, but because of the manner in which it is constructed. I refer to Mr. Parker. He said this was a striking example of bad legislation. We all admit it is experimental legislation. It was recognised that there would be many things that would probably not work out in practice as was intended, and that owing to their being so many parties associated with the industry it was necessary that power should be given to enable the Minister or the board to deal with problems that were expected to crop up from time to time. The board with the powers at their disposal, and under the control of the Minister, have met most of the problems that have cropped up in a very praiseworthy manner. The Bill really exemplifies what the Minister and the board believe should be incorporated in the Act. I am sure it will not be claimed that the Act, even when amended, will be perfect. It is not claimed that it will eliminate all the difficulties with which the board and the industry have been confronted in the last two years.

Hon. H. J. Yelland: It is still experimental.

The HONORARY MINISTER: Yes, and for that reason there is no desire to go to extremes. It is highly desirable that anything that is done shall be done with a view to improving the position wherever it is possible to do so, by placing in the Act such amendments as are considered absolutely essential. During the debate quite a number of questions were asked, concerning which I have made inquiries. Some important points were raised. One member wanted to know by interjection what the cost of the licensing would be. There is a clause in the Bill which limits the charge for a license to a maximum of 10s. At present the charge is only 5s. Although power is given to charge a maximum of 10s., I am advised that the board have no intention of increasing the amount. Mr. Yelland raised the question of bad milk. I pointed out there had been an improvement in the quality of the milk supplied to the metropolitan area since the board came into operation. I was asked what became of this bad milk. I pointed out that it was not bad in the ordinary sense of the term, but only bad by comparison with good milk, and said I would make inquiries into the matter. I am advised that what I said is actually the position. It is only bad by comparison with the first grade or best quality milk. When milk is classed as bad in the sampling it does not necessarily mean that it is unfit for human consumption. It is not prohibited from use. In some cases it contains excessive bacteria, and in other cases it is due to non-attention to hygiene. An inspector does not know the quality of the milk until he receives the result of the laboratory test. Immediately a bad report is received a man is sent out to inspect the dairy, and to advise the dairyman what measures to take to improve the standard of his milk. The result is that in many cases the dairyman is able to effect an immediate improvement in the quality of his milk. Until the milk is tested the inspector cannot say to what quality it belongs. In the meantime it has gone into consumption.

Hon. J. M. Macfarlane: It is like the departmental term of "unclean" as applied to butter fat. It is only unclean to the palate. The producer is often very hurt because that term is applied to his product.

The HONORARY MINISTER: Quite a wrong impression might have been created

by the reference I made to bad samples taken by inspectors during the period, and I therefore make this explanation. Mr. Mann did not severely criticise either the Bill or the board, but he put forward one or two suggestions. The first had to do with publicity. The Crown Solicitor is of opinion that the board have sufficient power, if they think fit, to spend a certain amount on publicity, and that there is no necessity to amend the Bill to give them further powers for this purpose. Mr. Mann also raised the point about retailers putting up a bond. He has given me a copy of an amendment he proposes to move. I am sorry I cannot accept it.

Hon. J. M. Macfarlane: I should think so.

The HONORARY MINISTER: We do not consider this is a matter that should be dealt with in this Bill. The contract entered into by the parties is purely a private one. The producer can please himself whether he enters into a contract or not. If he feels it desirable he should have some guarantee from the individual, he would insist upon that being given.

Hon. J. Nicholson: Before he supplies his milk.

The HONORARY MINISTER: No doubt in many cases he would be able to secure that guarantee in the ordinary course of trade.

Hon. H. Tuckey: If he cannot get a guarantee he still has to supply the milk.

Hon. J. M. Macfarlane: He need not do so.

Hon. W. J. Mann: A bond is provided for in Victoria.

The HONORARY MINISTER: I was not aware of that. For the time being we do not think it necessary that anything of that kind should be embodied in the Bill. Mr. Mann also raised the question as to the duration of the Act. He suggested it should be made permanent, and that he proposed to move in that direction. I hope he will not move in that way. We still believe this is experimental legislation, and we feel it is desirable it should come up for review. Consequently I could not support an amendment of that kind.

Hon. H. J. Yelland: A similar measure in the Dried Fruits Act is dealt with every year.

The HONORARY MINISTER: Yes. I am not opposing the suggestion on the ground that it may not be desirable, but

at present we do not think it is desirable, mainly from the point of view I have just expressed, that it is still in the experimental stage, and until such time as we are satisfied that it is really serving the purpose for which it is intended, we cannot very well agree to its becoming a permanent measure. I do not think I am called upon to deal with any other points that have been raised. It may be there is something else that hon. members feel I should reply to, but so many statements have been made which I think will probably be dealt with in the Committee stage that I will content myself with these few remarks.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Hon. E. H. Gray in the Chair; the Honorary Minister in charge of the Bill.

Clauses, 1, 2, 3—agreed to.

Clause 4—Amendment, Section 6 of the principal Act:

Hon. J. NICHOLSON: I hope the amendment which I am about to propose will appeal to hon. members. In dealing with an article of food which is so important an item in our daily diet, particularly for the young members of the family, I think it most vital and important that a woman should have some voice and representation on the board. Whilst I admit the section does not differentiate in any way between man and woman and that it would be open to the Governor-in-Council to appoint a woman if he thought fit, I wish to make it a definite requirement. It is for that reason that I am moving the amendment. I have received communications from various women's organisations throughout the State asking me to request that an amendment should be made to provide definitely that a woman should act as a representative on the board.

Hon. C. B. Williams: Why are you being selected out of all of us men here?

Hon. J. NICHOLSON: I think it is probably due to the fact that I have not the charm and grace of the hon. member who has just interjected. It may be due to the fact that the good ladies may have dreaded the hon. member espousing their cause. I feel very much honoured in having been asked to move the amendment, particularly as I realise the important part woman

plays in the home and the great duties which she performs and the ability it is necessary for her to display in looking after the family. I move an amendment—

That after the word "members" in the first line of paragraph (a) of Subsection (2) the words and parentheses "(one of whom shall be a woman)" be inserted.

Hon. H. J. YELLAND: I hope the House will not agree to the amendment. Provision is made whereby a woman can be appointed by the Governor under Subclause (a) of Clause 6 of the principal Act. The Minister should have a free hand in the matter. I oppose the amendment.

Hon. H. S. W. PARKER: Whether or not the Government have power to appoint a woman to the board, I sincerely hope they will not do so. I cannot see what use it would be to the public at large to have a woman acting on a board dealing with a business so complicated as that of the milk trade in the city. I have not yet heard of a woman anxious to run a dairy.

The CHAIRMAN: There is one at Fremantle.

Hon. H. S. W. PARKER: Does she go round and deliver the milk?

The CHAIRMAN: Yes.

Hon. H. S. W. PARKER: I think it unfair to ask a woman to sit on a board such as this. Here it is a question of distribution of milk. If Mr. Nicholson's arguments were carried to an extreme, women should control everything, and especially the finances. In the household they control the purse, but is it suggested that they should go out and earn the living?

Hon. J. M. MACFARLANE: I support the amendment for the reason that in dairy business women are more skilled than a good many men. They know more about milk. It is as easy to get a skilled woman as to get a skilled man in the milk trade. I fail to see that two consumers' representatives are required on the board—for that matter, there are already three consumers' representatives, seeing that the chairman has a casting vote. A woman householder would be valuable on the board. There is room for considerable improvement in the method of handling milk in the home. Women are quick at the uptake, and if the necessary knowledge is imparted to them they will speedily adopt the best method.

Hon. R. G. MOORE: I oppose the amendment. As to the handling of milk in the home, if women know so much more than

men, they will know the best method. To expect a woman member on the board to educate other women in handling milk in the home is to look for trouble. I appreciate the importance of woman in the home, and we should leave her there.

Hon. J. CORNELL: I also oppose the amendment, on the ground that there is no need for it. A woman can be appointed to the board to-day. Why go beyond that?

Hon. J. NICHOLSON: To make it definite that a woman should be appointed.

Hon. J. CORNELL: Women who attend meetings when they ought to be at home are the kind of women who seek such appointments. It is difficult to find a woman combining competency with inclination for public office. If a woman is to be appointed to the board, let the Government make the choice of one as a consumers' representative. In these days of enfranchised women there is no necessity to provide in Acts of Parliament that women must be appointed to this, that, and the other public position.

The HONORARY MINISTER: All of us appreciate Mr. Nicholson's gallantry in championing the cause of woman. The hon. member has better prospects of success in trying to bring the Minister controlling the Act to his way of thinking than in trying to bring the Committee to it. The Minister now has power to appoint a woman to the board, if he can be persuaded to do so. I feel sure that if the Minister thought there was a woman whose appointment would improve the working of the milk board, he would appoint her. Some of the functions of a member of that board would not be desirable from a woman's point of view. The Minister has stated that if there were necessity for the appointment of even two women to the board, he would not hesitate to make those appointments. However, for the amendment there is no necessity.

Amendment put and negatived.

Clause put and passed.

Clauses 5, 6, 7—agreed to.

Clause 8—Repeal, Sections 20-23, principal Act; new sections inserted:

Hon. J. NICHOLSON: Under this clause the penalty for carrying on the business of a dairyman or milk vendor without a license is a fine of £50 or three months' imprisonment. In the proposed new Section 21 provision is made for various licenses including a milk shop license. I suggest that the im-

position of the burden of obtaining a license, instead of being beneficial to the trade, will operate in the opposite direction. I confess my ignorance of this wide and perplexing subject of the whole milk industry, but it seems to me that to insist on a license will limit the consumption and thus re-act on production, whereas the general desire is to increase the consumption.

Hon. J. Cornell: We must have some supervision.

Hon. J. NICHOLSON: A restriction imposed on the disposal of goods is admittedly calculated to lessen the consumption.

The Honorary Minister: What is the restriction here?

Hon. J. NICHOLSON: The license. Instead of requiring a license, the board should be empowered to regulate the premises in which the milk is sold.

Hon. J. M. Macfarlane: They have been doing that.

Hon. J. NICHOLSON: If licenses are required, the board might refuse to license a man who desired to sell milk in a shop next door to premises already licensed, and there would be only a limited number of shops in the city capable of vending milk. That would be a restriction of trade.

Hon. H. V. Piesse: Do you think there should be more licenses in the city?

Hon. J. NICHOLSON: I would allow as many people as chose to enter the business so long as they maintained the standard and conformed to regulations regarding the nature of the premises. The very idea of a license is repugnant to me.

Hon. J. Cornell: Why have a license to sell beer?

Hon. J. NICHOLSON: Beer is in a different category.

Hon. J. Cornell: Both beer and milk are foods.

Hon. A. M. Clydesdale: Without a license would not the milk shops be in the same position as are the distributors?

Hon. J. NICHOLSON: The law of supply and demand would regulate the trade. If I chose to set up a butcher's shop, I would not have to get a license. Every shop in Hay-street could be utilised as a butcher's shop, so long as the requirements of the Health Department were complied with. These matters are dealt with, not by license, but through the law of supply and demand.

Hon. H. V. Piesse: But if you put milk into an ordinary shop do you think you should be allowed to sell it there?

Hon. J. NICHOLSON: I said I believed that these premises should be subject to the health authorities and regulations made prescribing that no milk should be sold in unsatisfactory surroundings. I move an amendment—

That paragraph (c) of Subclause 1 be struck out.

The HONORARY MINISTER: The whole object of the milk board is to increase the sale of whole milk in the metropolitan area and to improve the quality of that milk, if possible. They have given a deal of consideration to this question during the past two years, and after having handled the question so well they come forward with this proposal. I am advised that it is essential that we should have these various types of licenses. It seems to me we must leave a matter of this kind entirely in the hands of the board. Then if, after experience of the system, we should have some strong objection to make, I feel sure the House would be just as much against this idea as Mr. Nicholson is to-night. Are we not to recognise that the people dealing with this question are specialists in the line? If so, we must take a little notice of the suggestions that they make. The hon. member said he would not be agreeable to certain premises being used for the sale of milk. Later on he said he would leave this matter entirely in the hands of the Health Department. There, again, we must recognise that the board and its officers are specialists and are in far better position to deal with a question like this than is the Health Department, which covers a whole multitude of subjects, whereas the Milk Board are interested in only one commodity. Notwithstanding the objection put forward by Mr. Nicholson that we should not alter these five-year licenses for shops, if you do not license them you cannot have any check upon them. All those milk shops in Hay-street seem to be well conducted.

Hon. H. V. Piesse: And they are selling extra milk.

The HONORARY MINISTER: That is so. I suggest to Mr. Nicholson that he should be prepared to trust the board to know what is necessary, rather than accept his own opinion on the subject, which he admits he knows so little about.

Hon. H. V. PIESSE: I can imagine Mr. Nicholson and me walking down from Parliament House and availing ourselves of an opportunity to drink a glass of milk.

Hon. L. B. Bolton: I cannot imagine your doing it.

Hon. H. V. PIESSE: We find in Hay-street many milk bars beautifully arranged.

Hon. G. Fraser: And most of them in the charge of women.

Hon. H. V. PIESSE: Yes, that is a further encouragement for Mr. Nicholson and me to enter a bar and have a glass of milk. But could anyone imagine Mr. Nicholson and me going into a fish shop for a glass of milk?

Hon. J. Nicholson: I said milk must be sold in satisfactory surroundings.

Hon. H. V. PIESSE: If we support Mr. Nicholson in this amendment, we shall be taking the control out of the hands of the board.

Hon. H. S. W. PARKER: I agree with Mr. Nicholson. I have strong objection to all these licenses. I agree with what obtains at present, namely that you cannot sell milk in a shop unless you comply with certain health conditions. I agree that a person should be liable to severe penalties if he offer milk for sale in unhygienic premises. But I have heard it argued that the object of these licenses is that the authorities do not want too many milk bars on one side of a street, because in that event they will not pay. I see no objection to milk being sold in every suitable shop along the street, just as drapers have their shops alongside each other. What has it to do with the Milk Board whether a man can make his milk shop pay? In the suburbs it is very convenient for the residents that certain shops should sell milk. But why should the shopkeepers have to go to the board for a license for that purpose? It has nothing whatever to do with the Milk Board.

Hon. H. V. Piesse: Yes, they must police the Act.

Hon. H. S. W. PARKER: Why cannot the health officials look after the selling of milk in shops?

Hon. H. V. Piesse: Why duplicate it?

Hon. H. S. W. PARKER: Yes, why have qualified health inspectors thrown out of the business in order to make room for others who have not had special training?

Hon. H. J. YELLAND: I find myself in agreement with the two lawyers in the House. I had intended to rise when Mr. Parker rose, and had I done so I should

have expressed exactly the same opinions as he gave.

Hon. C. F. Baxter: Well, two wrongs do not make a right.

Hon. H. J. YELLAND: There must be only a certain number of licenses issued to milk vendors. When a medical man or a legal man provides himself with the necessary qualifications, no one can prevent him from taking out a license, so to speak, and entering upon practice. The board can restrict the number of licenses. If an individual were to have a shop in which he desired to sell milk, and the provisions for dealing with the business were quite hygienic, he should be entitled to demand a license. I support those who desire the elimination of this paragraph.

Hon. C. F. BAXTER: I have not previously spoken on the Bill, because I believe there are others more competent to deal with it. The present board, presided over by a very able chairman, have done wonderful work in establishing the milk industry in the metropolitan area on a sound footing. They have done that under legislation that was experimental and somewhat imperfect. Their most difficult task was in dealing with the personal interests that crept into the business. Now the board ask Parliament to give them further powers, not to interfere with the Health Department but to enable them to have more complete control over the milk supply in the metropolitan area. Unless this provision be agreed to, the board will not have the control that is necessary over those vending milk in shops. The license is required so that those conducting the shops shall be controlled. According to Mr. Parker, the milk shop vendors should not be licensed but be able to do as they like, and thereby interfere with the good work of the board. To agree to that course would be most unwise.

Hon. G. FRASER: According to the remarks of some hon. members, one would think that the licensing of these shops is something entirely new.

Hon. J. M. Macfarlane: Do the board agree to every application for a license?

Hon. G. FRASER: I am not in a position to say that they do.

The Honorary Minister: Nor is Mr. Macfarlane.

Hon. J. M. Macfarlane: Even if the Bill be agreed to, the health authorities will still carry out their part of the work.

Hon. G. FRASER: It is necessary for the board to have their powers of inspection as well.

Hon. J. CORNELL: What is all this argument about? Have the objectors to this provision read the Bill? There must be some form of supervision. A man may apply for a license and the decision of the board to refuse it is not final because he has the right of appeal to a magistrate. What more is required?

Hon. J. M. MACFARLANE: I agree with the contentions of Mr. Nicholson and Mr. Parker in one way, and I am not opposed to the board issuing licenses. On the other hand, Parliament should not give the board the right to refuse a license when the Health Department's inspectors have passed the premises as suitable. I admit the necessity for control, but I do not agree with provisions that may lead to conflict between the Health Department and the board. A young man I know of selected a shop some 200 or 300 yards from any other milk selling place, and spent about £600 in fitting it up. When he applied for a license he was refused because there were other licensed people not far away. That is a restriction upon trade. The board should not have the right to refuse a license when the health authorities have declared the premises to be suitable for the purpose.

Hon. C. B. WILLIAMS: The party to which I belong is opposed to the granting of monopolies. We should not give people the sole right to conduct a particular trade in a particular street. Why should a man have to appeal to a magistrate because he has been refused a license? I do not believe in the restriction of trade and will support the amendment.

Hon. E. H. ANGELO: I am prepared to support the amendment. The board have no right to create vested interests. I know of a case similar to that mentioned by Mr. Macfarlane. If the board find that milk has been sold in unsuitable premises they can always apply to the health authorities for action to be taken. If these licenses are insisted upon much less milk will be sold.

Hon. L. CRAIG: I am surprised at the objection to the granting of licenses. Both Mr. Nicholson and Mr. Parker are working under a license.

Hon. H. S. W. PARKER: Our licenses cannot be refused if we comply with the law.

Hon. L. CRAIG: A license merely shows that the person concerned is a fit and proper

one to carry on trade. It is for the board to exercise its discretion in that respect. What are the Lumpers' Union or the Miners' Union but monopolies? It costs more to join their unions than to take out a milk license. No one objects to dairymen being licensed, or to the carters being licensed, but it is a case of hands off the shop milk vendor. The whole thing should be left to the discretion of the board. I oppose the amendment.

Hon. R. G. MOORE: I oppose the amendment. If members do not want this paragraph they ought to throw out the whole Bill. The milk industry was in a bad way until the board brought about the requisite improvements. We should not do anything to restrict the operations of the authority at present in control.

Hon. H. TUCKEY: As a result of the operations of the board the consumption of milk has increased by over half a million gallons. What better indication could there be of the efficacy of the present control?

Hon. J. NICHOLSON: The issuing of licenses will enable the board to say definitely that only certain persons in certain places may be milk shop vendors. The position is economically unsound, and calculated to create those monopolies that are associated with licensed premises generally. If any man wishes to become a vendor of milk from a shop he should be allowed to do so, provided the premises comply with the conditions laid down by the health authorities.

Hon. R. G. MOORE: Why should not we give the same liberty to the man with a horse and cart, provided his horse and cart and cans are clean?

Hon. J. NICHOLSON: I am merely seeking to give to the seller of milk the same right as is enjoyed by a grocer, a butcher or a boot and shoe salesman. If this motion is not carried, those who are vitally interested in the sale of milk will find they have made a mistake in leaving it to a board to license people only in such places as the board thinks fit.

Hon. C. B. WILLIAMS: If there are two shops in one suburb, one of which is licensed to sell milk and the other not, people who go to the shop for milk will get their other goods there, while the other shopkeeper will be ruined. Are we not here to see that every citizen gets a fair deal? Why give a monopoly to one person in any suburb or any town? I support the amendment.

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

Ayes	7
Noes	17
Majority against	10

AYES.

Hon. C. G. Elliott	Hon. C. B. Williams
Hon. J. M. Macfarlane	Hon. H. J. Yelland
Hon. J. Nicholson	Hon. E. H. Angelo
Hon. H. S. W. Parker	(Teller.)

NOES.

Hon. C. F. Baxter	Hon. V. Hamersley
Hon. A. M. Clydesdale	Hon. W. H. Kitson
Hon. J. Cornell	Hon. G. W. Miles
Hon. L. Craig	Hon. R. G. Moore
Hon. J. M. Drew	Hon. H. V. Piesse
Hon. J. T. Franklin	Hon. H. Tuckey
Hon. G. Fraser	Hon. C. H. Wittenoom
Hon. E. H. Gray	Hon. W. J. Mann
	(Teller.)

Amendment thus negatived.

The CHAIRMAN: The question is that Clause 8 stand as printed.

Hon. H. J. YELLAND: I have always supported the Milk Board in every possible way, and my vote just now was cast with a view to trying to improve the conditions. I move an amendment—

That a proviso be added after Subsections (c) and (d) of Section 27 of the principal Act as follows:—“Provided that notwithstanding anything contained in Section 27 of the principal Act, a license shall be issued under Sections (c) and (d) hereof if the premises comply with the conditions required under the Health Act.”

Hon. W. J. MANN: That is the same thing over again.

Hon. H. J. YELLAND: No.

Members: Yes.

Hon. H. J. YELLAND: If we increase the number of licenses, it follows that the consumption of milk will also be increased. The board now has a right to refuse a license, notwithstanding that the proposed licensee's premises are hygienic. We have no right to stop a man from selling milk if he complies with the conditions under which milk can be sold.

The HONORARY MINISTER: This is merely an attempt to amend the Bill in the way desired by the mover of the previous amendment. It is an attempt to accomplish something that the House has decided shall not be done. We have already spent 1½ hours in discussing this particular point, and I am not wasting any more time on the amendment. I hope the amendment will not be carried.

Hon. J. M. MACFARLANE: I felt some difficulty in casting my vote on the last amendment, but here I do not feel any difficulty at all. In my opinion the board are exceeding the powers given to them by Parliament. The board do not employ qualified inspectors, and the inspectorial work is carried out by the Health Department. I am of opinion that the board must grant a license to any shop that the Health Department certifies is suitable for the trade.

Hon. R. G. MOORE: I move—

That the Committee do now divide.

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

Ayes	14
Noes	7
Majority for	7

AYES.

Hon. A. M. Clydesdale	Hon. W. J. Mann
Hon. L. Craig	Hon. R. G. Moore
Hon. J. M. Drew	Hon. H. V. Piesse
Hon. C. G. Elliott	Hon. H. Tuckey
Hon. J. T. Franklin	Hon. C. B. Williams
Hon. G. Fraser	Hon. C. H. Wittenoom
Hon. W. H. Kitson	Hon. C. F. Baxter
	(Teller.)

NOES.

Hon. J. Cornell	Hon. H. S. W. Parker
Hon. V. Hamersley	Hon. H. J. Yelland
Hon. J. M. Macfarlane	Hon. L. B. Bolton
Hon. J. Nicholson	(Teller.)

Motion thus passed.

Amendment put and negatived.

Hon. W. J. MANN: I move an amendment:—

That the following be inserted to stand as paragraph (iv) in Subsection 1 of proposed new Section 21:—“No milk vendor's license shall be issued to a milk vendor who buys milk direct from a dairyman unless and until the applicant for the milk vendor's license lodges with the Board a fidelity bond in a form approved by the Board from an insurance company approved by the Treasurer of Western Australia for a sum equal to the amount which the Board estimates the dairyman should be paid by the milk vendor for the supply of one month's milk. Every such fidelity bond shall inter alia contain a provision indemnifying the dairyman against losses arising from any failure to pay or to account for any moneys payable to such dairyman by the milk vendor.”

This safeguard is desired by a number of people who have been victimised, and also by a number of retailers. In the case of the former the position is as I outlined on the second reading. Men included in the definition of “milk vendor” accept milk to be forwarded or supplied to consumers. Such

men go out and purchase milk, bring it in, and then undercut legitimate retailers.

Hon. J. M. Macfarlane: If the board desire that amendment, why have they not asked for it?

Hon. W. J. MANN: The board desire it. There is good precedent to be found for it in Victorian legislation. The Milk Board Act of Victoria (24 George V., No. 4183) provides in Section 26—

(1) Notwithstanding anything in section forty-eight of the Milk and Dairy Supervision Act, 1928, no license under Part II. of that Act in respect of a dairy within the metropolis, or in respect of any dairy outside the metropolis, from which milk purchased direct from a dairy farmer may be sold or distributed by retail in the metropolis shall be issued, unless and until the applicant for the license lodges with the Minister a fidelity bond in the prescribed form from some insurance company approved by the Treasurer of Victoria for Two hundred and fifty pounds or for such less sum as is approved by the Minister or, where the applicant is a company, of Five hundred pounds or such less sum as is approved by the Minister.

(2) Every such fidelity bond shall inter alia contain a provision indemnifying the owners of dairy farms against losses arising from any failure to pay or to account for any moneys payable to such owners by the applicant.

(3) Any person concerned may upon payment of a fee of Two shillings and sixpence to the Minister inspect the said bond and take a copy thereof.

(4) Any person may with the approval of the Board in writing sue upon any such bond for indemnity in respect of any loss covered by the said bond.

In Victoria, insurance companies issue a security bond—which is really a bond of solvency—in the sum of £250 at the rate of 15s. per cent. The premium on the bond is £1 17s. 6d., which is also the minimum.

The HONORARY MINISTER: I cannot accept the amendment. In many cases, I believe, the producer has been mulet. However, I am advised the position has materially improved during the last 12 months.

Hon. J. M. Macfarlane: And will do so during the next 12 months as well.

The HONORARY MINISTER: The inclusion of such a provision in the Bill was considered, but the position was not regarded as serious enough.

Hon. C. B. WILLIAMS: I support the amendment, having heard accounts of the conduct complained of. If objection is raised, the milk vendor transfers his custom.

Hon. J. M. Macfarlane: That cannot be done here, under the board.

Hon. C. B. WILLIAMS: I learn that it is done. I support the amendment.

Hon. H. V. PIESSE: If we are going to insist on bonds in every line of business, we shall reach an unfortunate stage.

Hon. H. S. W. Parker: We require bonds of auctioneers.

Hon. H. V. PIESSE: They are dealing with trust moneys, and the same argument applies to lawyers. I cannot support the amendment. Business men deal on 30 days' credit, and failing that they demand cash.

Hon. R. G. MOORE: I oppose the amendment. If we protect one, we should protect all. Why not require a bond to ensure that consumers pay? I do not think it is within our province to legislate in this direction.

Amendment put and negatived.

Clause put and passed.

Clauses 9 to 15—agreed to.

Clause 16—Amendment of Section 42:

Hon. W. J. MANN: The clause will extend the operation of the Act for one year. Last night I suggested that in the light of two years' experience the measure should be made permanent. The Honorary Minister has intimated that he must insist on the clause. If the Act were made permanent, it could be amended at any time, and some security would be given to the board, who could frame a long-range policy. I move an amendment—

That all the words after "is" be struck out, and the word "repealed" inserted in lieu.

The HONORARY MINISTER: I regret that I cannot accept the amendment. Consideration has been given to the point, but as this legislation is still in the experimental stage, the Government feel that extension for one year would be advisable.

Hon. H. V. PIESSE: I support the amendment. The board have done excellent work and the Act should be made permanent. It could still be amended at any time.

Hon. J. NICHOLSON: The views of the Honorary Minister should appeal to members. While this legislation is in the experimental stage, it should not be made permanent. I direct attention to the Title, which indicates that the Bill is designed to amend and continue the Act.

Hon. H. TUCKEY: This legislation has passed the experimental stage, and although

I would have preferred an extension for three years, I will support the amendment.

Hon. H. J. YELLAND: When we look back over the past we find that we have had quite a number of Bills for experimental legislation coming before the House, as for instance the original Dried Fruits Bill, which although it became an Act it has had to be extended from year to year ever since, and is still on the statute-book as a temporary measure.

Hon. H. V. PIESSE: There were certain doubts about the Bill.

Hon. H. J. YELLAND: There is the same doubt about this Bill.

Hon. H. V. PIESSE: There is no doubt at all about this Bill.

Hon. H. J. YELLAND: It would be unwise to allow this legislation to go out of our hands until it has proved itself. I will oppose the amendment.

Hon. C. H. WITTENOOM: I, too, will oppose the amendment. The Act contains many complicated problems and is still in the experimental stage. So it would be a pity to have it continued for three years.

Hon. H. V. PIESSE: This legislation has proved itself since it has been carried on for two years, and with the amendments that have been put forward to-night, we should have a perfect measure. I support the Bill, because I realise it is for the benefit of the producers of milk.

Hon. J. CORNELL: I ask the Committee to go warily with this amendment. The Bill is by no means analogous to the Dried Fruits Act. To say that the parent Act has proved itself is begging the question, because there is not very much of the parent Act left, and the Bill is not so much for continuing what remains of the parent Act as for introducing an experimental departure from the parent Act.

Amendment put and negatived.

Clause put and passed.

Clauses 17 and 18—agreed to.

Title—agreed to.

Bill reported without amendment, and the report adopted.

Third Reading.

Bill read a third time, and *passé*.

BILL—ELECTORAL.

In Committee.

Resumed from the previous day. Mr. Nicholson in the Chair; the Chief Secretary in charge of the Bill.

Postponed Clause 130 (partly considered):

Hon. J. CORNELL: I move an amendment—

That after "paper" in line 1 of paragraph (a) the words "under Section 81" be inserted.

Amendment put and passed.

Hon. J. CORNELL: I move a further amendment—

That after the words "written on" in line 6 of paragraph (a) insert "a postal vote ballot paper or."

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

Postponed Clause 82:

Hon. J. CORNELL: I move an amendment—

That in line 2 the words "this division" be struck out and "Section 81" inserted in lieu.

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

Postponed Clause 83—Security:

Hon. J. CORNELL: I move an amendment—

That in lines 3 and 4 the words "seventy-seven, seventy-nine and" be struck out.

Amendment put and passed.

Hon. J. CORNELL: I move an amendment—

That in line 4 of paragraph (c) after "voters" the words "under Section 81" be inserted.

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

Postponed Clause 124:

Hon. J. CORNELL: I move an amendment—

That in line 4 of paragraph (c) after "voters" the words "under Section 81" be inserted.

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

Postponed Clause 126—Opening boxes for counting the votes:

Hon. J. CORNELL: I move an amendment—

That in line 2 of paragraph (a) after "voters" the words "under Section 81" be inserted.

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

Postponed Clause 127—The officers count the votes in the respective boxes which they open:

Hon. J. CORNELL: I move an amendment—

That at the end of Subclause 1 the words "under Section 81" be inserted.

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

Hon. J. CORNELL: That concludes the consideration of the Bill so far as I am concerned, except for the recommittal. Now we come to a very serious part of the Bill. I was not present when this matter was dealt with, otherwise I should have voted against the action that was taken. The whole of Clause 18, which deals with qualifications and disqualifications of electors, was deleted. The qualifications and disqualifications regarding the Legislative Council are provided for in the Constitution Act, but in deleting the whole of the clause the Committee deleted the qualifications and disqualifications for the Legislative Assembly, which are not provided for in the Constitution. It will be necessary to restore to the Bill the portion that relates to the Legislative Assembly. We could deal with the matter on recommittal, but it would be preferable to deal with the matter at this stage in the form of a new clause.

The CHAIRMAN: When the matter was dealt with it was understood that it would be necessary to reinstate part of Clause 18 to restore the portion relating to the Legislative Assembly.

New clause:

Hon. J. CORNELL: I move an amendment—

That a new clause to stand as Clause 18 be inserted as follows:—"Part III.—Enrolment, Division 1—Qualification of Electors for the Assembly.

(1) Subject to the disqualifications herein-after set out, every person not under twenty-one years of age who—

(a) is a natural born or a naturalised subject of His Majesty; and

(b) has lived in Western Australia for six months continuously at least; and

(c) has lived in the district for which he claims to be enrolled for at least a continuous period of one month immediately preceding the date of his claim. shall be entitled, subject to the provisions of this Act, to be enrolled as an elector, and when

enrolled, and so long as he continues to live in the district for which he is enrolled (and subject to the conditions stated in subsection (2) of section nineteen after he has ceased to live in the district) to vote at any polling place for the district at the election of a member of the Assembly for that district.

(2) For the purposes of this Act a person shall be deemed to have lived within the district wherein he has his usual place of abode, notwithstanding his occasional absence from such district.

(3) Any member of the Legislative Assembly, and the wife of any member of the Legislative Assembly, may claim to be enrolled for the district represented by such member and when so enrolled shall be deemed to live in such district.

(4) A person shall not be entitled to be enrolled at the same time on more than one Assembly roll."

That simply means that we replace what was struck out in regard to the Legislative Assembly qualifications and disqualifications.

New clause put and passed.

Bill again reported with further amendments.

Further Recommittal.

On motion by Hon. J. Cornell, Bill again recommitted for the purpose of further considering Clauses 3, 5, 20, 25, 36, 41, 50, 51, 62, new Clauses 79, 84, and 89, and Clauses 137 and 149.

In Committee.

Hon. J. Nicholson in the Chair: the Chief Secretary in charge of the Bill.

Clause 3—Arrangement into parts and divisions:

Hon. J. CORNELL: I move an amendment—

That in line 21 the words "voting in absence" be struck out, and "by post" inserted in lieu.

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

Clause 5—Interpretation:

Hon. J. CORNELL: I move an amendment—

That in the interpretation of "absent votes" all the words after "fifty-one" be struck out, and the following inserted in lieu:—"Pursuant to Section 81 or who votes under the provisions of Section 81."

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

Clause 20—Disqualifications:

Hon. E. H. ANGELO: In the absence of Mr. Holmes, I move an amendment—

That after "Australia" in subparagraph (iii) of paragraph (c) the words "living within the South-West Division of the State as described in the Land Act, 1933," be inserted.

The amendment will include any half-blood resident in the South-West Division. The three members of the North Province were opposed to the inclusion of half-bloods in the North, but South-West members claimed that quite a number of half-castes living there should be given the right. I do not think that any half-blood in the North has asked to get on the roll, but without the amendment a canvasser might at the last moment get them to lodge claims and trouble would be caused.

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

Clause 25—Names to be inscribed from existing rolls:

Hon. H. SEDDON: I move an amendment—

That after "Insane" of subparagraph (i) of paragraph (b) the words "the Registrar of Titles" be inserted.

This will enable information to be obtained of persons disqualified to remain on the roll.

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

Clause 36—Inspection of rolls by the public:

Hon. H. SEDDON: I move an amendment—

That the following subclause be inserted:—

(2) During the period between the printing of the roll and the printing of a supplementary or new roll, lists showing—

- (i) all names struck off;
- (ii) all alterations to; and
- (iii) all names added to

the roll for a province or district, together with the particulars relative thereto as set out in section twenty-seven shall be made at the end of each month, and shall be kept for public inspection without fee at the registrar's office on any week day during the hours the office is open.

In order that the public might be acquainted with the changes I am suggesting that lists be typed and posted at the office of the registrar.

Hon. C. B. Williams drew attention to the state of the Committee.

Bells rung and a quorum formed.

Clause 36, as amended, agreed to.

Clause 41:

Hon. J. CORNELL: I am not proposing to move the amendment appearing on the Notice Paper.

Clause put and passed.

Clause 50:

Hon. H. SEDDON: I move an amendment—

That the following words be added at the end of Subclause 1 of Clause 50:—

Provided that if the claim is for enrolment of an elector for a Province in respect of:—

- (a) a registered legal or equitable freehold estate in land; or
- (b) a registered leasehold estate in land; or
- (c) the occupation of a dwelling-house; or
- (d) enrolment as an elector on the roll of a municipality or road district,

the registrar shall compare the claim with information obtained from the certificate of title or other evidence of registration, and in the case of—

- (i) a leasehold estate;
- (ii) the occupation of a dwelling-house; or
- (iii) enrolment as a municipal or road board elector,

he shall compare the claim with the annual value assessed by the current valuation under the Municipal Corporations Act, 1906, or the Road Districts Act, 1919-1933, as the case may be, or, if there is no such valuation, with the annual value at which such leasehold estate or dwelling-house would be assessed on a valuation under those Acts respectively.

And if the registrar is not satisfied that the claimant is entitled to be enrolled, the provisions of subsection (3) of this section shall apply.

The amendment gives the Electoral Registrar something to which he may refer when he is determining the right of an elector to be enrolled for the Legislative Council.

Hon. J. CORNELL: I hope the mover will not press this amendment, because it is practically unworkable. The registrar at, say, Boulder, has not access to titles. The only registrar who has is the registrar in the metropolitan area.

Hon. H. S. W. Parker: Could he not act by his agent?

Hon. J. CORNELL: The position is that if a registrar, on receipt of a complaint, is not satisfied, he shall forthwith refer the claim, with such observations as he thinks fit, to the Chief Electoral Officer for decision.

Hon. H. Seddon: That is not sufficient for me.

Hon. J. CORNELL: The hon. member will not achieve anything if the amendment

is carried. It is waste of time inserting it in the Bill. How can the hon. member expect the registrar for the North Province, who I understand is at Broome, to have access to freehold and leasehold titles? If he receives a claim card and is not satisfied to put the man on the roll, his duty is to send the card to the only place where the information can be obtained—the office of the Chief Electoral Officer.

Hon. H. SEDDON: My reason for moving the amendment is the experience I have had with different registrars. Under the Bill as it stands, a registrar will satisfy himself by doing nothing. Before the registrar can be satisfied, he must obtain certain information. Under the amendment he can satisfy himself, and must satisfy himself, before placing the applicant's name on the roll. Under the present system, the registrar in the end accepts names *holus bolus*.

Hon. J. CORNELL: Unless the Chief Electoral Officer is to supply each district registrar with the information specified, the amendment is useless. It does not say that the Chief Electoral Officer "shall" supply the information. If Mr. Seddon could indicate means by which electoral registrars could be supplied with the necessary information frequently, then an electoral registrar would be able to act. Under the existing Act an electoral registrar has no power to send on an application to the Chief Electoral Registrar for decision. Under the Bill he has that power.

Amendment put and passed.

Clause, as amended, agreed to.

Clause 51—Objections to enrolment:

On motions by Hon. J. Cornell, in Subclause 22, the words "in absence," line 6, struck out, and after the words "relating to," line 7, "postal votes or" inserted.

Clause 62—Form of Writ:

Hon. J. CORNELL: At a previous Committee the provision in Subclause 5 that the date fixed for the polling shall not be more than 60 days was altered to 30 days. I have since conferred with the Chief Secretary and the Chief Electoral Officer, and I have ascertained that the provision for 60 days was inserted deliberately. For the North Province and the four northern seats, 90 days are allowed between the issue and the return of the writ; for the South, North-Eastern and Central Provinces, 75

days are allowed, and 60 days are provided for the remaining provinces. The Constitution Act includes machinery for an extension of the date should the writ not be returnable within the specified period, but there is no such machinery in respect of the return of a Council writ. In view of the representations made to me, we should restore the provision for the 60 days, and I move an amendment—

That in line 2 of paragraph (a) of Subclause 5 the figures "30," inserted at a previous Committee, be struck out, and the figures "60" inserted in lieu.

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

New Clause 79:

Hon. J. CORNELL: Last night we inserted a new clause to stand as Clause 89, which provided that no postal vote should be taken after 6 o'clock in the afternoon next preceding the polling day. Several members have pointed out that probable abuses will arise through votes being taken, and the claim being advanced that they were taken before 6 o'clock. The matter can be overcome by amending Subclause (6) of new Clause 79 so as to make the position more definite. I move an amendment—

That in Subclause 6 the words "close of the poll" be struck out and the following inserted in lieu:—"hour of six o'clock on the afternoon of the day preceding polling day."

Hon. H. V. PIESSE: I am not in favour of the amendment. There are many occasions when it is necessary to send out postal vote officers in order to get in the postal votes.

Hon. J. CORNELL: I cannot see that the amendment will cause any hardship to any elector. The collection of postal votes is more of a nuisance than a blessing. The amendment will tend to tighten up postal votes.

Hon. W. J. Mann: It will prohibit it in some places.

Hon. J. CORNELL: Very often postal votes are used so that votes may be obtained from people who have refused to go to the poll. The only way to stop that is by closing the time for the receipt of postal votes the day before the poll. It cannot be helped if a few sick people are affected by this amendment.

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

New Clause 89:

Hon. J. CORNELL: This clause says that no postal vote shall be taken after 8 o'clock. We have just decided when postal votes may be taken. I hope this new clause will be struck out.

New clause put and negatived.

Clause 84—Chief Electoral Officer to decide whether ballot paper to be put forward for scrutiny and counting:

Hon. J. CORNELL: I move an amendment—

That after "voter" in line 2 the words "under Section eighty-one" be inserted.

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

Clauses 137 and 149—agreed to.

Hon. J. CORNELL: I have given this Bill considerable attention and have pointed out necessary consequential amendments. I have prepared a Bill to amend the Constitution to make it apply, with minor exceptions, to that part of this Bill dealing with the qualifications and disqualifications of electors for the Council. Whatever the state of the measure may be eventually, I shall have no regrets, as I feel that I have done my part reasonably well.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: I should like an assurance from the hon. member that the Bill is now in order and is fit to be passed.

Hon. J. CORNELL: It is in order, except that the clauses will need to be numbered properly by the clerk, and the numerical references adjusted.

Bill again reported with further amendments.

ADJOURNMENT—SPECIAL.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: I move—

That the House at its rising adjourn until Tuesday next.

Question put and passed.

House adjourned at 12.27 a.m. (Friday).

Legislative Assembly,

Thursday, 5th December, 1935.

	PAGE
Questions: Secession petition, as to Federal action	2246
Wheat-carting subsidy	2246
Leave of absence	2247
Motion: Standing Orders suspension	2247
Resolution: State Forests, message	2247
Bills: Wheat and Wheat Products, 1A.	2246
Railways Classification Board Act Amendment, report, 3A.	2247
Bulk Handling, 2R., to refer to Select Committee, Com.	2247
Adelphi Hotel, returned	2247
Public Service Act Amendment, returned	2247
Public Service Appeal Board Act Amendment, returned	2247
Industrial Arbitration Act Amendment (No. 2), returned with amendments	2247
Constitution Acts Amendment Act, 1899, Amendment (No. 2), 1R.	2247
Adjournment, special	2247

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

QUESTION—SECESSION PETITION.

As to Federal Action.

Mr. SAMPSON asked the Premier: 1, With reference to the question asked by the Leader of the Opposition on the 24th October, 1935, is it the intention of the Government to request the Commonwealth Government to signify their assent to the reception of the Secession petition by the British Parliament? 2, If so, will such request be made in time to permit of supporting action by our representatives in the Federal Parliament before the end of the present sittings?

The PREMIER replied: 1 and 2, The matter is being considered in accordance with my promise to a deputation which waited upon me on the 27th November, 1935.

QUESTION—WHEAT CARTING SUBSIDY.

Mr. SEWARD asked the Minister for Lands: Is it the intention of the Government to pay the wheat carting subsidy in the Lakes King-Carnody area this year?

The MINISTER FOR LANDS replied: No.

BILL—WHEAT AND WHEAT PRODUCTS.

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